**Florida Department of Transportation Interchange Access Request Methodology Letter of Understanding (MLOU)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of request |  | | IJR |  | IMR | |  | | IOAR |
| Type of Process |  | Programmatic | | | |  | | Non-Programmatic | | |

**[Project Title]**

*Coordination of assumptions, procedures, data, networks, and outputs for project traffic review during the access request process will be maintained throughout the evaluation process.*

*Full compliance with all MLOU requirements does not obligate the Acceptance Authorities to accept the IAR.*

*The Requestor shall inform the approval authorities of any changes to the approved methodology in the MLOU and an amendment shall be prepared if determined to be necessary.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Requestor* |  |  |  |
|  | [Type Name Here] |  | *Date* |
|  | *[Type Title Here]* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Interchange Review*  *Coordinator* |  |  |  |
| [Type Name Here] |  | *Date* |
| [Type District/TP Here] |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| *Systems Management*  *Administrator* |  |  |  |
| (if applicable) | [Type Name Here] |  | *Date* |
|  | *Systems Implementation Office – Central Office* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Federal Highway Administration* |  |  |  |
|  | [Type Name Here] |  | *Date* |
|  | *Program Operations Engineer* |  |  |

#### 1.0 Project Description

*Provide background or supporting information that explains the basis for the request.*

* + 1. *Purpose and Need Statement*

*Provide the Purpose, the Need, and the Goals and Objectives.*

* + 1. *Project Location*

*Provide project description and a map of the IAR project location.*

* + 1. *Area of Influence*

*Provide a description of the area of influence along the main line and cross street.*

* + 1. *Project Schedule*

*Identify the schedule of production activities consistent with a proposed conceptual funding plan and opening year.*

#### Analysis Years

* + 1. *Traffic Forecasting*
       - Base year
       - Horizon year
    2. *Traffic Operational Analysis*
       - Existing year
       - Opening year
       - Design year

*A year of failure analysis shall be performed for Preferred Alternative, in case a failing LOS is obtained in Design Year.*

#### 

#### 3.0 Alternatives

The No-Build and Build alternatives shall be analyzed in the IAR. Details of all reasonable build alternatives considered, including those eliminated from further considerations, shall be documented. The documentation for the alternatives eliminated can be minimal like a summary of what was considered, reasons for elimination etc. Build Alternatives meeting purpose and need of the project shall have a more detailed description and evaluated in the IAR.

The implementation of TSM&O alternative will be considered in the IAR.

#### 4.0 Data Collection

*The type of data that may be used should be identified.*

* + 1. *Transportation System Data*
    2. *Existing and Historical Traffic Data*
    3. *Land Use Data*
    4. *Environmental Data*
    5. *Planned and Programmed Projects*

#### 5.0 Travel Demand Forecasting

* + 1. *Selected Travel Demand Model(s)*

1. *Project Traffic Forecast Development Methodology*

Describe the methodology and assumptions in developing the future year traffic volumes (AADT and DDHV)

1. *Validation Methodology*

Describe the validation methodology using current FDOT procedures and data collection procedure

Identify how modifications to the travel demand forecasting model will be made, including modifications to the facility type and area type for links, modifications to socio-economic data and all input and output modeling files for review.

1. *Adjustment Procedures*

Identify the process used to adjust modeled future year traffic to the defined analysis years. Discuss how trends/growth-rates will be factored into this, if applicable.

1. *Traffic Factors*
   * Utilizing recommended ranges identified in the [Project Traffic Forecasting Handbook](http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/statistics/trafficdata/ptf.pdf) and [Procedure (525-030-120).](http://www2.dot.state.fl.us/proceduraldocuments/procedures/bin/525030120.pdf)
   * Utilizing other factors, identified below

Roadway K D T Tf PHF MOCF PHF

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source:

#### 6.0 Traffic Operational Analysis

*The area type, traffic conditions, and analysis tools to be used are summarized in this section.*

* + 1. *Existing Area Type/Traffic Conditions*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Area Type | Conditions | |
| Under Saturated | Saturated |
| Rural |  |  |
| Urban Area/Transitioning Area |  |  |

* + 1. *Traffic Analysis Software Used*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Software | | System Component | | | | | |
| Freeway | | | | Crossroad | |
| Name | Version | Basic Segment | Weaving | Ramp Merge | Ramp Diverge | Arterials | Intersections |
| HCS  HCM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Synchro |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SimTraffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corsim |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vissim |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* + 1. *Calibration Methodology*
       - *Calibration methodology and parameters utilized will be documented.*
       - *Calibration Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) and calibration targets.*
    2. *Selection of Measures of Effectiveness (MOE)*
       - *The Level of Service criteria for each roadway classification, including mainline, ramps, ramp terminal intersections and the crossroad beyond the interchange ramp terminal intersections are identified below.*
       - *In addition to the Level of Service criteria, state other operational MOEs to be utilized for the evaluation of alternatives.*

#### 7.0 Safety Analysis

* + 1. *Detailed crash data within the study area will be analyzed and documented.*

Years: Source:

#### 8.0 Consistency with Other Plans/Projects

* + 1. *The request will be reviewed for consistency with facility Master Plans, Actions Plans, SIS Plan, MPO Long Range Transportation Plans, Local Government Comprehensive Plans or development applications, etc.*
    2. *Where the request is inconsistent with any plan, steps to bring the plan into consistency will be developed.*

*C.**The operational relationship of this request to the other interchanges will be reviewed and documented. The following other IARs are located within the area of influence.*

#### 9.0 Environmental Considerations

* + 1. *Status of Environmental Approval and permitting process.*

*B. Identify the environmental considerations that could influence the outcome of the alternative development and selection process.*

#### 10.0 Coordination

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No/NA |  |
|  |  | An appropriate effort of coordination will be made with appropriate proposed developments in the area. |
|  |  | Request will identify and include (if applicable) a commitment to complete the other non-interchange/non-intersection improvements that are necessary for the interchange/intersection to function as proposed. |
|  |  | Request will document whether the project requires financial or infrastructure commitments from other agencies, organizations, or private entities. |
|  |  | Request will document any pre-condition contingencies required in regards to the timing of other improvements and their inclusion in a TIP/STIP/LRTP prior to the Interstate access approval (final approval of NEPA document). |
|  |  | Request will document the funding and phasing. |

*\*Explain if No or Not Applicable (N/A) is checked*:

#### 11.0 Anticipated Design Exceptions and Variations

*Design exceptions/variations are not anticipated, but if an exception/variation should arise it will be processed per FHWA and FDOT standards.*

*The following exceptions/variations to FDOT, AASHTO or FHWA rules, policies, standards, criteria or procedures have been identified:*

#### 12.0 Conceptual Signing Plan

*A conceptual signing and marking plan shall be prepared and included in the access request.*

#### 13.0 Access Management Plan

*Access management plan within the area of influence will not be changed by the proposed improvements to the interchange.*

*The improvement will affect access management within the area of influence will be changed. An access management plan will be developed within the area of influence to complement the improvements to the interchange:*

#### 14.0 FHWA Policy Points

*The two FHWA policy points will be addressed within the access request*.