MEMORANDUM REPORT NO. 237

TRAFFIC STUDY FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE IN THE CITY OF FRANKLIN

MILWAUKEE COUNTY WISCONSIN

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

KENOSHA COUNTY

Steve Bostrom
Aloysius Nelson
Robert W. Pitts

RACINE COUNTY

Mike Dawson
James A. Ladwig
Peggy L. Shumway

MILWAUKEE COUNTY

Brian R. Dranzik
William R. Drew,
Treasurer
Theodore Lipscomb, Sr.

WALWORTH COUNTY

Charles L. Colman,
Chairman
Nancy Russell,
Vacant

OZAUKEE COUNTY

Thomas H. Buestrin
Jennifer Rothstein
Gus W. Wirth, Jr.,
Secretary

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Jeffrey D. Schleif
Daniel S. Schmidt
David L. Stroik

WAUKESHA COUNTY

Michael A. Crowley,
Vice-Chairman
José M.Delgado
James T. Dwyer

CITY OF FRANKLIN COMMON COUNCIL MEMBERS

Steve Olson.....Mayor

Mark A. Dandrea .....Alderman, District 1

Daniel M. Mayer .....Alderman, District 2

Kristen Wilhelm .....Alderwoman, District 3

Steve F. Taylor.....Alderman, District 4

Mike Barber .....Alderman, District 5

John R. Nelson.....Alderman, District 6

City of Franklin Engineer

Glen Morrow

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF

Michael G. Hahn, PE, PH.....Executive Director

Kevin J. Muhs.....Deputy Director

Stephen P. Adams.....Public Involvement and Outreach Manager

Christopher T. Hiebert, PE.....Chief Transportation Engineer

Laura L. Herrick, PE, CFM .....Chief Environmental Engineer

Elizabeth A. Larsen, SPHR .....Assistant Director-Administration

Eric D. Lynde.....Chief Special Project Planner

Benjamin R. McKay .....Chief Community Assistance Planner

Rob W. Merry, PLS.....Chief Surveyor

David A. Schilling .....Chief Land Use Planner

Dr. Thomas M. Slawski .....Chief Biologist

Special acknowledgment is due Mr. Ryan W. Hoel, PE, SEWRPC Deputy Chief Transportation Engineer, and Mr. Joshua Depies, SEWRPC Engineer, for their contributions to the preparation of this report.

MEMORANDUM REPORT No. 237

TRAFFIC STUDY FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE IN THE CITY OF FRANKLIN

Milwaukee County, Wisconsin

Prepared by the

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
W239 N1812 Rockwood Drive
P.O. Box 1607
Waukesha, WI 53187-1607
www.sewrpc.org

The preparation of this publication was financed in part through planning funds provided by the Federal Highway and Federal Transit Administrations of the U.S. Department of Transportation and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of these agencies.

August 2017

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Federal Transit Administration

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF MAPS

SEWRPC Memorandum Report No. 237

TRAFFIC STUDY FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE IN THE CITY OF FRANKLIN

INTRODUCTION

The City of Franklin requested that the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission conduct a traffic engineering study for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue to address vehicle delay and queue length issues experienced during student arrival and departure times at Franklin High School during the school year. The study area is shown on Map 1. Specifically, the study consisted of an analysis of the operation of the existing all-way stop control at the intersection based on current and forecast future traffic conditions, and the identification and evaluation of potential improvements to the operation of the intersection to accommodate both current and future traffic conditions. Potential improvements included an all-way stop controlled intersection with additional lanes at each approach, a traffic signal with right- and left-turn lanes at each approach, a traffic signal with left-turn lanes at each approach, and a single-lane roundabout. The potential improvements were evaluated based on their ability to address vehicle delay and queueing at the intersection, as well as based on their cost and impacts to adjacent right-of-way.

This report documents the process and findings of the traffic engineering study, including inventories of the existing conditions and physical characteristics, the evaluation of current operating conditions, and the identification and evaluation of alternatives to be considered by the City of Franklin for implementation. At the request of City of Franklin officials, the last section of the report describes a potential process for involving the public in the study process.

INVENTORY

This section documents the existing conditions at and near the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue, including existing land uses and features adjacent to the intersection, existing physical characteristics of the intersection, such as lane, shoulder, and right-of-way widths; current volumes entering the intersection (including bicycle and pedestrian volumes and truck/bus volumes), current vehicle turning movements within the intersection, and vehicle crashes (including crashes involving pedestrians, bicyclists, and school buses). In addition, this section documents forecast year 2050 entering and turning movement volumes developed by Commission staff based on forecast population and employment levels under the adopted year 2050 regional land use and transportation plan (VISION 2050).

Land Uses Proximate to the Intersection

Map 2 shows the existing land uses proximate to the intersection of S. 51st Street and West Drexel Avenue. The northeast quadrant of the intersection is predominately low- to medium-density[1] residential development, though this area

---

[1] *Low-density residential developments are characterized by a density of 0.7 to 2.2 dwelling units per acre and medium-density residential developments are characterized by a density of 2.3 to 6.9 dwelling units per acre.*

Map 1

STUDY AREA OF THE INTERSECTION OF 51ST STREET/DREXEL AVENUE

EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY

N

0 30 60 90 120 150
Feet

Source: SEWRPC.

Map 2

EXISTING LAND USE AREA IN THE INTERSECTION OF 51ST STREET/DREXEL AVENUE: 2010



Source: SEWRPC.

also includes Pleasant View Elementary School. The northwest quadrant of the intersection is dominated by the Payne and Dolan quarry. The southwest quadrant is predominately medium-density residential development. The southeast quadrant includes Franklin High School and medium-density residential development, located east of the high school.

Franklin High School

Franklin High School, which has direct access to S. 51st Street, has over 1,500 students enrolled and employs about 175 faculty and staff members. Classes at Franklin high School begin at 7:20 a.m. and end at 2:34 p.m. As provided by the Franklin School District, transportation to and from school each day includes approximately 25 school buses to drop-off students in the morning before school and 29 buses to pick-up students in the afternoon after school. About 400 additional students not using the bus are dropped off in the morning and about 100 students not using the bus[2] are picked up in the afternoon when school ends at 2:34 p.m. Students are also allowed to park on campus with a parking pass. About 340 parking passes have been purchased. In addition, students can park along W. Drexel Avenue east and west of S. 51st Street.

Pleasant View Elementary School

Pleasant View Elementary School is located within the residential area northeast of the intersection. It has about 500 students enrolled and employs about 65 faculty and staff members. Classes at Pleasant View Elementary School begin at 8:30 a.m. and end at 3:15 p.m.

Residential Land Use Conflicts with Intersection

As shown on Map 3, there are five driveways and one intersecting roadway located within the functional area[3] of the intersection. The proximity of driveways and intersecting roadways to an intersection can affect its operation. Vehicles entering and exiting such driveways and intersecting roadways can conflict with the stopping maneuver of vehicles approaching the intersection. In addition, queueing at the intersection may impact the access of vehicles entering and existing the driveways and intersecting roadways, particularly those driveways and roadways closest to the intersection.

Existing Roadway and Intersection Characteristics

The existing cross-sections for W. Drexel Avenue and S. 51st Street are shown in Figure 1. W. Drexel Avenue is a two-lane arterial roadway with two 12-foot wide traffic lanes and two 8-foot wide paved shoulders east and west of S. 51st Street. Parking is generally permitted on W. Drexel Avenue, with the exception of the south side of the roadway west of S. 51st Street and the north side of the roadway east of S. 51st Street where parking is prohibited during school hours. W. Drexel Avenue has an overall right-of-way width of 125 feet east of S. 51st Street and 78 feet to 98 feet west of S. 51st Street.

S. 51st Street is a two-lane arterial roadway with two 12-foot wide traffic lanes, along with two 8-foot wide paved shoulders south of W. Drexel Avenue and two 6- to 8-foot wide shoulders (4-foot wide paved shoulders with 2- to 4-foot wide gravel shoulders) north of W. Drexel Avenue. Parking is generally permitted on S. 51st Street, except during school hours. S. 51st Street has an overall right-of-way width of 120 feet south of W. Drexel Avenue and 74 feet north of W. Drexel Avenue.

---

[2] *The significant decrease in dropping offs of students not using the bus between the morning and the picking up of students in the afternoon is likely due to students either using a different means of leaving the school (such as by bus or walking) or remaining at the school for extra-curricular activities.*

[3] *The functional area for an all-way stopped controlled intersection is determined upstream by the distance needed for storage and the deceleration of vehicles (sum of distance for lane storage, deceleration of vehicle, and reaction of driver) and downstream by the distance needed for vehicles travelling through the intersection to have sufficient distance to stop to avoid vehicles entering/exiting roadway.*

Map 3

DRIVEWAYS AND CROSS-ROADWAYS IN THE FUNCTIONAL AREA OF THE ROADWAY[a]

Driveways in functional area of intersection

Roadways in functional area of intersection

Functional Area

N

0 25 50 75 100 Feet

[a]The functional area of the roadway shown on this map represents the typical functional area without excessive congestion. The functional area can change depending upon the amount of congestion (or vehicle queuing) that occurs. For example, depending on the approach and the peak period, the functional area can be 50 to 100 feet longer than what is shown on this map, with the south leg of S. 51st Street being nearly 400 feet longer during the morning peak period.

Source: SEWRPC.

Figure 1

EXISTING TYPICAL CROSS-SECTIONS FOR W. DREXEL AVENUE AND S. 51ST STREET

W. Drexel Avenue

East of 51st Street



West of 51st Street



S. 51st Street

North of Drexel Avenue



South of Drexel Avenue



Source: SEWRPC.

The intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue is all-way stop controlled (AWSC)—having stop signs located on all four legs of the intersection. A diagram of the existing lane configuration is provided on Figure 2. The north leg of the intersection (S. 51st Street) has a 12-foot wide shared through/left-turn lane and a 9-foot wide right-turn lane with no storage and a 100-foot long taper. The south leg of the intersection (S. 51st Street) has a 12-foot wide shared through/left-turn lane and a 10-foot wide right-turn lane with no storage and a 160-foot long taper. While there is no storage for right turning vehicles in the right-turn lanes, the existing shoulder is wide enough that it can be used for storage of right-turning vehicles, thus operating as "de facto" right-turn lanes. The east leg of the intersection (W. Drexel Avenue) has a 12-foot wide through/left-turn lane and an 11-foot wide right-turn lane with 110 feet of storage and a 40-foot long taper. The west leg of the intersection (W. Drexel Avenue) has a 12-foot wide through/left-turn lane and an 11-foot wide right-turn lane with 180 feet of storage and an 80-foot long taper.

Current Traffic Approaching Volumes and Turning Movements

The traffic volume and turning movements at the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue were collected, by Commission staff, utilizing video collection equipment from 11:00 a.m. on Monday, October 31, 2016 through 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, November 3, 2016. During this period, the volume and turning movements of vehicles (including trucks, buses, and bicycles travelling on the roadway) were documented. In addition, the number of pedestrians and bicyclists crossing the roadway at the intersection was also collected as part of the turning movement study.[4] For the purpose of the study, the traffic volumes on Tuesday, November 1, 2016, and Wednesday, November 2, 2016, were used to evaluate the performance of the existing intersection, and to develop and evaluate potential alternative intersection improvements to address existing intersection delay and vehicle queueing. This set of data represents two complete days' of traffic volumes, and other operational data and is representative of the traffic volume experienced at the intersection on an average weekday. Figure 3 shows the total traffic volume approaching the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue on an average weekday. The total average weekday traffic volume entering the intersection is about 14,600 vehicles. The average weekday traffic volume entering the intersection is relatively balanced among the four approaches ranging from about 3,400 to about 3,900 vehicles. Figure 3 also shows the turning movement at the intersection during an average weekday.

Based on the data collected, the average weekday traffic volume on W. Drexel Avenue ranges from about 6,900 to about 7,100 and on S. 51st Street from about 7,500 to about 7,700. These volumes are below the existing design capacity of the two roadways of 14,000 vehicles per average weekday. Thus, the existing two traffic lanes along each roadway is sufficient for existing traffic volume.

Nearly all of the vehicles approaching the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue on an average weekday, about 98 percent, are automobiles or light-duty trucks (such as pick-up trucks, sport-utility vehicles, or vans). Medium-and heavy-duty trucks and buses represent a relatively small portion of the total vehicles approaching the intersection—about two percent. Figure 4 shows the number of medium- and heavy-duty trucks and buses on the four approaches, which represents about two to three percent of the total vehicles on these approaches.

About 34 bicyclists (representing less than a half percent of the total approaching traffic) approached the intersection on an average weekday.[5]

---

[4] *Bicyclists utilizing the roadway were counted as vehicles and bicyclists utilizing crosswalks were counted as pedestrians.*

[5] *The 34 bicyclists approaching the intersection on an average weekday is based on the number of bicyclists measured on Tuesday, November 1, 2016. As only three bicyclists were observed approaching the intersection on Wednesday, November 2, 2016 (likely due to rainfall that day), only the bicyclists observed on November 1st were included in the total average weekday traffic volume.*

Figure 2

EXISTING LANE CONFIGURATION FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE



Source: SEWRPC.

Figure 3

AVERAGE WEEKDAY TOTAL TRAFFIC APPROACHING AND TURNING MOVEMENTS IN THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: NOVEMBER 1 AND 2, 2016



Source SEWRPC.

As shown in Figure 5, there are three peak hour periods of traffic volume approaching the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue on an average weekday:

- Morning Peak (6:45 a.m. to 7:45 a.m.) coinciding with the Franklin High School start time at 7:20 a.m.;
- After School Peak (2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.) coinciding with the Franklin High School end time at 2:34 p.m.; and
- Evening Peak (4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.).

The morning and evening peaks are consistent with the two peaks in traffic volumes that are typical for arterial roadways, as a majority of workers travel to and from work during these times. However, the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue experiences a third peak due to the proximity of Franklin High School and the school ending its day in the early afternoon. The morning peak hour experiences a sharp peak in traffic volume between 7:00 a.m. and 7:15 a.m., which represents about 32.8 percent (or 452 vehicles) of the 1,380 total vehicles approaching the intersection during the morning peak period. This sharp peak in traffic contributes to the severe delays and long queues that are generally experienced at the intersection for a short period of time during the morning peak hour. This results in a peak hour factor[6] (PHF) of 0.76 for the morning peak period. In contrast the after school peak and evening peak hours experience high but steady traffic volumes among the four 15-minute periods, likely resulting in more moderate delays and length of queues over a longer period of time. The PHF for these peak hours are 0.93 and 0.97, respectively.

Figure 6 shows the total traffic approaching the intersection, and the turning movements within the intersection, under each of the three identified peak hours. Unlike the total volume approaching the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue throughout the entire weekday, the amount of volume approaching the intersection is not balanced among the four approaches. In addition, the amount of volume carried by each approach varies between the three peak periods. Similarly, the proportion of turning movements varies between the three peak periods, particularly between the morning peak and the two afternoon peak periods.

[6] *PHF is a measure of flow variation during the peak hour ranging from 0.25 to 1.00. A low PHF indicates a sharp peak of traffic volumes within the highest or peak 15-minute period within the peak hour as compared to the other three 15-minute periods, while a higher PHF indicates more uniform or steady traffic volumes over the peak hour. It is unusual for a PHF to be below a value of 0.70.*

Figure 4

AVERAGE WEEKDAY MEDIUM- AND HEAVY-DUTY TRUCK AND BUS VOLUME APPROACHING THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: NOVEMBER 1 AND 2, 2016



Source SEWRPC.

Pedestrians

Figure 7 shows the number of pedestrians (including bicyclists crossing the roadway within the crosswalks) that utilized the intersection during the average weekday. As the pedestrian counts from November 2, 2016, were likely impacted by rain, only the 46 pedestrians observed utilizing the intersection on Tuesday, November 1, 2016, are shown on Figure 7. The high temperature for November 1, 2016, was about 77 degrees Fahrenheit. While the pedestrian traffic on this day may not be considered representative of an average weekday (which would include pedestrian traffic during inclement weather), Commission staff thought it appropriate to evaluate the intersection based on pedestrian traffic volumes measured during good weather conditions. About half of the pedestrians crossing the roadway at the intersection utilized the only existing crosswalk located on the east leg. While parking is permitted on the north side of W. Drexel Avenue west of the intersection, parking was observed only along the south side of W. Drexel Avenue east of the intersection on days that Commission staff were present at the intersection. The pedestrian traffic would not include any persons walking from this location to Franklin High School.

Future Traffic Volumes and Turning Movements

Commission staff utilized the Commission's fifth-generation travel simulation model[7] to prepare forecast year 2050 average weekday traffic volumes and turning movements for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue. The forecast was developed based on the planned population and employment growth and transportation improvements recommended in VISION 2050—the adopted year 2050 regional land use and transportation plan for Southeastern Wisconsin. The forecast year 2050 average weekday traffic volumes approaching the intersection of

[7] *The Commission has, for over 50 years, maintained and refined traffic forecasting and simulation models, similar to ones used by other metropolitan transportation planning organizations across the country. The forecasting and simulation of existing and future travel demand through travel simulation models is a complex procedure requiring development and application of a variety of mathematical models. The simulation of travel and traffic is based upon the premise that the magnitude and pattern of travel is a stable function of the characteristics of the land use pattern and of the transportation system, with the term land use referring to not only land use types and intensity, but also to population, household, and employment levels and characteristics. The fifth-generation travel simulation and forecasting models used in the development of the recently completed year 2050 regional land use and transportation plan (*VISION 2050*) were validated by comparing the model-estimated travel and traffic—based on inventoried 2000 and 2010 demographic, economic, and land use data and 2001/2002 and 2011/2012 transportation survey data—to estimate existing year 2001 and 2011 traffic volumes.*

Figure 5

TOTAL VEHICLE AVERAGE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC VOLUME APPROACHING THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE BY 15-MINUTE PERIODS: NOVEMBER 1 AND 2, 2016



Source: SEWRPC.

Figure 6

TOTAL APPROACHING AVERAGE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC VOLUME AND TURNING MOVEMENT AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE DURING THE MORNING, AFTER SCHOOL, AND EVENING PEAK PERIODS: NOVEMBER 1 AND 2, 2016



Source: SEWRPC.

S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue, along with the forecast turning movements of the intersection, over a 24-hour period and during the three identified peak hour periods are shown in Figure 8.

Based on the forecast year 2050 traffic conditions, the average weekday traffic volume in the year 2050 is estimated to range from about 9,000 to about 9,500 vehicles on W. Drexel Avenue and is estimated to be about 10,000 vehicles on S. 51st Street. These volumes are below the design capacity of the two roadways of 14,000 vehicles per average weekday. Thus, the existing two traffic lanes along each roadway is sufficient for year 2050 traffic volume and is consistent with the recommendations for each roadway in VISION 2050.

Figure 7

PEDESTRIAN AVERAGE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC UTILIZING THE INTERSECTION OF N. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: NOVEMBER 1, 2016[a]



[a]Pedestrian use of the intersection on November 2, 2016, was not included as the number of pedestrians on that day—22—was likely affected by rain.

Source: SEWRPC.

Current and Future Year 2050 Intersection Operating Conditions

When traffic volumes exceed the design capacity of an intersection, it experiences congestion. Typically, congestion occurs during the peak traffic times on an average weekday. Congestion at a controlled intersection can result in longer delays and queueing. The operation of an intersection is typically demonstrated by its level-of-service (LOS), which is determined by the average delay experienced at the intersection. Table 1 shows the LOS thresholds for the unsignalized (all-way stop and roundabout) and traffic signal controlled intersections. Generally, a LOS of A through C is considered acceptable for an intersection. When traffic volume exceeds the design capacity of an intersection, it can increase the delay experienced by the vehicles approaching the intersection and result in the backing-up, or queuing, of vehicles. A LOS of D through F represents congested conditions, with a LOS of F representing a breakdown in the operation of the intersection. The operation of the current all-way stop control for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue was analyzed with the HCS 2010 software program for each of the peak-hour periods under both existing and future year 2050 traffic conditions.

Figures 9 and 10 show the vehicle delay and associated level-of-service for each lane and approach for the three peak hours under existing and future traffic conditions. Based on the evaluation, the intersection operates under a LOS of F during the morning peak hour and a LOS of D during the after school and evening peak hours under existing traffic conditions. With respect to future year 2050 traffic volumes, the intersection is estimated to operate at a LOS of F during all three peak hours.

The average length of queued vehicles can be estimated based on the average delay estimated for each lane and approach. Table 2 shows the queue length that is estimated for each lane and approach for each of the three peak periods under both existing and future year 2050 traffic conditions. The northbound approach has the highest estimated queue length of all the lanes during the morning and after-school peak periods with a queue length of 19 and 12 vehicles, respectively. The queue length that was estimated for this approach is consistent with the queueing that was observed to occur at this approach during the morning and after-school peak periods. During the evening peak period the southbound approach is estimated to experience the highest length of queueing at eight vehicles.

Figure 8

FORECAST YEAR 2050 AVERAGE WEEKDAY AND PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND TURNING MOVEMENTS AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE



Source: SEWRPC.

Should no operational or geometric improvements be made to the intersection by the year 2050, the northbound approach may be expected to continue to have the longest queue length during the morning and after-school peak periods at 38 and 34 vehicles, respectively. During the evening peak period, the westbound through/left-turn lane would have the largest queue length at 23 vehicles.

Table 1

LEVEL-OF-SERVICE THRESHOLDS FOR CONTROLLED INTERSECTIONS

UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS (AWSC AND ROUNDABOUT)

Level of Traffic Congestion	Level-of-Service	Control Delay (veh/sec)	Operating Conditions
None	A	≤ 10	Nearly all drivers find freedom of operation. Very seldom is there more than one vehicle in queue.
	B	> 10 – 15	Some drivers begin to consider the delay an inconvenience. Occasionally there is more than one vehicle in queue.
	C	> 15 – 25	Many times there is more than one vehicle in queue. Most drivers feel restricted, but not objectionably so.
Moderate	D	>25 – 35	Often there is more than one vehicle in queue. Drivers feel quite restricted.
Severe	E	> 35 – 50	Represents a condition in which the demand is near or equal to the probable maximum number of vehicles that can be accommodated by the movement. There is almost always more than one vehicle in queue. Drivers find the delays approaching intolerable levels.
Extreme	F	> 50	Represents an intersection failure condition that is caused by the approaching traffic exceeding the intersections capacity. Drivers find such delay to be intolerable to the intersection.

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

Level of Traffic Congestion	Level-of-Service	Control Delay (veh/sec)	Operating Conditions
None	A	≤ 10	Progression is exceptionally favorable or the cycle length is very short. Most vehicles arrive during the green indication and travel through the intersection without stopping.
	B	> 10 – 20	Progression is highly favorable or the cycle length is short. More vehicles stop than with LOS A.
	C	> 20 – 35	Progression is favorable or cycle length is moderate. Individual cycle failures may begin at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant, although many vehicles still pass through the intersection without stopping.
Moderate	D	> 35 – 55	Progression is ineffective or the cycle length is long. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.
Severe	E	> 55 – 80	Progression is unfavorable and the cycle length is long. Individual cycle failures are frequent.
Extreme	F	> 80	Progression is very poor and the cycle length is long. Most cycles fail to clear the queue.

Note: Individual cycle failures occur when one or more of the queued vehicles are not able to depart as a result of insufficient capacity during the cycle.

Source: 2010 Highway Capacity Manual and SEWRPC.

Vehicular Crashes

Between the years 2011 and 2015, 19 vehicular crashes occurred at the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue, as shown in Table 3 and Figure 11.[8] This resulted in a crash rate—the ratio of crash frequency to traffic

[8] *A reportable crash is any crash resulting in: 1) an injury to or death of any person; 2) damage to government-owned non-vehicle property to an apparent extent of $200 or more; 3) damage to a government-owned vehicle to an apparent extent of $1,000 or more; 4) or total damage to property owned by any one person to an apparent extent of $1,000 or more. Vehicular crashes that occurred within the physical intersection as well as crashes that occurred upstream from the intersection due to queues and congestion are included in this analysis. The number of vehicle crashes shown does not include crashes involving a deer.*

Figure 9

EXISTING APPROACH AND INTERSECTION DELAY AND LEVEL-OF-SERVICE AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: CURRENT AWSC



Source: SEWRPC.

volume—of 0.71 crashes per one million entering vehicles over the five-year period. The five-year crash rate is below the average state-wide crash rate for intersections in an urban area of about one crash per one million entering vehicles and well below the intersection crash rate of 1.50 crashes per one million entering vehicles that WisDOT historically has considered acceptable for intersections. None of the vehicular crashes during the five-year period involved a pedestrian, bicyclist, or school bus. It should be noted that 16 of the 19 vehicular crashes occurred over the three-year period of 2013 through 2015, which resulted in a crash rate of 1.00 crashes per one million entering vehicles. The three-year crash rate is at the average state-wide crash rate for intersections in an urban area of about one crash per one million entering vehicles, but is well below the intersection crash rate of 1.50 crashes per one

Figure 10

FORECAST YEAR 2050 APPROACH AND INTERSECTION DELAY AND LEVEL-OF-SERVICE AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: CURRENT AWSC



Source: SEWRPC.

million entering vehicles that WisDOT historically has considered acceptable for intersections. While, no vehicular crashes resulted in a fatality or serious injury, there were a total of five injury-related crashes—two resulting in at least one non-incapacitating injury and three with reported possible injuries. Rear-end crashes represented eight of the 19 crashes that occurred at the intersection over the five-year period. This type of crash is typical at intersections with stopped or queued traffic, such as at all-way stop and traffic signal controlled intersections. Such crashes are generally caused by a driver not noticing the vehicle ahead has stopped or slowed, likely due to inattentive driving.

Table 2

EXISTING AND FORECAST YEAR 2050 QUEUE LENGTHS OF THE ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE

Approach	Morning Peak		After School Peak		Evening Peak	
	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050
Northbound Approach	19	38	12	34	6	17
Southbound Approach	7	11	5	11	8	19
Eastbound						
Thru/Left-turn Lane	7	21	2	5	3	9
Right-Turn Lane	3	8	1	1	1	1
Westbound						
Thru/Left-turn Lane	6	16	3	10	6	23
Right-Turn Lane	2	4	1	1	1	1

Source: SEWRPC.

Table 3

TOTAL VEHICULAR CRASHES AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE IN THE CITY OF FRANKLIN BY MANNER OF COLLISION: 2011-2015

Number on Figure 11	Date	Time	Type	Severity	Cause
1	10/4/2011	4:27 pm	Rear	Possible Injury	Inattentive Driving
2	12/21/2011	4:44 pm	Rear	Property Damage Only	Inattentive Driving
3	8/27/2012	6:40 pm	Angle	Non-Incapacitating Injury	Speeding, Inattentive Driving, Fail to Yield Right of Way, Disregarded Traffic Control
4	1/21/2013	11:28 am	Single	Property Damage Only	Failure to have control
5	3/3/2013	5:05 pm	Angle	Property Damage Only	Inattentive Driving
6	5/1/2013	4:39 pm	Angle	Property Damage Only	Fail to Yield Right of Way
7	5/11/2013	3:33 pm	Angle	Property Damage Only	Fail to Yield Right of Way
8	12/8/2013	6:06 pm	Rear	Property Damage Only	Failure to have control
9	12/11/2013	6:46 am	Angle	Property Damage Only	Fail to Yield Right of Way
10	3/8/2014	8:21 pm	Rear	Property Damage Only	Driver Condition
11	4/8/2014	2:52 pm	U-Turn	Property Damage Only	Fail to Yield Right of Way
12	5/27/2014	3:17 pm	Rear	Property Damage Only	Inattentive Driving
13	8/22/2014	11:21 am	Angle	Possible Injury	Speeding, Fail to Yield Right of Way, Disregarded Traffic Control
14	9/10/2014	5:05 pm	Rear	Property Damage Only	Inattentive Driving
15	6/29/2015	6:11 pm	Rear	Non-Incapacitating Injury	Inattentive Driving
16	8/3/2015	8:57 pm	Angle	Possible Injury	Fail to Yield Right of Way
17	8/4/2015	5:46 pm	Rear	Property Damage Only	Inattentive Driving
18	11/17/2015	6:42 pm	Angle	Property Damage Only	Fail to Yield Right of Way
19	12/29/2015	12:15 pm	Angle	Property Damage Only	Fail to Yield Right of Way

Source: Wisconsin Traffic Operations and Safety Laboratory and SEWRPC.

Figure 11

TOTAL VEHICULAR CRASHES OCCURRING AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE BETWEEN THE YEARS 2011-2015



Source: SEWRPC.

Of the 19 crashes, nine crashes, or about 47 percent, were angle crashes. Angle crashes are generally unusual at all-way stop controlled intersections as vehicles move more orderly and at lower speeds through such intersections. However, the prevalence of these types of crashes at the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue could be a result of the excessive delay and queueing that is occurring at the intersection. Under such conditions, drivers can become impatient and fail to properly yield right-of-way to other vehicles, conditions can result in angle crashes.

IDENTIFICATION OF ALTERNATIVE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

The Commission staff identified four potential alternatives to improve the operation (reducing average delay and queuing) of the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue based on existing and forecast future conditions. These alternatives include one alternative that involves improving the current all-way stop control at the intersection with additional turn lanes, two alternatives that involve installing traffic control signals, and one alternative that involves reconstructing the intersection as a roundabout. Planning level designs were developed for each of the alternatives for use in the evaluation of the alternatives. Commission staff would note that preliminary engineering would need to be conducted for any operational and geometric improvement to the intersection that may be pursued by the City of Franklin. Such preliminary engineering would necessarily be conducted at a higher level of detail than this study. Only at the conclusion of preliminary engineering would the actual design, costs, and impacts be more fully understood. With respect to the alternatives involving traffic signals, the Commission staff first needed to determine that a traffic signal was warranted under existing and forecast future conditions based on the standard warrant analysis methodologies. For each alternative, curb ramps and cross-walks were added at locations where sidewalks currently do not exist to assist pedestrians walking in those areas with crossing the intersection and to accommodate any future expansion of sidewalk along W. Drexel Avenue or along the west side of S. 51st Street. The remainder of this section describes the alternatives that were developed and analyzed as part of this study.

Table 4

TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS SUMMARY FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE

Warrant	Description	Result
Warrant 1	Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume	Not Satisfied
Warrant 2	Four-Hour Vehicular Volume	Satisfied
Warrant 3	Peak-Hour Vehicular Volume	Satisfied
Warrant 4	Pedestrian Volume	Not Evaluated
Warrant 5	School Crossing	Not Evaluated
Warrant 6	Coordinated Signal System	Not Evaluated
Warrant 7	Crash Experience	Not Satisfied
Warrant 8	Roadway Network	Satisfied

Source: SEWRPC.

Improving Existing All-Way Stop Intersection (Alternative 1)

This alternative involves retaining the all-way stop control for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue, and providing an additional lane to accommodate a 12-foot wide shared through and left-turn lane and a 12-foot wide shared through and right-turn lane. The additional lane is expected to increase the capacity of the intersection. As shown in Map 4, the additional lanes would continue through the intersection to encourage drivers to use the lane. The additional lane would be dropped under this alternative about 220 to 230 feet from the intersection on the north, south, and west legs, and about 380 feet from the intersection on the east leg in order to provide vehicles sufficient time to merge back into one lane. Considering that this alternative includes two possible through lanes for each approach, it is necessary to determine the proportion of through vehicles that utilize the left lane—the shared through and left-turn lane—in order to evaluate the existing and future year 2050 operating conditions of the alternative. As such, it was assumed that the approaching traffic in each travel direction, regardless of turning movement, would be split evenly between the shared through and left-turn lane and the shared through and right-turn lane.

Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Prior to the development of traffic signal alternatives, an analysis was conducted as to whether installing a traffic control signal is warranted at the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue. Table 4 lists the eight warrants used to justify the installation of a traffic control signal. Of these eight warrants, the Commission staff evaluated the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue with five of the signal warrants—Warrants 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8. These warrants were evaluated because the intended application for each warrant directly relates to the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue. A detailed summary of the analysis is provided in Appendix A of this document.

Map 4

PLANNING LEVEL DESIGN FOR ALTERNATIVE 1-ALL WAY STOP CONTROL WITH ADDITIONAL LANES



Source: SEWRPC.

Based on the warrant analysis conducted by Commission staff, installing a traffic control signal is justified for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue as three of the traffic signal warrants—2, 3, and 8—are satisfied, as shown in Table 4.

Traffic Control Signal Alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3)

Two traffic control signal alternatives were developed as part of this study. One alternative (Alternative 2) involves providing an exclusive left-turn lane and an exclusive right-turn lane at each approach of the intersection. The other alternative (Alternative 3) involves providing an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane at each approach to the intersection.

Traffic Control Signal with Exclusive Left- and Right-Turn Lanes (Alternative 2)

Map 5 shows the planning level design for an intersection with exclusive right- and left-turn lanes (Alternative 2). Providing right- and left-turn lanes at signalized intersections increases safety and intersection efficiency. The potential left-turn lanes as part of these alternatives are aligned to directly oppose each other to improve the efficiency and safety of the intersection by maximizing the visibility for left-turning vehicles to see opposing through vehicles and pick an adequate gap to complete the turn. The travelling path for through and right-turning traffic would be transitioned to the right of the left-turn lane as it approaches the intersection to avoid vehicles queued in the left-turn lane. This improves the safety of the intersection as it decreases the likelihood of a through vehicle rear-ending a queued left-turning vehicle. It also improves intersection efficiency as it allows through traffic, as well as right-turning traffic, to continue through the intersection without being delayed by the decelerating left-turning vehicles.

Traffic Control Signal with Only Exclusive Left-Turn Lanes (Alternative 3)

Map 6 shows the planning level design for a traffic signal alternative with exclusive left-turn lanes and shared through/right-turn lanes (Alternative 3). This alternative was developed to provide a traffic signal alternative that would be expected to have a lower cost and impact to adjacent properties than Alternative 2. While at certain times of the day right-turning traffic can be relatively high compared to through traffic for certain approaches, the right-turn lane was removed as part of this alternative, rather than removing a left-turn lane, as exclusive left-turn lanes generally provide more safety and traffic flow benefits than providing exclusive right-turn lanes at a signalized intersection. Like Alternative 2, the opposing left-turn lanes on each roadway are aligned to allow visibility of on-coming through traffic, and through/right-turning vehicle are transitioned to the right of the left-turn lane to avoid collisions with vehicles queued in the left-turn lane.

Traffic Signal Assumptions

For purposes of evaluating the two traffic signal alternatives, a number of planning-level assumptions were made with respect to the operation of the traffic signal, including the signal type (pre-timed, actuated, or adaptive), phasing (whether or not to include a protected left-turning phase), and timing.

Signal Type

The type of signal used (pre-timed[9], actuated[10], or adaptive[11]) is largely dependent on how the intersection operates (isolated or in coordination with other traffic signals) and, in some cases, the amount of traffic approaching the

---

[9] *Pre-timed traffic signals are a type of traffic signal timing approach where the length of green times available each cycle are predetermined and the phase sequence is fixed.*

[10] *Actuated traffic signals are a type of traffic signal timing approach where the length of green times available each cycle is dependent on the number and frequency of vehicles detected by detectors either embedded in the roadway or mounted over the intersection.*

[11] *Adaptive traffic signals are a type of traffic signal timing approach where the length of green times and the phase sequence adjusts, or adapts, based on real-time traffic demand.*

Map 5

PLANNING LEVEL DESIGN FOR ALTERNATIVE 2-TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH RIGHT- AND LEFT-TURN LANES



Source: SEWRPC.

Map 6

PLANNING LEVEL DESIGN FOR ALTERNATIVE 3-TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH LEFT-TURN LANES

Source: SEWRPC.

Table 5

TRAFFIC SIGNAL TIMING ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE

Phase	Drexel Avenue	51st Street
Minimum Green[a]	15 seconds	15 seconds
Maximum Green[b]	30 seconds	30 seconds
Yellow/Red	4 seconds	4 seconds
Gap Time[c]	2 seconds	2 seconds

[a]The minimum green time is based on driver expectation.

[b]The maximum green time countdown commences should a vehicle cross the vehicle loop detector before the minimum green time expires.

[c]During the maximum green countdown and beyond the minimum green time, should there be no vehicle that crosses the detector within the set gap time, the signal will change to yellow.

Source: SEWRPC.

intersection. Because the closest signalized intersection is one or more miles away, the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue can be considered to operate as an isolated intersection. As such, an actuated-type traffic signal was selected for the analysis based on this type of signal typically being used for isolated traffic controlled intersections. Actuated signals use detectors (either embedded in the roadway or mounted over the intersection) to indicate the presence of either a stopped vehicle or vehicle approaching the intersection. The number and location of the detectors (at the stop bar and/or upstream of the intersection) can affect the timing for the traffic signal. With respect to the analysis, it was assumed that there would be a detector both at the stop bar to detect the presence of stopped vehicles during a red-light signal and upstream of the intersection to detect the presence of vehicles approaching the intersection during a green-light signal.

Signal Phasing

The phasing of the traffic signal represents the period of time (including green time and yellow/all red clearance time) that is assigned to the movement of vehicles from specific approaches or lanes (such as a left-turn lane). The number of phases is dependent on the magnitude of the approaching traffic volume and turning movements at an intersection. If the number of phases are more than necessary, vehicles stopped at the intersection can experience excessive delay. For purposes of evaluating the traffic signal alternatives as part of this study, it was assumed that the traffic signals at the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue would have two phases with permissive left turns—one for the northbound/southbound traffic and one for the eastbound/westbound traffic. A protected left-turn phase was considered, but was dismissed because existing and future year 2050 traffic approach and left-turning movement volumes at the intersection would generally not be sufficient for a left-turn phase.[12]

Signal Timing

Table 5 shows the minimum and maximum green time, the yellow and all-red time, and the gap time used for the evaluation of the traffic signal alternatives. The minimum green time of 15 seconds was selected, which is consistent with driver expectations. Because of the potential presence of students at the intersection, pedestrian countdown timers were included in the analysis. The maximum green time countdown commences should a vehicle cross the roadway detector located upstream of the intersection before the minimum green time expires. During the maximum green countdown and beyond the minimum green time, should there be no vehicle that crosses the detector within the set gap time, the signal will change to the clearance interval (yellow and all-red).

[12] *Because a protected left-turn phase may only benefit westbound vehicles on W. Drexel Avenue turning left onto S. 51st Street during only the morning peak period under the future year 2050 average weekday traffic volume conditions, it was determined to first evaluate the two alternative traffic signal alternatives without the protected left-turn phase to determine whether this phase would be needed based how well each alternative performs with respect to intersection delay and vehicle queuing.*

Roundabout Alternative (Alternative 4)
Map 7 shows the planning-level design for the roundabout alternative (Alternative 4). It was assumed that a single lane roundabout would be sufficient to handle the current and future forecast year 2050 traffic volumes approaching and turning at the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue. The inscribed circle diameter—the diameter of the outer curb of the roadway—of a typical single lane roundabout can range from 120 to 160 feet in size. An inscribed circle diameter of 126 feet was selected for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue as this diameter would be sufficient for larger vehicles, in particular, buses, fire trucks, and semi-trucks. As shown on Map 7, the center of the roundabout was offset about 25 feet west of the current center of the intersection to avoid impacting driveways on W. Drexel Avenue and utility poles on S. 51st Street.

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

The four identified improvements to the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue were evaluated based on the criteria shown on Table 6. The evaluation of the four identified intersection improvements with these criteria are also shown on Table 6. As previously noted, preliminary engineering would necessarily be conducted for any operational and attendant geometric improvement to the intersection that may be pursued by the City of Franklin. Such preliminary engineering would necessarily be conducted at a higher level of detail than this study. Only at the conclusion of preliminary engineering would the actual design, costs, and impacts be better understood.

All of the alternative intersection improvements would provide an improvement to delay and vehicle queues over the current intersection configuration. However, the two traffic signal alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3) and the roundabout alternative (Alternative 4) would provide the greatest reduction in average intersection delay and improvement in level-of-service under both existing and future year 2050 average weekday traffic conditions. In addition, these alternatives would be expected to have an LOS of C or better under both existing and future conditions. Whereas, the all-way stop control alternative (Alternative 1) would be expected to have a LOS of E during the morning peak period under year 2050 traffic conditions. Appendix B includes figures showing the estimated delay and level-of-service for all of the lanes for each of the alternatives under both existing and future year 2050 average weekday traffic conditions.

With respect to vehicle queueing, the traffic signal alternative with both exclusive left-and right-turn lanes (Alternative 2) is estimated to provide the greatest reduction in queuing with the highest vehicle queue length ranging from two to four vehicles during the three peak periods under both existing and future year 2050 average weekday traffic conditions. However, with the exception of the morning peak period under year 2050 traffic conditions, the other three alternatives had highest queue lengths similar to Alternative 2. During the morning peak period, these three alternatives had longer queue lengths for some approaches due to excessive future year 2050 eastbound traffic turning south onto S. 51st Street towards Franklin High School. With respect to the traffic signal alternative with only a left-turn lane (Alternative 3), should such queuing eventually occur on the westbound W. Drexel Avenue approach, it could be alleviated by adding an exclusive right turn lane on the westbound approach to the intersection (which would slightly increase the cost of this alternative). Adding a protected left-turn phase to the traffic signal under this alternative would be expected to alleviate the delay for westbound vehicles turning left onto S. 51st Street, but would potentially increase the delay on all of the approaches, resulting in an increase in the overall delay experienced at the intersection to about 29 to 34 seconds (LOS of C) during the morning peak hour under year 2050 traffic conditions. With respect to the roundabout, should such queuing eventually occur by the year 2050 on the eastbound W. Drexel Avenue approach, it could be alleviated by adding a yielding bypass lane for the eastbound W. Drexel Avenue traffic turning right onto S. 51st Street, which would increase the capacity of the approach by separating the right-turning vehicles from the rest of the approaching traffic. Appendix C includes figures showing the estimated length of queues for all of the lanes for each alternative under both existing and future year 2050 average weekday traffic conditions.

With respect to impacts to adjacent lands, it is estimated that the four alternative intersection improvements would be expected to require little to no additional right-of-way. All four of the alternative intersection improvements

Map 7

PLANNING LEVEL DESIGN FOR ALTERNATIVE 4-ROUNDABOUT

Source: SEWRPC.

Table 6

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51st STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE

Alternative	Estimated Delay and Level-of-Service-Existing Traffic Volumes					
	Morning Peak		After School Peak		Evening Peak	
	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
AWSC – No Improvement	59.4	F	31.3	D	29.9	D
Alternative 1: AWSC – Additional Lanes	19.4	C	14.0	B	14.4	B
Alternative 2: Traffic Signals With Right- and Left- Turn Lanes	8.5	A	8.4	A	8.4	A
Alternative 3: Traffic Signals With Only Left-Turn Lane	10.3	B	9.2	A	9.0	A
Alternative 4: Roundabout	10.8	B	8.1	A	8.1	A

Alternative	Estimated Delay and Level-of-Service-Year 2050 Traffic Volumes					
	Morning Peak		After School Peak		Evening Peak	
	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
AWSC – No Improvement	160.1	F	122.2	F	121.0	F
Alternative 1: AWSC – Additional Lanes	49.3	E	21.2	C	22.7	C
Alternative 2: Traffic Signals With Right- and Left- Turn Lanes	9.3	A	8.8	A	8.9	A
Alternative 3: Traffic Signals With Only Left-Turn Lane	18.7	B	10.0	B	10.1	B
Alternative 4: Roundabout	24.5	C	12.1	B	12.3	B

Alternative	Highest Queue Length					
	Morning Peak		After School Peak		Evening Peak	
	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050
AWSC – No Improvement	19	38	12	34	8	23
Alternative 1: AWSC – Additional Lanes	4	12	3	6	2	5
Alternative 2: Traffic Signals With Right- and Left- Turn Lanes	2	3	2	3	2	4
Alternative 3: Traffic Signals With Only Left-Turn Lane	4	13	3	4	3	5
Alternative 4: Roundabout	4	14	3	5	2	5

Alternative	Potential Impacts to Adjacent Land		
	Potential Right-of-Way Acquisition (acres)	Number of Driveways Affected	Potential Utility Pole Relocation
Alternative 1: AWSC – Additional Lanes	0.02	Four residences affected by two additional lanes	0
Alternative 2: Traffic Signals With Right- and Left- Turn Lanes	0.07	Two residences affected by the added left-turn lane	2
Alternative 3: Traffic Signals With Only Left-Turn Lane	0.00	Two residences affected by the added left-turn lane	0
Alternative 4: Roundabout	0.05	Entering/exiting the driveway of one resident could potentially be affected by the splitter island	0

Table 6 (continued)

Alternative	Estimated Planning-Level Cost		
	Planning-Level Construction Cost[a]	Planning-Level Right-of-Way Cost	Planning-Level Total Cost[b]
Alternative 1: AWSC – Additional Lanes	$0.92 Million	$0.01 Million	$0.93 Million
Alternative 2: Traffic Signals With Right- and Left- Turn Lanes	$1.78 Million	$0.02 Million	$1.80 Million
Alternative 3: Traffic Signals With Only Left-Turn Lane	$1.61 Million	$0.00 Million	$1.61 Million
Alternative 4: Roundabout	$0.73 Million	$0.02 Million	$0.75 Million

[a] *The estimated planning-level construction costs include reconstructing the segments of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue affected by each of the alternatives, as shown on the planning-level designs. The construction costs for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could be reduced if the current pavement structure for all or portions of the affected roadway is in good enough condition that they could be resurfaced or reconditioned, rather than reconstructed. The estimated construction costs include preliminary and final engineering.*

[b] *Does not include cost for utility relocation.*

Note: With respect to operation and maintenance costs, Alternative 1 (upgrade existing AWSC) would have slightly higher annual operation and maintenance costs than the current intersection due to the additional lanes and pavement markings, but would be expected to have the lowest operation and maintenance costs of the four alternatives.

Alternatives 2 and 3 (provide traffic signals) would be expected to have the highest annual operation and maintenance costs of the alternatives, mostly due to the cost to provide electricity to the traffic signals and to regularly service equipment.

Alternative 4 (provide a roundabout) would be expected to have annual operation and maintenance costs less than those for Alternatives 2 and 3, but more than that for Alternative 1. Operation and maintenance costs for a roundabout typically include the costs to regularly re-stripe pavement markings, to maintain the additional pavement (including the colored pavement of the truck apron), and to maintain any landscaping in the center of the roundabout.

Source: SEWRPC.

would affect the ease of vehicles entering or exiting certain driveways. Under Alternative 1, vehicles entering or exiting four existing driveways would potentially be affected by the two additional lanes. However, the continued use of all-way stop control under this alternative should have sufficient gaps for vehicles to enter or exit driveways and roadways along W. Drexel Avenue and S. 51st Street downstream of the intersection. Under the two traffic signal alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3), there would be one additional driveway on S. 51st Street north of the intersection that would be located along the functional area of the intersection. Additionally, vehicles entering or exiting the two driveways closest to the intersection on W. Drexel Avenue would potentially be affected by the added left-turn lane under Alternatives 2 and 3. However, the traffic signals under these two alternatives should allow sufficient gaps for vehicles to enter and exist driveways and roadways along W. Drexel Avenue and S. 51st Street downstream of the intersection. With respect to the roundabout alternative (Alternative 4), vehicles entering or exiting the driveway closest to the intersection on W. Drexel Avenue could potentially be affected by being in proximity to a splitter island. Should it be difficult for a vehicle exiting this driveway to travel eastbound on W. Drexel Avenue, the vehicle can exit the driveway and travel west on W. Drexel Avenue and complete a U-turn maneuver through the roundabout to travel east. A vehicle turning left into this driveway from the eastbound lane on W. Drexel Avenue may cause vehicles to stop within the roundabout, which may not be expected by the other vehicles utilizing the roundabout. Further, during peak traffic times of the day, the roundabout under this alternative may not allow sufficient gaps for vehicles to enter or exit driveways and roadways without experiencing at least some delay along W. Drexel Avenue and S. 51st Street downstream of the intersection.

With respect to the effect on utility poles, the traffic signal alternative with right- and left-turn lanes (Alternative 2) is estimated to require the relocation of two utility poles—one in the northeast corner of the intersection and the other in the southeast corner of the intersection. The other three alternatives are expected to have no impacts

to utility poles, as they either essentially utilize the existing pavement envelope or, in the case of Alternative 4, the center of the roundabout was moved to avoid impacts to the utility poles, along with avoiding impacts to an existing driveway.

The estimated planning-level construction costs include reconstructing the segments of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue affected by each of the alternatives, as shown on the planning-level designs. Thus, while the roundabout alternative (Alternative 4) has the lowest estimated planning-level construction costs, the estimated planning-level construction costs for the other three alternatives could be reduced if the current pavement structure for all or portions of the affected roadway is in good enough condition that they could be resurfaced or reconditioned, rather than reconstructed.

With respect to operation and maintenance costs, the all-way stop control alternative (Alternative 1) would have slightly higher annual operation and maintenance costs than the current intersection due to the additional lanes and pavement markings, but would be expected to have the lowest operation and maintenance costs of the four alternatives. The two traffic signal alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3) would be expected to have the highest annual operation and maintenance costs of the alternatives, mostly due to the cost to provide electricity to the traffic signals and to regularly service equipment. The roundabout alternative (Alternative 4) would be expected to have annual operation and maintenance costs less than those for Alternatives 2 and 3, but more than that for Alternative 1. Operation and maintenance costs for a roundabout typically include the costs to regularly re-stripe pavement markings, to maintain the additional pavement (including the colored pavement of the truck apron), and to maintain any landscaping in the center of the roundabout.

While the planning level designs developed for the four alternative improvements to the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue did not include sufficient shoulder widths to accommodate parking, the provision of parking along W. Drexel Avenue and S. 51st Street near this intersection would be expected to be addressed during the necessary preliminary engineering for any intersection improvement the City of Franklin decides to pursue. Currently, parking is only permitted during school hours along the north side of W. Drexel Avenue west of S. 51st Street and the south side of W. Drexel Avenue east of S. 51st Street. It is expected that implementation of the traffic control types—all-way stop, traffic signal, or roundabout—included in the alternatives would not necessarily preclude parking at these locations. However, the shoulder shown on the planning-level designs for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would need to be widened to continue permitting parking at these two locations on W. Drexel Avenue. Additionally, more restrictive parking restrictions—such as prohibiting parking during all times of the day or during times of heavier traffic on weekdays—should be considered along the shared and turn lanes on the intersection approaches to minimize the "workload' for drivers approaching the intersection and reduce additional opportunities for collisions.

With respect to safety, it would be expected that crashes caused by the excessive delay and vehicle queuing experienced at the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue during periods of heavy traffic would potentially be reduced (particularly the angle crashes) with implementation of any of the alternatives. However, while such crashes could be reduced, depending on the type of traffic control pursued by the City of Franklin for the intersection, certain crashes that currently occur at the intersection may not be significantly reduced (such as rear-end crashes), or may occur more often. In addition, other types of crashes may occur that are not currently experienced at the intersection. For example, the addition of lanes as part of Alternative 1 and the implementation of a roundabout under Alternative 4 could result in the occurrence of side-swipe crashes. As well, the implementation of traffic signals under Alternatives 2 and 3 could result in the occurrence of left-turning crashes and increased chances for more severe crashes.[13] Estimating the potential effect (positive and negative) on crashes by these alternatives would require a detailed safety assessment that was not conducted as part of this study.

---

[13] *Should the City of Franklin choose to install traffic signals at the intersection and excessive amounts of left-turning crashes occurs (3 or more of such crashes on an approach), a protected left-turn phase could be added. However, this would lengthen the delay experienced by all of the approaches and increase the overall intersection delay.*

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A public comment period and information meeting was held to allow the public to review and provide comment on the inventory data collected (adjacent land uses and features, physical characteristics of the intersection, traffic volumes, intersection operating conditions, and vehicle crashes), alternative operational and geometric intersection improvements, and the results of the evaluation of the alternatives. The public information meeting was held at Franklin High School on May 31, 2017, in an open house format with boards presenting information on the inventory, alternatives, and the evaluation results. In addition, large display aerial maps of the identified alternative geometric and operational improvements were laid out on tables allowing the public attending the meeting to identify issues and make suggestions. The public was able to provide written comments related to the alternatives and the results of their evaluation. Any comments received during the public information meeting and public comment period—May 17, 2017, through June 15, 2017—could be reviewed by City officials to determine whether changes should be made to the evaluation and alternatives considered, and to assist in determining what potential operational and geometric intersection improvements to take into preliminary engineering study and for potential implementation. Appendix D provides a summary of the comments recieved at the public information meeting and during the public comment period.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Prior to developing a traffic control signal alternative for improving the operation of the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue, a traffic control signal warrant analysis was conducted to determine if installing a traffic control signal is justified under current and future traffic conditions. The eight traffic signal warrants considered (as shown in Table A-1) are consistent with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation's *Traffic Signal Design Manual* and the U.S. Department of Transportation's *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. Of the eight warrants used to justify the installation of a traffic control signal, the Commission staff evaluated five—Warrants 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8. These warrants were evaluated because the intended application for each warrant directly relates to, or addresses the issues experienced at, the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue. Specifically, Warrants 1, 2, and 3 determine whether the traffic volume observed at the intersection exceeds specified thresholds which have been established for specific time periods—one-hour, four-hour, or 8-hour periods. Warrant 7 determines whether a traffic control signal is needed based on the severity and frequency of crashes experienced at the intersection. This warrant focuses on those types of crashes which would likely be reduced with the installation of a traffic control signal. Warrant 8 determines whether a traffic control signal is needed based on its ability to concentrate and organize the traffic flow on a roadway network and whether the five-year projected traffic volumes would satisfy either Warrants 1, 2, or 3.

The remaining three warrants—4, 5, and 6—were not evaluated as the Commission staff determined that the warrants did not apply or address the issues experienced at the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue. Warrant 4 is intended for locations where traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that pedestrians experience excessive delay crossing the street. Although pedestrians (and bicyclists) utilize the pathway along S. 51st Street, the total number of pedestrians crossing the intersection is relatively low and they do not experience excessive delay that would warrant a traffic signal. Similarly, Warrant 5 is intended for locations where there is a high number of school children crossing the street. In the same respect to Warrant 4, the total number of school children crossing the intersection is low because the intersection is not immediately adjacent to, or does not directly serve, a school. Warrant 6 is intended for locations where installing a traffic signal is necessary to maintain proper platooning of vehicles as part of signal coordination. This warrant was not evaluated since the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue is an isolated intersection, one mile or more away from the nearest traffic signal controlled intersection.

For purposes of the warrant analysis, S. 51st Street was considered the major roadway and W. Drexel Avenue was considered the minor roadway, based on S. 51st Street carrying a higher level of traffic. Additionally, consideration must be given for the volume-based warrants as to what proportion of right-turning vehicles should be included in the traffic volumes of the minor roadway. Right-turning vehicles from the minor roadway are less likely to receive benefit from a signalized intersection, as such vehicles typically experience less delay than through and left-turning movements. Thus, right-turning vehicles from minor roadways with an exclusive left-turn lane having adequate storage, such as on W. Drexel Avenue, should be excluded from the traffic volumes applied to the traffic-volume based warrants. Therefore, the right-turning vehicles on W. Drexel Avenue were not included in the minor street traffic volume in the traffic signal warrant evaluation.

Of the five warrants evaluated, three of the warrants were satisfied—2, 3, and 8.[14] The following summarizes the evaluation conducted for each warrant:

---

[14] *Assuming W. Drexel Avenue as the major roadway and S. 51st Street as the minor roadway, two of the signal warrants would be satisfied—Warrants 2 and 8. Because there is no marked right-turn lane, all of the right-turning vehicles on S. 51st Street were included in the signal analysis.*

Warrant 1 – Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

Warrant 1 is used to determine whether traffic signals are warranted based on excessive traffic volume approaching the intersecting or if traffic on a major roadway is so heavy as to delay or conflict with crossing traffic for at least eight hours of a day. Warrant 1 is satisfied if one of the following three conditions are met over any eight hours on an average weekday:

A. The major street volume in both directions is greater than or equal to 500 vehicles per hour and the minor street volume in one direction is greater than or equal to 150 vehicles per hour,[15]

B. The major street volume in both directions is greater than or equal to 750 vehicles per hour and the minor street volume in one direction is greater than or equal to 75 vehicles per hour, or

C. The major street volume and the minor street volume is greater than or equal to 80 percent of the volumes given in Condition A and the major street volume and the minor street volume are greater than or equal 80 percent of the volumes given in Condition B.[16]

Table A-1

TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS SUMMARY FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE

Warrant	Description	Result
Warrant 1	Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume	Not Satisfied
Warrant 2	Four-Hour Vehicular Volume	Satisfied
Warrant 3	Peak-Hour Vehicular Volume	Satisfied
Warrant 4	Pedestrian Volume	Not Evaluated
Warrant 5	School Crossing	Not Evaluated
Warrant 6	Coordinated Signal System	Not Evaluated
Warrant 7	Crash Experience	Not Satisfied
Warrant 8	Roadway Network	Satisfied

Source: SEWRPC.

As shown in Table A-2, Condition A was satisfied for six out of the required eight hours and Condition B was not satisfied for any of the required eight hours. With respect to Condition C, only one of the two required conditions was met. Therefore, the traffic volumes measured for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue do not satisfy Warrant 1.

Warrant 2 – Four-Hour Vehicular Volume

Warrant 2 is intended for intersections with a large volume of intersecting traffic on at least four hours of a day. Warrant 2 is satisfied if any four hours of an average weekday fall above the applicable curve shown in Figure A-1. A total of 4 hours—7:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. and the three hours between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.—fall above the threshold curve for an intersection with one-lane approaches. Therefore, Warrant 2 is satisfied for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue.

Warrant 3 – Peak Hour

Warrant 3 is intended to determine whether the minor street of an intersection experiences excessive delays over at least one hour of a day. This warrant is generally applied only at intersections near land uses that can attract or discharge large number of vehicles over a short period of time, as is the case with Franklin High School. Warrant 3 is satisfied if either of the following conditions are met:

[15] *The major street and minor street volumes must be for the same 8 hours.*

[16] *Condition C may be used after an adequate trial of other alternatives fails to solve traffic problems. The 8 hours satisfied in Condition A are not required to be the same 8 hours in Condition B.*

Table A-2

TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT 1 FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: EIGHT-HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME

Hour	Major Street VPH (Both Directions)	Minor Street VPH (One Direction)[a]	Condition A	Condition B	Condition C	
					80 Percent of Condition A	80 Percent of Condition B
6:00 AM to 7:00 AM	352	161				
7:00 AM to 8:00 AM	589	254	•		•	
8:00 AM to 9:00 AM	377	187				
9:00 AM to 10:00 AM	262	155				
10:00 AM to 11:00 AM	272	121				
11:00 AM to 12:00 PM	344	130				
12:00 PM to 1:00 PM	465	140			•	
1:00 PM to 2:00 PM	432	149			•	
2:00 PM to 3:00 PM	645	180	•		•	•
3:00 PM to 4:00 PM	695	252	•		•	•
4:00 PM to 5:00 PM	691	321	•		•	•
5:00 PM to 6:00 PM	655	278	•		•	•
6:00 PM to 7:00 PM	535	188	•		•	
7:00 PM to 8:00 PM	324	119				
8:00 PM to 9:00 PM	302	83				
9:00 PM to 10:00 PM	194	52				
10:00 PM to 11:00 PM	64	34				
11:00 PM to 12:00 AM	60	19				
Condition Total			6	0	8	4
Condition Satisfied			No	No	No	

[a] *Right turns were not included on the Minor Street due to the presence of a right turn lane at the eastbound and westbound approaches of W. Drexel Avenue.*

NOTE: Condition A is satisfied when the major street volume in both directions is greater than or equal to 500 vehicles per hour and the minor street volume in one direction is greater than or equal to 150 vehicles per hour. Condition B is satisfied when the major street volume in both directions is greater than or equal to 750 vehicles per hour and the minor street volume in one direction is greater than or equal to 75 vehicles per hour. Condition C is satisfied when the major street volume and the minor street volume is greater than or equal 80 percent of the volumes given in Condition A and the major street volume and the minor street volume is greater than or equal 80 percent of the volumes given in Condition B.

Source: SEWRPC.

A. In the same hour (four consecutive 15 minute periods), the traffic on one minor-street approach experiences greater than or equal to 4 hours of total stopped time delay, the traffic on the same minor-street approach experiences traffic volume greater than or equal to 100 vehicles per hour, and the total intersection volume over the same hour is 800 vehicles per hour; or

B. Any hour (four consecutive 15 minute periods) of an average weekday falls above the applicable curve, as shown on Figure A-2

Figure A-1

TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT 2 FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: FOUR-HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME



Satisfies Condition for Warrant

Does Not Satisfy Condition for Warrant

Source: 2009 MUTCD and SEWRPC

Figure A-2

TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT 3 FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: PEAK-HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME



Satisfies Condition for Warrant

Does Not Satisfy Condition for Warrant

Source: 2009 MUTCD and SEWRPC

Only Condition B was analyzed due to the ease of determining whether this condition is satisfied. As shown in Figure A-2, Condition B was satisfied as the evening peak hour falls slightly above the applicable curve. Therefore, Warrant 3 is satisfied for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue.[17]

Warrant 7 – Crash Experience
Warrant 7 determines the need for a traffic control signal based on the severity and frequency of crashes experienced at the intersection. This warrant focuses on those types of crashes which would likely be reduced with the installation of a traffic control signal. Warrant 7 is satisfied if all of the following conditions are met:

A. An adequate trial of alternatives has failed to reduce the crash frequency

B. Five or more reported crashes susceptible to correction by a traffic control signal have occurred within a 12 month period

C. For any 8 hours of an average day, the major street volume in both directions is greater than or equal to 400 vehicles per hour and the minor street volume in one direction is greater than or equal to 120 vehicles per hour, the major street volume in both directions is greater than or equal to 600 vehicles per hour and the minor street volume in one direction is greater than or equal to 60 vehicles per hour;[18] or for any 4 hours of an average day the volume of pedestrian traffic crossing the major street at an intersection or midblock location is greater than or equal to 80; or for any one hour during the average day the volume of pedestrian traffic is greater than or equal to 152.

With respect to Condition B, installing a traffic control signal may reduce the number of right-angle and left-turning related crashes. Over the five-year period of 2011 through 2015, the twelve month period of January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013 had the highest number of angle- or turning-related crashes with four such crashes. However, this number of crashes is less than the required five of such crashes need to satisfy Condition B. As such, Warrant 7 is not satisfied.

Warrant 8 – Roadway Network
Warrant 8 determines the need for a traffic control signal to facilitate traffic flow on a network of major roadways. Warrant 8 is satisfied if the intersection is of two major routes[19] and if either of the following conditions are met:

A. The intersection has a total existing or projected volume of at least 1,000 vehicles per hour during the peak hour of a typical weekday and has 5-year projected traffic volumes that meet either Warrant 1, 2, or 3; or

B. The intersection has a total existing or projected volume of at least 1,000 vehicles per hour for any 5 hours of a non-normal business day (Saturday or Sunday).

---

[17] *Meeting Warrant 3 alone is not justification for the installation of a traffic signal. At least one additional warrant must also be met.*

[18] *The vehicles per hour thresholds for this condition is the same as Condition C under Warrant 1*

[19] *A major route is defined by the* 2009 MUTCD *as a segment that is part of the street or highway system that serves as the principal roadway network for through traffic flow; includes rural or suburban highways outside, entering, or traversing a city; or appears as a major route on an official plan, such as a major street plan in an urban area traffic and transportation study.*

Table A-3

TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT 8 FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: EVALUATE WARRANT 1 WITH YEAR 2021 VEHICULAR VOLUME

Hour	Major Street VPH (Both Directions)	Minor Street VPH (One Direction)[a]	Condition A	Condition B	Condition C	
					80 Percent of Condition A	80 Percent of Condition B
6:00 AM to 7:00 AM	363	172				
7:00 AM to 8:00 AM	611	271	•		•	•
8:00 AM to 9:00 AM	390	199				
9:00 AM to 10:00 AM	271	165				
10:00 AM to 11:00 AM	280	129				
11:00 AM to 12:00 PM	354	140				
12:00 PM to 1:00 PM	479	149			•	
1:00 PM to 2:00 PM	445	160			•	
2:00 PM to 3:00 PM	667	193	•		•	•
3:00 PM to 4:00 PM	718	271	•		•	•
4:00 PM to 5:00 PM	713	345	•		•	•
5:00 PM to 6:00 PM	675	298	•		•	•
6:00 PM to 7:00 PM	552	202	•		•	
7:00 PM to 8:00 PM	334	127				
8:00 PM to 9:00 PM	313	88				
9:00 PM to 10:00 PM	200	56				
10:00 PM to 11:00 PM	66	36				
11:00 PM to 12:00 AM	62	20				
Condition Total			6	0	8	5
Condition Satisfied			No	No	No	

[a] *Right turns were not included on the Minor Street due to the presence of a right turn lane at the Eastbound and Westbound approaches.*

NOTE: Condition A is satisfied when the major street volume in both directions is greater than or equal to 500 vehicles per hour and the minor street volume in one direction is greater than or equal to 150 vehicles per hour. Condition B is satisfied when the major street volume in both directions is greater than or equal to 750 vehicles per hour and the minor street volume in one direction is greater than or equal to 75 vehicles per hour. Condition C is satisfied when the major street volume and the minor street volume is greater than or equal 80 percent of the volumes given in Condition A and the major street volume and the minor street volume is greater than or equal 80 percent of the volumes given in Condition B.

Source: SEWRPC.

S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue both serve as major routes through the City of Franklin as each street is identified as an arterial street in the City of Franklin comprehensive plan and the regional transportation plan. The existing peak hour of a typical weekday—between 4:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m.—exceeds the required 1,000 vehicles per hour stated under Condition A. Year 2021 traffic volumes for S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue are shown on Table A-3. While the hourly volumes in 2021 still do not satisfy Warrant 1, as shown in Table A-3, these volumes do satisfy Warrants 2 and 3, as shown in Figure A-3, thus satisfying Condition A of Warrant 8. Under the existing and forecasted conditions, the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue satisfies the first condition for Warrant 8.

Figure A-3

TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT 8 FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: EVALUATE WARRANTS 2 AND 3 WITH YEAR 2021 VEHICULAR VOLUME



Source: 2009 MUTCD and SEWRPC

Appendix B

FIGURES SHOWING DELAY AND LEVEL-OF-SERVICE FOR EACH ALTERNATIVE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PER PEAK HOUR UNDER EXISTING AND FORECAST YEAR 2050 TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Figure B-1

DELAY AND LEVEL-OF-SERVICE AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W DREXEL AVENVUE: ALTERNATIVE 1-AWSC WITH ADDITIONAL LANES



Source: SEWRPC.

Figure B-2

DELAY AND LEVEL-OF-SERVICE AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: ALTERNATIVE 2 - TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH RIGHT- AND LEFT-TURN LANES



Source: SEWRPC.

Figure B-3

DELAY AND LEVEL-OF-SERVICE AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: ALTERNATIVE 3 - TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH LEFT-TURN LANES

Source: SEWRPC.

Figure B-4

DELAY AND LEVEL-OF-SERVICE AT THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE: ALTERNATIVE 4 - ROUNDABOUT



Source: SEWRPC.

Appendix C

TABLES SHOWING NUMBER OF QUEUED VEHICLES FOR EACH ALTERNATIVE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PER PEAK HOUR UNDER EXISTING AND FORECAST YEAR 2050 TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Table C-1

LENGTH OF QUEUED VEHICLES UNDER EXISTING AND FORECAST YEAR 2050 CONDITIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE 1: AWSC WITH ADDITIONAL LANES

Approach	Morning Peak		After School Peak		Evening Peak	
	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050
Northbound						
Thru/Left-turn Lane	4	8	3	6	2	3
Thru/Right-Turn Lane	3	7	2	5	2	3
Southbound						
Thru/Left-turn Lane	2	3	2	2	2	3
Thru/Right-Turn Lane	2	3	1	2	2	3
Eastbound						
Thru/Left-turn Lane	4	12	1	2	1	3
Thru/Right-Turn Lane	3	11	1	2	1	3
Westbound						
Thru/Left-turn Lane	3	8	2	3	2	5
Thru/Right-Turn Lane	3	7	1	3	2	5

Source: SEWRPC.

Table C-2

LENGTH OF QUEUED VEHICLES UNDER EXISTING AND FORECAST YEAR 2050 CONDITIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE 2: TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH RIGHT- AND LEFT-TURN LANES

Approach	Morning Peak		After School Peak		Evening Peak	
	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050
Northbound						
Left-turn Lane	1	2	1	1	1	1
Thru Lane	2	2	2	3	2	2
Right-Turn Lane	1	2	1	1	0	0
Southbound						
Left-turn Lane	0	0	1	1	1	1
Thru Lane	2	3	2	2	2	2
Right-Turn Lane	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eastbound						
Left-turn Lane	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thru Lane	2	3	1	2	1	2
Right-Turn Lane	2	3	0	1	1	1
Westbound						
Left-turn Lane	1	2	0	1	0	1
Thru Lane	1	2	1	2	2	4
Right-Turn Lane	1	2	1	1	1	1

Source: SEWRPC.

Table C-3

LENGTH OF QUEUED VEHICLES UNDER EXISTING AND FORECAST YEAR 2050 CONDITIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE 3: TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH LEFT-TURN LANES

Approach	Morning Peak		After School Peak		Evening Peak	
	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050
Northbound						
Left-turn Lane	1	3	1	2	1	1
Thru/Right-Turn Lane	4	9	3	4	2	3
Southbound						
Left-turn Lane	0	1	1	1	1	1
Thru/Right-Turn Lane	3	5	2	2	2	3
Eastbound						
Left-turn Lane	0	1	0	0	0	0
Thru/Right-Turn Lane	4	13	2	3	2	3
Westbound						
Left-turn Lane	1	4	0	1	0	1
Thru/Right-Turn Lane	3	7	2	4	3	5

Source: SEWRPC.

Table C-4

LENGTH OF QUEUED VEHICLES UNDER EXISTING AND FORECAST YEAR 2050 CONDITIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE 4: ROUNDABOUT

Approach	Morning Peak		After School Peak		Evening Peak	
	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050
Northbound Approach	3	8	3	5	2	3
Southbound Approach	2	2	2	2	2	4
Eastbound Approach	4	14	1	2	1	3
Westbound Approach	3	7	2	4	2	5

Source: SEWRPC.

Appendix D

RECORD OF PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE TRAFFIC ENGINEERING STUDY FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE

This appendix presents the public comment received on the Traffic Engineering Study for the Intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue during a formal public comment period of May 17, 2017, through June 15, 2017, and at a public information meeting held on Wednesday, May 31, 2017, at Franklin High School. The purpose of the public comment period and public information meeting was to allow the public to review and provide comment on the study alternatives developed to address excessive congestion—delay and queuing—at the S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue intersection and on the results of an evaluation of the alternatives. This document presents the public comments received on the study. The comments received will be considered by City of Franklin officials in determining what potential operational and geometric intersection improvements to take into preliminary engineering and potentially implementation.

This appendix presents:

- Comment received during the formal public comment period of May 17, 2017, through June 15, 2017:
  - Comments received via comment form during the May 31, 2017, public information meeting (Exhibit D-1a).
  - Comments received via email before the May 31, 2017, public information meeting (Exhibit D-1b).
  - Comments received via email after the May 31, 2017, public information meeting (Exhibit D-1c).
  - Comments posted on the City of Franklin's Neighborhood Watch Facebook discussion board (Exhibit D-1d).
- Material announcing the public information meeting (Exhibit D-2).
- Sign-in sheets from the May 31, 2017, public information meeting (Exhibit D-3).
- Information displayed at the May 31, 2017, public information meeting (Exhibit D-4).

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED

A total of nine formal comments were received during the public comment period or at the May 31, 2017, public meeting, including comments on the alternative intersection improvements presented in a draft report available on the Commission's website (sewrpc.org/51st-DrexelStudy), and as shown on Maps D-1 through D-4 which were displayed at the public meeting. Comments were provided on forms available at the May 31, 2017 meeting, via electronic mail, or through the Commission's website. The Commission staff was also informed by City officials of comments posted on the City of Franklin's Neighborhood Watch Facebook discussion board related to the alternative intersection improvements developed for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue. Relevant comments from the discussion board were summarized separately from the formal comments received.

Support for Improving Intersection

Eight of the nine formal commenters indicated their support for the need for improving the intersection to reduce the existing and future congestion. Of these eight commenters, seven commenters expressed support for at least one of the intersection improvement alternatives. The support expressed for the different alternatives was balanced, with three commenters expressing support for the all-way stop with additional lanes alternative (Alternative 1), four commenters expressing support for the traffic signal alternatives (Alternative 2 or 3), and three commenters expressing support for the roundabout alternative (Alternative 4). Three of those seven commenters supported multiple alternatives, including one commenter expressing support for either the all-way stop alternative or the

roundabout alternative, one commenter expressing support for either the roundabout alternative or the traffic signal alternatives, and one commenter expressing support for either the all-way stop alternative or the traffic signal alternatives. Of the supporters for the traffic signal alternatives, one commenter indicated that a traffic signal at the intersection would improve the ability of vehicles to enter and leave the driveways and the cross-roadways along S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue, and one commenter indicated that signalized intersections seem safer for pedestrians. One commenter indicating support for roundabouts commented that a roundabout may require a police officer to direct traffic during heavy traffic periods and that young drivers may have difficulty navigating a roundabout.

Of the seven commenters indicating support for at least one of the intersection improvement alternatives, five commenters expressed opposition to at least one of the alternative intersection improvements. Specifically, three commenters expressed opposition to the traffic signal alternative and three commenters expressed opposition to the roundabout, including one commenter expressing opposition to both the roundabout and the traffic signal alternatives. Of the commenters indicating their opposition to roundabouts, one commenter expressed concern with respect to young drivers navigating the roundabout, and another commenter expressed their dislike for the roundabout near a Target store in the City and expressed concern for elderly drivers being able to navigate a roundabout. One commenter who expressed opposition to the traffic signal alternatives stated concern for drivers running red lights.

One commenter, while indicating neither support nor opposition to any of the alternatives, suggested that any improvement to the operation of the intersection would need to address traffic entering and leaving Stonebrook Court, particularly for traffic turning left from eastbound W. Drexel Avenue onto Stonebrook Court and for traffic turning left from Stonebrook Court onto eastbound W. Drexel Avenue.

With respect to the discussion regarding the study on the City of Franklin's Neighborhood Watch Facebook discussion board, there was general support in the messages posted for the need for improvements to the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue. There were six commenters that posted on the Facebook page (and did not submit formal comment) that clearly expressed support or opposition to specific intersection improvement alternatives. Specifically, there were two commenters that expressed support for the traffic signal alternative with only left turn lanes (Alternative 3), three commenters that expressed support for the roundabout alternative (Alternative 4), and one commenter that expressed support for both Alternative 3 and Alternative 4. The two commenters that expressed support for the traffic signal alternatives also expressed opposition to the roundabout alternative. Of these two commenters, one noted that roundabouts are a more complex form of traffic control and that impatient drivers disregarded the current traffic control at the intersection during the morning peak period. That commenter also expressed concern that the operation of the roundabout would be affected by the large number of vehicles leaving events at the Franklin High School. The other commenters that expressed opposition to the roundabout alternative noted that young drivers from the high school may have difficulty navigating the roundabout.

Opposition to Improving Intersection

One commenter expressed opposition to the need for any improvement to the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue, indicating that the excessive congestion at the intersection is limited to the 15-minute period before the start of the school day of Franklin High School.

> SEWRPC Response: The commenter is correct in indicating that the traffic approaching the N. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue intersection is highest during the 15-minute period before the start of the school day for Franklin High School, resulting in the worst congestion experienced at the intersection on an average weekday. However, congestion also occurs on the average weekday during the hour at the end of the school day for the high school and during an hour in the evening when commuters are returning home from work.
>
> The operation of an intersection is typically demonstrated by its level-of-service (LOS), which is determined by the average vehicle delay estimated based on its geometric conditions and approaching traffic volumes. Table 1 of the report shows the LOS thresholds for an all-way stop controlled intersection. Generally, a LOS A through C is considered acceptable for an intersection. When traffic volumes exceed the

design capacity of an intersection, it can increase the delay experienced by the vehicles approaching the intersection and result in the backing-up, or queuing, of vehicles. Levels-of-service D through F represent congested conditions, with a LOS F representing a breakdown in the operation of the intersection. Figure 9 of the report shows that under existing traffic conditions, the overall intersection operates under a LOS F (with an average delay of 59.4 seconds) in the morning peak with all four legs of the intersection operating at a LOS D through F. However, the overall intersection also operates under congested conditions during the after school peak and evening peak periods. Specifically the overall intersection operates at a LOS D during the after school peak (with the northbound leg operating at a LOS F) and during the evening peak (with three legs operating at a LOS D or E). The excessive vehicle delay and queuing of vehicles estimated for the intersection during the morning, after school, and evening peak times were observed and confirmed by Commission staff.

The traffic congestion is expected to worsen as planned development (and the associated increase in traffic) occurs in the area. Figure 10 of the report shows that under year 2050 forecast traffic conditions, the overall intersection will operate at a LOS F during all three of the peak periods

Additional Comments

One commenter suggested that a new entrance to the Franklin High School parking lot be constructed east of the S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue intersection to divert traffic from the intersection, as an alternative to implementing any of the intersection improvement alternatives developed as part of the study.

SEWRPC Response: The addition of a third driveway could be expected to divert from the intersection some vehicles that currently utilize both the east leg of W. Drexel Avenue and the south leg of S. 51st Street to travel to and from the school. This could alleviate some of the congestion that is experienced at the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue during the morning and after school peak periods, but would not be expected to reduce congestion enough to alleviate the need for operational improvement to the intersection during both existing and future conditions. As an example, even if the driveway could attract from the intersection all of the traffic travelling on the east leg of W. Drexel Avenue to and from the south leg of S. 51st Street during the morning peak (which is unlikely to occur), the overall intersection would still operate at a LOS D under existing conditions and a LOS F under forecast year 2050 traffic conditions. Additionally, the driveway would not be expected to alleviate any of the congestion that occurs, and is expected to continue to occur in the future, during the evening peak period.

The construction of such a driveway would be expected to impact existing wetlands along the northern portion of the Franklin High School property, which would likely need to be mitigated. In addition, extensive grading and fill would be necessary to build the driveway from its existing location south of the football field to W. Drexel Avenue to address the nearly 20 foot difference in elevation from the driveway to the undeveloped areas south of W. Drexel Avenue on the school property. As such, the cost and environmental effects of construction of such a driveway are not considered to be commensurate with the limited benefit it would provide.

Two commenters on the Facebook discussion page suggested that, in addition to supporting the traffic signal with only left-turn lanes alternative (Alternative 4), both S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue be widened from two to four traffic lanes.

SEWRPC Response: The existing traffic on W. Drexel Avenue between S. 27th Street and S. 76th Street ranges from 6,900 to 7,100 average weekday vehicles, below the design capacity of the existing roadway of 14,000 average weekday vehicles. The future year 2050 forecast traffic on this segment of roadway ranges from 9,000 to 9,500 average weekday vehicles. Similarly, the existing traffic on S. 51st Street between W. Puetz Road and W. Rawson Avenue ranges from 7,500 to 7,700 average weekday vehicles, below the design capacity of the existing roadway of 14,000 average weekday vehicles. The future year 2050 forecast

traffic on this segment of roadway is 10,000 average weekday vehicles. As such, regardless of whether operational improvements are implemented at the S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue intersection, widening along the entire section of W. Drexel Avenue between S. 27th Street and S. 76th Street and the entire section of S. 51st Street between W. Puetz Road and W. Rawson Avenue is not warranted based on existing and future year 2050 average weekday traffic volumes.

.


Map D-1
PLANNING LEVEL DESIGN FOR ALTERNATIVE 1 -
ALL WAY STOP CONTROL WITH ADDITIONAL LANES
Potential Right-of-Way Acquisition (typical)
Right-of-Way (typical)
Edge of Pavement (typical)
Pavement Markings (typical)
Curb and Gutter (typical)
N
0
50
100
Feet


Map D-2
PLANNING LEVEL DESIGN FOR ALTERNATIVE 2 - TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH RIGHT- AND LEFT-TURN LANES
Potential Right-of-Way Acquisition (typical)
Right-of-Way (typical)
Edge of Pavement (typical)
Pavement Markings (typical)
Curb and Gutter (typical)
N
0
50
100
Feet


Map D-3
PLANNING LEVEL DESIGN FOR ALTERNATIVE 3 - TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH LEFT-TURN LANES
Right-of-Way (typical)
Edge of Pavement (typical)
Pavement Markings (typical)
Curb and Gutter (typical)
N
0
50
100
Feet


Map D-4
PLANNING LEVEL DESIGN FOR
ALTERNATIVE 4 - ROUNDABOUT
Potential Right-of-Way
Acquisition (typical)
Truck Apron (typical)
Right-of-Way (typical)
Edge of Pavement (typical)
Pavement Markings (typical)
Curb and Gutter (typical)
N
0
50
100
Feet

Exhibit D-1a

COMMENTS SUBMITTED VIA COMMENT FORM DURING MEETING
May 31, 2017, public information meeting at Franklin High School.

Comment Form

S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue
Traffic Engineering Study

City of Franklin

Name Jean Luftglow Date 5-31-17

Address 5531 w Beacon Rd 23

Comments will also be accepted until June 15, 2017 via:

Web: www.sewrpc.org/51st-DrexelStudy
E-mail: 51st.DrexelStudy@sewrpc.org
Fax: (262) 547-1103
Mail: SEWRPC
P.O. Box 1607
Waukesha, WI 53187

Comment:

Prefer Round about(s) or extended all way stop (*2), Pls NOT
used stop lights

For Round about, make it as bicycle friendly as possible. Need to
encourage more bicycling, including to Franklin High School.

Thank you.

(continue comments on back if more space is needed)

Thank you!

Exhibit D-1b

COMMENTS SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL BEFORE MEETING
May 31, 2017, public information meeting at Franklin High School.

From: website@sewrpc.org
Sent: Tuesday, 23 May 2017 08:44:00 (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)
To: 51st-DrexelStudy
Subject: S. 51st St. and W. Drexel Ave. Intersection Study Comment Form

comments:	Traffic signals at 51st & Drexel seem to be the safest, most practical, least cost and lowest impact alternative. Timing can be regulated or reverted to all way stop as traffic flow dictates. With the present all way stops at 68 th and 51st the east west vehicle spacing during heavy traffic times makes left turns from subdivisions and crossing the oak leaf trail slow and hazardous. Traffic signals at 51st and Drexel would greatly improve this situation along with the 51st street problem. With the addition of expressway on and off ramps at Drexel Avenue I have seen a substantial increase in traffic and can only expect this to grow. The safety of all and traffic flow will improve with traffic signals.
FirstName1:	Mark
LastName1:	Ariens
Email:	yderbutts@sbcglobal.net
MailingAddress1:	5832 W. Allwood dr.
Organization1:	
City1:	Franklin
State1:	Wi
Zipcode1:	53132
ClientIP:	172.13.52.75
SessionID:	biqpowizesndzbfq5xn4vn3d

See Current Results

Exhibit D-1c

COMMENTS SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL OR U.S. MAIL AFTER MEETING
May 31, 2017, public information meeting at Franklin High School.

From: website@sewrpc.org
Sent: Wednesday, 31 May 2017 22:21:02 (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)
To: 51st-DrexelStudy
Subject: S. 51st St. and W. Drexel Ave. Intersection Study Comment Form

comments:	Thank you for taking community member comments. I live off 55th street and frequent this intersection daily. For the past two years I have avoided it during peak times as the waiting and potential for accidents is getting worse. I would be in favor of a stoplight or a roundabout, although with a roundabout it may still be necessary to have an officer stationed during high school events as the traffic in one direction, exiting the school for example might still have increased congestion. I also worry about high school age drivers in a roundabout as they have less experience with these in the area. I also frequently bike or walk to other neighborhoods by crossing 51st street and had any thought been given to pedestrian traffic? Stoplights would be safest with a walk signal which includes an option for pedestrian traffic push button, in my mind. Thank you.
FirstName1:	Kirsten
LastName1:	Kohn
Email:	Kkohn04@yahoo.com
MailingAddress1:	8070 s 55th street
Organization1:	
City1:	Franklin
State1:	WI
Zipcode1:	53132
ClientIP:	98.144.192.201
SessionID:	s10brkhwy2aagqkltp1clszd

See Current Results

From: website@sewrpc.org
Sent: Wednesday, 31 May 2017 22:39:45 (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)
To: 51st-DrexelStudy
Subject: S. 51st St. and W. Drexel Ave. Intersection Study Comment Form

comments:	No roundabout!!!!! This is a high school area that is already an issue and you are considering a rounabout that most adult drivers cannot properly use. It would cause more traffic, more accidents an a lot of of issues. If any of the survey was done during football season you would understand the nightmare that a roundabout would cause. Student and youth drivers will not have the experience necessary to use. Put in a light at that area giving northbound traffic the priority during busy hours.
FirstName1:	Judith
LastName1:	Dornacher
Email:	Jdornacher1@gmail.com
MailingAddress1:	
Organization1:	
City1:	Franklin
State1:	WI
Zipcode1:	
ClientIP:	172.58.137.11
SessionID:	k33ferjfhmu3alvxcd3gvdzv

See Current Results

From: website@sewrpc.org
Sent: Thursday, 01 June 2017 06:45:38 (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)
To: 51st-DrexelStudy
Subject: S. 51st St. and W. Drexel Ave. Intersection Study Comment Form

comments:	I have witnessed too many people running red lights. Round abouts save lives. Please consider placing a round about on 51st and Drexel to ensure a safe intersection.
FirstName1:	Lorrie
LastName1:	Benning
Email:	Lorjben@yahoo.com
MailingAddress1:	
Organization1:	
City1:	Franklin
State1:	Wi
Zipcode1:	53132
ClientIP:	166.181.84.61
SessionID:	bd514102efj0kpt3caams400

See Current Results

From: Ratajewski, Ryan M
Sent: Thursday, 01 June 2017 11:08:59 (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)
To: 51st-DrexelStudy
Subject: 51st & Drexel comments

The 51st & Drexel intersection is really only congested between 7-7:45am and a bit less congested in the early afternoon when school lets out. The remaining times have always been fine. I drive this intersection minimum twice a day.

I believe changes to this intersection are not necessary at this time.

An alternative I would explore would be to create a third high school entrance/exit off of Drexel between the Fire Station and 51st. Not sure about wetlands, but a driveway from Drexel that goes along the east side of the football field connecting to the other drives.

Exhibit D-1c (continued)

COMMENTS SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL OR U.S. MAIL AFTER MEETING
May 31, 2017, public information meeting at Franklin High School.

Ryan Ratajewski
4751 W. Anita Ln
Franklin

From: website@sewrpc.org
Sent: Thursday, 08 June 2017 12:07:18 (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)
To: 51st-DrexelStudy
Subject: S. 51st St. and W. Drexel Ave. Intersection Study Comment Form

comments:	We've lived on 51st and drexel for about 13 years. The trafic is out of hand but between 3-6pm. That in my opinion does not justify million dollar projects. With the high school and kids learning to drive along with the abundance of school buses it woul dbe more practical to go with Alt. 2. It is a solution to the congestions at the corner, we are not teaching people how to drive in a rounf about and the school buses will have adaquate room to maneuver safety. My fear with a rouondabout is people will speed up and in turn cause more accidents and more stress on our Police Department. The longer turning lanes will alleviate some cars going west on drexel and the backups from turning left onto 51st. We have trouble getting out of our subdivision now and with the added backups of a roundabout and stop lights I feel will make the situation worse. Please consider the additional lanes. It will make the area more pleasing, you are not taking frontage from homes and the additional lanes make people stop and think about what they are doing.
FirstName1:	Ann
LastName1:	Adamski
Email:	Aadamski1@wi.rr.com
MailingAddress1:	7825 S Stonebrook Ct
Organization1:	Concern homeowner
City1:	Franklin
State1:	WI
Zipcode1:	53132
ClientIP:	199.181.202.7
SessionID:	u1o1dexxy25hmsvu2l2y0eig

See Current Results

From: website@sewrpc.org
Sent: Thursday, 01 June 2017 11:12:43 (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)
To: 51st-DrexelStudy
Subject: S. 51st St. and W. Drexel Ave. Intersection Study Comment Form

comments:	Any improvement other than a roundabout. Such a waste of money. Confusing as all get-out. Creates such delays. Prime example is the one by Target on Drexel. Seen more people stopping for no reason just because they are confused as to what to do. Population getting older and this simply makes things worse. I avoid that area due to that issue. Would have liked to go to meeting but didn't read about it until today. Think widening street to allow for turn lanes and if we are looking over 20 years from now then go with lights.
FirstName1:	Bonnie
LastName1:	Martins
Email:	bonnrmartins@yahoo.com
MailingAddress1:	8410 Fountain Court
Organization1:	
City1:	Franklin
State1:	Wisconsin
Zipcode1:	53132
ClientIP:	99.189.126.71
SessionID:	4ouvvewrjau51xlxjnnpjrxt

See Current Results

From: website@sewrpc.org
Sent: Monday, 12 June 2017 10:33:07 (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)
To: 51st-DrexelStudy
Subject: S. 51st St. and W. Drexel Ave. Intersection Study Comment Form

comments:	Solution will need to address residence traffic to & from homes on the Stonebrook cul-de-sac. Concern 1: Left hand turn to head east from Stonebrook CT. We need the ability especially during high traffic times to safely merge onto Drexel to travel east. Merging West direction I'm guessing won't be a concern. Concern 2: Left hand turn into Stonebrook CT. We need the ability to safely enter Stonebrook CT. Traveling east from 51st we need to make a safe left hand turn to our residence without accident.
FirstName1:	Steven
LastName1:	Rogalinski
Email:	steverogalinski@gmail.com
MailingAddress1:	7834 Stonebrook CT
Organization1:	
City1:	Franklin
State1:	WI
Zipcode1:	53132
ClientIP:	74.203.205.10
SessionID:	mrbdpwceigwtgeyvsxpu5j1l

See Current Results

Exhibit D-1d

COMMENTS POSTED ON THE CITY OF FRANKLIN'S NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH FACEBOOK DISCUSSION BOARD

Kirsten Kohn shared a link.
May 31 at 8:29pm

Please read the proposals and give input on the plans for changing the intersection of 51st and Drexel. Website www.sewrpc.org and there is a place for feedback. We are outgrowing this 4 way stop and more input will be helpful for the planners! Especially if you or your children frequent this intersection. Thank you!

SEWRPC
The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) is the official metropolitan planning organization (MPO) and regional planning commission (RPC) for the seven county southeastern Wisconsin area. SEWRPC was created in 1960 to provide the basic information and planning services necess...
SEWRPC.ORG

5 Likes 13 Comments 1 Share

Like Comment Share

Juan Ocasio, Dan Nichols, Tamara Grobschmidt and 2 others like this.

1 share

Kirsten Kohn More information, comments accepted through June 15th

Like · May 31 at 8:34pm · Edited

Theresa Grove Looks like there was a meeting a few hours ago. lol. http://www.sewrpc.org/.../Transporta.../Franklin51Drexel.htm

Traffic Engineering Study for the Intersection of S. 51st Street and W....
SEWRPC.ORG

Like · 1 · May 31 at 8:33pm

Chrisn Cindy Dawes Roundabout!
Like · 3 · May 31 at 8:35pm

Justin Stefanski I'm definitely for a roundabout in this case... traffic can flow through much better than what it currently does. Drove through there today at about 5:30.. yikes.
Like · 1 · May 31 at 8:50pm

Justin Stefanski And a traffic controlled intersection with only left turn would be second choice, however, since traffic is so low on non-peak times, I would hate to sit at a light even if it is a sensor and changes within 10-15 seconds. After

sporting events, i.e. football, round about would not need additional cops to direct traffic, however a light would likely require it to prevent huge back ups down 51st from the high school.
Like · May 31 at 8:55pm · Edited

Justin Stefanski But I would fear by 2050, as the projections show, a single lane roundabout could increase queuing more than other alternatives, but a double lane round about may be overkill at this point. Alas, it is almost the cheapest from a maintenance perspective and initial cost to build.
Like · May 31 at 9:19pm · Edited

Lisa Truong Yes!! This could be the roundabout us roundabout fans have been waiting for in Franklin!
Like · 3 · May 31 at 9:01pm

Michael Wegerbauer As long as they include a redesign of the FHS parking lot which inexplicably forces every vehicle in the lot to drive right in front of the school as people are entering and exiting the school! Yeah let's make every car and person co-mingle at the same place, what could go wrong?!
Like · 3 · May 31 at 9:25pm

Jennifer Johnsen Yep! Clearly forgot to include the civil engineer in planning on that one!
Like · 1 · June 1 at 6:12am

Michael Wegerbauer Jennifer Johnsen it's almost embarrassing. Such a beautiful new facility and that parking lot is just dreadful. 4 more years of playing Frogger in that lot.
Like · 2 · June 1 at 6:20am

Jennifer Johnsen Michael Wegerbauer my son graduated 2 years ago but I have 5 and 3 year olds as well. Hopefully there will be some "remodeling" before we have to go back there
Like · 1 · June 1 at 8:24am · Edited

Michael Wegerbauer And a new fieldhouse. That gym is terrible and borderline unsafe during a basketball game. All they need for the parking lot is a "dump out" on to Drexel with a dedicated left and right turn lane so only drivers who are picking or dropping someone at the front need to drive past there.
Like · 1 · June 1 at 9:04am

David Vancleve A roundabout of sufficient size to accomodate the school buses would most likely require the acquisition of both of the residences located on the NE & SW quadrants of the intersection, the NE most certainly. Widening the existing configuration to 4 lanes of travel in all directions with the left lanes being dedicated to left turn only and installing traffic signal control lights that are timed according to the level of vehicles / time of day would probably be the most beneficial at this location. I beleive a single or even a double lane roundabout would create more kaos during the peak school start and end times than it would alleviate due to the already high number of impatient drivers who disregard the lane configuration as it is and the seeming inability of some to even understand who has the right of way at a 4 way stop intersection. Roundabouts can only solve high volume congestion when they are engineered to be of sufficient size, smaller ones only slow traffic and reduce cross traffic accidents but require all drivers to understand their operating principles. After a big school event the vehicles from the West, North and East would be at a distinct disadvantage to the steady flow emerging from the school and entering the roundabout in a steady stream. Just my 2 cents, I live in the very near vicinity but I no longer have to deal with the school traffic congestion.
Like · 6 · May 31 at 9:59pm · Edited

Wendy Stuart Czajkowski Many near misses at the round about by Target. No directionals as to where anyone is going.
Like · June 1 at 9:47am

Mary Alles Starr I couldn't agree more with widening the two streets, the traffic is too heavy for just two lanes. With all the development going on in Oak Creek and the new interchange, the traffic between 27th and 51st has exploded. There are days you think you'll never get out of your subdivision because it's so heavy. I also agree that a roundabout there would do nothing more than cause chaos.
Like · June 1 at 9:49am

Angela Beadle From the SEWRPC website:

Comments will be accepted through June 15, 2017, and can be provided in written form at the meeting, electronically via email (51st-DrexelStudy@sewrpc.org) or through the S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue intersection study webpage (see below), or via letter to the below address. Any comments received during the public information meeting and the public comment period will be reviewed by City officials to determine whether changes should be made to the alternatives identified or their evaluation, and to assist in determining what potential operational and geometric intersection improvements to take into preliminary engineering and potential implementation.
Like · June 1 at 3:53am

Eric W Kent Roundabouts are more advanced and require more attention to detail and anticipation than 4-way stops. Given the high percentage of new drivers using that intersection and our community's already-demonstrated inability to properly use the 4-way stop, I vote for a stoplight. I believe a roundabout would be an unmitigated and semi-irreversible disaster.

Like · 4 · June 1 at 8:05am

Chrisn Cindy Dawes I'm a roundabout person but you do make a very valid point that didn't even cross my mind.
Like · June 1 at 8:16am

Bonnie Martins Detest the current roundabout by Target. So many folks appear confused and do not understand how it works. I've gotten so I avoid the area if at all possible. Also they take up much more land to install. Would city have to buy home on corner? Difficult for trucks to get around too. Fire dept is close to that area.
Like · 1 · June 1 at 9:18am

Mary Alles Starr Bonnie Martins I've had several close calls with people pulling in front of me while I'm in that roundabout by Target that I now, OMG, yup, go to the one in Oak Creek. LOL don't slam me folks, I know, i'd much rather support a Franklin business but I really like getting from point A to point B and back without an accident.
Like · June 1 at 10:00am

Chrisn Cindy Dawes Trucks aren't suppose to be on that round where the roundabout is in front of target.
Like · June 1 at 12:19pm

Michael Paradise I hate it when people stop in front of me to see if someone is coming and there isn't.
Like · June 2 at 6:29am

Michael Wegerbauer People have trouble with 4 ways stops too. The only problem wth roundabouts is if they get snow covered and there is a lot of traffic from all directions, makes it difficult to merge in. Otherwise they are superior. People will adjust. They should put a camera at 51st and Drexel now and make a video of what not to do. There is a car driven by a student that likes to stay in the straight lane if the line is shorter going east on Drexel and then turns right to go South on 51st cutting off the person turning right. Laughing all the way I might add.
Like · 2 · June 1 at 12:27pm

Mira Alphabet I see comments are accepted through the 15th but this just showed up on my thread today the 2nd. Not cool.
Like · June 2 at 5:06am

Lisa Truong You still have 13 more days, correct?
Like · June 2 at 6:35am

Mira Alphabet To respond to only what's in writing; I have no idea what was said at the meeting.
Like · June 2 at 6:36am · Edited

Ann Formankiewicz Adamski Nothing was said. It was just to see the plans. There were people there from the consultant group who put the study together. They had about 10 boards with the 4 options and a study of future traffic. You can put your comments on the website above. Please give your feedback they want to see who is at least interested in what's going on. Roundabouts and school buses. Mmmmmmm
Like · 1 · June 2 at 2:28pm · Edited

Mira Alphabet Roundabouts are great if they are built right. Haven't seen a good one here in Wiscosin. Google Indianapolis, or St Armand's Circle in FL for ones well done.
Like · 1 · June 2 at 2:44pm

Exhibit D-2

MATERIAL USED TO ANNOUNCE
May 31, 2017, Public Information Meeting

AN OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE INPUT

RESIDENTS ARE INVITED TO COMMENT ON A TRAFFIC ENGINEERING STUDY FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE

At the request of the City of Franklin, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission is conducting a **traffic engineering study for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue** to address congestion issues at the intersection, particularly during student arrival and departure times at the nearby Franklin High School. The study involves analyzing the current operation of the existing all-way stop signs at the intersection and identifying and evaluating potential improvements to the operation of the intersection, such as enhancing the existing all-way stop signs with additional lanes, replacing the stop signs with traffic signals, or constructing a roundabout.

PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

A public informational meeting is being held to allow the public to review and provide comment on the study alternatives and the results of an evaluation of the alternatives. The meeting will be in an open house format with boards presenting information on the S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue intersection, the identified alternative intersection improvements, and the results of an evaluation of the alternatives. The public meeting will be held:

Wednesday, May 31, 2017, 6:00-8:00 pm
Franklin High School Library
8222 S. 51st Street, Franklin, WI

People needing disability-related accommodations are asked to contact the Commission offices (below) a minimum of 3 business days in advance so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

More information on the traffic engineering study for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue may be obtained from the SEWRPC website at sewrpc.org/51st-DrexelStudy, or by calling (262) 547-6721.

Comments will be accepted through **June 15, 2017**, and can be provided in written form at the meeting, electronically via email or through the S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue intersection study webpage (sewrpc.org/51st-DrexelStudy), or via letter to the below address. Any comments received during the public information meeting and the public comment period will be reviewed by City officials to determine whether changes should be made to the alternatives identified or their evaluation, and to assist in determining what potential operational and geometric intersection improvements to take into preliminary engineering and potential implementation.

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, P.O. Box 1607, Waukesha, Wisconsin 53187-1607
Phone: 262-547-6721 Fax: 262-547-1103 e-mail: 51st-DrexelStudy@sewrpc.org

Exhibit D-3

SIGN-IN SHEETS FROM THE PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
May 31, 2017, public information meeting at Franklin High School.

00237631.DOCX

SIGN-IN ROSTER

Public Information Meeting
S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue Intersection Study

May 31, 2017
Franklin High School Library
8222 S. 51st Street

	Name	Address	Community
1.	[illegible]	7770 S. 51st.	
2.	[illegible]	7770 S. 51st	
3.	Chas Goehring	8017 S. 57th St	
4.	Diane Goehring	8017 S. 57th St	
5.	[illegible]	6832 Juliana Dr. 7852-56 S. 51st St.	
6.	Mark Gloudemans	FPS	
7.	[illegible]	5700 W Allwood Dr	
8.	Brad Severson	100 West Lawrence, Appleton WI 54911	
9.	Shirley MATHIAS	5670 W ALLWOOD DR	
10.	Mike Barber	7931 So 21st St	
11.	Randy Rohweng	4614 W. High View Dr.	
12.	Kris Mains	8058 S 57th St	
13.	Dave Mains	" "	
14.	Ann-John ADAMSKI	7825 S Stonebrook Ct.	
15.	Jean Ludemann	5531 W Beach Hill Rd.	
16.	Kristen Wilhelm	C of Franklin	
17.			
18.			
19.			

Exhibit D-4

INFORMATION DISPLAYED AT THE PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
May 31, 2017, public information meeting at Franklin High School.

TRAFFIC STUDY FOR THE INTERSECTION OF S. 51ST STREET AND W. DREXEL AVENUE

- The City of Franklin requested Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission staff conduct a traffic engineering study for the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue.

- The study was requested to address congestion (excessive vehicle delay and queuing) experienced at the intersection, particularly during student arrival and departure times at the nearby Franklin High School.

Study Area

Study Steps

1) Inventory
Existing conditions at and near the intersection were documented, including adjacent land uses, existing intersection characteristics, vehicle crashes, existing and future traffic volumes and vehicle turning movements, and existing and future operating conditions.

2) Identification of Alternatives
Commission staff identified four potential alternatives to improve the operation of the intersection based on existing and forecast future conditions, including adding turn lanes to the current all-way stop control, two traffic signal alternatives, and one roundabout alternative.

3) Evaluation of Alternatives
The four potential alternatives were evaluated based on each alternative's ability to reduce delay, and queueing, potential impacts to adjacent land, and estimated construction costs.

Exhibit D-4 (continued)

INFORMATION DISPLAYED AT THE PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
May 31, 2017, public information meeting at Franklin High School.

EXISTING LAND USES, INTERSECTION CONFIGURATION, AND VEHICLE CRASHES

Existing Nearby Land Uses



RESIDENTIAL
COMMERCIAL
GOVERNMENTAL AND INSTITUTIONAL
EXTRACTIVE AND LANDFILL
WETLANDS
WOODLANDS
AGRICULTURAL AND OTHER OPEN LANDS
SURFACE WATER

- Information was collected on the land uses for the area adjacent to the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue.
- The area surrounding the intersection includes residential development, Franklin High School, Pleasant View Elementary School, and a Payne and Dolan quarry.
  - Franklin High School
    - 1,500 students
    - Class begins at 7:20 a.m. and ends at 2:34 p.m.
  - Pleasant View Elementary School
    - About 500 students
    - Class begins at 8:30 a.m. and ends at 3:15 p.m.
- Because of their proximity to the intersection and effect on traffic, information on the characteristics of the two schools was also gathered.
- Driveways and intersecting roadways that are located in the functional area of the existing intersection were also identified.

Existing Intersection Configuration and Conflicts

Functional Area of Intersection
Four Driveways in Functional Area of Intersection
One Roadway in Functional Area of Intersection

- Stop-signs at all four approaches, called all-way stop control (AWSC)
- Both S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue are arterial roadways and serve both traffic generated from adjacent land uses and traffic travelling through the study area.
- Parking is generally permitted near the intersection, except during school hours when parking is prohibited on both sides of S. 51st Street and on the side of the existing right turn lanes on W. Drexel Avenue. Parking is permitted during school hours on the north side of W. Drexel Avenue west of S. 51st Street and on the south side of W. Drexel Avenue east of S. 51st Street.
- Vehicles entering and exiting driveways and intersecting roadways can conflict with the stopping maneuver of vehicles approaching the intersection. Queueing at the intersection may impact the access of vehicles entering and existing the driveways and intersecting roadways, particularly those driveways and roadways closest to the intersection.

Vehicle Crashes: 2011-2015



- A total of 19 vehicular crashes occurred at the intersection from 2011 through 2015 (or 0.71 crashes per one million entering vehicles). Of the 19 crashes, 16 occurred over the last three years (or 1.00 crashes per one million entering vehicles), and 5 crashes (or 26 percent) resulted in an injury. However, none of the crashes resulted in a serious injury or a fatality.
- A total of 8 crashes (or 42 percent of the 19 crashes) were rear-end crashes, which are typical for an AWSC intersection because of queueing that can occur at such intersections.
- A total of 9 crashes (or 47 percent of the 19 crashes) were angle crashes, which generally involved drivers failing to yield right-of-way. These types of crashes are generally unusual for AWSC intersections, except during times of excessive delay and queues.
- None of the reported crashes involved pedestrians, bicycles, or buses over the 5-year period.

Exhibit D-4 (continued)

INFORMATION DISPLAYED AT THE PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
May 31, 2017, public information meeting at Franklin High School.

CURRENT AND FORECAST YEAR 2050 TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Current Traffic Conditions

- Commission staff collected traffic volumes, vehicle classifications, and turning movements at the intersection on Tuesday, November 1 through Wednesday, November 2, 2016, to establish the average weekday traffic volume for the intersection used in the analysis.
- A total of about 14,600 vehicles enter the intersection of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue on an average weekday. Traffic traveling on the four legs of the intersection are fairly balanced:
  - W. Drexel Avenue ranges from 6,900 to 7,100 vehicles per average weekday
  - S. 51st Street ranges from 7,500 to 7,700 vehicles per average weekday
- Current average weekday volumes on S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue near the intersection are below the existing design capacity of 14,000 vehicles per average weekday.
- Nearly all of the vehicles approaching the intersection, about 98 percent, are automobiles or light-duty trucks. The remaining two percent were buses or medium- to heavy-duty trucks.
- In addition, 34 bicyclists and 46 pedestrians utilized the intersection, or less than one percent of roadway users.

Forecast Year 2050 Traffic Conditions

- Commission staff prepared forecast year 2050 average weekday traffic volumes and turning movements. The forecast traffic volumes were based on planned population and employment growth and transportation improvements recommended in VISION 2050--the adopted year 2050 regional land use and transportation plan for Southeastern Wisconsin.
  - W. Drexel Avenue is estimated to have 9,000 to 9,500 average weekday vehicles
  - S. 51st Street is estimated to have about 10,000 average weekday vehicles
- Volumes are below the existing design capacity of each roadway of 14,000 average weekday vehicles.

Peak Hour Traffic

- The one-hour periods of the day with the heaviest traffic is utilized in evaluating and designing the traffic control and geometry of an intersection. Generally, there are two peak hours in the day--during the morning commute and the afternoon commute. However, there is a third peak hour at the S. 51st Street/W. Drexel Avenue intersection that coincides with the end of classes at Franklin High School.

15-Minute Interval Approaching Traffic Volume



Current/Forecast Year 2050 Traffic Volumes/Turning Movements



Exhibit D-4 (continued)

INFORMATION DISPLAYED AT THE PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
May 31, 2017, public information meeting at Franklin High School.

EXISTING AND FUTURE OPERATION OF 51ST ST/DREXEL AVE INTERSECTION

- When traffic volume exceeds the design capacity of an intersection, it experiences longer delays and queueing of vehicles.

Delay and Level of Service (LOS)

- The level-of-service (LOS) for an intersection is determined by the average delay (as shown in the table below).
- Different LOS thresholds exist for AWSC and roundabouts, and for traffic signals.
- LOS of A through C is considered acceptable for an intersection.

LOS Thresholds for AWSC

Level of Traffic Congestion	Level-of-service	Control Delay at AWSC (veh/sec)	Operating Conditions
None	A	≤ 10	Nearly all drivers find freedom of operation. Very seldom is there more than one vehicle in queue.
	B	> 10 – 15	Some drivers begin to consider the delay an inconvenience. Occasionally there is more than one vehicle in queue.
	C	> 15 – 25	Many times there is more than one vehicle in queue. Most drivers feel restricted, but not objectionably so.
Moderate	D	>25 – 35	Often there is more than one vehicle in queue. Drivers feel quite restricted.
Severe	E	> 35 – 50	Represents a condition in which the demand is near or equal to the probable maximum number of vehicles that can be accommodated by the movement. There is almost always more than one vehicle in queue. Drivers find the delays approaching intolerable levels.
Extreme	F	> 50	Represents an intersection failure condition that is caused by geometric and/or operational constraints external to the intersection.

Existing and Forecast Year 2050 Delay and LOS for the Current Intersection Configuration



Highest Queuing Length (Representing Worst Lane)

- Queuing of an intersection can be estimated based on the average delay experienced at an intersection.

	Morning Peak	After School Peak	Evening Peak
Existing	19	12	8
Future Year 2050	38	32	23

Exhibit D-4 (continued)

INFORMATION DISPLAYED AT THE PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
May 31, 2017, public information meeting at Franklin High School.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

ALTERNATIVE 1 - ENHANCE EXISTING AWSC INTERSECTION

- Retain the all-way stop control at the intersection and provide the addition of a turn lane to accommodate a shared through and left-turn lane and a shared through and right-turn lane. The additional turn lane would be dropped downstream from the intersection at each approach to allow sufficient time for vehicles to merge back into one lane.

Planning Level Design for Alternative 1 - All Way Stop Control With Additional Lanes



ALTERNATIVE 2 - TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH RIGHT- AND LEFT-TURN LANES

- Install a traffic signal and construct exclusive right- and left-turn lanes. Left turn lanes are aligned directly opposite of each other to improve efficiency and safety by maximizing the visibility for left-turning vehicles.

Planning Level Design for Alternative 2 - Traffic Signal with Right- and Left- Turn Lanes



Exhibit D-4 (continued)

INFORMATION DISPLAYED AT THE PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
May 31, 2017, public information meeting at Franklin High School.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED (CONTINUED)

ALTERNATIVE 3 - TRAFFIC SIGNAL WITH LEFT- TURN LANES

- Install a traffic signal and construct exclusive left-turn lanes on all approaches.

Planning Level Design for Alternative 3 - Traffic Signal with Left- Turn Lanes



ALTERNATIVE 4 - ROUNDABOUT

- Construct a single-lane roundabout. The roundabout would be large enough for large vehicles such as buses, fire trucks, and semi-trucks.

Planning Level Design for Alternative 4 - Roundabout



Exhibit D (continued)

Information Displayed at
May 31, 2017, Public Information Meeting

EVALUATION OF DELAY: EXISTING



LOS Thresholds for AWSC/Roundabouts

Level of Traffic Congestion	Level-of-service	Control Delay at AWSC and Roundabout (veh/sec)	Operating Conditions
None	A	< 10	Nearly all drivers find freedom of operation. Very seldom is there more than one vehicle in queue.
	B	> 10 – 15	Some drivers begin to consider the delay an inconvenience. Occasionally there is more than one vehicle in queue.
	C	> 15 – 25	Many times there is more than one vehicle in queue. Most drivers feel restricted, but not objectionably so.
Moderate	D	>25 – 35	Often there is more than one vehicle in queue. Drivers feel quite restricted.
Severe	E	> 35 – 50	Represents a condition in which the demand is near or equal to the probable maximum number of vehicles that can be accommodated by the movement. There is almost always more than one vehicle in queue. Drivers find the delays approaching intolerable levels.
Extreme	F	> 50	Represents an intersection failure condition that is caused by geometric and/or operational constraints external to the intersection.

LOS Thresholds for Traffic Signals

Level of Traffic Congestion	Level-of-service	Control Delay at Traffic Signal (veh/sec)	Operating Conditions
None	A	< 10	Progression is exceptionally favorable or the cycle length is very short. Most vehicles arrive during the green indication and travel through the intersection without stopping.
	B	> 10 – 20	Progression is highly favorable or the cycle length is short. More vehicles stop than with LOS A.
	C	> 20 – 35	Progression is favorable or cycle length is moderate. Individual cycle failures may begin at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant, although many vehicles still pass through the intersection without stopping.
Moderate	D	>35 – 55	Progression is ineffective or the cycle length is long. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.
Severe	E	> 55 – 80	Progression is unfavorable and the cycle length is long. Individual cycle failures are frequent.
Extreme	F	> 80	Progression is very poor and the cycle length is long. Most cycles fail to clear the queue.

Exhibit D (continued)

Information Displayed at
May 31, 2017, Public Information Meeting

EVALUATION OF DELAY: 2050



LOS Thresholds for AWSC/Roundabouts

Level of Traffic Congestion	Level-of-service	Control Delay at AWSC and Roundabout (veh/sec)	Operating Conditions
None	A	≤ 10	Nearly all drivers find freedom of operation. Very seldom is there more than one vehicle in queue.
	B	> 10 – 15	Some drivers begin to consider the delay an inconvenience. Occasionally there is more than one vehicle in queue.
	C	> 15 – 25	Many times there is more than one vehicle in queue. Most drivers feel restricted, but not objectionably so.
Moderate	D	>25 – 35	Often there is more than one vehicle in queue. Drivers feel quite restricted.
Severe	E	> 35 – 50	Represents a condition in which the demand is near or equal to the probable maximum number of vehicles that can be accommodated by the movement. There is almost always more than one vehicle in queue. Drivers find the delays approaching intolerable levels.
Extreme	F	> 50	Represents an intersection failure condition that is caused by geometric and/or operational constraints external to the intersection.

LOS Thresholds for Traffic Signals

Level of Traffic Congestion	Level-of-service	Control Delay at Traffic Signal (veh/sec)	Operating Conditions
None	A	< 10	Progression is exceptionally favorable or the cycle length is very short. Most vehicles arrive during the green indication and travel through the intersection without stopping.
	B	> 10 – 20	Progression is highly favorable or the cycle length is short. More vehicles stop than with LOS A.
	C	> 20 – 35	Progression is favorable or cycle length is moderate. Individual cycle failures may begin at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant, although many vehicles still pass through the intersection without stopping.
Moderate	D	>35 – 55	Progression is ineffective or the cycle length is long. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.
Severe	E	> 55 – 80	Progression is unfavorable and the cycle length is long. Individual cycle failures are frequent.
Extreme	F	> 80	Progression is very poor and the cycle length is long. Most cycles fail to clear the queue.

Exhibit D (continued)

Information Displayed at
May 31, 2017, Public Information Meeting

Ability to Reduce Highest Queuing Length (Representing Worst Lane)

	Morning Peak		After School Peak		Evening Peak	
	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050	Existing	Year 2050
Existing Configuration	19	38	12	34	8	23
Alternative 1	4	12	3	6	2	5
Alternative 2	2	3	3	3	2	4
Alternative 3	5	13	3	4	3	5
Alternative 4	4	14	3	5	2	5

Estimated Right-of-Way Acquisition

Alternative	Right-of-Way Acquisition (acres)
Alternative 1	0.00
Alternative 2	0.07
Alternative 3	0.00
Alternative 4	0.04

Potential Effects on Residences

Alternative	Effects on Residences
Alternative 1	The ease of entering/exiting of the driveways of four residences would potentially be affected by two additional lanes within functional area of intersection.
Alternative 2	The ease of entering/exiting of the driveways of two residences would potentially be affected by the added left-turn lane. In addition, two residences would potentially be added to the functional area of the intersection.
Alternative 3	The ease of entering/exiting of the driveways of two residences would potentially be affected by the added left-turn lane. In addition, two residences would potentially be added to the functional area of the intersection.
Alternative 4	The ease of entering/exiting of the driveway of one resident could potentially be affected by being in proximity to a splitter island (If a vehicle has difficulty exiting this driveway to travel eastbound on Drexel Avenue, it could exit the driveway and travel west on Drexel Avenue and complete a U-turn through roundabout to travel east. A vehicle turning into this driveway from the eastbound lane on Drexel Avenue may cause vehicles to stop in the roundabout.)

Potential Impacts on Utilities

Alternative	Effects on Utilities
Alternative 1	None (essentially remaining in existing pavement envelope)
Alternative 2	2 utility poles would potentially need to be relocated (one in NE corner and one in SE Corner)
Alternative 3	None (essentially remaining in existing pavement envelope)
Alternative 4	None (able to move roundabout to avoid impacts to utility poles)

Estimated Costs

Alternative	Estimated Construction Cost [a]	Estimated Right-of-Way Cost	Estimated Total Cost [b]
Alternative 1	$ 0.78 Million	$ 0.00 Million	$ 0.78 Million
Alternative 2	$1.73 Million	$ 0.01 Million	$ 1.74 Million
Alternative 3	$ 1.53 Million	$ 0.00 Million	$ 1.53 Million
Alternative 4	$0.56 Million	$ 0.01 Million	$ 0.57 Million

[a] The estimated planning-level construction costs include reconstructing the segments of S. 51st Street and W. Drexel Avenue affected by each of the alternatives, as shown on the planning-level designs. The construction costs for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could be reduced if the current pavement structure for all or portions of the affected roadway is in good enough condition that they could be resurfaced or reconditioned, rather than reconstructed. The estimated construction costs include preliminary and final engineering.

[b] Does not include cost for utility relocation

Note: With respect to operation and maintenance costs, Alternative 1 (upgrade existing AWSC) would have slightly higher annual operation and maintenance costs than the current intersection due to the additional lanes and pavement markings, but would be expected to have the lowest operation and maintenance costs of the four alternatives.

Alternatives 2 and 3 (provide traffic signals) would be expected to have the highest annual operation and maintenance costs of the alternatives, mostly due to the cost to provide electricity to the traffic signals and to regularly service equipment.

Alternative 4 (provide a roundabout) would be expected to have annual operation and maintenance costs less than those for Alternatives 2 and 3, but more than that for Alternative 1. Operation and maintenance costs for a roundabout typically include the costs to regularly re-stripe pavement markings, to maintain the additional pavement (including the colored pavement of the truck apron), and to maintain any landscaping in the center of the roundabout.