HAMPO

E.G. Miles Parkway SR 196 / SR 119

Corridor Study

ATLAS

AEengineering, inc.
Civil Engineering • CEI • Construction Management

transport
STUDIO

Table of Contents

Table of Figures

List of Tables

Appendix A: Traffic Counts

Appendix B: Synchro Analysis Results (Unsignalized Intersections)

Appendix C: Synchro Analysis Results (Signalized Intersections)

Appendix D: Synchro Analysis Results (Full Build Condition)

Appendix E: ICE and Signal Warrants

Appendix F: Intersection Analysis Memo – Deal Street at E.G. Miles Parkway

Appendix G: Detailed Concept

Appendix E:
ICE and Signal Warrants

GDOT INTERSECTION CONTROL EVALUATION (ICE) TOOL

GDOT PI#:

Request By:

County: Liberty

GDOT District: 5 - Jesup

Major Road: EG Miles Pkwy | Road Class: Minor Arterial | Speed Limit: 40 mph

Crossing Road: Arlington Ave | Road Class: Local | Speed Limit: 35 mph

Major Rd Direction: East/West | Area Type: Suburb/Transition

Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop) | Project ID:

Prepared By: Atlas Technical Consultants | Date: 8/1/2022

Project Purpose:

Existing Data Year: 2022
Project Opening Year: 2022
Project Design Year: 2022
Annual Growth Rate: 1.0%
K Factor*: 10%

* K Factor = Proportion of average annual daily traffic occurring in the highest one hour of the day

LEGEND:

000 = AM Peak Approach Volume
(000) = PM Peak Approach Volume
[000] = ADT Volume (Estimate)

2022 EXISTING YEAR VOLUMES

APPROACH SPLITS:
EG Miles Pkwy: 93%
Arlington Ave: 7%

SB Arlington Ave

66 (54) [1700]
(0) (31) (0) (23)
0 21 0 45

WB EG Miles Pkwy

977 (655) [14500]
(49) 19
(599) 955
(7) 3
(0) 0

2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 15,600

0 (0)
9 (66)
452 (685)
2 (9)

463 (760) [14700]

EB EG Miles Pkwy

NB Arlington Ave

4 0 10 0
(5) (0) (4) (0)
14 (9) [300]

PEAK HR % TRUCKS:

EB	WB	NB	SB
2%	2%	0%	0%

2022 OPENING YEAR VOLUMES

SB Arlington Ave

66 (54) [1700]
(0) (31) (0) (23)
0 21 0 45

WB EG Miles Pkwy

996.3 (669.98) [14800]
(49) 19
(611) 974
(7) 3
(0) 0

2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 15,900

0 (0)
9 (66)
461 (699)
2 (9)

472.04 (773.7) [15000]

EB EG Miles Pkwy

NB Arlington Ave

4 0 10 0
(5) (0) (4) (0)
14 (9) [300]

2022 DESIGN YEAR VOLUMES

SB Arlington Ave

66 (54) [1700]
(0) (31) (0) (23)
0 21 0 45

WB EG Miles Pkwy

1091.6 (726.88) [16200]
(49) 19
(671) 1,070
(7) 3
(0) 0

2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 17,300

0 (0)
9 (66)
506 (767)
2 (9)

517.24 (842.2) [1640]

EB EG Miles Pkwy

NB Arlington Ave

4 0 10 0
(5) (0) (4) (0)
14 (9) [300]

Introduction: In 2005, SAFETEA-LU established the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and mandated that each state prepare a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) to prioritize safety funding investments. Intersections quickly became a common component of most states' SHSP emphasis areas and HSIP project lists, including Georgia's SHSP. Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policies and procedures represent a traceable and transparent procedure to streamline the evaluation of intersection control alternatives, and further leverage safety advancements for intersection improvements beyond just the safety program. Approximately one-third of all traffic fatalities and roughly seventy five percent of all traffic crashes in Georgia occur at or adjacent to intersections. Accordingly, the Georgia SHSP includes an emphasis on enhancing intersection safety to advance the *Toward Zero Deaths* vision embraced by the Georgia Governor's Office of Highway Safety (GOHS). This ICE tool was developed to support the ICE policy, developed and adopted to help ensure that intersection investments across the entire Georgia highway system are selected, prioritized and implemented with defensible benefits for safety towards those ends.

Tool Goal: The goal of this ICE tool is to provide a simplified and consistent way of importing traffic, safety, cost, environmental impact and stakeholder posture data to assess and quantify intersection control improvement benefits. The tool supports the ICE policy and procedures to provide traceability, transparency, consistency and accountability when identifying and selecting an intersection control solution that both meets project purpose and reflects overall best value in terms of specific performance-based criteria.

Requirements: An ICE is required for any intersection improvement (e.g. new or modified intersection, widening/reconstruction or corridor project, or work accomplished through a driveway or encroachment permit that affects an intersection) where: **1)** the intersection includes at least one roadway designated as a State Route (State Highway System) or as part of the National Highway System; or **2)** the intersection will be designed or constructed using State or Federal funding. In certain circumstances where an ICE would otherwise be required, the requirement may be waived based on appropriate evidence presented with a written request. (See the **"Waiver"** tab to review criteria that may make a project waiver eligible and for instructions to submit a waiver request to the Department). An ICE is not required when the proposed work does not include any changes to the intersection design, involves only routine traffic signal timing and equipment maintenance, or for driveway permits where the driveway is not a new leg to an already existing intersection on either 1) a divided, multi-lane highway with a closed median and only right-in/right-out access or 2) an undivided roadway where the development is not required to construct left and/or right turn lanes (as per the Driveway Manual and District Traffic Engineer).

Two-Stage Process: A complete ICE process consists of two (2) distinct stages, and it is expected that the respective level of effort for completing both stages of ICE will correspond to the magnitude and complexity of the intersection. Prior to starting an ICE, the District Traffic Engineer and/or State Traffic Engineer should be consulted for advice on an appropriate level of effort. The Stage 1 and Stage 2 ICE forms are designed to require minimal data inputs using drop-down menu choices and limiting text entry. All fields shaded grey include drop down menu choices and all fields shaded blue require data entry. All other cells in the worksheet are locked.

Stage 1: Screening Decision Record Stage 1 should be conducted early in the project development process and is intended to inform which alternatives are worthy of further evaluation in Stage 2. Stage 1 serves as a screening effort meant to *eliminate* non-competitive options and identify which alternatives merit further considerations based on their practical feasibility. Users should use good engineering judgement in responding to the seven policy questions by selecting "Yes" or "No" in the drop-down boxes. Alternatives should not be summarily eliminated without due consideration, and reasons for eliminating or advancing an alternative should be documented in the "Screening Decision Justification" column.

Stage 2: Alternative Selection Decision Record Stage 2 involves a more detailed and familiar evaluation of the alternatives identified in Stage 1 in order to support the selection of a preferred alternative that may be advanced to detailed design. Stage 2 data entry may require the use of external analysis tools to determine costs, operations and/or safety data that, combined with environmental and stakeholder posture data, form the basis of the ICE evaluation. A separate "CostEst" worksheet tab helps users develop pre-planning-level cost estimates for each Stage 2 alternative evaluated, and a separate Users Guide has been prepared to give guidance on Stage 1 and Stage 2 data entry. Once all data is entered, each alternative is scored and ranked, with the results reported at the bottom of the Stage 2 worksheet to inform on the best of the intersection controls evaluated for project recommendation.

Documentation: A complete ICE document consists of the combination of the outputs from either a completed and signed waiver form or both Stage 1 and Stage 2 worksheets (along with supporting costing and/or environmental documentation), to be included in the approved project Concept Report (or equivalent) or as a stand-alone document.

GDOT PI #	
Project Location:	EG Miles Pkwy @ Arlington Ave
Existing Control:	Conventional (Minor Stop)
Prepared by:	Atlas Technical Consultants
Date:	8/1/2022

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each policy question for each control type to identify which alternatives should be evaluated in the Stage 2 Decision Record; enter justification in the rightmost column

Note: Up to 5 alternatives may be selected and evaluated; Use this ICE Stage 1 to screen 5 or fewer alternatives to evaluate in Stage 2

Column questions:
1. Does alternative address the project need in a balanced manner and in scale with the project?
2. Does alternative improve safety performance in terms of reducing severe crashes?
3. Does alternative incorporate safety, convenience and accessibility for pedestrians and/or bicyclists?
4. Does alternative improve (or preserve) traffic operations (congestion, delay, reliability, etc.)?
5. Does alternative appear feasible given the site characteristics, constrains & location context?
6. Does alternative appear feasible with respect to other project factors?
7. Overall feasible alternative (select alternative for further evaluation in Stage 2)?

Intersection Alternative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Screening Decision Justification:
Unsignalized Intersections								
Conventional (Minor Stop)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Current Control
Conventional (All-Way Stop)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Too many lanes on mainline
Mini Roundabout	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	More than 90% of volume on Mainline
Single Lane Roundabout	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	More than 90% of volume on Mainline
Multilane Roundabout	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	More than 90% of volume on Mainline
RCUT (stop control)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Potential Alternative
RIRO w/down stream U-Turn	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	U Turn restriction
High-T (unsignalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	U Turn restriction
Offset-T Intersections	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	3 Leg Intersection
Diamond Interch (Stop Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Diamond Interch (RAB Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Add LT Lanes on Arlington Ave / No RT Lane Improvements	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Potential Alternative
Other unsignalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Signalized Intersections								
Traffic Signal	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Median U-Turn (Indirect Left)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
RCUT (signalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Displaced Left Turn (CFI)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Continuous Green-T	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Jughandle	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Quadrant Roadway	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Diamond Interch (Signal Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Diverging Diamond	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Single Point Interchange	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
No LT Lane Improvements / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Other Signalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	

☐ = Intersection type selected for more detailed analysis in Stage 2 Alternative Selection Decision Record

Project Location: EG Miles Pkwy @ Arlington Ave   District: 5 - Jesup   GDOT PI #:
Existing Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop)   County: Liberty   Prepared by: Atlas Technical Cons
Type of Analysis: Safety Funded Project   Area: Suburb/Transitio   Date: 8/1/2022

Opening / Design Year Traffic Operations

Intersection meets signal/AWS warrants?	None		
Traffic Analysis Measure of Effectiveness	Intersection Delay		
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro		
Analysis Time Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	
2022 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	28.9 sec	37.7 sec	
2022 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.33	0.23	
2022 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	35.5 sec	30.3 sec	
2022 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.33	0.29	

Complete Streets Warrants Met?
☐ PEDESTRIANS
☐ BICYCLES
☐ TRANSIT

Crash Data: Enter most recent 5 years of crash data	Crash Severity					Years:
	K*	A*	B*	C*	O	5
Angle	0	1	0	4	5	26%
Head-On	0	0	0	1	0	3%
Rear End	0	0	0	4	19	61%
Sideswipe - same	0	0	0	2	1	8%
Sideswipe - opposite	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Not Collision w/Motor Veh	0	0	0	0	1	3%
TOTALS:	0	1	0	11	26	38

Crash Type (left vertical label)

* Number of crashes resulting in injuries / fatalities, not number of persons

Alternatives Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Proposed Control Type/Improvement:	Conventional (Minor Stop)	RCUT (stop control)	Add Left Turn Lanes	N/A	N/A
Project Cost: (From CostEst Worksheet)	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*		
Construction Cost	$0	$299,000	$114,000		
ROW Cost	$0	$253,000	$0		
Environmental Cost	$0	$0	$0		
Reimbursable Utility Cost	$0	$4,000	$1,000		
Design & Contingency Cost	$0	$0	$0		
Cost Adjustment (justification req'd)	0%	0%	0%		
Total Cost	$0	$556,000	$115,000		

Traffic Operations:

	Alt 1		Alt 2		Alt 3						
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro		Synchro		Synchro						
Analysis Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr					
2022 Design Yr Build Intersection Delay	35.5 sec	30.3 sec	13.2 sec	11.8 sec	51.3 sec	49.1 sec					
2022 Design Yr Build Intersection V/C	0.33	0.29	0.10	0.10	0.05	0.24					

Safety Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Predefined CRF: PDO	0%	31%	3%		
Predefined CRF: Fatal/Inj	0%	53%	2%		
Predefined CRF Source:	CRF unavailable; provide user defined CRF below	NC/MO Table 4-7	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 270 / 274		
User Defined CRF: PDO					
User Defined CRF: Fatal/Inj					
User Defined CRF Source (write in if applicable):					

Environmental Impacts:[1]

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Historic District/Property	None	None	None		
Archaeology Resources	None	None	None		
Graveyard	None	None	None		
Stream	None	None	None		
Underground Tank/Hazmat	None	None	None		
Park Land	None	None	None		
EJ Community	None	None	None		
Wooded Area	None	None	None		
Wetland	None	None	None		

Note: If environmental impact is significant (**RED**), provide justification impact won't jeopardize project delivery using "Env" worksheet
[1] Environmental impacts are only preliminary estimates; detailed environmental impact documentation will be included with project concept report

Stakeholder Posture:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Local Community Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		
GDOT Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Final ICE Stage 2 Score:	4.4	6.3	6.0		
Rank of Control Type Alternatives:	3	1	2		
Final Intersection Control Selection:	**1 - RCUT (stop control)**				

Note: Stage 2 score is not given (shown as "-") if signal or AWS is selected as control type but respective warrants are not met

Provide additional comments and/or explain any unique analysis inputs, or results (as necessary):

TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS

INTERSECTION NAME: EG Miles Pkwy and Arlington Ave/ Surrey Dr   COUNT DATE: Typical Weekday

INTERSECTION CONDITION:

MAJOR STREET: Main Street   EG Miles Pkwy   # OF APPROACH LANES: 2
MINOR STREET: Cross Street   Arlington Ave/ Surrey Dr   # OF APPROACH LANES: 1

ISOLATED COMMUNITY WITH POPULATION LESS THAN 10,000 (Y OR N):   N
85TH PERCENTILE SPEED GREATER THAN 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET (Y OR N):   Y

	MAJOR ST BOTH APPROACHES	MINOR ST HIGHEST APPROACH	WARRANT 1, Condition A			WARRANT 1, Condition B			WARRANT 1, Combination Warrant						WARRANT 2	WARRANT 3
									CONDITION A			CONDITION B				
			MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET		
THRESHOLD VALUES ⟶			420	105		630	53		480	120		720	60			
06:00 AM TO 07:00 AM	696	37	Y			Y			Y							
07:00 AM TO 08:00 AM	885	49	Y			Y			Y			Y				
08:00 AM TO 09:00 AM	1,380	41	Y			Y			Y			Y				
09:00 AM TO 10:00 AM	1,355	32	Y			Y			Y			Y				
10:00 AM TO 11:00 AM	797	32	Y			Y			Y			Y				
11:00 AM TO 12:00 PM	969	24	Y			Y			Y			Y				
12:00 PM TO 01:00 PM	1,289	19	Y			Y			Y			Y				
01:00 PM TO 02:00 PM	1,316	29	Y			Y			Y			Y				
02:00 PM TO 03:00 PM	1,395	32	Y			Y			Y			Y				
03:00 PM TO 04:00 PM	1,439	14	Y			Y			Y			Y				
04:00 PM TO 05:00 PM	1,537	21	Y			Y			Y			Y				
05:00 PM TO 06:00 PM	1,566	20	Y			Y			Y			Y				
06:00 PM TO 07:00 PM	1,416	22	Y			Y			Y			Y				
07:00 PM TO 08:00 PM	1,044	15	Y			Y			Y			Y				
08:00 PM TO 09:00 PM	680	8	Y			Y			Y							
09:00 PM TO 10:00 PM	558	3	Y						Y							
	18,322	398			0			0			0			0	0	0
			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS OF BOTH COND. A AND COND. B NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**						4 HRS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**	1 HR NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**

TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS

INTERSECTION NAME: EG Miles Pkwy at Curtis St   COUNT DATE: Typical Weekday

INTERSECTION CONDITION:

MAJOR STREET:	Main Street	EG Miles Pkwy	# OF APPROACH LANES: 2
MINOR STREET:	Cross Street	Curtis St	# OF APPROACH LANES: 1

ISOLATED COMMUNITY WITH POPULATION LESS THAN 10,000 (Y OR N):   N
85TH PERCENTILE SPEED GREATER THAN 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET (Y OR N):   Y

	MAJOR ST BOTH APPROACHES	MINOR ST HIGHEST APPROACH	WARRANT 1, Condition A			WARRANT 1, Condition B			WARRANT 1, Combination Warrant						WARRANT 2	WARRANT 3
									CONDITION A			CONDITION B				
			MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET		
THRESHOLD VALUES ➔			420	105		630	53		480	120		720	60			
06:00 AM TO 07:00 AM	902	7	Y			Y			Y			Y				
07:00 AM TO 08:00 AM	1,787	37	Y			Y			Y			Y				
08:00 AM TO 09:00 AM	1,340	17	Y			Y			Y			Y				
09:00 AM TO 10:00 AM	1,098	20	Y			Y			Y			Y				
10:00 AM TO 11:00 AM	1,019	15	Y			Y			Y			Y				
11:00 AM TO 12:00 PM	1,152	17	Y			Y			Y			Y				
12:00 PM TO 01:00 PM	1,218	10	Y			Y			Y			Y				
01:00 PM TO 02:00 PM	1,262	14	Y			Y			Y			Y				
02:00 PM TO 03:00 PM	1,538	22	Y			Y			Y			Y				
03:00 PM TO 04:00 PM	1,537	12	Y			Y			Y			Y				
04:00 PM TO 05:00 PM	1,728	15	Y			Y			Y			Y				
05:00 PM TO 06:00 PM	1,897	14	Y			Y			Y			Y				
06:00 PM TO 07:00 PM	1,283	7	Y			Y			Y			Y				
07:00 PM TO 08:00 PM	948	7	Y			Y			Y			Y				
08:00 PM TO 09:00 PM	606	4	Y						Y							
09:00 PM TO 10:00 PM	499	4	Y						Y							
	19,814	222			0			0			0			0	0	0
			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS OF BOTH COND. A AND COND. B NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**						4 HRS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**	1 HR NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**

GDOT PI#:
Request By: HAMPO

County: Liberty
GDOT District: 5 - Jesup

Major Road: EG Miles Pkwy | Road Class: Minor Arterial | Speed Limit: 45 mph

Crossing Road: Curtis St | Road Class: Local | Speed Limit: 35 mph

Major Rd Direction: East/West | Area Type: Suburb/Transition

Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop) | Project ID:

Prepared By: Atlas Technical Consultants | Date: 8/1/2022

Project Purpose:

Existing Data Year: 2022
Project Opening Year: 2025
Project Design Year: 2045
Annual Growth Rate: 0.5%
K Factor*: 10%

* K Factor = Proportion of average annual daily traffic occurring in the highest one hour of the day

LEGEND:

000 = AM Peak Approach Volume
(000) = PM Peak Approach Volume
[000] = ADT Volume (Estimate)

2022 EXISTING YEAR VOLUMES

APPROACH SPLITS:
EG Miles Pkwy: 97%
Curtis St: 3%

N

SB Curtis St
56 (33) [800]
(0) (20) (0) (13)
0 19 0 37

WB EG Miles Pkwy
0 (0)
611 (1110) [19000]

1176 (787) [18900]
(15) 14
(772) 1,162
(0) 0
(0) 0

2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 19,350

7 (23)
604 (1087)
0 (0)

EB EG Miles Pkwy
NB Curtis St
0 0 0 0
(0) (0) (0) (0)
0 (0) [0]

PEAK HR % TRUCKS:

EB	WB	NB	SB
0%	0%	0%	0%

2025 OPENING YEAR VOLUMES

SB Curtis St
56 (33) [800]
(0) (20) (0) (13)
0 19 0 37

WB EG Miles Pkwy
0 (0)
618 (1225) [20700]

1176 (845) [20600]
(16) 14
(829) 1,162
(0) 0
(0) 0

2025 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 21,050

7 (25)
604 (1192)
7 (8)

EB EG Miles Pkwy
NB Curtis St
0 0 0 0
(0) (0) (0) (0)
0 (0) [0]

2045 DESIGN YEAR VOLUMES

SB Curtis St
56 (33) [800]
(0) (20) (0) (13)
0 19 0 37

WB EG Miles Pkwy
0 (0)
743 (1342) [22700]

1462 (926) [22600]
(16) 16
(910) 1,446
(0) 0
(0) 0

2045 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 23,050

8 (25)
727 (1309)
8 (8)

EB EG Miles Pkwy
NB Curtis St
0 0 0 0
(0) (0) (0) (0)
0 (0) [0]

Introduction: In 2005, SAFETEA-LU established the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and mandated that each state prepare a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) to prioritize safety funding investments. Intersections quickly became a common component of most states' SHSP emphasis areas and HSIP project lists, including Georgia's SHSP. Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policies and procedures represent a traceable and transparent procedure to streamline the evaluation of intersection control alternatives, and further leverage safety advancements for intersection improvements beyond just the safety program. Approximately one-third of all traffic fatalities and roughly seventy five percent of all traffic crashes in Georgia occur at or adjacent to intersections. Accordingly, the Georgia SHSP includes an emphasis on enhancing intersection safety to advance the *Toward Zero Deaths* vision embraced by the Georgia Governor's Office of Highway Safety (GOHS). This ICE tool was developed to support the ICE policy, developed and adopted to help ensure that intersection investments across the entire Georgia highway system are selected, prioritized and implemented with defensible benefits for safety towards those ends.

Tool Goal: The goal of this ICE tool is to provide a simplified and consistent way of importing traffic, safety, cost, environmental impact and stakeholder posture data to assess and quantify intersection control improvement benefits. The tool supports the ICE policy and procedures to provide traceability, transparency, consistency and accountability when identifying and selecting an intersection control solution that both meets project purpose and reflects overall best value in terms of specific performance-based criteria.

Requirements: An ICE is required for any intersection improvement (e.g. new or modified intersection, widening/reconstruction or corridor project, or work accomplished through a driveway or encroachment permit that affects an intersection) where: **1)** the intersection includes at least one roadway designated as a State Route (State Highway System) or as part of the National Highway System; or **2)** the intersection will be designed or constructed using State or Federal funding. In certain circumstances where an ICE would otherwise be required, the requirement may be waived based on appropriate evidence presented with a written request. (See the "**Waiver**" tab to review criteria that may make a project waiver eligible and for instructions to submit a waiver request to the Department). An ICE is not required when the proposed work does not include any changes to the intersection design, involves only routine traffic signal timing and equipment maintenance, or for driveway permits where the driveway is not a new leg to an already existing intersection on either 1) a divided, multi-lane highway with a closed median and only right-in/right-out access or 2) an undivided roadway where the development is not required to construct left and/or right turn lanes (as per the Driveway Manual and District Traffic Engineer).

Two-Stage Process: A complete ICE process consists of two (2) distinct stages, and it is expected that the respective level of effort for completing both stages of ICE will correspond to the magnitude and complexity of the intersection. Prior to starting an ICE, the District Traffic Engineer and/or State Traffic Engineer should be consulted for advice on an appropriate level of effort. The Stage 1 and Stage 2 ICE forms are designed to minimize required data inputs using drop-down menu choices and limiting text entry. All fields shaded grey include drop down menu choices and all fields shaded blue require data entry. All other cells in the worksheet are locked.

Stage 1: Screening Decision Record Stage 1 should be conducted early in the project development process and is intended to inform which alternatives are worthy of further evaluation in Stage 2. Stage 1 serves as a screening effort meant to *eliminate* non-competitive options and identify which alternatives merit further considerations based on their practical feasibility. Users should use good engineering judgement in responding to the seven policy questions by selecting "Yes" or "No" in the drop-down boxes. Alternatives should not be summarily eliminated without due consideration, and reasons for eliminating or advancing an alternative should be documented in the "Screening Decision Justification" column.

Stage 2: Alternative Selection Decision Record Stage 2 involves a more detailed and familiar evaluation of the alternatives identified in Stage 1 in order to support the selection of a preferred alternative that may be advanced to detailed design. Stage 2 data entry may require the use of external analysis tools to determine costs, operations and/or safety data that, combined with environmental and stakeholder posture data, form the basis of the ICE evaluation. A separate "CostEst" worksheet tab helps users develop pre-planning-level cost estimates for each Stage 2 alternative evaluated, and a separate Users Guide has been prepared to give guidance on Stage 1 and Stage 2 data entry. Once all data is entered, each alternative is scored and ranked, with the results reported at the bottom of the Stage 2 worksheet to inform on the best of the intersection controls evaluated for project recommendation.

Documentation: A complete ICE document consists of the combination of the outputs from either a completed and signed waiver form or both Stage 1 and Stage 2 worksheets (along with supporting costing and/or environmental documentation), to be included in the approved project Concept Report (or equivalent) or as a stand-alone document.

GDOT ICE STAGE 1: SCREENING DECISION RECORD

ICE Version 2.21 | Revised 2/4/2022

GDOT PI #	
Project Location:	EG Miles Pkwy @ Curtis St
Existing Control:	Conventional (Minor Stop)
Prepared by:	Atlas Technical Consultants
Date:	8/1/2022

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each policy question for each control type to identify which alternatives should be evaluated in the Stage 2 Decision Record; enter justification in the rightmost column

Note: Up to 5 alternatives may be selected and evaluated; Use this ICE Stage 1 to screen 5 or fewer alternatives to evaluate in Stage 2

Column headers:
1. Does alternative address the project need in a balanced manner and in scale with the project?
2. Does alternative improve safety performance in terms of reducing severe crashes?
3. Does alternative incorporate safety, convenience and accessibility for pedestrians and/or bicyclists?
4. Does alternative improve (or preserve) traffic operations (congestion, delay, reliability, etc.)?
5. Does alternative appear feasible given the site characteristics, constrains & location context?
6. Does alternative appear feasible with respect to other project factors?
7. Overall feasible alternative (select alternative for further evaluation in Stage 2)?

Intersection Alternative (see "Intersections" tab for detailed description of intersection/interchange type)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Screening Decision Justification:
Unsignalized Intersections — Conventional (Minor Stop)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Existing Conidtions
Conventional (All-Way Stop)	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Volume too high on the major street
Mini Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
Single Lane Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
Multilane Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
RCUT (stop control)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Potential Alternative
RIRO w/down stream U-Turn	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Potential Alternative
High-T (unsignalized)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Potential Alternative
Offset-T Intersections	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	3 Leg intersection
Diamond Interch (Stop Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Diamond Interch (RAB Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Add LT Lanes on Curtis St / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Potential Alternative
Other unsignalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Signalized Intersections — Traffic Signal	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Median U-Turn (Indirect Left)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
RCUT (signalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Displaced Left Turn (CFI)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Continuous Green-T	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Jughandle	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Quadrant Roadway	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Diamond Interch (Signal Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Diverging Diamond	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Single Point Interchange	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
No LT Lane Improvements / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Other Signalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	

☐ = Intersection type selected for more detailed analysis in Stage 2 Alternative Selection Decision Record

GDOT ICE STAGE 2: ALTERNATIVE SELECTION DECISION RECORD

ICE Version 2.21 | Revised 2/4/2022

Project Location: EG Miles Pkwy @ Curtis St
Existing Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop)
Type of Analysis: Safety Funded Project

District: 5 - Jesup
County: Liberty
Area: Suburb/Transitic

GDOT PI #:
Prepared by: Atlas Technical Cons
Date: 8/1/2022

Opening / Design Year Traffic Operations

Intersection meets signal/AWS warrants?	None	
Traffic Analysis Measure of Effectiveness	Intersection Delay	
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro	
Analysis Time Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
2025 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	43.7 sec	39.4 sec
2025 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.49	0.36
2045 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	61.1 sec	53.2 sec
2045 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.60	0.46

Complete Streets Warrants Met?
☐ PEDESTRIANS
☐ BICYCLES
☐ TRANSIT

Crash Data: Enter most recent 5 years of crash data

Crash Type	K*	A*	B*	C*	O	Years: 5
Angle	0	0	0	2	0	14%
Head-On	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Rear End	0	0	0	0	1	7%
Sideswipe - same	0	0	0	0	4	29%
Sideswipe - opposite	0	0	0	0	1	7%
Not Collision w/Motor Veh	0	0	0	0	6	43%
TOTALS:	0	0	0	2	12	14

* Number of crashes resulting in injuries / fatalities, not number of persons

Alternatives Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Proposed Control Type/Improvement:	Conventional (Minor Stop)	RCUT (stop control)	High-T (unsignalized)	Add Left Turn Lanes	N/A

Project Cost: (From CostEst Worksheet)

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
	Additional description here	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*	
Construction Cost	$0	$333,000	$165,000	$127,000	
ROW Cost	$0	$226,000	$42,000	$0	
Environmental Cost	$0	$0	$0	$0	
Reimbursable Utility Cost	$0	$4,000	$2,000	$1,000	
Design & Contingency Cost	$0	$0	$0	$0	
Cost Adjustment (justification req'd)	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Total Cost	$0	$563,000	$209,000	$128,000	

Traffic Operations:

	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3		Alternative 4		
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro		Synchro		Synchro		Synchro		
Analysis Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	
2045 Design Yr Build Intersection Delay	61.1 sec	53.2 sec	11.6 sec	16.3 sec	16.6 sec	26.3 sec	44.1 sec	44.1 sec	
2045 Design Yr Build Intersection V/C	0.60	0.46	0.14	0.21	0.22	0.26	0.36	0.36	

Safety Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Predefined CRF: PDO	0%	31%	23%	1%	
Predefined CRF: Fatal/Inj	0%	53%	45%	1%	
Predefined CRF Source:	CRF unavailable; provide user defined CRF below	NC/MO Table 4-7	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 2753 / 2755	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 270 / 274	
User Defined CRF: PDO					
User Defined CRF: Fatal/Inj					
User Defined CRF Source (write in if applicable):					

Environmental Impacts:[1]

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Historic District/Property	None	None	None	None	
Archaeology Resources	None	None	None	None	
Graveyard	None	None	None	None	
Stream	None	None	None	None	
Underground Tank/Hazmat	None	None	None	None	
Park Land	None	None	None	None	
EJ Community	None	None	None	None	
Wooded Area	None	None	None	None	
Wetland	None	None	None	None	

Note: If environmental impact is significant (RED), provide justification impact won't jeopardize project delivery using "Env" worksheet
[1] Environmental impacts are only preliminary estimates; detailed environmental impact documentation will be included with project concept report

Stakeholder Posture:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Local Community Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	
GDOT Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Final ICE Stage 2 Score:	5.3	6.2	7.3	4.8	
Rank of Control Type Alternatives:	3	2	1	4	

Final Intersection Control Selection: **1 - High-T (unsignalized)**

Note: Stage 2 score is not given (shown as "-") if signal or AWS is selected as control type but respective warrants are not met

Provide additional comments and/or explain any unique analysis inputs, or results (as necessary):

TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS

INTERSECTION NAME: EG Miles Pkwy at Deal St   COUNT DATE: Typical Weekday

INTERSECTION CONDITION:

MAJOR STREET: Main Street   EG Miles Pkwy   # OF APPROACH LANES: 2
MINOR STREET: Cross Street   Deal St   # OF APPROACH LANES: 1

ISOLATED COMMUNITY WITH POPULATION LESS THAN 10,000 (Y OR N): N
85TH PERCENTILE SPEED GREATER THAN 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET (Y OR N): Y

| | MAJOR ST BOTH APPROACHES | MINOR ST HIGHEST APPROACH | WARRANT 1, Condition A | | | WARRANT 1, Condition B | | | WARRANT 1, Combination Warrant | | | | | | WARRANT 2 | WARRANT 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | CONDITION A | | | CONDITION B | | | | |
			MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET		
THRESHOLD VALUES			420	105		630	53		480	120		720	60			
06:00 AM TO 07:00 AM	696	7	Y			Y			Y							
07:00 AM TO 08:00 AM	885	11	Y			Y			Y			Y				
08:00 AM TO 09:00 AM	1,380	11	Y			Y			Y			Y				
09:00 AM TO 10:00 AM	1,355	16	Y			Y			Y			Y				
10:00 AM TO 11:00 AM	797	19	Y			Y			Y			Y				
11:00 AM TO 12:00 PM	969	20	Y			Y			Y			Y				
12:00 PM TO 01:00 PM	1,289	24	Y			Y			Y			Y				
01:00 PM TO 02:00 PM	1,316	25	Y			Y			Y			Y				
02:00 PM TO 03:00 PM	1,395	22	Y			Y			Y			Y				
03:00 PM TO 04:00 PM	1,439	26	Y			Y			Y			Y				
04:00 PM TO 05:00 PM	1,537	41	Y			Y			Y			Y				
05:00 PM TO 06:00 PM	1,566	34	Y			Y			Y			Y				
06:00 PM TO 07:00 PM	1,416	34	Y			Y			Y			Y				
07:00 PM TO 08:00 PM	1,044	15	Y			Y			Y			Y				
08:00 PM TO 09:00 PM	680	13	Y			Y			Y							
09:00 PM TO 10:00 PM	558	7	Y						Y							
	18,322	325			0			0			0			0	0	0
			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS OF BOTH COND. A AND COND. B NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**						4 HRS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**	1 HR NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**

GDOT PI#: _____ **Request By:** _____

County: Liberty **GDOT District:** 5 - Jesup

Major Road: EG Miles Pkwy **Road Class:** Minor Arterial **Speed Limit:** 35 mph

Crossing Road: Deal St **Road Class:** Minor Arterial **Speed Limit:** 40 mph

Major Rd Direction: East/West **Area Type:** Suburb/Transition

Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop) **Project ID:** _____

Prepared By: Atlas Technical Consultants **Date:** _____

Project Purpose: _____

Existing Data Year:	2022
Project Opening Year:	2022
Project Design Year:	2022
Annual Growth Rate:	1.0%
K Factor*:	10%

* K Factor = Proportion of average annual daily traffic occurring in the highest one hour of the day

LEGEND:

000 = AM Peak Approach Volume

(000) = PM Peak Approach Volume

[000] = ADT Volume (Estimate)

2022 EXISTING YEAR VOLUMES

APPROACH SPLITS:
EG Miles Pkwy: 95%
Deal St: 5%

27 (9) [400]

| (0) | (7) | (0) | (2) |
| 0 | 20 | 3 | 4 |

SB Deal St

WB EG Miles Pkwy: 0 (0)

973 (664) [17400]	(3)	4		2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 18,300		7	(3)
	(625)	943				414	(1041)
	(36)	26				11	(34)

432 (1078) [17400]

EB EG Miles Pkwy

NB Deal St: 10 0 30 0

(30) (1) (39) (0)

40 (70) [1400]

PEAK HR % TRUCKS:

EB	WB	NB	SB
2%	2%	0%	0%

2022 OPENING YEAR VOLUMES

27 (9) [400]

| (0) | (7) | (0) | (2) |
| 0 | 20 | 3 | 4 |

SB Deal St

WB EG Miles Pkwy: 0 (0)

992.38 (677.22) [17800]	(3)	4		2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 18,700		7	(3)
	(638)	962				422	(1062)
	(37)	27				11	(35)

440.5 (1099.5) [17800]

EB EG Miles Pkwy

NB Deal St: 10 0 31 0

(31) (1) (40) (0)

40.8 (71.38) [1400]

2022 DESIGN YEAR VOLUMES

27 (9) [400]

| (0) | (7) | (0) | (2) |
| 0 | 20 | 3 | 4 |

SB Deal St

WB EG Miles Pkwy: 0 (0)

1089.28 (743.32) [19500]	(3)	4		2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 20,500		7	(3)
	(700)	1,056				464	(1166)
	(40)	29				12	(38)

483 (1207) [19500]

EB EG Miles Pkwy

NB Deal St: 11 0 34 0

(34) (1) (44) (0)

44.8 (78.4) [1600]

Introduction: In 2005, SAFETEA-LU established the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and mandated that each state prepare a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) to prioritize safety funding investments. Intersections quickly became a common component of most states' SHSP emphasis areas and HSIP project lists, including Georgia's SHSP. Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policies and procedures represent a traceable and transparent procedure to streamline the evaluation of intersection control alternatives, and further leverage safety advancements for intersection improvements beyond just the safety program. Approximately one-third of all traffic fatalities and roughly seventy five percent of all traffic crashes in Georgia occur at or adjacent to intersections. Accordingly, the Georgia SHSP includes an emphasis on enhancing intersection safety to advance the *Toward Zero Deaths* vision embraced by the Georgia Governor's Office of Highway Safety (GOHS). This ICE tool was developed to support the ICE policy, developed and adopted to help ensure that intersection investments across the entire Georgia highway system are selected, prioritized and implemented with defensible benefits for safety towards those ends.

Tool Goal: The goal of this ICE tool is to provide a simplified and consistent way of importing traffic, safety, cost, environmental impact and stakeholder posture data to assess and quantify intersection control improvement benefits. The tool supports the ICE policy and procedures to provide traceability, transparency, consistency and accountability when identifying and selecting an intersection control solution that both meets project purpose and reflects overall best value in terms of specific performance-based criteria.

Requirements: An ICE is required for any intersection improvement (e.g. new or modified intersection, widening/reconstruction or corridor project, or work accomplished through a driveway or encroachment permit that affects an intersection) where: **1)** the intersection includes at least one roadway designated as a State Route (State Highway System) or as part of the National Highway System; or **2)** the intersection will be designed or constructed using State or Federal funding. In certain circumstances where an ICE would otherwise be required, the requirement may be waived based on appropriate evidence presented with a written request. (See the **"Waiver"** tab to review criteria that may make a project waiver eligible and for instructions to submit a waiver request to the Department). An ICE is not required when the proposed work does not include any changes to the intersection design, involves only routine traffic signal timing and equipment maintenance, or for driveway permits where the driveway is not a new leg to an already existing intersection on either 1) a divided, multi-lane highway with a closed median and only right-in/right-out access or 2) an undivided roadway where the development is not required to construct left and/or right turn lanes (as per the Driveway Manual and District Traffic Engineer).

Two-Stage Process: A complete ICE process consists of two (2) distinct stages, and it is expected that the respective level of effort for completing both stages of ICE will correspond to the magnitude and complexity of the intersection. Prior to starting an ICE, the District Traffic Engineer and/or State Traffic Engineer should be consulted for advice on an appropriate level of effort. The Stage 1 and Stage 2 ICE forms are designed to minimize required data inputs using drop-down menu choices and limiting text entry. All fields shaded grey include drop down menu choices and all fields shaded blue require data entry. All other cells in the worksheet are locked.

Stage 1: Screening Decision Record Stage 1 should be conducted early in the project development process and is intended to inform which alternatives are worthy of further evaluation in Stage 2. Stage 1 serves as a screening effort meant to *eliminate* non-competitive options and identify which alternatives merit further considerations based on their practical feasibility. Users should use good engineering judgement in responding to the seven policy questions by selecting "Yes" or "No" in the drop-down boxes. Alternatives should not be summarily eliminated without due consideration, and reasons for eliminating or advancing an alternative should be documented in the "Screening Decision Justification" column.

Stage 2: Alternative Selection Decision Record Stage 2 involves a more detailed and familiar evaluation of the alternatives identified in Stage 1 in order to support the selection of a preferred alternative that may be advanced to detailed design. Stage 2 data entry may require the use of external analysis tools to determine costs, operations and/or safety data that, combined with environmental and stakeholder posture data, form the basis of the ICE evaluation. A separate "CostEst" worksheet tab helps users develop pre-planning-level cost estimates for each Stage 2 alternative evaluated, and a separate Users Guide has been prepared to give guidance on Stage 1 and Stage 2 data entry. Once all data is entered, each alternative is scored and ranked, with the results reported at the bottom of the Stage 2 worksheet to inform on the best of the intersection controls evaluated for project recommendation.

Documentation: A complete ICE document consists of the combination of the outputs from either a completed and signed waiver form or both Stage 1 and Stage 2 worksheets (along with supporting costing and/or environmental documentation), to be included in the approved project Concept Report (or equivalent) or as a stand-alone document.

![GDOT - Georgia Department of Transportation]

GDOT PI #	
Project Location:	EG Miles Pkwy @ Deal St
Existing Control:	Conventional (Minor Stop)
Prepared by:	Atlas Technical Consultants
Date:	

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each policy question for each control type to identify which alternatives should be evaluated in the Stage 2 Decision Record; enter justification in the rightmost column

Note: Up to 5 alternatives may be selected and evaluated; Use this ICE Stage 1 to screen 5 or fewer alternatives to evaluate in Stage 2

Column questions:
1. Does alternative address the project need in a balanced manner and in scale with the project?
2. Does alternative improve safety performance in terms of reducing severe crashes?
3. Does alternative incorporate safety, convenience and accessibility for pedestrians and/or bicyclists?
4. Does alternative improve (or preserve) traffic operations (congestion, delay, reliability, etc.)?
5. Does alternative appear feasible given the site characteristics, constrains & location context?
6. Does alternative appear feasible with respect to other project factors?
7. Overall feasible alternative (select alternative for further evaluation in Stage 2)?

Intersection Alternative (see "Intersections" tab for detailed description of intersection/interchange type)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Screening Decision Justification:
Unsignalized Intersections — Conventional (Minor Stop)	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	
Conventional (All-Way Stop)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Mini Roundabout	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Single Lane Roundabout	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Multilane Roundabout	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	
RCUT (stop control)	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	
RIRO w/down stream U-Turn	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
High-T (unsignalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Offset-T Intersections	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Diamond Interch (Stop Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Diamond Interch (RAB Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Add LT Lanes on Deal St / No RT Lane Improvements	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	
Other unsignalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Signalized Intersections — Traffic Signal	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Median U-Turn (Indirect Left)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
RCUT (signalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Displaced Left Turn (CFI)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Continuous Green-T	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Jughandle	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Quadrant Roadway	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Diamond Interch (Signal Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Diverging Diamond	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Single Point Interchange	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
No LT Lane Improvements / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Other Signalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	

☐ = Intersection type selected for more detailed analysis in Stage 2 Alternative Selection Decision Record

GDOT ICE STAGE 2: ALTERNATIVE SELECTION DECISION RECORD

ICE Version 2.21 | Revised 2/4/2022

Project Location:	EG Miles Pkwy @ Deal St	District: 5 - Jesup	GDOT PI #:
Existing Intersection Control:	Conventional (Minor Stop)	County: Liberty	Prepared by: Atlas Technical Cons
Type of Analysis:	Safety Funded Project	Area: Suburb/Transitio	Date:

Opening / Design Year Traffic Operations

	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
Intersection meets signal/AWS warrants?	None	
Traffic Analysis Measure of Effectiveness	Intersection Delay	
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro	
Analysis Time Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
2022 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	27.9 sec	43.3 sec
2022 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.26	0.53
2022 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	36.1 sec	71.9 sec
2022 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.34	0.71

Complete Streets Warrants Met?
- [ ] PEDESTRIANS
- [ ] BICYCLES
- [ ] TRANSIT

Crash Data: Enter most recent 5 years of crash data	Crash Severity					Years:
Crash Type	K*	A*	B*	C*	O	5
Angle	0	0	3	5	14	37%
Head-On	0	0	1	0	0	2%
Rear End	0	0	3	8	13	41%
Sideswipe - same	0	0	0	0	6	10%
Sideswipe - opposite	0	0	1	0	2	5%
Not Collision w/Motor Veh	0	0	1	0	2	5%
TOTALS:	0	0	9	13	37	59

* Number of crashes resulting in injuries / fatalities, not number of persons

Alternatives Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Proposed Control Type/Improvement:	Conventional (Minor Stop)	Multilane Roundabout	RCUT (stop control)	Add Left Turn Lanes	N/A
Project Cost: (From CostEst Worksheet)	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*	
Construction Cost	$0	$1,569,000	$642,000	$127,000	
ROW Cost	$0	$468,000	$506,000	$0	
Environmental Cost	$0	$0	$0	$0	
Reimbursable Utility Cost	$0	$18,000	$8,000	$1,000	
Design & Contingency Cost	$0	$0	$0	$0	
Cost Adjustment (justification req'd)	0%	+200%	+100%	0%	
Total Cost	$0	$2,055,000	$1,156,000	$128,000	
		User Cost Override	*User Cost Override*		

Traffic Operations:

Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro		GDOT RAB Tool		Synchro		Synchro		
Analysis Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	
2022 Design Yr Build Intersection Delay	36.1 sec	71.9 sec	7.9 sec	8.7 sec	15.4 sec	14.2 sec	77.6 sec	107.1 sec	
2022 Design Yr Build Intersection V/C	0.34	0.71	0.57	0.59	0.15	0.18	0.23	0.62	

Safety Analysis:

Predefined CRF: PDO	0%	32%	31%	2%	
Predefined CRF: Fatal/Inj	0%	71%	53%	2%	
Predefined CRF Source:	CRF unavailable; provide user defined CRF below	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 236 / 237	NC/MO Table 4-7	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 270 / 274	
User Defined CRF: PDO					
User Defined CRF: Fatal/Inj					
User Defined CRF Source (write in if applicable):					

Environmental Impacts:[1]

Historic District/Property	None	None	None	None	
Archaeology Resources	None	None	None	None	
Graveyard	None	None	None	None	
Stream	None	None	None	None	
Underground Tank/Hazmat	None	None	None	None	
Park Land	None	None	None	None	
EJ Community	None	None	None	None	
Wooded Area	None	None	None	None	
Wetland	None	None	None	None	

Note: If environmental impact is significant (RED), provide justification impact won't jeopardize project delivery using "Env" worksheet

[1] Environmental impacts are only preliminary estimates; detailed environmental impact documentation will be included with project concept report

Stakeholder Posture:

Local Community Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	
GDOT Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	

Final ICE Stage 2 Score:	4.0	6.4	7.2	4.2	
Rank of Control Type Alternatives:	4	2	1	3	
Final Intersection Control Selection:	**1 - RCUT (stop control)**				

Note: Stage 2 score is not given (shown as "-") if signal or AWS is selected as control type but respective warrants are not met

Provide additional comments and/or explain any unique analysis inputs, or results (as necessary):

GDOT PI#: _____   **Request By:** _____

County: Liberty   **GDOT District:** 5 - Jesup

Major Road: EG Miles Pkwy   **Road Class:** Functional Class   **Speed Limit:** 40 mph

Crossing Road: L Regional MC   **Road Class:** Functional Class   **Speed Limit:** < 35 mph

Major Rd Direction: East/West   **Area Type:** Suburb/Transition

Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop)   **Project ID:** _____

Prepared By: Atlas Technical Consultants   **Date:** 8/1/2022

Project Purpose: _____

Existing Data Year: 2022
Project Opening Year: 2022
Project Design Year: 2022
Annual Growth Rate: 1.0%
K Factor*: 10%

* K Factor = Proportion of average annual daily traffic occurring in the highest one hour of the day

LEGEND:

000 = AM Peak Approach Volume
(000) = PM Peak Approach Volume
[000] = ADT Volume (Estimate)

2022 EXISTING YEAR VOLUMES

APPROACH SPLITS:
EG Miles Pkwy: 95%
L Regional MC: 5%

PEAK HR % TRUCKS:

EB	WB	NB	SB
2%	2%	0%	0%

SB L Regional MC

12 (21) [500]

| (0) | (11) | (2) | (8) |
| 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy

								0	(0)
977 (655) [14300]	(6)	13		2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 15,050		17	(8)	463 (761) [14300]
	(635)	927				440	(735)	
	(14)	37				6	(18)	
	(0)	0						

EB EG Miles Pkwy

| 8 | 3 | 18 | 0 |
| (32) | (6) | (24) | (0) |

29 (62) [1000]

NB L Regional MC

2022 OPENING YEAR VOLUMES

SB L Regional MC

12 (21) [500]

| (0) | (11) | (2) | (8) |
| 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy

								0	(0)
995.54 (667.7) [14600]	(6)	13		2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 15,350		17	(8)	471.8 (775.7) [14600]
	(648)	946				449	(750)	
	(14)	37				6	(18)	
	(0)	0						

EB EG Miles Pkwy

| 8 | 3 | 18 | 0 |
| (32) | (6) | (24) | (0) |

29 (62) [1000]

NB L Regional MC

2022 DESIGN YEAR VOLUMES

SB L Regional MC

12 (21) [500]

| (0) | (11) | (2) | (8) |
| 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy

								0	(0)
1088.24 (731.2) [16000]	(6)	13		2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 16,700		17	(8)	515.8 (849.2) [15900]
	(711)	1,038				493	(823)	
	(14)	37				6	(18)	
	(0)	0						

EB EG Miles Pkwy

| 8 | 3 | 18 | 0 |
| (32) | (6) | (24) | (0) |

29 (62) [1000]

NB L Regional MC

Introduction: In 2005, SAFETEA-LU established the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and mandated that each state prepare a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) to prioritize safety funding investments. Intersections quickly became a common component of most states' SHSP emphasis areas and HSIP project lists, including Georgia's SHSP. Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policies and procedures represent a traceable and transparent procedure to streamline the evaluation of intersection control alternatives, and further leverage safety advancements for intersection improvements beyond just the safety program. Approximately one-third of all traffic fatalities and roughly seventy five percent of all traffic crashes in Georgia occur at or adjacent to intersections. Accordingly, the Georgia SHSP includes an emphasis on enhancing intersection safety to advance the *Toward Zero Deaths* vision embraced by the Georgia Governor's Office of Highway Safety (GOHS). This ICE tool was developed to support the ICE policy, developed and adopted to help ensure that intersection investments across the entire Georgia highway system are selected, prioritized and implemented with defensible benefits for safety towards those ends.

Tool Goal: The goal of this ICE tool is to provide a simplified and consistent way of importing traffic, safety, cost, environmental impact and stakeholder posture data to assess and quantify intersection control improvement benefits. The tool supports the ICE policy and procedures to provide traceability, transparency, consistency and accountability when identifying and selecting an intersection control solution that both meets project purpose and reflects overall best value in terms of specific performance-based criteria.

Requirements: An ICE is required for any intersection improvement (e.g. new or modified intersection, widening/reconstruction or corridor project, or work accomplished through a driveway or encroachment permit that affects an intersection) where: **1)** the intersection includes at least one roadway designated as a State Route (State Highway System) or as part of the National Highway System; or **2)** the intersection will be designed or constructed using State or Federal funding. In certain circumstances where an ICE would otherwise be required, the requirement may be waived based on appropriate evidence presented with a written request. (See the **"Waiver"** tab to review criteria that may make a project waiver eligible and for instructions to submit a waiver request to the Department). An ICE is not required when the proposed work does not include any changes to the intersection design, involves only routine traffic signal timing and equipment maintenance, or for driveway permits where the driveway is not a new leg to an already existing intersection on either 1) a divided, multi-lane highway with a closed median and only right-in/right-out access or 2) an undivided roadway where the development is not required to construct left and/or right turn lanes (as per the Driveway Manual and District Traffic Engineer).

Two-Stage Process: A complete ICE process consists of two (2) distinct stages, and it is expected that the respective level of effort for completing both stages of ICE will correspond to the magnitude and complexity of the intersection. Prior to starting an ICE, the District Traffic Engineer and/or State Traffic Engineer should be consulted for advice on an appropriate level of effort. The Stage 1 and Stage 2 ICE forms are designed to minimize required data inputs using drop-down menu choices and limiting text entry. All fields shaded grey include drop down menu choices and all fields shaded blue require data entry. All other cells in the worksheet are locked.

Stage 1: Screening Decision Record Stage 1 should be conducted early in the project development process and is intended to inform which alternatives are worthy of further evaluation in Stage 2. Stage 1 serves as a screening effort meant to *eliminate* non-competitive options and identify which alternatives merit further considerations based on their practical feasibility. Users should use good engineering judgement in responding to the seven policy questions by selecting "Yes" or "No" in the drop-down boxes. Alternatives should not be summarily eliminated without due consideration, and reasons for eliminating or advancing an alternative should be documented in the "Screening Decision Justification" column.

Stage 2: Alternative Selection Decision Record Stage 2 involves a more detailed and familiar evaluation of the alternatives identified in Stage 1 in order to support the selection of a preferred alternative that may be advanced to detailed design. Stage 2 data entry may require the use of external analysis tools to determine costs, operations and/or safety data that, combined with environmental and stakeholder posture data, form the basis of the ICE evaluation. A separate "CostEst" worksheet tab helps users develop pre-planning-level cost estimates for each Stage 2 alternative evaluated, and a separate Users Guide has been prepared to give guidance on Stage 1 and Stage 2 data entry. Once all data is entered, each alternative is scored and ranked, with the results reported at the bottom of the Stage 2 worksheet to inform on the best of the intersection controls evaluated for project recommendation.

Documentation: A complete ICE document consists of the combination of the outputs from either a completed and signed waiver form or both Stage 1 and Stage 2 worksheets (along with supporting costing and/or environmental documentation), to be included in the approved project Concept Report (or equivalent) or as a stand-alone document.

GDOT ICE STAGE 1: SCREENING DECISION RECORD

ICE Version 2.21 | Revised 2/4/2022

GDOT PI #	
Project Location:	EG Miles Pkwy @ L Regional MC
Existing Control:	Conventional (Minor Stop)
Prepared by:	Atlas Technical Consultants
Date:	8/1/2022

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each policy question for each control type to identify which alternatives should be evaluated in the Stage 2 Decision Record; enter justification in the rightmost column

Note: Up to 5 alternatives may be selected and evaluated; Use this ICE Stage 1 to screen 5 or fewer alternatives to evaluate in Stage 2

Column questions:
1. Does alternative address the project need in a balanced manner and in scale with the project?
2. Does alternative improve safety performance in terms of reducing severe crashes?
3. Does alternative incorporate safety, convenience and accessibility for pedestrians and/or bicyclists?
4. Does alternative improve (or preserve) traffic operations (congestion, delay, reliability, etc.)?
5. Does alternative appear feasible given the site characteristics, constrains & location context?
6. Does alternative appear feasible with respect to other project factors?
7. Overall feasible alternative (select alternative for further evaluation in Stage 2)?

Intersection Alternative (see "Intersections" tab for detailed description of intersection/interchange type)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Screening Decision Justification:
Unsignalized Intersections — Conventional (Minor Stop)	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	Current Control
Conventional (All-Way Stop)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Too many lanes on mainline
Mini Roundabout	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	More than 90% of volume on Mainline
Single Lane Roundabout	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	More than 90% of volume on Mainline
Multilane Roundabout	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	More than 90% of volume on Mainline
RCUT (stop control)	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	Potential Alternative
RIRO w/down stream U-Turn	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	U Turn restriction
High-T (unsignalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	U Turn restriction
Offset-T Intersections	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	3 Leg Intersection
Diamond Interch (Stop Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Diamond Interch (RAB Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Add one LT Lane on L Regional MC / No RT Lane Improvements	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	Potential Alternative
Other unsignalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Signalized Intersections — Traffic Signal	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	Potential Alternative
Median U-Turn (Indirect Left)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
RCUT (signalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Displaced Left Turn (CFI)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Continuous Green-T	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Jughandle	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Quadrant Roadway	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Diamond Interch (Signal Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Diverging Diamond	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Single Point Interchange	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
No LT Lane Improvements / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Other Signalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	

☐ = Intersection type selected for more detailed analysis in Stage 2 Alternative Selection Decision Record

GDOT Georgia Department of Transportation

Project Location: EG Miles Pkwy @ L Regional MC
Existing Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop)
Type of Analysis: Safety Funded Project

District: 5 - Jesup
County: Liberty
Area: Suburb/Transitio

GDOT PI #:
Prepared by: Atlas Technical Cons
Date: 8/1/2022

Opening / Design Year Traffic Operations

	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
Intersection meets signal/AWS warrants?	None	
Traffic Analysis Measure of Effectiveness	Intersection Delay	
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro	
Analysis Time Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
2022 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	24.3 sec	31.1 sec
2022 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.11	0.31
2022 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	29.7 sec	38.8 sec
2022 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.14	0.38

Complete Streets Warrants Met?
☐ PEDESTRIANS
☐ BICYCLES
☐ TRANSIT

Crash Data: Enter most recent 5 years of crash data — Crash Severity

Crash Type	K*	A*	B*	C*	O	Years: 5
Angle	0	0	0	2	3	26%
Head-On	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Rear End	0	0	0	3	5	42%
Sideswipe - same	0	0	0	0	2	11%
Sideswipe - opposite	0	0	0	0	1	5%
Not Collision w/Motor Veh	1	0	0	0	2	16%
TOTALS:	1	0	0	5	13	19

* Number of crashes resulting in injuries / fatalities, not number of persons

Alternatives Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Proposed Control Type/Improvement:	Conventional (Minor Stop)	RCUT (stop control)	Add Left Turn Lanes	Traffic Signal	N/A

Project Cost: (From CostEst Worksheet)

		Additional description here	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*	*Add LT bays all approaches*	
Construction Cost		$0	$321,000	$70,000	$201,000	
ROW Cost		$0	$253,000	$0	$0	
Environmental Cost		$0	$0	$0	$0	
Reimbursable Utility Cost		$0	$4,000	$1,000	$4,000	
Design & Contingency Cost		$0	$0	$0	$0	
Cost Adjustment (justification req'd)		0%	0%	0%	0%	
Total Cost		$0	$578,000	$71,000	$205,000	

Traffic Operations:

	Alt 1		Alt 2		Alt 3		Alt 4		Alt 5
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro		Synchro		Synchro		Synchro		
Analysis Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	
2022 Design Yr Build Intersection Delay	29.7 sec	38.8 sec	13.2 sec	11.7 sec	51.5 sec	50.8 sec	0.0 sec	0.0 sec	
2022 Design Yr Build Intersection V/C	0.14	0.38	0.07	0.23	0.10	0.77	0.00	0.00	

Safety Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Predefined CRF: PDO	0%	31%	1%	39%	
Predefined CRF: Fatal/Inj	0%	53%	1%	40%	
Predefined CRF Source:	CRF unavailable; provide user defined CRF below	NC/MO Table 4-7	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 270 / 274	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 7982 / 7984	
User Defined CRF: PDO					
User Defined CRF: Fatal/Inj					
User Defined CRF Source (write in if applicable):					

Environmental Impacts:[1]

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Historic District/Property	None	None	None	None	
Archaeology Resources	None	None	None	None	
Graveyard	None	None	None	None	
Stream	None	None	None	None	
Underground Tank/Hazmat	None	None	None	None	
Park Land	None	None	None	None	
EJ Community	None	None	None	None	
Wooded Area	None	None	None	None	
Wetland	None	None	None	None	

Note: If environmental impact is significant (RED), provide justification impact won't jeopardize project delivery using "Env" worksheet
[1] Environmental impacts are only preliminary estimates; detailed environmental impact documentation will be included with project concept report

Stakeholder Posture:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Local Community Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	
GDOT Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Final ICE Stage 2 Score:	4.5	5.1	4.2	-	
Rank of Control Type Alternatives:	2	1	3	-	
Final Intersection Control Selection:	**1 - RCUT (stop control)**				

Note: Stage 2 score is not given (shown as "-") if signal or AWS is selected as control type but respective warrants are not met

Provide additional comments and/or explain any unique analysis inputs, or results (as necessary):

GDOT PI#:

Request By: HAMPO

County: Liberty

GDOT District: 5 - Jesup

Major Road: EG Miles Pkwy | Road Class: Minor Arterial | Speed Limit: 45 mph

Crossing Road: Live Oak Church | Road Class: Local | Speed Limit: 35 mph

Major Rd Direction: East/West | Area Type: Suburb/Transition

Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop) | Project ID:

Prepared By: Atlas Technical Consultants | Date:

Project Purpose:

Existing Data Year: 2022
Project Opening Year: 2025
Project Design Year: 2045
Annual Growth Rate: 0.5%
K Factor*: 10%

* K Factor = Proportion of average annual daily traffic occurring in the highest one hour of the day

LEGEND:

000 = AM Peak Approach Volume
(000) = PM Peak Approach Volume
[000] = ADT Volume (Estimate)

2022 EXISTING YEAR VOLUMES

APPROACH SPLITS:
EG Miles Pkwy: 95%
Live Oak Church: 5%

SB Live Oak Church

125 (85) [1900]

| (0) | (51) | (0) | (34) |
| 0 | 43 | 0 | 82 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy

| Peds | ⤸ | ⇩ | ⤵ | | Peds | 0 | (0) |

1176 (787) [18600]	(59)	40	⤷	2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 19,400	⤶	21	(24)	611 (1046) [18300]
	(728)	1,136	⇨		⇦	590	(1022)	
	(0)	0	⤸		⤹	0	(0)	

| (0) | 0 | Peds | ⤹ | ⇧ | ⤴ | Peds | |

EB EG Miles Pkwy

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |

0 (0) [0]

NB Live Oak Church

PEAK HR % TRUCKS:

EB	WB	NB	SB
0%	0%	0%	0%

2025 OPENING YEAR VOLUMES

SB Live Oak Church

125 (85) [1900]

| (0) | (51) | (0) | (34) |
| 0 | 43 | 0 | 82 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy

| Peds | ⤸ | ⇩ | ⤵ | | Peds | 0 | (0) |

1199 (802) [19000]	(59)	40	⤷	2025 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 19,750	⤶	21	(24)	623 (1067) [18600]
	(743)	1,159	⇨		⇦	602	(1043)	
	(0)	0	⤸		⤹	0	(0)	

| (0) | 0 | Peds | ⤹ | ⇧ | ⤴ | Peds | |

EB EG Miles Pkwy

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |

0 (0) [0]

NB Live Oak Church

2045 DESIGN YEAR VOLUMES

SB Live Oak Church

125 (85) [1900]

| (0) | (51) | (0) | (34) |
| 0 | 43 | 0 | 82 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy

| Peds | ⤸ | ⇩ | ⤵ | | Peds | 0 | (0) |

1320 (640) [20300]	(59)	40	⤷	2045 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 21,350	⤶	21	(24)	686 (1176) [20500]
	(581)	1,280	⇨		⇦	665	(1152)	
	(0)	0	⤸		⤹	0	(0)	

| (0) | 0 | Peds | ⤹ | ⇧ | ⤴ | Peds | |

EB EG Miles Pkwy

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |

0 (0) [0]

NB Live Oak Church

Introduction: In 2005, SAFETEA-LU established the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and mandated that each state prepare a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) to prioritize safety funding investments. Intersections quickly became a common component of most states' SHSP emphasis areas and HSIP project lists, including Georgia's SHSP. Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policies and procedures represent a traceable and transparent procedure to streamline the evaluation of intersection control alternatives, and further leverage safety advancements for intersection improvements beyond just the safety program. Approximately one-third of all traffic fatalities and roughly seventy five percent of all traffic crashes in Georgia occur at or adjacent to intersections. Accordingly, the Georgia SHSP includes an emphasis on enhancing intersection safety to advance the *Toward Zero Deaths* vision embraced by the Georgia Governor's Office of Highway Safety (GOHS). This ICE tool was developed to support the ICE policy, developed and adopted to help ensure that intersection investments across the entire Georgia highway system are selected, prioritized and implemented with defensible benefits for safety towards those ends.

Tool Goal: The goal of this ICE tool is to provide a simplified and consistent way of importing traffic, safety, cost, environmental impact and stakeholder posture data to assess and quantify intersection control improvement benefits. The tool supports the ICE policy and procedures to provide traceability, transparency, consistency and accountability when identifying and selecting an intersection control solution that both meets project purpose and reflects overall best value in terms of specific performance-based criteria.

Requirements: An ICE is required for any intersection improvement (e.g. new or modified intersection, widening/reconstruction or corridor project, or work accomplished through a driveway or encroachment permit that affects an intersection) where: **1)** the intersection includes at least one roadway designated as a State Route (State Highway System) or as part of the National Highway System; or **2)** the intersection will be designed or constructed using State or Federal funding. In certain circumstances where an ICE would otherwise be required, the requirement <u>may</u> be waived based on appropriate evidence presented with a written request. (See the **"Waiver"** tab to review criteria that may make a project waiver eligible and for instructions to submit a waiver request to the Department). An ICE is not required when the proposed work does not include any changes to the intersection design, involves only routine traffic signal timing and equipment maintenance, or for driveway permits where the driveway is not a new leg to an already existing intersection on either 1) a divided, multi-lane highway with a closed median and only right-in/right-out access or 2) an undivided roadway where the development is not required to construct left and/or right turn lanes (as per the Driveway Manual and District Traffic Engineer).

Two-Stage Process: A complete ICE process consists of two (2) distinct stages, and it is expected that the respective level of effort for completing both stages of ICE will correspond to the magnitude and complexity of the intersection. Prior to starting an ICE, the District Traffic Engineer and/or State Traffic Engineer should be consulted for advice on an appropriate level of effort. The Stage 1 and Stage 2 ICE forms are designed to minimize required data inputs using drop-down menu choices and limiting text entry. All fields shaded grey include drop down menu choices and all fields shaded blue require data entry. All other cells in the worksheet are locked.

Stage 1: Screening Decision Record Stage 1 should be conducted early in the project development process and is intended to inform which alternatives are worthy of further evaluation in Stage 2. Stage 1 serves as a screening effort meant to *eliminate* non-competitive options and identify which alternatives merit further considerations based on their practical feasibility. Users should use good engineering judgement in responding to the seven policy questions by selecting "Yes" or "No" in the drop-down boxes. Alternatives should not be summarily eliminated without due consideration, and reasons for eliminating or advancing an alternative should be documented in the "Screening Decision Justification" column.

Stage 2: Alternative Selection Decision Record Stage 2 involves a more detailed and familiar evaluation of the alternatives identified in Stage 1 in order to support the selection of a preferred alternative that may be advanced to detailed design. Stage 2 data entry may require the use of external analysis tools to determine costs, operations and/or safety data that, combined with environmental and stakeholder posture data, form the basis of the ICE evaluation. A separate "CostEst" worksheet tab helps users develop pre-planning-level cost estimates for each Stage 2 alternative evaluated, and a separate Users Guide has been prepared to give guidance on Stage 1 and Stage 2 data entry. Once all data is entered, each alternative is scored and ranked, with the results reported at the bottom of the Stage 2 worksheet to inform on the best of the intersection controls evaluated for project recommendation.

Documentation: A complete ICE document consists of the combination of the outputs from either a completed and signed waiver form or both Stage 1 and Stage 2 worksheets (along with supporting costing and/or environmental documentation), to be included in the approved project Concept Report (or equivalent) or as a stand-alone document.

GDOT ICE STAGE 1: SCREENING DECISION RECORD

ICE Version 2.21 | Revised 2/4/2022

GDOT PI #	
Project Location:	EG Miles Pkwy @ Live Oak Church
Existing Control:	Conventional (Minor Stop)
Prepared by:	Atlas Technical Consultants
Date:	

Note: Up to 5 alternatives may be selected and evaluated; Use this ICE Stage 1 to screen 5 or fewer alternatives to evaluate in Stage 2

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each policy question for each control type to identify which alternatives should be evaluated in the Stage 2 Decision Record; enter justification in the rightmost column

Column questions:
1. Does alternative address the project need in a balanced manner and in scale with the project?
2. Does alternative improve safety performance in terms of reducing severe crashes?
3. Does alternative incorporate safety, convenience and accessibility for pedestrians and/or bicyclists?
4. Does alternative improve (or preserve) traffic operations (congestion, delay, reliability, etc.)?
5. Does alternative appear feasible given the site characteristics, constrains & location context?
6. Does alternative appear feasible with respect to other project factors?
7. Overall feasible alternative (select alternative for further evaluation in Stage 2)?

Intersection Alternative (see "Intersections" tab for detailed description of intersection/interchange type)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Screening Decision Justification:
Unsignalized Intersections — Conventional (Minor Stop)	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	Existing Conidtions
Conventional (All-Way Stop)	No	**Yes**	**Yes**	No	**Yes**	No	No	Volume too high on the major street
Mini Roundabout	No	**Yes**	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
Single Lane Roundabout	No	**Yes**	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
Multilane Roundabout	No	**Yes**	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
RCUT (stop control)	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	Potential Alternative
RIRO w/down stream U-Turn	No	**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	No	Potential Alternative
High-T (unsignalized)	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	Potential Alternative
Offset-T Intersections	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	3 Leg intersection
Diamond Interch (Stop Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Diamond Interch (RAB Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Add LT Lanes on Live Oak Church / No RT Lane Improvements	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	Potential Alternative
Other unsignalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Signalized Intersections — Traffic Signal	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Median U-Turn (Indirect Left)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
RCUT (signalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Displaced Left Turn (CFI)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Continuous Green-T	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Jughandle	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Quadrant Roadway	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Diamond Interch (Signal Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Diverging Diamond	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Single Point Interchange	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
No LT Lane Improvements / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Other Signalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	

☐ = Intersection type selected for more detailed analysis in Stage 2 Alternative Selection Decision Record

Project Location: EG Miles Pkwy @ Live Oak Church   District: 5 - Jesup   GDOT PI #:
Existing Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop)   County: Liberty   Prepared by: Atlas Technical Cons
Type of Analysis: Safety Funded Project   Area: Suburb/Transitic   Date:

Opening / Design Year Traffic Operations

			Crash Data: Enter most recent 5 years of crash data	Crash Severity					Years:
				K*	A*	B*	C*	O	5
Intersection meets signal/AWS warrants?	None		Angle	0	0	0	0	4	15%
Traffic Analysis Measure of Effectiveness	Intersection Delay		Head-On	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro		Rear End	0	0	2	4	4	37%
Analysis Time Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	Sideswipe - same	0	0	0	0	6	22%
2025 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	89.6 sec	62.0 sec	Sideswipe - opposite	0	0	0	0	1	4%
2025 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.87	0.66	Not Collision w/Motor Veh	0	0	0	2	4	22%
2045 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	140.0 sec	100.8 sec	TOTALS:	0	0	2	6	19	27
2045 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	1.02	0.82							

Complete Streets Warrants Met?
☐ PEDESTRIANS
☐ BICYCLES
☐ TRANSIT

Crash Type

* Number of crashes resulting in injuries / fatalities, not number of persons

Alternatives Analysis:

	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3		Alternative 4		Alternative 5
Proposed Control Type/Improvement:	Conventional (Minor Stop)		RCUT (stop control)		High-T (unsignalized)		Add Left Turn Lanes		N/A
Project Cost: (From CostEst Worksheet)	*Additional description here*		*Additional description here*		*Additional description here*		*Additional description here*		
Construction Cost	$0		$330,000		$164,000		$127,000		
ROW Cost	$0		$226,000		$0		$0		
Environmental Cost	$0		$0		$0		$0		
Reimbursable Utility Cost	$0		$4,000		$2,000		$1,000		
Design & Contingency Cost	$0		$0		$0		$0		
Cost Adjustment (justification req'd)	0%		0%		0%		0%		
Total Cost	$0		$560,000		$166,000		$128,000		

Traffic Operations:

	Alt 1 AM	Alt 1 PM	Alt 2 AM	Alt 2 PM	Alt 3 AM	Alt 3 PM	Alt 4 AM	Alt 4 PM	
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro		Synchro		Synchro		Synchro		
Analysis Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	
2045 Design Yr Build Intersection Delay	140.0 sec	100.8 sec	12.4 sec	16.0 sec	21.1 sec	36.9 sec	95.2 sec	143.7 sec	
2045 Design Yr Build Intersection V/C	1.02	0.82	0.24	0.25	0.41	0.50	0.47	1.04	

Safety Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Predefined CRF: PDO	0%	31%	23%	2%	
Predefined CRF: Fatal/Inj	0%	53%	45%	2%	
Predefined CRF Source:	CRF unavailable; provide user defined CRF below	NC/MO Table 4-7	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 2753 / 2755	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 270 / 274	
User Defined CRF: PDO					
User Defined CRF: Fatal/Inj					
User Defined CRF Source (write in if applicable):					

Environmental Impacts:[1]

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Historic District/Property	None	None	None	None	
Archaeology Resources	None	None	None	None	
Graveyard	None	None	None	None	
Stream	None	None	None	None	
Underground Tank/Hazmat	None	None	None	None	
Park Land	None	None	None	None	
EJ Community	None	None	None	None	
Wooded Area	None	None	None	None	
Wetland	None	None	None	None	

*Note: If environmental impact is significant (**RED**), provide justification impact won't jeopardize project delivery using "Env" worksheet*
[1] Environmental impacts are only preliminary estimates; detailed environmental impact documentation will be included with project concept report

Stakeholder Posture:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Local Community Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	
GDOT Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Final ICE Stage 2 Score:	4.6	6.1	7.2	3.3	
Rank of Control Type Alternatives:	3	2	1	4	

Final Intersection Control Selection: **1 - High-T (unsignalized)**

Note: Stage 2 score is not given (shown as "-") if signal or AWS is selected as control type but respective warrants are not met

Provide additional comments and/or explain any unique analysis inputs, or results (as necessary):

TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS

INTERSECTION NAME: EG Miles Pkwy ar Live Oak Chruch Rd   COUNT DATE: Typical Weekday

INTERSECTION CONDITION:

MAJOR STREET: Main Street   EG Miles Pkwy   # OF APPROACH LANES: 2
MINOR STREET: Cross Street   Live Oak Church Rd   # OF APPROACH LANES: 1

ISOLATED COMMUNITY WITH POPULATION LESS THAN 10,000 (Y OR N):   N
85TH PERCENTILE SPEED GREATER THAN 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET (Y OR N):   Y

| | MAJOR ST BOTH APPROACHES | MINOR ST HIGHEST APPROACH | WARRANT 1, Condition A | | | WARRANT 1, Condition B | | | WARRANT 1, Combination Warrant | | | | | | WARRANT 2 | WARRANT 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | CONDITION A | | | CONDITION B | | | | |
			MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET		
THRESHOLD VALUES →			420	105		630	53		480	120		720	60			
06:00 AM TO 07:00 AM	902	37	Y			Y			Y			Y				
07:00 AM TO 08:00 AM	1,787	82	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
08:00 AM TO 09:00 AM	1,340	56	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				
09:00 AM TO 10:00 AM	1,098	48	Y			Y			Y			Y				
10:00 AM TO 11:00 AM	1,019	37	Y			Y			Y			Y				
11:00 AM TO 12:00 PM	1,152	31	Y			Y			Y			Y				
12:00 PM TO 01:00 PM	1,218	39	Y			Y			Y			Y				
01:00 PM TO 02:00 PM	1,262	34	Y			Y			Y			Y				
02:00 PM TO 03:00 PM	1,538	47	Y			Y			Y			Y				
03:00 PM TO 04:00 PM	1,537	35	Y			Y			Y			Y				
04:00 PM TO 05:00 PM	1,728	32	Y			Y			Y			Y				
05:00 PM TO 06:00 PM	1,897	35	Y			Y			Y			Y				
06:00 PM TO 07:00 PM	1,283	22	Y			Y			Y			Y				
07:00 PM TO 08:00 PM	948	23	Y			Y			Y			Y				
08:00 PM TO 09:00 PM	606	14	Y						Y							
09:00 PM TO 10:00 PM	499	12	Y						Y							
	19,814	584			0			2			0			1	1	1
			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS OF BOTH COND. A AND COND. B NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**						4 HRS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**	1 HR NEEDED **SATISFIED**

GDOT INTERSECTION CONTROL EVALUATION (ICE) TOOL

GDOT PI#:

Request By: HAMPO

County: Liberty

GDOT District: 5 - Jesup

Major Road: EG Miles Pkwy — Road Class: Minor Arterial — Speed Limit: 45 mph

Crossing Road: Live Oak Dr — Road Class: Local — Speed Limit: 35 mph

Major Rd Direction: East/West — Area Type: Suburb/Transition

Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop) — Project ID:

Prepared By: Atlas Technical Consultants — Date:

Project Purpose:

Existing Data Year: 2022
Project Opening Year: 2025
Project Design Year: 2045
Annual Growth Rate: 0.5%
K Factor*: 10%

*K Factor = Proportion of average annual daily traffic occurring in the highest one hour of the day

LEGEND:

000 = AM Peak Approach Volume
(000) = PM Peak Approach Volume
[000] = ADT Volume (Estimate)

2022 EXISTING YEAR VOLUMES

APPROACH SPLITS:
EG Miles Pkwy: 94%
Live Oak Dr: 6%

SB Live Oak Dr — 0 (0) [0]
(0) (0) (0) (0)
0 0 0 0

WB EG Miles Pkwy:
0 (0)
0 (0)
585 (1040)
26 (70)
611 (1110) [18800]

EB EG Miles Pkwy:
1176 (787) [18800]
(0) 0
(740) 1,128
(47) 48
(0) 0

2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 19,800

NB Live Oak Dr:
37 0 69 0
(50) (0) (33) (0)
106 (83) [2000]

PEAK HR % TRUCKS:

EB	WB	NB	SB
0%	0%	0%	0%

2025 OPENING YEAR VOLUMES

SB Live Oak Dr — 0 (0) [0]
(0) (0) (0) (0)
0 0 0 0

WB EG Miles Pkwy:
0 (0)
0 (0)
597 (1061)
39 (87)
636 (1148) [19400]

EB EG Miles Pkwy:
1206 (812) [19200]
(10) 7
(755) 1,151
(47) 48
(0) 0

2025 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 20,400

NB Live Oak Dr:
37 0 69 0
(50) (0) (33) (0)
106 (83) [2200]

2045 DESIGN YEAR VOLUMES

SB Live Oak Dr — 0 (0) [0]
(0) (0) (0) (0)
0 0 0 0

WB EG Miles Pkwy:
0 (0)
0 (0)
673 (1196)
39 (87)
712 (1283) [21700]

EB EG Miles Pkwy:
1352 (908) [21500]
(10) 7
(851) 1,297
(47) 48
(0) 0

2045 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 22,700

NB Live Oak Dr:
37 0 69 0
(50) (0) (33) (0)
106 (83) [2200]

Introduction: In 2005, SAFETEA-LU established the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and mandated that each state prepare a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) to prioritize safety funding investments. Intersections quickly became a common component of most states' SHSP emphasis areas and HSIP project lists, including Georgia's SHSP. Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policies and procedures represent a traceable and transparent procedure to streamline the evaluation of intersection control alternatives, and further leverage safety advancements for intersection improvements beyond just the safety program. Approximately one-third of all traffic fatalities and roughly seventy five percent of all traffic crashes in Georgia occur at or adjacent to intersections. Accordingly, the Georgia SHSP includes an emphasis on enhancing intersection safety to advance the *Toward Zero Deaths* vision embraced by the Georgia Governor's Office of Highway Safety (GOHS). This ICE tool was developed to support the ICE policy, developed and adopted to help ensure that intersection investments across the entire Georgia highway system are selected, prioritized and implemented with defensible benefits for safety towards those ends.

Tool Goal: The goal of this ICE tool is to provide a simplified and consistent way of importing traffic, safety, cost, environmental impact and stakeholder posture data to assess and quantify intersection control improvement benefits. The tool supports the ICE policy and procedures to provide traceability, transparency, consistency and accountability when identifying and selecting an intersection control solution that both meets project purpose and reflects overall best value in terms of specific performance-based criteria.

Requirements: An ICE is required for any intersection improvement (e.g. new or modified intersection, widening/reconstruction or corridor project, or work accomplished through a driveway or encroachment permit that affects an intersection) where: **1)** the intersection includes at least one roadway designated as a State Route (State Highway System) or as part of the National Highway System; or **2)** the intersection will be designed or constructed using State or Federal funding. In certain circumstances where an ICE would otherwise be required, the requirement may be waived based on appropriate evidence presented with a written request. (See the **"Waiver"** tab to review criteria that may make a project waiver eligible and for instructions to submit a waiver request to the Department). An ICE is not required when the proposed work does not include any changes to the intersection design, involves only routine traffic signal timing and equipment maintenance, or for driveway permits where the driveway is not a new leg to an already existing intersection on either 1) a divided, multi-lane highway with a closed median and only right-in/right-out access or 2) an undivided roadway where the development is not required to construct left and/or right turn lanes (as per the Driveway Manual and District Traffic Engineer).

Two-Stage Process: A complete ICE process consists of two (2) distinct stages, and it is expected that the respective level of effort for completing both stages of ICE will correspond to the magnitude and complexity of the intersection. Prior to starting an ICE, the District Traffic Engineer and/or State Traffic Engineer should be consulted for advice on an appropriate level of effort. The Stage 1 and Stage 2 ICE forms are designed to minimize required data inputs using drop-down menu choices and limiting text entry. All fields shaded grey include drop down menu choices and all fields shaded blue require data entry. All other cells in the worksheet are locked.

Stage 1: Screening Decision Record Stage 1 should be conducted early in the project development process and is intended to inform which alternatives are worthy of further evaluation in Stage 2. Stage 1 serves as a screening effort meant to *eliminate* non-competitive options and identify which alternatives merit further considerations based on their practical feasibility. Users should use good engineering judgement in responding to the seven policy questions by selecting "Yes" or "No" in the drop-down boxes. Alternatives should not be summarily eliminated without due consideration, and reasons for eliminating or advancing an alternative should be documented in the "Screening Decision Justification" column.

Stage 2: Alternative Selection Decision Record Stage 2 involves a more detailed and familiar evaluation of the alternatives identified in Stage 1 in order to support the selection of a preferred alternative that may be advanced to detailed design. Stage 2 data entry may require the use of external analysis tools to determine costs, operations and/or safety data that, combined with environmental and stakeholder posture data, form the basis of the ICE evaluation. A separate "CostEst" worksheet tab helps users develop pre-planning-level cost estimates for each Stage 2 alternative evaluated, and a separate Users Guide has been prepared to give guidance on Stage 1 and Stage 2 data entry. Once all data is entered, each alternative is scored and ranked, with the results reported at the bottom of the Stage 2 worksheet to inform on the best of the intersection controls evaluated for project recommendation.

Documentation: A complete ICE document consists of the combination of the outputs from either a completed and signed waiver form or both Stage 1 and Stage 2 worksheets (along with supporting costing and/or environmental documentation), to be included in the approved project Concept Report (or equivalent) or as a stand-alone document.

GDOT ICE STAGE 1: SCREENING DECISION RECORD

ICE Version 2.21 | Revised 2/4/2022

GDOT PI #	
Project Location:	EG Miles Pkwy @ Live Oak Dr
Existing Control:	Conventional (Minor Stop)
Prepared by:	Atlas Technical Consultants
Date:	

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each policy question for each control type to identify which alternatives should be evaluated in the Stage 2 Decision Record; enter justification in the rightmost column

Note: Up to 5 alternatives may be selected and evaluated; Use this ICE Stage 1 to screen 5 or fewer alternatives to evaluate in Stage 2

Column questions (angled headers):
1. Does alternative address the project need in a balanced manner and in scale with the project?
2. Does alternative improve safety performance in terms of reducing severe crashes?
3. Does alternative incorporate safety, convenience and accessibility for pedestrians and/or bicyclists?
4. Does alternative improve (or preserve) traffic operations (congestion, delay, reliability, etc.)?
5. Does alternative appear feasible given the site characteristics, constrains & location context?
6. Does alternative appear feasible with respect to other project factors?
7. Overall feasible alternative (select alternative for further evaluation in Stage 2)?

Intersection Alternative (see "Intersections" tab for detailed description of intersection/interchange type)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Screening Decision Justification:
Unsignalized Intersections — Conventional (Minor Stop)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Existing Conidtions
Conventional (All-Way Stop)	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Volume too high on the major street
Mini Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
Single Lane Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
Multilane Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
RCUT (stop control)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Potential Alternative
RIRO w/down stream U-Turn	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Potential Alternative
High-T (unsignalized)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	U-Turn Limitation
Offset-T Intersections	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	3 Leg intersection
Diamond Interch (Stop Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Diamond Interch (RAB Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Add LT Lanes on Live Oak Dr / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Potential Alternative
Other unsignalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Signalized Intersections — Traffic Signal	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Median U-Turn (Indirect Left)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
RCUT (signalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Displaced Left Turn (CFI)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Continuous Green-T	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Jughandle	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Quadrant Roadway	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Diamond Interch (Signal Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Diverging Diamond	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
Single Point Interchange	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Signal not warranted
No LT Lane Improvements / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Other Signalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	

☐ = Intersection type selected for more detailed analysis in Stage 2 Alternative Selection Decision Record

Project Location: EG Miles Pkwy @ Live Oak Dr

District: 5 - Jesup

GDOT PI #:

Existing Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop)

County: Liberty

Prepared by: Atlas Technical Cons

Type of Analysis: Safety Funded Project

Area: Suburb/Transitio

Date:

Opening / Design Year Traffic Operations

Intersection meets signal/AWS warrants?	None	
Traffic Analysis Measure of Effectiveness	Intersection Delay	
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro	
Analysis Time Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
2025 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	120.9 sec	125.8 sec
2025 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.96	0.91
2045 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	221.4 sec	205.9 sec
2045 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	1.21	1.12

Complete Streets Warrants Met?
- ☐ PEDESTRIANS
- ☐ BICYCLES
- ☐ TRANSIT

Crash Data: Enter most recent 5 years of crash data	Crash Severity					Years:
	K*	A*	B*	C*	O	5
Angle		0	1	5	13	40%
Head-On		0	0	2	2	8%
Rear End		1	0	2	8	23%
Sideswipe - same		0	0	0	9	19%
Sideswipe - opposite		0	0	1	2	6%
Not Collision w/Motor Veh		0	0	0	2	4%
TOTALS:	0	1	1	10	36	48

Crash Type (vertical label)

* Number of crashes resulting in injuries / fatalities, not number of persons

Alternatives Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Proposed Control Type/Improvement:	Conventional (Minor Stop)	RCUT (stop control)	Add Left Turn Lanes	N/A	N/A

Project Cost: (From CostEst Worksheet)

	Additional description here	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*		
Construction Cost	$0	$330,000	$127,000		
ROW Cost	$0	$226,000	$0		
Environmental Cost	$0	$0	$0		
Reimbursable Utility Cost	$0	$4,000	$1,000		
Design & Contingency Cost	$0	$0	$0		
Cost Adjustment (justification req'd)	0%	0%	0%		
Total Cost	$0	$560,000	$128,000		

Traffic Operations:

Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro		Synchro		Synchro					
Analysis Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr				
2045 Design Yr Build Intersection Delay	221.4 sec	205.9 sec	21.1 sec	13.3 sec	95.2 sec	143.7 sec				
2045 Design Yr Build Intersection V/C	1.21	1.12	0.39	0.21	0.47	1.04				

Safety Analysis:

Predefined CRF: PDO	0%	31%	2%		
Predefined CRF: Fatal/Inj	0%	53%	2%		
Predefined CRF Source:	CRF unavailable; provide user defined CRF below	NC/MO Table 4-7	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 270 / 274		
User Defined CRF: PDO					
User Defined CRF: Fatal/Inj					
User Defined CRF Source (write in if applicable):					

Environmental Impacts:[1]

Historic District/Property	None	None	None		
Archaeology Resources	None	None	None		
Graveyard	None	None	None		
Stream	None	None	None		
Underground Tank/Hazmat	None	None	None		
Park Land	None	None	None		
EJ Community	None	None	None		
Wooded Area	None	None	None		
Wetland	None	None	None		

Note: If environmental impact is significant (RED), provide justification impact won't jeopardize project delivery using "Env" worksheet

[1] Environmental impacts are only preliminary estimates; detailed environmental impact documentation will be included with project concept report

Stakeholder Posture:

Local Community Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		
GDOT Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		

Final ICE Stage 2 Score:	4.3	6.0	4.9		
Rank of Control Type Alternatives:	3	1	2		
Final Intersection Control Selection:	**1 - RCUT (stop control)**				

Note: Stage 2 score is not given (shown as "-") if signal or AWS is selected as control type but respective warrants are not met

Provide additional comments and/or explain any unique analysis inputs, or results (as necessary):

TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS

INTERSECTION NAME: EG Miles Pkwy at Live Oak Dr   COUNT DATE: Typical Weekday

INTERSECTION CONDITION:

MAJOR STREET: Main Street   EG Miles Pkwy   # OF APPROACH LANES: 2
MINOR STREET: Cross Street   Live Oak Dr   # OF APPROACH LANES: 1

ISOLATED COMMUNITY WITH POPULATION LESS THAN 10,000 (Y OR N):   N
85TH PERCENTILE SPEED GREATER THAN 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET (Y OR N):   Y

| | MAJOR ST BOTH APPROACHES | MINOR ST HIGHEST APPROACH | WARRANT 1, Condition A | | | WARRANT 1, Condition B | | | WARRANT 1, Combination Warrant | | | | | | WARRANT 2 | WARRANT 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | CONDITION A | | | CONDITION B | | | | |
			MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET		
THRESHOLD VALUES ⟶			420	105		630	53		480	120		720	60			
06:00 AM TO 07:00 AM	902	18	Y			Y			Y			Y				
07:00 AM TO 08:00 AM	1,787	36	Y			Y			Y			Y				
08:00 AM TO 09:00 AM	1,340	37	Y			Y			Y			Y				
09:00 AM TO 10:00 AM	1,098	36	Y			Y			Y			Y				
10:00 AM TO 11:00 AM	1,019	32	Y			Y			Y			Y				
11:00 AM TO 12:00 PM	1,152	26	Y			Y			Y			Y				
12:00 PM TO 01:00 PM	1,218	44	Y			Y			Y			Y				
01:00 PM TO 02:00 PM	1,262	45	Y			Y			Y			Y				
02:00 PM TO 03:00 PM	1,538	43	Y			Y			Y			Y				
03:00 PM TO 04:00 PM	1,537	46	Y			Y			Y			Y				
04:00 PM TO 05:00 PM	1,728	58	Y			Y	Y	**Y**	Y			Y				
05:00 PM TO 06:00 PM	1,897	49	Y			Y			Y			Y				
06:00 PM TO 07:00 PM	1,283	45	Y			Y			Y			Y				
07:00 PM TO 08:00 PM	948	34	Y			Y			Y			Y				
08:00 PM TO 09:00 PM	606	23	Y						Y							
09:00 PM TO 10:00 PM	499	16	Y						Y							
	19,814	588			0			1			0			0	0	0
			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS OF BOTH COND. A AND COND. B NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**						4 HRS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**	1 HR NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**

GDOT Georgia Department of Transportation

GDOT PI#: ____

Request By: HAMPO

County: Liberty

GDOT District: 5 - Jesup

Major Road: EG Miles Pkwy | Road Class: Minor Arterial | Speed Limit: 45 mph

Crossing Road: Miles Xing | Road Class: Local | Speed Limit: 35 mph

Major Rd Direction: East/West | Area Type: Suburb/Transition

Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop) | Project ID: ____

Prepared By: Atlas Technical Consultants | Date: ____

Project Purpose: ____

Existing Data Year: 2022
Project Opening Year: 2025
Project Design Year: 2045
Annual Growth Rate: 0.5%
K Factor*: 10%

* K Factor = Proportion of average annual daily traffic occurring in the highest one hour of the day

LEGEND:

000 = AM Peak Approach Volume
(000) = PM Peak Approach Volume
[000] = ADT Volume (Estimate)

2022 EXISTING YEAR VOLUMES

APPROACH SPLITS:
EG Miles Pkwy: 90%
Miles Xing: 10%

SB Miles Xing: 195 (118) [3200]

| (0) | (71) | (0) | (47) |
| 0 | 68 | 0 | 127 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy: 658 (654) [18800]

EB EG Miles Pkwy: 1197 (814) [18300]

(117)	101
(697)	1,096
(0)	0
(0)	0

2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 20,500

24	(50)
569	(544)
65	(60)

NB Miles Xing

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |

0 (0) [700]

PEAK HR % TRUCKS:

EB	WB	NB	SB
0%	0%	0%	0%

2025 OPENING YEAR VOLUMES

SB Miles Xing: 195 (118) [3200]

| (0) | (71) | (0) | (47) |
| 0 | 68 | 0 | 127 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy: 699 (1106) [19100]

EB EG Miles Pkwy: 1219 (828) [19000]

(117)	101
(711)	1,118
(0)	0
(0)	0

2025 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 20,650

24	(50)
580	(996)
65	(60)

NB Miles Xing

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |

0 (0) [0]

2045 DESIGN YEAR VOLUMES

SB Miles Xing: 195 (118) [3200]

| (0) | (71) | (0) | (47) |
| 0 | 68 | 0 | 127 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy: 730 (1220) [20900]

EB EG Miles Pkwy: 1336 (903) [20800]

(117)	101
(786)	1,235
(0)	0
(0)	0

2045 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 22,450

24	(50)
641	(1110)
65	(60)

NB Miles Xing

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |

0 (0) [0]

Introduction: In 2005, SAFETEA-LU established the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and mandated that each state prepare a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) to prioritize safety funding investments. Intersections quickly became a common component of most states' SHSP emphasis areas and HSIP project lists, including Georgia's SHSP. Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policies and procedures represent a traceable and transparent procedure to streamline the evaluation of intersection control alternatives, and further leverage safety advancements for intersection improvements beyond just the safety program. Approximately one-third of all traffic fatalities and roughly seventy five percent of all traffic crashes in Georgia occur at or adjacent to intersections. Accordingly, the Georgia SHSP includes an emphasis on enhancing intersection safety to advance the *Toward Zero Deaths* vision embraced by the Georgia Governor's Office of Highway Safety (GOHS). This ICE tool was developed to support the ICE policy, developed and adopted to help ensure that intersection investments across the entire Georgia highway system are selected, prioritized and implemented with defensible benefits for safety towards those ends.

Tool Goal: The goal of this ICE tool is to provide a simplified and consistent way of importing traffic, safety, cost, environmental impact and stakeholder posture data to assess and quantify intersection control improvement benefits. The tool supports the ICE policy and procedures to provide traceability, transparency, consistency and accountability when identifying and selecting an intersection control solution that both meets project purpose and reflects overall best value in terms of specific performance-based criteria.

Requirements: An ICE is required for any intersection improvement (e.g. new or modified intersection, widening/reconstruction or corridor project, or work accomplished through a driveway or encroachment permit that affects an intersection) where: **1)** the intersection includes at least one roadway designated as a State Route (State Highway System) or as part of the National Highway System; or **2)** the intersection will be designed or constructed using State or Federal funding. In certain circumstances where an ICE would otherwise be required, the requirement may be waived based on appropriate evidence presented with a written request. (See the **"Waiver"** tab to review criteria that may make a project waiver eligible and for instructions to submit a waiver request to the Department). An ICE is not required where the proposed work does not include any changes to the intersection design, involves only routine traffic signal timing and equipment maintenance, or for driveway permits where the driveway is not a new leg to an already existing intersection on either 1) a divided, multi-lane highway with a closed median and only right-in/right-out access or 2) an undivided roadway where the development is not required to construct left and/or right turn lanes (as per the Driveway Manual and District Traffic Engineer).

Two-Stage Process: A complete ICE process consists of two (2) distinct stages, and it is expected that the respective level of effort for completing both stages of ICE will correspond to the magnitude and complexity of the intersection. Prior to starting an ICE, the District Traffic Engineer and/or State Traffic Engineer should be consulted for advice on an appropriate level of effort. The Stage 1 and Stage 2 ICE forms are designed to minimize required data inputs using drop-down menu choices and limiting text entry. All fields shaded grey include drop down menu choices and all fields shaded blue require data entry. All other cells in the worksheet are locked.

Stage 1: Screening Decision Record Stage 1 should be conducted early in the project development process and is intended to inform which alternatives are worthy of further evaluation in Stage 2. Stage 1 serves as a screening effort meant to *eliminate* non-competitive options and identify which alternatives merit further considerations based on their practical feasibility. Users should use good engineering judgement in responding to the seven policy questions by selecting "Yes" or "No" in the drop-down boxes. Alternatives should not be summarily eliminated without due consideration, and reasons for eliminating or advancing an alternative should be documented in the "Screening Decision Justification" column.

Stage 2: Alternative Selection Decision Record Stage 2 involves a more detailed and familiar evaluation of the alternatives identified in Stage 1 in order to support the selection of a preferred alternative that may be advanced to detailed design. Stage 2 data entry may require the use of external analysis tools to determine costs, operations and/or safety data that, combined with environmental and stakeholder posture data, form the basis of the ICE evaluation. A separate "CostEst" worksheet tab helps users develop pre-planning-level cost estimates for each Stage 2 alternative evaluated, and a separate Users Guide has been prepared to give guidance on Stage 1 and Stage 2 data entry. Once all data is entered, each alternative is scored and ranked, with the results reported at the bottom of the Stage 2 worksheet to inform on the best of the intersection controls evaluated for project recommendation.

Documentation: A complete ICE document consists of the combination of the outputs from either a completed and signed waiver form or both Stage 1 and Stage 2 worksheets (along with supporting costing and/or environmental documentation), to be included in the approved project Concept Report (or equivalent) or as a stand-alone document.

GDOT ICE STAGE 1: SCREENING DECISION RECORD

GDOT PI #	
Project Location:	EG Miles Pkwy @ Miles Xing
Existing Control:	Conventional (Minor Stop)
Prepared by:	Atlas Technical Consultants
Date:	

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each policy question for each control type to identify which alternatives should be evaluated in the Stage 2 Decision Record; enter justification in the rightmost column

Note: Up to 5 alternatives may be selected and evaluated; Use this ICE Stage 1 to screen 5 or fewer alternatives to evaluate in Stage 2

Column questions:
1. Does alternative address the project need in a balanced manner and in scale with the project?
2. Does alternative improve safety performance in terms of reducing severe crashes?
3. Does alternative incorporate safety, convenience and accessibility for pedestrians and/or bicyclists?
4. Does alternative improve (or preserve) traffic operations (congestion, delay, reliability, etc.)?
5. Does alternative appear feasible given the site characteristics, constrains & location context?
6. Does alternative appear feasible with respect to other project factors?
7. Overall feasible alternative (select alternative for further evaluation in Stage 2)?

Intersection Alternative (see "Intersections" tab for detailed description of intersection/interchange type)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Screening Decision Justification:
Unsignalized Intersections — Conventional (Minor Stop)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Existing Conidtions
Conventional (All-Way Stop)	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Volume too high on the major street
Mini Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
Single Lane Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
Multilane Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
RCUT (stop control)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Left turn Volumes too high
RIRO w/down stream U-Turn	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Left turn Volumes too high
High-T (unsignalized)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	U Turn Volumes
Offset-T Intersections	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	3 Leg intersection
Diamond Interch (Stop Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Diamond Interch (RAB Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Add LT Lanes on Miles Xing / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Potential Alternative
Other unsignalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Signalized Intersections — Traffic Signal	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Potential Alternative
Median U-Turn (Indirect Left)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Left turn Volumes too high
RCUT (signalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Left turn Volumes too high
Displaced Left Turn (CFI)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Not feasible
Continuous Green-T	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	U Turn Volumes
Jughandle	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	3 Leg intersection
Quadrant Roadway	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	4 Leg intersection
Diamond Interch (Signal Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Diverging Diamond	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Single Point Interchange	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
No LT Lane Improvements / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Other Signalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	

☐ = Intersection type selected for more detailed analysis in Stage 2 Alternative Selection Decision Record

GDOT ICE STAGE 2: ALTERNATIVE SELECTION DECISION RECORD

ICE Version 2.21 | Revised 2/4/2022

Project Location: EG Miles Pkwy @ Miles Xing   District: 5 - Jesup   GDOT PI #:
Existing Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop)   County: Liberty   Prepared by: Atlas Technical Cons
Type of Analysis: Safety Funded Project   Area: Suburb/Transitic   Date:

Opening / Design Year Traffic Operations

Intersection meets signal/AWS warrants?	Meets Signal Warrants	
Traffic Analysis Measure of Effectiveness	Intersection Delay	
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro	

Complete Streets Warrants Met?
☐ PEDESTRIANS
☐ BICYCLES
☐ TRANSIT

	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
Analysis Time Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
2025 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	500.0 sec	314.0 sec
2025 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	3.35	1.42
2045 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	500.0 sec	500.0 sec
2045 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	4.28	1.87

Crash Data: Enter most recent 5 years of crash data	Crash Severity					Years: 5
	K*	A*	B*	C*	O	
Angle	0	1	0	3	4	42%
Head-On	0	0	0	0	2	11%
Rear End	0	0	0	1	4	26%
Sideswipe - same	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Sideswipe - opposite	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Not Collision w/Motor Veh	0	0	0	0	4	21%
TOTALS:	0	1	0	4	14	19

Crash Type

* Number of crashes resulting in injuries / fatalities, not number of persons

Alternatives Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Proposed Control Type/Improvement:	Conventional (Minor Stop)	Add Left Turn Lanes	Traffic Signal	N/A	N/A
Project Cost: (From CostEst Worksheet)	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*	*Add LT bay(s) on minor ST*		
Construction Cost	$0	$114,000	$136,000		
ROW Cost	$0	$0	$0		
Environmental Cost	$0	$0	$0		
Reimbursable Utility Cost	$0	$1,000	$3,000		
Design & Contingency Cost	$0	$0	$0		
Cost Adjustment (justification req'd)	0%	0%	0%		
Total Cost	$0	$115,000	$139,000		

Traffic Operations:

	Alt 1		Alt 2		Alt 3			
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro		Synchro		Synchro			
Analysis Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr		
2045 Design Yr Build Intersection Delay	500.0 sec	500.0 sec	500.0 sec	247.4 sec	12.7 sec	12.8 sec		
2045 Design Yr Build Intersection V/C	4.28	1.87	4.12	1.70	0.76	0.84		

Safety Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3		
Predefined CRF: PDO	0%	4%	39%		
Predefined CRF: Fatal/Inj	0%	3%	40%		
Predefined CRF Source:	CRF unavailable; provide user defined CRF below	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 270 / 274	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 7982 / 7984		
User Defined CRF: PDO					
User Defined CRF: Fatal/Inj					
User Defined CRF Source (write in if applicable):					

Environmental Impacts:[1]

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3		
Historic District/Property	None	None	None		
Archaeology Resources	None	None	None		
Graveyard	None	None	None		
Stream	None	None	None		
Underground Tank/Hazmat	None	None	None		
Park Land	None	None	None		
EJ Community	None	None	None		
Wooded Area	None	None	None		
Wetland	None	None	None		

Note: If environmental impact is significant (RED), provide justification impact won't jeopardize project delivery using "Env" worksheet
[1] Environmental impacts are only preliminary estimates; detailed environmental impact documentation will be included with project concept report

Stakeholder Posture:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3		
Local Community Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		
GDOT Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3		
Final ICE Stage 2 Score:	1.9	1.1	5.2		
Rank of Control Type Alternatives:	2	3	1		
Final Intersection Control Selection:	**1 - Traffic Signal**				

Note: Stage 2 score is not given (shown as "-") if signal or AWS is selected as control type but respective warrants are not met

Provide additional comments and/or explain any unique analysis inputs, or results (as necessary):

TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS

INTERSECTION NAME: EG Miles at Miles Xing   COUNT DATE: Typical Weekday

INTERSECTION CONDITION:

MAJOR STREET: Main Street EG Miles	# OF APPROACH LANES:	2
MINOR STREET: Cross Street Miles Xing	# OF APPROACH LANES:	1

ISOLATED COMMUNITY WITH POPULATION LESS THAN 10,000 (Y OR N): N
85TH PERCENTILE SPEED GREATER THAN 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET (Y OR N): Y

Time	MAJOR ST BOTH APPROACHES	MINOR ST HIGHEST APPROACH	W1 Cond A MAJOR STREET	W1 Cond A MINOR STREET	W1 Cond A BOTH MET	W1 Cond B MAJOR STREET	W1 Cond B MINOR STREET	W1 Cond B BOTH MET	Combo Cond A MAJOR STREET	Combo Cond A MINOR STREET	Combo Cond A BOTH MET	Combo Cond B MAJOR STREET	Combo Cond B MINOR STREET	Combo Cond B BOTH MET	WARRANT 2	WARRANT 3
THRESHOLD VALUES →			420	105		630	53		480	120		720	60			
06:00 AM TO 07:00 AM	902	62	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	
07:00 AM TO 08:00 AM	1,787	123	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
08:00 AM TO 09:00 AM	1,340	118	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
09:00 AM TO 10:00 AM	1,098	62	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	
10:00 AM TO 11:00 AM	1,019	53	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				
11:00 AM TO 12:00 PM	1,152	40	Y			Y			Y			Y				
12:00 PM TO 01:00 PM	1,218	63	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	
01:00 PM TO 02:00 PM	1,262	47	Y			Y			Y			Y				
02:00 PM TO 03:00 PM	1,538	55	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				
03:00 PM TO 04:00 PM	1,537	35	Y			Y			Y			Y				
04:00 PM TO 05:00 PM	1,728	44	Y			Y			Y			Y				
05:00 PM TO 06:00 PM	1,897	44	Y			Y			Y			Y				
06:00 PM TO 07:00 PM	1,283	29	Y			Y			Y			Y				
07:00 PM TO 08:00 PM	948	25	Y			Y			Y			Y				
08:00 PM TO 09:00 PM	606	24	Y						Y							
09:00 PM TO 10:00 PM	499	11	Y						Y							
	19,814	835			2			7			1			5	5	2
			8 HOURS NEEDED NOT SATISFIED			8 HOURS NEEDED NOT SATISFIED			8 HOURS OF BOTH COND. A AND COND. B NEEDED NOT SATISFIED						4 HRS NEEDED SATISFIED	1 HR NEEDED SATISFIED

GDOT PI#: _____

Request By: HAMPO

County: Liberty

GDOT District: 5 - Jesup

Major Road: EG Miles Pkwy | Road Class: Minor Arterial | Speed Limit: 45 mph

Crossing Road: Pineland Ave | Road Class: Local | Speed Limit: 35 mph

Major Rd Direction: East/West | Area Type: Suburb/Transition

Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop) | Project ID: _____

Prepared By: Atlas Technical Consultants | Date: _____

Project Purpose: _____

Existing Data Year: 2022
Project Opening Year: 2025
Project Design Year: 2045
Annual Growth Rate: 0.5%
K Factor*: 10%

* K Factor = Proportion of average annual daily traffic occurring in the highest one hour of the day

LEGEND:

000 = AM Peak Approach Volume
(000) = PM Peak Approach Volume
[000] = ADT Volume (Estimate)

2022 EXISTING YEAR VOLUMES

APPROACH SPLITS:

EG Miles Pkwy: 89%
Pineland Ave: 11%

SB Pineland Ave

0 (0) [0]

| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy

Peds	↱	⇓	↲	Peds	0	(0)
1176 (787) [18400]	(0)	0	⇗	2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 20,650	⇖	0	(0)	624 (1127) [18700]
	(685)	1,096	⇒		⇐	569	(957)	
	(102)	80	⇘		⇙	55	(170)	
	(0)	0	Peds	↰	⇑	↱	Peds	

EB EG Miles Pkwy

| 59 | 0 | 112 | 0 |
| (91) | (0) | (61) | (0) |

171 (152) [4200]

NB Pineland Ave

PEAK HR % TRUCKS:

EB	WB	NB	SB
2%	2%	0%	0%

2025 OPENING YEAR VOLUMES

SB Pineland Ave

0 (0) [0]

| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy

Peds	↱	⇓	↲	Peds	0	(0)
1205.08494868 5 810.8030929281 25	(10)	7	⇗	2025 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 21,050	⇖	0	(0)	635.465634855625
	(699)	1,118	⇒		⇐	580	(976)	
	(102)	80	⇘		⇙	55	(170)	
	(0)	0	Peds	↰	⇑	↱	Peds	

EB EG Miles Pkwy

| 59 | 0 | 112 | 0 |
| (91) | (0) | (61) | (0) |

171 (152) [4200]

NB Pineland Ave

2045 DESIGN YEAR VOLUMES

SB Pineland Ave

0 (0) [0]

| (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

WB EG Miles Pkwy

Peds	↱	⇓	↲	Peds	0	(0)
1322.36711472 111 884.10446700691	(10)	7	⇗	2045 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 22,750	⇖	0	(0)	696.35391266086 6
	(772)	1,235	⇒		⇐	641	(1079)	
	(102)	80	⇘		⇙	55	(170)	
	(0)	0	Peds	↰	⇑	↱	Peds	

EB EG Miles Pkwy

| 59 | 0 | 112 | 0 |
| (91) | (0) | (61) | (0) |

171 (152) [4200]

NB Pineland Ave

Introduction: In 2005, SAFETEA-LU established the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and mandated that each state prepare a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) to prioritize safety funding investments. Intersections quickly became a common component of most states' SHSP emphasis areas and HSIP project lists, including Georgia's SHSP. Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policies and procedures represent a traceable and transparent procedure to streamline the evaluation of intersection control alternatives, and further leverage safety advancements for intersection improvements beyond just the safety program. Approximately one-third of all traffic fatalities and roughly seventy five percent of all traffic crashes in Georgia occur at or adjacent to intersections. Accordingly, the Georgia SHSP includes an emphasis on enhancing intersection safety to advance the *Toward Zero Deaths* vision embraced by the Georgia Governor's Office of Highway Safety (GOHS). This ICE tool was developed to support the ICE policy, developed and adopted to help ensure that intersection investments across the entire Georgia highway system are selected, prioritized and implemented with defensible benefits for safety towards those ends.

Tool Goal: The goal of this ICE tool is to provide a simplified and consistent way of importing traffic, safety, cost, environmental impact and stakeholder posture data to assess and quantify intersection control improvement benefits. The tool supports the ICE policy and procedures to provide traceability, transparency, consistency and accountability when identifying and selecting an intersection control solution that both meets project purpose and reflects overall best value in terms of specific performance-based criteria.

Requirements: An ICE is required for any intersection improvement (e.g. new or modified intersection, widening/reconstruction or corridor project, or work accomplished through a driveway or encroachment permit that affects an intersection) where: **1)** the intersection includes at least one roadway designated as a State Route (State Highway System) or as part of the National Highway System; or **2)** the intersection will be designed or constructed using State or Federal funding. In certain circumstances where an ICE would otherwise be required, the requirement may be waived based on appropriate evidence presented with a written request. (See the "**Waiver**" tab to review criteria that may make a project waiver eligible and for instructions to submit a waiver request to the Department). An ICE is not required when the proposed work does not include any changes to the intersection design, involves only routine traffic signal timing and equipment maintenance, or for driveway permits where the driveway is not a new leg to an already existing intersection on either 1) a divided, multi-lane highway with a closed median and only right-in/right-out access or 2) an undivided roadway where the development is not required to construct left and/or right turn lanes (as per the Driveway Manual and District Traffic Engineer).

Two-Stage Process: A complete ICE process consists of two (2) distinct stages, and it is expected that the respective level of effort for completing both stages of ICE will correspond to the magnitude and complexity of the intersection. Prior to starting an ICE, the District Traffic Engineer and/or State Traffic Engineer should be consulted for advice on an appropriate level of effort. The Stage 1 and Stage 2 ICE forms are designed to minimize required data inputs using drop-down menu choices and limiting text entry. All fields shaded grey include drop down menu choices and all fields shaded blue require data entry. All other cells in the worksheet are locked.

Stage 1: Screening Decision Record Stage 1 should be conducted early in the project development process and is intended to inform which alternatives are worthy of further evaluation in Stage 2. Stage 1 serves as a screening effort meant to *eliminate* non-competitive options and identify which alternatives merit further considerations based on their practical feasibility. Users should use good engineering judgement in responding to the seven policy questions by selecting "Yes" or "No" in the drop-down boxes. Alternatives should not be summarily eliminated without due consideration, and reasons for eliminating or advancing an alternative should be documented in the "Screening Decision Justification" column.

Stage 2: Alternative Selection Decision Record Stage 2 involves a more detailed and familiar evaluation of the alternatives identified in Stage 1 in order to support the selection of a preferred alternative that may be advanced to detailed design. Stage 2 data entry may require the use of external analysis tools to determine costs, operations and/or safety data that, combined with environmental and stakeholder posture data, form the basis of the ICE evaluation. A separate "CostEst" worksheet tab helps users develop pre-planning-level cost estimates for each Stage 2 alternative evaluated, and a separate Users Guide has been prepared to give guidance on Stage 1 and Stage 2 data entry. Once all data is entered, each alternative is scored and ranked, with the results reported at the bottom of the Stage 2 worksheet to inform on the best of the intersection controls evaluated for project recommendation.

Documentation: A complete ICE document consists of the combination of the outputs from either a completed and signed waiver form or both Stage 1 and Stage 2 worksheets (along with supporting costing and/or environmental documentation), to be included in the approved project Concept Report (or equivalent) or as a stand-alone document.

GDOT Georgia Department of Transportation

ICE Version 2.21 | Revised 2/4/2022

GDOT PI #	
Project Location:	EG Miles Pkwy @ Pineland Ave
Existing Control:	Conventional (Minor Stop)
Prepared by:	Atlas Technical Consultants
Date:	

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each policy question for each control type to identify which alternatives should be evaluated in the Stage 2 Decision Record; enter justification in the rightmost column

Note: Up to 5 alternatives may be selected and evaluated; Use this ICE Stage 1 to screen 5 or fewer alternatives to evaluate in Stage 2

Intersection Alternative (see "Intersections" tab for detailed description of intersection/interchange type)

Column questions:
1. Does alternative address the project need in a balanced manner and in scale with the project?
2. Does alternative improve safety performance in terms of reducing severe crashes?
3. Does alternative incorporate safety, convenience and accessibility for pedestrians and/or bicyclists?
4. Does alternative improve (or preserve) traffic operations (congestion, delay, reliability, etc.)?
5. Does alternative appear feasible given the site characteristics, constrains & location context?
6. Does alternative appear feasible with respect to other project factors?
7. Overall feasible alternative (select alternative for further evaluation in Stage 2)?

Group	Intersection Alternative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Screening Decision Justification:
Unsignalized Intersections	Conventional (Minor Stop)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Existing Conidtions
	Conventional (All-Way Stop)	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Volume too high on the major street
	Mini Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
	Single Lane Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
	Multilane Roundabout	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Non balance volumes
	RCUT (stop control)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Left turn Volume too high
	RIRO w/down stream U-Turn	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Left turn Volume too high
	High-T (unsignalized)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Potential Alternative
	Offset-T Intersections	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	3 Leg intersection
	Diamond Interch (Stop Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
	Diamond Interch (RAB Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
	Add LT Lanes on Pineland Ave / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Potential Alternative
	Other unsignalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Signalized Intersections	Traffic Signal	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Potential Alternative
	Median U-Turn (Indirect Left)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Left turn Volume too high
	RCUT (signalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Left turn Volume too high
	Displaced Left Turn (CFI)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Left turn Volume too high
	Continuous Green-T	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Potential Alternative
	Jughandle	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	3 Leg intersection
	Quadrant Roadway	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	4 Leg intersection
	Diamond Interch (Signal Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
	Diverging Diamond	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
	Single Point Interchange	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
	No LT Lane Improvements / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
	Other Signalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	

☐ = Intersection type selected for more detailed analysis in Stage 2 Alternative Selection Decision Record

Project Location: EG Miles Pkwy @ Pineland Ave — **District:** 5 - Jesup — **GDOT PI #:**
Existing Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop) — **County:** Liberty — **Prepared by:** Atlas Technical Cons
Type of Analysis: Safety Funded Project — **Area:** Suburb/Transitio — **Date:**

Opening / Design Year Traffic Operations

Intersection meets signal/AWS warrants?	Meets Signal Warrants	
Traffic Analysis Measure of Effectiveness	Intersection Delay	
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro	

	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
Analysis Time Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
2025 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	340.3 sec	500.0 sec
2025 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	1.56	2.22
2045 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	500.0 sec	500.0 sec
2045 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	1.97	2.86

Complete Streets Warrants Met?
☐ PEDESTRIANS
☐ BICYCLES
☐ TRANSIT

Crash Data: Enter most recent 5 years of crash data	Crash Severity					Years:
	K*	A*	B*	C*	O	5
Angle	0	0	2	11	29	59%
Head-On	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Rear End	0	0	1	5	11	24%
Sideswipe - same	0	0	0	0	6	8%
Sideswipe - opposite	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Not Collision w/Motor Veh	0	0	0	0	4	6%
TOTALS:	0	0	3	16	52	71

(Crash Type label on left side)

* Number of crashes resulting in injuries / fatalities, not number of persons

Alternatives Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Proposed Control Type/Improvement:	Conventional (Minor Stop)	High-T (unsignalized)	Add Left Turn Lanes	Traffic Signal	Continuous Green-T
Project Cost: (From CostEst Worksheet)	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*	*Add LT bays all approaches*	*Additional description here*
Construction Cost	$0	$147,000	$114,000	$181,000	$147,000
ROW Cost	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Environmental Cost	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Reimbursable Utility Cost	$0	$2,000	$1,000	$4,000	$2,000
Design & Contingency Cost	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Cost Adjustment (justification req'd)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Cost	$0	$149,000	$115,000	$185,000	$149,000

Traffic Operations:

Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro		Synchro		Synchro		Synchro		Synchro	
Analysis Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
2045 Design Yr Build Intersection Delay	500.0 sec	500.0 sec	223.6 sec	146.6 sec	483.1 sec	500.0 sec	13.1 sec	6.4 sec	14.1 sec	7.3 sec
2045 Design Yr Build Intersection V/C	1.97	2.86	1.30	1.06	1.59	2.73	0.79	0.46	0.75	0.49

Safety Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Predefined CRF: PDO	0%	23%	4%	39%	39%
Predefined CRF: Fatal/Inj	0%	45%	4%	40%	49%
Predefined CRF Source:	CRF unavailable; provide user defined CRF below	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 2753 / 2755	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 270 / 274	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 7982 / 7984	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 7982/8655 / 7984/8656
User Defined CRF: PDO					
User Defined CRF: Fatal/Inj					
User Defined CRF Source (write in if applicable):					

Environmental Impacts:[1]

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Historic District/Property	None	None	None	None	None
Archaeology Resources	None	None	None	None	None
Graveyard	None	None	None	None	None
Stream	None	None	None	None	None
Underground Tank/Hazmat	None	None	None	None	None
Park Land	None	None	None	None	None
EJ Community	None	None	None	None	None
Wooded Area	None	None	None	None	None
Wetland	None	None	None	None	None

Note: If environmental impact is significant (RED), provide justification impact won't jeopardize project delivery using "Env" worksheet
[1] Environmental impacts are only preliminary estimates; detailed environmental impact documentation will be included with project concept report

Stakeholder Posture:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Local Community Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
GDOT Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Final ICE Stage 2 Score:	2.7	5.3	2.6	5.5	6.3
Rank of Control Type Alternatives:	4	3	5	2	1

Final Intersection Control Selection: 1 - Continuous Green-T

Note: Stage 2 score is not given (shown as "-") if signal or AWS is selected as control type but respective warrants are not met

Provide additional comments and/or explain any unique analysis inputs, or results (as necessary):

TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS

INTERSECTION NAME: EG Miles at Pineland Ave   COUNT DATE: Typical Weekday

INTERSECTION CONDITION:

MAJOR STREET: Main Street   EG Miles Pkwy   # OF APPROACH LANES: 2
MINOR STREET: Cross Street   Pineland Ave   # OF APPROACH LANES: 1

ISOLATED COMMUNITY WITH POPULATION LESS THAN 10,000 (Y OR N):   N
85TH PERCENTILE SPEED GREATER THAN 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET (Y OR N):   Y

Time	MAJOR ST BOTH APPROACHES	MINOR ST HIGHEST APPROACH	WARRANT 1, Condition A			WARRANT 1, Condition B			WARRANT 1, Combination Warrant CONDITION A			CONDITION B			WARRANT 2	WARRANT 3
			MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET		
THRESHOLD VALUES			420	105		630	53		480	120		720	60			
06:00 AM TO 07:00 AM	902	25	Y			Y			Y			Y				
07:00 AM TO 08:00 AM	1,787	59	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				
08:00 AM TO 09:00 AM	1,340	54	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				
09:00 AM TO 10:00 AM	1,098	57	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				
10:00 AM TO 11:00 AM	1,019	45	Y			Y			Y			Y				
11:00 AM TO 12:00 PM	1,152	45	Y			Y			Y			Y				
12:00 PM TO 01:00 PM	1,218	62	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	
01:00 PM TO 02:00 PM	1,262	56	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				
02:00 PM TO 03:00 PM	1,538	58	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				
03:00 PM TO 04:00 PM	1,537	78	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
04:00 PM TO 05:00 PM	1,728	84	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
05:00 PM TO 06:00 PM	1,897	89	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
06:00 PM TO 07:00 PM	1,283	71	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	
07:00 PM TO 08:00 PM	948	65	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	
08:00 PM TO 09:00 PM	606	49	Y						Y							
09:00 PM TO 10:00 PM	499	30	Y						Y							
	19,814	927			0			11			0			6	6	3
			8 HOURS NEEDED NOT SATISFIED			8 HOURS NEEDED SATISFIED			8 HOURS OF BOTH COND. A AND COND. B NEEDED NOT SATISFIED						4 HRS NEEDED SATISFIED	1 HR NEEDED SATISFIED

GDOT PI#: _____   Request By: _____

County: Liberty   GDOT District: 5 - Jesup

Major Road: EG Miles Pkwy   Road Class: Minor Arterial   Speed Limit: 45 mph

Crossing Road: Willowbrook Rd   Road Class: Local   Speed Limit: 35 mph

Major Rd Direction: East/West   Area Type: Suburb/Transition

Intersection Control: Conventional (Minor Stop)   Project ID: _____

Prepared By: Atlas Technical Consultants   Date: _____

Project Purpose: _____

Existing Data Year: 2022
Project Opening Year: 2022
Project Design Year: 2022
Annual Growth Rate: 1.0%
K Factor*: 10%

* K Factor = Proportion of average annual daily traffic occurring in the highest one hour of the day

LEGEND:

000 = AM Peak Approach Volume
(000) = PM Peak Approach Volume
[000] = ADT Volume (Estimate)

APPROACH SPLITS:

EG Miles Pkwy: 96%
Willowbrook Rd: 4%

PEAK HR % TRUCKS:

EB	WB	NB	SB
2%	2%	0%	0%

2022 EXISTING YEAR VOLUMES

N

SB Willowbrook Rd

56 (34) [1000]

| (0) | (19) | (2) | (13) |
| 0 | 18 | 3 | 35 |

Peds / Peds

WB EG Miles Pkwy

0	(0)
6	(37)
603	(1065)
2	(8)

611 (1110) [18800]

1176 (787) [18800]	(25)	10
	(756)	1,163
	(6)	3
	(0)	0

2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 19,450

EB EG Miles Pkwy

Peds / Peds

| 5 | 1 | 9 | 0 |
| (6) | (1) | (4) | (0) |

15 (11) [300]

NB Willowbrook Rd

2022 OPENING YEAR VOLUMES

SB Willowbrook Rd

56 (34) [1000]

| (0) | (19) | (2) | (13) |
| 0 | 18 | 3 | 35 |

Peds / Peds

WB EG Miles Pkwy

0	(0)
6	(37)
615	(1086)
2	(8)

623.06 (1131.3) [19152]

1199.26 (802.12) [19100]	(25)	10
	(771)	1,186
	(6)	3
	(0)	0

2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 19,800

EB EG Miles Pkwy

Peds / Peds

| 5 | 1 | 9 | 0 |
| (6) | (1) | (4) | (0) |

15 (11) [300]

NB Willowbrook Rd

2022 DESIGN YEAR VOLUMES

SB Willowbrook Rd

56 (34) [1000]

| (0) | (19) | (2) | (13) |
| 0 | 18 | 3 | 35 |

Peds / Peds

WB EG Miles Pkwy

0	(0)
6	(37)
675	(1193)
2	(8)

683.36 (1237.8) [21000]

1315.56 (877.72) [21000]	(25)	10
	(847)	1,303
	(6)	3
	(0)	0

2022 Intersection Daily Entering Volume (est): 21,650

EB EG Miles Pkwy

Peds / Peds

| 5 | 1 | 9 | 0 |
| (6) | (1) | (4) | (0) |

15 (11) [300]

NB Willowbrook Rd

Introduction: In 2005, SAFETEA-LU established the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and mandated that each state prepare a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) to prioritize safety funding investments. Intersections quickly became a common component of most states' SHSP emphasis areas and HSIP project lists, including Georgia's SHSP. Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policies and procedures represent a traceable and transparent procedure to streamline the evaluation of intersection control alternatives, and further leverage safety advancements for intersection improvements beyond just the safety program. Approximately one-third of all traffic fatalities and roughly seventy five percent of all traffic crashes in Georgia occur at or adjacent to intersections. Accordingly, the Georgia SHSP includes an emphasis on enhancing intersection safety to advance the *Toward Zero Deaths* vision embraced by the Georgia Governor's Office of Highway Safety (GOHS). This ICE tool was developed to support the ICE policy, developed and adopted to help ensure that intersection investments across the entire Georgia highway system are selected, prioritized and implemented with defensible benefits for safety towards those ends.

Tool Goal: The goal of this ICE tool is to provide a simplified and consistent way of importing traffic, safety, cost, environmental impact and stakeholder posture data to assess and quantify intersection control improvement benefits. The tool supports the ICE policy and procedures to provide traceability, transparency, consistency and accountability when identifying and selecting an intersection control solution that both meets project purpose and reflects overall best value in terms of specific performance-based criteria.

Requirements: An ICE is required for any intersection improvement (e.g. new or modified intersection, widening/reconstruction or corridor project, or work accomplished through a driveway or encroachment permit that affects an intersection) where: **1)** the intersection includes at least one roadway designated as a State Route (State Highway System) or as part of the National Highway System; or **2)** the intersection will be designed or constructed using State or Federal funding. In certain circumstances where an ICE would otherwise be required, the requirement may be waived based on appropriate evidence presented with a written request. (See the "**Waiver**" tab to review criteria that may make a project waiver eligible and for instructions to submit a waiver request to the Department). An ICE is not required when the proposed work does not include any changes to the intersection design, involves only routine traffic signal timing and equipment maintenance, or for driveway permits where the driveway is not a new leg to an already existing intersection on either 1) a divided, multi-lane highway with a closed median and only right-in/right-out access or 2) an undivided roadway where the development is not required to construct left and/or right turn lanes (as per the Driveway Manual and District Traffic Engineer).

Two-Stage Process: A complete ICE process consists of two (2) distinct stages, and it is expected that the respective level of effort for completing both stages of ICE will correspond to the magnitude and complexity of the intersection. Prior to starting an ICE, the District Traffic Engineer and/or State Traffic Engineer should be consulted for advice on an appropriate level of effort. The Stage 1 and Stage 2 ICE forms are designed to minimize required data inputs using drop-down menu choices and limiting text entry. All fields shaded grey include drop down menu choices and all fields shaded blue require data entry. All other cells in the worksheet are locked.

Stage 1: Screening Decision Record Stage 1 should be conducted early in the project development process and is intended to inform which alternatives are worthy of further evaluation in Stage 2. Stage 1 serves as a screening effort meant to *eliminate* non-competitive options and identify which alternatives merit further considerations based on their practical feasibility. Users should use good engineering judgement in responding to the seven policy questions by selecting "Yes" or "No" in the drop-down boxes. Alternatives should not be summarily eliminated without due consideration, and reasons for eliminating or advancing an alternative should be documented in the "Screening Decision Justification" column.

Stage 2: Alternative Selection Decision Record Stage 2 involves a more detailed and familiar evaluation of the alternatives identified in Stage 1 in order to support the selection of a preferred alternative that may be advanced to detailed design. Stage 2 data entry may require the use of external analysis tools to determine costs, operations and/or safety data that, combined with environmental and stakeholder posture data, form the basis of the ICE evaluation. A separate "CostEst" worksheet tab helps users develop pre-planning-level cost estimates for each Stage 2 alternative evaluated, and a separate Users Guide has been prepared to give guidance on Stage 1 and Stage 2 data entry. Once all data is entered, each alternative is scored and ranked, with the results reported at the bottom of the Stage 2 worksheet to inform on the best of the intersection controls evaluated for project recommendation.

Documentation: A complete ICE document consists of the combination of the outputs from either a completed and signed waiver form or both Stage 1 and Stage 2 worksheets (along with supporting costing and/or environmental documentation), to be included in the approved project Concept Report (or equivalent) or as a stand-alone document.

GDOT ICE STAGE 1: SCREENING DECISION RECORD

ICE Version 2.21 | Revised 2/4/2022

GDOT PI #	
Project Location:	EG Miles Pkwy @ Willowbrook Rd
Existing Control:	Conventional (Minor Stop)
Prepared by:	Atlas Technical Consultants
Date:	

Note: Up to 5 alternatives may be selected and evaluated; Use this ICE Stage 1 to screen 5 or fewer alternatives to evaluate in Stage 2

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each policy question for each control type to identify which alternatives should be evaluated in the Stage 2 Decision Record; enter justification in the rightmost column

Column headers:
1. Does alternative address the project need in a balanced manner and in scale with the project?
2. Does alternative improve safety performance in terms of reducing severe crashes?
3. Does alternative incorporate safety, convenience and accessibility for pedestrians and/or bicyclists?
4. Does alternative improve (or preserve) traffic operations (congestion, delay, reliability, etc.)?
5. Does alternative appear feasible given the site characteristics, constrains & location context?
6. Does alternative appear feasible with respect to other project factors?
7. Overall feasible alternative (select alternative for further evaluation in Stage 2)?

Intersection Alternative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Screening Decision Justification
Unsignalized Intersections								
Conventional (Minor Stop)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	
Conventional (All-Way Stop)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Multiple lanes on mainline
Mini Roundabout	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Over 90% on mainline
Single Lane Roundabout	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Over 90% on mainline
Multilane Roundabout	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Over 90% on mainline
RCUT (stop control)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Potential Alternative
RIRO w/down stream U-Turn	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Limits access
High-T (unsignalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	4 approaches
Offset-T Intersections	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Not feasible
Diamond Interch (Stop Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Diamond Interch (RAB Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No grade seperation
Add LT Lanes on Willowbrook Rd / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Other unsignalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Signalized Intersections								
Traffic Signal	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Median U-Turn (Indirect Left)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
RCUT (signalized)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Displaced Left Turn (CFI)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Continuous Green-T	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Jughandle	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Quadrant Roadway	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Diamond Interch (Signal Control)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Diverging Diamond	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
Single Point Interchange	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No signal warranted
No LT Lane Improvements / No RT Lane Improvements	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Other Signalized (provide description):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	

☐ = Intersection type selected for more detailed analysis in Stage 2 Alternative Selection Decision Record

Project Location:	EG Miles Pkwy @ Willowbrook Rd	District: 5 - Jesup	GDOT PI #:
Existing Intersection Control:	Conventional (Minor Stop)	County: Liberty	Prepared by: Atlas Technical Cons
Type of Analysis:	Safety Funded Project	Area: Suburb/Transitic	Date:

Opening / Design Year Traffic Operations

Intersection meets signal/AWS warrants?	None	
Traffic Analysis Measure of Effectiveness	Intersection Delay	
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro	
Analysis Time Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr
2022 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	27.9 sec	43.3 sec
2022 Opening Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.26	0.53
2022 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection Delay	36.1 sec	71.9 sec
2022 Design Yr No-Build Peak Hr Intersection V/C	0.34	0.71

Complete Streets Warrants Met?
- [ ] PEDESTRIANS
- [ ] BICYCLES
- [ ] TRANSIT

Crash Data: Enter most recent 5 years of crash data	Crash Severity					Years: 5
	K*	A*	B*	C*	O	
Angle	0	0	3	5	14	37%
Head-On	0	0	1	0	0	2%
Rear End	0	0	3	8	13	41%
Sideswipe - same	0	0	0	0	6	10%
Sideswipe - opposite	0	0	1	0	2	5%
Not Collision w/Motor Veh	0	0	1	0	2	5%
TOTALS:	0	0	9	13	37	59

(Crash Type — left vertical label)

* Number of crashes resulting in injuries / fatalities, not number of persons

Alternatives Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Proposed Control Type/Improvement:	Conventional (Minor Stop)	RCUT (stop control)	Add Left Turn Lanes	N/A	N/A
Project Cost: (From CostEst Worksheet)	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*	*Additional description here*		
Construction Cost	$0	$321,000	$127,000		
ROW Cost	$0	$253,000	$0		
Environmental Cost	$0	$0	$0		
Reimbursable Utility Cost	$0	$4,000	$1,000		
Design & Contingency Cost	$0	$0	$0		
Cost Adjustment (justification req'd)	0%	0%	0%		
Total Cost	$0	$578,000	$128,000		

Traffic Operations:

	Alt 1		Alt 2		Alt 3			
Traffic Analysis Software Used	Synchro		Synchro		Synchro			
Analysis Period	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr	AM Peak Hr	PM Peak Hr		
2022 Design Yr Build Intersection Delay	36.1 sec	71.9 sec	15.4 sec	14.2 sec	162.5 sec	107.1 sec		
2022 Design Yr Build Intersection V/C	0.34	0.71	0.15	0.04	0.73	0.71		

Safety Analysis:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3		
Predefined CRF: PDO	0%	31%	2%		
Predefined CRF: Fatal/Inj	0%	53%	1%		
Predefined CRF Source:	CRF unavailable; provide user defined CRF below	NC/MO Table 4-7	FHWA Clearinghouse #s 270 / 274		
User Defined CRF: PDO					
User Defined CRF: Fatal/Inj					
User Defined CRF Source (write in if applicable):					

Environmental Impacts:[1]

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3		
Historic District/Property	None	None	None		
Archaeology Resources	None	None	None		
Graveyard	None	None	None		
Stream	None	None	None		
Underground Tank/Hazmat	None	None	None		
Park Land	None	None	None		
EJ Community	None	None	None		
Wooded Area	None	None	None		
Wetland	None	None	None		

Note: If environmental impact is significant (RED), provide justification impact won't jeopardize project delivery using "Env" worksheet
[1] Environmental impacts are only preliminary estimates; detailed environmental impact documentation will be included with project concept report

Stakeholder Posture:

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3		
Local Community Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		
GDOT Support	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3		
Final ICE Stage 2 Score:	4.0	6.3	5.0		
Rank of Control Type Alternatives:	3	1	2		

Final Intersection Control Selection: **1 - RCUT (stop control)**

Note: Stage 2 score is not given (shown as "-") if signal or AWS is selected as control type but respective warrants are not met

Provide additional comments and/or explain any unique analysis inputs, or results (as necessary):

TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS

INTERSECTION NAME: EG Miles Pkwy at Willowbrook Dr/Sharon St

COUNT DATE: Typical Weekday

INTERSECTION CONDITION:

MAJOR STREET:	Main Street	EG Miles Pkwy	# OF APPROACH LANES: 2
MINOR STREET:	Cross Street	Willowbrook Dr/ Sharon St	# OF APPROACH LANES: 1

ISOLATED COMMUNITY WITH POPULATION LESS THAN 10,000 (Y OR N): N
85TH PERCENTILE SPEED GREATER THAN 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET (Y OR N): Y

Time	MAJOR ST BOTH APPROACHES	MINOR ST HIGHEST APPROACH	WARRANT 1, Condition A			WARRANT 1, Condition B			WARRANT 1, Combination Warrant CONDITION A			CONDITION B			WARRANT 2	WARRANT 3
			MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET	MAJOR STREET	MINOR STREET	BOTH MET		
THRESHOLD VALUES →			420	105		630	53		480	120		720	60			
06:00 AM TO 07:00 AM	616	11	Y						Y							
07:00 AM TO 08:00 AM	1,176	56	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y				
08:00 AM TO 09:00 AM	914	25	Y			Y			Y			Y				
09:00 AM TO 10:00 AM	674	35	Y			Y			Y							
10:00 AM TO 11:00 AM	566	27	Y						Y							
11:00 AM TO 12:00 PM	640	32	Y			Y			Y							
12:00 PM TO 01:00 PM	624	20	Y						Y							
01:00 PM TO 02:00 PM	601	28	Y						Y							
02:00 PM TO 03:00 PM	764	44	Y			Y			Y			Y				
03:00 PM TO 04:00 PM	715	27	Y			Y			Y							
04:00 PM TO 05:00 PM	680	37	Y			Y			Y							
05:00 PM TO 06:00 PM	787	33	Y			Y			Y			Y				
06:00 PM TO 07:00 PM	523	18	Y						Y							
07:00 PM TO 08:00 PM	360	20														
08:00 PM TO 09:00 PM	210	11														
09:00 PM TO 10:00 PM	211	9														
	10,061	433			0			1			0			0	0	0
			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**			8 HOURS OF BOTH COND. A AND COND. B NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**						4 HRS NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**	1 HR NEEDED **NOT SATISFIED**