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## ABSTRACT

Fundamental diagram (FD), a graphical representation of the relation among traffic flow, speed, and density, has been the foundation of traffic flow theory, hence contributes to understanding transportation engineering for many years. For example, the analysis of traffic flow dynamics relies on input from this FD to find development, propagation and dissipation of congestion. Moreover, traffic engineers can also use the FD to determine the traffic flow characteristics so that a highway and its facility can be evaluated over time and space. Underlying these importance, FD corresponding to relation between speed and density; which roughly correlates to drivers' speed choices under varying car-following distances, is used for this study. Since reported traffic stream models are mainly developed for homogeneous traffic conditions, they may not be directly suitable for the traffic condition of Bangladesh which shows weak lane discipline and heterogeneous in nature. From broad literature, hardly any studies have been found to focus this issue especially in Bangladesh. Only a very few studies have been reported from India, which is not sufficient to justifiably represent the traffic scenario in Bangladesh. In this situation, the present study investigates the characteristics of speed-density FD i.e. its shape and structure, for different roadway geometry and traffic operating conditions comprises both non-lane-based and heterogeneous traffic of Bangladesh. It also investigates the flow parameters for stated traffic condition.

For this study, 6 different cases have been considered. Traffic data is collected from 12 different locations of 3 major highways of Bangladesh. Data collection is done through video recording which is further processed by image processing technique. To investigate the structure of FD, the speed-density plots of field data for different locations are fitted with six established FD models namely: linear, $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree polynomial, $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial, exponential, $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential and logarithmic. From this investigation, it reveals that $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential structure is the best fitted FD model for most of the cases under prevailing traffic condition. It is also found that, free-flow speed tends to decrease dramatically if there is no footpath or shoulder and presence of market along the road-side. It is also found that if the free-flow speed decrease, the jam density is increased.
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## CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

Bangladesh has an extensive and diversified transport system. It has 21092.57 km highways (RTHD, 2017), 2885 route km railways (Railway Forum Progress Report, 2016) and $24,000 \mathrm{~km}$ inland waterways (Banglapedia, 2012). Of multiple modes of transportation the road transport plays the most dominant role. It carries more than $80 \%$ passenger modal share. According to National Report on Sustainable Development in May 2012, passenger growth is reported to have increased from 11.75 billion in 1973 to 131.75 billion in 2007, growing as fast as at an annual average of $7.45 \%$. Existing road infrastructure is insufficient against the huge traffic demand causing severe traffic congestion both in national highways and in city roads. According to a study jointly conducted by the Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce and Industry (MCCI) and Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport Bangladesh in 2010, it was revealed that the annual cost of traffic congestion in capital Dhaka was around Tk 1 billion a day. The study found that about 3.2 million business hours were lost every day due to the traffic jams. A more recent assessment concluded that the estimated loss is now $50 \%$ more than what it was in 2010 , adding up to a staggering amount of about Tk. 550 billion annually. To overcome this situation, rapid development has been started in road transport sector during last few years that includes construction of new roads \& bridges and widening of existing roads \& highways.

For proper planning, design, implementation and operation of such road infrastructures, it is the prime requirement to know the flow characteristic and flow parameters of the traffic stream. Planning must be done considering present and future traffic state. Otherwise, after few years of construction, the capacity of the road will be exceeded and will be needed further widening. In this regard, the prime requirement is to know the appropriate traffic flow characteristic and accurate flow parameters. Traffic stream models are used in the planning, design and operation of transportation facilities. These models provide the fundamental relationships between macroscopic traffic stream characteristics for uninterrupted flow situations. The relationships are for free-flow and congested-flow conditions away from flow interruptions such as at intersections.

The fundamental diagram (FD) is a speed-flow-density relationship that reflects the interrelation between the traffic flow parameters. A macroscopic model involving traffic flow ( $q$ ), traffic density $(\rho)$ and speed $(v)$ forms the basis of the FD. In order to investigate the traffic flow characteristics, finding out FD is one of the most important requirements. In fact, the FD (describing flow-density, speed-density or speed-flow relationship at a given location or section of the roadway) is a basic tool in understanding the behavior of traffic stream characteristics in macroscopic flow models. It can be used to predict the capacity of a road, or its behavior when applying inflow regulation or speed limits. In the nominal work of Greenshields (1935), FD was defined and used as the relationship between $q$ and $\rho$ for an equilibrium traffic state. Since then, several works have been conducted to establish a static relationship between $q$ and $\rho$ in theory and in empirical modeling with field data fitting. It is generally recognized that FD is location dependent due to road geometry and traffic characteristics. FD may have several equivalent forms: flow-density (occupancy) which is concave, speed-density (occupancy) which is monotone decreasing and speed-flow with two foliations: upper limb and lower limb.

The beginnings for traffic flow descriptions on a highway are derived from observations by Greenshields, firstly shown to the public during 13th Annual Meeting of the Highway Research Board in Dec. 1933. He carried out tests to measure traffic flow, traffic density and speed using photographic measurement methods for the first time. Greenshields postulated a linear relationship between speed and traffic density. When using the relation Flow $=$ density $*$ speed; the linear speed-density relation converts into a parabolic relation between speed and traffic flow. The term 'flow' was not known that time and Greenshields called that term 'densityvehicles per hour' or density of the second kind.

Many models exist for modeling the static $v-\rho$ or $q-\rho$ relationship. Although the function expressions are different; they are more or less similar in the domain $\rho \in\left[0, \rho_{j}\right]$. However, some of them do not satisfy the two boundary conditions $v(0)=v_{f}, \rho=0$ simultaneously. Few wellknown models for speed-density relationships are Greenberg Model (1959), Edie Model (1961), Polynomial Model (Zhang,1999) and Exponential Model by Papageorgiou (2002) and Hegyi (2002). Edie Model was a combination of Greenberg Model and Underwood Model (1961). This combination removed some shortcomings such as the violation of boundary conditions of those two models. Some other models such as BPR Model and Van Aerde Model in planning are referred to Skabardonis and Dowling (1997) and Van Aerde (1995).

Almost all these models were developed and validated for homogeneous traffic. But in Bangladesh, like other developing countries, the traffic operating condition is non-lane based and highly heterogeneous. Although non-motorized vehicle has been banned from major highways in Bangladesh recently, the fact remains that here the traffic stream comprises of private cars, buses, mini-buses, trucks, covered van, auto-rickshaws and other utility vehicles of varying shape, size, speed and other operating conditions. The traffic behavior in such heterogeneous condition is significantly different from that in homogeneous condition. This necessitates modeling fundamental diagram with empirical data of heterogeneous traffic under different road geometry and traffic operating conditions for Bangladesh.

### 1.2 Statement of the Problem and Opportunities

### 1.2.1 High-resolution data collection technique

Empirical traffic data are the basic input in building and analyzing traffic stream models. But no such data are available for the traffic of Bangladesh for this purpose. Again, no existing facilities are available to collect continuous traffic data for 24 hours/7days/one year. Within the vast literature on macroscopic traffic flow modeling, surprisingly very few studies have addressed the heterogeneous traffic condition prevalent in many developing countries like Bangladesh, India etc. Such limited research is primarily attributed to the difficulty of high-resolution data collection in the stated traffic condition. For collecting data under homogeneous traffic conditions, several types of equipment are available. Among these, induction loops (Loop Detectors) are widely used for both traffic management and traffic flow modeling purposes. Loop detectors are useful in collecting microscopic as well as macroscopic traffic data. Generally, these are employed for each lane and not suitable for collecting data under non-lane based mixed traffic conditions. Again implementation and maintenance cost of loop detectors are very high. Recently, some video image processing data collection techniques are being used for data collection in case of non-lane based heterogeneous traffic condition. In this research video data collection technique is used. The technique which is based on image processing will be able to measure traffic state in the non-lane based heterogeneous operating conditions with reasonable accuracy.

### 1.2.2 Data processing tools

For this research, total 6 cases will be considered. For each case video footage will be taken from two different locations with duration of at least (2x2.5) 5 hours. So, total ( $6 \times 2 \times 5$ ) 60 hours video footage will be analyzed for traffic data. It is not humanly possible to find out the vehicle count, speed and density manually by watching such a long video. Again high resolution data (20 sec data) is required for this research that is not possible to extract manually from the video footage. To overcome this problem, in the recent years, image processing tools have been applied to the field of traffic research with goals that include queue detection, vehicle classification, and vehicle counting. In this research, for extracting high resolution traffic data from the video footages, an object detection algorithm has been used which operates based on the Background Subtraction (BGS) technique of image processing. The developed algorithm can successfully detect non-lane-based heterogeneous movement of vehicles. Even, it can identify non-motorized traffic, dark car and shadow quite accurately. Video data and vehicle geometry are provided as input to the algorithm and it gives vehicle count and time mean speed at required intervals as the output.

### 1.3 Research Objectives and Scope of Study

The overall objective of the research work is to investigate the impact of road geometry and traffic operating conditions on traffic flow parameters. However, the specific objectives are:
(a) Finding the shape and structure of fundamental diagram for different road geometry and traffic operating conditions.
(b) Finding the trends in flow parameters for different road geometry and traffic operating conditions.

It is expected that the obtained flow parameter values for different road geometry and traffic operating conditions will provide a guideline to estimate capacity of new roads for better geometric design. It is also expected that this research will lead to development of higher order macro model suitable for non-lane-based heterogeneous traffic. In the long-run, with that model, it will be possible for designing different proactive flow control strategies.

For this study, six different geometric and traffic conditions will be considered. These are as below:

Case-1: $\quad$ Roadway with and without footpath
Case-2: Roadway with and without bus stop
Case-3: Highway section with on-ramp and off-ramp
Case-4: $\quad$ Multi-lane merged to a single lane highway
Case-5: Roadway with and without shoulder
Case-6: Roadway with and without road-side market

### 1.4 Organization of the Thesis

This thesis consisting of five chapters is structured as follows:
Chapter 1 gives an introduction of the relevant research background, statement of the problems as well as the objectives and scope of the studies.

Chapter 2 comprehensively reviews basic relationships between traffic flow parameters and previous works on modeling FD with special focus on speed-density models. Few classical and non-classical models are reviewed in details. During this review special emphasis is given on modeling FD for heterogeneous traffic flow conditions.

Chapter 3 presents details of the study area selected and the high-resolution data collection and processing techniques adopted for the research. Some justifications regarding the choice of methods and choice of study area employed are also provided.

Chapter 4 presents developments of FD models for 6 different cases of different road geometry and traffic operating conditions for non-lane based heterogeneous traffic of Bangladesh. The shape and structure of best fitted model will be investigated for all the cases. It will also be investigated, how the flow parameters e.g. the free-flow speed and jam-density change with the change of road geometry and traffic operating conditions.

Chapter 5 summarizes the main conclusions of this research and discusses recommendations for future research works related to FD modeling for heterogeneous traffic.

## CHAPTER 2

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Introduction

The traffic flow on freeways and rural highways is described traditionally in terms of three basic parameters: the mean speed $(v)$, the traffic flow rate $(q)$, and the traffic density $(\rho)$. The functional relationship between these three parameters is called Fundamental Diagram (FD). It gives the relation between speed-flow-density of traffic flow for an equilibrium state. Generally three types of FD are used to represent three basic relationships. These are speed-density relationships, speed-flow relationships and flow-density relationships. The three diagrams shown in Figure 2.1 are seem to be redundant, for it is obvious that if any one relationship is known, the other two are uniquely defined. However, all three diagrams have a particular use and purpose. Speed-density diagram is used in most theoretical work for two reasons. First, there is a singlevalued speed for single-valued density, which is not true for other two relationships. Secondly, it is used to formulate car-following model where speed is a function of space. Flow-density diagram is used as the basis of freeway control system where density (percent occupancy) is used as the control parameters and flow (productivity) is objective function. Finally, the speed-flow diagram is used to determine the level of service of roadway. However, in this research more emphasis is given on the speed-density FD. So, literature review mainly focuses on speeddensity models.

### 2.2 Relationships Between Basic Parameters of FD

The speed-density relationship is shown in the upper-left corner of figure 2.1 where a linear speed-density relationship is assumed to simplify the presentation. This relationship indicates that speed approaches free-flow speed $\left(v_{f}\right)$ when density and flow approaches zero $(\rho \rightarrow 0$ and $q \rightarrow 0$ ). As density (and flow) increases speed is reduced until flow is maximum ( $q_{m}$ ), and speed and density approach their optimum values $\left(v \rightarrow v_{0}\right.$ and $\left.\rho \rightarrow \rho_{0}\right)$. Further increase in density results in lower speeds and lower flows until density reaches its maximum value $\left(\rho_{j}\right)$ and correspondingly speed and flow approach zero ( $v \rightarrow 0$ and $q \rightarrow 0$ ). Here it is to be noted that flows can be represented on the speed-density diagram as contour lines with maximum flow contour $\left(q_{\mathrm{m}}\right)$ just touching the speed-density line at optimum values of speed and density ( $v_{0}$ and $\rho_{0}$ ).


Figure 2.1 Fundamental Diagrams

The flow-density relationship is shown directly below the speed-density relationship in figure 2.1 because of their common horizontal scales. Under very low density conditions ( $\rho \rightarrow 0$ ), flow approaches zero $(q \rightarrow 0)$, and speed approaches free-flow speed $\left(v \rightarrow v_{f}\right)$. As flow increases, density increases while speed is decreasing. When optimum density is reached, flow becomes maximum. Further increase in density results in decreased flow until finally, as jam density is reached and flow approaches zero. Here, speeds can be represented on the flow-density diagram as radial lines extending up to the right from the origin. Steeper-sloped lines represent higher speeds; that is, a vertical line represents a speed of infinity while horizontal line represents a speed of zero. The slope of flow-density curve is when maximum flow occurs.

The speed-flow relationship is shown directly to the right of speed-density relationship in figure 2.1 because of their common vertical scales. The upper limb of the speed-flow curve is described as the free-flow regime and lower limb is referred as congested flow regime. Under free-flow conditions, the speed decreases as the flow level increases up to the maximum flow. Further speed restrictions coupled with flow reductions are encountered when density exceeds optimum density.

### 2.3 FD Model

Modeling of the speed-density relationship began with the Greenshields' linear model in the seminal paper: A Study in Highway Capacity (Greenshields, 1935). There has been a fairly large amount of effort afterwards to revise or improve such an over-simplified relationship. These efforts include Greenberg's Model (Greenberg, 1959), the Underwood Model (Underwood, 1961), Northwestern (Drake and May, 1967; Drew, 1968), Pipes-Munjal Generalized Model (Pipes, 1967), Newell's Model (Newell, 1961), Del Castillo and Benitez Model (Del Castillo, 1995a,b), Modified Greenshields Model (Jayakrishnan and Tsai, 1995), Kerner and Konhäuser Model (Kerner and Konhäuser, 1994), Van Aerde Model (Van Aerde, 1995) and MacNicolas Model (MacNicholas, 2008). From the vast literature, it is found that many models exist for modeling the static $v-\rho$ or $q-\rho$ relationship. Although the function expressions are different; they are more or less similar in the domain $\rho \in[0, \rho \mathrm{j}]$. However, some of them do not satisfy the two boundary conditions $v(0)=v \mathrm{f}, \rho=0$ simultaneously. Few classical and non-classical models are discussed as below.

### 2.3.1 Classical FD models

The Greensheilds Model: The model was proposed by Greenshields (1935) as a linear model to analyze the relationship between speed, flow and density. The model is simple and satisfies all boundary conditions, ( $v=0$ at $\rho=\rho_{\mathrm{j}}$ and $v=v_{\mathrm{f}}$ at $\rho=0$ ), but the goodness of fit is generally not high, particularly for freeway data. The Greenshields formulation is as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{f}\left(1-\frac{\rho}{\rho_{j}}\right) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where: $v$ - speed, $\rho$ - density, $v_{f}$ - free-flow speed, $\rho_{j}-$ jam density.
The Greenberg Model: Proposed by Greenberg in 1959, the model uses a fluid flow analogy and data from the Lincoln Tunnel in New York to establish a logarithmic relation between speed and density, namely

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{c} \ln \frac{\rho_{j}}{\rho} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where $v_{c}$ is the speed at capacity.

This model does not satisfy the boundary condition at the low concentration regime ( $v \rightarrow \infty$ at $\rho=0$ ) but behaves well under congested conditions ( $v=0$ at $\rho=\rho_{\mathrm{j}}$ ).

The Underwood Model: Developed by Underwood in 1961, the model hypothesizes an exponential relationship between density and speed. The model is observed to generally have a better fit than the Greenshields and Greenberg models for the uncongested traffic conditions, but does not present a good fit to the data for congested conditions. The Underwood model is as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{f} e^{-\rho / \rho_{o}} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where, $\rho_{\mathrm{o}}$ is optimum density.
The Drake Model: This model was developed by Drake in 1967. He studied the various macroscopic traffic models postulated at that time and did not find any of them statistically significant. In developing his model, he estimated the density from speed and flow data, fitted the speed vs. density function and transformed the speed vs. density function to a speed vs. flow function. His model generally yields a better fit than the above three models for uncongested conditions. However, as in the Underwood case, it is not a good fit for congested conditions. The formulation of the Drake model is as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{f} e^{\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_{0}}\right)^{2}\right]} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 2.3.2 Non-classical FD model

There are many combinations and modifications of the classical models which are known as nonclassical model. Few non-classical models are discussed below:

Edie Model: It is a combination of the Greenberg model and Underwood Model. This combination removed some shortcomings such as the boundary conditions of those two models. Edie model is expressed as:

$$
v(\rho)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{e}^{\left(-w_{1} \frac{\rho}{\rho_{j}}+w_{2}\right)}, \rho \leq \rho_{j}  \tag{2.5}\\
g_{1}+g_{2} \ln \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_{j}}\right)^{n}, \rho>\rho_{j}
\end{array}\right.
$$

The Modified Greenberg Model: Considering that even under very light traffic conditions there are always some vehicles on the freeway, the modified Greenberg model introduces a non-zero average minimum density, $\rho_{0}$, in the Greenberg model (Ardekani \& Ghandehari, 2008). The modified Greenberg model formulation is as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
q=\nu_{c} \rho \ln \frac{\rho_{j}+\rho_{\mathrm{o}}}{\rho+\rho_{\mathrm{o}}} \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where, $\rho_{0}$ is the average minimum density, $v_{\mathrm{c}}$ is the speed at capacity.
Unlike the classic Greenberg model, the modified version yields a finite free flow speed of $v_{\mathrm{f}}=v_{\mathrm{c}} \ln \left(1+\rho_{\mathrm{j}} / \rho_{0}\right)$ when density approaches zero.

The Underwood Model with Taylor Series Expansion: The Underwood model does not yield a solution for the jam density when speed approaches zero. But the exponential function can be expanded in a Taylor series obtaining a numerical approximation for the jam density

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{f} e^{-\rho / \rho_{c}}=v_{f}\left(1-\frac{\rho}{\rho_{c}}+\frac{\rho^{2}}{2 \rho_{c}^{2}}-\frac{\rho^{3}}{6 \rho_{c}^{3}}+\frac{\rho^{4}}{24 \rho_{c}^{4}}-\frac{\rho^{5}}{120 \rho_{c}^{5}}+\ldots \ldots . .\right) \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Taking up the term containing $\rho^{3}$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{f} e^{-\rho / \rho_{c}}=v_{f}\left(1-\frac{\rho}{\rho_{c}}+\frac{\rho^{2}}{2 \rho_{c}^{2}}-\frac{\rho^{3}}{6 \rho_{c}^{3}}\right) \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $v=0$, the solution of equation (2.7) gives an estimate for the jam density.
The Drake Model with Taylor Series Expansion: As in the case of the Underwood, the Drake model also does not yield a solution for the jam density when speed approaches zero. Hence, we can use the Taylor series expansion to obtain a numerical approximation for the jam density, as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{f}\left(1-\frac{\rho^{2}}{2 \rho_{c}^{2}}+\frac{\rho^{4}}{8 \rho_{c}^{4}}-\frac{\rho^{6}}{48 \rho_{c}^{6}}\right) \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Again, at $v=0$ the solution of equation (2.8) would yield an estimate for the jam density, $\rho_{\mathrm{j}}$.
The Polynomial and Quadratic Models: We can also express the relationship between density and speed in terms of a second degree polynomial equation namely

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{f}+b \rho+c \rho^{2} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where, b and c are additional model parameters
Alternatively, the speed vs. density relationship may be expressed as a quadratic equation of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{f}\left(1-\frac{\rho^{2}}{\rho_{j}^{2}}\right) \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following polynomial model is cited in (Zhang, 1999) as the one-parameter polynomial model:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{f}\left(1-\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_{c}}\right)^{n}\right) \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where, $v_{\mathrm{f}}=$ the free-flow speed, $\rho \mathrm{j}=$ the Jam density, $\mathrm{n}=1$ is the Greensheild model.
Exponential Model: An exponential model used by papageorgiou (2002) and Hegyi et al (2002) as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v(\rho)=v_{f} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{a}\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_{c}}\right)^{a}\right) \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where, $v_{f}=$ free-flow speed, $a=$ model parameter, $\rho_{c}=$ Critical density. It generalizes somehow the Underwood model.

## Generalized Polynomial Model for $\boldsymbol{v}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$

It can be shown that most previous models can be approximated by or generalized to the following polynomial with non-negative coefficients and possibly non-integer power:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v(\rho)=v_{m}\left[1-\sum_{i=0}^{N} a_{i}\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_{j}}\right)^{b_{i}}\right], \quad \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{i}}>0, \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}} \geq 0, \mathrm{i}=0,1, \ldots \ldots, \mathrm{~N} \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

to avoid any ambiguity, $b_{i} \neq b_{j}$ for $i \neq j$. Equation (2.12) is called Generalized Polynomial FD Model. The nonnegative coefficients $\left(a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots ., a_{N}\right)$ are to be determined by fitting from practical data. The concavity is an important property for FD for the following reasons: (a) modeling of the static relationship; (b) understanding average driver behavior; and (c) its potential application in traffic control. The concavity holding for previous models is also true for the Generalized Polynomial FD model (2.12) in $q-\rho$ relationship for $\rho \in\left[0, \rho_{\mathrm{j}}\right]$. In fact, it is easy to calculate that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d^{2} q(\rho)}{d \rho^{2}}<\mathrm{O}, \quad \text { for } \rho>0 \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

which means that $\mathrm{q}(\rho)=\rho . V(\rho)$ is strictly concave for $\rho>0$ since the coefficients $\left(\mathrm{a}_{0}, \mathrm{a}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{N}}\right)$ are all nonnegative. It is clear that $v(0)=\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{f}}$ the free flow speed. $v\left(\rho_{\mathrm{j}}\right)=0$ leads to the constraint that $\sum_{i=0}^{N} a_{i}=1$ It is thus called generalized Polynomial Model with Unit Sum Coefficients (GPMUSC). This model is a generalization of previous models if one considers Taylors series approximation to order N .

Reversed $\lambda$ Shaped FD: The simplest reversed $\lambda$ shape FD is to adopt straight line segment for the two limbs as shown in Figure 2.2

With this shape, the slope of the left limb is the homogenous-flow speed $v_{\mathrm{h}}$. Several possible models for the left and right limbs are listed below.

## Left Limb Models:

(1) Linear Model: $q+\mathrm{a}_{1}+\mathrm{b}_{1} \rho, \quad \rho \leq \rho_{\mathrm{c}}{ }^{\mathrm{h}}$
(2) Parabolic Model: $\mathrm{q}=\alpha+\beta \rho+\gamma \rho, \quad \rho \leq \rho_{\mathrm{c}}{ }^{\mathrm{h}}$


Figure 2.2 Reversed $\lambda$ Shape FD with both limbs as straight line

## Right Limb Models:

(1) Linear model: $\mathrm{q}=\mathrm{a}_{1}+\mathrm{b}_{1} \rho, \quad \rho_{\mathrm{c}}{ }^{\mathrm{h}}<\rho \leq \rho$
(2) GPMUSC Model for $\rho_{\mathrm{c}}{ }^{\mathrm{h}}<\rho \leq \rho_{\mathrm{j}}$
(3) Edie model for $\rho_{\mathrm{c}}{ }^{\mathrm{h}} \rho<\rho \leq \rho_{\text {j }}$

### 2.3.3 Few study on FD model for heterogeneous traffic

Traffic comprising of motorized and non-motorized two-wheelers and three-wheelers along with several other vehicles with no-lane discipline is termed as heterogeneous. From the literature it can be seen that most of the models were validated using the data collected from western countries with homogeneous and lane disciplined traffic conditions. Only limited amount of research has been reported from non-homogeneous traffic conditions in recent years. Kadiyali et.al studied the speed flow relationships on different categories of rural highways in India in 1982. They developed linear speed-flow relationships by regression analysis.

In a study Thankappan et al. (2010) investigate the speed-density FD model for heterogeneous traffic. They utilized 1hour video data of 3 week days for peak traffic flow conditions at afternoon from Rajib Gandhi road, Chennai,India. The exponential model was found to be the best for speed-density relationships. The shape of FD was as:


Figure 2.3 FD Obtained by Thankappan et al. (2010)
The exponential model was as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=66.6448 e^{-0.0038 \rho} \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

In another study the same author Ajitha Thankappan and Lelitha Vanajakshi (2015) investigate the FD model for the same road with both peak and off-peak traffic data. This time they used video data of 1 hour for each of five week days and 2 hours for each of 3 other week days. They extracted traffic data manually from video footage in laboratory. It was found that an exponential model similar to the Drake model is the best fit in terms of MAPE and RMSE. The form of equation was:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v_{f} \exp \left[-0.5\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_{o}}\right)^{2}\right] \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 2.4 Summary

This chapter provided an overview of modeling FD to describe the speed-density relationship of traffic flow. It is reviled that most of these models were developed and validated for lane-based homogeneous traffic conditions. But for this case, the traffic is mostly non-lane-based heterogeneous for which standard FD models have not been developed. Hence, this research work aims at developing speed-density model for non-lane-based heterogeneous traffic at different road geometry and traffic operating conditions.

## CHAPTER 3

## DATA COLLECTION AND PROCESSING

### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents details of the study area selected, the high-resolution data collection method and data processing techniques adopted for the research. The collected data will serve as the basis for the development of the FD models to represent speed-density relationship at different road geometry and traffic operating conditions. Some justification regarding the choice of study site and data collection methods are also provided here.

### 3.2 Study Area

For this study six different cases of different geometric and traffic operating conditions are considered as mentioned in chapter-1. For six cases, three different areas are considered as study area. For cases 1, 2 and 3 Tongi Diversion Road (From Kuril Flyover to Airport Roundabout) is selected as the study area (Figure 3.1). For cases 4 and 5, a segment (from Kanchpur Bridge to Gumti Bridge) of Dhaka-Chittagong National Highway (N1) is selected as the study area (Figure 3.2). For case-6, a segment (from Tongi to Joydebpur) of Dhaka-Mymensingh National Highway (N3) is selected as the study area (Figure 3.3).

Tongi Diversion Road or Airport Road is an 8-lane (4-lane in one direction) major arterial road in Dhaka that connects the capital city with Shahjalal International Airport. There are 4 through lane in each direction at the study site of this road having total width of 14.5 m to 15 m . At Kuril Flyover both the on and off ramps have two lanes in each direction having total width of 7 m . Having a considerable pedestrian movement some portion of the road does not have footpath at the road side. At some places there are road-side bus stops. The traffic stream at the study site consists of buses, minibuses, cars, jeeps, motorcycles, auto-rickshaws and utility vehicles. However the traffic stream is dominated by buses, private cars and auto-rickshaws having no non-motorized vehicle. Lane discipline is absent both on the road and on the flyover. Such geometric and traffic characteristics make the test-site an ideal study location for non-lane-based heterogeneous condition.


Figure 3.1 Locations of camera at study sites on Tongi Diversion Road

Dhaka-Chittagong Highway is a 4 lane (2 lane in each direction) major National Highway of Bangladesh connecting the capital city with the port city Chittagong which is known as commercial capital city. The road width in each direction is 7.5 m . Existing Meghna Bridge is a 2 lane bridge ( 1 lane in each direction). So, while approaching towards the bridge the 2 lane in each directon merges into a single lane. At many places of this highway do not have proper
shoulder on the side of carriage way. The traffic stream at the study site consists of buses, trucks, minibuses, cars, jeeps, motorcycles, auto-rickshaws, covered vans, and utility vehicles. However, the traffic stream is dominated by buses, trucks and covered vans having no non-motorized vehicle. Lane discipline is absent all through. Because of such geometric and traffic characteristics the test-site is an ideal study location for non-lane-based heterogeneous condition.


Figure 3.2 Locations of camera at study Sites on Dhaka-Chittagong Highway
Dhaka-Mymensingh Highway is a 4 lane (2 lane in each direction) National Highway of Bangladesh connecting the capital city with Mymensingh district town. The road width in each direction is 7.5 m . There is a road-side market in between Tongi and Joydebpur. It is a street market for vegetable, fish, clothing and other comodities. Every morning and afternoon there is a
big crowd on the road side due to the presence of this market. The traffic stream at this site consists of buses, trucks, minibuses, cars, jeeps, motorcycles, auto-rickshaws, rickshaws and vans. However, the traffic stream is dominated by buses, cars and auto-rickshaws, rickshaw and vans. Here rickshaws and vans were the non-motorized vehicle. Lane discipline is also absent here. Because of such traffic characteristics the test-site is an ideal study location for non-lanebased heterogeneous condition.


Figure 3.3 Locations of camera at study sites on Dhaka-Mymensingh Highway

### 3.3 Data Collection Methods

Collection of high-resolution traffic data required for modeling FD is very challenging task under the existing traffic condition of the study area. Generally traffic data is measured by means of detectors located along the road side. Traffic data technologies can be split into two categories: the intrusive and non-intrusive methods.

The intrusive methods basically consist of a data recorder and a sensor placing on or in the road. They have been employed for many years. Some important intrusive methods are pneumatic road tubes, piezoelectric sensors and magnetic loops. Pneumatic road tubes are rubber tubes placed across the road lanes to detect vehicles from pressure changes that are produced when a vehicle tire passes over the tube. The main drawback of this technology is that it has limited lane coverage and its efficiency is subject to weather, temperature and traffic conditions. This system may also not be efficient in measuring low speed flows. Piezoelectric sensors are placed in a groove along roadway surface of the lane(s) monitored. The principle is to convert mechanical energy into electrical energy. Indeed, mechanical deformation of the piezoelectric material modifies the surface charge density of the material so that a potential difference appears between the electrodes. The amplitude and frequency of the signal is directly proportional to the degree of deformation. This system can be used to measure weight and speed. Magnetic loops are the most conventional technology used to collect traffic data. The loops are embedded in roadways in a square formation that generates a magnetic field. The information is then transmitted to a counting device placed on the side of the road. This has a generally short life expectancy because it can be damaged by heavy vehicles, but is not affected by bad weather conditions. This technology has been widely deployed in Europe. However, the implementation and maintenance costs can be expensive.

Non-intrusive techniques are based on remote observations. Even if manual counting is the most used method, new technologies have recently emerged which seem very promising. Few nonintrusive methods are manual counts, passive and active infra-red, passive magnetic, microwave radar, ultrasonic and passive acoustic and video image processing. Manual counts is the most traditional methods but very ineffective for non-lane-based heterogeneous traffic conditions. Other methods are very expensive, affected by weather conditions and also not effective for heterogeneous traffic conditions.

Video cameras can record vehicle numbers, type and speed very easily. By image processing technique it is easy to get traffic data from recorded video. This is an efficient and cost-effective method of high-resolution traffic data collection in heterogeneous traffic condition. So this method is adopted for this study.

### 3.4 Video Recording

Locations of video camera at different study sites are shown in figure 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. The main challenge was to install camera at desired height and desired angle. At some locations camera was installed on the foot over bridges, somewhere on the roof tops and other places on the mobile cranes (used for video shooting).

On 15th April 2015 video recording was done at the study site of Tongi Diversion Road by using 6 video cameras installed at six different locations (Figure 3.4). It was done in two phases; from 10:30 am to 1:00 pm 2.5 hours and from 3:00 pm to 5:30 pm 2.5 hours. So for each case 5 hours video was taken for the study. These videos were processed and extracted data were filtered for anomalies. Ultimately 3.5 hours data was used for modeling FD.

(a)


Figure 3.4 Video recording at study sites; (a) with bus-stop, (b) without bus-stop, (c) on-ramp

On 25th August 2015 video recording was done at the study site of Dhaka-Chittagong National Highway by using 4 video cameras installed at 4 different locations (Figure 3.5). It was done in two phases; from 10:30 am to 1:00 pm 2.5 hours and from 2:30 pm to 5:00 pm 2.5 hours. So for each case 5 hours video was taken for the study. These videos were processed and extracted data were filtered for anomalies. Ultimately 3.5 hours data was used for modeling FD.



Figure 3.5 Video recording at study sites; (a) double lane highway, (b) single lane highway, (c) roadway with shoulder, (d) roadway without shoulder

On 10th and 13th November 2015 video recording was done at the study site of DhakaMymensingh National Highway for the case with and without market respectively (Figure 3.6). Here iPhone 6 with 64 GB memory and external power bank is used for video recording and video is taken from roof top of 3 storied buildings. It was done from 2:00 pm to $5: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ for
continuous 3 hours. These videos were processed and extracted data were filtered for anomalies.
Ultimately 2.5 hours data was used for modeling FD.


Figure 3.6 Video recording at study sites; (a) with market, (b) without market

### 3.5 Data Processing

High resolution ( 20 sec ) traffic data is extracted from video footages. It is then aggregated in 1 minute. Extraction of high resolution traffic data is done by an object detection algorithm (Muniruzzaman et al. 2016) which operates basing on the Background Subtraction (BGS) technique of image processing. The developed algorithm can successfully detect non-lane-based movement of vehicles. It can also identify different sizes of motorized and non-motorized traffic, dark car and shadow quite accurately. Video data and vehicle geometry are provided as input to the algorithm and it gives vehicle count and time mean speed at required intervals as the output. For measuring flow, strip based counting method combining successive incremental differentiation is used. On the other hand, for measuring speed, the algorithm segments the whole field of vision and detects the change in center of area of an object in each segment to find the corresponding pixel speed. Then calibrating the pixel distance with the field distance, instantaneous and time mean speeds are obtained, which can easily be converted to space mean speed. The density of the traffic stream for the research is estimated from the measured flow and speed. The developed algorithm has been proved to give highly accurate traffic data with Mean Absolute Error (MAE) of only 14.01 and 0.88 in flow and speed measurements respectively when compared with actual field measurements. The algorithm addresses some of the major problems faced in the BGS technique, like the camouflage effect, camera jitter, sudden illumination variation, low camera angle and elevation etc. The process of traffic detection by the algorithm is briefly illustrated below.

### 3.5.1 Traffic detection technique

The background modeling algorithm used for traffic detection in this research is quite simple and accurate. It involves the use of static frames for object extraction from a video stream or image. Traffic is detected according to the following basic steps.

## Step 1: Choosing the static background model (B)

This is the primary step of static background subtraction technique. The background model is a frame within the video having no traffic in it. This background is selected up careful inspection of the video. Figure 3.7 shows such a background model used for traffic detection from the video of the off-ramp location of the study site.


Figure 3.7 Background model (B)

Step 2: Selecting the frame (I) on which vehicle detection is to be performed
Using an iteration process, the frame on which the detection should be performed is to be selected one by one from the video file. Figure 3.8 shows a typical frame for traffic detection.


Figure 3.8 Random frame (I) for vehicle detection

Step 3: Determining the absolute difference ( $D$ ) between $B$ and $I$
The difference between the static background model B and the traffic detection frame I give the differential image where only the traffic exists. For example, Figure 3.9 is the differential image of the frame I of Figure 3.8.


Figure 3.9 Differential images (D) of frame I

## Step 4: Converting differential image into binary image

In order to make the differential image machine readable, it is converted into binary image using a "threshold value." The selection of proper threshold value is very important for accurate vehicle detection. In the differential image, the pixels having intensities lower than the selected threshold is assigned value " 0 ", whereas those having intensities higher than the threshold are assigned " 1 ". Thus the differential image gets converted into a binary code as in Figure 3.10.


Figure 3.10 Binary images of D

## Step 5: Performing morphological operation

Next, some morphological operations are required for enhancing the quality of the binary image by removing unwanted -noises. For this purpose, binary opening is used. Its magnitude depends on the type of opening algorithms used i.e. square, circular, disk type opening etc. On the other hand, binary closing is needed to recover an object from the binary image. Its magnitude depends on the same factors as opening. The improvement of the quality of binary image after applying opening and closing are shown in Figures 3.11 and 3.12 respectively.


Figure 3.11 Binary image after opening


Figure 3.12 Binary image after closing

### 3.6 Summary

This research aims at modeling FD for non-lane-based heterogeneous traffic conditions of Bangladesh. For this high-resolution data is the pre-requisite. The current chapter introduced the test section used in this research along with details of the video-based data collection method adopted. It then briefly discussed the image processing technique used here for extracting speed and density data from the video footages of the test site. The measured high-resolution data will be used for the development and analysis of the FD model in the subsequent chapters.

## CHAPTER 4

## MODELING FUNDAMENTAL DIAGRAM AND ANALYSIS

### 4.1 Introduction

FD is the basic tool in understanding the behavior of traffic stream characteristics in both microscopic and macroscopic traffic flow models. In order to investigate traffic flow parameters finding the shape and structure of FD is one of the most important requirements. FD gives functional relationships between three basic parameters (speed, density and flow rate) of traffic flow for an equilibrium state. However, speed-density relationship is the main focus of this research. This chapter presents developments of FD models for different road geometry and traffic operating conditions for non-lane based heterogeneous traffic of Bangladesh. Then the shape and structure of best fitted model will be investigated for all the cases. Finally, it will also investigate, how the flow parameters e.g. the free-flow speed and jam-density change with the change of road geometry and traffic operating conditions.

### 4.2 FD Investigation for Different Road Geometry and Traffic Operating Conditions.

Six different cases are considered for this research. Six different FD models namely, linear, polynomial of $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree, exponential of $1^{\text {st }}$ degree and $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree and logarithmic models are developed from the extracted data. Correlation coefficient $\left(\mathrm{R}^{2}\right)$ and root mean square error (RMSE) are used for evaluating fitness of different FD structures.

### 4.2.1 Case-1: Roadway with and without footpath

For this case Airport Road (From Hotel Radisson to Airport Roundabout) of Dhaka city is selected as the study site.

## (a) With footpath

Figure 4.1 represents the FDs modeled for the traffic flow with footpath and Table 4.1 shows other details of these FD models. Among six models, $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential model is the best fitted model as it has the maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}(0.9045)$ and least RSME (3.189) values. So the best fitted structure of FD for this case is $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential and the equation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=26.31 e^{-0.1832 \rho}+50.86 e^{-0.01642} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 4.1 FDs for the Traffic Flow in Roadway with Footpath

Table 4.1 Model fitting for the traffic flow on roadway with footpath

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow Speed (miles/hr) | Jam Density (veh/mile/lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear <br> Model | $v=-0.3882 \rho+43.9$ | 0.8248 | 4.283 | 43.9 | 113 |
| 2nd Degree Polynomial | $v=0.003667 \rho^{2}-0.7831 \rho+52.18$ | 0.8949 | 3.304 | 52.18 | 106.78 |
| 3rd Degree Polynomial | $\begin{aligned} & v=-3.029 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.009139 \rho^{2} \\ & -1.06 \rho+55.85 \end{aligned}$ | 0.8994 | 3.233 | 55.85 | 150.68 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{1}^{\text {st }} \text { Degree } \\ & \text { Exponential } \end{aligned}$ | $v=54.05 e^{-0.0177 \rho}$ | 0.8991 | 3.25 | 54.05 | $\infty$ |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Exponential | $v=26.31 e^{-0.1832 \rho}+50.86 e^{-0.01642}$ | 0.9045 | 3.189 | 81.17 | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=86.6-16.47 \ln \rho$ | 0.9041 | 3.214 | $\infty$ | 192.1 |

## (b) Without footpath

Similarly, Figure 4.2 represents the FDs modeled for the traffic flow without footpath and Table 4.2 shows other details of the FD models.


Figure 4.2 FDs for the Traffic Flow in Roadway without Footpath
Table 4.2 Model fitting for the traffic flow on roadway without footpath

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow Speed (miles/hr) | Jam Density (veh/mile/lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | $v=-0.3082 \rho+40.6$ | 0.8345 | 3.695 | 40.60 | 113.73 |
| 2nd Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=0.002769 \rho^{2}-0.5966 \rho+47.86$ | 0.8981 | 2.912 | 47.86 | 107.73 |
| 3rd Degree Polynomial | $\begin{aligned} & v=-1.647 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.005697 \rho^{2} \\ & -0.7959 \rho+50.78 \end{aligned}$ | 0.8811 | 3.067 | 50.78 | 173.68 |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Degree Exponential | $v=50.12 e^{-0.01513 \rho}$ | 0.9004 | 2.867 | 50.12 | $\infty$ |
| $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { Degree }$ <br> Exponential | $v=49.26 e^{-0.01689 \rho}+1.986 e^{0.00178 \rho}$ | 0.9011 | 2.879 | 51.19 | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=84.41-15.69 \ln \rho$ | 0.9041 | 3.214 | $\infty$ | 216.99 |

Among six models, logarithmic model has the highest $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ (0.9041) value but RSME (3.214) value is much higher than that of $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential model. On the other hand, $\mathrm{R}^{2}(0.9011)$ value of $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree polynomial model is slightly less than that of logarithmic model. Considering both $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ and RSME values the best fitted structure of FD for this case is $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential and the equation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=49.26 e^{-0.01689 \rho}+1.986 e^{0.00178 \rho} \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 4.3 Comparison between traffic flow on roadway with and without footpath

## (c) Comparisons between two conditions:

In case of both the best fitted models for roadway with and without footpath, jam-densities are infinity as the speed never reaches zero. Among other models $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial model is the $2^{\text {nd }}$ best model that gives both free-flow speed and jam-density. So for the comparison, $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial models are considered and shown in figure 4.3. Free-flow speed in location with footpath is found 55.85 mph from the model, whereas it is found 50.78 mph from model in location without footpath. So, free-flow speed is reduced by 9.08 percent due to side friction if there is no footpath on the roadway. Similarly, jam density in location without footpath is found $173.68 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{mile} / l a n e$ and in location with footpath is found $150.68 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{mile} / \mathrm{lane}$. Here it is found that jam-density is increased by 15.26 percent if there is no footpath. Due to low speed the traffic stream remain more compacted and thereby jam-density is increased.

### 4.2.2 Case-2: Roadway with and without bus stop

For this case another segment of the same road (From Hotel Radisson to Airport Roundabout) of Dhaka city is selected as the study site.

## (a) With bus stop

Figure 4.4 represents the FDs modeled for the traffic flow with bus stop and Table 4.2 shows other details of these FD models. Among six models, 2nd degree polynomial model is the best fitted model as it has the maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}(0.9199)$ and least RSME (3.615) values. So the best fitted structure of FD for this case is $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential and the equation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=89.51 e^{-0.06244 \rho}+26.06 e^{-0.007735 \rho} \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 4.4 FDs for the traffic flow in roadway with bus stop

## (b) Without bus stop

Similarly, figure 4.5 represents the FDs modeled for the traffic flow without bus stop and table 4.4 shows other details of the FD models. Among six models, 2nd degree exponential model is the best fitted model as it has the maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}(0.9413)$ and least RSME (3.346) values. So the best fitted structure of FD for this case is $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential and the equation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=99.9 e^{-0.06713 \rho}+17.94 e^{-0.008012 \rho} \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Table 4.3 Model fitting for the traffic flow on roadway with bus stop

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow <br> Speed (miles/hr) | Jam Density (veh/mile/lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | $v=-0.2073 \rho+36.91$ | 0.6372 | 7.639 | 36.91 | 178.05 |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=0.002524 \rho^{2}-0.6992 \rho+54.91$ | 0.8277 | 5.283 | 54.91 | 138.46 |
| $3^{\text {rd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $\begin{aligned} & v=-2.986 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.01139 \rho^{2} \\ & -1.446 \rho+71 \end{aligned}$ | 0.8884 | 4.266 | 71.00 | 196.73 |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Degree Exponential | $v=61.8 e^{-0.0174 \rho}$ | 0.8363 | 5.131 | 61.80 | $\infty$ |
| $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Exponential | $v=89.51 e^{-0.06244 \rho}+26.06 e^{-0.007735 \rho}$ | 0.9199 | 3.615 | 115.57 | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=95.32-17.84 \ln \rho$ | 0.8479 | 4.947 | $\infty$ | 211.04 |



Figure 4.5 FDs for the traffic flow in roadway without bus stop

Table 4.4 Model fitting for the traffic flow on roadway without bus stop

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow <br> Speed <br> $(\mathbf{m i l e s} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Jam Density <br> (veh/mile/lane) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | $v=-0.1891 \rho+31.23$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 . 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 5 . 2 4}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=0.002875 \rho^{2}-0.7666 \rho+53.08$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 3 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 0 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 3 . 3 2}$ |
| $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=-4.227 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.01559 \rho^{2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 7 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 8 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 9 . 9 2}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Degree <br> Exponential | $v=82.95 e^{-0.03074 \rho}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 4 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 3 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 . 9 0}$ | $\infty$ |
| $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Exponential | $v=99.9 e^{-0.06713 \rho}+17.94 e^{-0.008012 \rho}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 4 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 3 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7 . 8 4}$ | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=90.23-17.63 \ln \rho$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 9 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 2 3 5}$ | $\infty$ | $\mathbf{1 6 7 . 0 0}$ |



Figure 4.6 Comparison between traffic flow on roadway with and without Bus Stop

## (c) Comparisons between two conditions:

In case of both the best fitted models for roadway with and without bus stop, jam-densities are infinity as the speed never reaches zero. Among the other models $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial model is the $2^{\text {nd }}$ best fitted model that gives both free-flow speed and jam-density. So for the comparison, $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial models are considered and as shown in figure 4.6. Free-flow speed in location with bus stop is found 71.00 mph from the model, whereas it is found 75.36 mph in location without bus stop. So free-flow speed is increased by 6.14 percent due to absence of road-side bus stop on the roadway. Similarly, jam density in location without bus stop is found $196.73 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{mile} / l a n e$ and in location with bus stop it is found $189.92 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{mile} / l a n e$. Here it is found that jam-density is increased by 3.59 percent if there is a bus stop on the road side. Due to low speed for the presence of road-side bus stop, the traffic stream remain more compacted and thereby jam-density is increased.

### 4.2.3 Case-3: Highway section with on-ramp and off-ramp

For this case, ramps of Kuril Fly-over on Airport Road at Dhaka city are selected as the study sites.

## (a) On-ramp

Figure 4.7 represents the FDs modeled for on-ramp traffic flow and table 4.5 shows other details of the FD models. Among six models, 2nd degree exponential model is the best fitted model as it has the maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ (0.7505) and least RSME (3.956) values. So the best fitted structure of FD for this case is $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential and the equation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=34.02 e^{-0.08381 \rho}+15.3 e^{-0.007293 \rho} \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

## (b) Off-ramp

Similarly, Figure 4.8 represents the FDs modeled for off-ramp traffic flow and Table 4.6 shows other details of the FD models. Among six models, 2nd degree Exponential model is the best fitted model as it has the maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}(0.7936)$ and least RSME (2.502) values. So the best fitted structure of FD for this case is $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential and the equation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=36.46 e^{-0.06646 \rho}+6.38 e^{-0.006742 \rho} \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 4.7 FDs for the on-ramp traffic flow

Table 4.5 Model fitting for the on-ramp traffic flow

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow Speed (miles/hr) | Jam Density (veh/mile/lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | $v=-0.1121 \rho+20.12$ | 0.4903 | 5.617 | 20.12 | 179.48 |
| $2^{\text {nd }} \text { Degree }$ <br> Polynomial | $v=0.001092 \rho^{2}-0.3116 \rho+25.76$ | 0.6371 | 4.755 | 25.76 | 142.67 |
| $3^{\text {rd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $\begin{aligned} & v=-1.341 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.005225 \rho^{2} \\ & -0.6461 \rho+31.79 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7154 | 4.226 | 31.79 | 194.81 |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Degree Exponential | $v=29.21 e^{-0.01749 \rho}$ | 0.6621 | 4.574 | 29.21 | $\infty$ |
| $2^{\text {nd }} \text { Degree }$ <br> Exponential | $v=34.02 e^{-0.08381 \rho}+15.3 e^{-0.007293 \rho}$ | 0.7505 | 3.956 | 49.32 | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=43.97-8.058 \ln \rho$ | 0.7113 | 4.228 | $\infty$ | 234.32 |



Figure 4.8 FDs for the off-ramp traffic flow

Table 4.6 Model fitting for the off- ramp traffic flow

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow Speed (miles/hr) | Jam Density (veh/mile/lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | $v=-0.05618 \rho+10.71$ | 0.3689 | 4.344 | 10.71 | 190.63 |
| $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=0.0007417 \rho^{2}-0.2261 \rho+17.63$ | 0.587 | 3.527 | 17.63 | 152.42 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }} \text { Degree } \\ & \text { Polynomial } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & v=-9.913 \times 10^{-6} \rho^{3}+0.00415 \rho^{2} \\ & -0.5455 \rho+25.01 \end{aligned}$ | 0.715 | 2.941 | 25.01 | 221.88 |
| $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ Degree Exponential | $v=29.58 e^{-0.03 \rho}$ | 0.7038 | 2.976 | 29.58 | $\infty$ |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Exponential | $v=36.46 e^{-0.06646 \rho}+6.38 e^{-0.006742 \rho}$ | 0.7936 | 2.502 | 42.78 | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=31.22-5.971 \ln \rho$ | 0.6559 | 3.208 | $\infty$ | 186.70 |



Figure 4.9 Comparison between on-ramp and off-ramp traffic flow

## (c) Comparisons between two conditions:

In case of both the best fitted models for highway section with on-ramp and off-ramp, jamdensities are infinity as the speed never reaches zero. Among the other models, $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial model is the $2^{\text {nd }}$ best fitted model that gives both free-flow speed and jam-density. So for the comparison, $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial models are considered and as shown in figure 4.9. Free-flow speed for on-ramp traffic flow is found 31.79 mph from model, whereas it is found 25.01 mph for off-ramp traffic flow. So free-flow speed is decreased by 21.33 percent. Due to over consciousness of driver during off-ramp driving the free-flow speed is decreased. Similarly, jam density for on-ramp traffic flow is found $194.81 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{mile} / \mathrm{lane}$ from model and it is found $221.88 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{mile} / \mathrm{lane}$ off-ramp traffic flows. Here it is revealed that jam-density is increased by 13.89 percent from on-ramp to off-ramp traffic flow while the most suitable FD model is considered. Due to low free-flow speed traffic stream remain more compacted in case of offramp and thereby jam-density is increased.

### 4.2.4 Case-4: Multi-lane merged to a single-lane highway

For this case a segment of Dhaka-Chittagong National Highway (N1) beyond Meghna Bridge is selected as the study site (Figure 3.2).

## (a) Multi-lane

Figure 4.10 represents the FDs modeled for the traffic flow for multi-lane (double-lane) and table 4.7 shows other details of the FD models. Among six models, both $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial and $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential models have the same maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}(0.7947)$ and least $\operatorname{RSME}(3.759)$ values. So here both the models are best fitted models as shown below:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=-1.072 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.004096 \rho^{2}-0.5589 \rho+30.67 \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=30.89 e^{-0.01967 \rho}+0.0958 e^{0.0958 \rho} \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 4.10 FDs for the multi-lane traffic flow

Table 4.7 Model fitting for the multi-lane traffic flow

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow Speed (miles/hr) | Jam Density (veh/mile/lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | $v=-0.2253 \rho+25.75$ | 0.695 | 4.53 | 25.75 | 114.29 |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=0.00189 \rho^{2}-0.4472 \rho+29.51$ | 0.7897 | 3.783 | 29.51 | 118.31 |
| $3^{\text {rd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $\begin{aligned} & v=-1.072 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.004096 \rho^{2} \\ & -0.5589 \rho+30.67 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7947 | 3.759 | 30.67 | 182.00 |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Degree Exponential | $v=30.81 e^{-0.01919 \rho}$ | 0.7942 | 3.721 | 30.08 | $\infty$ |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Exponential | $v=30.89 e^{-0.01967 \rho}+0.0958 e^{0.0958 \rho}$ | 0.7947 | 3.759 | 30.98 | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=42.35-7.693 \ln \rho$ | 0.7701 | 3.933 | $\infty$ | 245.92 |

## (a) Single-lane

Similarly, figure 4.11 represents the FDs modeled for the traffic flow of single-lane merged from multi-lane and table 4.8 shows other details of the FD models. Among six models, 3rd degree polynomial model is the best fitted model as it has the maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}(0.7951)$ and least RSME (3.14) values. So the best fitted structure of FD for this case is 3rd degree polynomial and the equation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=-3.227 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.009119 \rho^{2}-0.8055 \rho+28.49 \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

## (c) Comparisons between two conditions:

For both the conditions of single-lane and multi-lane traffic, $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial model is found as the best model that gives both free-flow speed and jam-density. Comparison between both the conditions is as shown in figure 4.12. Free-flow speed for multi-lane traffic is 30.67 mph whether it is 28.49 mph in case of single-lane traffic flow. So free-flow speed is decreased by $7.11 \%$ when multi-lane (double-lane) traffic merged into single-lane traffic. Similarly, jam density in case multi-lane traffic is $182.00 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{mile} / l a n e$ and in case of single-lane jam density is $162.31 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{mile} / \mathrm{lane}$. Here it is found that jam-density is also decreased by $10.82 \%$ for the case multi-lane traffic merged into single-lane traffic.


Figure 4.11 FDs for the single-lane traffic flow

Table 4.8 Model fitting for the single-lane traffic flow

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow Speed (miles/hr) | Jam Density (veh/mile/lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | $v=-0.2037 \rho+20.04$ | 0.552 | 4.595 | 20.04 | 98.38 |
| $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=0.003965 \rho^{2}-0.5938 \rho+26.55$ | 0.7855 | 3.196 | 26.55 | 74.88 |
| $3^{\text {rd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $\begin{aligned} & v=-3.227 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.009119 \rho^{2} \\ & -0.8055 \rho+28.49 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7951 | 3.14 | 28.49 | 162.31 |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Degree Exponential | $v=27.291 e^{-0.02642 \rho}$ | 0.7517 | 3.421 | 27.29 | $\infty$ |
| $2^{\text {nd }} \text { Degree }$ <br> Exponential | $v=28.64 e^{-0.03256 \rho}+0.4267 e^{0.0254 \rho}$ | 0.7931 | 3.156 | 29.07 | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=36.52-7.156 \ln \rho$ | 0.7196 | 3.637 | $\infty$ | 165.58 |



Figure 4.12 Comparisons between multi-lane merging to single-lane traffic flow

### 4.2.5 Case-5: Roadway with and without shoulder

For this case a segment of Dhaka-Chittagong National Highway (N1) in between Kanchpur Bridge and Meghna Bridge is selected as the study site (Figure 3.2).

## (a) With shoulder

Figure 4.13 represents the FDs modeled for the traffic flow on the highway with shoulder and table 4.9 shows other details of the FD models. Among six models, 2nd degree exponential model is the best fitted model as it has the maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}(0.7348)$ and least RSME (6.157) values. So the best fitted structure of FD for this case is $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential and the equation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=37.46 e^{-0.07186 \rho}+12.59 e^{-0.01007 \rho} \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

## (b) Without shoulder

Similarly, figure 4.14 represents the FDs modeled for the traffic flow on highway without shoulder and table 4.10 shows other details of the FD models. Among six models, 2nd degree exponential model is the best fitted model as it has the maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ (0.7676) and least RSME
(3.08) values. So the best fitted structure of FD for this case is $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential and the equation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=18.64 e^{-0.009431 \rho}+27.8 e^{-0.2547 \rho} \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 4.13 FDs for the traffic flow in roadway with shoulder

Table 4.9 Model fitting for the traffic flow on roadway with shoulder

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow <br> Speed <br> $($ miles/hr) | Jam Density <br> (veh/mile/lane) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | $v=-0.1978 \rho+24.42$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 7 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 5 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 2 . 5 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=0.003144 \rho^{2}-0.648 \rho+33.59$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 5 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 9 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 0 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=-4.483 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.0129 \rho^{2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 1 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 3 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 2 . 4 3}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}^{\text {st }}$ Degree <br> Exponential | $v=41.6 e^{-0.0338 \rho}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 0 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 4 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 6}$ | $\infty$ |
| $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Exponential | $v=37.46 e^{-0.07186 \rho}+12.59 e^{-0.01007 \rho}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 3 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 1 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 0 5}$ | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=52.07-10.64 \ln \rho$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 4 7 2}$ | $\infty$ | $\mathbf{1 3 3 . 4 6}$ |



Figure 4.14 FDs for the traffic flow on roadway with shoulder

Table 4.10 Model fitting for the traffic flow on roadway without shoulder

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow <br> Speed <br> $(\mathbf{m i l e s} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Jam Density <br> (veh/mile/lane) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | $v=-0.1495 \rho+20.49$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 4 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 2 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 7 . 0 6}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=0.001384 \rho^{2}-0.311 \rho+23.65$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 3 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 8 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 2 . 3 6}$ |
| $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=-2.806 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.007306 \rho^{2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 4 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 6 . 2 1}$ |
| 1 <br> Exponential | $v=28.28 e^{-0.01484 \rho}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2 <br> Expegree Degree <br> Exponential | $v=18.64 e^{-0.009431 \rho}+27.8 e^{-0.2547 \rho}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 6 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 4 4}$ | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=34.49-5.943 \ln \rho$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 5 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 1 3 9}$ | $\infty$ | $\mathbf{3 3 1 . 4 5}$ |

## (c) Comparisons between two conditions:

In case of both the best fitted models for traffic flow in roadway with and without shoulder, jamdensities are infinity as the speed never reaches zero. Among the other models, $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial model is the $2^{\text {nd }}$ best fitted model that gives both free-flow speed and jam-density. So for the comparison, $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial models are considered and are shown in figure 4.15. Free-flow speed for traffic flow in roadway with shoulder is found 39.98 mph whereas; it is found 27.28 mph in case of traffic flow in roadway without shoulder. So free-flow speed is decreased by 31.76 percent. Due to absence of shoulder the free-flow speed is decreased. Similarly, jam density in case of traffic flow in roadway with shoulder is found 152.43 veh/mile/lane and in case of traffic flow in roadway without shoulder jam density is 156.21 veh/mile/lane. Here it is found that jam-density is increased by 2.48 percent if there is no shoulder on highway. Due to low free-flow speed traffic stream remain more compacted in case of without shoulder and thereby jam-density is increased.


Figure 4.15 Comparison between traffic flow on roadway with and without Shoulder

### 4.2.6 Case-6: Roadway with and without road-side market

For this case, a segment of Dhaka-Mymensingh Highway is selected as the study site (Figure 3.3).

## (a) With road-side market

Figure 4.16 represents the FDs modeled for the traffic flow on the highway with road-side market and Table 4.11 shows other details of the FD models. Among six models, 3rd degree polynomial model is the best fitted model as it has the maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}(0.8142)$ and least RSME (2.62) values. So the best fitted structure of FD for this case is 3rd degree polynomial and the equation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=-4.598 \times 10^{-6} \rho^{3}+0.002147 \rho^{2}-0.3619 \rho+27.33 \tag{4.12}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 4.16 FDs for the traffic flow on roadway with road-side market

## (b) Without road-side market

Similarly, figure 4.17 represents the FDs modeled for the traffic flow on highway without roadside market and table 4.10 shows other details of the FD models. Among six models, 2nd degree exponential model is the best fitted model as it has the maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}(0.8225)$ and least RSME (3.503) values. So the best fitted structure of FD for this case is $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential and the equation is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=20.08 e^{-0.04527 \rho}+17.09 e^{-0.008299 \rho} \tag{4.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Table 4.11 Model fitting for the traffic flow on roadway with road-side market

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow Speed (miles/hr) | Jam Density (veh/mile/lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | $v=-0.08809 \rho+18.98$ | 0.6908 | 3.36 | 18.98 | 215.46 |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=0.0005676 \rho^{2}-0.2131 \rho+23.95$ | 0.7927 | 2.762 | 23.95 | 187.72 |
| $3^{\text {rd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $\begin{aligned} & v=-4.598 \times 10^{-6} \rho^{3}+0.002147 \rho^{2} \\ & -0.3619 \rho+27.33 \end{aligned}$ | 0.8148 | 2.62 | 27.33 | 244.41 |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Degree Exponential | $v=25.1 e^{-0.01089 \rho}$ | 0.8000 | 2.703 | 25.1 | $\infty$ |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Exponential | $v=14.54 e^{-0.02962 \rho}+14.72 e^{-0.006712 \rho}$ | 0.8142 | 2.624 | 29.26 | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=42.49-7.36 \ln \rho$ | 0.8105 | 2.631 | $\infty$ | 321.53 |



Figure 4.17 FDs for the traffic flow on roadway without road-side market

Table 4.12 Model fitting for the traffic flow on roadway without road-side market

| Model | Equation | R2 | RMSE | Free-flow Speed (miles/hr) | Jam Density (veh/mile/lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear | $v=-0.1066 \rho+21.15$ | 0.6183 | 5.096 | 21.15 | 198.41 |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $v=0.0007991 \rho^{2}-0.2828 \rho+27.51$ | 0.7696 | 3.975 | 27.51 | 176.95 |
| $3^{\text {rd }}$ Degree <br> Polynomial | $\begin{aligned} & v=-7.108 \times 10^{-6} \rho^{3}+0.003272 \rho^{2} \\ & -0.508 \rho+32.03 \end{aligned}$ | 0.8132 | 3.594 | 32.03 | 241.36 |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ Degree Exponential | $v=30.68 e^{-0.01475 \rho}$ | 0.7967 | 3.719 | 30.06 | $\infty$ |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ Degree <br> Exponential | $v=20.08 e^{-0.04527 \rho}+17.09 e^{-0.008299 \rho}$ | 0.8225 | 3.503 | 37.17 | $\infty$ |
| Logarithmic | $v=46.48-8.325 \ln \rho$ | 0.818 | 3.519 | $\infty$ | 265.92 |

## (c) Comparisons between two conditions:

In case of the best fitting models for traffic flow in roadway with and without road-side market, jam-densities are infinity as the speed never reaches zero. Among the other models, $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial model is the $2^{\text {nd }}$ best fitted model that gives both free-flow speed and jam-density. So for the comparison, $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial model is considered and is shown in figure 4.15. Freeflow speed for traffic flow in roadway with road-side market is 27.33 mph , whereas it is 32.03 mph in case of traffic flow in roadway without road-side market. So free-flow speed is increased by 17.20 percent. Due to absence of road-side market the free-flow speed is increased. Similarly, jam density in case of traffic flow in roadway with road-side market is $244.41 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{mile} / \mathrm{lane}$ and in case of traffic flow in roadway without road-side market jam density is 241.36 veh/mile/lane. Here it is found that jam-density is increased by 1.26 percent if there is a road-side market on highway. Due to low free-flow speed traffic stream remain more compacted in case of road-side market and thereby jam-density is increased.


Figure 4.18 Comparison between traffic flow on roadway with and without road-side market

### 4.3 Results and Findings

From the above analysis it is found that for most of the conditions $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential model is the best fitted FD model except for three conditions, e.g. traffic flow in a multi-lane roadway, traffic flow in a single-lane roadway and traffic flow in a roadway with road-side market. For these three cases $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial model is the best fitted model. For $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential model, jam-density is infinity as the speed never reaches zero. So for the comparison of flow parameters, free-flow speed and jam-density are calculated from $2^{\text {nd }}$ best fitted $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial model. The results are compiled in the table 4.13.

The important findings from the study are:
(a) For heterogeneous traffic of Bangladesh, the best fitted FD model is $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential model. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ best model is $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial model.
(b) If the free-flow speed is decreased, the jam-density is increased except for the case where multi-lane merges to a single lane. When a vehicle moves from multi-lane to single-lane both the free-flow speed and jam-density are reduced.
(c) If there is no footpath along road-side, free-flow speed is decreased by 22.88 percent due to side friction and jam-density is increased by 15.26 percent.
(d) When there is a bus stop along road-side, free flow speed is decreased by 5.78 percent and jam-density is increased by 3.58 percent.
(e) On-ramp free flow speed is more than off-ramp free-flow speed. When the vehicles move from on-ramp to off-ramp the free-flow speed is reduced by 21.32 percent and jam-density is increased by 13.89 percent.
(f) When vehicles move from double-lane road merges to a single-lane road the free-flow speed reduced by 7.11 percent and jam-density is also reduced by 10.82 percent.
(g) If there is no shoulder along road-side, free-flow speed is decreased by 31.76 percent and jam-density is increased by 2.48 percent.
(h) If there is a market on road-side, free-flow speed is decreased by 17.20 percent and jamdensity is increased by 1.26 percent.

### 4.4 Summary

This chapter represents the analysis of different FD models, structures of those models and the best fitted FD model for heterogeneous traffic of Bangladesh. It also represents the results and findings of this research. From extensive analysis of FD models, based on the model validation parameters, it is found that for heterogeneous non-lane-based traffic $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree exponential FD model is best representative. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ best fitted model is $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree polynomial model. It is also found that if the free-flow speed decreases, the jam-density is increased except in a case multilane merges to a single lane. When a vehicle moves from multi-lane to single-lane, both the freeflow speed and the jam-density are reduced.

## CHAPTER 5

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Conclusions

This research investigated shape and structure of FD representing speed-density relationships for six different road geometry and traffic operating conditions. It also studied the trends in flow parameters, i.e., the nature of changing flow parameters due to change in road geometry and traffic operating conditions. The research is conducted for existing traffic conditions of Bangladesh which is mostly non-lane based and highly heterogeneous. Free-flow speed and jam density for different conditions that has been obtained from this research will provide a guideline to estimate highway capacity which will be required for better geometric design of new roads. Main conclusions from this research are summarized chapter-wise below.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of basic relationships between traffic flow parameters and modeling FD to describe speed-density relationship of traffic flow. Few classical and nonclassical FD models are reviewed in details in this chapter. For the review purposes, special emphasis is given on speed-density models. Modeling speed-density relationship began with the Greenshields (1935) linear model: ‘A Study in Highway Capacity’ more than eighty years before. There has been a fairly large amount of effort afterwards to revise or improve such an over simplified model. As a result many models exist to represent speed-density relationship. Greenshields Model, Greenberg Model, Underwood Model and Drake model are the classical FD models. There are many modifications and combinations of these classical models known as non-classical models; such as, Edie Model (combination of Greenberg and Underwood Model), Modified Greenberg Model, Underwood model with Taylor Series Expansion, Drake Model with Taylor Series Expansion and many more. From the literature that is reviewed in this chapter, it can be seen that most of the models were developed and validated using the data collected from western countries with homogeneous and lane disciplined traffic conditions. Only limited amount of research has been reported from non-lane-based heterogeneous traffic conditions in recent years in India.

Chapter 3 focuses on study area in details, data collection methods and data processing techniques adopted in this research. For this study six different geometric and traffic conditions were considered. For each case there are two conditions as below:

Case-1: Roadway with and without footpath
Case-2: Roadway with and without bus stop
Case-3: Highway section with on-ramp and off-ramp
Case-4: $\quad$ Multi-lane merged to a single lane highway
Case-5: Roadway with and without shoulder
Case-6: Roadway with and without road-side market

For those six cases, study was conducted on three different highways, i.e. Tongi Diversion Road (Airport Road), Dhaka-Chittagong National Highway (N1) and Dhaka-Mymensingh National Highway (N3). Airport Road is an 8-lane highway with 4-lane in each direction and other two are 4-lane highway with 2-lane in each direction. The traffic stream of these highways consists of buses, micro-buses, cars, trucks, covered vans, utility vehicles, auto-rickshaws, rickshaws and vans. Lane discipline is totally absent in case of all the highways.

Generally traffic data is measured by means of detectors located along the road side. But installation and maintenance cost of these detectors are very high. Video cameras can record number, type and speed of vehicle very easily. By image processing technique, it is easy to get traffic data from recorded videos. This is an efficient and cost-effective method of highresolution data collection in heterogeneous traffic condition.

For this research video footages are recorded from 12 different locations for about 4 to 5 hours each in two phases. These videos were processed and extracted data were filtered for anomalies. Ultimately 3.5 hours data was used for modeling FD. High-resolution ( 20 sec ) traffic data was extracted from video footages. It is then aggregated in 1 minute. Extraction of high resolution traffic data is done by an object detection algorithm which operates basing on the Background Subtraction (BGS) technique of image processing. The developed algorithm can successfully detect non-lane-based movement of vehicles. It can also identify different sizes of motorized and non-motorized traffic, dark car and shadow quite accurately.

Chapter 4 presents developments of FD models for different road geometry and traffic operating conditions for non-lane based heterogeneous traffic of Bangladesh. Then the shape and structure of best fitted models are investigated for all the cases. Finally, it is investigated, how the flow parameters e.g. the free-flow speed and jam-density have been changed with the change of road geometry and traffic operating conditions. Six different cases were considered for this research. With the extracted data, six different FDs namely, linear, polynomial $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree, polynomial $3^{\text {rd }}$ degree, exponential $1^{\text {st }}$ degree, exponential $2^{\text {nd }}$ degree and logarithmic were plotted using MATLAB R2013b. Correlation coefficient ( $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ ) and root mean square error (RMSE) were used for evaluating fitness of different FD models.

Table 4.13 Best fitted FD models

| Cases | Geometric/ Traffic Condition | Best Fitted Model | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | RSME | Free-flow Speed (Miles/hr) | Jamdensity (veh/mile / lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | With Footpath | $v=26.31 e^{-0.1832 \rho}+50.86 e^{-0.01642}$ | 0.9045 | 3.189 | 65.85 | 150.68 |
|  | Without Footpath | $v=49.26 e^{-0.01689 \rho}+1.986 e^{0.00178 \rho}$ | 0.9011 | 2.879 | 50.78 | 173.68 |
| 2 | With Bus Stop | $v=89.51 e^{-0.06244 \rho}+26.06 e^{-0.007735 \rho}$ | 0.9199 | 3.615 | 71.00 | 196.73 |
|  | Without Bus Stop | $v=99.9 e^{-0.06713 \rho}+17.94 e^{-0.008012 \rho}$ | 0.9413 | 3.346 | 75.36 | 189.92 |
| 3 | On-Ramp | $v=34.02 e^{-0.08381 \rho}+15.3 e^{-0.007293 \rho}$ | 7505 | 3.956 | 31.79 | 194.81 |
|  | Off-Ramp | $v=36.46 e^{-0.06646 \rho}+6.38 e^{-0.006742 \rho}$ | 0.7936 | 2.502 | 25.01 | 221.88 |
| 4 | Multi-lane (doublelane) | $\begin{aligned} & v=-1.072 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.004096 \rho^{2} \\ & -0.5589 \rho+30.67 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7947 | 3.759 | 30.67 | 182.00 |
|  | Single-lane | $\begin{aligned} & v=-3.227 \times 10^{-5} \rho^{3}+0.009119 \rho^{2} \\ & -0.8055 \rho+28.49 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7951 | 3.14 | 28.49 | 162.31 |
| 5 | With Shoulder | $v=37.46 e^{-0.07186 \rho}+12.59 e^{-0.01007 \rho}$ | 0.7348 | 6.157 | 39.98 | 152.43 |
|  | Without Shoulder | $v=18.64 e^{-0.009431 \rho}+27.8 e^{-0.2547 \rho}$ | 0.7676 | 3.08 | 27.27 | 156.21 |
| 6 | With Market | $\begin{aligned} & v=-4.598 \times 10^{-6} \rho^{3}+0.002147 \rho^{2} \\ & -0.3619 \rho+27.33 \end{aligned}$ | 0.8148 | 2.62 | 27.33 | 244.41 |
|  | Without Market | $v=20.08 e^{-0.04527 \rho}+17.09 e^{-0.008299 \rho}$ | 0.8225 | 3.503 | 32.03 | 241.36 |

From the analysis it is found that, for most of the conditions 2 nd degree exponential model is the best fitted FD model except for three conditions, e.g., multi-lane, single-lane and with road-side market. For 2nd degree exponential model, jam-density is infinity as the speed never reaches zero. So for the comparison of flow parameters; free-flow speed and jam-density is taken from 2 nd best 3 rd degree polynomial model.

### 5.2 Recommendations for Further Research

FD models have been studied for more than eighty years in the developed countries. But hardly any study was conducted to model FD for non-lane-based heterogeneous traffic prevailing in most South Asian countries, especially in Bangladesh. This is mainly due to the complexity of data collection and processing and the wide variations of driver population, vehicle components and traffic environment. Even though the current study tries to focus its effort in this sector; it cannot be viewed as a complete understanding of FD models for highly complex heterogeneous traffic operation under wide variety of road geometry. In fact, this study mainly focuses on developing deterministic speed-density FD models which lack the power to address the uncertainty brought about by random factors in traffic flow. Therefore, there is a scope to develop stochastic speed-density relationships. In this section some recommendations are provided for future research:

Modeling FD will be more representative, if data from different season and weather conditions are available. If possible, it will be more appropriate to select more test sites throughout each corridor. Then the operational and geometric variations can be captured more accurately. The model FD developed from this data set will then be more representative to this variation.
(a) Some uncertainty has been missing from the modeled FDs. If more stochastic parameters can be added to the equation; these model can capture and predict traffic state more accurately.
(b) Capacity drop phenomenon is not analyzed in this study. There is a huge scope of study in analyzing the change of capacity in stated traffic and geometric condition. It would be more versatile if the capacity issues can be incorporated in the modeled FDs.
(c) One of the main functions of FD is that, the macroscopic flow parameters estimated from FD are being used in many microscopic and macroscopic models. So the more accurate, reliable and complete the FD is, the traffic models will yield more accurate results. If the
modeled FD can be tested in other traffic model, it will ascertain the appropriate applicability of FD.
(d) Various agencies use FD for network management and signal control. There is a scope of research of using the modeled FDs in signal control in stated traffic condition.
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## APPENDX

## Extracted Traffic Data

## Data for Roadway with Footpath



| 29.11127343 | 937.5 | 32.22255588 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26.55771157 | 870 | 32.73438966 |
| 28.24695572 | 939.375 | 33.24826249 |
| 27.87051641 | 937.5 | 33.64202604 |
| 26.67761786 | 915 | 34.2919371 |
| 30.03956238 | 1046.25 | 34.83311684 |
| 33.17046359 | 1170 | 35.27358389 |
| 27.6649314 | 990 | 35.80991348 |
| 30.3299752 | 1102.5 | 36.34794531 |
| 30.59386614 | 1125 | 36.78411994 |
| 28.63673065 | 1068.75 | 37.31087736 |
| 28.35537527 | 1068.75 | 37.69717289 |
| 27.25390527 | 1044 | 38.29468842 |
| 28.04979736 | 1089 | 38.83198098 |
| 24.39271065 | 960 | 39.35339043 |
| 22.54322738 | 894.375 | 39.68853231 |
| 26.00741449 | 1050 | 40.38289034 |
| 22.74286113 | 927 | 40.75774544 |
| 29.42870168 | 1215 | 41.2898668 |
| 27.66368694 | 1155 | 41.75025725 |
| 29.86427555 | 1260 | 42.19335386 |
| 24.56275816 | 1046.25 | 42.58734512 |
| 25.34501938 | 1095 | 43.23196738 |
| 24.40444662 | 1067.142857 | 43.77272022 |
| 20.32471186 | 900 | 44.29282969 |
| 22.56910623 | 1008 | 44.68035805 |
| 28.22393338 | 1275 | 45.17350921 |
| 23.08722702 | 1057.5 | 45.80691017 |
| 28.16329407 | 1305 | 46.33690919 |
| 24.02803452 | 1125 | 46.81882926 |
| 23.74988196 | 1125 | 47.37638179 |
| 27.80208708 | 1327.5 | 47.72761819 |
| 25.80775758 | 1245 | 48.24545973 |
| 24.93126704 | 1215 | 48.73401623 |
| 29.33358446 | 1440 | 49.09048882 |
| 19.33790572 | 960 | 49.64193589 |
| 30.36687248 | 1530 | 50.38385171 |
| 18.08319902 | 918 | 50.7503604 |
| 19.27999242 | 990 | 51.35792081 |
| 20.23217841 | 1057.5 | 52.27041614 |
| 16.04334341 | 855 | 53.29313087 |
| 17.27773305 | 930 | 53.83500193 |
| 18.79792741 | 1020 | 54.23824063 |
| 25.35957484 | 1395 | 55.00880865 |
| 20.71389725 | 1170 | 56.48381789 |
| 17.41193421 | 990 | 56.8575546 |
| 17.30093548 | 990 | 57.22310656 |
| 24.12959162 | 1395 | 57.81283089 |


| 18.5988308 | 1102.5 | 59.27716381 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22.43408786 | 1350 | 60.16748313 |
| 15.53172549 | 945 | 60.85260262 |
| 22.04520567 | 1350 | 61.23780473 |
| 18.97611605 | 1181.25 | 62.24503242 |
| 11.44282201 | 720 | 62.92154148 |
| 14.91224787 | 945 | 63.37072776 |
| 16.87678605 | 1080 | 63.99322695 |
| 10.31103725 | 675 | 65.463831 |
| 12.78458985 | 855 | 66.8773899 |
| 20.39509131 | 1395 | 68.3988112 |
| 14.44523427 | 990 | 68.53471404 |
| 16.74900113 | 1170 | 69.85491198 |
| 15.21788627 | 1080 | 70.96912022 |
| 18.85456926 | 1350 | 71.61785681 |
| 12.47683627 | 900 | 72.15112527 |
| 15.62284263 | 1147.5 | 73.44937437 |
| 16.23450226 | 1215 | 74.84060679 |
| 16.05991286 | 1215 | 75.65420873 |
| 10.64147263 | 810 | 76.11728454 |
| 16.91157272 | 1305 | 77.16609342 |
| 11.76499242 | 922.5 | 78.40979062 |
| 13.67270218 | 1080 | 78.98950666 |
| 14.83463802 | 1215 | 81.90290847 |
| 10.35767148 | 855 | 82.547511 |
| 12.99259305 | 1080 | 83.12428442 |
| 14.53496014 | 1260 | 86.68754424 |
| 14.11179048 | 1260 | 89.28703993 |
| 12.53522492 | 1170 | 93.33697698 |
| 13.84089994 | 1305 | 94.28577661 |
| 7.967923871 | 765 | 96.00995346 |
| 8.872088136 | 900 | 101.4417335 |
| 9.129190227 | 1080 | 118.3018398 |
| 7.411314365 | 900 | 121.4359499 |
|  |  |  |

## Data for Roadway without Footpath

| Speed <br> (mph) | Flow (veh/hr-lane) | Density veh/mile-lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39.5033398 | 450 | 11.39144189 |
| 22.52514283 | 270 | 11.98660546 |
| 25.47702494 | 315 | 12.34327164 |
| 40.64678116 | 540 | 13.28518482 |
| 37.35233225 | 517.5 | 13.86299563 |
| 35.73203019 | 562.5 | 15.74086189 |
| 46.97782743 | 765 | 16.28427796 |
| 39.29617954 | 660 | 16.76240373 |
| 36.21792503 | 630 | 17.39470164 |
| 35.34385318 | 630 | 17.82488165 |
| 39.62914513 | 720 | 18.17080738 |
| 39.80575906 | 750 | 18.83318249 |
| 43.2703031 | 832.5 | 19.23401693 |
| 47.58861605 | 945 | 19.85769031 |
| 38.2583861 | 774 | 20.26320271 |
| 36.91885995 | 765 | 20.72149233 |
| 34.39559163 | 727.5 | 21.15097802 |
| 36.48975502 | 792.6923077 | 21.72188081 |
| 36.50163648 | 810 | 22.19695314 |
| 32.4337655 | 739.2857143 | 22.80173294 |
| 35.00247122 | 810 | 23.1380107 |
| 30.34111152 | 720 | 23.73883942 |
| 38.43872356 | 932.1428571 | 24.24391816 |
| 32.85639916 | 810 | 24.63425878 |
| 30.3123747 | 770.625 | 25.4199815 |
| 38.00269822 | 981 | 25.80233839 |
| 35.95266597 | 945 | 26.26474014 |
| 40.1051606 | 1073.571429 | 26.75877862 |
| 36.79633883 | 1001.25 | 27.21192899 |
| 34.71203941 | 963 | 27.73792522 |
| 36.12269375 | 1020 | 28.25035394 |
| 30.35568369 | 871.875 | 28.70330282 |
| 27.54261411 | 802.5 | 29.14192132 |
| 33.76387945 | 1005 | 29.77181511 |
| 33.99401478 | 1029.375 | 30.26934247 |
| 24.85169991 | 765 | 30.79350325 |
| 40.32339447 | 1260 | 31.25025323 |
| 32.31220162 | 1026 | 31.79174726 |
| 30.56561749 | 990 | 32.37957235 |
| 33.60482491 | 1102.5 | 32.79399799 |
| 30.16594379 | 1002.857143 | 33.25693218 |
| 32.61753271 | 1099.285714 | 33.71428377 |
| 27.22926919 | 932.1428571 | 34.22553936 |


| 31.54601962 | 1092.857143 | 34.65439984 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27.80823691 | 978.75 | 35.19062492 |
| 25.23327598 | 900 | 35.68935138 |
| 25.67001855 | 930 | 36.22450759 |
| 33.26433423 | 1215 | 36.52422172 |
| 27.72802769 | 1035 | 37.31997165 |
| 27.80484707 | 1046.25 | 37.63143191 |
| 26.3341401 | 1009.285714 | 38.32662468 |
| 27.64567073 | 1068.75 | 38.65972204 |
| 26.69362409 | 1046.25 | 39.20011916 |
| 24.9020504 | 990 | 39.75140739 |
| 25.42741676 | 1023.75 | 40.25963139 |
| 28.51187037 | 1161 | 40.72516836 |
| 25.01807943 | 1035 | 41.3560308 |
| 23.39134652 | 977.1428571 | 41.77897902 |
| 23.08551568 | 975 | 42.24191877 |
| 28.42156021 | 1215 | 42.7557388 |
| 23.93594013 | 1035 | 43.24009641 |
| 28.09043076 | 1226.25 | 43.6359797 |
| 25.85552086 | 1147.5 | 44.37346713 |
| 30.10765292 | 1350 | 44.84148575 |
| 23.86299167 | 1080 | 45.26757339 |
| 23.10175704 | 1057.5 | 45.78795064 |
| 29.12892157 | 1350 | 46.33602519 |
| 20.81887426 | 972 | 46.69389742 |
| 22.18493744 | 1050 | 47.34110124 |
| 16.74365381 | 798.75 | 47.72300889 |
| 25.33431601 | 1224 | 48.32337152 |
| 21.90639253 | 1068.75 | 48.78975801 |
| 16.50914515 | 810 | 49.06371545 |
| 23.29894017 | 1158.75 | 49.72900764 |
| 24.60228205 | 1237.5 | 50.29789407 |
| 24.11618422 | 1237.5 | 51.31160178 |
| 20.53550137 | 1065 | 51.84996462 |
| 23.0530634 | 1206 | 52.30347848 |
| 23.35572372 | 1237.5 | 52.98495742 |
| 20.83469586 | 1110 | 53.2782914 |
| 19.45090542 | 1046.25 | 53.81496142 |
| 23.65398606 | 1282.5 | 54.21953552 |
| 20.97442776 | 1147.5 | 54.70282705 |
| 26.83894191 | 1485 | 55.33005007 |
| 24.1886385 | 1350 | 55.80709854 |
| 20.20038653 | 1147.5 | 56.81919264 |
| 20.68076879 | 1181.25 | 57.12146476 |
| 18.65287697 | 1080 | 57.90314831 |


| 27.90539768 | 1620 | 58.05328483 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19.92768389 | 1170 | 58.71494132 |
| 19.52607872 | 1155 | 59.14743699 |
| 18.09286191 | 1080 | 59.69204903 |
| 18.44906707 | 1125 | 60.97869315 |
| 22.82771515 | 1395 | 61.1127821 |
| 20.05251834 | 1237.5 | 61.68480399 |
| 19.25705274 | 1200 | 62.31178194 |
| 22.04599925 | 1395 | 63.27678707 |
| 17.85901746 | 1147.5 | 64.25259746 |
| 15.235295 | 990 | 64.98069122 |
| 13.79872886 | 900 | 65.22339916 |
| 20.52821547 | 1350 | 65.76314448 |
| 13.33838198 | 900 | 67.47445091 |
| 13.93165359 | 945 | 67.81875379 |
| 15.51337183 | 1080 | 69.60873243 |
| 16.8979692 | 1185 | 70.11187792 |
| 17.18995639 | 1215 | 70.6808076 |
| 10.42965934 | 742.5 | 71.20222439 |
| 22.74095396 | 1642.5 | 72.23670465 |
| 9.574530181 | 697.5 | 72.85083753 |
| 12.88416799 | 945 | 73.34583038 |
| 17.57781385 | 1305 | 74.24131413 |
| 14.16285651 | 1057.5 | 74.70261924 |
| 11.39261464 | 855 | 75.04861937 |
| 17.20947483 | 1305 | 75.83032095 |
| 15.1316517 | 1170 | 77.32136738 |
| 12.282349 | 967.5 | 78.79003452 |
| 18.20817141 | 1440 | 79.08537147 |
| 17.56174415 | 1440 | 81.9964115 |
| 15.29320909 | 1260 | 82.38950977 |
| 17.64358461 | 1485 | 84.16657006 |
| 17.54129481 | 1485 | 84.65737656 |
| 12.62184003 | 1080 | 85.56597116 |
| 17.94527397 | 1575 | 87.7668406 |
| 12.32515247 | 1125 | 91.2767613 |
| 11.73905688 | 1080 | 92.00057648 |
| 8.194319404 | 765 | 93.35735676 |
| 11.0600836 | 1035 | 93.57976283 |
| 14.60241576 | 1440 | 98.61382008 |
| 13.1225456 | 1305 | 99.44716824 |
| 11.17442878 | 1125 | 100.6762871 |
| 9.678004444 | 990 | 102.2938154 |
| 16.90897487 | 1755 | 103.7910349 |
| 8.099690664 | 945 | 116.6711223 |
| 11.53883818 | 1440 | 124.7959264 |
| 10.01009758 | 1305 | 130.3683595 |


| 10.0189307 | 1395 | 139.2364157 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.652323046 | 540 | 147.8511055 |
| 11.50419925 | 1890 | 164.287836 |
| 8.350748785 | 1395 | 167.050888 |
| 4.892963882 | 900 | 183.9375932 |

Data for Roadway with Bus Stop

| Speed <br> (mph) | Flow <br> (veh/hr-lane) | Density (veh/mile-lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 241.318358 | 1485 | 6.153696769 |
| 90.79332216 | 900 | 9.912623292 |
| 68.79576746 | 738 | 10.74294461 |
| 113.6197148 | 1305 | 11.48568276 |
| 81.69958609 | 1035 | 12.66836283 |
| 82.11494302 | 1125 | 13.70030787 |
| 61.70696412 | 877.5 | 14.20965906 |
| 60.4678786 | 933.75 | 15.4235163 |
| 72.11977662 | 1185 | 16.37691422 |
| 54.10844188 | 967.5 | 17.87160448 |
| 45.50647505 | 840 | 18.49065978 |
| 39.39484596 | 774 | 19.63621908 |
| 48.37937513 | 990 | 20.51240711 |
| 35.24654666 | 790.7142857 | 22.42007257 |
| 61.49992547 | 1440 | 23.41588114 |
| 44.86797638 | 1091.25 | 24.37699934 |
| 32.53586341 | 832.5 | 25.62185391 |
| 24.7571197 | 648 | 26.17610838 |
| 48.53553637 | 1335 | 27.53270097 |
| 43.61892942 | 1237.5 | 28.38164103 |
| 44.85584589 | 1305 | 29.09319787 |
| 32.62143459 | 990 | 30.41701767 |
| 30.68027011 | 956.25 | 31.16369833 |
| 26.5508228 | 862.5 | 32.49326036 |
| 33.93157322 | 1132.5 | 33.3772573 |
| 29.66960035 | 1023.75 | 34.5412585 |
| 33.10369378 | 1170 | 35.32143888 |
| 28.38192631 | 1035 | 36.55104623 |
| 21.73934496 | 817.5 | 37.5930971 |
| 25.46189544 | 981 | 38.52396996 |
| 29.34679485 | 1161 | 39.5632474 |
| 23.01164807 | 933.75 | 40.57781582 |
| 24.3730246 | 1008 | 41.34773238 |
| 20.74540339 | 885 | 42.64026743 |
| 21.70373808 | 945 | 43.51253836 |
| 24.45757607 | 1080 | 44.16237812 |
| 30.42321677 | 1395 | 45.83523847 |
| 26.01951289 | 1215 | 46.6957243 |
| 25.57380099 | 1215 | 47.52812 |
| 16.4017737 | 795 | 48.43940741 |
| 23.83547571 | 1179 | 49.45155868 |
| 20.05080166 | 1009.285714 | 50.36521037 |
| 23.60340995 | 1215 | 51.45497037 |


| 16.31732654 | 857.1 | 52.55565847 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18.16266444 | 967.5 | 53.25612406 |
| 18.87272209 | 1035.031579 | 54.83856062 |
| 17.95965955 | 996.4285714 | 55.51089248 |
| 19.8263069 | 1125 | 56.70556297 |
| 15.44658141 | 886.2039474 | 57.39365987 |
| 20.359445 | 1192.5 | 58.57288608 |
| 15.24897535 | 908.1578947 | 59.57296695 |
| 19.89032211 | 1204.615385 | 60.5392367 |
| 15.86391945 | 979.7105263 | 61.76647647 |
| 19.83952113 | 1237.5 | 62.36389744 |
| 18.24135521 | 1155 | 63.29905991 |
| 17.87381135 | 1155.631579 | 64.61335519 |
| 19.84592592 | 1298.571429 | 65.4274699 |
| 14.6110079 | 969.7781955 | 66.32028526 |
| 19.09032062 | 1293.75 | 67.76054826 |
| 15.56841293 | 1067.621053 | 68.48448197 |
| 22.68202756 | 1575 | 69.45434371 |
| 17.80915085 | 1255.460526 | 70.52580208 |
| 14.90094921 | 1065 | 71.50105713 |
| 18.52741947 | 1342.484211 | 72.42658375 |
| 16.9378091 | 1248.75 | 73.70309717 |
| 15.32340449 | 1142.415789 | 74.53556647 |
| 10.7766846 | 810 | 75.16226279 |
| 14.49147791 | 1106.467105 | 76.37071915 |
| 14.05499557 | 1090.697368 | 77.64008739 |
| 17.23029666 | 1350 | 78.31726002 |
| 14.14031243 | 1128.684211 | 79.81283929 |
| 12.89051592 | 1035 | 80.2915885 |
| 16.02289931 | 1305 | 81.45954738 |
| 13.29236189 | 1102.5 | 82.93366328 |
| 15.64903559 | 1305 | 83.39292369 |
| 14.35926507 | 1215 | 84.61191655 |
| 15.18024153 | 1296 | 85.39176222 |
| 16.47998035 | 1440 | 87.38640622 |
| 13.21782639 | 1170 | 88.47656923 |
| 15.08573451 | 1350 | 89.48851639 |
| 19.63509644 | 1770 | 90.14215923 |
| 11.05127544 | 1012.5 | 91.61944271 |
| 11.3962698 | 1057.5 | 92.80481308 |
| 15.13961572 | 1417.5 | 93.62871628 |
| 14.31598677 | 1350 | 94.37895562 |
| 13.23712629 | 1260 | 95.17778388 |
| 7.472501331 | 720 | 96.3539093 |
| 15.40424168 | 1507.5 | 97.87434672 |
| 5.029854748 | 495 | 98.41238461 |
| 17.59006043 | 1755 | 99.77225529 |
| 10.49369496 | 1057.5 | 100.7757341 |


| 13.7318668 | 1395 | 101.5885182 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11.44999814 | 1170 | 102.1834227 |
| 15.961687 | 1665 | 104.3122823 |
| 10.02399555 | 1057.5 | 105.4902211 |
| 13.97478343 | 1485 | 106.2628275 |
| 8.845574399 | 967.5 | 109.3996837 |
| 10.99630835 | 1215 | 110.491627 |
| 10.02495647 | 1147.5 | 114.4601177 |
| 9.33441015 | 1080 | 115.5717694 |
| 11.21516343 | 1305 | 116.3342854 |
| 11.1315029 | 1305 | 117.2348434 |
| 9.674257566 | 1147.5 | 118.5524034 |
| 10.52305667 | 1260 | 119.7370725 |
| 8.637821986 | 1057.5 | 122.320682 |
| 8.755029095 | 1080 | 123.3576712 |
| 10.11138969 | 1260 | 124.5651006 |
| 9.453545887 | 1188 | 125.661884 |
| 9.940763072 | 1260 | 126.750833 |
| 9.166000781 | 1170 | 127.6456361 |
| 10.17973208 | 1305 | 128.1967395 |
| 7.967607172 | 1035 | 129.9009825 |
| 6.907149022 | 900 | 130.2997803 |
| 7.709171681 | 1012.5 | 131.3307698 |
| 9.649978638 | 1282.5 | 132.9008494 |
| 8.074534161 | 1080 | 133.7538462 |
| 8.677864732 | 1170 | 134.828146 |
| 5.99705617 | 810 | 135.0662687 |
| 8.074932438 | 1102.5 | 136.4989232 |
| 6.713917242 | 922.5 | 137.3933297 |
| 8.42331597 | 1170 | 138.9001676 |
| 9.995848989 | 1395 | 139.5412628 |
| 7.8431499 | 1102.5 | 140.5668525 |
| 7.647823063 | 1080 | 141.2155898 |
| 10.4323575 | 1485 | 142.345582 |
| 11.11587401 | 1597.5 | 143.6864836 |
| 9.868847531 | 1425 | 144.3781797 |
| 9.284820339 | 1350 | 145.3942881 |
| 7.359018415 | 1080 | 146.7587033 |
| 10.1625835 | 1530 | 150.5522685 |
| 7.136200667 | 1080 | 151.3410357 |
| 6.180673314 | 945 | 152.8619493 |
| 6.755809662 | 1035 | 153.2014743 |
| 9.4592918 | 1462.5 | 154.538509 |
| 11.05090519 | 1732.5 | 156.7812928 |
| 6.575169587 | 1035 | 157.399466 |
| 7.517695929 | 1192.5 | 158.6488689 |
| 7.201718231 | 1147.5 | 159.3425277 |
| 6.455257187 | 1035 | 160.3344328 |


| 8.225247751 | 1327.5 | 161.3888137 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.463782966 | 1215 | 162.7759482 |
| 7.96836805 | 1305 | 163.7693334 |
| 7.112502589 | 1170 | 164.4990614 |
| 7.338764933 | 1215 | 165.559193 |
| 7.853299354 | 1305 | 166.1721961 |
| 5.885484012 | 990 | 168.2104646 |
| 9.139674038 | 1575 | 172.3256205 |
| 5.445397938 | 945 | 173.5410361 |
| 8.963040038 | 1575 | 175.7216294 |
| 3.913043478 | 720 | 184 |
| 4.760674845 | 877.5 | 184.2738489 |
| 8.267441721 | 1530 | 185.0632943 |
| 8.812730474 | 1665 | 188.9312291 |
| 6.81995468 | 1305 | 191.3502452 |
| 7.734415567 | 1530 | 197.8171443 |
| 4.06791642 | 810 | 199.1191353 |
| 5.609242521 | 1147.5 | 204.5835392 |
| 4.500848807 | 945 | 209.9603965 |
| 5.467494573 | 1170 | 213.991982 |
| 4.64012396 | 1035 | 223.0543858 |
| 5.092126754 | 1170 | 229.7664722 |
| 5.844243335 | 1350 | 230.9965418 |
| 6.536967115 | 1530 | 234.053495 |
| 6.315121442 | 1485 | 235.1498722 |
| 3.416149068 | 810 | 237.1090909 |
| 4.062623698 | 1005 | 247.3904358 |

## Data for Roadway without Bus Stop

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Speed } \\ & \text { (mph) } \end{aligned}$ | Flow <br> (veh/hr-lane) | Density (veh/mile-lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85.71428571 | 495 | 5.775 |
| 103.9633245 | 630 | 6.059829303 |
| 91.07142857 | 675 | 7.411764706 |
| 58.56763032 | 517.5 | 8.780436332 |
| 79.68676674 | 720 | 9.035377259 |
| 58.67057377 | 630 | 10.73792124 |
| 57.55454684 | 675 | 11.72800477 |
| 59.32507175 | 720 | 12.13652135 |
| 34.95016869 | 450 | 12.87547433 |
| 26.24222077 | 360 | 13.71835117 |
| 12.18313355 | 180 | 14.77452408 |
| 42.85293637 | 720 | 16.80164911 |
| 39.18034605 | 720 | 18.37656051 |
| 16.475761 | 315 | 19.11899547 |
| 41.51187199 | 810 | 19.51249031 |
| 30.93042924 | 630 | 20.36829153 |
| 26.1945305 | 540 | 20.6149906 |
| 25.36164755 | 540 | 21.29199213 |
| 41.17627468 | 900 | 21.85724685 |
| 22.42894489 | 495 | 22.06969621 |
| 21.91221514 | 495 | 22.58918924 |
| 39.44372906 | 945 | 23.95818099 |
| 25.84036225 | 652.5 | 25.21743796 |
| 35.55939833 | 945 | 26.57662624 |
| 31.51600615 | 855 | 27.129072 |
| 40.62344848 | 1125 | 27.69336533 |
| 23.36811061 | 675 | 28.88551888 |
| 27.87757072 | 810 | 29.05561636 |
| 25.76358957 | 780 | 30.26085543 |
| 22.43753627 | 690 | 30.73736287 |
| 15.8949176 | 495 | 31.14202996 |
| 29.63290544 | 945 | 31.88745216 |
| 38.96200754 | 1260 | 32.33919604 |
| 15.77391821 | 517.5 | 32.84892526 |
| 20.4241267 | 675 | 33.04914868 |
| 31.30260065 | 1057.5 | 33.80888533 |
| 15.43642377 | 540 | 34.98219587 |
| 15.28103857 | 540 | 35.30146018 |
| 19.471514 | 697.5 | 35.81950183 |
| 20.93315587 | 765 | 36.5448958 |
| 20.210816 | 753.75 | 37.25396904 |
| 24.5773377 | 922.5 | 37.53106556 |
| 12.96573841 | 495 | 38.17754024 |


| 19.53409669 | 765 | 39.19317881 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17.30492498 | 690 | 39.89823008 |
| 25.41232366 | 1035 | 40.72827081 |
| 16.28294392 | 675 | 41.45442024 |
| 23.20190964 | 967.5 | 41.709258 |
| 26.53105911 | 1125 | 42.40313194 |
| 8.307944518 | 360 | 43.33201783 |
| 20.66995002 | 900 | 43.54146958 |
| 17.35952359 | 765 | 44.06802963 |
| 9.898564169 | 450 | 45.46113884 |
| 21.59166821 | 990 | 45.85511398 |
| 17.50368119 | 810 | 46.27597995 |
| 20.20349997 | 945 | 46.77695603 |
| 9.022801872 | 427.5 | 47.35871121 |
| 16.4556503 | 787.5 | 47.83589502 |
| 24.34643624 | 1170 | 48.05631463 |
| 15.68703814 | 765 | 48.78755089 |
| 16.61305361 | 817.5 | 49.22055369 |
| 10.90824479 | 540 | 49.50383954 |
| 16.09398135 | 810 | 50.32953519 |
| 15.07876686 | 765 | 50.71860768 |
| 13.36005112 | 686.25 | 51.37303657 |
| 7.788668803 | 405 | 51.99861623 |
| 15.81569792 | 825 | 52.16750406 |
| 8.504947689 | 450 | 52.91037834 |
| 18.73010074 | 1035 | 55.25864567 |
| 18.56516093 | 1035 | 55.74958407 |
| 15.99687561 | 900 | 56.25120412 |
| 5.55431843 | 315 | 56.71262892 |
| 15.34760433 | 877.5 | 57.19958728 |
| 12.46181869 | 720 | 57.83249089 |
| 10.798697 | 630 | 58.34037198 |
| 25.25335077 | 1485 | 58.80407767 |
| 9.13972577 | 540 | 59.08273547 |
| 12.61645963 | 765 | 60.63507692 |
| 9.476792087 | 585 | 61.71874383 |
| 11.4118111 | 720 | 63.092527 |
| 9.846268064 | 630 | 63.98363278 |
| 11.22157074 | 720 | 64.16214061 |
| 10.06137942 | 652.5 | 64.85785079 |
| 13.5565339 | 900 | 66.38865118 |
| 8.103821865 | 540 | 66.66229494 |
| 12.28936887 | 832.5 | 67.73500447 |
| 8.842935551 | 607.5 | 68.74425975 |
| 11.71582463 | 810 | 69.14947329 |
| 7.098077288 | 495 | 69.78113906 |
| 9.232613571 | 652.5 | 70.67768726 |
| 11.08441569 | 787.5 | 71.03669804 |


| 12.50861869 | 900 | 71.95039056 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.675424516 | 697.5 | 72.10627271 |
| 9.863317737 | 720 | 72.99774976 |
| 12.31681873 | 900 | 73.07081637 |
| 9.735301011 | 720 | 73.95765156 |
| 9.073642151 | 675 | 74.3912961 |
| 9.826109777 | 735 | 74.80199256 |
| 13.19424427 | 990 | 75.02998569 |
| 10.70058458 | 810 | 75.69679898 |
| 7.965962462 | 607.5 | 76.21934932 |
| 10.4853764 | 810 | 77.25704597 |
| 15.06451648 | 1170 | 77.66595111 |
| 10.06537507 | 787.5 | 78.27030361 |
| 10.29219581 | 810 | 78.70040709 |
| 10.01582226 | 798.75 | 79.74672783 |
| 10.67475433 | 855 | 80.0955201 |
| 11.04435521 | 900 | 81.489592 |
| 9.34152261 | 765 | 81.89243146 |
| 9.316770186 | 765 | 82.11 |
| 7.009966198 | 585 | 83.45261354 |
| 7.52918854 | 630 | 83.67435569 |
| 9.07763106 | 765 | 84.28253676 |
| 6.769649573 | 585 | 86.41510816 |
| 8.041620355 | 697.5 | 86.73712972 |
| 9.950727234 | 877.5 | 88.16202624 |
| 8.107135831 | 720 | 88.81064966 |
| 9.054559258 | 810 | 89.45769496 |
| 12.29984489 | 1102.5 | 89.63419927 |
| 10.4837965 | 945 | 90.13910181 |
| 8.426624548 | 765 | 90.81306092 |
| 9.36701229 | 855 | 91.2777707 |
| 8.233741719 | 765 | 92.90288825 |
| 9.142080745 | 855 | 93.52356688 |
| 7.066579492 | 675 | 95.52004626 |
| 9.237838294 | 900 | 97.41640685 |
| 9.196996327 | 900 | 97.85803626 |
| 10.08456972 | 990 | 98.16978088 |
| 7.286427867 | 720 | 98.81385133 |
| 9.92152171 | 990 | 99.78308055 |
| 9.5354603 | 967.5 | 101.4626284 |
| 5.73943144 | 585 | 101.9264724 |
| 6.575514038 | 675 | 102.6535714 |
| 9.545303781 | 990 | 103.7263331 |
| 9.49691871 | 990 | 104.2173186 |
| 8.794239956 | 922.5 | 104.8781718 |
| 6.417469209 | 675 | 105.1837332 |
| 9.34523049 | 990 | 105.9363919 |
| 5.077761899 | 540 | 106.3462114 |


| 6.280117041 | 675 | 107.4820733 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10.74451448 | 1170 | 108.8927752 |
| 8.650649591 | 945 | 109.2403798 |
| 8.613957411 | 945 | 109.7060029 |
| 7.277099859 | 810 | 111.3250406 |
| 8.872194085 | 990 | 111.5845743 |
| 7.981030265 | 900 | 112.7673959 |
| 6.227220434 | 705 | 113.2120028 |
| 6.520791952 | 742.5 | 113.8679383 |
| 7.860918688 | 900 | 114.490435 |
| 3.523473254 | 405 | 114.9434013 |
| 4.658385093 | 540 | 115.92 |
| 7.162826907 | 832.5 | 116.2309615 |
| 5.778632858 | 675 | 116.8096359 |
| 9.575025409 | 1125 | 117.4931608 |
| 7.958074534 | 945 | 118.7473171 |
| 7.162266782 | 855 | 119.3738063 |
| 8.633633381 | 1035 | 119.8800035 |
| 7.122609053 | 855 | 120.0402821 |
| 7.073108053 | 855 | 120.8803815 |
| 7.049740194 | 855 | 121.2709874 |
| 6.467646102 | 787.5 | 121.7455263 |
| 10.25828982 | 1260 | 122.827491 |
| 5.289844145 | 652.5 | 123.3648444 |
| 5.788473073 | 720 | 124.3851342 |
| 4.683232113 | 585 | 124.9137318 |
| 6.978988995 | 877.5 | 125.7368495 |
| 5.971585475 | 765 | 128.1066818 |
| 9.007009965 | 1170 | 129.8988238 |
| 8.281573499 | 1080 | 130.41 |
| 4.813526681 | 630 | 130.8837468 |
| 5.836788074 | 765 | 131.0652349 |
| 5.762936587 | 765 | 132.7556794 |
| 6.161621738 | 825 | 133.8871411 |
| 6.033176791 | 810 | 134.2576271 |
| 6.325824754 | 855 | 135.1476271 |
| 5.597594716 | 765 | 136.6658429 |
| 6.558219815 | 900 | 137.2420021 |
| 5.490126727 | 765 | 139.3410458 |
| 3.222283288 | 450 | 139.6525258 |
| 3.850033509 | 540 | 140.2585195 |
| 4.44996441 | 630 | 141.574166 |
| 7.463975608 | 1080 | 144.6950066 |
| 1.227289335 | 180 | 146.664682 |
| 5.478877425 | 810 | 147.840504 |
| 6.482363631 | 967.5 | 149.2430664 |
| 4.197330268 | 630 | 150.0954082 |
| 5.825903478 | 877.5 | 150.6198511 |


| 5.017357311 | 765 | 152.4707037 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.876249218 | 900 | 153.1589228 |
| 4.233825238 | 652.5 | 154.0849167 |
| 4.654830159 | 720 | 154.6780388 |
| 5.072717357 | 787.5 | 155.2797006 |
| 4.035731507 | 630 | 156.1055285 |
| 5.704089893 | 900 | 157.7830976 |
| 4.411004504 | 697.5 | 158.1267922 |
| 5.051623076 | 810 | 160.3421462 |
| 5.174607236 | 832.5 | 160.8579514 |
| 5.270319103 | 855 | 162.2404707 |
| 5.739720708 | 945 | 164.6563825 |
| 3.536197088 | 585 | 165.4319557 |
| 3.253475303 | 540 | 165.9763636 |
| 6.220765279 | 1035 | 166.3782435 |
| 6.726420979 | 1125 | 167.2558642 |
| 6.33919133 | 1080 | 170.3687338 |
| 3.422347179 | 585 | 170.935317 |
| 5.484427313 | 945 | 172.3060488 |
| 2.329192547 | 405 | 173.88 |
| 4.903189432 | 855 | 174.3762936 |
| 5.399239382 | 945 | 175.0246531 |
| 4.325120211 | 765 | 176.8736966 |
| 5.79901626 | 1035 | 178.4785477 |
| 5.542014983 | 990 | 178.6353886 |
| 4.719250224 | 855 | 181.1728473 |
| 6.631433568 | 1215 | 183.2183023 |
| 2.670405112 | 495 | 185.3651335 |
| 5.06014699 | 945 | 186.7534682 |
| 3.591667994 | 675 | 187.9349654 |
| 5.262550742 | 990 | 188.1217015 |
| 3.575928327 | 675 | 188.7621726 |
| 5.713144221 | 1080 | 189.0377624 |
| 4.217348171 | 810 | 192.06382 |
| 6.776227672 | 1305 | 192.5850286 |
| 2.795031056 | 540 | 193.2 |
| 4.642278126 | 900 | 193.8703317 |
| 3.008444367 | 585 | 194.4526568 |
| 4.351601347 | 855 | 196.479395 |
| 4.100793413 | 810 | 197.5227519 |
| 3.962804105 | 787.5 | 198.7369764 |
| 5.417373471 | 1080 | 199.3586017 |
| 2.916015397 | 585 | 200.6162247 |
| 2.905959864 | 585 | 201.3104197 |
| 4.558710277 | 922.5 | 202.3680512 |
| 3.772083177 | 765 | 202.8057082 |
| 5.538345279 | 1125 | 203.129264 |
| 2.618786264 | 540 | 206.2024149 |


| 2.787151218 | 585 | 209.8917332 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.988152615 | 1260 | 210.4154789 |
| 2.968540163 | 630 | 212.2255268 |
| 3.993607963 | 855 | 214.0921212 |
| 4.189894973 | 900 | 214.8025231 |
| 4.350457823 | 945 | 217.2185178 |
| 3.924001933 | 855 | 217.8898009 |
| 4.124324485 | 900 | 218.2214051 |
| 3.083594078 | 675 | 218.9004074 |
| 3.054816533 | 675 | 220.9625333 |
| 4.445430346 | 990 | 222.7005988 |
| 3.219838564 | 720 | 223.6136955 |
| 2.789416473 | 630 | 225.8536888 |
| 3.17634067 | 720 | 226.6759378 |
| 3.12756529 | 720 | 230.2110214 |
| 3.88847951 | 900 | 231.4529362 |
| 3.292005728 | 765 | 232.3811292 |
| 2.869309051 | 675 | 235.2482734 |
| 3.806017035 | 900 | 236.4676752 |
| 3.965194046 | 945 | 238.3237715 |
| 2.792594861 | 675 | 241.7197074 |
| 3.329693081 | 810 | 243.2656645 |
| 4.382730796 | 1080 | 246.4217061 |
| 2.996250816 | 742.5 | 247.824769 |
| 2.161228544 | 540 | 249.8578883 |
| 2.278001502 | 585 | 256.8040449 |
| 3.829738866 | 990 | 258.5032647 |

## Data for Highway Section with On－Ramp

| Speed <br> （mph） | Flow （veh／hr－lane） | Density （veh／mile－lane） |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.598948533 | 90 | 11.84374386 | ロ－ロ 「 |
| 5.081874647 | 180 | 35.42 |  |
| 12.60097489 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 23.65766644 | 720 | 30.43410903 | 하 |
| 15.45685849 | 360 | 23.29063181 | －$\square_{0}^{10}$ |
| 14.15274767 | 450 | 31.79594595 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 5.081874647 | 540 | 106.26 | \％응 |
| 13.71291425 | 360 | 26.25262532 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 4.743321388 | 540 | 113.8442783 | 윽 |
| 21.01566911 | 360 | 17.13007557 | $\square$ |
| 10.16374929 | 900 | 88.55 | ＂．．＂ |
| 6.348890948 | 630 | 99.22992931 |  |
| 36.57572544 | 270 | 7.381945177 | こ 心．W－ |
| 10.16374929 | 360 | 35.42 |  |
| 14.38639514 | 360 | 25.02364189 |  |
| 7.622811971 | 990 | 129.8733333 | $0$ |
| 11.0877265 | 900 | 81.17083333 |  |
| 13.36699283 | 360 | 26.93201116 | ¢ ¢ |
| 5.712459275 | 810 | 141.7953216 | －N0 O O |
| 5.809506699 | 450 | 77.45924453 |  |
| 8.711163374 | 900 | 103.3157067 |  |
| 25.70922167 | 810 | 31.50620468 |  |
| 27.96759585 | 180 | 6.436019778 | $\stackrel{1}{1}$ |
| 6.025719804 | 720 | 119.4877995 | こ |
| 26.0923213 | 630 | 24.14503458 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 17.27102376 | 270 | 15.63312076 | F ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |
| 7.706492925 | 450 | 58.39231987 | ゅ |
| 19.08865665 | 900 | 47.14841995 |  |
| 17.03224527 | 810 | 47.55685391 |  |
| 13.37862918 | 630 | 47.0900263 |  |
| 6.57302393 | 720 | 109.5386245 |  |
| 10.70679846 | 450 | 42.02937058 |  |
| 16.79507674 | 180 | 10.71742647 |  |
| 9.864070854 | 450 | 45.62011026 |  |
| 20.32749859 | 1170 | 57.5575 |  |
| 9.815516604 | 900 | 91.69155698 |  |
| 71.18153586 | 540 | 7.586236986 |  |
| 1.196915213 | 270 | 225.5798883 |  |
| 20.32749859 | 810 | 39.8475 |  |
| 117.0100145 | 630 | 5.384154535 |  |
| 20.32749859 | 630 | 30.9925 |  |
| 15.24562394 | 270 | 17.71 |  |
| 6.672542728 | 180 | 26.97622291 |  |


| 11.50681617 | 270 | 23.46435331 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18.25352228 | 360 | 19.72222098 |
| 238.8481084 | 540 | 2.260851064 |
| 5.928853755 | 450 | 75.9 |
| 10.3590636 | 810 | 78.19239568 |
| 69.09759447 | 270 | 3.907516638 |
| 17.41738736 | 270 | 15.50175089 |
| 22.26999658 | 540 | 24.24787081 |
| 20.91825198 | 360 | 17.20985101 |
| 12.87680804 | 540 | 41.93585852 |
| 6.775832863 | 630 | 92.9775 |
| 16.39067541 | 0 | 0 |
| 16.30205047 | 450 | 27.60388952 |
| 8.890562781 | 810 | 91.10784322 |
| 11.47276866 | 900 | 78.44662664 |
| 18.94522868 | 270 | 14.25160944 |
| 197.9511172 | 360 | 1.818630807 |
| 13.160954 | 360 | 27.35364017 |
| 24.2007571 | 720 | 29.75113535 |
| 4.810502117 | 270 | 56.127197 |
| 41.60627631 | 720 | 17.30508144 |
| 5.558031076 | 90 | 16.1927846 |
| 19.27607625 | 180 | 9.338 |
| 12.26097425 | 810 | 66.06326574 |
| 20.32749859 | 630 | 30.9925 |
| 23.6667211 | 1080 | 45.63369786 |
| 21.27397072 | 450 | 21.15260973 |
| 57.69422393 | 630 | 10.91963731 |
| 4.065499718 | 720 | 177.1 |
| 5.428906176 | 720 | 132.6234009 |
| 19.11060223 | 270 | 14.12828317 |
| 5.402611563 | 1170 | 216.5619324 |
| 7.072341272 | 270 | 38.17689074 |
| 10.65458905 | 540 | 50.6823865 |
| 6.619371205 | 450 | 67.98228806 |
| 13.04717825 | 630 | 48.28630283 |
| 8.469791078 | 90 | 10.626 |
| 5.081874647 | 360 | 70.84 |
| 16.41423886 | 270 | 16.44913312 |
| 18.93095288 | 360 | 19.01647541 |
| 9.597431895 | 270 | 28.13252576 |
| 18.99653142 | 810 | 42.63936306 |
| 14.34052068 | 450 | 31.37961376 |
| 7.313597376 | 360 | 49.22338235 |
| 4.355892555 | 720 | 165.2933333 |
| 8.062589584 | 540 | 66.976 |
| 6.832749279 | 990 | 144.8904328 |
| 16.7098904 | 900 | 53.86031735 |


| 55.90062112 | 450 | 8.05 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8.346954342 | 270 | 32.34712794 |
| 14.01960241 | 630 | 44.93708034 |
| 6.233956508 | 90 | 14.43705934 |
| 7.75055855 | 360 | 46.44826533 |
| 30.92889963 | 360 | 11.63959935 |
| 4.092536937 | 630 | 153.938745 |
| 13.97515528 | 450 | 32.2 |
| 20.40763584 | 540 | 26.46068384 |
| 3.654459828 | 450 | 123.1372135 |
| 19.21456954 | 720 | 37.47156544 |
| 45.23874125 | 450 | 9.947226371 |
| 20.16920335 | 360 | 17.84899452 |
| 5.41295187 | 630 | 116.3875119 |
| 10.37549407 | 450 | 43.37142857 |
| 7.3767832 | 360 | 48.80175955 |
| 5.633056205 | 90 | 15.97711735 |
| 8.081856619 | 630 | 77.95238516 |
| 20.32749859 | 540 | 26.565 |
| 10.16374929 | 630 | 61.985 |
| 16.61253339 | 990 | 59.59355968 |
| 7.487125413 | 630 | 84.14444332 |
| 18.66260794 | 180 | 9.644954265 |
| 30.5089647 | 360 | 11.79981043 |
| 19.82319042 | 90 | 4.540136986 |
| 17.30438986 | 270 | 15.60297718 |
| 5.487608618 | 360 | 65.60234614 |
| 14.00389376 | 630 | 44.98748781 |
| 16.33474181 | 540 | 33.05837375 |
| 10.70143208 | 270 | 25.23026806 |
| 8.437864535 | 450 | 53.33102921 |
| 16.5300538 | 810 | 49.00165541 |
| 3.608130999 | 270 | 74.83098592 |
| 18.37107159 | 450 | 24.49503273 |
| 9.488459155 | 540 | 56.91124251 |
| 15.24562394 | 630 | 41.32333333 |
| 11.33633966 | 360 | 31.75628209 |
| 16.90170967 | 540 | 31.9494306 |
| 10.75707201 | 810 | 75.29930072 |
| 20.89835106 | 540 | 25.83935921 |
| 1.998238621 | 450 | 225.1983299 |
| 8.86901821 | 990 | 111.6245312 |
| 21.73092312 | 360 | 16.56625437 |
| 7.525083612 | 720 | 95.68 |
| 12.16792081 | 450 | 36.9824892 |
| 12.55736756 | 720 | 57.33685796 |
| 5.674693488 | 720 | 126.8790995 |
| 6.878989601 | 810 | 117.7498509 |


| 11.42017878 | 630 | 55.16551119 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.234895539 | 90 | 21.252 |
| 48.34817357 | 540 | 11.16898448 |
| 9.2883003 | 630 | 67.82726437 |
| 12.89682717 | 90 | 6.978460579 |
| 19.5416223 | 900 | 46.05554166 |
| 14.83482432 | 540 | 36.40083552 |
| 18.69189481 | 720 | 38.51936934 |
| 49.31899337 | 360 | 7.299419056 |
| 42.99921677 | 270 | 6.27918414 |
| 9.17588585 | 360 | 39.23326923 |
| 6.813380985 | 900 | 132.0930096 |
| 17.22355452 | 630 | 36.57781553 |
| 14.0693332 | 1170 | 83.15959138 |
| 4.423406946 | 360 | 81.38523187 |
| 11.72383311 | 990 | 84.44337196 |
| 5.784781256 | 540 | 93.3483871 |
| 8.678236573 | 1260 | 145.1907873 |
| 7.801999458 | 1350 | 173.0325678 |
| 4.068937196 | 900 | 221.1879802 |
| 8.729951674 | 1350 | 154.6400313 |
| 1.270468662 | 630 | 495.88 |
| 3.260629051 | 450 | 138.0101793 |
| 5.846776325 | 720 | 123.1447827 |
| 4.021094988 | 180 | 44.76392638 |
| 15.06498124 | 270 | 17.92235886 |
| 32.39818125 | 270 | 8.333801146 |
| 2.474129648 | 360 | 145.5057136 |
| 11.34079623 | 450 | 39.67975361 |
| 12.37251158 | 270 | 21.82257 |
| 12.16994654 | 360 | 29.58106667 |
| 6.28885924 | 450 | 71.55510766 |
| 8.853695504 | 540 | 60.99148088 |
| 17.00552672 | 1080 | 63.508765 |
| 6.219437138 | 1080 | 173.6491544 |
| 6.464158173 | 1080 | 167.0751196 |
| 16.4627574 | 540 | 32.80130946 |
| 3.379626849 | 720 | 213.0412712 |
| 5.081874647 | 990 | 194.81 |
| 22.39951796 | 810 | 36.16149246 |
| 29.29390514 | 540 | 18.43386866 |
| 31.59353039 | 450 | 14.24342245 |
| 10.29392026 | 810 | 78.68722307 |
| 6.750211196 | 540 | 79.99749702 |
| 9.572273209 | 450 | 47.01077687 |
| 15.34629612 | 1260 | 82.10450195 |
| 13.28296406 | 360 | 27.10238455 |
| 13.070205 | 990 | 75.74479513 |


| 3.779469617 | 720 | 190.5029205 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16.86315548 | 450 | 26.68539707 |
| 24.06378381 | 990 | 41.14066216 |
| 29.51788918 | 360 | 12.19599402 |
| 6.984646433 | 630 | 90.19783693 |
| 18.94153278 | 540 | 28.50878049 |
| 18.5188746 | 990 | 53.45897208 |
| 13.7458006 | 810 | 58.92708788 |
| 21.30705241 | 990 | 46.46348922 |
| 4.550492362 | 1170 | 257.1150343 |
| 17.8127281 | 630 | 35.36796815 |
| 16.43916037 | 630 | 38.32312514 |
| 22.29889441 | 540 | 24.21644725 |
| 6.332585455 | 720 | 113.6976366 |
| 9.487103026 | 1080 | 113.8387553 |
| 18.39366379 | 180 | 9.785978588 |
| 9.460105112 | 180 | 19.02727273 |

## Data for Highway Section with Off-Ramp

| Speed <br> (mph) | Flow (veh/hr-lane) | Density (veh/mile-lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.923076923 | 450 | 104.65 |
| 3.846153846 | 450 | 52.325 |
| 4.492788462 | 450 | 44.79400749 |
| 1.581373172 | 180 | 50.90512563 |
| 1.727262045 | 540 | 139.8166542 |
| 2.538423818 | 1170 | 206.1318509 |
| 0.829388183 | 450 | 242.648743 |
| 3.920353539 | 1620 | 184.8047613 |
| 4.310109548 | 360 | 37.35403897 |
| 45.20100919 | 1080 | 10.68560213 |
| 13.73856708 | 1260 | 41.0159223 |
| 7.391357757 | 1440 | 87.12878217 |
| 7.728491708 | 180 | 10.41600393 |
| 5.276435156 | 810 | 68.65430718 |
| 4.487189837 | 450 | 44.84989655 |
| 2.013276298 | 900 | 199.9228821 |
| 3.530650636 | 450 | 57.00082527 |
| 4.458197635 | 360 | 36.11324871 |
| 3.708028001 | 720 | 86.83861068 |
| 2.307492062 | 1260 | 244.2045238 |
| 23.52103476 | 450 | 8.556171191 |
| 12.80243016 | 1260 | 44.01508097 |
| 13.07692308 | 720 | 24.62352941 |
| 5.651413492 | 1530 | 121.0759045 |
| 1.937817085 | 360 | 83.08317707 |
| 2.794868113 | 180 | 28.80279023 |
| 2.874131893 | 180 | 28.00845716 |
| 25.53499132 | 1980 | 34.67790487 |
| 4.632703554 | 450 | 43.44115648 |
| 2.374783826 | 810 | 152.5402001 |
| 6.490966473 | 1980 | 136.4203626 |
| 1.119871537 | 630 | 251.5913572 |
| 14.23950276 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.513089372 | 270 | 235.3391177 |
| 0.953623922 | 450 | 211.0370717 |
| 0.194622555 | 0 | 0 |
| 1.629330392 | 450 | 123.5169987 |
| 1.923076923 | 270 | 62.79 |
| 0.515646905 | 180 | 156.1145799 |
| 1.90236514 | 540 | 126.9472379 |
| 1.841549449 | 630 | 152.9961631 |
| 5.026401043 | 1080 | 96.09261097 |
| 2.270308969 | 450 | 88.6443223 |


| 3.320670195 | 810 | 109.0894243 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.953762293 | 1350 | 86.82350281 |
| 10.61153674 | 720 | 30.34433258 |
| 4.670521635 | 900 | 86.17881073 |
| 3.661572217 | 630 | 76.94782005 |
| 2.180121577 | 450 | 92.31136564 |
| 1.913366806 | 630 | 147.2535215 |
| 4.34840997 | 810 | 83.30631254 |
| 2.894116753 | 540 | 83.44514773 |
| 2.019838099 | 810 | 179.3460575 |
| 6.99399123 | 1170 | 74.8142202 |
| 3.26879231 | 540 | 73.88049686 |
| 1.354190595 | 630 | 208.057862 |
| 7.424696254 | 810 | 48.78987471 |
| 2.346855855 | 720 | 137.2048476 |
| 19.68118525 | 1530 | 34.76670694 |
| 3.528236747 | 630 | 79.85575238 |
| 5.729166667 | 630 | 49.17818182 |
| 7.087257387 | 1170 | 73.82968777 |
| 3.418980451 | 180 | 23.54503079 |
| 3.704254784 | 540 | 65.19529947 |
| 2.884615385 | 1350 | 209.3 |
| 2.876129078 | 1080 | 167.9340485 |
| 2.292290091 | 900 | 175.5885965 |
| 14.23816568 | 900 | 28.26909091 |
| 4.132398157 | 720 | 77.92085558 |
| 5.761980568 | 720 | 55.88356229 |
| 4.922515537 | 720 | 65.41370922 |
| 1.791958042 | 540 | 134.7687805 |
| 2.783215526 | 720 | 115.6935196 |
| 36.00461417 | 540 | 6.707473627 |
| 3.33121291 | 900 | 120.8268612 |
| 7.710548259 | 450 | 26.10060831 |
| 2.867270313 | 270 | 42.11322507 |
| 4.570475217 | 810 | 79.25871661 |
| 1.157097454 | 90 | 34.78531549 |
| 15.73771024 | 900 | 25.57551218 |
| 4.202864716 | 540 | 57.4608074 |
| 17.37942613 | 1350 | 34.73935189 |
| 13.74746357 | 900 | 29.27812814 |
| 6.578179572 | 1080 | 73.42456901 |
| 2.54383677 | 720 | 126.5804488 |
| 3.217535243 | 990 | 137.6053303 |
| 3.356178151 | 630 | 83.94965562 |
| 3.104064995 | 720 | 103.7349413 |
| 4.12890239 | 1710 | 185.2187162 |
| 13.27113481 | 1800 | 60.6579627 |
| 3.008944768 | 900 | 133.767826 |


| 2.837369457 | 810 | 127.6710719 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.02202215 | 810 | 51.58770397 |
| 2.942160116 | 990 | 150.484672 |
| 0.805720277 | 360 | 199.8212091 |
| 5.058692968 | 540 | 47.73960419 |
| 2.953882222 | 90 | 13.6261357 |
| 48.38600676 | 540 | 4.991112435 |
| 6.151101923 | 360 | 26.17417205 |
| 6.986324215 | 360 | 23.04502268 |
| 1.838235294 | 810 | 197.064 |
| 6.835171755 | 180 | 11.77731927 |
| 7.044782796 | 360 | 22.8537919 |
| 16.30847037 | 990 | 27.14846887 |
| 5.088296151 | 270 | 23.73093004 |
| 18.30486047 | 630 | 15.39208673 |
| 2.000878825 | 450 | 100.5808035 |
| 2.692307692 | 630 | 104.65 |
| 7.823495241 | 360 | 20.57903725 |
| 2.109847035 | 630 | 133.5404868 |
| 7.064935103 | 270 | 17.09145211 |
| 1.607486929 | 360 | 100.1563354 |
| 1.531073998 | 270 | 78.86620775 |
| 25.85470085 | 450 | 7.783884298 |
| 3.084935897 | 90 | 13.04727273 |
| 2.004159035 | 180 | 40.16647311 |
| 0.660103785 | 270 | 182.9257803 |
| 7.731633623 | 450 | 26.02942791 |
| 0.896978022 | 360 | 179.4915773 |
| 24.35674036 | 540 | 9.915119859 |
| 3.847366852 | 900 | 104.6170057 |
| 6.613905433 | 540 | 36.51397838 |
| 1.813842816 | 990 | 244.0950209 |
| 2.475478437 | 360 | 65.03793271 |
| 5.425840766 | 720 | 59.34564133 |
| 1.439109939 | 630 | 195.7807338 |
| 14.54030984 | 1170 | 35.98616574 |
| 5.020679445 | 1080 | 96.20211871 |
| 3.39326327 | 810 | 106.7556423 |
| 2.649585647 | 360 | 60.76421805 |
| 4.348901099 | 540 | 55.53126974 |
| 2.619328346 | 360 | 61.46613892 |
| 4.216977824 | 450 | 47.72375109 |
| 6.747094693 | 1170 | 77.55189808 |
| 1.799450549 | 90 | 22.36793893 |
| 3.714817081 | 450 | 54.17494202 |
| 0.576923077 | 90 | 69.76666667 |
| 0.915550732 | 450 | 219.8130513 |
| 1.24245922 | 450 | 161.9771472 |


| 2.676523813 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10.73631805 | 720 | 29.99165993 |
| 4.174180905 | 1170 | 125.3539346 |
| 1.429005777 | 540 | 168.998617 |
| 4.955598347 | 540 | 48.73276305 |
| 5.257193677 | 1530 | 130.1549918 |
| 4.520070541 | 90 | 8.904728286 |
| 11.47447517 | 810 | 31.57007136 |
| 3.075144298 | 540 | 78.53290011 |
| 1.556460131 | 450 | 129.2998105 |
| 5.413044278 | 630 | 52.05019312 |
| 1.660276007 | 270 | 72.72887128 |
| 3.24098624 | 720 | 99.35247364 |
| 0.874732906 | 270 | 138.0421374 |
| 4.389393718 | 450 | 45.84915661 |
| 5.62682531 | 180 | 14.30646867 |
| 3.800806014 | 900 | 105.8985906 |
| 0.889000912 | 360 | 181.1021765 |
| 0.619861772 | 270 | 194.8014951 |
| 5.153723394 | 360 | 31.23955007 |
| 4.153320531 | 540 | 58.14624664 |
| 1.332629209 | 630 | 211.4241517 |
| 8.492584776 | 270 | 14.21828609 |
| 0.927250874 | 450 | 217.0394288 |
| 5.475135285 | 630 | 51.45991566 |
| 5.128205128 | 90 | 7.84875 |
| 1.601669008 | 180 | 50.26007222 |
| 2.476774459 | 450 | 81.25487537 |
| 1.583748188 | 360 | 101.6575748 |
| 3.015632031 | 720 | 106.7769531 |
| 4.526941848 | 1080 | 106.6945448 |
| 0.566418875 | 90 | 71.06048502 |
| 2.971078823 | 540 | 81.28360586 |
| 3.321678322 | 90 | 12.11736842 |
| 4.604867788 | 900 | 87.40750408 |
| 0.460897028 | 90 | 87.32970184 |
| 3.524446974 | 630 | 79.9416198 |
| 5.129480872 | 630 | 54.92758566 |
| 1.866139709 | 810 | 194.1172991 |
| 2.654907364 | 450 | 75.80302151 |
| 0.206043956 | 90 | 195.3466667 |
| 1.965254765 | 810 | 184.3272468 |
| 8.691997538 | 630 | 32.41487343 |
| 1.913964304 | 810 | 189.2668527 |
| 2.044599214 | 900 | 196.8600972 |
| 12.75808044 | 1350 | 47.32294978 |
| 12.54521017 | 270 | 9.625187494 |
| 1.552508524 | 810 | 233.3320522 |

## Data for Multi－lane Highway

| Agg Speed （mph） | Agg Flow （Veh／hour－lane） | Agg Density （Veh／mile－lane） |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 38.20534281 | 90 | 2.35823973 |  |
| 33.48744959 | 90 | 2.690210167 |  |
| 28.21124542 | 90 | 3.196156565 |  |
| 24.21039493 | 90 | 3.720894315 |  |
| 26.58177554 | 112.5 | 4.239761053 | $\bigcirc 0$ |
| 28.12911283 | 135 | 4.757234642 | ¢ ${ }_{0}^{0}$ |
| 28.43076656 | 147.2727273 | 5.191956818 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 27.57634842 | 160 | 5.804031243 | 윽 $\overrightarrow{\text { ® }}$ |
| 25.16132134 | 157.5 | 6.266468061 | 6 |
| 29.55927543 | 200 | 6.747966236 |  |
| 27.34782126 | 198 | 7.21612584 |  |
| 29.6032128 | 225 | 7.606327475 |  |
| 28.50060805 | 234 | 8.226046232 |  |
| 17.33103763 | 150 | 8.698363588 |  |
| 24.22930823 | 225 | 9.25902195 |  |
| 24.42013324 | 236.25 | 9.649018189 |  |
| 22.03252176 | 225 | 10.2064254 |  |
| 23.00148608 | 247.5 | 10.77290986 | $\bigcirc$ ON Oマ |
| 27.10641134 | 306 | 11.30603239 |  |
| 23.62712677 | 280 | 11.81042335 | S． |
| 29.70838128 | 360 | 12.1384568 | C당 |
| 28.37106263 | 360 | 12.68323125 | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1} \frac{0}{3}$ |
| 18.17019607 | 240 | 13.24831704 | ご○ 「 |
| 21.703273 | 300 | 13.84064908 | ¢ 0 ¢ ¢ |
| 22.82617563 | 326.25 | 14.27394474 | Fi |
| 20.73547674 | 306 | 14.75819544 | の ${ }_{3}$ |
| 26.47661416 | 405 | 15.31602746 |  |
| 19.33642515 | 306 | 15.78962555 |  |
| 18.50864116 | 300 | 16.2350762 |  |
| 24.91888534 | 420 | 16.85469681 |  |
| 23.08324338 | 398.5714286 | 17.22924806 |  |
| 24.09797677 | 427.5 | 17.72083586 |  |
| 11.47667406 | 210 | 18.29519575 |  |
| 20.06076723 | 378 | 18.83101234 |  |
| 16.75126368 | 324 | 19.32781087 |  |
| 20.48065426 | 405 | 19.79604141 |  |
| 22.25640689 | 450 | 20.17745705 |  |
| 21.62531041 | 450 | 20.79918293 |  |
| 22.30246412 | 472.5 | 21.18163068 |  |
| 19.38606 | 420 | 21.68407947 |  |
| 16.287955 | 360 | 22.10222217 |  |
| 17.55412753 | 398.5714286 | 22.71207534 |  |
| 21.27095615 | 495 | 23.27041612 |  |


| 16.64249952 | 396 | 23.7914899 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21.07330644 | 510 | 24.20677015 |
| 14.57094715 | 360 | 24.72961478 |
| 20.66467635 | 522 | 25.26847831 |
| 17.51761428 | 450 | 25.69862022 |
| 17.04223576 | 450 | 26.4049862 |
| 26.88810793 | 720 | 26.77763724 |
| 20.36269238 | 555 | 27.26266057 |
| 20.67197969 | 576 | 27.84328634 |
| 22.21795056 | 630 | 28.35545062 |
| 18.7054269 | 540 | 28.83219607 |
| 19.62209102 | 585 | 29.82539131 |
| 17.85995531 | 540 | 30.23523804 |
| 23.36291518 | 720 | 30.8180719 |
| 30.17320653 | 945 | 31.32823168 |
| 26.56859175 | 840 | 31.62713145 |
| 17.40368733 | 570 | 32.82621405 |
| 21.53813137 | 720 | 33.42908388 |
| 5.360220329 | 180 | 33.58070918 |
| 19.69432171 | 675 | 34.20534701 |
| 20.80689891 | 720 | 34.60390725 |
| 12.62667218 | 450 | 35.63884399 |
| 29.91699625 | 1080 | 36.09988086 |
| 23.31169981 | 855 | 36.68356537 |
| 12.68602454 | 472.5 | 37.2945525 |
| 25.16592199 | 945 | 37.54920586 |
| 20.0670166 | 765 | 38.13991276 |
| 18.64739618 | 720 | 38.61128884 |
| 15.09606593 | 600 | 39.73102304 |
| 26.38672002 | 1080 | 40.92967975 |
| 8.327223074 | 360 | 43.2322068 |
| 13.37057073 | 585 | 43.75473267 |
| 10.28020763 | 495 | 48.17681903 |
| 9.189041571 | 450 | 48.97137493 |
| 1.827843599 | 90 | 49.23834843 |
| 5.2465496 | 270 | 51.4623935 |
| 20.90975237 | 1080 | 51.65053995 |
| 17.26613907 | 900 | 52.12514485 |
| 6.659590806 | 360 | 54.05737535 |
| 9.699591408 | 540 | 55.6724482 |
| 7.721409062 | 450 | 58.2795182 |
| 13.35249734 | 810 | 60.66280935 |
| 9.572119503 | 585 | 61.14941705 |
| 20.36548242 | 1260 | 61.86939125 |
| 4.238597185 | 270 | 63.7003207 |
| 6.956057775 | 450 | 64.69214918 |
| 9.394347084 | 630 | 67.0616057 |
| 3.965089438 | 270 | 68.0943026 |


| 8.859606175 | 630 | 71.1092556 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 9.768932227 | 720 | 73.7030397 |
| 5.640277264 | 450 | 79.78331185 |
| 4.494320934 | 360 | 80.10108875 |
| 11.85306673 | 990 | 83.5226885 |
| 7.770660113 | 720 | 92.65622168 |
| 4.587001847 | 450 | 98.103296 |
| 5.929389439 | 630 | 106.2504001 |
| 0.844861632 | 90 | 106.5263193 |
| 5.279249914 | 720 | 136.3830112 |
| 1.773781932 | 270 | 152.2171329 |
| 5.672131726 | 900 | 158.6705041 |
| 5.594581485 | 900 | 160.8699422 |
| 5.316745845 | 900 | 169.2764759 |
| 8.285654979 | 1440 | 173.7943474 |
| 3.292380926 | 720 | 218.6867243 |
| 2.640310069 | 900 | 340.8690557 |
| 0.835586998 | 360 | 430.8348512 |
| 0.562596376 | 360 | 639.8903645 |

## Data for Single-lane Highway

| Agg Speed (mph) | Agg Flow (veh/hour-lane) | Agg Density (veh/mile-lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37.17212422 | 90 | 2.422211737 |
| 33.60186335 | 90 | 2.683382434 |
| 27.6391677 | 90 | 3.261519565 |
| 24.61159007 | 90 | 3.657969656 |
| 21.07065838 | 90 | 4.276249824 |
| 19.23898137 | 90 | 4.682130489 |
| 30.68657888 | 162 | 5.297894184 |
| 25.74685714 | 150 | 5.800711767 |
| 25.26702485 | 157.5 | 6.245127083 |
| 19.08038332 | 128.5714286 | 6.723417141 |
| 23.23121207 | 167.1428571 | 7.189065196 |
| 28.90604348 | 225 | 7.773522999 |
| 25.27565218 | 210 | 8.301792921 |
| 22.09467258 | 192.8571429 | 8.681473912 |
| 23.55847027 | 218.5714286 | 9.2775734 |
| 25.26462112 | 247.5 | 9.743301751 |
| 32.2828323 | 330 | 10.21971203 |
| 16.54725466 | 180 | 10.89898036 |
| 14.11870808 | 157.5 | 11.20148429 |
| 19.94916522 | 234 | 11.74404395 |
| 29.03545342 | 360 | 12.39863538 |
| 24.70326709 | 315 | 12.7704425 |
| 15.13587577 | 202.5 | 13.34830381 |
| 19.55341615 | 270 | 13.80547981 |
| 14.99695765 | 212.7272727 | 14.2526199 |
| 24.36059627 | 360 | 14.77476646 |
| 5.933515528 | 90 | 15.16853905 |
| 24.73140373 | 390 | 15.75793169 |
| 19.31623603 | 315 | 16.31658927 |
| 18.70736646 | 315 | 16.84290531 |
| 10.42831677 | 180 | 17.26339339 |
| 15.9352866 | 282.8571429 | 17.73970977 |
| 16.00921118 | 292.5 | 18.3014677 |
| 19.25862112 | 360 | 18.68148299 |
| 17.69729813 | 337.5 | 19.09770735 |
| 16.43178634 | 324 | 19.73952204 |
| 14.46898137 | 292.5 | 20.19974042 |
| 13.03363975 | 270 | 20.71464069 |
| 16.08196025 | 342 | 21.29083777 |
| 18.66745342 | 405 | 21.79783432 |
| 14.13491925 | 315 | 22.35013852 |
| 15.75145342 | 360 | 22.77801019 |
| 7.755130435 | 180 | 23.17232801 |


| 15.17755528 | 360 | 23.72285734 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17.93299379 | 435 | 24.2783946 |
| 7.272111801 | 180 | 24.75244017 |
| 15.40136646 | 390 | 25.27050725 |
| 7.048397516 | 180 | 25.53771969 |
| 11.82331677 | 315 | 26.63265626 |
| 17.50561491 | 480 | 27.37221872 |
| 10.38494907 | 288 | 27.7331668 |
| 9.628434783 | 270 | 28.04198268 |
| 8.637149069 | 247.5 | 28.67661571 |
| 4.621975155 | 135 | 29.22231256 |
| 18.1256646 | 540 | 29.79201106 |
| 9.499036023 | 288 | 30.29658592 |
| 6.851925466 | 210 | 30.66843765 |
| 15.90987577 | 495 | 31.17444251 |
| 7.943433541 | 252 | 31.72855248 |
| 8.424223602 | 270 | 32.05043132 |
| 7.851801243 | 257.1428571 | 32.7671489 |
| 8.11990062 | 270 | 33.23679989 |
| 6.65910559 | 225 | 33.7526696 |
| 5.26315528 | 180 | 34.20004169 |
| 9.117391304 | 315 | 34.54664844 |
| 5.099925466 | 180 | 35.29463346 |
| 17.6310559 | 630 | 35.7324033 |
| 11.82767702 | 427.5 | 36.18160809 |
| 6.151639752 | 225 | 36.56467665 |
| 9.679751553 | 360 | 37.22275703 |
| 11.94372671 | 450 | 37.67668258 |
| 5.425639752 | 210 | 38.73629649 |
| 6.870335404 | 270 | 39.27957045 |
| 11.33027329 | 450 | 39.71669889 |
| 8.935937889 | 360 | 40.28676773 |
| 6.636186336 | 270 | 40.68664543 |
| 6.560049689 | 270 | 41.15822483 |
| 4.292944099 | 180 | 41.92926715 |
| 8.415726708 | 360 | 42.7770545 |
| 10.40467081 | 450 | 43.24980659 |
| 8.222086957 | 360 | 43.78509427 |
| 8.16484472 | 360 | 44.09146926 |
| 5.973652174 | 270 | 45.20950405 |
| 5.775875777 | 270 | 46.7534077 |
| 12.38008696 | 585 | 47.24682662 |
| 4.711304348 | 225 | 47.78515985 |
| 4.663229814 | 225 | 48.21159787 |
| 8.30426087 | 405 | 48.75927038 |
| 9.490807452 | 472.5 | 49.73482914 |
| 7.162658385 | 360 | 50.2606687 |
| 10.57103106 | 540 | 51.08300195 |


| 7.533614907 | 390 | 51.7768387 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.443590063 | 180 | 52.27105005 |
| 8.539378882 | 450 | 52.6970411 |
| 19.81721739 | 1080 | 54.4980649 |
| 3.297018634 | 180 | 54.5947779 |
| 3.269515528 | 180 | 55.0540282 |
| 7.932521739 | 450 | 56.7284925 |
| 7.539875776 | 450 | 59.6826809 |
| 5.93273292 | 360 | 60.67018743 |
| 5.832391304 | 360 | 61.70941784 |
| 5.639701863 | 360 | 63.83316155 |
| 5.509341615 | 360 | 65.343561 |
| 7.504658386 | 495 | 65.96140173 |
| 5.448074534 | 360 | 66.07839115 |
| 6.345838509 | 450 | 70.9126145 |
| 4.906509317 | 360 | 73.37191815 |
| 10.02029814 | 810 | 80.83591815 |
| 3.27957764 | 270 | 82.32767435 |
| 8.762310559 | 900 | 102.7126343 |
| 5.229391304 | 540 | 103.2624963 |
| 5.198086957 | 540 | 103.8843722 |
| 9.317962733 | 990 | 106.2464005 |
| 6.527403727 | 720 | 110.304193 |

## Data for Roadway with Shoulder

| Speed <br> (mph) | Flow (veh/hr-lane) | Density (veh/mile-lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 76.57056259 | 180 | 2.350772855 |
| 66.35023787 | 180 | 2.712876484 |
| 56.60335811 | 180 | 3.181277629 |
| 26.38058885 | 90 | 3.411599358 |
| 41.59783834 | 180 | 4.327147928 |
| 61.66035774 | 315 | 5.139666059 |
| 49.38639742 | 270 | 5.425171961 |
| 45.85001206 | 270 | 5.887919465 |
| 43.74174737 | 270 | 6.172592916 |
| 13.90341876 | 90 | 6.473228026 |
| 25.10806996 | 180 | 7.169009815 |
| 12.24961483 | 90 | 7.347169787 |
| 23.20029959 | 180 | 7.7585205 |
| 11.08065551 | 90 | 8.122957334 |
| 10.51150531 | 90 | 8.562046761 |
| 9.825561633 | 90 | 9.159781737 |
| 38.03115021 | 360 | 9.465924591 |
| 36.01189552 | 360 | 9.996696781 |
| 17.98165366 | 180 | 10.01020281 |
| 32.00958979 | 360 | 11.2466296 |
| 27.79578575 | 315 | 11.33693025 |
| 30.6763638 | 360 | 11.73541957 |
| 36.90457582 | 450 | 12.19360987 |
| 17.77380603 | 225 | 12.65687327 |
| 13.9453773 | 180 | 12.90750305 |
| 13.65019965 | 180 | 13.18662031 |
| 23.47029399 | 315 | 13.41084176 |
| 39.86006017 | 540 | 13.5473955 |
| 19.00838902 | 270 | 14.20425475 |
| 33.59470072 | 495 | 14.73308149 |
| 18.13109864 | 270 | 14.89154107 |
| 5.88503249 | 90 | 15.29303367 |
| 14.31362249 | 225 | 15.72381714 |
| 25.23487658 | 450 | 17.85123768 |
| 28.25862897 | 540 | 19.10920734 |
| 4.510607114 | 90 | 19.95296813 |
| 8.836021466 | 180 | 20.34387446 |
| 30.63031492 | 630 | 20.56370907 |
| 16.95641816 | 360 | 21.23089891 |
| 12.65864383 | 270 | 21.32929907 |
| 12.50714155 | 270 | 21.58766645 |
| 9.740900841 | 225 | 23.08586772 |
| 11.55446042 | 270 | 23.3890256 |


| 26.36296118 | 630 | 23.89716374 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14.90763585 | 360 | 24.14869827 |
| 12.91945898 | 315 | 24.39329539 |
| 7.074088208 | 180 | 25.44497534 |
| 10.50531015 | 270 | 25.70128783 |
| 20.42956402 | 540 | 26.43228213 |
| 16.32390578 | 450 | 27.56693196 |
| 7.93845061 | 225 | 28.32852222 |
| 9.340985266 | 270 | 28.90487377 |
| 23.99165512 | 720 | 30.01043473 |
| 19.34554486 | 630 | 32.56563743 |
| 16.25024657 | 540 | 33.230265 |
| 13.09924654 | 450 | 34.3531209 |
| 10.40164756 | 360 | 34.60396841 |
| 20.70890668 | 720 | 34.76764906 |
| 7.315203905 | 270 | 36.90942912 |
| 14.26299544 | 540 | 37.86020983 |
| 18.55798329 | 720 | 38.79731912 |
| 4.440119705 | 180 | 40.53944757 |
| 8.674778351 | 360 | 41.49961941 |
| 10.44731288 | 450 | 43.07327686 |
| 10.35578532 | 450 | 43.45397147 |
| 24.72003985 | 1080 | 43.68924995 |
| 6.138526946 | 270 | 43.98449374 |
| 22.26120204 | 990 | 44.47199205 |
| 5.967851278 | 270 | 45.2424143 |
| 15.06526705 | 720 | 47.79205026 |
| 10.72467871 | 540 | 50.35558346 |
| 1.761733185 | 90 | 51.08605591 |
| 11.97220304 | 630 | 52.62189404 |
| 11.89594036 | 630 | 52.95924331 |
| 5.077766191 | 270 | 53.17298786 |
| 3.322990195 | 180 | 54.16808038 |
| 7.27500082 | 405 | 55.67104809 |
| 12.41650745 | 720 | 57.98732073 |
| 4.638337412 | 270 | 58.21051295 |
| 10.30801182 | 630 | 61.1175085 |
| 4.165685668 | 270 | 64.81526008 |
| 4.150635923 | 270 | 65.05027301 |
| 6.624147155 | 450 | 67.93327344 |
| 6.429150688 | 450 | 69.99369307 |
| 3.506253508 | 270 | 77.00527054 |
| 7.227891157 | 630 | 87.16235293 |
| 6.869821105 | 630 | 91.70544478 |
| 7.788627356 | 720 | 92.44247633 |
| 6.548837277 | 630 | 96.2002831 |
| 3.702341155 | 360 | 97.23577188 |
| 2.488421768 | 270 | 108.5025069 |


| 3.280940784 | 360 | 109.7246259 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.949101603 | 720 | 121.0266773 |
| 2.903848656 | 360 | 123.9734031 |
| 2.811062029 | 360 | 128.0654771 |
| 3.45620409 | 450 | 130.2006445 |
| 1.377187295 | 180 | 130.7011768 |
| 1.969339637 | 270 | 137.1017954 |
| 0.623195432 | 90 | 144.4169764 |
| 7.40737045 | 1080 | 145.8007274 |
| 1.180816086 | 180 | 152.4369477 |
| 3.502162904 | 540 | 154.1904288 |
| 2.271610764 | 450 | 198.0973181 |
| 1.250334144 | 270 | 215.9422754 |
| 1.788909135 | 450 | 251.5499481 |

Data Without Shoulder

| Agg Speed (mph) | Agg Flow (veh/hr-lane) | Agg Density (veh/mile-lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39.78364042 | 90 | 2.265958902 |
| 32.11606553 | 90 | 2.814475154 |
| 27.85678711 | 90 | 3.238580387 |
| 24.86224968 | 90 | 3.627111355 |
| 24.33844548 | 105 | 4.320006091 |
| 21.83217303 | 105 | 4.7944461 |
| 24.15399253 | 126 | 5.231489512 |
| 26.39855173 | 150 | 5.686108579 |
| 25.25271192 | 157.5 | 6.240358408 |
| 22.48933089 | 150 | 6.677906443 |
| 24.92454897 | 180 | 7.21736527 |
| 14.60858684 | 112.5 | 7.723109905 |
| 15.34128941 | 126 | 8.123811087 |
| 10.22906563 | 90 | 8.799607863 |
| 19.38927751 | 180 | 9.303103554 |
| 16.21850655 | 157.5 | 9.683289659 |
| 17.23030764 | 180 | 10.44039912 |
| 22.58348894 | 240 | 10.63553735 |
| 17.06076525 | 191.25 | 11.23345892 |
| 12.69975394 | 150 | 11.80915217 |
| 19.41809282 | 240 | 12.29796939 |
| 26.25622058 | 337.5 | 12.8122311 |
| 16.77573673 | 225 | 13.36804575 |
| 19.70258969 | 270 | 13.70343669 |
| 12.54351817 | 180 | 14.33811677 |
| 11.18101718 | 165 | 14.75642253 |
| 35.30868339 | 540 | 15.29368836 |
| 19.90324276 | 315 | 15.81042724 |
| 13.95137987 | 225 | 16.16324017 |
| 8.028241753 | 135 | 16.85292817 |
| 15.60739763 | 270 | 17.26980607 |
| 5.058822849 | 90 | 17.79195067 |
| 21.33746774 | 390 | 18.29263725 |
| 8.01252831 | 150 | 18.73489136 |
| 9.36347909 | 180 | 19.22538726 |
| 15.08019047 | 300 | 19.89844422 |
| 19.8874775 | 405 | 20.38749325 |
| 17.23457665 | 360 | 20.81260523 |
| 7.379620919 | 157.5 | 21.27504986 |
| 13.45684267 | 292.5 | 21.73853164 |
| 14.20109431 | 315 | 22.16631515 |
| 17.72918756 | 405 | 22.85204647 |
| 16.34700209 | 378 | 23.12561678 |


| 8.506289754 | 202.5 | 23.85089634 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10.25180465 | 247.5 | 24.18666496 |
| 14.54670285 | 360 | 24.75637011 |
| 8.29765787 | 210 | 25.29948879 |
| 19.16515775 | 495 | 25.82301075 |
| 29.17003386 | 765 | 26.21930987 |
| 18.70867358 | 517.5 | 27.69084756 |
| 11.13159111 | 315 | 28.28859532 |
| 3.134220037 | 90 | 28.71527811 |
| 6.160266043 | 180 | 29.22009256 |
| 15.08469805 | 450 | 29.87497101 |
| 23.81088161 | 720 | 30.26752517 |
| 10.29041625 | 315 | 30.6127748 |
| 11.45944424 | 360 | 31.41514653 |
| 8.516215885 | 270 | 31.70422218 |
| 10.44890356 | 337.5 | 32.29355556 |
| 10.41747149 | 342 | 32.78868134 |
| 10.76790739 | 360 | 33.43267982 |
| 15.18115318 | 510 | 33.59298149 |
| 9.101282656 | 315 | 34.62452639 |
| 16.38552032 | 576 | 35.15543931 |
| 8.812921996 | 315 | 35.71439418 |
| 17.27381298 | 630 | 36.47139174 |
| 11.01958596 | 405 | 36.78661034 |
| 15.93897452 | 594 | 37.27824278 |
| 19.08371136 | 720 | 37.72851026 |
| 14.15965581 | 540 | 38.23008742 |
| 11.60967015 | 450 | 38.73018047 |
| 16.08413094 | 630 | 39.16904197 |
| 2.257924999 | 90 | 39.85960564 |
| 6.733210408 | 270 | 40.09974197 |
| 8.812109692 | 360 | 40.8351058 |
| 13.14189761 | 540 | 41.09547935 |
| 15.03610279 | 630 | 41.83934807 |
| 14.95413146 | 630 | 42.12882584 |
| 8.392720872 | 360 | 42.89302968 |
| 6.116742699 | 270 | 44.14114069 |
| 11.38683139 | 510 | 44.79327564 |
| 15.94817672 | 720 | 45.16191036 |
| 17.89369102 | 855 | 47.80977078 |
| 11.20916158 | 540 | 48.17487874 |
| 18.22920202 | 900 | 49.37133284 |
| 10.76851126 | 540 | 50.14620745 |
| 8.211353318 | 420 | 51.1300677 |
| 14.76153148 | 765 | 51.7738453 |
| 12.03007243 | 630 | 52.368762 |
| 13.70099323 | 720 | 52.55093465 |
| 12.564816 | 675 | 53.73837215 |


| 9.841446711 | 540 | 54.84107143 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12.99809154 | 720 | 55.35934955 |
| 11.27963913 | 630 | 55.84118464 |
| 6.342703693 | 360 | 56.7581299 |
| 9.443733161 | 540 | 57.15038998 |
| 11.70472232 | 675 | 57.6875398 |
| 10.82727504 | 630 | 58.2218013 |
| 13.81946538 | 810 | 58.60232955 |
| 9.146756505 | 540 | 59.037321 |
| 12.28467584 | 765 | 62.28694645 |
| 5.743122634 | 360 | 62.6836693 |
| 11.36979003 | 720 | 63.3257077 |
| 9.874817277 | 630 | 63.79864885 |
| 10.48616941 | 675 | 64.37013595 |
| 6.943382833 | 450 | 64.80990765 |
| 11.8371189 | 780 | 65.89729553 |
| 18.96430501 | 1260 | 66.44061035 |
| 14.61963264 | 990 | 67.7171598 |
| 11.41382314 | 810 | 70.96658065 |
| 13.88999401 | 990 | 71.18382268 |
| 6.282967629 | 450 | 71.60822848 |
| 15.42109894 | 1125 | 72.95986845 |
| 9.221901494 | 675 | 73.18772355 |
| 9.706651341 | 720 | 74.1759413 |
| 20.49968375 | 1530 | 74.6352977 |
| 4.784946367 | 360 | 75.235953 |
| 8.019532994 | 630 | 78.5581904 |
| 4.452466018 | 360 | 80.8540702 |
| 9.712400078 | 810 | 83.3985414 |
| 10.72370433 | 900 | 83.92622295 |
| 9.058411728 | 810 | 89.4196493 |
| 13.92421185 | 1260 | 90.48986135 |
| 17.86327538 | 1620 | 90.6888555 |
| 7.881785797 | 720 | 91.3498563 |
| 8.611966917 | 810 | 94.05516855 |
| 6.923966273 | 660 | 95.35452283 |
| 7.894655824 | 765 | 96.90313288 |
| 7.381423941 | 720 | 97.54215525 |
| 10.02752112 | 990 | 98.7282887 |
| 5.446117027 | 540 | 99.1532127 |
| 15.41146388 | 1710 | 110.9563643 |
| 4.849079995 | 540 | 111.3613305 |
| 9.582344221 | 1080 | 112.7072849 |
| 2.761688579 | 360 | 130.3550309 |
| 2.26077079 | 360 | 159.2377262 |
| 8.329382508 | 1800 | 216.102454 |
| 0.514852245 | 180 | 349.6148684 |

## Data for Roadway with Market

| Agg Speed (mph) | Agg Flow (veh/hr-lane) | Agg Density (veh/mile-lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16.08363 | 90 | 5.59575 |
| 13.97193 | 90 | 6.441485 |
| 24.50194 | 180 | 7.40367 |
| 28.37769 | 270 | 9.522415 |
| 20.29144 | 225 | 11.1039875 |
| 21.42374 | 270 | 12.577195 |
| 26.98307 | 420 | 15.57160833 |
| 22.85039 | 378 | 16.542543 |
| 10.38223 | 180 | 17.337315 |
| 34.15248 | 630 | 18.454525 |
| 27.44512 | 540 | 19.68460667 |
| 17.24919 | 360 | 20.85963 |
| 25.25528 | 540 | 21.40675 |
| 13.99713 | 315 | 22.6143275 |
| 14.75708 | 342 | 23.184237 |
| 21.93461 | 540 | 24.68417 |
| 10.68518 | 270 | 25.268635 |
| 18.6566 | 495 | 26.547205 |
| 16.5759 | 450 | 27.147845 |
| 15.81136 | 450 | 28.42540167 |
| 21.32684 | 630 | 29.540235 |
| 18.34608 | 558 | 30.403168 |
| 17.02514 | 540 | 31.63041667 |
| 17.06391 | 555 | 32.58405833 |
| 9.832231 | 330 | 33.59301333 |
| 19.14352 | 666 | 34.788239 |
| 14.51801 | 510 | 35.195275 |
| 18.41176 | 675 | 36.60053 |
| 19.5997 | 735 | 37.558375 |
| 11.64543 | 450 | 38.64403 |
| 13.43299 | 540 | 40.18389833 |
| 13.92288 | 576 | 41.45991 |
| 12.66582 | 540 | 42.58516 |
| 14.41618 | 630 | 43.66141375 |
| 14.29588 | 630 | 44.06863 |
| 18.24909 | 832.5 | 45.65509 |
| 9.613695 | 450 | 46.808225 |
| 18.80103 | 900 | 47.86972 |
| 14.37655 | 697.5 | 48.46658 |
| 13.99777 | 690 | 49.33334 |
| 20.09375 | 1020 | 50.70375 |
| 13.08101 | 675 | 51.6302 |
| 8.546119 | 450 | 52.57366667 |


| 17.97015 | 960 | 53.53835 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12.77498 | 697.5 | 54.5863125 |
| 10.86663 | 600 | 55.24015 |
| 16.47538 | 930 | 56.48006667 |
| 12.59593 | 720 | 57.1613 |
| 11.4723 | 675 | 58.81495 |
| 4.527123 | 270 | 59.64055 |
| 12.4005 | 750 | 60.48805 |
| 7.298035 | 450 | 61.66045 |
| 13.70842 | 855 | 62.3251875 |
| 17.46539 | 1125 | 64.404675 |
| 14.44338 | 945 | 65.4327625 |
| 9.906383 | 660 | 66.58768333 |
| 12.59725 | 855 | 67.8955 |
| 9.213653 | 630 | 68.3768 |
| 12.92069 | 900 | 69.6566 |
| 7.668609 | 540 | 70.54196667 |
| 9.307327 | 675 | 72.5488875 |
| 9.776516 | 720 | 73.64585 |
| 15.08124 | 1125 | 74.569 |
| 13.69503 | 1035 | 75.560875 |
| 10.61782 | 810 | 76.280675 |
| 4.669811 | 360 | 77.0909 |
| 6.82188 | 540 | 79.15705 |
| 6.727673 | 540 | 80.2655 |
| 9.357507 | 765 | 81.5977625 |
| 13.15737 | 1080 | 82.08325 |
| 9.623815 | 810 | 84.1759 |
| 10.40308 | 900 | 86.506425 |
| 8.25295 | 720 | 87.24843333 |
| 13.23265 | 1170 | 88.41765 |
| 7.034691 | 630 | 89.50133333 |
| 2.949085 | 270 | 91.5538 |
| 8.525048 | 787.5 | 92.40205 |
| 9.598206 | 900 | 93.7675 |
| 9.534573 | 900 | 94.3933 |
| 10.38671 | 990 | 95.31415 |
| 12.18174 | 1170 | 96.0454 |
| 12.29427 | 1200 | 97.64905 |
| 10.04183 | 990 | 98.58648333 |
| 3.633142 | 360 | 99.0878 |
| 7.685853 | 780 | 101.4910833 |
| 7.014869 | 720 | 102.578125 |
| 9.39478 | 990 | 105.37765 |
| 8.432763 | 900 | 106.7266 |
| 7.544962 | 810 | 107.3564 |
| 4.122203 | 450 | 109.1649 |
| 4.071943 | 450 | 110.51235 |


| 6.436304 | 720 | 111.857575 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.17053 | 810 | 112.96235 |
| 5.572086 | 630 | 113.0636 |
| 5.242976 | 600 | 114.4440833 |
| 7.805432 | 900 | 115.30435 |
| 8.88113 | 1035 | 116.4588 |
| 4.590055 | 540 | 117.64565 |
| 5.703512 | 675 | 118.489225 |
| 9.316629 | 1116 | 119.77758 |
| 7.438425 | 900 | 120.99335 |
| 4.637118 | 570 | 122.9010333 |
| 8.723417 | 1080 | 123.8047 |
| 7.947381 | 990 | 124.56935 |
| 5.332687 | 675 | 126.57715 |
| 7.632147 | 990 | 129.7145 |
| 8.297055 | 1080 | 130.16665 |
| 8.789632 | 1170 | 133.11135 |
| 6.628975 | 900 | 135.7676 |
| 5.196468 | 720 | 138.55565 |
| 5.816388 | 810 | 139.2617 |
| 5.726002 | 810 | 141.45995 |
| 6.01183 | 855 | 142.19325 |
| 2.503591 | 360 | 143.79345 |
| 6.219525 | 900 | 144.724075 |
| 9.226661 | 1350 | 146.3151 |
| 3.642467 | 540 | 148.251175 |
| 11.34216 | 1710 | 150.76495 |
| 7.139039 | 1080 | 151.26745 |
| 5.264712 | 810 | 153.8546 |
| 6.995401 | 1080 | 154.3759 |
| 5.21464 | 810 | 155.33195 |
| 3.395941 | 540 | 159.01335 |
| 7.302299 | 1170 | 160.252225 |
| 10.93503 | 1800 | 164.60865 |
| 4.890531 | 810 | 165.567725 |
| 6.982711 | 1170 | 167.5567 |
| 1.586948 | 270 | 170.13785 |
| 6.829583 | 1170 | 171.31355 |
| 6.705513 | 1170 | 174.5128667 |
| 4.572471 | 810 | 177.1471 |
| 4.04047 | 720 | 178.1971 |
| 2.509257 | 450 | 179.33595 |
| 5.920512 | 1080 | 182.41665 |
| 2.903237 | 540 | 185.99925 |
| 5.24091 | 990 | 188.8985 |
| 4.608925 | 900 | 195.2733 |
| 6.423722 | 1260 | 196.14795 |
| 3.988457 | 810 | 203.08605 |


| 4.346852 | 900 | 207.0464 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.545592 | 540 | 212.1314 |
| 3.368933 | 720 | 213.71755 |
| 3.320905 | 720 | 216.80835 |
| 0.817261 | 180 | 220.248 |
| 2.83457 | 630 | 222.25595 |
| 1.926548 | 450 | 233.57845 |
| 4.868011 | 1200 | 246.46305 |

## Data for Roadway without Market

| Agg Speed (mph) | Agg Flow (veh/hr-lane) | Agg Density (veh/mile-lane) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36.93437562 | 90 | 2.436754338 |
| 20.70019056 | 90 | 4.347786061 |
| 35.83312839 | 180 | 5.023284544 |
| 20.36785282 | 135 | 6.528684884 |
| 23.61385439 | 180 | 7.622643766 |
| 35.23008047 | 300 | 8.50096169 |
| 29.8506477 | 270 | 9.045029867 |
| 12.85819579 | 135 | 10.6259048 |
| 15.37774865 | 180 | 11.70298758 |
| 27.99006192 | 342 | 12.21921809 |
| 26.06020131 | 360 | 13.8147767 |
| 28.82920698 | 405 | 14.16118712 |
| 27.37928655 | 420 | 15.33513475 |
| 19.51435319 | 324 | 16.59814368 |
| 23.06802865 | 405 | 17.52752488 |
| 19.57057087 | 360 | 18.42202764 |
| 27.72779977 | 540 | 19.47503965 |
| 19.80202729 | 405 | 20.43164673 |
| 26.94348664 | 570 | 21.19601795 |
| 18.50987047 | 414 | 22.46048941 |
| 15.1574036 | 360 | 23.75115313 |
| 23.74732702 | 585 | 24.6076775 |
| 15.87887557 | 405 | 25.40000267 |
| 15.07771331 | 405 | 26.84984005 |
| 20.66133785 | 570 | 27.59539349 |
| 30.18266843 | 864 | 28.58182815 |
| 13.68180579 | 405 | 29.58975766 |
| 25.02908904 | 765 | 30.57305981 |
| 18.22715858 | 570 | 31.30624735 |
| 21.32801391 | 690 | 32.43789724 |
| 17.3734575 | 585 | 33.56614809 |
| 17.81290092 | 612 | 34.36592824 |
| 20.02694583 | 720 | 35.95156277 |
| 14.73522614 | 540 | 36.64687564 |
| 18.11586552 | 675 | 37.3240744 |
| 20.11615127 | 774 | 38.5437668 |
| 22.07308114 | 900 | 40.77429314 |
| 17.26760291 | 720 | 41.69658081 |
| 10.562238 | 450 | 42.57288813 |
| 16.79692483 | 750 | 44.65289879 |
| 14.57549005 | 660 | 45.39655257 |
| 17.26451093 | 810 | 46.9170545 |
| 12.13512564 | 576 | 47.51882978 |


| 9.328876839 | 450 | 48.2266057 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12.71705963 | 630 | 49.53985444 |
| 13.41515201 | 675 | 50.32605175 |
| 9.669285173 | 495 | 51.26678784 |
| 10.83139169 | 570 | 52.6196931 |
| 8.417783589 | 450 | 53.45825243 |
| 4.978222931 | 270 | 54.23622119 |
| 10.46355893 | 585 | 55.91801691 |
| 9.275940973 | 522 | 56.32388956 |
| 12.45061489 | 720 | 57.82847284 |
| 10.75696888 | 630 | 58.54395339 |
| 13.57766122 | 810 | 59.57283017 |
| 9.705920652 | 585 | 60.26707866 |
| 11.77771672 | 720 | 61.13239238 |
| 20.25345487 | 1260 | 62.20164999 |
| 4.253969279 | 270 | 63.47013396 |
| 9.782154662 | 630 | 64.40298909 |
| 13.05196422 | 855 | 65.36588935 |
| 5.401613863 | 360 | 66.64674838 |
| 11.86720096 | 810 | 68.25535376 |
| 11.33013062 | 787.5 | 69.46825023 |
| 15.33125586 | 1080 | 70.44432691 |
| 9.433449483 | 675 | 71.48205971 |
| 13.59392902 | 990 | 72.82683813 |
| 13.29841106 | 990 | 74.35951197 |
| 9.594412126 | 720 | 75.04368069 |
| 10.01045462 | 765 | 76.46799058 |
| 5.497312021 | 450 | 81.85818783 |
| 7.274825511 | 600 | 82.48168637 |
| 13.98803869 | 1170 | 83.64289135 |
| 10.58496043 | 900 | 85.026298 |
| 13.50443438 | 1170 | 86.63820842 |
| 7.164810049 | 630 | 87.92975609 |
| 2.03638506 | 180 | 88.39192722 |
| 17.17674139 | 1530 | 89.07393811 |
| 3.356104243 | 315 | 93.84525645 |
| 8.599117493 | 810 | 94.32191989 |
| 14.20424459 | 1350 | 95.04201304 |
| 14.93367027 | 1440 | 96.42639579 |
| 10.15375809 | 990 | 97.50084558 |
| 9.124867884 | 900 | 98.69091315 |
| 3.616324322 | 360 | 99.54859353 |
| 7.993931471 | 810 | 101.4469258 |
| 8.726346167 | 900 | 103.1359498 |
| 4.311402859 | 450 | 104.3743799 |
| 6.807764664 | 720 | 105.7615878 |
| 10.97468362 | 1170 | 106.6089958 |
| 10.0405117 | 1080 | 107.6125684 |


| 8.018219282 | 870 | 108.5520787 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10.71093719 | 1170 | 109.2341388 |
| 5.285085417 | 585 | 110.6519185 |
| 4.845043498 | 540 | 111.4541077 |
| 7.210896229 | 810 | 112.3300037 |
| 2.380866472 | 270 | 113.5726899 |
| 3.118157276 | 360 | 115.6308346 |
| 7.72488674 | 900 | 116.5065625 |
| 6.105909715 | 720 | 117.9185467 |
| 2.990083004 | 360 | 120.3979955 |
| 6.426248688 | 810 | 126.0455422 |
| 2.827054326 | 360 | 127.3410265 |
| 7.372770752 | 990 | 134.2778764 |
| 7.300846233 | 990 | 135.6007192 |
| 5.941292966 | 810 | 136.3339604 |
| 9.669686507 | 1350 | 139.6115581 |
| 3.157883611 | 450 | 142.500502 |
| 6.276723682 | 900 | 143.3869078 |
| 4.32862641 | 630 | 145.544446 |
| 4.843309494 | 720 | 148.6586808 |
| 3.529193484 | 540 | 153.009463 |
| 6.355250528 | 990 | 155.7767071 |
| 2.187322134 | 360 | 164.584811 |
| 4.89114487 | 810 | 165.6053994 |
| 3.088070235 | 540 | 174.8664891 |
| 5.137057075 | 900 | 175.1975863 |
| 4.079988472 | 720 | 176.5559943 |
| 2.473876735 | 450 | 181.9007364 |
| 6.409616251 | 1170 | 182.5382292 |
| 5.736954032 | 1080 | 188.2532079 |
| 2.360974901 | 450 | 190.5992308 |
| 4.696959659 | 900 | 191.6133127 |
| 2.273470237 | 450 | 197.9352941 |
| 4.972134475 | 1080 | 217.2105371 |
| 3.677672442 | 810 | 220.248 |
| 1.584577208 | 360 | 227.1899395 |
| 2.541192634 | 585 | 230.4258482 |
| 1.167269288 | 270 | 231.3090928 |
| 0.753296895 | 180 | 238.9496109 |
| 2.25390631 | 540 | 239.5840491 |
| 2.524631323 | 630 | 249.4668277 |
| 3.199442382 | 810 | 253.1691162 |

