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## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Study Purpose and Background

The modern roundabout is an adaptation of the traffic circle, which was first introduced in the United States in the early 1900's. One of the underlying principles of the modern roundabout is the give-way rule, which requires entering traffic to yield to circulating traffic. This rule prevents the roundabout from locking up by not allowing vehicles to enter the intersection until there are sufficient gaps within the circulating traffic. In addition, there are numerous safety benefits associated with roundabouts. Studies from across the country have shown that intersections with a high number of crashes have seen a reduction in the number and severity of crashes once roundabouts have been installed.

Initially, roundabouts were negatively compared to traffic circles, which currently exist in New Jersey. But given the success stories and proven benefits of roundabouts operating in other locations across the country, at the request of the counties in the region, DVRPC was asked to conduct a Regional Roundabout Analysis. This project was included as part of the DVRPC Work Program as a two-phased project. Although there are a few roundabouts operating in the Pennsylvania counties of the region, the overall concept of roundabouts is relatively new for the DVRPC region. The purpose of Phase 1 of the Regional Roundabout Analysis project is to examine the applicability of single lane roundabouts at appropriate locations in the region. Specific goals of the analysis include:
o Reviewing national and regional examples of roundabout design standards and recent roundabout installations.
o Identifying regional issues related to the installation of roundabouts.
o Coordinating with PennDOT, NJDOT, and county engineers/planners on the development of screening methods to determine potential appropriateness for the siting of a single lane roundabout.
o Coordinating with counties to identify a short list of prioritized locations in which roundabouts could be applicable.

The second phase of the analysis will choose select locations that were identified from the counties' prioritized list for a more in-depth study. This phase of the study will include conducting field views, collecting crash and traffic data, and simulating the roundabout at those locations.
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## 2. ROUNDABOUTS

### 2.1 History of Circular Intersection

Commonly known as traffic circles or rotaries, the circular intersection has been a part of the United States transportation since 1905. With the design of a traffic circle, vehicles entering the circle are given priority, which results in higher speeds upon entry into the circle. Traffic signals and stop signs were later installed to help control traffic moving through the circle; however, by the mid-1950's, these intersections fell out of favor due to the high rate of crashes, high travel speeds, and congestion associated with them. In 1963, the traffic circle was redesigned in England into the modern roundabout. The modern roundabout is a type of circular intersection that incorporates a new design to reduce crashes, traffic delays, and speeds at intersections. It is a oneway circular intersection with traffic flowing around a center island. Unlike the rotary, roundabouts do not have traffic signals or stop signs.

### 2.2 Design and Operational Characteristics

A modern roundabout has a number of physical characteristics that differentiate it from stop and signal-controlled intersections, as well as traffic circles. Although each roundabout is unique and designed to accommodate a particular intersection's traffic flow, each shares some basic characteristics. Figure 1 shown below depicts the top three basic features of a roundabout that distinguishes it from a traffic circle.

Figure 1-3 Basic Design Features of a Roundabout


Source: Alaska Roundabout website (http://www.alaskaroundabouts.com/mythfact1.html)

## Yield-at-Entry

At roundabouts the entering traffic yields the right-of-way to the circulating traffic already in the circle. Yield signs are posted on all of the approaches into the roundabout. This yield-at-entry rule prevents traffic from locking and allows free flow movements.

## Deflection

The entry and center island deflects entering traffic to slower speeds, thus reinforcing the yielding process.

## Flare

The entry to a roundabout often flares out from one to three lanes at the yield line to provide for increased capacity.

## Central Island

Other design features of the roundabout include the central island. The central island is a raised area in the center of a roundabout around which traffic circulates. The central island is not limited to the shape of a circle. The roundabout in Towson, Maryland, has an elliptical shaped central island. As indicated in Table 1, the recommended inscribed circle diameter (which is the distance across the circle inscribed by the outer curb of the roundabout) determines the number of lanes that a roundabout can carry. In general, the smaller an inscribed diameter, the lower the circulation speeds. In contrast, the greater a roundabout's diameter, the more lanes it may hold and the better its accommodation for a large design vehicle. The tracking of large vehicles, such as WB67 trucks and buses, may require a truck apron, which is a mountable portion of the central island adjacent to the circulating roadway.

Table 1 - Roundabout Geometric Summary

| Number of lanes | Diameter Range |
| :---: | :---: |
| Single Lane | 110 to 150 feet |
| Two Lane | 150 to 230 feet |
| Three Lane | 200 to 260 feet |

Source: NE Roundabouts Course Manual

## Splitter Island

The splitter island is a unique characteristic of modern roundabouts. Its position along the median of the approach and departure lanes separates entering and exiting traffic, which creates vehicular lateral deflection. The pedestrian crosswalk and its intersection with the splitter island are usually placed approximately one vehicle length upstream of the yield line. Pedestrian mobility is further supported with the splitter islands, which double as pedestrian refuges. These allow a pedestrian to cross the approach and departure lanes in two distinct movements when required, with the pedestrian focusing upon only one direction of vehicle travel at a time. Furthermore, the relatively low speeds of approaching and exiting vehicles are conducive to a high rate of yielding compliance.

## Travel Patterns through a Roundabout

The design of a roundabout allows for traffic to flow in a continuous counterclockwise direction, and is able to accommodate all modes of traffic. Navigation through a roundabout is relatively easy. Drivers approaching a roundabout must remember the following:
o Reduce speeds on entry (20 to 30 mph )
o Yield to pedestrians
o Yield to vehicles in the roundabout
o Drive in a counterclockwise direction within the roundabout
o Exit with slow speeds and yield to pedestrians
Larger trucks and buses follow the same rules as applied to regular size vehicles; however, they may require use of the truck apron provided to negotiate tight turning radii. Pedestrians should use the sidewalks and designated crosswalks around the perimeter of the roundabout. In crossing each leg of the roundabout, pedestrians should be alert to oncoming traffic and use the splitter island, which allows the pedestrian to cross one direction of traffic at a time. Pedestrians should never walk in the roundabout or cross to the central island. Bicyclists have two options in navigating through a roundabout. 1.) Utilize the bicycle as a vehicle, following the same rules of travel through the roundabout 2.) Walk the bicycle around the roundabout, following the same rules as a pedestrian.

When all of these characteristics are combined, the roundabout will encourage slower approach and circulation speeds, creating more acceptable gaps in the circulation stream, which makes travel through the intersection safer for all users. Figure 2 depicts the mentioned design features.

Figure 2 - Roundabout Design Features


Source: FHWA Roundabout Brochure

### 2.3 Roundabouts vs. Other Intersection Control Devices

## Roundabout vs. Traffic Signal

A roundabout has numerous benefits compared to a traffic signal. Table 2 below highlights some of the advantages.

Table 2: Benefits of Roundabouts vs. Traffic Signals

| Benefit | Roundabout | Traffic Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety (see Figure 3) | o Lower travel speeds <br> o 16 conflict points between vehicles and pedestrians | o Higher travel speeds <br> o 56 conflict points between vehicles and pedestrians |
| Intersection Efficiency | o Keeps traffic moving, thus less congestion | o Traffic stops in one direction; therefore, may cause congestion |
| Air Quality | o Traffic passes through without stopping | o As traffic stops, vehicles are left idle, thus causing pollution |

Source: DVRPC

Figure 3: Conflict Points on a 4-Way Intersection Compared to a Roundabout


Source: Roundabout USA website (www.roundabooutusa.com/intro.html)

## Roundabout vs. Stop Controlled Intersection

When compared to a two-way stop controlled (TWSC) intersection, roundabouts are helpful when congestion exists on the minor street. Roundabouts do not prioritize approaches; therefore, there is no hierarchy of movements for cross streets at intersections. In comparison to an all-way stop controlled (AWSC) intersection, roundabouts offer greater capacity and lower delays, especially during off-peak periods.

### 2.4 Benefits

According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), other state DOT's, and studies conducted, there are numerous benefits associated with roundabouts. Communities from across the country where roundabouts have been installed have experienced the following benefits:

## Safety

o Up to a 90\% reduction of fatalities
o $76 \%$ reduction in injury crashes
o $30-40 \%$ reduction in pedestrian crashes
o $75 \%$ fewer conflict points

## Slower Vehicles Speeds (under 30 mph )

o Drivers have more time to judge and react to other vehicles and/or pedestrians
o Advantageous to older and novice drivers
o Reduces the severity of crashes
o Keeps pedestrians safer

## Efficient Traffic Flow

o 30-50\% increase in traffic capacity

## Reduction in Pollution and Fuel Use

o Improved traffic flow for intersections that handle a high number of left turns
o Reduced need for storage lanes

## Money Saved

o No signal equipment to install and repair
o Savings estimated at an average of \$5,000 per year in electricity and maintenance costs
o Service life of a roundabout is 25 years (vs. the 10-year service life of signal equipment)

## Community Enhancement

o Traffic calming
o Aesthetic landscaping

### 2.5 Other Factors to Consider

Roundabouts are safe and efficient; however, they may not be the best solution for every intersection. Roundabout installation may be most appropriate at intersections with the following characteristics:
o Frequent left-turn movements
o Complex intersection geometry
o Balanced traffic flows
o More than four legs
o High traffic delays
o Traffic calming (gateway into a community)
o High number of pedestrians and bicyclists
o Areas where traffic signals are not warranted
0 Areas where there is sufficient right-of-way (ROW) surrounding the intersection, such as wooded and agricultural type land use
o Level grades approaching the intersection
o Traffic volume range between 20,000 to 25,000 vehicles per day (for single lane roundabout only)

## 3. ROUNDABOUTS IN THE DVRPC REGION

### 3.1 Roundabout Literature

## Federal Roundabout Publications

In June 2000, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published Roundabouts: An Informational Guide. This publication represented the first federal-level initiative aimed at promoting and standardizing roundabouts in the United States. The publication represents a comprehensive reference for the planning, design, and operational considerations of a roundabout. It also discusses the potential costs and benefits of a roundabout versus stop and signal controlled intersections from a variety of perspectives, such as crash safety, right-of-way acquisition, and public involvement. For many transportation officials, this publication remains the first
 and only roundabout resource. Nonetheless, the standards and guidelines for roundabouts in the United States are constantly evolving, especially in comparison to the level of expertise that other countries have gained and developed. FHWA is in the process of updating this publication. Roundabouts have also been endorsed by FHWA as part of the Priority, Market Ready Technologies and Innovations (T\&Is), which are believed to warrant special attention.

A more recent federal-level document was published in 2007 by the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP). The report, NCHRP Report 572: Roundabouts in the United States, attempts to identify and understand the constraints that impact the efficacy of domestic roundabout operations, especially in comparison to international examples. Consequently, the authors utilize international models in an effort to accurately calculate the safety, operations, and capacity of existing domestic roundabouts. Though the findings of the report conclude that certain international models are sufficient for domestic roundabouts, it describes how the performance of many roundabouts is
 subpar to the expectations of internationally calibrated models. As a result, where deemed necessary, Roundabouts in the United States develops unique and specific models that are a better representation of domestic roundabout characteristics.

Additionally, there is another currently ongoing federal-level study: NCHRP Project 0378A Crossing Solutions at Roundabouts and Channelized Turn Lanes for Pedestrians with Vision Disabilities. This project will attempt to identify a range of solutions to assist
visually-impaired pedestrians with navigating a roundabout and other yield-controlled intersections. Its expected completion date is early 2009.

## Pennsylvania and New Jersey Roundabout Publications

Pennsylvania is the only state in the DVRPC region to have produced a formal document to guide state and local agencies with the planning, design, operation and implementation of roundabouts. Recently updated and published in June 2007, PennDOT's Publication No. 414: Guide to Roundabouts is intended to serve as a supplement to FHWA's An Informational Guide. This manual is not considered to take the place of any formal plan review of any proposed roundabout. The technical basis of this document was derived from information contained in the Kansas Department of Transportation Roundabout Guide.


To date, NJDOT has not produced a guide or report for roundabout planning and design in New Jersey. As a result, the FHWA's An Informational Guide is the main source of standards and guidelines available to New Jersey transportation officials.

Other states have also adopted An Informational Guide as their formal state guide. However, numerous state DOTs have also developed their own roundabout reports; most noticeably Kansas, Missouri, New York, and Maryland.

### 3.2 DVRPC Roundabout Activities

In conjunction with this project, DVRPC had several opportunities to visit, participate in and promote various roundabout opportunities in the region. In addition, through the capital programming process, two roundabouts in our region have been funded.

## Maryland Roundabout Tour

In February 2007, DVRPC met with staff from the Maryland State Highway Administration and designers from Kittelson and Associates, Inc. The purpose of the two-day visit was to tour roundabouts located in urban, suburban, and rural areas, and to gain insight on the development of Maryland's roundabout program. Currently, Maryland has over 60 roundabouts in operation, and several are in the planning, design, and construction phases. Since the installation of roundabouts, the state has seen a decrease in the number and severity of crashes at intersections. The first roundabout viewed was located in Towson during the afternoon peak period. This was one of the first roundabouts in Maryland. Prior to the opening of the Towson Roundabout in 1998, the intersection was controlled by two traffic signals and had a high number of crashes. There has been a slight increase in the number of crashes since the introduction of the roundabout; however, the crash severity has been greatly reduced. Results of a pedestrian survey showed a positive pedestrian experience at this roundabout. The following day DVRPC staff toured six other roundabouts in various locations, including
four incorporated within the highway interchange systems in suburban areas. Observations and video were taken from a rural single lane roundabout located in Lothian, Maryland. This particular roundabout was of interest given the high percentage of heavy trucks traveling through the circle. The last roundabout viewed was located in Annapolis, Maryland. This urban two-lane roundabout is located as a gateway into the historic area of the city, and has been constructed as part of a redevelopment


Source: DVRPC Photo project. Some of the observations made were the use of splitter islands as pedestrian facilities and the new construction surrounding the intersection.

## NE Roundabout Design Workshop



Source: NE Roundabout

DVRPC hosted the NE Roundabout Design Workshop in March 2007. Mr. Howard McCullough, independent consultant and Roundabout Coordinator for New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), was the presenter for the two-day workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to familiarize attendees with the planning concerns, operational analysis, and current detailed design methods for modern roundabouts. Topics covered during day one included history, safety, capacity software, lighting, policy, and public involvement as it pertains to roundabouts. Day two focused on the design and construction of roundabouts. Mr. McCullough shared with the group several practices common in New York State. There was also various discussion on the proper software used in modeling roundabouts. The workshop had 39 attendees representing various organizations, including PennDOT, NJDOT, FHWA, counties, special interest groups, and several consulting firms.

## Chester County Field View

In June 2007, DVRPC staff was invited to participate in an outing with PennDOT, Safety, Agriculture, Villages, and Environment Inc. (S.A.V.E), and MTJ Engineering to view several intersections located in southern Chester County for roundabout consideration. The majority of the intersections viewed had one common theme: none of them were easy "shoe-ins" for a roundabout. They all had steep slopes and wetland or right-of-way issues. However, given the many benefits of roundabouts, and not to dismiss any location, Mr. Mark Johnson of MTJ Engineering, who specializes in roundabout design and engineering, was bought in to consult on the feasibility of


Source: DVRPC Photo
roundabouts at these specific intersections.
While viewing the locations, local township representatives along with some adjacent property owners were on hand to give feedback and opinions on the option of roundabouts being installed at these locations. One of the sites visited was the intersection of PA52 (Lenape Road), Unionville Road, and Wawaset Road in Pocopson Township. This intersection was a DVRPC funded model project site. By participating in the outing, DVRPC had the opportunity to gain a local perspective on the selection process of choosing a roundabout site and to ask questions to a roundabout expert.

## DVRPC TIP Funded Roundabout Projects

Outside of the scope of this specific project, two roundabout projects were recently approved for funding through the DVRPC Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). These projects were established in the Pennsylvania TIP to fund "pilot" roundabout projects in the region. The Pennsylvania District 6 Roundabouts Incentive Program made $\$ 2$ million available in the Pennsylvania DVRPC region. Two locations had been identified and were recommended for funding through the program:

- Cold Spring Creamery Road and Burnt House Hill Road in Buckingham Township, Bucks County; \$800,000 for construction
- PA 52/Wawaset and Unionville Road South in Pocopson Township, Chester County; \$850,000 for construction

Both projects have continued to advance through the design process using local funding, and construction funding will be provided at the agreed upon amount based on current estimates.

The construction of the Cold Spring Creamery and Burnt House Hill Roads roundabout in Buckingham Township is on hold at the moment as Buckingham Township is currently waiting for the approval of various permits and guidance from PennDOT. Construction is estimated to begin in the spring or summer of 2008.

An engineering consultant firm has been hired for the PA52/Wawaset and Unionville Road roundabout. The firm is currently conducting environmental studies and preparing for the scoping and field view with PennDOT. They are also in the process of coordinating utility locations with the utility companies and fine-tuning the roundabout concept plan. Construction is estimated to begin in June of 2008.

## 4. DVRPC ROUNDABOUT SCREENING CRITERIA PROCESS

### 4.1 DVRPC Roundabout Screening Criteria

One of the goals of this analysis was to coordinate with the counties, DOTs, and other stakeholders in developing criteria to be used for screening in the applicability of roundabouts in this region.

At the second Technical Advisory meeting held in March 2007, DVRPC staff developed and presented a list of eight criteria to stakeholders. The criteria developed were:
1.) Crash history
2.) Proximity to existing roundabouts
3.) Topography
4.) AADT
5.) Roadway facility type
6.) Identified within the CMP
7.) Land use
8.) Proximity to other signals

GIS limitation was an issue with applying certain data layers. Of the eight criteria developed in-house by DVRPC staff, the GIS data layers only applied to five of the criteria - AADT, Roadway facility type, Identified within the CMP, Land use, and Proximity to other signals. Crash history, proximity to existing roundabouts, and topography could not be applied in GIS because the information associated with these criteria was at a macro level and would require further evaluation and analysis on a site-by-site basis. Highlights from both Technical Advisory meetings are presented in Appendix A.

It was agreed that, in lieu of requiring all criteria to be met in order for consideration as a candidate location, certain criteria should be reconsidered as additional benefits that would only strengthen a location's candidacy for a roundabout, such as topography or proximity to existing roundabout. However, crash history, the use of functional classification (rather than roadway facility type), identification of location within the CMP, land use, and the proximity to other signals should be used in screening locations for roundabout application. Some other suggestions from the discussion were to consider non-GIS factors into the criteria such as ROW, other resources, municipal support, and the weighting of specific criteria.

### 4.3 Methodology For Screening

Given the large geographic area that the screening process is designed to evaluate, in combination with the available GIS data sets, the methodology considers the intersections of only two-lane roadways. After considering those intersections, other considerations are looked at next.

The first two criteria were necessary in order for an intersection to be considered a suitable roundabout candidate location. Intersections whose associated roadways did not meet these qualifications were never considered.

## 1. Functional Class

For the purposes of this document, roadways of four functional classes were considered: rural minor arterial, rural major collector, rural minor collector, and urban minor collector. Only roadways that met these classifications were considered suitable. Functional class broadly defines the geometry and volume characteristics of all roadway facilities, thus these functional classes were selected due to their likelihood of being a two-lane roadway and carrying an appropriate volume of vehicles.

## 2. Number of Travel Lanes along the Roadway

Only roadways with exactly two travel lanes (one lane in each direction) were considered. Roadways with a greater number of travel lanes will more likely require a multi-lane roundabout, thus limiting the number of lanes will further refine the screening process for single-lane roundabouts. Due to the limitations of GIS, there were some locations filtered through the GIS that had more than the two-lane roadway requirement.

The following four criteria are immensely helpful for the successful implementation and operation of a roundabout. However, the omission of any number of these factors does not automatically exclude a location from roundabout consideration. Instead, the presence of such qualities may be interpreted as additional advantages. These four criteria were only considered for locations that met the initial two roadway requirements.

## 3. DVRPC Congestion Management Process (CMP)

An intersection was selected if it was identified within a designated CMP Congested Corridor or Emerging and Regionally Significant Corridor. As defined in the June 2007 DVRPC Congestion Management Process Report, a major component of the CMP is to "connect the Long Range Plan for the region and short-range efforts, such as the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and corridor studies." Thus, the inclusion of a candidate roundabout location within a CMP Corridor may assist with developing further analysis and securing potential funding. Additionally, it addresses the relationship between roundabouts and alleviating traffic congestion.

## 4. Land Use

If a candidate intersection is sited within or adjacent to three particular land uses: (agricultural, wooded and vacant as defined by DVRPC's GIS 2000 Land Use Map), it was selected. These particular land use categories were considered because they are generally the least likely to resist right-of-way (ROW) acquisition. Since the greatest impediment to the successful implementation of a roundabout is oftentimes ROW
limitations, a potential roundabout's immediately adjacent land use may benefit or hinder its candidacy.

## 5. Crash History

Taking into consideration the crash history at an intersection is an important factor when considering installing a roundabout. Studies have shown a reduction and severity of crashes at intersections with roundabouts. For the purposes of this study, an intersection with a minimum of 15 crashes from years 2003 to 2005 (as identified within the PennDOT and NJDOT crash databases) was used as the requirement for determining its candidacy. Only crashes coded as "At Intersection" were considered for the methodology. The significance of the crash history criterion revolves around the documented safety benefits from a roundabout's operating conditions. National studies have shown a drastic reduction in the number and severity of crashes at intersections with roundabouts.

## 6. Signal Score

A signal score was developed to determine whether a candidate intersection is currently signalized, as well as its proximity to another traffic signal. This criterion was only applicable to the Pennsylvania counties, given that New Jersey traffic signal data is not available for the GIS. Table 2 describes the ranking system of each score.

Table 3: Signal Score

| Score | Definition |
| :---: | :--- |
| 0 | A potential roundabout location that is between 20 and 1,000 <br> feet from an existing traffic signal |
| 1 | A potential roundabout location that is greater than 1,000 feet <br> from an existing traffic signal. |
| 2 | A potential roundabout location is currently signalized. |

A higher signal score implies a greater likelihood for a successful roundabout. For instance, a signal score of "1" signifies a stronger roundabout candidate location than an equivalent intersection with a signal score of " 0 ."

The signal score has two implications. The first is based upon the fact that the successful operation of a roundabout requires a continuous flow of vehicles along the circulating lane. However, the formation of an upstream queue may perpetuate itself downstream and into the roundabout. For similar reasons, a 1,000 foot threshold from an existing traffic signal is required by PennDOT for the installation of a new traffic signal, thus the equivalent minimum threshold is used for roundabout location selection. The second implication of the signal score is to identify which candidate locations currently utilize a traffic signal; the replacement of which could demonstrate discernible safety and operational benefits.
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## 5. REGIONAL ROUNDABOUT SELECTION PROCESS

### 5.1 Selection Overview

All of the roundabout screening criteria developed were summarized in tables for all of the nine counties in the region. The information provided in each of the tables acted as a guide for the counties to help quantify the locations screened as potential sites for roundabouts. The following information was contained in the table: location number, municipality, first name of road approach, last name of road approach, CMP, land use, and crashes. For the Pennsylvania counties, an extra field was added to the table to denote the signal score of the identified intersection. Each of the locations was identified by a Yes or No within the CMP, land use, and crashes columns to reflect whether or not the identified intersection met DVRPC's base criteria. Maps were also created that corresponded to the intersections identified within each table.

There were numerous locations selected for each of the counties. The maps and the corresponding data table for the locations were given to each county for review. The purpose of having the counties review the generated lists was to gain feedback and to have each of the counties narrow the list and prioritize the locations as identified. In conjunction with this review process, DVRPC staff met with most of the counties to discuss issues and determine priority candidate locations for further consideration. Based on in house knowledge and limitations to the DVRPC GIS data regarding this project, some of the counties added and/or deleted locations from the generated list. The number of locations revealed from the DVRPC generated list ranged from 98 to 334 potential candidate roundabout sites among the nine counties. Listed below is the county breakdown of roundabout candidate sites from the DVRPC derived list.

## Pennsylvania Counties

o Bucks - 245
o Chester - 276
o Delaware-158
o Montgomery - 300
o Philadelphia - 334

## New Jersey Counties

o Burlington - 98
o Camden-202
o Gloucester - 116
o Mercer - 139
In New Jersey, the lists of DVRPC criteria-based sites were reviewed by each of the county engineering and planning staff. Unlike New Jersey, the Pennsylvania counties do not have designated engineering departments; therefore, the DVRPC data was evaluated by staff from each of the county planning commissions. The prioritized lists of locations from the Pennsylvania counties were reviewed by PennDOT officials. With the exception of Chester County, PennDOT staff was able to comment on some of the sites
chosen by the counties. Comments from PennDOT are listed in the following section with the counties' top three locations.

Once DVRPC had received the prioritized listing of locations back from the counties, GIS maps were then created to indicate the top locations that each of the counties submitted for further consideration. Each of these maps distinguishes the top three county locations and whether the locations were derived from the DVRPC criteria list or identified by the county. A few of the sites chosen from some of the counties reflected intersections that were in the planning or study process of being considered for roundabouts and were not incorporated within this document. With the exception of a few cases, intersections with multiple lanes at each approach that would not warrant a single lane roundabout design were also not documented. The following pages summarize the selection process for each of the counties in determining its top intersection for further roundabout review.

### 5.1.1 BUCKS COUNTY

## Candidate Prioritization Selection

There were 245 candidate sites identified from the DVRPC criteria for Bucks County. As shown in Map 1A, the intersections identified are evenly distributed throughout the county. Bucks County Planning Commission selected 15 intersections for further consideration for roundabout installation. Map 1B shows that only three of the county's candidate sites were not identified in the DVRPC generated list. Given the predominant rural characteristic of Bucks County, the Planning Commission staff avoided selecting locations where traffic volumes were too low to benefit from the installation of roundabouts. Intersections with skewed alignments, high travel speeds at the approaches, crashes, available ROW, and in house knowledge were chosen for further study. Figures 4-6 below describe the county's top three intersections. The remaining 12 sites are listed in Table 4. The complete DVRPC criteria list for Bucks County is located in Appendix B .

Figure 4: Bucks County Prioritized Location \#1 Intersection of PA 532 (Washington Crossing Road) and Stoopville Road




Figure 5: Bucks County Prioritized Location \#2 Intersection of PA 313 (Broad Street) and Front Street


Municipality: Quakertown Borough
COUNTY COMMENTS: This is a four-legged signalized intersection connecting PA 313 with Front Street. Three of the four approach legs are PA 313, two of which are one-way couplets. There are multiple splitter islands delineating the path of most of the intersection's turn movements. The intersection's overall area is fairly large due to its irregular layout and splitter islands. The adjacent land use is commercial, consisting of built structures with minimal setback from the curb. There are sidewalks throughout the vicinity of the intersection. A pair of tracks for SEPTA's Bethlehem Line carries minimal rail traffic and divides the intersection. The grade at this intersection is fairly flat. A roundabout at this location would greatly simplify the numerous confusing vehicle movements, though a system of traffic signals would remain in order to accommodate trains along the Bethlehem rail line.

PENNDOT COMMENTS: Too many impacts

Figure 6: Bucks County Prioritized Location \#3 Intersection of PA 132 (Street Road) and State Road


Municipality: Bensalem Township
COUNTY COMMENTS: This is a four-legged signalized intersection. The northbound approach is the driveway to a residential property. Consequently, the intersection operates primarily as a Tintersection, with Street Road serving as the post of the "T." Each of the three primary approaches has two lanes at the intersection; although upstream from the intersection, they each carry a single travel lane. The immediately adjacent land uses are mostly wooded and vacant land, though there is a commercial warehouse and its associated parking lot on the northeast parcel. Consequently, there is truck traffic due to the proximity of this location to nearby industry and warehousing centers. There is no pedestrian infrastructure in the vicinity of the intersection. There are no significant grade changes at this location.

PENNDOT COMMENTS: None

Table 4: Bucks County's Top Candidate Locations

| Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Big Oak Road and <br> Stony Hill Road | Lower Makefield Township | None |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | Bridgetown Pike and <br> Langhorne Yardley <br> Road | Middletown Township | None |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Swamp Road and Mill <br> Creek Road | Wrightstown Township | None |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | PA 152 (Baringer <br> Avenue) and PA 113 <br> (Main Street) | Silverdale Borough | None |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | Main Street and Kumry <br> Road | Trumbauersville Borough | None |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | Bordentown Road and <br> Pennsbury Road | Newton Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | PA 412 (Durham Road) <br> and PA 212 (Main <br> Street) | Springfield Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | Sycamore Street and <br> Washington Crossing <br> Road | Newtown Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Bristol Road and <br> Bustleton Pike | Northampton Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | PA 232 (Windy Bush <br> Road) and Street Road | Upper Makefield Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | Old Bethlehem Pike <br> and Tollgate Road | Richland Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | PA 132 (Street Road ) <br> and Lower State Road | Warrington Township | Non\| |
| $\mathbf{1}$ |  | None\| |  |

## Current Roundabout Activities

The intersection of PA 202 (Lower York Road) and PA 179 (Bridge Street) in Solesbury Township is under review for consideration of a roundabout. There is a roundabout currently operating in Richland Township at the intersection of Station Road and Old Bethlehem Pike. Also, Bucks County houses 1 "hybrid" roundabout. The "hybrid" roundabout in Warminster Township is located on Old York Road at an office park located approximately one-quarter mile south of Bristol Road.
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### 5.1.2 CHESTER COUNTY

## Candidate Prioritization Selection

Chester County had 276 intersections identified from the DVRPC roundabout screening process. As indicated in Map 2A, the candidate locations are distributed throughout the county. Chester County Planning Commission selected 10 locations for further review of roundabout installation. The county established two categories: the first five being priority locations that have local support and good geometry; the last five are good candidates with no obvious problems. The candidates were established by the county using a listing of potential sites previously submitted for the Pennsylvania TIP to fund "pilot" roundabout projects in the region (January 2007), expressions of interest from municipalities, and feedback from staff and PennDOT. Some of the county's intersections identified from the pilot round of TIP candidate selection process are included in the 10 locations for further analysis. Additionally, as a result of its technical review, the Planning Commission added 33 additional candidate locations to the DVRPC generated list. Map 2B shows the location of the county's top 10 intersections for consideration. Below, Figures $7-9$ highlight the top three priority intersections listed by the county for further analysis. Table 5 contains the list of the other 24 locations for roundabout consideration. The cells highlighted in blue are the locations added by the county for further study. Appendix B contains the complete listing of DVRPC intersections.

Figure 7: Chester County Prioritized Location \#1 Intersection of PA 796 (Daleville Jennersville Road) and PA 926 (Street Road)




Figure 8: Chester County Prioritized Location \#2 Intersection of PA 896 (New London Road) and PA 841 (Chesterville Road)


## Municipality: Franklin Township

COUNTY COMMENTS: This intersection of two state traffic routes is currently stop controlled for the Route 841 approaches. The intersection currently has sight-distance and slope challenges that pose safety concerns. PennDOT and the township have been coordinating on interim safety improvements to the intersection. Further analysis of this intersection was recommended by the multi-municipal PA 896 Corridor Plan and the DVRPC PA 896 Road Safety Audit.

PENNDOT COMMENTS: None

Figure 9: Chester County Prioritized Location \#3 Intersection of Boot Road and Ship Road


Municipality: West Whiteland Township
COUNTY COMMENTS: The skewed nature of this three-legged intersection presently limits certain turning movements. A roundabout design would potentially improve the accessibility of these turning movements and the safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. The intersection contains minimal environmental constraints or physical restrictions. Additionally, there is development potential to the southwest of the intersection, which could be accommodated as a fourth approach to the roundabout. An operational consideration is that the intersection is located approximately 500 feet from the signalized intersection of Phoenixville Pike and Boot Road.

PENNDOT COMMENTS: None

Table 5: Chester County's Top Candidate Locations

| Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PRIORITY CANDIDATE LOCATIONS |  |  |  |
| 4 | PA 10 (Limestone Road) and PA 896 (Newark Road) | Upper Oxford Township | This location was submitted for consideration for the DVRPC PA TIP "pilot" roundabout project. There is strong municipal support for a roundabout at this location |
| 5 | PA 896 (Newark Road) and Baltimore Pike | Upper Oxford Township | This location was submitted for consideration for the DVRPC PA TIP "pilot" roundabout project. There is strong municipal support for a roundabout at this location |
| GOOD CANDIDATE LOCATIONS |  |  |  |
| 6 | PA 23 (Ridge Road) and PA 724 (Schuylkill Road) | East Pikeland Township | No obvious geometric problems; worth consideration for a roundabout |
| 7 | PA 82 (Manor Road) and Reeceville/Cedar Knoll Road | West Brandywine Township | No obvious geometric problems; worth consideration for a roundabout |
| 8 | PA 82 (Doe Run Road) and Strasburg Road | East Fallowfield Township | South Brandywine Middle School located on the southwest corner of intersection; no obvious geometric problems; worth consideration |
| 9 | Phoenixville Road (Fern Hill Road) and Marshall Street (Goshen Road) | West Goshen Township | No obvious geometric problems; worth consideration for a roundabout |
| 10 | PA 41 (Gap Newport Pike) and PA 926 (Street Road) | Londonderry Township | Very skewed four-legged intersection with no obvious geometric problems; worth consideration for a roundabout |

## Current Roundabout Activities

Chester County is proactive in moving forward with roundabout installations. There are currently two TIP funded roundabout projects in the following locations: Pocopson Township at the intersection of PA 52 (Lenape Road), Unionville and Wawaset Road; London Grove Township at the intersection of PA 41 (Gap Newport Pike); and Baltimore Pike. A roundabout is one of the improvement alternatives being evaluated at the intersection of North Valley Road and Swedesford Road in Tredyffrin Township. A roundabout project is underway in West Bradford Township at the intersection of Strasburg Road and Romansville/Shadyside Road, which is to be funded by the developer.
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### 5.1.3 DELAWARE COUNTY

## Candidate Prioritization Selection

Based upon the DVRPC criteria developed, there were 158 potential roundabout locations identified for Delaware County. As shown in Map 3A, these sites are scattered throughout the county. The Delaware County Planning Department (DCPD) solicited comments from its Transportation and Historic Preservation sections, as well as from each individual municipality. DCPD's Historic Preservation section identified possible effects to historic properties and archaeological factors in the areas around potential roundabout locations. They noted potential conflicts at 64 of the 158 proposed sites. Each project was given a low, medium, or high rating based on the proximity of the intersection to areas of known historical significance. If historic resources were present in the area, these were noted and described, if possible. Eight of Delaware County's 49 municipalities provided comments on the list supplied by DVRPC and several suggested other intersections where roundabouts would be advantageous to traffic movement and public safety. To expedite project implementation, locations without municipal support were eliminated. The Transportation Section of DCPD recommended 12 prioritized locations for further study based on the provided feedback. As depicted in Map 3B, two of the 12 sites were locations selected by the county as a priority for further analysis. Also shown, the top three locations are in close proximity to one another. Highlighted below in Figures 10 - 12 are the top three candidate sites. The remaining nine locations are listed in Table 6. A complete listing of the DVRPC table and comments from the County Historic Preservation and municipalities are provided in Appendices B and C.
Figure 10: Delaware County Prioritized Location \#1 Intersection of Bridgewater Road and Brookhaven Road


Municipality: Brookhaven Borough
COUNTY COMMENTS: This signalized "Y" intersection is relatively flat; however, the elevation increases nearby, potentially posing a problem for ROW acquisition, if needed. This intersection is very wide and is located in a dense suburban environment. A roundabout at this location could eliminate the existing traffic signal. There were no noted nearby historic resources. This intersection is near the planned Chester Creek Trail and should accommodate bicycle and pedestrian improvements. There is an AADT of 12,000 and 14,000 on Bridgewater Road and Brookhaven Road, respectively.

PENNDOT COMMENTS: The geometry is good for a roundabout; however, traffic volumes are of some concern.



Figure 11: Delaware County Prioritized Location \#2 Intersection of East Dutton Mill Road and Chester Creek Road


Municipality: Middletown Township
COUNTY COMMENTS: This intersection is
located in the center of the Dutton's Mill Industrial Village, and may be archeologically significant. Some structures could be avoided in design; however, steep elevations may prove challenging to shifting the intersection. Traffic counts are about 2,000 and 11,000 AADT on Chester Creek Road and Dutton Mill Road. A roundabout at this location would be beneficial in allowing the through movement at Chester Creek, which is currently difficult to make.

PENNDOT COMMENTS: There is some geometrical concern of a roundabout at this location due to the awkward layout of the intersection.

Figure 12: Delaware County Prioritized Location \#3 Intersection of Bridgewater Road and Chester Creek Road


Municipality: Brookhaven Borough
COUNTY COMMENTS: This intersection is currently controlled by stop signs and is located in close proximity to priority locations 1 and 2 . The AADT through this intersection is 12,000 and 3,000 on Bridgewater Road and Chester Creek Road, respectively.

PENNDOT COMMENTS: There is some geometrical concern over the intersection being close to the bridge and Chester Creek, which could prove problematic for roundabout installation.

Table 6: Delaware County's Top Candidate Locations

| Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | Media Line Road and Gradyville Road | Marple Township | This intersection is fairly wide with good site distance. Minimal ROW is needed and the approaches entering into the intersection is relatively flat grade. There were nine crashes reported (7/1/02 to 7/1/07), including one fatality. The surrounding land use is low-density residential with large scale offices and Delaware County Community College. AADT of 7,000 on Media Lane Road and 1,000 on Gradyville Road. The primary purpose is to improve safety. |
| 5 | Chichester Avenue and Larkin Road/Bethel Avenue | Upper Chichester Township | Currently, left-turn movements have slowed the efficiency of vehicular movements through the intersection. The surrounding land use is mixed with residential, retail, and recreational uses. The AADTs are about 14,000 on Chichester Avenue, and approximately 5,000 on Larkin Road and Bethal Avenue. Route 322 corridor is being reconstructed near the intersection. Due to the large amount of ROW, a roundabout would be beneficial and make it easier to travel through the intersection. |
| 6 | Grand Avenue and Amosland Road | Ridley Township | Grand Avenue is used as a cut through route to avoid traffic congestion on Route 420, and it also parallels MacDade Boulevard. Grand Avenue and Amosland Road is a five-point $Y$ intersection located in a medium-density residential community, with two schools, a daycare, and a playground nearby. The purpose of the roundabout would be to discourage cut through traffic. |


| Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | MacDade Boulevard and Morton Avenue | Ridley Township | This intersection has five approaches, including a skew leg. It has good sight distance and is within a dense, older suburban commercial area. A roundabout could eliminate traffic signals and encourage smoother travel through the intersection. The AADT is 23,000 for MacDade Boulevard and 11,000 for Morton Road |
| 8 | Larkin Road and Bethel Road | Upper Chichester Township | This intersection is located in a lowdensity suburban residential area. The intersection is slightly skewed, with the north leg of Bethel Road entering at a sharp angle. A roundabout would be used to calm traffic traveling through the residential neighborhood. Traffic counts are about 5,000 and 4,000 vehicles on Larkin Road and Bethel Road, respectively. |
| 9 | Cherry Tree Road and Weir Road | Upper Chichester Township | Cherry Tree Road and Weir Road is a " $T$ " intersection, located in a low-density residential area. There were no historic resources located nearby. |
| 10 | Valley Road and Forge Road | Middletown Township | Currently, there is little traffic at this location, though a roundabout may be considered if the intersection requires signalization due to future development. There is ample ROW on the north side of the intersection. There is a historic property about 310 feet away from the intersection on Valley Road. The area is low-density residential, with some agricultural use. The AADT on Valley Road and Forge Road is 2,000 and 1,000, respectively. There may be some elevation issues at this location. |


| Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | Chichester Avenue and <br> Chelsea Road | Upper Chichester <br> Township | This "Y" intersection could benefit <br> from a roundabout to provide right- <br> turn movements onto Chelsea <br> Road from Chichester Avenue, <br> which are currently prohibited. <br> There is a historic property nearby; <br> however, the property is set back a <br> significant distance away from the <br> intersection. The surrounding area <br> is low-density residential. Traffic <br> counts are about 11,000 for <br> Chichester Avenue and 1,000 for <br> Chelsea Road. |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Valley Road and New <br> Darlington Road | Middletown Township | Currently, there is little traffic at this <br> location. This three-legged <br> intersection is skewed. There is <br> ample ROW on the north side of <br> the intersection, but not on the <br> south. AADT on Valley Road and <br> New Darlington Road is <br> approximately 2,000 and less than <br> 1,000 vehicles, respectively. |

## Current Roundabout Activities

Currently, there are two roundabouts in design in the county. The first location is at the intersection of Concord Road and Donnelly Avenue in Aston Township. The second roundabout being designed is located in Newtown Township at the intersection of St. David's Road and Newtown Road and is incorporated as part the Episcopal Academy Campus construction project.
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### 5.1.4 MONTGOMERY COUNTY

## Candidate Prioritization Selection

From the DVRPC screening process, there were 300 roundabout candidate locations identified for Montgomery County. Map 4A shows that the majority of these intersections are evenly distributed throughout the county. Staff from the Montgomery County Planning Commission chose 31 locations for further consideration. This list of 31 intersections was then narrowed down to three categories: high, medium, and low. Six intersections fell within the high category and were prioritized in level of importance by the county. The remaining 35 locations were listed in medium (15) and low (10) categories. See Table 7 below. All of the locations considered by the county came from the DVRPC screening process. In-house knowledge, the evaluation of places with sufficient traffic volumes, and the approaching intersection grades were some of the factors considered for determining appropriate locations of candidate roundabout sites. Shown in Map 4B, five of the six prioritized locations are clustered in the vicinity of East Norriton Township and Norristown Borough. Figures 13-15 highlight the county's top three intersections for further roundabout evaluation. The entire list of DVRPC candidate roundabout locations for Montgomery County can be found in Appendix B.

Figure 13: Montgomery County Prioritized Location \#1 Intersection of Whitehall Road and Sterigere Street




Figure 14: Montgomery County Prioritized Location \#2 Intersection of New Hope Street and Belvoir Road/Marielle Lane


Municipalities: East Norriton and Plymouth Townships

COUNTY COMMENTS: This is a slightly skewed four-legged intersection, though the eastbound approach serves as a local cul-de-sac. Although the New Hope Street approaches are particularly wide, all approaches are single lane with no restricted movements. The adjacent land uses are comprised entirely of single-family detached residential parcels. The intersection is relatively wide, and all adjacent buildings are moderately setback from the roadway. There is a continuous sidewalk network along three quarters of the intersection. There is no significant grade change at this location. This location is near an elementary school, and thus a roundabout may assist school-aged pedestrians. It also carries moderate levels of vehicular volume.

PENNDOT COMMENTS: Strong maybe, but there could be some impact to adjacent property owners.

Figure 15: Montgomery County Prioritized Location \#3 Intersection of Township Line Road and Cemetery Road/Seitz Road


Municipalities: Perkiomen and Limerick Townships

COUNTY COMMENTS: This four-legged unsignalized intersection is located on the border of Perkiomen and Limerick Townships. Three of the approaches leading into the intersection contain two lanes. On Township Line Road, both approaches contain a dedicated left-turn lane and the westbound approach of Seitz Road contains a dedicated right turn lane. This intersection is known for having cut through traffic. The western edge of the intersection is primarily wooded and agricultural. The northeastern and southeastern quadrants of the intersection provide access to two businesses and residential communities.

PENNDOT COMMENTS: Grade issues and traffic volumes through the intersection are of some concern. Sight distance may also be a problem given the grades approaching the intersection.

Table 7: Montgomery County's Top Candidate Locations

| Rank | Intersection | Municipality |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | County Comments


| Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOW LEVEL OF PRIORITY |  |  |  |
| 22 | Warminster Road and Fulmor Avenue | Hatboro Borough | None |
| 23 | Camp Hill Road and Valley Green Road | Whitemarsh Township | None |
| 24 | Schoolhouse Road and Lower Road | Franconia Township | None |
| 25 | Lower Road and Godshall Road | Franconia Township | None |
| 26 | Pleasant View Road and Bliem Road | Lower Pottsgrove Township | None |
| 27 | Walton Road and Stenton Avenue | Whitpain Township | None |
| 28 | Pinetown Road and Delaware Drive | Upper Dublin Township | None |
| 29 | Bethlehem Pike and Highland Avenue | Upper Dublin Township | None |
| 30 | Bethlehem Pike and Bannockburn Avenue | Upper Dublin Township | None |
| 31 | Bergey Road and Cowpath Road | Hatfield Township | None |

## Current Roundabout Activities

There is a developer funded roundabout planned for the intersection of PA 29 (Gravel Pike) and PA 73 (Skippack Pike) in Lower Frederick Township. This will be the county's first roundabout constructed.

### 5.1.5 PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

## Candidate Prioritization Selection Process

The City of Philadelphia had 334 candidate roundabout locations identified from the DVRPC generated list. As indicated in Map 5A, most of the sites selected were clustered in Center City and the central section of the City. Although these intersections met the DVRPC based criteria for roundabout consideration, the majority of the locations were not considered by the Philadelphia Streets Department due to ROW constraints and the impact of nearby historic properties. The Street Department prioritized three locations for further study. The following factors were considered by the department in determining appropriate locations for the installation roundabouts: demonstrated problem area, excessive speeds, wide-open areas, no ROW constraints, and local support from citizens and City Council representatives. As shown in Map 5B, two of the three intersections chosen were not identified originally by DVRPC. All of the sites are located in the northeastern section of the City. Appendix $B$ has a complete listing of the 334 Philadelphia locations identified by DVRPC. Figures $16-18$ below provides details of the three prioritized intersections selected by the Philadelphia Streets Department. There are no current roundabout activities being pursued in the City.

Figure 16: Philadelphia County Prioritized Location \#1 Intersection of Shady Lane and Pine Road




Figure 17: Philadelphia County Prioritized Location \#2 Intersection of Byberry Road and Worthington Road


Municipality: Philadelphia
COUNTY COMMENTS: Byberry Road carries heavy truck and vehicular traffic and provides a link to I-95 and Woodhaven Road. Nighttime speeding along Byberry Road is a major concern at this intersection. This signalized " $Y$ " intersection has wide shoulders at the approaches and is located in a predominately residential community with pedestrian activity. There were 102 reportable and nonreportable crashes recorded at this location between 2001 through 2005.

PENNDOT COMMENTS: The heavier volumes on Byberry Road and the Woodhaven Road project would likely impact a single lane roundabout installed at this intersection.

Figure 18: Philadelphia County Prioritized Location \#3 Intersection of Tomlinson Road and Rennard Street



### 5.2.1 BURLINGTON COUNTY

## Candidate Prioritization Selection

Burlington County had 98 candidate roundabout sites identified from the DVRPC screening process. As shown in Map 6A, the majority of these intersections are concentrated in the northern section of the county. Burlington County Department of Engineering reviewed the DVRPC generated list of potential locations and narrowed and prioritized 17 intersections for further roundabout consideration. Eight of these sites were identified by the county and the other nine were selected from the DVRPC generated list. The number one location was selected by the county and the top two and three locations came from the DVRPC generated list. See Map 6B. These locations were chosen by the county based upon crash history, high travel speeds, complex intersection geometry, likely municipal support, and areas where a roundabout would provide traffic calming and act as a gateway into a community. Figures 19 - 21 provide more detailed information on the county's top three intersections for roundabout consideration. Table 8 lists the county's other 14 prioritized locations. The cells shaded in light blue are the county's identified locations. See Appendix B for the complete list of DVRPC identified candidate roundabout intersections.

Figure 19: Burlington County Prioritized Location \#1 Intersection of CR 545 (Bordentown-Georgetown Road) and CR 660 Old York Road




Figure 20: Burlington County Prioritized Location \#2
Intersection of CR 543 (Burlington-Columbus Road) and Petticoat Bridge Road


Figure 21: Burlington County Prioritized Location \#3 Intersection of CR 532 (Tabernacle-Medford Lakes Road) and CR 648 (Carranza Road)


Table 8: Burlington County's Top Candidate Locations

| Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | CR 684 (Smithville <br> Road) and CR 621 <br> (Powell Road) | Easthampton Township | None |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | CR 660 (Old York <br> Road) and CR 677 <br> (Chesterfield- <br> Crosswicks Road) | Chesterfield Township | None |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | CR 612 (Eayrestown <br> Road) and Bobby's Run <br> Boulevard | Lumberton Township | None |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | CR 622 (Tuckerton <br> Road) and Oak Shade <br> Road | Shamong Township | None |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | CR 528 (Bordentown- <br> Chesterfield Road) and <br> CR 660 (Old York <br> Road) | Chesterfield Township | None |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | CR 612 (Eayrestown <br> Road) at Municipal <br> Drive | Lumberton Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | CR 543 (Burlington- <br> Columbus Road) and <br> CR 660 (Old York <br> Road) | Florence Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | CR 541 (Stokes Road) <br> and Oak Shade Road | Shamong Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | CR 620 (Indian Mills <br> Road) and Oak Shade <br> Road | Shamong Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | CR 616 (Church Road) <br> and Ark Road | Medford Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | Riverton Road/Branch <br> Pike and Parry <br> Boulevard | Cinnaminson Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | CR 563 (Pemberton <br> Avenue) and CR 532 <br> (Chatsworth Road) | Woodland Township | None |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | Wrightstown-Sykesville <br> Road and Wrightstown- <br> Georgetown Road | North Hanover Township | Noure\| |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | Larchmont Boulevard <br> and Union Mill Road | Mount Laurel Township | Non |

## Current Roundabout Activities

There is currently a two-lane roundabout under construction funded by NJ DOT near NJ 607 (Cinnaminson Avenue) and US 130 in Cinnaminson Township.

### 5.2.2 CAMDEN COUNTY

## Candidate Prioritization Selection

There were 202 candidate roundabout locations selected from the DVRPC criteria process for Camden County. Camden County had the highest number of locations identified among the New Jersey counties. Map 7A show that these intersections are concentrated in the central and western section of the county. The Camden County Department of Public Works reviewed the DVRPC list of locations and identified 34 locations for further roundabout consideration. All of the sites selected by the county were generated by the DVRPC list. Some of the factors used in determining possible intersections include, no ROW constraints, minimal impact to historic property, awkward intersection geometry, traffic volume, crash history, and in-house staff knowledge. As shown in Map 7B, most of the intersections cited for roundabout consideration are concentrated in the populated northeastern and north central part of the county. Listed below in Figure 22-24 are descriptions of the county's top three intersections for further roundabout study. Table 9 below highlights the other 31 sites chosen. The DVRPC list of Camden County's locations is provided in Appendix B.

Figure 22: Camden County Prioritized Location \#1 Intersection of CR 706 (New Brooklyn-Blackwood Rd.) and CR 705 (Sicklerville Road)




Figure 23: Camden County Prioritized Location \#2 Intersection of CR 630 (Collings Avenue) and Essex Street


## Municipality: Gloucester City

COMMENTS: This is a three-legged, two-way, stopped controlled intersection. Three single family homes are located at the base of the intersection along Essex Street. The Bordentown Secondary freight railroad line runs parallel to CR 630 and is approximately 100 feet west of the intersection. Railroad Street is a one way in the northbound direction, which intersects Essex Street as an offset to the intersection with CR 630. The surrounding area is predominately residential, with some industrial land uses nearby. There are sidewalks along the approaches of the intersection.

Figure 24: Camden County Prioritized Location \#3 Intersection of CR 701 (Hilliards Road) and CR 700 (Norcross Road)


Municipality: Gibbsboro Borough
COMMENTS: This a four-legged, unsignalized,
skewed intersection. The speed limit in the surrounding wooded residential community ranges from 25 to 35 mph . All four approaches contain one travel lane with narrow shoulders. A driveway is located within the existing footprint of the eastern edge of the intersection. This intersection connects to Gibbsboro Road and Berlin Road, which accesses the Lindenwold PATCO Speedline.

Table 9: Camden County's Top Candidate Locations

| Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | CR 653 (Wyoming Avenue) and W. Graisbury Avenue | Audubon Borough | None |
| 5 | CR 643 (Crystal Lake Avenue) and CR 647 (Hopkins Avenue) | Audubon Borough | None |
| 6 | CR 647 (Hopkins Avenue) and E. Nicholson Avenue | Audubon Borough | None |
| 7 | CR 659 (Browning Avenue) and Creek Road | Bellmawr Borough | None |
| 8 | CR 561 (Tansboro Road) and CR 720 (New Freedom Road) | Berlin Borough | None |
| 9 | CR 607 (Kaighns Avenue) and S. $4^{\text {th }}$ Street | Camden City | None |
| 10 | CR 537 (Federal Street) and CR 543 (River Avenue) | Camden City | None |
| 11 | CR 537 (Federal Street) and S. $10^{\text {th }}$ Street | Camden City | None |
| 12 | CR 601 (E. State Street) and CR 543 (River Avenue) | Camden City | None |
| 13 | CR 601 (E. State Street) and Harrison Avenue | Camden City | None |
| 14 | CR 675 (Cropwell Road) and Marlowe Road | Cherry Hill Township | None |
| 15 | CR 718 ( $4^{\text {th }}$ Avenue) and CR 680 (Center Street) | Chesilhurst Borough | None |
| 16 | CR 648 (Bettlewood Avenue) and Lakeview Drive | Collingswood Borough | None |
| 17 | CR 632 (Jersey Avenue) and Water Street | Gloucester City | None |
| 18 | CR 704 (Erial-Williamstown Road) and CR 687 (Jarvis Road) | Gloucester Township | None |
| 19 | CR 706 (Erial-Blenheim Road) and Tice Avenue | Gloucester Township | None |
| 20 | CR 706 (Blenheim-Erial Road) and CR 681 (Good Intent Road) | Gloucester Township | None |
| 21 | CR 705 (Sicklerville Road) and CR 687 (Jarvis Road) | Gloucester Township | None |


| Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 2}$ | CR 759 (Peter Cheeseman <br> Road) and CR 673 (College <br> Drive) | Gloucester Township | None |
| $\mathbf{2 3}$ | CR 683 (Chews Landing <br> Road) and CR 759 (Little <br> Gloucester Road) | Gloucester Township | None |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | CR 656 (Station Avenue) <br> and Lippincott Avenue | Haddon Heights Borough | None |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ | CR 641 (West End Avenue) <br> and Euclid Avenue | Haddonfield Borough | None |
| $\mathbf{2 6}$ | CR 669 (Warwick Road) <br> and CR 665 (Hutchinson <br> Avenue) | Haddonfield Borough | None |
| $\mathbf{2 7}$ | CR 669 (Warwick Road) <br> and CR 667 (Oak Avenue) | Lawnside Borough | None |
| $\mathbf{2 8}$ | CR 650 (Kendall Boulevard) <br> and Clinton Avenue | Oaklyn Borough | None |
| $\mathbf{2 9}$ | Schubert Avenue and Davis <br> Road | Runnemede Borough | None |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | CR 684 (Kirkwood- <br> Gibbsboro Road) and CR <br> 670 (Burnt Mill Road) | Voorhees Township | None |
| $\mathbf{3 1}$ | CR 716 (Old White Horse <br> Pike) and CR 536 (Chew <br> Road) | Waterford Township | None |
| $\mathbf{3 2}$ | CR 723 (Winslow Road) <br> and CR 726 (Hay Street) | Winslow Township | None |
| $\mathbf{3 3}$ | CR 710 (Hayes Mill Road) <br> and CR 561 (Cedarbrook <br> Road) | Winslow Township | None |
| $\mathbf{3 4}$ | CR 720 (New Freedom <br> Road) and CR 691 <br> (Watsontown-New Freedom <br> Road) | Winslow Township | None |

## Current Roundabout Activities

The county's first roundabout is being proposed to replace the existing seven-points intersection of Park Avenue, Chestnut Avenue, and Gilmore Avenue in Merchantville Borough. A roundabout at this location would help alleviate conflicting traffic movements through the intersection and act as an attractive gateway into the community. This location was identified in the DVRPC screening process.

### 5.2.3 GLOUCESTER COUNTY

## Candidate Prioritization Selection

In Gloucester County, there were 116 candidate sites generated from the DVRPC criteria selection process. As indicated in Map 8A, two of the 22 townships in the county did not have any intersections identified for roundabout consideration. The majority of these locations were scattered in the northern and central sections of the county. Staff from the County Planning and Engineering Departments reviewed the DVRPC generated list and determined seven locations for roundabout feasibility. Some of the factors used in narrowing the list of locations included intersections that did not have recent construction or improvements, contained minimal ROW constraints, was not located within a nearby historic property, and did not have any substantial grades at or near the approach to the intersection. Five of the seven locations chosen by the county for further study were selected from the DVRPC list. See Map 8B. Figures $25-27$ below describe the county's top three intersections. The remaining four intersections are listed in Table 10. The complete DVRPC criteria list for Gloucester County is located in Appendix B.

Figure 25: Gloucester County Prioritized Location \#1 Intersection of CR 612 (Corkery Lane/Franklinville-Williamstown Road) and CR 610 (Clayton Road)




Figure 26: Gloucester County Prioritized Location \#2 Intersection of CR 538 (Franklinville Road) and CR 694 (Monroeville Road)


Municipality: Woolwich Township
COMMENTS: This is a four-legged, skewed, angular, unsignalizd intersection connecting two county routes. Three of the four approaches carry one single lane. The surrounding land use around the immediate intersection is primarily rural, with a single family residential neighborhood located in the southwest and corner of the intersection. There are no pedestrian facilities at this intersection. CR 538 provides direct access to Swedesboro Borough. A request for an all-way stop was recently put in for this intersection. A roundabout at this site could serve as a potential gateway into the borough.

Figure 27: Gloucester County Prioritized Location \#3 Intersection of CR 643 (Grove Street) and CR 640 (Delaware Street)


Table 10: Gloucester County's Top Candidate Locations

| Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | NJ 47 (Delsea Drive) and Salina Road | Washington Township | This intersection is heavily congested, has poor sight distance, and serves as a connector to the Gloucester County College campus. A roundabout at this location could be used as a traffic calming device. |
| 5 | CR 630 (Egg Harbor Road) and CR 603 (Blackwood-Barnsboro Road) and NJ 47 (Delsea Drive) and NJ 41 (Hurffville Road) | Washington and Deptford Townships | This intersection is poorly designed, making it difficult to navigate. It is also not pedestrian friendly and is heavily congested. The surrounding land use around the intersection is developed for the most part, with restaurants, strip malls, and gas stations. |
| 6 | NJ 47 (Delsea Drive) and CR 621 <br> (Almonesson Road) | Westville Borough | This intersection is currently stop controlled, with motorists stopping on CR 621. The land use surrounding the intersection is primarily residential and recreational, with a public park located along NJ 47. NJ 47 is heavily traveled, which makes it difficult for motorists turning onto NJ 47 from CR 621. This intersection has heavy pedestrian traffic. |
| 7 | NJ 77 (Bridgeton Pike) and CR 581 (Commissioners Road) | Harrison Township | This intersection is not controlled by an existing traffic light; only stop signs on CR 581 and New Street. The location also has poor geometry. This is a high growth area of our county and would be a good location for a roundabout. |

## Current Roundabout Activities

The intersection of CR 620 (Kings Sharptown Highway/Old Ferry Road) and CR 605 (Woodstown Road) in Swedesboro Borough is currently planned for a roundabout. Preliminary drawings have been completed. The intersection of Route 322 and the proposed Rowan Boulevard in the Borough of Glassboro is currently planned for a roundabout. The roundabout on Route 322 will connect pedestrians and motorists to Rowan Boulevard.
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### 5.2.4 MERCER COUNTY

## Candidate Prioritization Selection

For Mercer County, there were 139 potential roundabout locations selected from the DVRPC screening process. Nearly 32 percent of the sites identified were clustered in the City of Trenton. See Map 9A. In review of the DVRPC generated list, Mercer County Planning and Traffic Engineering staff added 11 new locations for further roundabout consideration. Of the 140 total locations, Mercer County staff has identified 27 locations in which further study of the installation of roundabouts may be warranted. These sites were given a level of priority ranking of 1 to 4 . Three intersections were given a score of 1 , where the feasibility of a roundabout is strongly desired. Eleven sites were rated priority 2 , including locations where traffic signals have been requested, where there is sufficient available ROW, or where roundabouts have been recommended as a result of corridor studies. Three other locations were identified as priority 3 as potential locations for roundabouts as gateways to town centers or business districts. The last six intersections were identified as priority 4, which are sites worth considering. All of the county's top locations are indicated in Map 9B. The county's top three priority locations are highlighted in Figure 28 - 30. Table 11 contains the list of the other 24 locations for roundabout consideration. The cells highlighted in blue are the locations added by the county for further study. A complete listing of the original DVRPC list is provided in Appendix B. Additional comments regarding the sites selected is located in Appendix C.

Figure 28: Mercer County Prioritized Location \#1 Intersection of CR 638 (Clarksville Road) and Post Road




Figure 29: Mercer County Prioritized Location \#2 Intersection of CR 571 (Washington Road) and Faculty Road


Municipality: Princeton Township
COMMENTS: This four-way intersection is currently signal controlled. The approach legs are orthogonal to one another, with all legs carrying two travel lanes, except for the eastbound 571 approach. Where there are two travel lanes, one is left-turn exclusive, while the other is a shared through-and-right. Its location is adjacent to a heavily wooded portion of Princeton University and the floodplain of Carnegie Lake. The former is along a moderately steep grade, while the latter is relatively flat. Three of the four approaches have crosswalks and sidewalks; only southbound Faculty Road lacks these facilities. This location is near to the existing roundabout at the intersection of Faculty Road and Elm Drive.

Figure 30: Mercer County Prioritized Location \#3 Intersection of CR 571 (Stockton Street) Oak Lane, Dutch Neck Road, and Herron Avenue


## Municipality: Hightstown Borough

COMMENTS: This five-legged intersection functions as two closely spaced intersections. At this intersection, all approaches carry only one travel lane. Located within a suburban residential environment, the adjoining land uses are singlefamily detached residential, parking, and community services. There are no built structures immediately adjacent to the intersection and no significant elevations grades. There are sidewalks along the majority of legs, except for Dutch Neck Road and the southbound sides of Oak Lane and Herron Avenue. This is a complex intersection where a signal may be required. Nearby are two schools, and the intersection carries a large volume of trucks.

Table 11: Mercer County's Top Candidate Locations

| County Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Witherspoon Street and Cherry Hill Road | Princeton Township | Recommended from the US 206 Corridor Study by Glatting Jackson and Urban Engineers for the Princeton Regional Planning Commission, included by reference in the DVRPC 2006 US 206 Corridor Study |
| 2 | CR 618 (Nottingham Way) and George Dye Road | Hamilton Township | Signal required, roundabout would act as a traffic calming device for traffic avoiding Route 33 |
| 2 | CR 640 (Main Street) and CR 632 (PenningtonLawrenceville Road) | Hopewell Township | Intersection has very wide ROW and a roundabout at this location would act as a traffic calming tool and gateway into Pennington |
| 2 | CR 632 (Blackwell Road) and CR 546 (PenningtonLawrenceville Road) | Hopewell Township | This site has a high percentage of turning movements and a wide ROW |
| 2 | Witherspoon Street and Valley Road | Princeton Township | Recommended from the US 206 Corridor Study by Glatting Jackson and Urban Engineers for the Princeton Regional Planning Commission, included by reference in the DVRPC 2006 US 206 Corridor Study |
| 2 | CR 569 (Carter Road) and CR 609 (Rosedale Road) | Lawrence Township | Intersection has a high percentage of turning movements, with a constricted ROW |
| 2 | CR 635 (State Street) and Wall Street | Trenton City | This signalized intersection is complex and is located near a train station |
| 2 | CR 524 (Broad Street) and CR 609 (YardvilleHamilton Road) | Hamilton Township | Intersection has five approaches and is signalized with multiple signal phases |
| 2 | CR 546 (PenningtonLawrenceville Road) and Keefe Road/Federal City Road. | Lawrence Township | Signalized intersection has a high percentage of turning movements, with a wide ROW |
| 2 | US 206 and Ewing Street | Princeton Township | Recommended from the US 206 Corridor Study by Glatting Jackson and Urban Engineers for the Princeton Regional Planning Commission, included by reference in the DVRPC 2006 US 206 Corridor Study |


| County Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | US 206 and NJ 27 | Princeton Borough | Recommended from the US 206 Corridor Study by Glatting Jackson and Urban Engineers for the Princeton Regional Planning Commission, included by reference in the DVRPC 2006 US 206 Corridor Study |
| 2 | NJ 27 and CR 583 (Mercer Street) | Princeton Borough | Recommended from the US 206 Corridor Study by Glatting Jackson and Urban Engineers for the Princeton Regional Planning Commission, included by reference in the DVRPC 2006 US 206 Corridor Study |
| 2 | US 206 and Terhune Road | Princeton Township | Recommended from the US 206 Corridor Study by Glatting Jackson and Urban Engineers for the Princeton Regional Planning Commission, included by reference in the DVRPC 2006 US 206 Corridor Study |
| 2 | US 206 and Mountain Avenue | Princeton Township | Recommended from the US 206 Corridor Study by Glatting Jackson and Urban Engineers for the Princeton Regional Planning Commission, included by reference in the DVRPC 2006 US 206 Corridor Study |
| 3 | CR 518 (Hopewell-Rocky Hill Road) and CR 569 (Hopewell-Princeton Road) | Hopewell Borough | A roundabout at this intersection could be utilized as a gateway into the borough |
| 3 | CR 518 (LambertvilleHopewell Road) and CR 654 (PenningtonHopewell Road) | Hopewell Borough | A roundabout at this intersection could be utilized as a gateway into the borough |
| 3 | NJ 33 and Airport Road | East Windsor Township | Signal requested by the township, a roundabout at this intersection could be utilized as a gateway into Hightstown Borough |
| 4 | CR 579 (Bear Tavern Road) and CR 546 (Washington Crossing Pennington Road) | Hopewell Township | Current signal has a long cycle length, a wide ROW |


| County <br> Rank | Intersection | Municipality | County Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | CR 636 (Upper Ferry <br> Road) and CR 634 <br> (Lower Ferry Road) | Ewing Township | Intersection has a high <br> percentage of turning movements, <br> with a wide ROW |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | CR 624 (Rocky Hill <br> Road) and CR 625 <br> (Elm Ridge Road) | Hopewell Township | Signalized intersection adjacent to <br> Bristol-Myers Squibb access, new <br> development in the area |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Alexander Road and <br> Faculty Road | Princeton Township | Intersection has a high <br> percentage of turning movements, <br> roundabout could serve as a <br> traffic calming device and is close <br> to a roundabout on Faculty Road <br> and Elm Drive |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | CR 634 (Lower Ferry <br> Road) and Carlton <br> Avenue | Ewing Township | Signalized intersection in <br> residential area, ROW would likely <br> be an issue |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | CR 614 (Nottingham <br> Way/ N. Clinton <br> Avenue) and Mulberry <br> Street | Trenton City | Intersection has a high <br> percentage of turning movements, <br> with a wide ROW |

## Current Roundabout Activities

NJDOT is in the process of planning for three other roundabouts in Mercer County, which are likely to be two lanes. Two of the intersections will be converted from traffic circles into modern roundabouts (Brunswick Circle and Whitehorse Circle). The other intersection is currently under study for a roundabout at 5-Points Mercerville (NJ 33 and CR 533).
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### 6.0 CONCLUSION

Roundabouts are circular intersections with a yield-control design feature, which requires vehicles to yield to traffic traveling in a counterclockwise flow within the circle. Developed in England during the early 1960's, roundabouts have been used extensively in countries across the world to improve safety, reduce pollution, and aesthetically enhance intersections in surrounding communities. Since the 1990's, roundabouts have gained popularity in several states across the United States and have become an effective alternative in the safety and operational improvements at intersections.

In the Delaware Valley Region, roundabouts have not been a common form of intersection treatment due to their oftentimes unpopular associations with traffic circles. Given the accounts of the successes of roundabout installation from other states, roundabouts may be a viable option to consider when upgrading or building new intersections in the region. With the assistance of PennDOT, NJDOT, and other planning partners, Phase 1 of this analysis developed screening criteria for siting feasible county-wide locations for implementing single-lane roundabouts. 1,868 sites were identified through the analysis process for the nine counties. The information was tabulated, mapped, and distributed to the counties for their review to narrow and prioritize the listing of locations that met the identified criteria. The counties identified 151 locations (72 in Pennsylvania and 79 in New Jersey) for further study.

Although roundabouts may not be suitable for all intersections, they are worth considering as an option to the improvement of some intersections. In Phase 2 of the analysis, select locations identified by the counties from Phase 1 will be further investigated. This will involve field views, data collection, crash history, and traffic data, and modeling using VISSIM software to simulate the operation of a roundabout for each location.
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## 1. Welcome and Introduction

Rosemarie Anderson, Manager of Safety and Corridor Planning, welcomed everyone. Everyone in attendance introduced themselves and the organizations they represented.
2. Overview of Regional Roundabout Analysis Project

Regina Moore, Transportation Engineer and Project Manager, provided a general overview of the Regional Roundabout Analysis project. She started the presentation by defining and describing the history of roundabouts. Information was shared on the benefits of installing a traffic signal versus a roundabout, including intersection efficiency, air quality, and safety. Ms. Moore provided information and shared examples of roundabouts operating efficiently in other states across the country.

Ms. Moore also went on to explain the goal of the project, which is to improve intersection safety and traffic flow through the application of roundabouts, as appropriate and described the three objectives for meeting the goal of the project, which are (1) coordinate with DOTs and counties to establish regional design and operational standards; (2) determine criteria to be used in screening locations where siting a roundabout would be appropriate; (3) identify a short list of potential locations based on the criteria used in the screening process. She concluded her presentation by showing a video entitled "Making the Case for Roundabouts," developed by the FHWA Midwestern Resource Center.

## 3. Roundabouts in the DVRPC Region

Mr. Jeffrey L'Amoreaux, Director of Traffic and Transportation, Van Cleef Engineering Associates, gave a presentation on his experiences with two local roundabouts currently in operation in the region. The first roundabout Mr. L'Amoreaux described to the group is located at the intersection of Denow Road and Brewster Court in Hopewell Township, Mercer County. He went on to describe in detail the design elements of this roundabout, including its 90 -foot diameter, mountable splitter islands, and emergency vehicle compatibility. Since its opening in August 2005, there have been no reported accidents at this location. The next roundabout example Mr. L'Amoreaux shared with the group is located in Richland Township, Bucks County, at the intersection of Old Bethlehem Pike and Station Road. Opened in 2004, this roundabout has a 110-foot diameter, truck apron, and splitter islands and was a necessary improvement due to the previous intersection geometry. Mr. L'Amoreaux presentation also included a video clip of traffic circulating this intersection. The group was shown the traffic simulation model for the intersection used in the analysis.
4. Current Federal, State, and Local Policies/Standards and Projects

Regina Moore gave the final presentation of the meeting on the current roundabout polices/standards of the Federal Highway Administration, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and other states. She began by presenting information and guidance available from the federal government. She referenced FHWA's Roundabout Informational Guide, which offers general guidance on the planning, design and performance of roundabouts. This manual is currently in the process of being updated. FHWA also has included the roundabouts as a "Priority Market Ready Technologies and Innovations," which will be incorporated into its master plan for additional research and deployment of technology. Ms. Moore went on to describe the policies of two proactive states in roundabout construction: Maryland and New York. Maryland currently has an official Roundabout Design Guide for roundabout consideration. Currently, the state has over 50 roundabouts in operation and 30 roundabouts in the planning, design, and construction stages. A study conducted on eight single lane roundabouts in Maryland with at least two years of before and after data concluded that there has been 64 percent reduction of total crashes and 83 percent reduction of injury crashes at these locations. New York has a policy that mandates that roundabouts be analyzed before deciding to build a new signalized intersection or making major improvements to an existing signalized intersection. Ms. Moore also
mentioned information on site considerations that New York uses in determining appropriate locations for roundabouts. Existing PennDOT and NJDOT guidance and policies were also discussed. PennDOT uses the state Roundabout Guide:
Publication 414 in conjunction with FHWA Roundabout Guide for roundabout design.
It is also the process of developing a statewide roundabout manual slated for release in June 2007. There is no official statewide guidance on the use of roundabouts by NJDOT. Each intersection is evaluated individually and any roundabout consideration is referenced using the FHWA Roundabout Guide. Ms. Moore presented existing/current regional roundabout projects for both states that are either in existence, planned, designed, or under consideration.

## 5. Open Discussion

The attendees were given the opportunity to provide feedback and input on incorporating the application of roundabouts in the region. Summarized below are the thoughts and comments generated from this discussion.

## Policy

- NJDOT is very optimistic regarding roundabouts.
- Neither PennDOT nor NJDOT have specific criteria for determining appropriate locations of roundabouts. In fact, PennDOT suggests looking at potential sites from a "feasibility study" perspective.
- PennDOT is approaching roundabout implementation very cautiously because it wants to ensure that the first ones they construct are very successful.
- Today, many roundabouts are incorporated within subdivision development. Will a roundabout in a private residential development hinder or help the notion of public acceptance of roundabouts?
- A lot of the initiative and momentum for roundabouts is coming from local municipalities.


## Planning

- Research for roundabouts is ongoing. Consequently, design guidelines are constantly evolving.
- It is necessary to recognize and address all the variables that would detract from a roundabout's effectiveness, not just elements that are beneficial for a roundabout's operations.
- PennDOT's Roundabout Guide: Publication 414 has a survey for scoping potential roundabout locations. This survey can be used for planning purposes only.
- For understanding a roundabouts performance, the peak-hour approach volume is critical.
- Very important question: How much does a roundabout cost? A very possible source for this answer is the Maryland State Highway Administration.
- Steep grade can lead to drainage and line-of-sight problems.
- Careful consideration should be given in locating a roundabout near signalized intersections. There is the chance for queues to back up into a nearby
roundabout; therefore, the proximity of a signalized intersection should be considered.
- Each location for roundabout determination should be looked at carefully. Roundabouts that work in other areas may not work in this region; therefore, we should avoid "the cookie cutter" approach in determining criteria
- As a region, we should start with implementing single-lane roundabouts and build from there.
- When considering locations, roundabouts should be in a simple location where there is heavy left-turn/U-turn movements, limited ROW and grades.


## Operational Considerations

- Mountable splitter islands can accommodate emergency vehicles. However, would this compromise the effect of a splitter island as a pedestrian refuge?
- Ramp metering is used on some roundabouts; oftentimes to make up for geometric or driver deficiencies.
- Many questions and concerns regarding the usage of vehicle turn signals at and within a roundabout. Does their usage help or hurt operations and safety?
- With regards to allowing emergency vehicles to pass, should vehicles pull over within the circulatory roadway, or exit the roundabout and then pullover?


## Data and Modeling

- SIRDA and RODEL are analytical but not visual modeling tools.
- VISSIM and SYNCHRO can both look at a roundabout within a signalized network.
- It is important to talk with municipal officials of areas with currently operating roundabouts, in order to obtain "after the fact" feedback about their operations.
- The state police is a potential source of data for roundabout intersections


## 6. Next Steps

Given the feedback from the open discussion, additional research and coordination with the DOTs and counties will take place over the coming weeks. Information on the next meeting will be forthcoming.
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## 1. Welcome and Introduction

Rosemarie Anderson, Manager of Safety and Corridor Planning, welcomed everyone. Everyone in attendance introduced themselves and the organizations they represented.
2. Highlights of September 27, 2006 Technical Meeting

Regina Moore, Transportation Engineer and Project Manager, provided a brief recap of the September 27, 2006 technical meeting. A copy of the meeting highlights were included in the information packets provided.

## 3. Maryland Roundabout Field Visit

Ellis Kim, Transportation Engineer gave a presentation on DVRPC's staff field visit of roundabouts in Maryland. On February 20 - 21, 2007, DVRPC staff met with Mike Neiderhauser, Traffic Engineer with the Maryland State Highway Administration, and Ed Myers, Sr. Principal Engineer with Kittelson and Associates. The purpose of the visit was to tour roundabouts located in urban, suburban, and rural areas and to gain
insight into the development of Maryland's roundabout program. Currently, Maryland has over 60 roundabouts in operation with several in the planning, design and constructions stages. In discussion with Mr. Neiderhauser and Mr. Myers, Maryland has seen a major decrease in the number and severity of crashes at intersections with roundabouts. As a result of the safety and ease of operation associated with roundabouts, there has been a positive perception from the general public. The first roundabout viewed was located in Towson, during the afternoon peak period of February 20. This was one of the first roundabouts in Maryland. Prior to the opening of Towson Roundabout in 1998, the intersection was controlled by two traffic signals and had a high number of crashes. There has been a slight increase in the number of crashes since the introduction of the roundabout; however, the crash severity has been greatly reduced. Results of a pedestrian survey showed a positive pedestrian experience at this roundabout. Mr. Kim discussed the DVRPC's staff observations, including signage, traffic entering and exiting, and pedestrian comfort associated with the roundabout. A video showing traffic movement inside the roundabout was presented. On February 21, staff toured six other roundabouts in various locations, including four incorporated within highway interchange systems in suburban areas. Mr. Kim shared observations and video taken from a rural single roundabout located in Lothian, Maryland. This particular roundabout was of interest given the high percentage of heavy trucks traveling through the circle. The last roundabout viewed was located in Annapolis, Maryland. This urban two-lane roundabout is located as a gateway into the historical area of the city, and has been constructed as part of a redevelopment project. Some of the observations made were the use of splitter islands as pedestrian facilities and the new construction surrounding the intersection. Video was also shown depicting traffic traveling through this roundabout.

## 4. Presentation

Mr. Jeff Smithline, Traffic Engineer, Vollmer Associates, gave a presentation on the Route 29 Boulevard Traffic Study in Trenton and the recently approved roundabout project in Lawrence Township, New Jersey. Mr. Smithline stated the goal for the Route 29 Study which was to improve access to the Delaware River Waterfront and safety along Route 29. This would promote urban and economic redevelopment in the Trenton area. Incorporated within the presentation were several slides depicting three alternatives consisting of the existing condition, traffic data, and CAD drawings of the roundabouts at select intersections. Mr. Smithline also discussed the differences of choosing a roundabout option, which would promote slower speeds versus having a signal alternative. He also showed the traffic simulation for the intersections used in the analysis.

Next, Mr. Smithline presented information on the recently approved roundabout project at the intersection of Route 1 Business and Whitehead Road, in Lawrence Township, New Jersey. Currently, this location is a T-intersection, with a jughandle entering onto Whitehead Road. The improvements for the intersection include removal of the existing jughandle and providing a gateway into the community. Mr. Smithline showed a drawing of the proposed roundabout over the aerials, which
showed a comparison with the existing Brunswick Circle. The presentation ended with discussion on the alternatives selected: concept 1 - jughandle removal with a double left-turn bay, or concept 2 - jughandle removal with a roundabout.

## 5. DVRPC's Region-wide Preliminary Roundabout Criteria List

Regina Moore and Ellis Kim presented to the group for discussion a broad based list of criteria for potential location selection for single-lane roundabouts in the region. This list was developed through research and information compiled from various publications, discussions, and observations. Ms. Moore started the presentation and described the methodology used in determining the list of the eight criteria developed. The criteria are: 1) Crash History, 2) Proximity to Existing Roundabouts, 3) Topography, 4) AADT, 5) Roadway Facility Type, 6) Identified within the CMP, 7) Land Use, and 8) Proximity to Other Signals. The list presented was not in order of importance and is to be used in determining appropriate locations of single-lane roundabouts only. There were some limitations to the criteria, including determining locations for the City of Philadelphia. Philadelphia met few of the criteria given the roadway network and land use density, which results in ROW constraints. Given this limitation, the option of roundabouts being located in the city is not eliminated; however, further evaluation is required to determine appropriate locations. GIS limitation is an issue with applying certain data layers. Of the eight criteria developed, the GIS data layers only applied to five of the criteria including AADT, Roadway Facility Type, Identified Within the CMP, Land Use, and Proximity to Other Signals. Crash History, Proximity to Existing Roundabouts, and Topography were not able to be applied in GIS because the information associated with these criteria was at a macro level and would require further evaluation and analysis on a site by site basis.

Ms. Moore and Mr. Kim explained in detailed each of the eight criteria, after which attendees were given the opportunity to provide feedback and input on the list that was developed. Summarized below are the criteria descriptions and the thoughts and comments generated from the discussion.

1. Crash History - Target intersections where there are high crash histories within the past three years and focus on crash types commonly associated "at intersections" (i.e. angle, rear-end, pedestrians, left-turning movement)

- Agreed that this was a beneficial criteria

2. Proximity to Existing Roundabout - Target locations within a municipality or bordering a municipality where there is an already existing roundabout; likelihood of positive public acceptance

- Eliminate criteria \#2 (proximity to existing roundabout)
o Very few existing roundabouts to justify criteria
o Use this criteria at a later time when more are in operation

3. Topography - Only target locations with grades $<3$ to 4 percent in order to avoid locations with substantial grade differences, which may limit sight distances,
complicate construction, and cause increased speeds exiting the roundabout on a downhill grade

- Agreed that this was beneficial criteria

4. $\operatorname{AADT}$ - A maximum AADT of 7,000 vehicles for any approach of a four-legged intersection based

- Mr. Kim explained in detailed the theory behind selecting an AADT threshold of 7,000 , which was based upon calculations taken from FHWA and PennDOT; maximum AADT graphs and tables

5. Roadway Facility Type - Only focused on two-ane roadway segments; look at roadways at the county level ( NJ ) or the equivalent in PA which is the "locally owned, state maintained," to be considered appropriate substitutes.

- There was some confusion on the exact roadway type used for PA
o Sean Lawrence, GIS specialist, discussed the roadway layers used, which were PA locally owned roadways
o Change the wording of PA "locally owned, state maintained" roadways
o Agreed to use functional classification

6. Identified Within the CMP - Appropriate locations must be within a CMP corridor or subcorridor; designation of the CMP assists in verifying current or anticipated congestion and may assist candidate locations with receiving future funding.

- Use CMP criteria as a "bonus" or a definite option for when considering multilane roundabouts
- Some locations may be deleted based upon exceeding the 7,000 vehicle threshold

7. Land Use - ROW is the primary limiting factor; sites must be located within or alongside an "open space" or "undeveloped" parcel

- The criteria should not be so focused on the ROW issue; each location should be looked at on a site-by-site basis
- Consider limiting the land use GIS layer
- From Mercer County perspective
o Prefer a list without the land use layer; and use as a bonus layer
- Eliminate the "open space" wording

8. Proximity to Other Signals - The intersection must be an appropriate distance from a signalized intersection, due to the possibility of queues from downstream signalized intersections extending into the roundabout.

- It was suggested that this criteria should be a primary filter that may require further site-by-site analysis
- One concern was to consider what would happen if two signals that function as one. How would that be a factor?

Some other suggestions were to consider non-GIS factors into the criteria, such as ROW, other resources, and municipal support. Mr. Jeff L'Amoreaux also offered
the idea of not just focusing on the exact approaches of intersections for the actual site of the roundabout. The roundabout design could be shifted to take advantage of more open space or existing ROW. Ms. Rosemarie Anderson, Manager of Safety and Corridor Studies, mentioned that one important thing to take into account is how many of these criteria and which ones must be met for a location to be considered an appropriate candidate for a roundabout. The presentation ended with Mr. Kim showing an example of the specific data and map from Chester County, which identified locations created from the five GIS layer criteria developed in house by DVRPC staff.

## 6. Other Roundabout Activities

a) Elizabeth Schoonmaker, Manager of Capital Programs, briefly discussed two roundabout projects that were recently approved for funding through the DVRPC TIP. These two projects were established in the Pennsylvania TIP to fund "pilot" roundabout projects in the region. The Pennsylvania District 6 Roundabouts Incentive Program made $\$ 2$ million funding available in the Pennsylvania DVRPC region. Two locations had been identified and were recommended for funding through the program:

- Cold Spring Creamery Road and Burnt House Hill Road in Buckingham Township, Bucks County; \$800,000 for construction
- PA 52/Wawaset and Unionville Road South in Pocopson Township, Chester County; \$850,000 for construction

Both projects will advance through the design process using local funding, and construction funding will be provided at the agreed upon amount based on current estimates. Additional costs above and beyond the estimates will be the responsibility of the townships.
b) DVRPC hosted the NE Roundabout Design Workshop on March 1-2, 2007. Ms. Moore briefed the group with highlights from the course. Over the two days, Mr. Howard McCullough, Roundabout Coordinator for New York State DOT, presented his workshop on the planning, policies, and design elements associated with roundabouts. Mr. McCullough, shared with the group several practices common in New York State. There was also various discussion on the proper software used in modeling roundabouts. Overall, attendees were pleased with the outcome of the workshop.

## 7. Next Steps

Based upon the input received from the criteria discussion, DVRPC staff will modify and adjust the criteria list. From this list maps will be developed displaying intersections that met the criteria for potential roundabout locations. This information will be made available to the nine counties. DVRPC will plan meet with the counties to individually discuss and narrow the list into a more manageable number of potential locations.


## Bucks County DVRPC Candidate Locations

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Bucks County - 245 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location <br> Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 871 | Bedminister Twp | KELLERS CHURCH RD | RIDGE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 875 | Bedminister Twp | BEDMINSTER RD | KELLERS CHURCH RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 876 | Bedminister Twp | IRISH MEETING HOUSE RD | KELLERS CHURCH RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 872 | Bedminister Twp | ELEPHANT RD | RIDGE RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 873 | Bedminister Twp | ELEPHANT RD | BLUE SCHOOL RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 874 | Bedminister Twp | BEDMINSTER RD | FRETZ VALLEY RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 877 | Bedminister Twp | WISMER RD | DARK HOLLOW RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 216 | Bensalem Twp | MECHANICSVILLERD | GALLOWAY RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 217 | Bensalem Twp | MECHANICSVILLERD | DUNKS FERRY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 218 | Bensalem Twp | OLD LINCOLN HW | SOMERTON RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 220 | Bensalem Twp | BROWNSVILLERD | ELMWOOD AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 824 | Bensalem Twp | BRISTOL RD | OLD LINCOLN HW | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 825 | Bensalem Twp | BRISTOL RD | NESHAMINY BL | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 826 | Bensalem Twp | BRISTOL RD | RICHLIEU RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 827 | Bensalem Twp | BRISTOL RD | PASQUALONE BL | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 828 | Bensalem Twp | BENSALEM BL | GIBSON RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 829 | Bensalem Twp | STATE RD | HAUNTED LN | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 830 | Bensalem Twp | BENSALEM BL | BYBERRY RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 831 | Bensalem Twp | HULMEVILLERD | MECHANICSVILLERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 834 | Bensalem Twp | STATERD | STREETRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 835 | Bensalem Twp | STATERD | TENNIS AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 215 | Bensalem Twp | GALLOWAY RD | RICHLIEURD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 219 | Bensalem Twp | OLD LINCOLN HW | ROCKHILL DR | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 221 | Bensalem Twp | TREVOSERD | SOMERTON RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 823 | Bensalem Twp | HULMEVILLERD | BENSALEM BL | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 832 | Bensalem Twp | HULMEVILLERD | GALLOWAY RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 833 | Bensalem Twp | HULMEVILLE RD | BYBERRY RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 836 | Bensalem Twp | STATE RD | MILL RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |

[^0] Crashes: Years 2003-2005
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Bucks County - 245 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 226 | Bridgeton Twp | RIVER RD | BRIDGETON HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 851 | Bridgeton Twp | CHESTNUT RIDGE RD | BRIDGETON HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 850 | Bridgeton Twp | RIVER RD | NARROWSVILLE HILL RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 1049 | Bristol Boro | OLD ROUTE 13 | BEAVER ST | 2 | No | No | No |
| 1050 | Bristol Boro | OTTER ST | BATH ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 1051 | Bristol Boro | OTTER ST | OLD ROUTE 13 | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 146 | Bristol Twp | MILL CREEK RD | GREEN LN | 0 | No | No | No |
| 147 | Bristol Twp | RADCLIFFEST | GREEN LN | 0 | No | No | No |
| 148 | Bristol Twp | NEWPORTVILLERD | NEWPORTRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 149 | Bristol Twp | NEWPORTVILLERD | FORDRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 692 | Bristol Twp | NEW FALLS RD | DURHAM RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 695 | Bristol Twp | MILL CREEK RD | LEVITTOWN PY | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 696 | Bristol Twp | STATE RD | CEDAR AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 693 | Bristol Twp | BATH RD | BATH RD | 0 | No | Yes | No |
| 150 | Bristol Twp | BATH RD | FORD RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 694 | Bristol Twp | EDGELY RD | MILL CREEK RD | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 260 | Buckingham Twp | COLD SPRING CREAMERY RD | BURNT HOUSE HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 261 | Buckingham Twp | MECHANICSVILLE RD | BURNT HOUSE HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 262 | Buckingham Twp | NEW HOPE RD | FOREST GROVERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 900 | Buckingham Twp | SWAMP RD | FOREST GROVERD | 0 | No | Yes | No |
| 901 | Buckingham Twp | FOREST GROVE RD | SWAMP RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 946 | Chalfont Boro | MAIN ST | PARK AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 947 | Chalfont Boro | MAIN ST | SUNSET AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 271 | Doylestown Twp | EDISON FURLONG RD | PEBBLE HILL RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 272 | Doylestown Twp | LIMEKILN RD | SANDY RIDGERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 911 | Doylestown Twp | PARK AV | KEELEY AV | 2 | No | No | No |
| 273 | Doylestown Twp | SANDY RIDGERD | BROAD ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 910 | Doylestown Twp | OLD DUBLIN PK | OLD DUBLIN PK | 1 | Yes | No | No |

[^1] Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 ' of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Bucks County - 245 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 913 | Doylestown Twp | ALMSHOUSE RD | LOWER STATE RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 270 | Doylestown Twp | ALMSHOUSERD | TAMENEND AV | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 912 | Doylestown Twp | ALMSHOUSE RD | LOWER STATE RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 259 | Dublin Boro | ELEPHANT RD | DEEP RUN RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 841 | Durham Twp | DURHAM RD | GALLOWS HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 842 | Durham Twp | GALLOWS HILL RD | LEHNENBERG RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 840 | Durham Twp | DURHAM RD | DURHAM RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 235 | East Rockhill Twp | BRANCH RD | MAIN ST | 1 | No | No | No |
| 234 | East Rockhill Twp | PARK AV | THREE MILE RUN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 125 | Falls Twp | PENNSBURY RD | BORDENTOWN RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 124 | Falls Twp | PENN VALLEY RD | RAMP RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 126 | Falls Twp | MILL CREEK RD | RAMP RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 633 | Falls Twp | PENN VALLEY RD | OLD BRISTOL PK | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 228 | Haycock Twp | MOUNTAIN VIEW DR | OLD BETHELEM RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 859 | Haycock Twp | SAW MILL RD | OLD BETHELEM RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 860 | Haycock Twp | DEER WOOD LN | SAW MILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 861 | Haycock Twp | OLD BETHELEM RD | AXE HANDLE RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 862 | Haycock Twp | AXE HANDLE RD | UNION RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 252 | Hilltown Twp | HILLTOWN PK | BLOOMING GLEN RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 254 | Hilltown Twp | CALLOWHILL RD | CALLOWHILL RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 889 | Hilltown Twp | SOUDERTONRD | BLOOMING GLEN RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 890 | Hilltown Twp | SOUDERTON RD | CALLOWHILL RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 894 | Hilltown Twp | HILLTOWN PK | CHURCH RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 895 | Hilltown Twp | HILLTOWN PK | DIAMOND ST | 1 | No | No | No |
| 896 | Hilltown Twp | HILLTOWN PK | NEW GALENA RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 892 | Hilltown Twp | BETHLEHEM PK | BROAD ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 253 | Hilltown Twp | DUBLIN RD | HILLTOWN PK | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 891 | Hilltown Twp | SOUDERTON RD | DIAMOND ST | 2 | No | Yes | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Bucks County - 245 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location <br> Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 893 | Hilltown Twp | LIMEKILN PK | HILLTOWN PK | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 1063 | Hulmeville Boro | HULMEVILLE RD | HULME AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 680 | Langhorne Boro | MAPLE AV | BELLEVUE AV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 313 | Lower Makefield Twp | LINDENHURST RD | QUARRY RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 315 | Lower Makefield Twp | OXFORD VALLEY RD | EDGEWOOD RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 316 | Lower Makefield Twp | EDGEWOOD RD | MAKEFIELD RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 972 | Lower Makefield Twp | LANGHORNE-YARDLEY RD | LANGHORNE YARDLEY RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 976 | Lower Makefield Twp | YARDLEY MORRISVILLERD | YARDLEY MORRISVILLERD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 977 | Lower Makefield Twp | YARDLEY MORRISVILLE RD | MAKEFIELD RD | 0 | No | No | No |
| 314 | Lower Makefield Twp | DOLINGTON RD | QUARRY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 317 | Lower Makefield Twp | BIG OAK RD | MAKEFIELD RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 318 | Lower Makefield Twp | BIG OAK RD | STONY HILL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 319 | Lower Makefield Twp | BIG OAK RD | OXFORD VALLEY RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 321 | Lower Makefield Twp | HEACOCK RD | STONY HILL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 973 | Lower Makefield Twp | YARDLEY NEWTOWN RD | MIRROR LAKE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 974 | Lower Makefield Twp | LANGHORNE YARDLEY RD | MIRROR LAKE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 975 | Lower Makefield Twp | LANGHORNE YARDLEY RD | EDGEWOOD RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 978 | Lower Makefield Twp | PINE GROVE RD | YARDLEY MORRISVILLERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 312 | Lower Makefield Twp | LINDENHURST RD | TWINING RD | 2 | No | Yes | No |
| 320 | Lower Makefield Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | BIG OAK RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 979 | Lower Makefield Twp | PINE GROVE RD | BIG OAK RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 682 | Lower Southampton Twp | BRIDGETOWN PK | BRISTOL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 683 | Lower Southampton Twp | BRIDGETOWN PK | BRISTOL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 684 | Lower Southampton Twp | BRIDGETOWN PK | ELMWOOD AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 685 | Lower Southampton Twp | BRISTOL RD | BROWNSVILLE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 681 | Lower Southampton Twp | BRIDGETOWN PK | BRIDGETOWN PK | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 358 | Middletown Twp | HULMEVILLE RD | HULMEVILLERD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 359 | Middletown Twp | BROWNSVILLE RD | OLD LINCOLN HW | 1 | Yes | No | No |

[^2]Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Bucks County - 245 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 360 | Middletown Twp | BROWNSVILLERD | PERIWINKLE AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 361 | Middletown Twp | HIGHLAND AV | OLD LINCOLN HW | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1009 | Middletown Twp | WINCHESTER AV | FLOWERS MILL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1010 | Middletown Twp | TRENTON RD | BRISTOL OXFORD VALLEY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1011 | Middletown Twp | TRENTON RD | BRISTOL OXFORD VALLEY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1012 | Middletown Twp | TRENTON RD | WOODBOURNE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1013 | Middletown Twp | BRISTOL OXFORD VALLEY RD | WOODBOURNE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1014 | Middletown Twp | TRENTONRD | DURHAM RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 1015 | Middletown Twp | HIGHLAND AV | HULMEVILLERD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1006 | Middletown Twp | WOODBOURNE RD | PENNS TR | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 1007 | Middletown Twp | WOODBOURNE RD | BIG OAK RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 1008 | Middletown Twp | BRIDGETOWN RD | LANGHORNE YARDLEY RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 232 | Milford Twp | KRAMMES RD | STEINBURG RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 233 | Milford Twp | ROSE DALERD | OLD BETHLEHEM PK | 1 | No | No | No |
| 867 | Milford Twp | UPPER RIDGERD | TRUMBAUERSVILLERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 868 | Milford Twp | ALLENTOWN RD | ROSE DALE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 866 | Milford Twp | TRUMBAUERSVILLERD | CREAMERY RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 865 | Milford Twp | KUMRY RD | KRAMMES RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 1016 | Morrisville Boro | TRENTON AV | PENNSYLVANIA AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1017 | Morrisville Boro | OLD BRISTOL PK | PENNSYLVANIA AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 266 | New Britain Twp | CALLOWHILL RD | NEW GALENA RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 267 | New Britain Twp | NEW GALENA RD | NEW GALENA RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 905 | New Britain Twp | LIMEKILN PK | NEW GALENA RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 906 | New Britain Twp | LIMEKILN PK | NEW GALENA RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 907 | New Britain Twp | PARK AV | CALLOWHILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 908 | New Britain Twp | BRISTOL RD | UPPER STATE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 902 | New Hope Boro | RIVER RD | WINDY BUSH RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 1000 | Newtown Boro | STATE ST | CENTRE AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |

[^3] Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Bucks County - 245 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 311 | Newtown Twp | EAGLERD | EAGLERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 968 | Newtown Twp | WASHINGTON CROSSING RD | SYCAMORE ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 969 | Newtown Twp | SYCAMORE ST | WASHINGTON AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 970 | Newtown Twp | BUCK RD | SYCAMORE ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 971 | Newtown Twp | NEWTOWN YARDLEY RD | LOWER DOLINGTON RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 967 | Newtown Twp | DURHAM RD | EAGLE RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 227 | Nockamixon Twp | DURHAM RD | CHURCH HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 984 | Northampton Twp | SECOND STREET PK | WORTHINGTON MILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 345 | Northampton Twp | HOLLAND RD | MIDDLE HOLLAND RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 346 | Northampton Twp | HOLLAND RD | LOWER HOLLAND RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 347 | Northampton Twp | CHURCHVILLE LN | HOLLAND RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 348 | Northampton Twp | HOLLAND RD | EAST HOLLAND RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 349 | Northampton Twp | BRIDGETOWN PK | EAST HOLLAND RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 350 | Northampton Twp | BUSTLETON PIKE | BRISTOL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 985 | Northampton Twp | BUSTLETON PK | UPPER HOLLAND RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 986 | Northampton Twp | BUSTLETON PK | LOWER HOLLAND RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 983 | Northampton Twp | SECOND STREET PK | HATBORO RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 258 | Perkasie Boro | FIFTH ST | FIFTH ST | 2 | No | No | No |
| 898 | Perkasie Boro | FIFTH ST | CALLOWHILL RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 257 | Perkasie Boro | MARKET ST | MARKET ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 899 | Perkasie Boro | FIFTH ST | FIFTH ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 239 | Plumstead Twp | CARVERSVILLE RD | DANBORO POINT PLEASANT PK | 1 | No | No | No |
| 240 | Plumstead Twp | DANBORO POINT PLEASANT PK | TOHICKON HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 880 | Plumstead Twp | STUMP RD | STUMP RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 882 | Plumstead Twp | STATEPARKRD | TOHICKON HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 881 | Plumstead Twp | WISMER RD | STUMP RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 878 | Quakertown Boro | PARK AV | MAIN ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 236 | Quakertown Boro | MAIN ST | MILL ST | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |

[^4] Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Bucks County - 245 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 229 | Richland Twp | CALIFORNIA RD | CHERRY RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 230 | Richland Twp | OLD BETHLEHEM PK | STATION RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 231 | Richland Twp | OLD BETHLEHEM PK | TOLLGATE RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 863 | Richland Twp | OLD BETHLEHEM PK | PALETOWN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 864 | Richland Twp | RICHLANDTOWN PK | RICHLANDTOWN PK | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 869 | Richlandtown Boro | MAIN ST | CHERRY ST | 1 | No | No | No |
| 870 | Richlandtown Boro | MAIN ST | UNION RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 263 | Sellersville Boro | MAPLEAV | LAWN AV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 264 | Sellersville Boro | NOBLEST | LAWN AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 265 | Sellersville Boro | CAT HILL RD | FARMERS LN | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 909 | Silverdale Boro | MAIN ST | BARINGER AV | 2 | No | No | No |
| 242 | Solebury Twp | MECHANICSVILLERD | MECHANICSVILLE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 243 | Solebury Twp | AQUETONG RD | CARVERSVILLERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 244 | Solebury Twp | AQUETONG RD | WINDY BUSH RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 245 | Solebury Twp | RIVER RD | AQUETONG RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 246 | Solebury Twp | AQUETONG RD | STONEY HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 247 | Solebury Twp | AQUETONG RD | GREEN HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 885 | Solebury Twp | RIVER RD | FLEECY DALERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 886 | Solebury Twp | RIVER RD | GREEN HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 887 | Solebury Twp | RIVER RD | PHILLIPS MILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 223 | Springfield Twp | OLD BETHLEHEM RD | OLD BETHELEM RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 224 | Springfield Twp | SPRINGTOWN RD | HELLERTOWN RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 225 | Springfield Twp | DURHAM RD | DURHAM RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 843 | Springfield Twp | QUAKERTOWN RD | CALIFORNIA RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 844 | Springfield Twp | STATERD | RICHLANDTOWN PK | 1 | No | No | No |
| 846 | Springfield Twp | DURHAM RD | SLIFER VALLEY RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 848 | Springfield Twp | DURHAM RD | STONY GARDEN RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 849 | Springfield Twp | DURHAM RD | GALLOWS HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |

[^5] Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Bucks County - 245 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 845 | Springfield Twp | OLD BETHLEHEM RD | SLIFER VALLEY RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 847 | Springfield Twp | DURHAM RD | LEHNENBERG RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 853 | Tinicum Twp | DARK HOLLOW RD | DARK HOLLOW RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 854 | Tinicum Twp | DARK HOLLOW RD | RED HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 855 | Tinicum Twp | GEIGEL HILL RD | UPPER TINICUM CHURCH RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 856 | Tinicum Twp | HEADQUARTERS RD | GEIGEL HILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 852 | Tinicum Twp | HEADQUARTERS RD | RED HILLRD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 857 | Tinicum Twp | RIVER RD | HEADQUARTERS RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 858 | Tinicum Twp | RIVER RD | DARK HOLLOW RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 241 | Trumbauersville Boro | BROAD ST | BROAD ST | 0 | No | No | No |
| 883 | Trumbauersville Boro | CREAMERY RD | KUMRY RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 884 | Trumbauersville Boro | MAIN ST | BROAD ST | 1 | No | No | No |
| 711 | Tullytown Boro | MAIN ST | OXFORD AV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 921 | Upper Makefield Twp | STREETRD | WINDY BUSH RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 922 | Upper Makefield Twp | RIVER RD | STONY BROOK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 923 | Upper Makefield Twp | PINEVILLE RD | EAGLERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 924 | Upper Makefield Twp | WASHINGTON CROSSING RD | DOLINGTON RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 925 | Upper Makefield Twp | WASHINGTON CROSSING RD | WRIGHTSTOWN RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 926 | Upper Makefield Twp | WASHINGTON CROSSING RD | TAYLORSVILLE RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 131 | Upper Southampton Twp | BRISTOL RD | CHURCHVILLERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 636 | Upper Southampton Twp | BRISTOL RD | DAVISVILLERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 637 | Upper Southampton Twp | BUSTLETON PIKE | GRAVEL HILL RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 638 | Upper Southampton Twp | BUSTLETON PK | BRISTOL RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 999 | Warminster Twp | BRISTOL RD | HATBORO RD | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 950 | Warrington Twp | BRISTOL RD | LOWER STATE RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 951 | Warrington Twp | STREETRD | LOWER STATE RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 952 | Warrington Twp | BRISTOL RD | GUINEA LN | 1 | No | No | No |
| 953 | Warrington Twp | BRISTOL RD | VALLEY RD | 2 | No | Yes | No |

[^6] Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Bucks County - 245 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Location } \\ \text { Number } \end{array}$ | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Sig } \\ \text { Score } \end{array}$ | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 305 | Warwick Twp | ALMSHOUSERD | GUINEALN | 2 | No | No | No |
| 306 | Warwick Twp | RUSHLAND RD | ALMSHOUSE RD | 1 | №- | No | № |
| 307 | Warwick Twp | ALMSHOUSERD | MEARNS RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 954 | Warwick Twp | BRISTOL RD | MEARNS RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 248 | West Rockhill Twp | ALLENTOWNRD | FINLAND RD | 1 | № | № | No |
| 249 | West Rockhill Twp | ALLENTOWN RD | RIDGE VALLEY RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 888 | West Rockhill Twp | RIDGEVALLEY RD | FORREST RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 250 | West Rockhill Twp | LAWN AV | FARMERS LN | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 268 | West Rockhiil Twp | DIAMOND ST | BRANCH RD |  | Yes | No | No |
| 293 | Wrightstown Twp | JAMISON RD | SACKETTSFORD RD | 1 | № | No | No |
| 296 | Wrightsomn Twp | WINDY BUSH RD | PIIEEL | 1 | No | No | No |
| 945 | Wrightstown Twp | SWAMPRD | WORTHINGTONMLLRD | 1 | No | № | No |
| 294 | Wrightstown Twp | FOREST GROVE RD | TOWNSHPLINERD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 295 | Wrightstown Twp | MLL CREEK RD | TOWNSHP LINE RD | 1 | Yes | No | № |
| 941 | Wrightstown Twp | SECOND STREET PK | CHERRY LN | 1 | No | Yes | № |
| 942 | Wrightstown Twp | SWAMP RD | MLL CREEK RD | 1 | No | Yes | № |
| 943 | Wrightstown Twp | SWAMPRD | SWAMP RD | - | № | Yes | No |
| 944 | Wrightstown Twp | SECOND STREET PK | SWAMP RD | 2 | No | Yes | No |
| 838 | Yardley Boro | AFTONAV | MAIN ST | 2 | № | No | No |
| 837 | Yardley Boro | MAIN ST | YARDLEYRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 839 | Yardley Boro | READING AV | MAIN ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |

## Chester County DVRPC Candidate Locations

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Chester County - 276 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 599 | Atglen Boro | VALLEY AV | SWANN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 193 | Birmingham Twp | BRINTONS BRIDGE RD | CREEKRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 194 | Birmingham Twp | BIRMINGHAM RD | NEW STREET RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 765 | Birmingham Twp | LENAPERD | CREEK RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 762 | Birmingham Twp | STREET RD | CREEKRD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 763 | Birmingham Twp | STREET RD | CREEKRD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 764 | Birmingham Twp | BIRMINGHAM RD | STREET RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 54 | Caln Twp | KINGS HW | BAILEY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 55 | Caln Twp | KINGS HW | BAILEY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 56 | Caln Twp | KINGS HW | BARLEY SHEAF RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 548 | Caln Twp | REECEVILLERD | BLACK HORSE HILL RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 549 | Caln Twp | REECEVILLERD | KINGS HW | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 50 | Caln Twp | BONDSVILLERD | G O CARLSON BL | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 51 | Caln Twp | MARSHALLTON RD | HAZELWOODAV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 53 | Caln Twp | BONDSVILLERD | EDGES MILL R | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 550 | Caln Twp | LLOYDAV | G O CARLSON BL | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 49 | Caln Twp | BARLEY SHEAF RD | G O CARLSON BL | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 52 | Caln Twp | KINGS HW | BONDSVILLE RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 363 | Charlestown Twp | CHARLESTOWNRD | COLD STREAM RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 1030 | Charlestown Twp | CONESTOGA RD | VALLEY HILL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1033 | Charlestown Twp | COLD STREAM RD | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 1031 | Charlestown Twp | MOREHALL RD | CHARLESTOWNRD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 1032 | Charlestown Twp | MOREHALL RD | WHITEHORSE RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 71 | Coatesville City | EIGHTH AV | OLIVEST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 575 | Coatesville City | STRODEAV | VALLEY RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 576 | Coatesville City | FIRST AV | OAK ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 547 | Downingtown Boro | GLENSIDE RD | BRADFORD AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded
Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000' of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Chester County - 276 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig <br> Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 572 | East Bradford Twp | LENAPE RD | CREEK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 573 | East Bradford Twp | BIRMINGHAM RD | LENAPE RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 68 | East Bradford Twp | WEST MINER ST | BRADFORD AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 69 | East Bradford Twp | WEST MINER ST | PRICE ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 70 | East Bradford Twp | BRADFORD AV | PRICE ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 574 | East Bradford Twp | STRASBURG RD | BRADFORD AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 67 | East Bradford Twp | BRANDYWINE CREEK RD | BRANDYWINE CREEK RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 21 | East Brandywine Twp | REECEVILLERD | BONDSVILLE RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 17 | East Brandywine Twp | DOWLIN FORGERD | CREEKRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 18 | East Brandywine Twp | CORNER KETCH LYNDELLRD | CREEK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 19 | East Brandywine Twp | HOPEWELLRD | CORNER KETCH LYNDELL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 20 | East Brandywine Twp | HOPEWELL RD | REEDS RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 46 | East Caln Twp | CREEK RD | NORWOOD RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 353 | East Coventry Twp | CEDARVILLE RD | ELLIS WOODS RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 998 | East Coventry Twp | SCHUYLKILL RD | OLD SCHUYLKILL RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 581 | East Fallowfield Twp | BUCK RUN RD | STRASBURG RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 582 | East Fallowfield Twp | DOE RUN RD | STRASBURG RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 580 | East Fallowfield Twp | STRASBURG RD | BRANDYWINE CREEK RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 546 | East Goshen Twp | GOSHEN RD | DUTTON MILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 539 | East Goshen Twp | N CHESTER RD | GREEN HILLRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 540 | East Goshen Twp | N CHESTER RD | PAOLIPK | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 541 | East Goshen Twp | PAOLI PK | AIRPORT RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 543 | East Goshen Twp | N CHESTER RD | BOOTRD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 544 | East Goshen Twp | N CHESTER RD | BOOTRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 545 | East Goshen Twp | STRASBURGRD | N CHESTER RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 47 | East Goshen Twp | STRASBURG RD | ELLIS LN | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 542 | East Goshen Twp | PAOLI PK | ELLIS LN | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000' of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Chester County - 276 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 772 | East Marlborough Twp | DOERUNRD | EMBREEVILLERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 773 | East Marlborough Twp | DOERUNRD | WAWASETRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 774 | East Marlborough Twp | STREETRD | STREETRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 771 | East Marlborough Twp | DOE RUN RD | UPLAND RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 703 | East Nantmeal Twp | CONESTOGA RD | FAIRVIEW RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 704 | East Nantmeal Twp | BULLTOWN RD | CONESTOGA RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 122 | East Nottingham Twp | HICKORY HILL RD | OXFORD ELKDALERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 120 | East Nottingham Twp | FORGERD | BALTIMOREPK | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 121 | East Nottingham Twp | BALTIMOREPK | BARNSLEY CHROME RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 627 | East Nottingham Twp | FORGERD | HOPEWELL RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 628 | East Nottingham Twp | CHROME CALVERT RD | BARNSLEY CHROME RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 154 | East Pikeland Twp | KIMBERTON RD | COLD STREAM RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 702 | East Pikeland Twp | COLD STREAM RD | MERLINRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 153 | East Pikeland Twp | POTHOUSERD | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 701 | East Pikeland Twp | PIKE SPRING RD. | PIKE SPRING RD. | 2 | No | Yes | No |
| 123 | East Vincent Twp | PUGHTOWNRD | SHEEDER RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 629 | East Vincent Twp | RIDGERD | WOODS RD | 0 | No | No | No |
| 630 | East Vincent Twp | RIDGERD | BRIDGE ST | 0 | No | No | No |
| 631 | East Vincent Twp | SCHUYLKILL RD | NEW ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 632 | East Vincent Twp | SCHUYLKILL RD | BRIDGE ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 496 | East Whiteland Twp | N CHESTER RD | KING RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 497 | East Whiteland Twp | CONESTOGA | SWEDESFORD RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 498 | East Whiteland Twp | CONESTOGA RD | SWEDESFORD RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 499 | East Whiteland Twp | CONESTOGA RD | MALENRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 501 | East Whiteland Twp | SWEDESFORDRD | SWEDESFORD RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 500 | East Whiteland Twp | CONESTOGA RD | PHOENIXVILLE PK | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 524 | Easttown Twp | NEWTOWN RD | WATERLOO RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded
Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000' of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Chester County - 276 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sig } \\ \text { Score } \end{gathered}$ | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 525 | Easttown Twp | WATERLOORD | CONESTOGA RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 32 | Easttown Twp | SUGARTOWN RD | LEOPARD RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 33 | Easttown Twp | SUGARTOWN RD | LEOPARD RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 34 | Eastown Twp | SUGARTOWN RD | WATERLOORD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 31 | Easttown Twp | SOUTH VALLEY RD | GRUBBS MILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 819 | Elk Twp | WEST GROVE LEWISVILLERD | BRICK MEETING HOUSERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 821 | Elk Twp | WEST GROVE LEWISVILLERD | OXFORD LEWISVILLERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 822 | Elk Twp | OXFORD-LEWISVILLERD | STATE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 820 | Elk Twp | OXFORD LEWISVILLE RD | BRICK MEETING HOUSE RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 155 | Elverson Boro | CHESTNUTST | MAIN ST | 1 | No | No | No |
| 156 | Elverson Boro | CONESTOGA RD | CONESTOGA RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 118 | Franklin Twp | LEWISVILLE CHESTERVILL RD | NORTH CREEK R | 1 | No | No | No |
| 623 | Franklin Twp | NEW LONDON RD | GOOD HOPE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 96 | Highland Twp | BUCK RUNRD | DOERUN STATION RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 95 | Highland Twp | LIMESTONERD | GUMTREERD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 598 | Highland Twp | OCTORARO TRAIL | HIGHLAND RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 714 | Honey Brook Twp | SUPLEE RD | CHESTNUT TREE RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 116 | Kennett Square Boro | SOUTH ST | BROAD ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 117 | Kennett Square Boro | UNION ST | UNION ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 613 | Kennett Square Boro | UNION ST | STATE ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 204 | Kennett Twp | KAOLINRD | OLD KENNETTRD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 205 | Kennett Twp | CREEKRD | KENNETTRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 203 | Kennett Twp | KAOLINRD | MARSHALL BRIDGE RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 206 | Kennett Twp | CREEK RD | OLD KENNETT RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 210 | London Grove Twp | WICKERTON RD | PROSPECT AV | 1 | No | No | No |
| 778 | Londonderry Twp | DALEVILLE JENNERSVILLE RD | STREET RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 616 | Lower Oxford Twp | LIMESTONE RD | STREETRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 615 | Lower Oxford Twp | FORGE RD | STREET RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |

[^7]Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000' of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Chester County - 276 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 617 | Lower Oxford Twp | STREET RD | LANCASTER PK | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 537 | Malvern Boro | KING ST | WARREN AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 538 | Malvern Boro | PAOLI PK | WARREN AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 112 | New Garden Twp | PENN GREEN RD | CHESTERVILLE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 113 | New Garden Twp | GOOD HOPE RD | PENN GREEN RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 114 | New Garden Twp | NEWARK RD | NEWARK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 115 | New Garden Twp | NEWARK RD | NEWARK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 612 | New Garden Twp | BALTIMOREPK | BALTIMOREPK | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 611 | New Garden Twp | NEWARK RD | BALTIMORE PK | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 620 | New London Twp | NEWARK RD | KELTON JENNERSVILLE RD | 0 | No | No | No |
| 621 | New London Twp | NEWARK RD | OXFORD RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 622 | New London Twp | NEWARK RD | STATE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 604 | Newlin Twp | EMBREEVILLE RD | BRANDYWINE CREEK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 351 | North Coventry Twp | CEDARVILLE RD | KIEM RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 987 | North Coventry Twp | SCHUYLKILL RD | LAURELWOOD RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 119 | Oxford Boro | THIRD ST | LOCUST ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 624 | Oxford Boro | THIRD ST | PINE ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 625 | Oxford Boro | THIRD ST | THIRD ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 626 | Oxford Boro | MARKET ST | LINCOLN AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 593 | Parkesburg Boro | CHURCH ST | FIRSTAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 594 | Parkesburg Boro | CHURCH ST | MAIN ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 614 | Penn Twp | KELTON JENNERSVILLE RD | BALTIMORE PK | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 783 | Pennsbury Twp | LENAPE RD | STREET RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 751 | Pocopson Twp | WAWASET RD | NORTHBROOK RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 567 | Sadsbury Twp | VALLEY RD | STRASBURG RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 570 | Sadsbury Twp | VALLEY RD | NEWPORT AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 569 | Sadsbury Twp | VALLEY RD | HIGHLAND RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 568 | Sadsbury Twp | VALLEY RD | OAK ST | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |

[^8]Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000' of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Chester County - 276 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 571 | Sadsbury Twp | OAK ST | OLD WILMINGTON RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 171 | Schuylkill Twp | CHARLESTOWN RD | POTHOUSE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 739 | Schuylkill Twp | VALLEY FORGE RD | VALLEY PARK RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 740 | Schuylkill Twp | YELLOW SPRINGS RD. | VALLEY FORGE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 741 | Schuylkill Twp | YELLOW SPRINGS RD. | PAWLINGS RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 742 | Schuylkill Twp | VALLEY FORGE RD | PAWLINGS RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 743 | Schuylkill Twp | STATE RD | POTHOUSE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1311 | Schuylkill Twp | SCHUYLKILL RD | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 169 | Schuylkill Twp | WHITEHORSERD | POTHOUSERD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 170 | Schuylkill Twp | WHITEHORSERD | VALLEY PARK RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 1310 | Schuylkill Twp | SCHUYLKILL RD | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 84 | South Coatesville Boro | WEST CHESTER RD | WEST CHESTER RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 584 | South Coatesville Boro | FIRST AV | FIRST AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 83 | South Coatesville Boro | BRANDYWINE CREEK RD | OVERHILL RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 679 | Spring City Boro | BRIDGE ST | BRIDGE ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 175 | Thornbury Twp | CREEK RD | TANGUAY RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 176 | Thornbury Twp | CREEK RD | DILWORTHTOWN RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 748 | Thornbury Twp | CREEK RD | CHEYNEY RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 746 | Thornbury Twp | STREETRD | CONCORD RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 747 | Thornbury Twp | STREETRD | CHEYNEY THORNTON RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 745 | Thornbury Twp | STREET RD | NEW STREET RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 375 | Tredyffrin Twp | DEVON RD | DARBY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 376 | Tredyffrin Twp | CONESTOGA RD | OLD LANCASTER RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 377 | Tredyffrin Twp | VALLEY RD | CENTRALAV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 378 | Tredyffrin Twp | SWEDESFORD RD | VALLEY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 379 | Tredyffrin Twp | SWEDESFORD RD | VALLEY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 380 | Tredyffrin Twp | SWEDESFORD RD | RAMP RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 381 | Tredyffrin Twp | CONESTOGA RD | UPPER GULPH RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Chester County - 276 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 382 | Tredyffrin Twp | UPPER GULPHRD | UPPER GULPH RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 383 | Tredyffrin Twp | UPPER GULPH R | UPPER GULPH RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 384 | Tredyffrin Twp | CHESTERBROOK BL | DUPORTAIL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 385 | Tredyffrin Twp | CASSATTRD | OLD CASSATT RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 386 | Tredyffrin Twp | VALLEY RD | YELLOW SPRINGS RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1057 | Tredyffrin Twp | UPPER GULPH RD | OLDEAGLE SCHOOL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1058 | Tredyffrin Twp | VALEEY FORGERD | WALKER RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1059 | Tredyffrin Twp | VALLEY FORGERD | CHESTERBROOK BL | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1060 | Tredyffrin Twp | KING OFPRUSSIA RD | UPPER GULPH RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1061 | Tredyffrin Twp | VALLEY FORGE RD | YELLOW SPRINGS RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 207 | Upper Oxford Twp | LIMESTONE RD | NEWARK RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 791 | Upper Oxford Twp | NEWARKRD | BALTIMOREPK | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 792 | Upper Oxford Twp | LIMESTONE RD | VILLA NOVA RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 364 | Upper Uwchlan Twp | DORLAN MILL RD | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | 0 | No | No | No |
| 365 | Upper Uwchlan Twp | LITTLE CONESTOGA RD | PARKRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1037 | Upper Uwchlan Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | MILFORD RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 495 | Uwchlan Twp | WHITFORD RD | CRUMP RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 5 | Uwchlan Twp | SHIPRD | NEWCOMEN RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 2 | Uwchlan Twp | PECKRD | NORWOOD R | 0 | No | No | No |
| 3 | Uwchlan Twp | MILFORD RD | PENNYPACKER RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 4 | Uwchlan Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | MILFORD RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 577 | Valley Twp | VALLEY RD | SOUTH PARK AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1027 | Wallace Twp | INDIANTOWNRD | FAIRVIEW RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 1028 | Wallace Twp | FAIRVIEW RD | CREEK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 1029 | Wallace Twp | LITTLE CONESTOGA RD | FAIRVIEW RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 1018 | Warwick Twp | RIDGE RD | HEDGERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 1019 | Warwick Twp | RIDGERD | ROCK RUNRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 1020 | Warwick Twp | HARMONYVILLE RD | SCHOOL HOUSE RD | 1 | No | No | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000' of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Chester County - 276 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location <br> Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1021 | Warwick Twp | PINE SWAMP RD | HARMONYVILLE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 1022 | Warwick Twp | PINE SWAMP RD | HARMONYVILLE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 72 | West Bradford Twp | TELEGRAPH RD | STRASBURG RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 73 | West Bradford Twp | STRASBURG RD | MARSHALLTON THORNDALE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 74 | West Bradford Twp | STRASBURG RD | NORTHBROOK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 75 | West Bradford Twp | STRASBURG RD | SUGAR BRIDGERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 76 | West Bradford Twp | MARSHALLTON RD | POORHOUSE RD | 0 | No | No | No |
| 77 | West Bradford Twp | GLENSIDERD | MARSHALLTONRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 78 | West Bradford Twp | THORNDALE RD | MARSHALLTON RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 493 | West Brandywine Twp | REECEVILLERD | MANOR RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 494 | West Brandywine Twp | MANOR RD | HIBERNIA RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 0 | West Brandywine Twp | CEDAR KNOLL RD | HIBERNIA RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 1 | West Brandywine Twp | REECEVILLE RD | REECEVILLE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 523 | West Caln Twp | KINGS HW | OLD WILMINGTON RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 29 | West Caln Twp | COMPASS RD | KINGS HW | 2 | No | No | No |
| 30 | West Caln Twp | COMPASS RD | OLD PHILADELPHIA PK | 2 | No | No | No |
| 85 | West Chester Boro | ROSEDALEAV | MATLACK ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 86 | West Chester Boro | FRANKLIN ST | ROSEDALEAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 87 | West Chester Boro | FRANKLIN ST | NEILDS ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 585 | West Chester Boro | PRICEST | NEW ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 586 | West Chester Boro | WEST MINER ST | NEW ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 587 | West Chester Boro | MARSHALL ST | HIGH ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 63 | West Goshen Twp | GROVERD | SUNSET HOLLOW RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 65 | West Goshen Twp | WESTTOWN RD | LITTLE SHILO RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 66 | West Goshen Twp | GREEN HILL RD | AIRPORT RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 558 | West Goshen Twp | WESTTOWN RD | NEILDS ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 559 | West Goshen Twp | HIGH ST | GREEN HILL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 560 | West Goshen Twp | HIGH ST | GROVE RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Chester County - 276 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 561 | West Goshen Twp | PHOENIXVILLE PK | GREEN HILL R | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 562 | West Goshen Twp | PHOENIXVILLE PK | GREEN HILLRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 564 | West Goshen Twp | PAOLIPK | FERNHILL RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 566 | West Goshen Twp | MONTGOMERY AV | GOSHEN RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 565 | West Goshen Twp | GOSHEN RD | FERNHILL RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 64 | West Goshen Twp | WESTTOWNRD | WESTTOWN WY | 1 | No | No | No |
| 563 | West Goshen Twp | GREEN HILL RD | BOOTRD | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 618 | West Grove Boro | EVERGREEN ST | OLD BALTIMORE PK | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 619 | West Grove Boro | PROSPECT AV | NEW BALTIMORE PK | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 178 | West Marlborough Twp | COATSVILLE RD | STREETRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 179 | West Marlborough Twp | DOERUNRD | CHATHAM RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 180 | West Marlborough Twp | GREENLAWN SPRINGDELL RD | SPRING DELLRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 754 | West Marlborough Twp | STREET RD | NEWARKRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 755 | West Marlborough Twp | STREET RD | NEWARK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 752 | West Marlborough Twp | NEWARK RD | CHURCHRD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 753 | West Marlborough Twp | CHATHAM RD | CLONMELL UPLAND RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 756 | West Marlborough Twp | CLONMELL NEWARK RD | NEWARK RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 151 | West Nantmeal Twp | MANOR RD | LITTLE CONESTOGA RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 698 | West Nantmeal Twp | MANOR RD | LEWIS MILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 699 | West Nantmeal Twp | MANORRD | FAIRVIEW RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 152 | West Nantmeal Twp | MANOR RD | CREEKRD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 697 | West Nantmeal Twp | CHESTNUT TREERD | CREEK RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 700 | West Nantmeal Twp | CONESTOGA RD | CHESTNUT TREE RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 214 | West Nottingham Twp | CHRISTINE RDEAST | BALTIMOREPK | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 818 | West Nottingham Twp | CHRISTINE RD WEST | HOPEWELL RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 1035 | West Pikeland Twp | CONESTOGA RD | BYERS RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1036 | West Pikeland Twp | PIKE SPRING RD. | PIKE SPRING RD. | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1034 | West Pikeland Twp | CONESTOGA RD | NEWCOMEN RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000' of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Chester County - 276 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 707 | West Vincent Twp | PUGHTOWN RD | ST MATTHEWS RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 709 | West Vincent Twp | FLOWING SPRINGS RD | HOLLOW RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 708 | West Vincent Twp | FLOWING SPRINGS RD | STMATTHEWS RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 706 | West Vincent Twp | CONESTOGA RD | ST MATTHEWS RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 526 | West Whiteland Twp | BOOTRD | WHITFORD RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 527 | West Whiteland Twp | BOOTRD | HIGH ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 530 | West Whiteland Twp | KING RD | SHIPRD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 35 | West Whiteland Twp | WHITFORDRD | SHOEN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 36 | West Whiteland Twp | WHITFORD RD | WHITFORD HILLS RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 37 | West Whiteland Twp | SHIPRD | SWEDESFORDRD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 38 | West Whiteland Twp | SHIPRD | SWEDESFORD RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 528 | West Whiteland Twp | BOOTRD | KING RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 529 | West Whiteland Twp | SHIP RD | BOOT RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 88 | Westtown Twp | WESTTOWN RD | OAK LN | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 532 | Willistown Twp | GOSHEN RD | SUGARTOWN RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 531 | Willistown Twp | STREET RD | DUTTON MILL RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 535 | Willistown Twp | PAOLIPK | DEVON RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 536 | Willistown Twp | SUGARTOWN RD | KING ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 533 | Willistown Twp | PROVIDENCERD | WARRENAV | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 534 | Willistown Twp | SUGARTOWN RD | PAOLIPK | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 39 | Willistown Twp | SUGARTOWN RD | BOOT RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 40 | Willistown Twp | SUGARTOWN RD | DUTTON MILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 41 | Willistown Twp | SUGARTOWN RD | PROVIDENCERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 44 | Willistown Twp | WHITEHORSERD | GRUBBS MILL R | 1 | No | No | No |
| 45 | Willistown Twp | WHITEHORSERD | VALLEY RD. | 1 | No | No | No |
| 42 | Willistown Twp | GOSHEN RD | PROVIDENCERD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 43 | Willistown Twp | GOSHEN RD | GRUBBS MILL RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal

## Delaware County DVRPC Candidate Locations

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Delaware County - 158 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sig } \\ \text { Score } \end{gathered}$ | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 757 | Aldan Boro | PROVIDENCE RD | OAK LN | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 758 | Aldan Boro | CLIFTON AV | PROVIDENCE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 759 | Aldan Boro | SPRINGFIELD RD | PROVIDENCE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 760 | Aldan Boro | SPRINGFIELD RD | CLIFTON AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 784 | Aston Twp | CONCORD RD | CHERRYTREERD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 785 | Aston Twp | CONCORDRD | ASTON MILLSRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 786 | Aston Twp | CONCORDRD | DUTTONMILLRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 787 | Aston Twp | CONCORDRD | BRIDGEWATER RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 788 | Aston Twp | PENNELLRD | KNOWLTONRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 211 | Bethel Twp | GARNET MINE RD | KIRK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 795 | Bethel Twp | FOULKRD | ZEBLEYRD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 796 | Bethel Twp | NAAMANS CREEKRD | FOULKRD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 797 | Bethel Twp | FOULKRD | KIRKRD | 0 | No | No | No |
| 804 | Bethel Twp | NAAMANS CREEKRD | MARSH RD | 0 | No | No | No |
| 800 | Bethel Twp | FOULKRD | FOULKRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 801 | Bethel Twp | CONCORDRD | FOULKRD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 799 | Bethel Twp | FOULKRD | GARNET MINE RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 802 | Bethel Twp | CONCORDRD | CHELSEARD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 803 | Bethel Twp | CONCORDRD | CHICHESTER AV | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 798 | Bethel Twp | FOULK RD | BETHEL RD | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 789 | Brookhaven Boro | BRIDGEWATERD | CREEK RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 790 | Brookhaven Boro | CREEK RD | BRIDGEWATER RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 222 | Chadds Ford Twp | OAKLAND RD | DILWORTHTOWN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 208 | Chester City | ENGLEST | SEVENTH ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 209 | Chester City | CONCORDAV | SEVENTH ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 793 | Chester City | SEVENTHST | AVEOFTHE STATES | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 794 | Chester City | SEVENTHST | MADISONST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 201 | Chester Heights Boro | VALLEY BROOK RD | BODLEY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 779 | Chester Heights Boro | LLEWELYN RD | VALLEY BROOK RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 780 | Chester Heights Boro | VALLEY BROOK RD | SMITHBRIDGERD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 781 | Chester Heights Boro | BIRNEY HW | LENNI RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 782 | Chester Heights Boro | BIRNEY HW | BODLEYRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 812 | Chester Twp | CONCORD RD | GREEN ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |

[^9]Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 ' of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than $1000^{\prime}$ from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Delaware County - 158 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 813 | Chester Twp | CONCORD RD | CONCORD RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 814 | Chester Twp | BETHEL ST | ENGLE ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 199 | Concord Twp | THORNTON RD | MILL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 196 | Concord Twp | SPRING VALLEY RD | BRINTON LAKE RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 197 | Concord Twp | BETHELRD | GARNET MINE RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 198 | Concord Twp | MILL RD | BRINTON LAKE RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 775 | Concord Twp | SMITHBRIDGERD | TEMPLERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 776 | Concord Twp | CONCORDRD | CHEYNEYRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 777 | Concord Twp | CONCORD RD | SMITHBRIDGE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 189 | Darby Boro | FIFTH ST | WALNUT ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 190 | Darby Boro | PINEST | FOURTH ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 191 | Darby Boro | FOURTHST | WALNUTST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 192 | Darby Boro | CEDAR AV | CHESTER AV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 212 | Eddystone Boro | NINTH ST | SAVILLE AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 80 | Edgmont Twp | VALLEY RD | SWEETWATER RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 81 | Edgmont Twp | VALLEYRD | GRADYVILLERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 82 | Edgmont Twp | DELCHESTER RD | GRADYVILLE RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 583 | Edgmont Twp | PROVIDENCE RD | GRADYVILEE-RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 200 | Glenolden Boro | DELMAR DR | AMOSLAND RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 57 | Haverford Twp | LAWRENCE RD | ELLIS RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 58 | Haverford Twp | EARLINGTONRD | BROOKLINE BL | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 59 | Haverford Twp | MANOA RD | BROOKLINE BL | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 60 | Haverford Twp | MANOA RD | KARAKUNGDR | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 61 | Haverford Twp | COOPERTOWN RD | COLLEGEAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 62 | Haverford Twp | COLLEGEAV | COOPERTOWN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 551 | Haverford Twp | EAGLERD | BURMONT RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 552 | Haverford Twp | STEELRD | BURMONTRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 553 | Haverford Twp | STEEL RD | EAGLERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 554 | Haverford Twp | EAGLERD | MANOARD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 555 | Haverford Twp | DARBYRD | COOPERTOWNRD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 556 | Haverford Twp | ELLISRD | DARBY RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 557 | Haverford Twp | SPROUL RD | DARBY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 109 | Lansdowne Boro | MARSHALL RD | SHADELAND AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |

[^10] Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than $1000^{\prime}$ from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Delaware County - 158 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110 | Lansdowne Boro | UNION AV | WYCOMBE AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 111 | Lansdowne Boro | WYCOMBEAV | STEWARTAV | 2 | Yes | No | NO |
| 607 | Lansdowne Boro | LANSDOWNE AV | MARSHALL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 608 | Lansdowne Boro | LANSDOWNE AV | PLUMSTEAD AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 609 | Lansdowne Boro | MARSHALL RD | WYCOMBEAV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 610 | Lansdowne Boro | WYCOMBE AV | PLUMSTEAD AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 79 | Marple Twp | PALMERS MILL RD | PAXON HOLLOW RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 578 | Marple Twp | MEDIA LINERD | GRADYVILLERD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 579 | Marple Twp | MARPLE RD | MARPLE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 172 | Middletown Twp | VALLEY RD | FORGE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 173 | Middletown Twp | NEW DARLINGTON RD | FORGE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 174 | Middletown Twp | NEW DARLINGTON RD | VALLEY RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 744 | Middletown Twp | DUTTTON MILL RD | CREEKRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 766 | Morton Boro | MORTON AV | YALE AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 767 | Morton Boro | PROVIDENCE RD | MORTON AV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 181 | Nether Providence Twp | ROSE VALLEY RD | MANCHESTER RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 182 | Nether Providence Twp | BROOKHAVENRD | ROSEVALLEYRD | 2 | Yes | NO | No |
| 183 | Nether Providence Twp | BROOKHAVEN RD | WATERVILLERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 184 | Nether Providence Twp | ROGERS LN | PLUSH MILL RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 185 | Nether Providence Twp | PLUSH MILLRD | TURNERRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 186 | Nether Providence Twp | TURNERRD | ROGERS LN | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 187 | Nether Providence Twp | BROOKHAVENRD | AVONDALERD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 188 | Nether Providence Twp | BULLENS LN | BULLENS LN | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 761 | Nether Providence Twp | AVONDALE RD | AVONDALE RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 48 | Newtown Twp | GRADYVILLE RD | GRADYVILLE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 22 | Radnor Twp | WAYNEAV | EAGLE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 23 | Radnor Twp | DARBY PAOLIRD | NEWTOWN RD | 1 | Yes | NO | No |
| 24 | Radnor Twp | DARBY PAOLI RD | SAW MILL RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 25 | Radnor Twp | COUNTY LINE RD | ITHAN AV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 26 | Radnor Twp | ITHANAV | ROBERTSRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 27 | Radnor Twp | DARBYPAOLIRD | GOSHENRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 28 | Radnor Twp | COOPERTOWN RD | DUNCAN LN | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 514 | Radnor Twp | SPROUL RD | BRYN MAWR AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |

[^11]Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000' of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Delaware County - 158 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 515 | Radnor Twp | BRYN MAWR AV | DARBY PAOLI RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 517 | Radnor Twp | ITHAN AV | CONESTOGARD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 518 | Radnor Twp | CONESTOGARD | RADNOR CHESTERRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 519 | Radnor Twp | CONESTOGARD | WAYNEAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 520 | RadnorTwp | CONESTOGARD | BROOKERD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 522 | Radnor Twp | KING OFPRUSSIARD | MATSONFORDRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 516 | Radnor Twp | BROOKERD | DARBYPAOLIRD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 521 | Radnor Twp | Kiñ | EAGLERD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 202 | Ridley Park Boro | RIDLEY AV | SELLERS AV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 768 | Ridley Twp | MORTON AV | MACDADE BL | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 97 | Springfield Twp | ROLLING RD | SCENIC RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 98 | Springfield Twp | POWELLRD | THOMPSONAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 600 | Springfield Twp | SWARTHMOREAV | YALEAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 601 | Springfield Twp | POWELLRD | SAXER AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 602 | Springfield Twp | EAGLERD | REEDRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 603 | Springfield Twp | EAGLERD | ROLLING RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 195 | Swarthmore Boro | MICHIGAN AV | PARK AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 769 | Swarthmore Boro | FAIRVIEW RD | MICHIGAN AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 770 | Swarthmore Boro | YALE AV | SWARTHMORE AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 99 | Thornbury Twp | WESTOWN RD | GLENN MILLS RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 101 | Thornbury Twp | GLENMILSSRD | THORNTONRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 102 | Thornbury Twp | WESTOWN RD | THORNTONRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 104 | Thornbury Twp | DILWORTHTOWN RD | DILWORTHTOWN RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 105 | Thornbury Twp | SPRINGLAWNRD | GLEN MILLSRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 106 | Thornbury Twp | CREEKRD | SWEETWATERRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 107 | Thornbury Twp | GRADYVILERE | CREEKRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 108 | Thornbury Twp | STONY BANKRD | FORGERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 606 | Thornbury Twp | CHEYNEYRD | GLENMILLSRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 100 | Thornbury Twp | BRINTON LAKERD | GLENN MILLS RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 103 | Thornbury Twp | DILWORTHTOWN RD | CONCORDRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 605 | Thornbury Twp | SPRINGLAWN RD | CHEYNEYRD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 815 | Upland Boro | UPLAND AV | SIXTH ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 816 | Upland Boro | SIXTH ST | SIXTH ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |

[^12]Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 ' of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than $1000^{\prime}$ from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Delaware County - 158 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 817 | Upland Boro | UPLAND AV | UPLAND AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 806 | Upper Chichester Twp | NAAMANS CREEK RD | LARKIN RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 213 | Upper Chichester Twp | CHERRYTREERD | WEIRRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 805 | Upper Chichester Twp | CHICHESTERAV | CHELSEARD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 808 | Upper Chichester Twp | CHICHESTERAV | LARKIN RD | 2 | Yes | No | NO |
| 809 | Upper Chichester Twp | CHICHESTERAV | MEETINGHOUSERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 810 | Upper Chichester Twp | CHICHESTERAV |  | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 811 | Upper Chichester Twp | CHICHESTERAV | BETHELRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 807 | Upper Chichester Twp | LARKIN RD | BETHELRD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 588 | Upper Darby Twp | PROVIDENCE RD | PROVIDENCE RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 589 | Upper Darby Twp | PROVIDENCERD | BISHOPAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 590 | Upper Darby Twp | PROVIDENCERD | AS'SLAND AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 591 | Upper Darby Twp | FRANKLINAV | SOUTHAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 592 | Upper Darby Twp | BURMONT RD | MARSHALL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 89 | Upper Providence Twp | RIDLEY CREEK RD | BISHOP HOLLOW RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 597 | Upper Providence Twp | PROVIDENCE RD | BISHOP HOLLOW RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 90 | UpperProvidence Twp | ROSETREERD | DOGKENNELRD | 0 | Yes | No | NO |
| 91 | UpperProvidence Twp | ROSETREERD | RIDEY CREEKRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 92 | UpperProvidence Twp | RIDLEY CREEKRD | ----MIRKN | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 93 | UpperProvidenceTwp | CRUMCREEKRD | ROSETREERD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 94 | Upper Providence Twp | KNOWLTONRD | KIRKLN | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 595 | UpperProvidence Twp | RIDLEY CREEKRD | MEDIA STATIONRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 596 | Upper Providence Twp | ROSE TREERD | ORANGE ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 177 | Yeadon Boro | BAILY RD | UNION AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 749 | Yeadon Boro | LANSDOWNEAV | PROVIDENCERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 750 | Yeadon Boro | LANSDOWNE AV | BAILY RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded
Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Cig Score: $0=$ intersection is
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000' of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than 1000' from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing signal

## Montgomery County DVRPC Candidate Locations

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Montgomery County - 300 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Sig } \\ \text { Score } \end{array}$ | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 162 | Abington Twp | MILL RD | MOREDONRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 163 | Abington Twp | EDGEHILL RD | EDGEHILL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 164 | Abington Twp | MEETINGHOUSERD | MEETINGHOUSE-RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 165 | Abington Twp | FOX CHASERD | CEDAR RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 715 | Abington Twp | OLD VALLEY RD | THEFAIRWAY VALLEY RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 718 | Äbington Twp | SUSQUEMANNARD | WASHANGTONLN | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 719 | Abington Twp | SUSQUEHANNARD | MILL RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 720 | Abington Twp | SUSQUEHANNA RD | SUSQUEHANNA RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 721 | Äbington Twp | GREENWOODAV | MEETINGHOUSERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 722 | Abington Twp | OLD WELSHRD | FITZWATERTOWN RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 723 | Abington Twp | FITZWATERTOWNRD | NORTH HILLS AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 724 | Abington Twp | WALNUTST | JENKINTOWNRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 725 | Abington Twp | JENKINTOWNRD | EDGEHILL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 726 | Abington Twp | JENKINTOWN RD | EDGEHILL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 727 | Abington Twp | EDGEHIL RD | TYSONAV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 716 | Abington Twp | THE FAIRWAY VALLEY RD | WASHINGTON LN | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 717 | Ábington Twp | SUSQUEHANNA RD | OLD VĀLLEY RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 157 | Ambler Boro | TENNISAV | REIFFS MILL RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 158 | Ambler Boro | PEN-AMBLER RD | MT PLEASANT AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1055 | Bridgeport Boro | FOURTH ST | FOURTH ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 710 | Bryn Athyn Boro | BYBERRY RD | BYBERRY RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 370 | Cheltenham Twp | RICES MILL RD | GLENSIDE AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 371 | Cheltenham Twp | WLLOW GROVEAV | GLENSIDEAV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 372 | Cheltenham Twp | NEW SECOND ST | TOOKANY CREEK PY | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 373 | Cheltenham Twp | CENTRAL AV | TOOKANY CREEKPY | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 374 | Cheltenham Twp | NEWSECOND ST | MONTGOMERYAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1052 | Cheltenham Twp |  | FRONT ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1053 | Cheltenham Twp | ASHMEAD RD | TOOKANY CREEK PY | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1054 | Cheltenham Twp | CHURCH RD | CEDAR RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 127 | Collegeville Boro | CLAYHOR RD | PARK AV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 387 | Conshohocken Boro | COLWELL RD | BROOK RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1062 | Conshohocken Boro | NEW ELM ST | COLWELL RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 251 | Douglass Twp | MIDDLE CREEK RD | CONGO RD | 1 | No | No | No |

[^13]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Montgomery County - 300 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location <br> Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Sig } \\ \text { Score } \end{array}$ | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 145 | East Norriton Twp | JOHNSON HW | OLD ARCHRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 686 | East Norriton Twp | BELVOIR RD | NEW HOPEAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 687 | East Norriton Twp | OLD ARCHRD | OLD ARCH RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 688 | East Norriton Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | NORTH WALES RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 691 | East Norriton Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | POTSHOPRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 689 | East Norriton Twp | TOWNSTIPLINERD | NORTH-WALES ROAD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 690 | East Norriton Twp | TOWNSHIP LİNE RD | WHITEHALL RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 275 | Franconia Twp | COWPATHRD | FORRESTRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 276 | Franconia Twp | COWPATH RD | MORWOODRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 278 | Franconia Twp | MORWOOD RD | CAMP RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 918 | Franconia Twp | COWPATH RD | TELFORDPK | 2 | No | No | No |
| 919 | Franconia Twp | COUNTY LINERD | CAT HIL RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 274 | Franconia Twp | SCHOOLHOUSE RD | LOWER RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 277 | Franconia Twp | MORWOODRD | GODSHAL RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 279 | Franconia Twp | LOWERRD | GODSHALL RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 280 | Franconia Twp | COWPATH RD | RELIANCE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 281 | Franconia Twp | COWPATHRD | COWPATH RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 916 | Franconia Twp | BETHLEHEM PK | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 917 | Franconia Twp | LOWERRD | ALLENTOWN RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 920 | Franconia Twp | COUNTY LINE RD | FORRESTRD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 914 | Franconia Twp | SCHOOLHOUSERD | WAMBOLD- ${ }^{\text {RD }}$ | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 915 | Franconia Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | COWPATH RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 139 | Hatboro Boro | MONTGOMERY AV | NEW ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 658 | Hatboro Boro | BYBERRY RD | WARMINSTER RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 659 | Hatboro Boro | BYBERRY RD | NEW ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 660 | Hatboro Boro | MONTGOMERY AV | JACKS | - | Yes | No | No |
| 138 | Hatboro Boro | WARMINSTER RD |  | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 948 | Hatfield Boro | MAIN ST | BROAD ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 949 | Hatfield Boro | BROAD ST | UNIONST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 288 | Hatfield Twp | ORVILLARD | KOFFEL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 928 | Hatfield Twp | HORSHAM RD | LINE ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 929 | Hatfield Twp | HORSHAM RD | BROAD ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 930 | Hatfield Twp |  | MOYER RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |

[^14]Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Montgomery County - 300 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 931 | Hatfield Twp | HATFIELD VALLEY RD | ORVILLARD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 935 | Hatfield Twp | BERGEYRD | COWPATHRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 936 | Hatfield Twp | COWPATHRD | DERSTINE RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 934 | Hatfield Twp | ALLENTOWN RD | WAMBOLD RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 937 | Hatfield Twp | UNION ST | SOUDERTONPK | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 938 | Hatfield Twp | SOUDERTONPK | TOWNSHIP LINERD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 939 | Hatfield Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | TOWNSHIP LINERD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 932 | Hatfield Twp | HATFIELD VALLEYRD | ORVILLARD | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 933 | Hatfield Twp | KOFFELRD | ELROYRD | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 996 | Horsham Twp | HORSHAM RD | DAVIS GROVE RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 352 | Horsham Twp | MEETINGHOUSERD | MORELANDAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 991 | Horsham Twp | BLAIR MILL RD | MORELANDAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 992 | Horsham Twp | DRESHERRD | WITMERRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 993 | Horsham Twp | HORSHAMRD | NORRISTOWN RD | 2 | Yes | No | NO |
| 994 | Horsham Twp | HORSHAM RD | MAPLEAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 995 | Horsham Twp | NORRISTOWN RD | NORRISTOWN RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 997 | Horsham Twp | HORSHAM RD | HORSHAM RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1056 | Jenkintown Boro | WASHINGTON LN | GREENWOOD AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 337 | Lansdale Boro | LANSDALEAV | SEVENTH ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 338 | Lansdale Boro | SEVENTH ST | LINE ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 339 | Lansdale Boro | VALLEY FORGERD | ElGHTH ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 340 | Lansdale Boro | EIGHTH ST | MOYERRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 341 | Lansdale Boro | CANNONAV | EIGHTH ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 980 | Lansdale Boro | BROADST | SEVENTHST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 981 | Lansdale Boro | HANCOCKST | CHURCHRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 982 | Lansdale Boro | BROAD ST | HANCOCKST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 308 | Limerick Twp | NEIFFER RD | NEIFFER RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 955 | Limerick Twp | TOWNSHIP LINERD | SEITZRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 956 | Limerick Twp | WARTMANRD | TOWNSHIP LINERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 957 | Limerick Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | LİNFIELD TRAPPERD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 287 | Lower Frederick Twp | GAME FARM RD | SMITH RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 927 | Lower Frederick Twp | YERGER RD | NEIFFER RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 362 | Lower Gwynedd Twp | PLYMOUTH RD | EVANS RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |

[^15]Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Montgomery County - 300 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1023 | Lower Gwynedd Twp | BETHLEHEM PK | DAGER RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1024 | Lower Gwynedd Twp | PENLYNPK | BETHLEHEM PK | 0 | Yes | No | NO |
| 1025 | Lower Gwynedd Twp | PENLYNPK | DAGER RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1026 | Lower Gwynedd Twp | PENLYN PK | OLD PENLYN PK | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 6 | Lower Merion Twp | BOWMAN AV | WYNNEWOOD RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 7 | Lower Merion Twp | WYNNEWOOD AV | HAVERFORD AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 8 | Lower Merion Twp | WYNNEWOOD RD | WYNNEWOODAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 9 | Lower Merion Twp | MANA | BRYNMAWRAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 13 | Lower Merion Twp | MORRISAV | MORRISAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 14 | Lower Merion Twp | MORRISAV | MORRISAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 15 | Lower Merion Twp | ROBERTSRD | NEW-GULPH RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 16 | Lower Merion Twp | NEW-GULPH RD | MORRISAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 502 | Lower Merion Twp | HAVERFORD RD | REMINGTON RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 503 | Lower Merion Twp | HAVERFORD RD | MANOA RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 504 | Lower Merion Twp | HAVERFORD RD | HAVERFORD RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 506 | Lower Merion Twp | CONSHOHOCKEN STATERD | YOUNGS FORD RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 507 | Lower Merion Twp | CONSHOHOCKENSTATERD | SPRINGMILL RD | 2 | Yes | No | NO |
| 508 | Lower Merion Twp | SPRING MILL RD | MORRISAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 509 | Lower Merion Twp | OLD GULPHRD | SPRINGMILL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 510 | Lower Merion Twp | BELMONTAV | ROCKHILL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 511 | Lower Merion Twp | CONSHOHOCKENSTATERD | ROCKHILLRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 512 | Lower Merion Twp | CONSHOHOCKENSTATERD | HOLLOWRD | 1 | Yes | No | NO |
| 513 | Lower Merion Twp | MATSON FORD RD | UPPER GULPH RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 10 | Lower Merion Twp | OLD GULPHRD | MILL CREEKRD | 1 | Yes | Yes | NO |
| 11 | Lower Merion Twp | MILLCREEKRD | OLDGULPHRD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 12 | Lower Merion Twp | OLD ${ }^{\text {OULPHRD }}$ | YOUNGSFORDRD | 1 | Yes | Yes | NO |
| 505 | Lower Merion Twp | MILL-CREEKRD | MILL CREEK RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 705 | Lower Moreland Twp | BYBERRY RD | PINE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 301 | Lower Pottsgrove Twp | BUCHERT RD | BUCHERT RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 302 | Lower Pottsgrove Twp | BUCHERTRD | KEIMRD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 303 | Lower Pottsgrove Twp | PLEASANT VIEW RD | BLIEMRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 304 | Lower Pottsgrove Twp | PLEASANT VIEW RD | BUCHERTRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 128 | Lower Providence Twp | EAGLEVILLE RD | PINETOWN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |

Land Use: Vacant or Wooded
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Montgomery County - 300 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 129 | Lower Providence Twp | EAGLEVILLE RD | ARCOLA RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 130 | Lower Providence Twp | ARCOLARD | LEVEL RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 635 | Lower Providence Twp | PARK AV | EAGLEVILLE RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 634 | Lower Providence Twp | PAWLINGS RD | AU'UUBON RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 297 | Lower Salford Twp | CAMP WAWA RD | HALDEMAN RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 298 | Lower Salford Twp | SALFORDVILLERD | HALDEMANRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 300 | Lower Salford Twp | MORWOOD RD | MILL RD | 1 | No | NO | No |
| 299 | Lower Salford Twp | MAPPLEAV | OAKK DR | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 255 | Marlborough Twp | FINLAND RD | UPPER RIDGE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 256 | Marlborough Twp | UPPER RIDGERD | CRUSHERRD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 897 | Marlborough Twp | UPPER RIDGE RD | UPPERRIDGE RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 309 | Montgomery Twp | LANSDALEAV | KNAPP RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 958 | Montgomery Twp | NORTH WALES RD | KNAPPRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 961 | Montgomery Twp | HORSHAM RD | HORSHAM RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 962 | Montgomery Twp | HORSHAMRD | TAYLORRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 959 | Montgomery Twp | HORSHAMRD | HORSHAM RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | NO |
| 960 | Montgomery Twp | HORSHAM RD | UPPER STATE RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 391 | Norristown Boro | MARSHALL ST | STANBRIDGE ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 392 | Norristown Boro | STANBRIDGEST | STERIGER ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 393 | Norristown Boro | ARCH ST | FORNANCEST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 394 | Norristown Boro | FORNANCEST | NEW HOPEAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1070 | Norristown Boro | AIRY ST | SWEDE ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1071 | Norristown Boro | ARCH ST | AIRY ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1072 | Norristown Boro | STERIGER ST | HARDINGBL | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 395 | Norristown Boro | HARDING BL | FORNANCE ST | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 336 | Perkiomen Twp | WARTMAN RD | BRIDGE ST | 1 | No | No | No |
| 335 | Perkiomen Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | PERKIOMEN AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 388 | Plymouth Twp | PLYMOUTH RD | JOHNSON HW | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 389 | Plymouth Twp | BELVOIRRD | PLYMOUTHRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 390 | Plymouth Twp | NARCISSARD | HICKORY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1065 | Plymouth Twp | SANDY HILLRD | PLYMOUTHRD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 1066 | Plymouth Twp | SANDY HILLRD | PLYMOUTHRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1067 | Plymouth Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | WALTON RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |

[^16]Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Montgomery County - 300 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sig } \\ \text { Score } \end{gathered}$ | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1068 | Plymouth Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | PENLYN BLUEBELL PK | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1069 | Plymouth Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | UNION MEETINGRD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 1064 | Plymouth Twp | FAIRFIELD RD | FAIRFIELD RD | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 323 | Pottstown Boro | KEIM ST | BEECH ST | 2 | No | No | No |
| 324 | Pottstown Boro | KEIM ST | JACKSON ST | 0 | No | No | No |
| 328 | Pottstown Boro | GLASGOW ST | SHOEMAKER RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 330 | Pottstown Boro | HANOVER ST | HANOVER ST | 0 | No | No | No |
| 331 | Pottstown Boro | WILSON ST | HANOVER ST | 2 | No | No | No |
| 333 | Pottstown Boro | JACKSONST | ADAMS ST | 2 | No | No | No |
| 334 | Pottstown Boro | HANOVER ST | MERVINE ST | 1 | No | No | No |
| 322 | Pottstown Boro | KEIM ST | INDUSTRIAL HY | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 325 | Pottstown Boro | BEECH ST | HĀEE ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 326 | Pottstown Boro | HANOVER ST | BEECH ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 327 | Pottstown Boro | MANATAWNY ST | GLASGOW ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 329 | Pottstown Boro | STATE RD | EIGHTH ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 332 | Pottstown Boro | FARMINGTON AV | WILSON ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 639 | Royersford Boro | LEWIS RD | MAIN ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 640 | Royersford Boro | MAİN ST | SECOND AV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 903 | Salford Twp | RIDGE RD | MORWOOD RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 904 | Salford Twp | RIDGE RD | ĀLLENTOWN RD | 2 | No | No | No |
| 342 | Skippack Twp | KRATZRD | EVANSBURG RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 343 | Skippack Twp | ANDERSRD | KRATZRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 344 | Skippack Twp | ANDERS RD | STUMP HALL RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 1312 | Springfield Twp | PAPER MILL RD | CHELTENHAM AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 310 | Towamencin Twp | BUSTARD RD | MORRISRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 964 | Towamencin Twp | A-ALENTOWN RD | ORVILLA RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 966 | Towamencin Twp | ALLENTOWN RD | ALLENTOWN RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 965 | Towamencin Twp | WAMBOLD RD | WAMBOLD RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 963 | Towamencin Twp | ĀLLENTOWWN RD | TROXEL RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 140 | Upper Dublin Twp | CAMP HILL RD | CAMP HILL RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 142 | Upper Dublin Twp | CAMP HILL RD | VIRGINIA DR | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 143 | Upper Dublin Twp | HIGHLANDAV | PINETOWNRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 144 | Upper Dublin Twp | NORTH HILLS AV | KIMBALL AV | 0 | Yes | No | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Montgomery County - 300 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Sig } \\ \text { Score } \end{array}$ | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 661 | Upper Dublin Twp | JENKINTOWN RD | FITZWATERTOWN RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 662 | Upper-Dublin Twp | LIMEKILNPK | JENKINTOWNRD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 663 | Upper Dublin Twp | LIMEKILNPK | TWININGRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 664 | Upper Dublin Twp | PINETOWN RD | DELAWAREDR | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 665 | Upper Dublin Twp | LIMEKILNPK | DRESHERTOWNRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 666 | Üper Dublin Twp | LIMEKİN- | SUSQUEEAANANA | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 667 | Upper Dublin Twp | SUSQUEHANNA RD | TWININGRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 668 | Upper Dublin Twp | LIMEKILNPK | JARRETTOWN RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 669 | Üpper-Dublin Twp | LIMEKILN- | DRESHERTOWNRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 670 | Upper Dublin Twp | SUSQUEHANNA RD | SUSQUEHANNA RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 671 | U-pper Dublin Twp | SUSQUEMAN-NA RD | FORT WASHINGTONAV | 2 | --̇-s | No | No |
| 672 | Upper-Dublin Twp | SUSQUEHANNARD | PINETOWNRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 673 | Upper Dublin Twp | FORTWASHINGTONAV | HIGHLANDAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 674 | Upper Dublin Twp | BETHLEHEM PK | HIGHLAND AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 675 | Upper-Dublin Twp | BETHLEHEMPK | BANNOCKBURNAV | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 676 | Upper Dublin Twp | BETHLEHEM PK | TENNIS AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 677 | Upper Dublin Twp | FORT WASHINGTON AV | MEETING HOUSE RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 678 | Upper Dublin Twp | FORT WASHINGTON AV | FORT WASHINGTONAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 141 | Üpper Dublin Twp | CAMMP HIL̈L̄- |  | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 269 | Upper Frederick Twp | PERKIOMENVILLE RD | DEEP CREEK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 988 | Upper Gwynedd Twp | NORTH WALES RD | NORTH WALES RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 989 | Upper Gwy | WALNUTST | BEAVERST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 990 | Upper Gwynedd Twp | BROAD ST | WHITES RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 238 | Upper Hanover Twp | GERYVILLE PK | FINLAND RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 879 | Upper Hanover Twp | KUTZTOWN RD | SCHWOYER RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 237 | Upper Hanover Twp | GERYVILLE PK | JAMES RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 366 | Upper Merion Twp | CROTONRD | WARNER RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 367 | Upper Merion Twp | CROOKED LN | CHURCA RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 368 | Upper Merion Twp | UPPER GULPH RD | UPPER GULPHRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 369 | Upper Merion Twp | FLINT HILL RD | FLINT HILL | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1038 | Upper Merion Twp | MATSON FORD RD | SOUTH GULPH RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1040 | Upper Merion Twp | SWEDELAND RD | SWEDELAND RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1041 | Upper Merion Twp | SWEDELAAND RD | FLiṄ | 0 | Yes | No | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Montgomery County - 300 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sig } \\ \text { Score } \end{gathered}$ | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1042 | Upper Merion Twp | SCHUYLKILL RIVER RD | SWEDELAND RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1043 | Upper Merion Twp | FLINT HILL RD | FOURTH ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1044 | Upper Merion Twp | COATES ST | FOURTH ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 1045 | Upper Merion Twp | VALLEY FORGERD | KEEBLER RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 1046 | Upper Merion Twp | VALLEY FORGERD | HENDERSONRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1047 | Upper Merion Twp | ALLENDALERD | FIRSTAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1048 | Upper Merion Twp | ALLENDALE RD | KEEBLER RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1039 | Upper Merion Twp | HOLSTEIN RD | BALLİGOMINGO RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 137 | Upper Moreland Twp | WARMINSTER RD | MONTGOMERY AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 653 | Upper Moreland Twp | BYBERRYRD | DAVISVILLERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 654 | Upper Moreland Twp | BYBERRYRD | ORANGEMANSRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 655 | Upper Moreland Twp | TERWOODRD | DAVISVILEERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 656 | Upper Moreland Twp | BLAIR MILL RD | HORSHAM RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 657 | Upper Moreland Twp | BLAIR MILL RD | WITMERRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 136 | Upper Moreland Twp | TERWOOD RD | EDGE HILL RD | 1 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 292 | Upper Pottsgrove Twp | GILBERTSVILLE RD | MOYER RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 289 | Upper Pottsgrove Twp | FARMINGTON AV | NORTH STATE ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 290 | Upper Pottsgrove Twp | GILBERTSVILLERD | MAUGERS MILL RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 291 | Upper Pottsgrove Twp | FARMINGTONAV | GILBERTSVILLERD | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 940 | Upper Pottsgrove Twp | MAUGERS MILL RD | HANOVER RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 354 | Upper Providence Twp | SECOND AV | VAUGHN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 355 | Upper Providence Twp | LEWIS RD | VAUGHN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 356 | Upper Providence Twp | LEWISRD | YEAGERRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 357 | Upper Providence Twp | YEAGER RD | MINGO RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 1005 | Upper Providence Twp | EGYPT RD | RAMP RD | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 282 | Upper Salford Twp | SCHWENKSVILLE RD | SPRING MOUNT RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 284 | Upper Salford Twp | SKIPPACKRD | OLD SKIPPACK RD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 285 | Upper Salford Twp | SKIPPACKRD | SALFORDST | 1 | No | No | No |
| 286 | Upper Salford Twp | OLD SKIPPACK RD | SCHWENKSVILLERD | 1 | No | No | No |
| 283 | Upper Salford Twp | LEDERACH RD | SCHWENKSVILLE RD | 1 | No | Yes | No |
| 159 | West Norriton Twp | BURNSIDE AV | MARSHALL ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 160 | West Norriton Twp | MARSHALLST | JEFFERSON ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 161 | West Norriton Twp | MARSHALL ST | LIBERTY AV | 1 | Yes | No | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded
Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000' of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; 2 = intersection has an existing traffic signal
DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Montgomery County - 300 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sig } \\ \text { Score } \end{gathered}$ | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 712 | West Norriton Twp | WHITEHALLRD | STERIGER ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 713 | West Norriton Twp | NORTH WHITEHALL RD | MARSHALL ST | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 166 | Whitemarsh Twp | BARREN HILL RD | HARTS LN | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 167 | Whitemarsh Twp | FLOURTOWN RD | THOMASRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 168 | Whitemarsh Twp |  | VĀL̇EY GREEN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 728 | Whitemarsh Twp | BETHLEHEM PK | WEST VALLEY GREENAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 729 | Whitemarsh Twp | BETHLEMEM PK | VALLEE GREEN RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 730 | Whitemarsh Twp | BETHLEHEM PK | MORRISRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 731 | Whitemarsh Twp | MORRISRD | JOSHUARD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 732 | Whitemarsh Twp | WESTMALLEY GREENAV | FLOURTOWNRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 734 | Whitemarsh Twp | STENTON-AV | JOSHUARD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 736 | Whitemarsh Twp | BARREN HILL RD | HECTORST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 737 | Whitemarsh Twp | NORTHEN | HECTOR ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 738 | Whitemarsh Twp | HECTORST | LEEST | 0 | Yes | No | No |
| 733 | Whitemarsh Twp | STENTON-AV | MILL RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 735 | Whitemarsh Twp |  | JÖSTUĀ RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 132 | Whitpain Twp | TOWNSHIP LINE RD | NARCISSA RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 133 | Whitpain Twp | UNION MEETINGRD | JOLLY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 134 | Whitpain Twp | OLDARCH ST | JOLLYRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 135 | Ẅhitpain Twp | JOLEY RD | JOLTY RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 641 | Whitpain Twp | NARCISSARD | NORRISTOWN RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 642 | Whitpain Twp | STENTONAV | NARCISSA RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 643 | Whitpain Twp | NORRISTOWN RD | STENTONAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 644 | Whitpain Twp | STENTONAV | WALTONRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 646 | Whitpain Twp | STENTON-AV | PENLYN BLUEBELLPK | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 647 | Whitpain Twp | TOWNSHIP-LINERD | TOWNSHIP LINERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 648 | Whitpain Twp | MORRIS RD | LEWISLN | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 649 | Whitpain Twp | MORRIS RD | MT P-EAASANT A- | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 651 | Whitpain Twp | MORRISRD | PLYMOUTH RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 652 | Whitpain Twp | YOSTRD | NORTH WALES RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |
| 645 | Whitpain Twp | WĀT-TONRD | STENTONAV | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 650 | Whitpain Twp | MORRIS RD | PENLYN BLUEBELL PK | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 1001 | Worcester Twp | MORRIS RD | NORTH WALES RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005
Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000' of signal; $1=$ intersection is further than 1000' from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal

## Philadelphia County DVRPC Candidate Locations

NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005
NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005
NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005
NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal
NOTE:
Land Use: Vacant or Wooded Crashes: Years 2003-2005 Sig Score: $0=$ intersection is between 1000 of signal; 1 = intersection is further than 1000 from signal; $2=$ intersection has an existing traffic signal

| Philadelphia - 334 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | Sig Score | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| 1119 | Philadelphia City | WISSAHICKON AV | MIDVALE AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1121 | Philadelphia City | WISSAHICKON AV | MANHEIM ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |
| 1116 | Philadelohia City | WISSAHICKON AV | RITTENHOUSE ST | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 439 | Philadelphia City |  | CADWALLADER ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |

## Burlington County DVRPC Candidate Locations

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Burlington County - 98 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location <br> Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 | Bass River Twp | US 9 | ROUTE 542 | No | No | No |
| 101 | Bass River Twp | US 9 | SOUTH MAPLE AV | Yes | No | No |
| 54 | Bordentown City | ROUTE 545 | ROUTE 528 | Yes | No | No |
| 55 | Bordentown City | ROUTE 545 | W BURLINGTON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 56 | Bordentown City | BURLINGTON COUNTY 662 | W BURLINGTON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 57 | Bordentown City | BURLINGTON COUNTY 662 | ROUTE 545 | Yes | No | No |
| 58 | Bordentown City | BURLINGTON COUNTY 662 | PARK ST | Yes | No | No |
| 130 | Bordentown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 660 | ROUTE 545 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 188 | Burlington City | HIGH ST | HIGH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 187 | Burlington Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 656 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 658 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 552 | Burlington Twp | FOUNTAIN AVE | BURLINGTON COUNTY 660 | Yes | No | No |
| 553 | Burlington Twp | NECK RD | ROUTE 543 | Yes | No | No |
| 131 | Chesterfield Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 660 | ROUTE 528 | No | No | No |
| 132 | Chesterfield Twp | ROUTE 528 |  | No | No | No |
| 205 | Cinnaminson Twp | W MILL RD | PARK AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 206 | Cinnaminson Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 607 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 608 | Yes | No | No |
| 207 | Cinnaminson Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 603 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 606 | Yes | No | No |
| 3 | Delanco Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 624 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 625 | Yes | No | No |
| 5 | Delran Twp | HAINES MILL RD | CONROW RD | No | No | No |
| 6 | Eastampton Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 621 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 684 | Yes | No | No |
| 208 | Eastampton Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 630 | ROUTE 537 | Yes | No | No |
| 1 | Edgewater Park Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 624 | BRIDGEBORORD | Yes | No | No |
| 2 | Edgewater Park Twp | BRIDGEBORO RD | BURLINGTON COUNTY 625 | Yes | No | No |
| 200 | Edgewater Park Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 624 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 626 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 129 | Evesham Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 619 | ELMWOOD RD | Yes | No | No |
| 439 | Evesham Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 618 | ELMWOOD RD | Yes | Yes | No |
| 189 | Fieldsboro Boro | BURLINGTON COUNTY 662 | WASHINGTON ST | Yes | No | No |
| 190 | Florence Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 660 | ROUTE 543 | No | No | No |
| 191 | Florence Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 656 | HORNBERGER AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 554 | Florence Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 660 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 656 | Yes | Yes | No |

[^17]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Burlington County - 98 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| ocation Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 237 | Hainesport Twp | ROUTE 537 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 674 | Yes | No | No |
| 238 | Hainesport Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 636 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 674 | No | No | No |
| 19 | Lumberton Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 636 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 612 | No | No | No |
| 192 | Mansfield Twp | ROUTE 543 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 656 | Yes | No | No |
| 193 | Mansfield Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 628 | ROUTE 543 | Yes | No | No |
| 194 | Mansfield Twp | ROUTE 543 | MT PLEASANT RD | No | No | No |
| 195 | Mansfield Twp | ROUTE 545 | ROUTE 543 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 339 | Medford Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 616 | ROUTE 541 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 340 | Medford Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 616 | HARTFORD RD | No | No | No |
| 209 | Moorestown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 603 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 614 | No | No | No |
| 210 | Moorestown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 603 | NEW ALBANY RD | No | No | No |
| 211 | Moorestown Twp | ROUTE 537 | NEW ALBANY RD | Yes | No | No |
| 212 | Moorestown Twp | NEW ALBANY RD | BURLINGTON COUNTY 607 | Yes | No | No |
| 213 | Moorestown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 614 | HAINES MILL RD | No | Yes | No |
| 214 | Moorestown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 613 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 614 | No | No | No |
| 215 | Moorestown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 603 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 613 | Yes | No | No |
| 216 | Moorestown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 603 | NEW ALBANY RD | No | No | No |
| 217 | Moorestown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 607 | ROUTE 537 | Yes | No | No |
| 218 | Moorestown Twp | ROUTE 537 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 603 | Yes | No | No |
| 219 | Moorestown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 636 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 615 | No | No | No |
| 220 | Moorestown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 686 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 615 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 221 | Moorestown Twp | CENTRETONRD | BURLINGTON COUNTY 686 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 222 | Moorestown Twp | ROUTE 537 | CENTRETON RD | Yes | Yes | No |
| 223 | Moorestown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 614 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 615 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 224 | Moorestown Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 608 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 611 | Yes | No | No |
| 225 | Mount Holly Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 630 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 628 | Yes | No | No |
| 226 | Mount Holly Twp | ROUTE 537 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 617 | Yes | No | No |
| 227 | Mount Holly Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 691 | ROUTE 537 | Yes | No | No |
| 10 | Mount Laurel Twp | UNION MILL RD | ARK RD | No | No | No |
| 228 | Mount Laurel Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 635 | R CO 636 CREEK RD to I-295 SB | Yes | No | No |

[^18]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Burlington County - 98 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location <br> Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 229 | Mount Laurel Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 635 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 636 | Yes | No | No |
| 230 | Mount Laurel Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 686 | ROUTE 537 | Yes | No | No |
| 231 | Mount Laurel Twp | UNION MILL RD | BURLINGTON COUNTY 612 | No | No | No |
| 232 | Mount Laurel Twp | UNION MILL RD | BURLINGTON COUNTY 603 | No | Yes | No |
| 233 | Mount Laurel Twp | UNION MILL RD | BURLINGTON COUNTY 686 | No | Yes | No |
| 234 | Mount Laurel Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 612 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 674 | No | Yes | No |
| 235 | Mount Laurel Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 603 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 674 | No | No | No |
| 236 | Mount Laurel Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 674 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 686 | No | No | No |
| 4 | New Hanover Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 616 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 667 | No | No | No |
| 201 | New Hanover Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 669 | PEMBERTON-POINTVILLE RD | No | Yes | No |
| 202 | New Hanover Twp | ROUTE 545 | PEMBERTON-POINTVILLE RD | No | No | No |
| 133 | North Hanover Twp | ROUTE 528 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 665 | No | No | No |
| 134 | North Hanover Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 665 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 666 | No | No | No |
| 135 | North Hanover Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 616 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 665 | No | No | No |
| 440 | North Hanover Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 665 | ROUTE 537 | No | No | No |
| 441 | North Hanover Twp | ROUTE 537 | ROUTE 528 | No | No | No |
| 23 | Pemberton Boro | BURLINGTON COUNTY 616 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 687 | Yes | No | No |
| 7 | Pemberton Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 616 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 668 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 8 | Pemberton Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 630 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 616 | No | No | No |
| 9 | Pemberton Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 645 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 646 | No | No | No |
| 156 | Shamong Twp | ROUTE 534 | ROUTE 541 | No | No | No |
| 157 | Shamong Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 620 | ROUTE 534 | No | No | No |
| 20 | Southampton Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 616 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 681 | No | No | No |
| 21 | Southampton Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 616 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 681 | Yes | No | No |
| 22 | Southampton Twp | RIDGE RD | RETREAT RD | No | No | No |
| 0 | Springfield Twp | ROUTE 537 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 670 | No | Yes | No |
| 196 | Springfield Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 660 | NECK RD | Yes | No | No |
| 197 | Springfield Twp | NJ 68 | ROUTE 537 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 198 | Springfield Twp | ROUTE 537 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 669 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 199 | Springfield Twp | NJ 68 | SAYLORS POND RD | Yes | Yes | No |

[^19]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Burlington County - 98 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85 | Tabernacle Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 648 | ROUTE 532 | No | No | No |
| 102 | Washington Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 679 | ROUTE 563 | No | Yes | No |
| 103 | Washington Twp | ROUTE 542 | ROUTE 563 | No | No | No |
| 104 | Washington Twp | ROUTE 542 | ROUTE 563 | No | Yes | No |
| 203 | Westampton Twp | BURLINGTON COUNTY 630 | BURLINGTON COUNTY 637 | Yes | No | No |
| 62 | Woodland Twp | ROUTE 532 | ROUTE 563 | No | No | No |
| 63 | Woodland Twp | ROUTE 532 | ROUTE 563 | No | No | No |
| 204 | Wrightstown Boro | BURLINGTON COUNTY 616 | SAYLORS POND RD | Yes | No | No |

## Camden County DVRPC Candidate Locations

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Camden County - 202 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 73 | Audubon Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 744 | W GRAISBURY AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 74 | Audubon Boro | W GRAISBURY AVE | EDGEWOOD AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 356 | Audubon Boro | W GRAISBURY AVE | CAMDEN COUNTY 653 | Yes | No | No |
| 357 | Audubon Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 643 | CAMDEN COUNTY 647 | Yes | No | No |
| 358 | Audubon Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 647 | E NICHOLSON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 359 | Audubon Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 744 | MERCHANT AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 75 | Audubon Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 660 | W GRAISBURY AVE | Yes | Yes | No |
| 83 | Barrington Boro | AUSTIN AVE | 4TH AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 84 | Barrington Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 653 | AUSTIN AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 368 | Barrington Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 659 | NJ 41 | Yes | No | No |
| 369 | Barrington Boro | NJ 41 | CAMDEN COUNTY 653 | Yes | No | No |
| 370 | Barrington Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 659 | AUSTIN AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 375 | Bellmawr Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 659 | 4TH AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 376 | Bellmawr Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 659 | S BELLRD | Yes | No | No |
| 377 | Bellmawr Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 659 | CAMDEN COUNTY 753 | Yes | No | No |
| 378 | Bellmawr Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 753 | S BELLRD | Yes | No | No |
| 379 | Bellmawr Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 753 | PARK DR | Yes | No | No |
| 328 | Berlin Boro | ROUTE 561 | CAMDEN COUNTY 720 | Yes | No | No |
| 326 | Berlin Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 692 | BETHEL AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 24 | Camden City | PARK BLVD | EUCLID AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 25 | Camden City | S 9TH ST | CARL MILLER BLVD | Yes | No | No |
| 26 | Camden City | S 9TH ST | CHELTON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 27 | Camden City | S 4TH ST | CHELTON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 28 | Camden City | ATLANTIC AVE | S 4TH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 29 | Camden City | ATLANTIC AVE | fr Atlantic Av to 1676 SB | Yes | No | No |
| 30 | Camden City | CHESTNUT ST | S 7TH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 31 | Camden City | S 4TH ST | CHESTNUT ST | Yes | No | No |
| 32 | Camden City | S 4TH ST | PINE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 33 | Camden City | ML KING BLVD | S 4TH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 34 | Camden City | BENSON AVE | S 7TH ST | Yes | No | No |

[^20]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Camden County - 202 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 740 SECONDARY | PINE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 36 | Camden City | ERIEST | N7TH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 37 | Camden City | ERIEST | 9TH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 38 | Camden City | ERIEST | N 2ND ST | Yes | No | No |
| 39 | Camden City | HARRISONAVE | 22ND ST | Yes | No | No |
| 40 | Camden City | HARRISON AVE | CAMBRIDGE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 43 | Camden City | LINE STREET | HILLSILDEAV | Yes | No | No |
| 253 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 603 | S 9TH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 254 | Camden City | ATLANTIC AVE | S 9TH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 255 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 607 | S 4TH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 256 | Camden City | S 4TH ST | CAMDEN COUNTY 604 | Yes | No | No |
| 257 | Camden City | S 2ND ST | PINE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 258 | Camden City | S 2ND ST | COOPER ST | Yes | No | No |
| 259 | Camden City | N 3RD ST | COOPER ST | Yes | No | No |
| 260 | Camden City | DELAWAREAVE | COOPER ST | Yes | No | No |
| 261 | Camden City | S 2ND ST | LINDEN ST | Yes | No | No |
| 262 | Camden City | N 5TH ST | COOPER ST | Yes | No | No |
| 263 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 601 | STATE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 264 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 601 | N 7TH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 265 | Camden City | ROUTE 537 | ROUTE 543 | Yes | No | No |
| 266 | Camden City | ROUTE 537 | S 10TH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 268 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 601 | ROUTE 543 | Yes | No | No |
| 271 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 609 | CAMDEN COUNTY 608 | Yes | No | No |
| 273 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 601 | ROSEMONTAVE | Yes | No | No |
| 274 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 609 | LINE STREET | Yes | No | No |
| 275 | Camden City | ROUTE 537 | DUDLEY RD | Yes | No | No |
| 276 | Camden City | ROUTE 537 | SAUNDERS ST | Yes | No | No |
| 277 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 610 | SAUNDERS ST | Yes | No | No |
| 278 | Camden City | LINE STREET | GARFIELD AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 279 | Camden City | ROUTE 537 | CAMDEN COUNTY 611 | Yes | No | No |

[^21]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Camden County - 202 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 280 | Camden City | ROUTE 537 | FR CO 537 WB TO CO 537 WB | Yes | No | No |
| 281 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 610 | CAMDEN COUNTY 611 | Yes | No | No |
| 41 | Camden City | HARRISONAVE | LOIS AVE | Yes | Yes | No |
| 42 | Camden City | CLEVELANDAVE | LOIS AVE | Yes | Yes | No |
| 272 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 601 | CAMDEN COUNTY 608 | No | No | Yes |
| 267 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 601 | HARRISONAVE | Yes | No | Yes |
| 269 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 601 | ROUTE 537 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 270 | Camden City | CAMDEN COUNTY 609 | CAMDEN COUNTY 610 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 148 | Cherry Hill Twp | MORRIS DR | HEARTWOODRD | Yes | No | No |
| 149 | Cherry Hill Twp | BROWNING LA | S WOODLEIGH DR | Yes | No | No |
| 150 | Cherry Hill Twp | KINGSTON DR | CHELTON PKWY | Yes | No | No |
| 151 | Cherry Hill Twp | COVEREDBRIDGERD | MUNN LA W | Yes | No | No |
| 152 | Cherry Hill Twp | CHAPEL AV | KINGSTON DR | Yes | No | No |
| 153 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 674 | N BIRCHWOOD PARK DR | Yes | No | No |
| 154 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 674 | S BIRCHWOOD PARK DR | Yes | No | No |
| 155 | Cherry Hill Twp | OLD ORCHARD RD | RABBIT RUN RD | Yes | No | No |
| 465 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 673 | MORRIS DR | Yes | No | No |
| 468 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 671 | PEARL_CROFTRD | Yes | No | No |
| 469 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 671 | COVERED BRIDGERD | Yes | No | No |
| 470 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 671 | BROWNINGLA | Yes | No | No |
| 471 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 671 | CAMDEN COUNTY 672 | Yes | No | No |
| 473 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 675 | RABBIT RUN RD | Yes | No | No |
| 474 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 675 | OLD ORCHARD RD | Yes | No | No |
| 475 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 675 | MARLOWERD | Yes | No | No |
| 476 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 626 | CHERRY HILL BLVD | Yes | No | No |
| 466 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 670 | WALT WHITMAN BLVD | Yes | Yes | No |
| 467 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 671 | CAMDEN COUNTY 675 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 472 | Cherry Hill Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 671 | HEARTWOOD RD | Yes | No | Yes |
| 111 | Chesilhurst Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 718 | CAMDEN COUNTY 680 | No | No | No |
| 327 | Clementon Boro | ROUTE 534 | CAMDEN COUNTY 733 | Yes | No | No |

[^22]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Camden County - 202 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 61 | Collingswood Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 648 | LAKEVIEW DR | Yes | No | No |
| 342 | Collingswood Boro | ROUTE 561 | CAMDEN COUNTY 640 | Yes | No | No |
| 343 | Collingswood Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 630 | ATLANTIC AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 344 | Collingswood Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 630 | CAMDEN COUNTY 641 | Yes | No | No |
| 345 | Collingswood Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 630 | PARK AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 346 | Collingswood Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 630 | CAMDEN COUNTY 648 | Yes | No | No |
| 347 | Collingswood Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 603 | CAMDEN COUNTY 606 | Yes | No | No |
| 48 | Gibbsboro Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 701 | NORCROSSRD | Yes | No | No |
| 316 | Gibbsboro Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 686 | CAMDEN COUNTY 701 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 69 | Gloucester City | CAMDEN COUNTY 631 | CAMDEN COUNTY 633 | Yes | No | No |
| 70 | Gloucester City | CAMDEN COUNTY 755 | CAMDEN COUNTY 630 | Yes | No | No |
| 71 | Gloucester City | KLEMM AVE | HIGHLANDAVE | Yes | No | No |
| 72 | Gloucester City | KLEMM AVE | HIGHLAND AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 352 | Gloucester City | CAMDEN COUNTY 634 | ROUTE 551 | Yes | No | No |
| 353 | Gloucester City | KLEMM AVE | MONMOUTH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 354 | Gloucester City | CAMDEN COUNTY 635 | KLEMM AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 355 | Gloucester City | MONMOUTH ST | ROUTE 551 | Yes | No | No |
| 46 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 706 | CAMDEN COUNTY 687 | Yes | No | No |
| 297 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 704 | CAMDEN COUNTY 687 | Yes | No | No |
| 298 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 706 | CAMDEN COUNTY 704 | Yes | No | No |
| 299 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 688 | CAMDEN COUNTY 703 | Yes | No | No |
| 300 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 688 | CAMDEN COUNTY 706 | Yes | No | No |
| 301 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 705 | CAMDEN COUNTY 688 | Yes | No | No |
| 304 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 759 | BROADACRES DR | Yes | No | No |
| 305 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 706 | TICE AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 306 | Gloucester Twp | COLESRD | TICEAVE | Yes | No | No |
| 308 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 706 | CAMDEN COUNTY 681 | Yes | No | No |
| 310 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 683 | CAMDEN COUNTY 677 | Yes | No | No |
| 296 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 705 | CAMDEN COUNTY 687 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 302 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 759 | CAMDEN COUNTY 673 | Yes | Yes | No |

[^23]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Camden County - 202 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 307 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 759 | HIDER LN | Yes | Yes | No |
| 309 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 683 | CAMDEN COUNTY 759 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 311 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 683 | CAMDEN COUNTY 681 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 303 | Gloucester Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 706 | CAMDEN COUNTY 673 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 76 | Haddon Heights Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 653 | GARDEN ST | Yes | No | No |
| 77 | Haddon Heights Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 727 | GARDEN ST | Yes | No | No |
| 78 | Haddon Heights Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 656 | 3RD AV | Yes | No | No |
| 79 | Haddon Heights Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 656 | LIPPINCOTT AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 59 | Haddon Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 647 | CAMDEN COUNTY 646 | Yes | No | No |
| 60 | Haddon Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 647 | BRESLIN AV | Yes | No | No |
| 341 | Haddon Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 643 | CAMDEN COUNTY 646 | Yes | No | No |
| 64 | Haddonfield Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 656 | STATION AV | Yes | No | No |
| 65 | Haddonfield Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 641 | EUCLID AV | Yes | No | No |
| 348 | Haddonfield Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 669 | CAMDEN COUNTY 665 | Yes | No | No |
| 349 | Haddonfield Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 669 | UPLAND WAY | Yes | No | No |
| 350 | Haddonfield Boro | EUCLID AVE | WASHINGTON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 351 | Haddonfield Boro | NJ 41 | ROUTE 561 | Yes | No | No |
| 49 | Hi-Nella Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 677 | CAMDEN COUNTY 727 | Yes | No | No |
| 322 | Laurel Springs Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 669 | CAMDEN COUNTY 696 | Yes | No | No |
| 373 | Lawnside Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 669 | CAMDEN COUNTY 667 | Yes | No | No |
| 374 | Lawnside Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 727 | CAMDEN COUNTY 659 | Yes | No | No |
| 50 | Lindenwold Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 696 | CAMDEN COUNTY 698 | Yes | No | No |
| 51 | Lindenwold Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 696 | CAMDEN COUNTY 727 | Yes | No | No |
| 319 | Lindenwold Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 686 | CAMDEN COUNTY 702 | Yes | No | No |
| 320 | Lindenwold Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 683 | CAMDEN COUNTY 696 | Yes | No | No |
| 321 | Lindenwold Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 673 | CAMDEN COUNTY 698 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 282 | Merchantville Boro | ROUTE 537 | CAMDEN COUNTY 626 | Yes | No | No |
| 283 | Merchantville Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 626 | FR CO 622 SB TO CO 626 SB | Yes | No | No |
| 284 | Merchantville Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 621 | CAMDEN COUNTY 622 | Yes | No | No |
| 285 | Merchantville Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 621 | E. CHESTNUT AVE | Yes | No | No |

[^24]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Camden County - 202 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 286 | Merchantville Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 616 | CAMDEN COUNTY 621 | Yes | No | No |
| 287 | Merchantville Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 616 | ROUTE 537 | Yes | No | No |
| 288 | Merchantville Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 616 | MONROE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 66 | Oaklyn Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 649 | CAMDEN COUNTY 729 | Yes | No | No |
| 67 | Oaklyn Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 649 | MANORAVE | Yes | No | No |
| 68 | Oaklyn Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 650 | CAMDEN COUNTY 649 | Yes | No | No |
| 11 | Pennsauken Twp | AMON AVE | 42NDAVE | Yes | No | No |
| 12 | Pennsauken Twp | 47TH STREET | AMON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 13 | Pennsauken Twp | 47TH STREET | PLEASANT AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 14 | Pennsauken Twp | PLEASANTAVE | MERCHANTVILLEAVE | Yes | No | No |
| 15 | Pennsauken Twp | MERCHANTVILLE AVE | WAYNE AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 16 | Pennsauken Twp | 47TH STREET | WAYNE AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 17 | Pennsauken Twp | SUCKLE HWY | NATIONAL HWY | Yes | No | No |
| 18 | Pennsauken Twp | CLEMENT AVE | WAYNE AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 239 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 628 | McCLELLANAVE | Yes | No | No |
| 240 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 662 | GARFIELD AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 241 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 626 | CAMDEN COUNTY 637 | Yes | No | No |
| 242 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 611 | AMON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 243 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 610 | 42NDAVE | Yes | No | No |
| 244 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 611 | ROUTE 543 | Yes | No | No |
| 245 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 616 | PLEASANTAVE | Yes | No | No |
| 246 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 610 | CAMDEN COUNTY 614 | Yes | No | No |
| 247 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 610 | MERCHANTVILLEAVE | Yes | No | No |
| 248 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 610 | 47TH STREET | Yes | No | No |
| 249 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 615 | SUCKLE HWY | Yes | No | No |
| 250 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 615 | NATIONAL HWY | Yes | No | No |
| 251 | Pennsauken Twp | HYLTON RD | NATIONAL HWY | Yes | No | No |
| 252 | Pennsauken Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 615 | CAMDEN COUNTY 621 | Yes | No | No |
| 329 | Pine Hill Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 688 | CAMDEN COUNTY 687 | Yes | No | No |
| 330 | Pine Hill Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 703 | CAMDEN COUNTY 687 | Yes | No | No |

[^25]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Camden County - 202 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44 | Runnemede Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 736 | DAVIS RD | Yes | № | № |
| 289 | Runnemede Boro | THIRD AVE | Smith Lane | Yes | No | No |
| 45 | Somerdale Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 727 | FAIRVIEW AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 317 | Stratord Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 669 | CAMDEN COUNTY 673 | Yes | No | № |
| 318 | Stratord Boro | CAMDEN COUNTY 727 | CAMDEN COUNTY 673 | Yes | No | No |
| 380 | Voorhes Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 684 | CAMDEN COUNTY 670 | Yes | No | No |
| 381 | Voorhees Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 670 | LAUREL RD | Yes | No | No |
| 382 | Voorhees Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 678 | LAUREL RD | Yes | No | No |
| 383 | Voorhees Twp | LAUREL RD | ECHELON RD | Yes | No | No |
| 402 | Waterford Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 716 | ROUTE 536 | Yes | No | No |
| 404 | Waterford Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 712 | CAMDEN COUNTY 709 | Yes | No | No |
| 405 | Waterford Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 710 | CAMDEN COUNTY 713 | Yes | No | No |
| 403 | Waterford Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 713 | COOPER RD | Yes | Yes | No |
| 97 | Winsow Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 723 | CAMDEN COUNTY 726 | Yes | No | No |
| 98 | Winstow Twp | ROUTE 561 | CAMDEN COUNTY 726 | Yes | № | No |
| 99 | Winslow Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 723 | ROUTE 561 | Yes | No | No |
| 408 | Winslow Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 710 | ROUTE 561 | Yes | No | No |
| 409 | Winslow Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 720 | CAMDEN COUNTY 691 | Yes | No | No |
| 410 | Winslow Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 720 | SCHOOL HOUSELA | Yes | № | No |
| 406 | Winslow Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 705 | CAMDEN COUNTY 706 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 407 | Winslow Twp | ROUTE536 | CAMDEN COUNTY 705 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 411 | Winslow Twp | CAMDEN COUNTY 691 | CAMDEN COUNT | Yes | Yes | No |

NOTE:
Land Use = Vacant or Wooded Crashes = Years 2003-2005

## Gloucester County DVRPC Candidate Locations

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Gloucester County - 116 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 122 | Clayton Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 608 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 636 | Yes | No | No |
| 421 | Clayton Boro | NJ 47 | MADISON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 422 | Clayton Boro | NJ 47 | E. CLAYTON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 423 | Clayton Boro | NJ 47 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 636 | Yes | No | No |
| 424 | Clayton Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 610 | NJ 47 | Yes | No | No |
| 425 | Clayton Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 610 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 608 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 87 | Deptford Twp | STREGISDR | PRINCETON BLVD | Yes | No | No |
| 88 | Deptford Twp | ROUTE 534 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 647 | Yes | No | No |
| 89 | Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 644 | FLORENCEAVE | Yes | No | No |
| 384 | Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 603 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 663 | Yes | No | No |
| 386 | Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 663 | WOODCREEK RD | Yes | No | No |
| 387 | Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 621 | ROUTE 534 | Yes | No | No |
| 388 | Deptford Twp | NJ 41 | ROUTE 534 | Yes | No | No |
| 389 | Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 621 | NJ 41 | Yes | No | No |
| 390 | Deptford Twp | EMAPLEST | ST REGIS DR | Yes | No | No |
| 391 | Deptford Twp | ROUTE 534 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 706 | Yes | No | No |
| 392 | Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 621 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 706 | Yes | No | No |
| 394 | Deptford Twp | NJ 47 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 644 | Yes | No | No |
| 395 | Deptford Twp | NJ 47 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 644 | Yes | No | No |
| 396 | Deptford Twp | ROUTE 551 | ROUTE 553 | Yes | No | No |
| 398 | Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 663 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 665 | Yes | No | No |
| 90 | Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 644 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 646 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 385 | Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 647 | NJ 47 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 393 | Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 621 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 644 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 397 | Deptford Twp | NJ 47 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 665 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 323 | East Greenwich Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 673 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 680 | Yes | No | No |
| 324 | East Greenwich Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 673 | ROUTE 551 | Yes | No | No |
| 325 | East Greenwich Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 607 | ROUTE 551 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 116 | Elk Twp | ROUTE 538 | NJ 77 | No | No | No |
| 117 | Elk Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 641 | ROUTE 538 | No | No | No |
| NOTE: <br> Land Use = Vacant or Wooded Crashes = Years 2003-2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Gloucester County - 116 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location <br> Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 118 | Elk Twp | NJ 77 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 641 | No | No | No |
| 420 | Elk Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 609 | ROUTE 538 | No | No | No |
| 119 | Elk Twp | ROUTE 538 | WILLOW GROVERD | Yes | No | No |
| 120 | Elk Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 667 | ROUTE 553 | Yes | No | No |
| 121 | Elk Twp | ROUTE 553 | ROUTE 538 | Yes | No | No |
| 124 | Franklin Twp | ROUTE 538 | WILLIAMSTOWN RD | No | No | No |
| 126 | Franklin Twp | WEYMOUTHRD | WEYMOUTHRD | No | No | No |
| 428 | Franklin Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 655 | ROUTE 538 | No | No | No |
| 429 | Franklin Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 612 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 655 | No | No | No |
| 433 | Franklin Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 655 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 657 | No | No | No |
| 123 | Franklin Twp | ROUTE 538 | FAWN RUN DR | Yes | No | No |
| 125 | Franklin Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 613 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 612 | Yes | No | No |
| 427 | Franklin Twp | NJ 47 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 655 | Yes | No | No |
| 431 | Franklin Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 657 | ROUTE 538 | Yes | No | No |
| 426 | Franklin Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 659 | ROUTE 538 | No | Yes | No |
| 430 | Franklin Twp | NJ 47 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 657 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 127 | Franklin Twp | ROUTE 555 | ROUTE 557 | No | No | Yes |
| 128 | Franklin Twp | ROUTE 555 | ROUTE 538 | No | No | Yes |
| 432 | Franklin Twp | NJ 47 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 613 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 112 | Glassboro Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 641 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 667 | Yes | No | No |
| 416 | Glassboro Boro | STANGER AVE | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 637 | Yes | No | No |
| 417 | Glassboro Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 641 | ROUTE 553 | Yes | No | No |
| 418 | Glassboro Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 641 | ACADEMY ST | Yes | No | No |
| 419 | Glassboro Boro | ROUTE 553 | NEW ST | Yes | No | No |
| 47 | Greenwich Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 607 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 653 | Yes | No | No |
| 312 | Greenwich Twp | NJ 44 | RAILROAD ST | Yes | No | No |
| 314 | Greenwich Twp | NJ 44 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 680 | Yes | No | No |
| 315 | Greenwich Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 680 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 653 | Yes | No | No |
| 313 | Greenwich Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 673 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 653 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 414 | Harrison Twp | NJ 77 | ROUTE 581 | No | No | No |
| NOTE: <br> Land Use = Vacant or Wooded <br> Crashes = Years 2003-2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Gloucester County - 116 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 413 | Harrison Twp | NJ 45 | NJ 77 | Yes | No | No |
| 412 | Harrison Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 609 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 641 | No | Yes | No |
| 92 | Mantua Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 626 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 627 | Yes | No | No |
| 399 | Mantua Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 635 | TYLERS MILL RD | Yes | No | No |
| 400 | Mantua Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 603 | ROUTE 553 | Yes | No | No |
| 91 | Mantua Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 603 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 627 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 401 | Mantua Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 678 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 632 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 436 | Monroe Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 610 | ROUTE 555 | No | No | No |
| 438 | Monroe Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 655 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 658 | Yes | No | No |
| 435 | Monroe Twp | ROUTE 555 | WILLIAMSTOWN RD | No | Yes | No |
| 437 | Monroe Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 610 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 612 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 86 | National Park Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 638 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 643 | Yes | No | No |
| 372 | National Park Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 642 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 643 | Yes | No | No |
| 434 | Newfield Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 661 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 615 | Yes | No | No |
| 290 | Paulsboro Boro | NJ 44 | N COMMERCE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 291 | Paulsboro Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 678 | SWEDESBORO AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 415 | Pitman Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 624 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 682 | Yes | No | No |
| 113 | South Harrison Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 607 | ROUTE 538 | No | No | No |
| 114 | South Harrison Twp | ROUTE 538 | NJ 45 | No | No | Yes |
| 115 | South Harrison Twp | ROUTE 538 | CEDAR GROVE RD | No | No | Yes |
| 105 | Swedesboro Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 605 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 620 | Yes | No | No |
| 106 | Swedesboro Boro | ROUTE 551 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 671 | Yes | No | No |
| 108 | Swedesboro Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 694 | FRANKLIN ST | Yes | No | No |
| 109 | Swedesboro Boro | ROUTE 551 | FRANKLIN ST | Yes | No | No |
| 110 | Swedesboro Boro | ROUTE 551 | ROUTE 538 | Yes | No | No |
| 107 | Swedesboro Boro | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 694 | GRANT AV | Yes | No | Yes |
| 52 | Washington Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 634 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 658 | Yes | No | No |
| 332 | Washington Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 654 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 630 | Yes | No | No |
| 334 | Washington Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 639 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 630 | Yes | No | No |
| 335 | Washington Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 635 | NJ 47 | Yes | No | No |
| NOTE: <br> Land Use = Vacant or Wooded <br> Crashes = Years 2003-2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase
Gloucester County - 116 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 336 | Washington Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 635 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 654 | Yes | No | No |
| 337 | Washington Twp | NJ 47 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 654 | Yes | No | No |
| 338 | Washington Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 603 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 621 | Yes | No | No |
| 53 | Washington Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 639 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 658 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 333 | Washington Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 658 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 651 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 331 | Washington Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 654 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 634 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 80 | West Deptford Twp | JUSSUPRD | HOLLY DR | Yes | No | No |
| 81 | West Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 644 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 643 | Yes | No | No |
| 82 | West Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 644 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 638 | Yes | No | No |
| 360 | West Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 656 | ST REGIS DR | Yes | No | No |
| 361 | West Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 642 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 644 | Yes | No | No |
| 362 | West Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 643 | RIVERWINDS ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Yes | No | No |
| 364 | West Deptford Twp | ROUTE 551 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 643 | Yes | No | No |
| 365 | West Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 656 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 643 | Yes | No | No |
| 367 | West Deptford Twp | ROUTE 551 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 648 | Yes | No | No |
| 363 | West Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 643 | NJ 44 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 366 | West Deptford Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 656 | ROUTE 551 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 371 | Westville Boro | NJ 47 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 621 | Yes | No | No |
| 292 | Woodbury City | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 644 | ROUTE 553 | Yes | No | No |
| 293 | Woodbury City | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 650 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 649 | Yes | No | No |
| 294 | Woodbury City | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 663 | ROUTE 553 | Yes | No | No |
| 295 | Woodbury City | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 642 | TATUM ST | Yes | No | No |
| 93 | Woolwich Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 620 | ROUTE 551 | Yes | No | No |
| 94 | Woolwich Twp | ROUTE 551 | BRIDGEPORTAV | Yes | No | No |
| 95 | Woolwich Twp | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 694 | ROUTE 538 | Yes | No | No |
| 96 | Woolwich Twp | ROUTE 551 | GLOUCESTER COUNTY 653 | Yes | No | No |

NOTE:
Land Use = Vacant or Wooded Crashes = Years 2003-2005

## Mercer County DVRPC Candidate Locations

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Mercer County - 139 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 167 | East Windsor Twp | PERRINEVILLE RD | MERCER COUNTY 630 | Yes | No | No |
| 168 | East Windsor Twp | PROBASCO ROAD | WYCOFFS MILL RD | Yes | No | No |
| 506 | East Windsor Twp | ROUTE 571 | MILFORD RD | Yes | No | No |
| 507 | Ewing Twp | MERCER COUNTY 634 | WILBURTHA RD | Yes | No | No |
| 510 | Ewing Twp | MERCER COUNTY 611 | CARLTON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 511 | Ewing Twp | MERCER COUNTY 634 | ROUTE 579 | Yes | No | No |
| 512 | Ewing Twp | LOWER FERR Y RD | ROUTE 579 | Yes | No | No |
| 513 | Ewing Twp | MERCER COUNTY 636 | LOWER FERRY RD | Yes | No | No |
| 514 | Ewing Twp | LOWER FERR Y RD | CARLTON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 515 | Ewing Twp | MOUNTAIN VIEW RD | ROUTE 579 | Yes | No | No |
| 516 | Ewing Twp | ROUTE 579 | MERCER COUNTY 647 | Yes | No | No |
| 169 | Ewing Twp | HILLCREST AVE | HOMAN AVE | Yes | Yes | No |
| 170 | Ewing Twp | MERCER COUNTY 647 | MOUNTAIN VIEW RD | Yes | Yes | No |
| 508 | Ewing Twp | LOWER FERR Y RD | STUYYVESANT AVE | Yes | Yes | No |
| 509 | Ewing Twp | MERCER COUNTY 611 | MERCER COUNTY 636 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 517 | Ewing Twp | NJ 175 | MERCER COUNTY 634 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 137 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 672 | OLD YORK RD | No | No | No |
| 138 | Hamilton Twp | OLD YORK RD | S. BROAD ST | No | No | No |
| 136 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 672 | S. BROAD ST | Yes | No | No |
| 139 | Hamilton Twp | MAIN ST | MERCER COUNTY 672 | Yes | No | No |
| 140 | Hamilton Twp | MAIN ST | MERCER COUNTY 609 | Yes | No | No |
| 141 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 609 | NJ 156 | Yes | No | No |
| 142 | Hamilton Twp | KLOCKNER RD | EDGEWOOD RD | Yes | No | No |
| 143 | Hamilton Twp | KUSER RD | HEMPSTEAD RD | Yes | No | No |
| 144 | Hamilton Twp | INDEPENDENCE AVE | HOBSON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 145 | Hamilton Twp | OVERLOOK AV | W PARK AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 442 | Hamilton Twp | ROUTE 524 | MAIN ST | Yes | No | No |
| 443 | Hamilton Twp | ROUTE 524 | NJ 156 | Yes | No | No |
| 444 | Hamilton Twp | YARDVILLE-HAMILTON SQ RD | SUNNYBRAE BLVD | Yes | No | No |
| 445 | Hamilton Twp | ROUTE 533 | S CLINTON AVE | Yes | No | No |

[^26]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Mercer County - 139 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 446 | Hamilton Twp | LEONARD AVENUE | MERCER COUNTY 626 | Yes | No | No |
| 447 | Hamilton Twp | LEONARD AVENUE | S CLINTON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 448 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 626 | LIBERTY ST | Yes | No | No |
| 449 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 618 | HAMILTON SQUARE-WHITEHORSE RD | Yes | No | No |
| 450 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER ST | HUGHES DR | Yes | No | No |
| 451 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 618 | GEORGE DYE RD | Yes | No | No |
| 452 | Hamilton Twp | YARDVIILLE-HAMILTON SQ RD | MERCER COUNTY 618 | Yes | No | No |
| 453 | Hamilton Twp | ROUTE 535 | MERCER COUNTY 652 | Yes | No | No |
| 454 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 606 | KLOCKNER RD | Yes | No | No |
| 455 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 606 | WARD AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 456 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 606 | LIBERTY ST | Yes | No | No |
| 457 | Hamilton Twp | LEONARD AVENUE | NEWKIRK AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 458 | Hamilton Twp | LIBERTY ST | NEWKIRK AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 459 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 606 | NEWKIRK AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 460 | Hamilton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 614 | ROUTE 535 | Yes | No | No |
| 463 | Hamilton Twp | FLOCK RD | PAXSON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 464 | Hamilton Twp | BAKERS BASIN RD | ROUTE 533 | Yes | No | No |
| 146 | Hamilton Twp | SWEETBRIAR AVE | CARLISLE AVE | Yes | Yes | No |
| 147 | Hamilton Twp | BASIN RD | BUCKNELL AVE | Yes | Yes | No |
| 462 | Hamilton Twp | ROUTE 535 | HUGHES DR | Yes | No | Yes |
| 461 | Hamilton Twp | ROUTE 533 | HUGHES DR | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 171 | Hightstown Boro | WARD ST | MAXWELL AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 172 | Hightstown Boro | MERCER COUNTY 633 | MAXWELL AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 173 | Hightstown Boro | ROUTE 539 | WYCOFFS MILLL RD | Yes | No | No |
| 518 | Hightstown Boro | ROUTE 539 | ROUTE 571 | Yes | No | No |
| 160 | Hopewell Boro | ROUTE 518 | ROUTE 569 | Yes | No | No |
| 161 | Hopewell Boro | ROUTE 518 | MERCER COUNTY 654 | Yes | No | No |
| 158 | Hopewell Twp | MERCER COUNTY 624 | MERCER COUNTY 625 | No | No | No |
| 481 | Hopewell Twp | MERCER COUNTY 632 | ROUTE 546 | No | No | No |
| 478 | Hopewell Twp | MERCER COUNTY 611 | SCOTCH RD | Yes | No | No |

[^27]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Mercer County-139 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 479 | Hopewell Twp | ROUTE 579 | ROUTE 546 | Yes | No | No |
| 480 | Hopewell Twp | MERCER COUNTY 640 | MERCER COUNTY 632 | Yes | No | No |
| 482 | Hopewell Twp | MERCER COUNTY 631 | REED RD | Yes | No | No |
| 159 | Hopewell Twp | ROUTE 518 | ROUTE 579 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 477 | Hopewell Twp | ROUTE 546 | MERCER COUNTY 637 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 493 | Lawrence Twp | ROUTE 583 | TEXAS AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 494 | Lawrence Twp | ROUTE 583 | GAINSBORO RD | Yes | No | No |
| 495 | Lawrence Twp | ROUTE 583 | ROUTE 546 | Yes | No | No |
| 497 | Lawrence Twp | PROVINCE LINE RD | PROVINCE LINE RD | Yes | No | No |
| 498 | Lawrence Twp | ROUTE 569 | MERCER COUNTY 604 | No | Yes | No |
| 492 | Lawrence Twp | BAKERS BASIN RD | LAWRENCE STATION RD | Yes | Yes | No |
| 496 | Lawrence Twp | ROUTE 569 | ROUTE 583 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 504 | Pennington Boro | MERCER COUNTY 640 | E DELAWARE AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 505 | Pennington Boro | MERCER COUNTY 640 | MERCER COUNTY 631 | Yes | No | No |
| 165 | Princeton Boro | MOORE ST | FRANKLIN ST | Yes | No | No |
| 488 | Princeton Boro | MERCER COUNTY 604 | HODGE RD | Yes | No | No |
| 489 | Princeton Boro | WITHERSPOON ST | FRANKLIN ST | Yes | No | No |
| 490 | Princeton Boro | HODGE RD | WITHERSPOON ST | Yes | No | No |
| 491 | Princeton Boro | HODGE RD | MOORE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 162 | Princeton Twp | VALLEY RD | MOORE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 484 | Princeton Twp | WITHERSPOOON ST | MOORE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 486 | Princeton Twp | WITHERSPOOON ST | VALLEY RD | Yes | No | No |
| 163 | Princeton Twp | PENNINGTON-ROCKY HILL R R | CHERRY HILL RD | No | Yes | No |
| 164 | Princeton Twp | PENNINGTON-ROCKY HILL RD | ELM RD | No | Yes | No |
| 487 | Princeton Twp | MERCER COUNTY 605 | HERRONTOWN RD | No | Yes | No |
| 483 | Princeton Twp | ALEXANDER RD | FACULTY RD | Yes | Yes | No |
| 485 | Princeton Twp | WITHERSPOON ST | CHERRY HILL RD | Yes | Yes | No |
| 175 | Trenton City | CHESTNUT AVE | WALNUT AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 176 | Trenton City | WALNUT AVE | MONMOUTH ST | Yes | No | No |
| 178 | Trenton City | LAFAYETTE ST | N WILLOW ST | Yes | No | No |

[^28]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I
Mercer County - 139 DRAFT Single Lane Roundabout Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 179 | Trenton City | W HANOVER ST | N WILLOW ST | Yes | No | No |
| 180 | Trenton City | N WILLOW ST | BELLEVVUE AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 181 | Trenton City | FERRY ST | CENTER ST | Yes | No | No |
| 182 | Trenton City | FEDERAL ST | CENTER ST | Yes | No | No |
| 183 | Trenton City | BELLEVUE AVE | S HERMITAGE AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 184 | Trenton City | HOFFMAN AVE | HOMAN AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 186 | Trenton City | NEW YORK AVE | SPRUCE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 521 | Trenton City | MERCER COUNTY 650 | LIBERTY ST | Yes | No | No |
| 522 | Trenton City | S CLINTON AVE | CHESTNUT AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 526 | Trenton City | ROEBLING AVE | S CLINTON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 528 | Trenton City | MERCER COUNTY 635 | WALL ST | Yes | No | No |
| 529 | Trenton City | S CLINTON AVE | MERCER COUNTY 635 | Yes | No | No |
| 530 | Trenton City | E STATE ST | EWING ST | Yes | No | No |
| 532 | Trenton City | PERRY ST | N STOCKTON ST | Yes | No | No |
| 533 | Trenton City | MONTGOMERY ST | E STATE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 534 | Trenton City | E STATE ST | N STOCKTON ST | Yes | No | No |
| 535 | Trenton City | W STATE ST | N WILLOW ST | Yes | No | No |
| 538 | Trenton City | S CLINTON AVE | WALL ST | Yes | No | No |
| 539 | Trenton City | MERCER COUNTY 626 | MERCER COUNTY 635 | Yes | No | No |
| 540 | Trenton City | CASS ST | CENTER ST | Yes | No | No |
| 541 | Trenton City | BRIDGE ST | UNION ST | Yes | No | No |
| 542 | Trenton City | FERRY ST | BRIDGE ST | Yes | No | No |
| 543 | Trenton City | MERCER COUNTY 636 | BELLEVUE AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 544 | Trenton City | W STATE ST | S HERMITAGE AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 546 | Trenton City | PROSPECT ST | STUYYESANT AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 547 | Trenton City | PROSPECT ST | HOMAN AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 548 | Trenton City | STUYVESANT AVE | S HERMITAGE AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 551 | Trenton City | NOTTINGHAM WAY | S CLINTON AVE | Yes | No | No |
| 550 | Trenton City | MERCER COUNTY 634 | PROSPECT ST | Yes | Yes | No |
| 177 | Trenton City | CHESTNUT AVE | ROEBLING AVE | Yes | No | Yes |

[^29]DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase I

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | CMP | Land Use | Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 185 | Trenton City | NEW YORK AVE | NEW YORK AVE | Yes | No | Yes |
| 520 | Trenton City | LIBERTY ST | S CLINTON AVE | Yes | No | Yes |
| 523 | Trenton City | CHESTNUT AVE | MERCER COUNTY 606 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 524 | Trenton City | MERCER COUNTY 606 | HUDSON AVE | Yes | No | Yes |
| 525 | Trenton City | MERCER COUNTY 606 | MERCER COUNTY 626 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 527 | Trenton City | MERCER COUNTY 606 | CANAL ST | Yes | No | Yes |
| 531 | Trenton City | PERRY ST | MONTGOMERY ST | Yes | No | Yes |
| 536 | Trenton City | W HANOVER ST | MERCER COUNTY 653 | Yes | No | Yes |
| 537 | Trenton City | MERCER COUNTY 653 | BELLEVUE AVE | Yes | No | Yes |
| 545 | Trenton City | BELLEVVUE AVE | PROSPECT ST | Yes | No | Yes |
| 549 | Trenton City | MERCER COUNTY 636 | HOMAN AVE | Yes | No | Yes |
| 174 | Washington Twp | SHARON RD | SPRING GARDEN RD | Yes | No | No |
| 519 | Washington Twp | ROUTE 526 | CIRCLE DRIVE | No | Yes | No |
| 166 | West Windsor Twp | VILLAGE RD W. | PENN LYLE RD | No | No | No |
| 500 | West Windsor Twp | ROUTE 526 | ROUTE 535 | Yes | No | No |
| 501 | West Windsor Twp | MERCER COUNTY 615 | MILLSTONE RD | Yes | No | No |
| 503 | West Windsor Twp | MERCER COUNTY 638 | N POST RD | Yes | No | No |
| 499 | West Windsor Twp | ROUTE 526 | ROUTE 535 | Yes | Yes | No |
| 502 | West Windsor Twp | ALEXANDER RD | N POST RD | Yes | Yes | No |



# Delaware County Additional Comments on the Candidate Locations 

DVRPC Regional Roundabout Analysis Phase 1
Delaware County's Additional Comments on Candidate Locations

| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Sig } \\ \text { Score } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | CMP | Land Use | Crashes | Elevation | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { project } \\ \text { planned } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Archaeological } \\ \text { Probability } \end{gathered}$ | Note | Resources | Municipal Notes | Suggestion Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 757 | Aldan Boro | PROVIDENCERD | OAK LN | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 758 | Aldan Boro | CLIFTONAV | PROVIDENCERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 759 | Aldan Boro | SPRIINGFIELD RD | PROVIIDENCERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 760 | Aldan Boro | SPRINGFIELD RD | CLIFTONAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 784 | Aston Twp | CONCORDRD | CHERRYTREERD | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 785 | Aston Twp | CONCORDRD | ASTONMILLS RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 786 | Aston Twp | CONCORDRD | DGTTON MILLRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 787 | Aston Twp | CONCORDRD | BRIDGEWATER RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 788 | Aston Twp | PENNELL RD | KNOWLTONRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Moderate | Viliage Green Crosssoads | Yes |  | potential obstacles |
| 211 | Bethel Twp | GARNET MINE RD | KIRK R ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 1 | No | No | No |  |  |  | 1007 Kirk Road | Yes (65) |  | potential obstacles |
| -795 | Bether Twp | FOULK CD - | ZEBEEEMED | 2 | No | No | No |  |  | High | Zebiley Corner Disistict | Yes |  | potential obstacles |
| -796 | Bethe T- Twp | NAAMANSCREEK- | FOULK- KIRK RD | $\underline{2}$ | No | No | No |  |  | High | Boothwy district | Yes---- |  | -potential obstacles |
| -797 | Bethel Twp | NAAMANSCREE ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | MARSHD | $\bigcirc$ | No | No | No |  |  |  | 1296 Kirk Road | yes (58) |  | potential obstacles |
| 800 | Bethel Twp | FOULK- ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | FOULKRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 801 | Bethel Twp | CONCORDRD | FOULK RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |  |  | High | Chēlsea- Historic District - Elig. For N.R. | Yes |  | potential obstacles |
| 799 | Bethel Twp | FOULK | GARNETMINE RD | 1 | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |  | -aimer House | Yes (47)-- |  | potential obstacles |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Chenelsea Historic District-Elig. |  |  | - |
| 802 | Bethel Twp | CONCORDRD | CHELSEARD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |  |  | High | For N.R. | Yes |  | potential obstacles |
| 803 | Bethel Twp | CONCORDRD | CHICHESTERAV | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 798 | Bethee Twp | FOULK RD | BETHEL RD | 2 | Yes | No | Yes |  |  | High | Pubilic School\#1 | yes (39) |  | potential obstacles |
| 789 | Brookhaven Boro | BRIDGEWATERD | CREEK RD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |  | perhaps the intersection at Brido | gwater/Brookh | aven/Creek Road could be done and a traffic signal eliminated. | yes |
| 790 | Brookhaven Boro | CREEK RD | BRIDGEWATER RD | 0 | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |  | perhaps the intersection at Bridg | gwater/Brookh | aven/Creek Road could be done and a traffic signal eliminated. | yes |
| 222 | Chadds Ford Twp | OAKLAND RD | DILWORTHTOWN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  | High | Dilworthtown National Register and local district | Yes |  | potential obstacles |
| 208 | Chester City | ENGLE ST | SEVENTH ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 209 | Chester city | CONCORDAV | SEVENTH ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 793 | Chester City | SEVENTHST | AVE OF THESTATES | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  | High |  | Yes (11) |  | potential obstacles |
| 794 | Chester City | SEVENTH ST | MADISONST ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 0 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Moderate |  | Yes (16) |  | potential obstacles |
| 201 | Chester Heights Boro | VALLEY BROOKRD | BODLEYRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Low | High site 52 | Yes (45) |  | potential obstacles |
| 779 | Chester Heights Boro | LLEWELYNRD | VALLEY BROOK RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Moderate | High site 47; Moderate site 46 | Yes (41) |  | potential obstacles |
| 780 | Chester Heights Boro | VALLEY BROOK RD | SMITHBRIDGER | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Moderate | High site 38 | None |  |  |
| 781 | Chester Heights Boro | BIRNEY HW | LENNIRD | $-1$ | Yes | No | No |  |  | Moderate |  | Yes (47) |  | potential obstacles |
| 782 | Chester Heights Boro | BIRNEY HW | BODLEYRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  | High |  | None |  |  |
| 812 | Chester Twp | CONCORDRD | GREEN ST | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Low |  | Yes (15) |  | potential obstacles |
| 813 | Chester Twp | CONCORDRD | CONCORDRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  | High |  | Yes (16-19) |  | potential obstacles |
| 814 | Chester Twp | BETHELST | ENGLEST | 0 | Yes | No | No |  |  | High |  | Yes (16-19) |  | potential obstacles |
| 199 | Concord Twp | THORNTONRD | MILL RD | -1 | № | No | No |  |  | High | AME Church | Yes (132) |  | potential obstacles |
| 196 | Concord Twp | SPRINGVALLEY ${ }^{\text {do }}$ | BRINTONLAEERD | $-1$ | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 197 | Concord Twp | BETHELRD | GARNET MINERD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 778 | Concord Twp | MMILRD | BRINTONLAKERD | - 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  | John Meyers House |  |  |  |
| 776 | Concord Twp | CONCORDRD | CHEYNEYRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  | --1 | John Meyers House |  |  | potential obstacles |
| 777 | Concord Twp | COANCORDRD | SMITTHBRIDGE RD | - | Yes | No | No |  |  | Moderate | Hañ̄̆um Hoūe | Yes (98) |  | -otentiailobstactes |
| 189 | Darby Boro | FIFTHST | WALNUT ST | 0 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 190 | Darby Boro | PINEST | FOURTH ST | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 191 | Darby Boro | FOURTHS | WALNOTS | $\bigcirc$ | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 192 | Darby Boro | CEDAR AV | CHESTERAV | 0 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Low and High |  | None |  |  |
| 212 | Eddystone Boro | NINTH ST | SAVILLE AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 | Edgmont Twp | VALLEY RD | SWEETWATERRD | 1 | No | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -81 | Edgmont Twp | DELCHESTER ${ }^{\text {V }}$ - | GRADYVILLER RD | $\frac{1}{1}$ | Ye- | No | No |  |  | Moderate | Moderate site 33 | Yes (54)-- |  | potential obstacles |
| 583 | Edgmont Twp | PROVİIENCERD |  | 1 | No | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 200 | Glenolden Boro | DELMAR DR | AMOSLAND RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 57 | Haverford Twp | LAWRENCERD | ELLIS RD | $-1$ | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 58 | Haverford Twp | EARLINGTONRD | BROOKLINEBL | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Haverford Twp | MANOARD | $\frac{\text { BROOKLINE BL }}{\text { KARAKUNG }}$ | $\frac{1}{1}$ | Yes | No | No |  |  |  | Faraway Estate | Yes (28) |  | potential obstacles |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Location Number | City/Township | First Name of Road Approach | Last Name of Road Approach | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sig } \\ \text { Score } \end{gathered}$ | CMP | Land Use | Crashes | Elevation | $\begin{gathered} \text { project } \\ \text { planned } \end{gathered}$ | Archaeological Probability | Note | Resources | Municipal Notes | Suggestion Level | Ran |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 61 | Haverford Twp | COOPERTOWNRD | COLLEGEAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  | Faraway Estate | Yes (28) |  | potential obstacles |  |
| 62 | Haverford Twp | COLLEGEAV | COOPERTOWNRD | - | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 551 | Haverford Twp | EAGLERD | BURMONT RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 552 | Haverford Twp | STEELRD | BURMONTRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -553 | Haverford Twp | STEEELRD | MANEARD | $\frac{2}{2}$ | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 555 | Haverford Twp | DARBY RD | COOPERTOWN RD | 0 | Yes | No | No |  |  | High | Cooperstown district | Yes |  | potential obstacles |  |
| 556 | Haverford Twp | ELISTRD | DARBYRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  | High | Cooperstow - disistict | Yes |  | Dotential obstacles |  |
| 557 | Haverford Twp | SPROUL-RD | DARBYRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 109 | Lansdowne Boro | MARSHALL RD | SHADELAND AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 110 | Lansdowne Boro | UNONAV | WYCOMBEAV | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  | High | R. Powell Residence |  |  | potential obstacles |  |
| 111 | Lansdowne Boro | WYCOMBE AV | STEWARTAV | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 607 | Lansdowne Boro | LANSDOWNE AV | MARSHALL RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Moderate | Edge of historic district along |  |  | potential obstacles |  |
| 608 | Lansdowne Boro | LANSDOWNE AV | PLUMSTEAD AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Moderate | Historic district along Lansdowne Avenue |  |  | potential obstacles |  |
| 609 | Lansdowne Boro | MARSHALL RD | WYCOMBEAV | 0 | Yes | No | No | yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 610 | Lanssowne Boro | WYCOMBEAV | PLUMMSTEAD AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 79 | Marple Twp | PALMERS MILL RD | PAXON HOLLOW RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  | High | Mill ruins | Yes (85) | elevation changes of the roadways and acquisition of property | no |  |
| 578 | Marple Twp | MEDAALINE-R | GRADYVILLEER | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  | Wide intersection with good site | distance. Be | etween $2002 \pm 20079$ accidents ( 7 reportabie). 18 venicles, 4 | yes | 4 |
| 579 | Marple Twp | MARPLE RD | MARPLE RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  | High | Marple Presbyterian Church | Yes (61) | property acquisition and historic resources | no |  |
| 172 | Middletown Twp | VALLEY RD | FORGE RD |  | No | No | No |  |  | High | 310 Valley Road | Yes (5) | There is little current traffic need, but this could benefit for a study when there is a need to avoid signalization could combine with 173 for offset left | potential obstacles |  |
| 173 | Middietown Twp | NEW DARLINGTON RD | FORGERD | 1 | No | No | No |  |  |  | There is little current traffic | need, but this | could benefit for a study when there is a need to avoid signaliz | tion could combine w | 11 |
| 174 | Middietown Twp | NEW DARLINGTON RD | VALLEY RD | 1 | No- | No | No |  |  |  |  |  | e is little current need, but perhaps in the future to avoid signaliz | ation | 13 |
| 744 | Middletown Twp | DUTTON MILL RD | CREEK RD | 1 | No | No | No |  |  | High | Dutton's Mills Industrial Village | Yes | There is little need currently, but perhaps in the future to avoid | potential obstacles | 2 |
| 766 | Morton Boro | MORTON AV | Yale AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Moderate | High site 12 |  |  | potential obstacles |  |
| 767 | Morton Boro | PROVIDENCERD | MORTONAV | 0 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Low | Low site 5 |  |  | potential obstacles |  |
| 181 | Nether Providence Twp | ROSE VALLEY RD | MANCHESTER RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  | 1 don't thin | k any of the s | uggested locations would be appropriate. | no |  |
| 182 | Nether Providence Twp | BROOKHAVEN RD | ROSE VALLEYRD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  | 1 don't thin | $k$ any of the sis | uggested locations would be appropriate. | no |  |
| 183 | Nether Providence Twp | BROOKHAVEN RD | WATERVILLEERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  | Moderate | Frankilinion works --I | -- Yes --- | I' don't think any of the suggested locations would be appropriaa | -ootentialobstacies |  |
| --184 | $\frac{\text { Nether Providence Twp }}{\text { Nether Providence }}$ | ROGERS LN | PLUSHMILLR | 0 | Yes | No | No |  | ---- |  | I doon't hin | k any of the s | uggested locations would be appropriate. | ------- |  |
| 186 | Nether Providence Twp | TURNER RD | ROGERS LN | $-1$ | Yes | No | No |  |  |  | I don't thin | k any of the st | uggested locations would be appropriate. | -------no |  |
| 187 | Nether Providence Twp | BROOKHAVEN RD | AVONDALE RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  | I don't thin | k any of the s | uggested locations would be appropriate. | --------- |  |
| 188 | Nether Providence Twp | BULLENSLE | BULLENSLN | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  | I don't thin | $k$ any of the s | uggested locations would be appropriate. | no |  |
| 761 | Nether Providence Twp | AVONDALERD | AVONDALERD | - | Yes | Yes | No |  |  | High | Strath ${ }^{\text {avaeen Mili Complex }}$ | Yes | \|I don't think any of the suggested locations would be approprial | potential obstacies |  |
| 48 | Newtown Twp | GRADYVILLE RD | GRADYVILLE RD | 1 | No | No | No |  |  | Low and High |  | Yes (1) |  | potential obstacles |  |
| 22 | Radnor Twp | WAYNEAV | EAGLERD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | Radnor TMp | DARBYPAOLIRD | NEWTOWN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -24 | $\frac{\text { Radnor Twp }}{\text { Radior }}$ | DARBY PAOLIR | SAWMILL RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  | Villanova University |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | Radnor Twp | ITHANAV | ROBERTS RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  | - - - - - - - - - |  |
| 27 | Radnor Twp | DARBY PAOLI ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | GOSHEN RD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | Radnor Twp | COOPERTOWNRD | DUNCANLN | $-1$ | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 514 | Radnor Twp | SPROUL RD | BRYN MAWR AV | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 515 | Radnor Twp | BRYN MAWR AV | DARBY PAOLIRD | 1 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 517 | Radnor Twp | ITHANA | CONESTOGA RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 518 | Radnor Twp | CONESTOGARD | RADNOR CHESTER R | 1 | Yes | No | No | yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -519 | Radnor Twp | CONESTOGARD | WAYNEAV | $-1$ | $\frac{\mathrm{Yes}}{\mathrm{Yes}}$ | No | $\frac{\mathrm{NO}}{\mathrm{NO}}$ |  | yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 522 | Radnor Twp | KING OF PRUUSSIA RD | MATSONFORD RD | 2 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 516 | Radnor Twp | BROOKE RD | DARBY PAOLIRD | $-1$ | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 521 | Radnor Twp | KING OFPRUSSIA RD | EAGLERD | 2 | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 202 | Ridley Park Boro | RIDLEY AV | SELLERS AV | 0 | Yes | No | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 768 | Ridley Twp | MORTON AV | MACDADE BL | 2 | Yes | No | No |  | yes |  | closed loop system on MacDade |  |  |  | 7 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{GIS} \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | FIRST_SLD | LAST_SLD_N | CMP | LAND USE | CRASH | MCD_NAME | PRIOR. | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 503 | MERCER COUNTY 638 | N POST RD | Y | N | N | West Windsor Twp |  | Near new Alex. Rd roundabout, high turn vols (gf) |
|  | CR 571 (Washington Rd) | Faculty Rd |  |  |  | Princeton Twp | 1 | Near roundabout on Faculty (gf) |
|  | CR 571 | Stockton St |  |  |  | Hightstown boro | 1 | Complex int, signal req, schools, trucks (gf) |
| 485 | WITHERSPOON ST | CHERRY HILL RD | Y | Y | N | Princeton Twp | 2 | Recc by Glatting/UI RE 206 (ml) |
| 451 | MERCER COUNTY 618 | GEORGE DYE RD | Y | N | N | Hamilton Twp | 2 | Signal req'd, calm Rt 33 reliever (gf) |
| 480 | MERCER COUNTY 640 | MERCER COUNTY 632 | Y | N | N | Hopewell Twp | 2 | Calm town gateway, wide ROW (gf) |
| 481 | MERCER COUNTY 632 | ROUTE 546 | N | N | N | Hopewell Twp | 2 | High \% turn, wide ROW (gf) |
| 486 | WITHERSPOON ST | VALLEY RD | Y | N | N | Princeton Twp | 2 | Recc by Glatting/Urban RE 206 (ml) |
| 498 | ROUTE 569 | MERCER COUNTY 604 | N | Y | N | Lawrence Twp | 2 | high \% turn, constricted ROW (gf) |
| 528 | MERCER COUNTY 635 | WALL ST | Y | N | N | Trenton City | 2 | Near Train Station, complex intersection (gf) |
|  | Route 524 | Route 609 |  |  |  | Hamilton Twp | 2 | Yardville 5-Points (gf) |
|  | Rt 546 (Pen-Law) | Fed. City / Keefe |  |  |  | Lawrence Twp | 2 | High \% turn, wide ROW (gf) |
|  | US 206 | Ewing St |  |  |  | Princeton Twp | 2 | Recc by Glatting/UI RE 206 (ml) |
|  | US 206 | NJ 27 (MP 0.00) |  |  |  | Princeton Boro |  | Recc by Glatting/UI RE 206 (ml) |
|  | NJ 27 | Mercer St |  |  |  | Princeton Boro | 2 | Recc by Glatting/UI RE 206 (ml) |
|  | US 206 | Terhune |  |  |  | Princeton Twp | 2 | Recc by Glatting/UI RE 206 (ml) |
|  | US 206 | Mountain Ave |  |  |  | Princeton Twp | 2 | Recc by Glatting/UI RE 206 (ml) |
|  | Nottingham | George Dye |  |  |  | Hamilton Twp | 2 | Signal req'd, calm traff in res area (gf) |
| 160 | ROUTE 518 | ROUTE 569 | Y | N | N | Hopewell Boro |  | May provide Boro gateway (ml) |
| 161 | ROUTE 518 | MERCER COUNTY 654 | Y | N | N | Hopewell Boro | 3 | May provide Boro gateway (ml) |
|  | NJ 33 | Airport Rd |  |  |  | East Windsor Twp | 3 | Signal req' by Twp, gateway to Highstown boro (ml) |
| 479 | ROUTE 579 | ROUTE 546 | Y | N | N | Hopewell Twp | 4 | Signal w/long cycle, wide ROW (ml) |
| 513 | MERCER COUNTY 636 | LOWER FERRY RD | Y | N | N | Ewing Twp | 4 | high turn vols, wide ROW (gf) |
| 158 | MERCER COUNTY 624 | MERCER COUNTY 625 | N | N | N | Hopewell Twp | 4 | @ BMS gate, new development (gf) |
| 483 | ALEXANDER RD | FACULTY RD | Y | Y | N | Princeton Twp | 4 | High \% turn, calm bef entering BD (ml) |
| 514 | LOWER FERRY RD | CARLTON AVE | Y | N | N | Ewing Twp |  | Signallized, low need (gf) |
| 551 | NOTTINGHAM WAY | S CLINTON AVE | Y | N | N | Trenton City |  | High \% turn, maybe suff ROW (ml) |
| 510 | MERCER COUNTY 611 | CARLTON AVE | Y | N | N | Ewing Twp |  |  |
| 136 | MERCER COUNTY 672 | S. BROAD ST | Y | N | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 137 | MERCER COUNTY 672 | OLD YORK RD | N | N | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 138 | OLD YORK RD | S. BROAD ST | N | N | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 139 | MAIN ST | MERCER COUNTY 672 | Y | N | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 140 | MAIN ST | MERCER COUNTY 609 | Y | N | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 141 | MERCER COUNTY 609 | NJ 156 | Y | N | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 142 | KLOCKNER RD | EDGEWOOD RD | Y | N | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 143 | KUSER RD | HEMPSTEAD RD | Y | N | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 144 | INDEPENDENCE AVE | HOBSON AVE | Y | N | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 145 | OVERLOOK AV | W PARK AVE | Y | N | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 146 | SWEETBRIAR AVE | CARLISLE AVE | Y | Y | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 147 | BASIN RD | BUCKNELL AVE | Y | Y | N | Hamilton Twp |  |  |
| 159 | ROUTE 518 | ROUTE 579 | Y | Y | N | Hopewell Twp |  |  |
| 162 | VALLEY RD | MOORE ST | Y | N | N | Princeton Twp |  |  |
| 163 | PENNINGTON-ROCKY HILL RD | CHERRY HILL RD | N | Y | N | Princeton Twp |  |  |
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#### Abstract

This report documents the first phase of an analysis on examining the applicability of constructing roundabouts at appropriate locations in the region. In general, the concept of roundabouts is relatively new to the region, however given the proven safety benefits and successful applications from across the country, roundabouts are a worthy mechanism for improving the efficiency and safety at intersections.

By using such factors as functional classification, number of travel lanes, CMP, land use, and crash history, DVRPC worked with officials from PennDOT, NJDOT, counties and other stakeholders in developing screening criteria for determining where citing single lane roundabouts would be appropriate. Once generated, this information was tabulated, mapped and distributed to the counties for their review to narrow, and prioritize the listing of locations that met the identified criteria. The top three intersections prioritized by the counties would be considered for further evaluation of roundabout consideration during the second phase of this analysis.
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