

## CENTRAL TEXAS Regional Mobility Authority

## AGENDA ITEM \#4 SUMMARY

Authorize installation of traffic signals at the intersection of Hero Way with the northbound and southbound 183A frontage roads.

Strategic Plan Relevance: Regional Mobility
Department:
Associated Costs:

Funding Source:
Board Action Required:

## Engineering

approximately $\$ 100,000$ (most materials already owned by Mobility Authority)

General Funds

Yes

Description of Matter:
The intersection of 183A and Hero Way is currently stop-controlled. A Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis was performed on January 16, 2014 and indicates that a signal is warranted.

The results of the warrant are based on the data collected in accordance with the TxDOT standard process for signals. The peak hour criteria (Warrant 3 - Peak Hour) were met. It is recommended that a traffic signal be installed.

Reference documentation: Draft Resolution
Traffic Study Warrants
Support Letter from Leander City Mayor Fielder and Williamson County Commissioner Long

Contact for further information: Wesley M. Burford, P.E., Director of Engineering

# GENERAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE <br> CENTRAL TEXAS REGIONAL MOBILITY AUTHORITY 

# RESOLUTION NO. 14- <br> $\qquad$ <br> AUTHORIZING INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT THE INTERSECTION OF HERO WAY WITH THE NORTHBOUND AND SOUTHBOUND 183A FRONTAGE ROADS 

WHEREAS, the Director of Engineering has recently completed an engineering and traffic study for the intersection of the 183A frontage roads and Hero Way to determine if traffic signals at the intersections are now warranted; and

WHEREAS, based on the results of the engineering and traffic study and the resources now available to the Mobility Authority, the Executive Director recommends the installation of traffic signals at the intersections of the 183A frontage roads and Hero Way.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board hereby approves the installation of traffic signals at the intersection of the 183A frontage roads and Hero Way as recommended by the Executive Director, and authorizes and directs the Executive Director to complete the installation of those traffic signals within a reasonable time.

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Central Texas Regional Mobility Authority on the $26^{\text {th }}$ day of February, 2014.

Submitted and reviewed by:

Andrew Martin
General Counsel for the Central
Texas Regional Mobility Authority

Approved:

Ray A. Wilkerson
Chairman, Board of Directors
Resolution Number: 14-
Date Passed: 02/26/14

# Traffic Signal Warrant 183A Frontage Road 

 And Hero Way

CENTRAL TEXAS Regional Mobility Authority


February 2014
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## I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This report presents a summary of findings for a Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis performed by HNTB Corporation, Inc. for the intersection of 183A Frontage Road and Hero Way in Leander, Williamson County, Texas. A Site Location Map has been included in the Appendix of this report as Exhibit 1.

In order to conduct the signal warrant analysis 24 -hour traffic counts were collected for the intersection of 183A and Hero Way on January 16, 2014. Based on previous data obtained in September 2013 for the Annual Traffic Report, the intersection of 183A Southbound Frontage Road and Hero Way had the highest volumes and number of accidents. This data can be found in the Appendix of this report as Exhibit 2. A site visit was also conducted to observe the geometric configuration of the intersection as well as any unique characteristics about the approaches.

The intersection of 183A and Hero Way is currently a diamond interchange with the frontage road divided with 183A main lanes. The northbound and southbound frontage roads speed limit is 60 mph and Hero Way Approach is 45 mph . Hero Way Approach is currently stop-controlled at both intersections.

## II. ANALYSIS

The 2011 Texas Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (TMUTCD) requires that certain warrants be met prior to the installation of a traffic signal. These warrants are summarized at follows:

| 1. | Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume | 5. | School Crossing |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Four-Hour Vehicular Volume | 6. | Coordinated Signal System |
| 3. | Peak Hour | 7. | Crash Experience |
| 4. | Pedestrian Volume | 8. | Roadway Network |
|  |  | 9. | Intersection Near a Grade Crossing |

Below are the TMUTCD descriptions of the Traffic Signal Warrants. In addition to the descriptions, TMUTCD also considers sound engineering judgment and recommendations as enough evidence to warrant the necessity of a traffic signal.

## A. Warrant 1 - Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

This warrant involves three (3) conditions (A, B, or a combination of A and B) which can individually satisfy the conditions of Warrant 1. Condition A is the Minimum Vehicular Volume which is intended for application at locations where a large volume of intersecting traffic is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal. Condition B is the Interruption of Continuous Traffic which is intended for application where the traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that traffic on a minor street suffers excessively.

## B. Warrant 2 - Four-Hour Vehicular Volume

This warrant is intended to be applied where the volumes of intersecting traffic is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal.
C. Warrant 3 - Peak Hour

This warrant is intended for use at a location where traffic conditions are such that for a minimum of one (1) hour of an average day, the minor-street traffic suffers undue delay when entering or crossing the major street.
D. Warrant 4 - Pedestrian Volume

This warrant is intended for application where the traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that pedestrians experience excessive delay in crossing the major street.
E. Warrant 5 - School Crossing

This warrant is intended for application where the fact that school children cross the major street is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal.
F. Warrant 6 - Coordinated Signal System

This warrant is when progressive movement in a coordinated signal system sometimes necessitates installing traffic control signals at intersections where they would not otherwise be needed in order to maintain proper platooning of vehicles.
G. Warrant 7 - Crash Experience

This warrant is intended for application where the severity and frequency of crashes are the principal reasons to consider installing a traffic control signal. Requests for crash data have been submitted to TxDOT and we have yet to receive them.
H. Warrant 8 - Roadway Network

This warrant is analyzed when installing a traffic control signal at some intersections might be justified to encourage concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway.
I. Warrant 9 - Intersection Near a Grade Crossing

This warrant is analyzed when installing a traffic control signal at some intersections might be justified to encourage concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway.

## III. RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following results and recommendations are based on data that has been collected, standards set by the TMUTCD. The signal warrant was performed for the 183A Southbound Frontage Road and Hero Way existing conditions. Due to the high volume of accidents, Warrant 7 was analyzed but did not meet the minimum volumes criteria. Warrant 3 satisfied the peak hour criteria therefore a traffic signal installation is recommended to be installed. Please refer to Exhibit 3 within the Appendix of this report for the detailed Signal Warrant Worksheets.

## APPENDIX

## SITE LOCATION MAP



## 24-HOUR TRAFFIC COUNTS




## SIGNAL WARRANT WORKSHEETS

## 2011 TMUTCD Warrants

| County: City: | Williamson |  |  | District: | Austin |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Leander |  | Population: |  | Survey Date: | 1-16-14 |
|  |  | Name |  | Control | Section | 85\% Speed |
| Major |  | Hero Way |  | Stop |  | 45 MPH |
| Minor | 183A | 183A SBFR |  | Free |  |  |

Eight Highest Hours: Include the same 8 hours for the Major and Minor St. volumes.

| Time <br> Ends | Major St. - Both App. |  | Minor St. - Hi. Vol. App. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Veh. Total | Ped. Total | Veh. Total | Ped. Total |
| 8:00 AM | 431 |  | 409 |  |
| 6:00 PM | 507 |  | 202 |  |
| 5:00 PM | 527 |  | 175 |  |
| 9:00 AM | 332 |  | 285 |  |
| 4:00 PM | 421 |  | 152 |  |
| 7:00 PM | 415 |  | 157 |  |
| 7:00 AM | 220 |  | 327 |  |
| 3:00 PM | 298 |  | 160 |  |

## Warrant 1. Eight Hour Vehicular Volume

| $\square$ Yes | $\checkmark$ | No | Meets $70 \%^{\text {c }}$ (and major-street speed exceeds 40 mph or population less than 10,000 ) or $100 \%^{\text {a }}$ (regardless of speed) of Condition A. <br> - or - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ Yes | $\checkmark$ | No | Meets $70 \%{ }^{\text {c }}$ (and major-street speed exceeds 40 mph or population less than 10,000 ) or $100 \%^{\text {a }}$ (regardless of speed) of Condition B. - or - |
| $\square$ Yes | $\square$ | No | Meets $80 \%^{\text { }}$ of Conditions A and B. |
| $\square$ Yes | $\checkmark$ | No | - or - <br> Meets $56 \%^{\text {d }}$ of Conditions A and B (and major-street speed exceeds 40 mph or population less than 10,000). |

## Condition A - Minimum Vehicle Volume

| Number of Lanes |  | Vehicles per hour on Major St (Total of Both Approaches) |  |  |  |  | Vehicles per hour on higher-volume Minor St approach (One Direction Only) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Major | Minor | Required |  |  |  | Existing$\underline{71.0 \%}$ | Required |  |  |  | Existing$114.3 \%$ |
| Street | Street | 100\% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $80 \%{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $70 \%{ }^{\text {c }}$ | $56 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ |  | 100\% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $80 \%{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $70 \%^{\text {c }}$ | $56 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |
| 1 | 1 | 500 | 400 | 350 | 280 |  | 150 | 120 | 105 | 84 |  |
| 2 or more | 1 | 600 | 480 | 420 | 336 |  | 150 | 120 | 105 | 84 |  |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 600 | 480 | 420 | 336 | 298 | 200 | 160 | 140 | 112 | 160 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 500 | 400 | 350 | 280 |  | 200 | 160 | 140 | 112 |  |

Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic

| Number of Lanes |  | Vehicles per hour on Major St (Total of Both Approaches) |  |  |  |  | Vehicles per hour on higher-volume Minor St approach (One Direction Only) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Major | Minor | Required |  |  |  | Existing$47.3 \%$ | Required |  |  |  | Existing$\underline{228.6 \%}$ |
| Street | Street | 100\% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $80 \%{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $70 \%^{\text {c }}$ | $56 \%{ }^{\text {d }}$ |  | 100\% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $80 \%{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 70\% ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 56\% ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |
| 1 | 1 | 750 | 600 | 525 | 420 |  | 75 | 60 | 53 | 42 |  |
| 2 or more | 1 | 900 | 720 | 630 | 504 |  | 75 | 60 | 53 | 42 |  |
| 2 or more | 2 or more | 900 | 720 | 630 | 504 | 298 | 100 | 80 | 70 | 56 | 160 |
| 1 | 2 or more | 750 | 600 | 525 | 420 |  | 100 | 80 | 70 | 56 |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Basic minimum hourly volume.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Used for combination of Conditions A and B after adequate trial of other remedial measures.
${ }^{c}$ May be used when the major-street speed exceeds 40 mph or in a community with a population of less than 10,000 .
${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ May be used for combination of Conditions A and B after adequat trial of other remedial measures when major street exceeds
40 mph or in an isolated community with a population of less than 10,000 .

| $\square$ Yes $\quad \square$ No | Meets each of 4 Highest Hours (Warrant $2-$ see Figure 1). |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


*Note: 80 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 60 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 1. Four-hour volume warrant (community less than 10,000 population or above 40 MPH on major street). (Warrant 2.)

Warrant 3. Peak Hour (70\% Factor)

| $\square$ Yes $\quad \checkmark$ No | Are all of the following conditions true for any four consecutive 15 minute periods? <br> 1. The total stopped time delay experienced by the traffic on one minor street approach (one direction only) controlled by a stop sign equals or exceeds 4 vehicle-hours for a one-lane approach and 5 vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach, and <br> 2. The volume of the same minor street approach (one direction only) equals or exceeds 100 vph for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vph for two moving lanes, and <br> 3. The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 650 vph for intersections with three approaches or 800 vph for intersections with four (or more) approaches. |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - or - |
| $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | Meets one High Hour (Warrant 3 - see Figure 2). |


*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 2. Peak hour volume warrant (community less than 10,000 population or above 40 MPH on major street). (Warrant 3.)

Warrant 4. Four Hour Pedestrian Volumes (70\% Factor)


Figure 3. Four-hour pedestrian warrant (community less than 10,000 population or above 35 MPH on major street). (Warrant 4.)

Warrant 4. Peak Hour Pedestrian Volumes (70\% Factor)

| $\square$ Yes | $\checkmark$ | No | Meets Peak Hour Pedestrian (Warrant4 - see Figure 4). |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



Figure 4. Peak hour pedestrian warrant (community less than 10,000 population or above 35 MPH on major street).
(Warrant 4.)

Warrant 5. School Crossing

|  |  | $\square$ | No | Is the number of adequate gaps in traffic stream during the period when the children are using the crossing less than the number of minutes in the same period? - and - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ |  | $\square$ | No | Is there a minimum of 20 students during the highest crossing hour? - and - |
| $\square$ | Yes | 『 | No | Is the nearest signal located more than 300 feet away? <br> (This warrant may be applied, if the proposed signal is less than 300 feet and does not restrict the progressive movement of traffic.) |

## Warrant 6. Coordinated Signal System

| $\square$ Yes$\square$ <br> N/A | NoOn a one-way street or a street with traffic predominantly in one direction, are the adjacent <br> signals far enough apart that the necessary degree of vehicle platooning does not occur? <br> $-\boldsymbol{o r}-$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $\square$ Yes | $\checkmark$ | NoOn a two-way street, are the adjacent signals far enough appart that the necessary degree of <br> vehicle platooning does not occur and would the proposed and adjacent traffic control signal <br> provide a progressive operation? |

## Warrant 7. Crash Experience



## Warrant 8. Roadway Network



## Remarks:

Warrant 9. Intersection Near a Grade Crossing (Two or More Approach Lanes at the Track Crossing)

| $\square$ Yes | $\checkmark$ | No | Meets one High Hour (Warrant $9-$ see Figure 5). |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


*25 vph applies as the lower threshold volume
** VPH after applying the adjustment factors in Tables 4C-2, 4C-3, and/or 4C-4, if appropriate

Figure 5. Railroad Grade Crossing (Two or More Approach Lanes at the Track Crossing).
(Warrant 9.)


January 14, 2014
Mike Heligenstein
Executive Director
Central Texas Regional Mobility Authority
3300 N IH-35, Suite 300
Austin, TX 78705
Dear Mr. Heligenstein,
While the opening of Hero Way has brought increased mobility to the Leander area, it has also created an overwhelming traffic safety problem occurring at the intersection of Hero Way and the 183A frontage roads. Within the first ten months of operation, over 30 traffic accidents were reported at this intersection. This past Friday, January 10, 2014 there was an accident involving a fatality of a beloved Liberty Hill resident.

We strongly urge the Mobility Authority to address this problem immediately. Given the Friday fatality, a fully signalized intersection should now be warranted. I am sure you can appreciate the seriousness of the situation and share our concern.

Your time and attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Nothing is more important than the safety of our citizens and we would like to see the appropriate measures taken to prevent another accident or fatality from taking place.

## Sincerely,



Cc: Ray Wilkerson, CTRMA Board Chair
Bob Daigh, Williamson County Senior Director of Infrastructure

