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### 1.0 Existing and Planned Conditions

### 1.1 Proposed Development

Exhibit 1-1 illustrates the location of the proposed site which is in the southeast quadrant of the Brian Coburn Boulevard/Fern Casey Street intersection in Orleans South. The site is located within the future East Urban Community (EUC) Phase 3 lands.

Exhibit 1-2 illustrates the proposed site plan (September, 2019) and access arrangement. The proposed development is anticipated to provide for 186 residential dwellings that consist of:

- 90 back-to-back townhomes within 11 structures that are to be located on the east side of the development which would be serviced by individual driveways and garages; and
- 96 mid-rise terrace dwellings within 8 structures are to be located along the north, south and west sides of the development. A total of 135 motor-vehicle parking stalls and 50 interior bicycle parking stalls would be provided for the terrace dwellings.

The proposed development is located in the General Urban Area. A review of the existing Zoning Bylaw indicates a "DR" - Development Reserve Zone" designation. The site is currently greenfield. This traffic study report is in support of a Major Zoning By-Law Amendment application and an application for Site Plan Control Approval. The likely intended future zoning of the site would be an "R4F" designated zone intended for low-rise multiple-unit residential dwellings.


Exhibit 1-1: Site Location Context


Exhibit 1-2: Site Plan of Proposed Development (Nov. 2020)

Exhibit 1-2 illustrates that the proposed development would be accessed by way of three locations:

- A right-in right-out access is proposed along Fern Casey Street approximately 130 m south of the existing Brian Coburn Boulevard/Fern Casey Street roundabout;
- A full movement access is proposed to connect to Couloir Road, approximately 80 m to the east of the Fern Casey Street/Couloir Road intersection; and
- A full movement access is proposed to connect to Street No. 23, approximately 220m north of the Street No. 23/Couloir Road intersection.

Street No. 23 would be constructed as part of this site plan application to a $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ design/operating speed with a 1.8 m sidewalk.

The proposed site is anticipated to be built in a single phase with a date of occupancy of approximately 2024. The transportation analysis will consider applicable guidelines as laid out within the City of Ottawa Official Plan and regulations as laid out within the City's Zoning and other relevant by-laws.

### 1.2 ExISTING CONDITIONS

Area Roadways
The City of Ottawa TMP (Map 6) was referenced along with a desktop review of aerial photography to document the existing roadways that would serve the proposed development and surrounding area:

- Brian Coburn Boulevard is an existing 2-lane east-west undivided two-lane arterial roadway (posted speed $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) located north of the proposed development and running from Navan Road in the west to Trim Road in the east. The surrounding land use is characterized by in-development and planned residential dwellings. A MUP is provided along the south side of the roadway while an on-street cycling lane is available along the north side of the boulevard;
- Fern Casey Street is an existing major collector roadway that currently connects Brian Coburn Boulevard to Renaud Road. It is characterized by 2-lanes of travel, sidewalks with a boulevard arrangement on either side of the corridor, a $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ posted speed limit, a concrete median and a 42 m right-of-way;
- Renaud Road is an east-west collector with 2-lanes of travel (one lane per-direction) that connects Mer Bleue Road in the east to Navan Road in the west. The surrounding land uses are planned to be residential, with the Trailsedge community on the north side and the Crème and Eastboro developments on the south side. In general, Renaud Road is posted at $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, with a lower speed limit of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ in the vicinity of the Notre-Dame-des-Champs school, located at the corner of Renaud Road and Fern Casey Street. Sidewalks currently exist to the west of the recently constructed school;
- Navan Road is a north-south arterial located west of the proposed site with 2-lanes of travel (one lane perdirection) and a rural cross-section. The posted speed limit is $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ south of the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass and $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ near the Navan Road/Orléans Boulevard intersection. The corridor is bounded by mostly rural residential and commercial properties.
- Mer Bleue Road is a 4-lane (two lanes per-direction) north-south arterial that starts south of Innes Road and tapers to a 2-lanes roadway just north of Renaud Road. The 4-lane section provides an urban crosssection with on-street cycling lanes, sidewalks with boulevards on both sides. The existing 2-lane
section of Mer Bleue Road is characterized by a rural cross-section with un-cultivated farmland, agricultural land and existing rural residences on both sides. Mer Bleue Road between Innes Road and Renaud Road is posted at $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. The posted speed is reduced to $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ south of Renaud Road.


## Area Driveways and Land Uses

The following surrounding land uses and driveways along Fern Casey Street:

- Axis Way and Locust Ridge provide access to the existing Richcraft Trailsedge Phase 2 residential development west of the proposed site from Fern Casey Street; and
- Crevasse Road and Couloir Road provide access to Trailsedge Phase 3 located south of the proposed site.


## Area Traffic Management

No Area Traffic Management strategies have been identified for the boundary roads within the area.

## Area Intersections

Navan Road/Renaud Road: This intersection is a 4leg traffic signal-controlled intersection. All approaches provide for a single thru lane and auxiliary left turn bay. The northbound approach provides for a short NB-RT taper and channelized island. The eastbound approach affords a dedicated EB-RT auxiliary lane.


Brian Coburn Boulevard/Fern Casey Street: This intersection is a 3-leg roundabout with single lane approaches. In the future, Fern Casey Street is to be extended northward and form a fourth leg to the intersection;

Brian Coburn Boulevard/Navan Road: This roundabout was recently constructed as a 3-leg, single lane roundabout intersection.


Renaud Road/Fern Casey Street: This " T " intersection is currently STOP-controlled on the north leg. An EB-LT auxiliary lane is provided from Renaud Road with singlelane thru movements on each approach.

## Brian Coburn Boulevard/Mer Bleue Road: This

 4-leg roundabout intersection is characterized by 2 NB and 2 SB approach lanes along the Mer Bleue corridor and single EB and WB approach lanes along the Brian Coburn Boulevard corridor in the east-west direction.


Renaud Road/Mer Bleue Road: This intersection is currently configured a "T"-intersection with STOP-control on all approaches.

Fern Casey Street/Axis Way-Couloir Road : This intersection is currently configured as a "T"intersection with STOP-control on the minor east-west approaches. The northbound approach allows for an auxiliary NB-LT bay and a shared NB-Th/RT lane. The southbound approach allows for a SB-Th lane, an auxiliary SB-RT lane and a dedicated SB-LT lane.


## Existing Cycling Facilities

The City of Ottawa's "Map 1: Cycling Network - Primary Urban" from the Transportation Master Plan indicated:

- Brian Coburn Boulevard accommodates a "Major Pathway" in the form of an east-west multi-use pathway (MUP) along the south side of the corridor;
- Navan Road and Mer Bleue Road are both designated as cycling "Spine Routes" that provide onstreet cycling lanes; and
- Page Road is designated as a north-south "Spine Route" that intersects Brian Coburn Boulevard at a pedestrian crossing to the west of the proposed site.

The following peak period traffic counts undertaken in 2018 (AM, Mid-day, PM peaks) were reviewed to gain an understanding of existing cyclist volumes:

- The July, 2018 traffic count at the Brian Coburn Boulevard/Navan Road intersection indicated 2 north-south cyclists along Navan Road and 3 westbound cyclists along Brian Coburn Boulevard;
- The May, 2018 traffic count at the Renaud Road/Fern Casey Street intersection indicated 9 eastwest cyclists along Renaud Road and no cyclists along Fern Casey Street; and
- The November, 2018 count at the Renaud Road/Mer Bleue Road intersection indicated no cyclists in either direction.

In general, the recorded current cyclists traffic information indicated negligible cyclist traffic.

## Existing Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian provisions are afforded on each of the boundary streets to the proposed development. A sidewalk and boulevard arrangement exists along the full length of either side of Fern Casey Street while an MUP is provided on the south side of Brian Coburn Boulevard.

The peak period traffic counts undertaken in 2018 indicated:

- 15 pedestrians crossed Renaud Road at the Fern Casey Street/Renaud Road intersection adjacent to the new school;
- 4 pedestrians were recorded throughout the entire 12-hour traffic count undertaken at the Renaud Road/Mer Bleue Road intersection; and
- 3 pedestrians were recorded throughout the peak-hour at the Brian Coburn Boulevard/Navan Road intersection traffic count.

Overall, the recorded current pedestrian traffic at each of the above intersections were determined to be insignificant.

## Existing Transit Provisions

Exhibit 1-3 illustrates the transit routes that serve the proposed site. The exhibit also illustrates the Chapel Hill Park-and-Ride facility located nearest the Brian Coburn Boulevard/Navan Road intersection. The nearest transit stops are located at the intersection of Fern Casey Street and Chemin de la Crevasse Road to the south of the site.

The following transit routes are anticipated to serve residents of the development:

- Route 225 would serve as the primary existing transit route to connect the proposed development to the existing LRT at Blair Station via the Blackburn Hamlet By-Pass-Innes Road corridor. It connects Willow Aster in the east, the Chapel Hill Park-and-Ride, and the Blair Road Line 1 Station in the west. A review of the schedule for Tuesday, September $22^{\text {nd }}$ indicated that this route runs only in the peak period with 20-minute headways between buses.
- Route 34 also connects the Chapel Hill Park-and-Ride to Blair Station via Montreal Road. This route runs with an approximate 15 -minute headway during the peak periods and a 30 -minute headway during non-peak periods.
- Route 228 travels along Renaud Road and Navan Road to the south of the proposed development. The route serves to connect the Navan Road corridor to the existing Blair Station and is scheduled with 30-minute headways in the peak direction during the peak periods.


Exhibit 1-3: Existing Transit Routes

## Existing (2020) Traffic Volumes

Exhibit 1-4 illustrates the existing morning and afternoon peak hour traffic volumes within the study area intersections. The following recent traffic counts were obtained for the area intersections:

- Brian Coburn Boulevard/Navan Road (City Count: July 2018);
- Brian Coburn Boulevard/Fern Casey Street (Castleglenn Count: December, 2018);
- Fern Casey Street/Renaud Road (City Count: May 2018);
- Mer Bleue Road/Renaud Road (City Count: November 2018);
- Navan Road/Renaud Road (City Count: October 29th 2019);
- Mer Bleue Road/Brian Coburn Boulevard (TIS 2225 Mer Bleue Rd - Orleans Health Hub: Dec. 2017);
- Fern Casey Street/Axis Way-Couloir Road ("T" intersection) (Castleglenn Count: December, 2018); and
- Mer Bleue Road/Deceour Drive (Castleglenn Count: September, 2019).


## Existing Road Safety Information

Five (5) year (January $1^{\text {st }}$, 2014 to December $31^{\text {st }}, 2018$ ) historical collision information was reviewed for the area intersections. The collision information provides:

- the date and time of each collision;
- the type of collision (i.e. angle collision, rear-end);
- vehicle details (truck, passenger vehicle, etc.);
- vehicle path/maneuver characteristics; and
- the number of pedestrians involved (in the collision).

For each intersection within the area a standard collision rate based on the number of collisions- per-million-entering-vehicles (MEV) was calculated. A collision rate greater than 1.0 collisions/MEV was considered to pose a potential safety concern.

The following provides a summary of the collision information collected and evaluated:

- Brian Coburn Boulevard/Mer Bleue Road: A total of 9 collisions occurred at this intersection in the past 5 years with $56 \%$ (5) of the collisions being rear-end collisions. All of the collisions were found to result in property damage only. A collision rate of 0.25 collisions/MEV was calculated;
- Fern Casey Street/Renaud Road: Two collisions have occurred at this intersection in the past 5 years, both of which were angle collisions. This resulted in a collision rate of $0.2 / \mathrm{MEV}$;
- Renaud Road/Mer Bleue Road: Three collisions occurred at this intersection all of which resulted in property damage. A collision rate of $0.25 / \mathrm{MEV}$ was determined for this location;
- Navan Road/Renaud Road: A total of 14 collisions occurred at this intersection in the past 5 years. About $43 \%$ (6) of these collisions were rear-end collisions ( 3 in east direction, 2 in north direction and one in west direction) and $36 \%$ (5) were angle collisions ( 2 east / south direction and 2 in north / east direction, one in south / west direction). The majority ( $79 \%$ ) of the collisions resulted in property damage. A single collision involved a pedestrian, which resulted in a non-fatal injury. A collision rate of 0.54 collisions/MEV was determined for this intersection
- Brian Coburn Boulevard/Fern Casey Street: This intersection was only recently constructed, however, three collisions have occurred at the intersection in 2018 (2 property damage only, one nonfatal injury). A collision rate of 0.16 was calculated for this intersection.
- Brian Coburn Boulevard/Navan Road: This intersection was only recently constructed, however, three collisions have occurred at the intersection (3 property damage only, one non-fatal injury). A collision rate of 0.14 was calculated for this intersection

The collision information indicated that there appears to be no discernable pattern given the incidence of collisions over the 5 -year period.

### 1.3 Planned Conditions

Planned Transportation Network Changes
A review of the City of Ottawa's documents ${ }^{1}$ indicated that:

- Mer Bleue Road is scheduled for widening from Brian Coburn Boulevard to Renaud Road by 2024. This is assumed to include intersection improvements at Decoeur Drive and Renaud Road. The Mer Bleue/Renaud Road intersection is to receive traffic signal control improvements within the nest 10 -years, with the design to-be-determined;
- The realignment of Mer Bleue Road between Renaud Road and Navan Road has been included in the 2031 TMP Network Concept;

1. City of Ottawa Transportation Master Plan (Nov. 2013) Map 11 (Road Network Affordable Transportation Network), Map 5 (Rapid Transit and Transit Priority Network - 2031 Affordable Network), Appendix "E" of the 2019 DC Background Study and other planning documents

- The Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension between Navan Road and Orleans Boulevard is scheduled to occur before 2024;
- Fern Casey Street is to be extended northward into the EUC Phase 3 lands to connect with the Vanguard Drive Extension and Frank Bender Street. This would form a local connection to Innes Road for the future residential development within the area;
- Brian Coburn Boulevard would be upgraded with transit signal priority (Isolated Measures) between Blackburn Hamlet Bypass and Tenth Line Road, in order to improve transit service between Orleans South and the Inner Area in lieu of other BRT measures such as the Cumberland Transitway;
- Vanguard Drive is to be extended to the west as a collector roadway through the East Urban Community Phase 3 lands, to connect Tenth Line Road to Mer Bleue and Lamarche Avenue; and
- Innes Road would receive transit priority measures (queue jumps and transit signal priority) between the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass and Trim Road. Some improvements have already taken place.

The "Rapid Transit and Transit Priority Map" for the 2031 Affordable Network (Map 5) within the City of Ottawa Transportation Master Plan indicated that Brian Coburn Boulevard is a designated "Transit Priority Corridor (Isolated Measures)".

The City of Ottawa's Transportation Master Plan Map 4 (Rapid Transit and Transit Priority Network - 2031 Conceptual Network) indicated that the Cumberland Transitway / Blackburn Hamlet By-Pass Extension would be located north of the proposed development. This will greatly benefit the future transit share. However, the extension of the Transitway is anticipated to occur well beyond the 2031 Official Plan horizon and would have no impact on this traffic study report analyses/evaluation.


Morning (Afternoon) - Vehicles-Per-Hour
Exhibit 1-4: Existing (2020) Morning and Afternoon Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

## Adjacent Development Initiatives

A review of adjacent developments planned within the immediate area was undertaken as part of this scoping report. As the proposed 6429 Renaud Road development is located within the East Urban Community Phase 3 lands, this traffic study report would assume similar rates of development for adjacent initiatives:

- East Urban Community, Phase 3 Lands (Draft MTS, Castleglenn, May 2020): The EUC Phase 3 lands encompass the proposed development, Trailsedge North and the Orleans Health Hub near the Brian Coburn Boulevard/Mer Bleue Road intersection. The precise timing of the development of the lands north of the Hydro Corridor is uncertain, but would almost certainly beyond the City of Ottawa 2031 planning horizon and after the build-out of the proposed Blocks 193 and 194 ( 6429 Renaud Road) development.
- Richcraft Trailsedge - Phase 4: The Trailsedge Phase 4 subdivision is located to the east of the proposed 6429 Renaud Road development. A site plan concept indicated 917 residential dwellings ( 142 singles / 285 townhouses and 490 apartment units) as well as 300 mixed-use jobs and 180 commercial jobs. This development would connect to Brian Coburn Boulevard via the future Ascender Way and to the Mer Bleue Drive corridor via a fourth west leg at the Mer Bleue Road/Decoeur Drive intersection. It is understood that any Phase 4 development would occur after the 2031 TMP forecast horizon year;
- Richcraft Trailsedge East: Stage 3: The Trailsedge East development is located immediately south of the proposed 6429 Renaud Road development. The Trailsedge East development is bounded by Fern Casey in the west, Mer Bleue in the east and Renaud Road in the south. Stage 3-1 of the development is currently in development, with the entire development potential remaining of 945 units by 2029;
- Stage 6-Minto Avalon West \& 2336 Tenth Line Road (Mer Bleue Road/Decoeur Drive): The Minto Avalon West residential development located east of the proposed development, as of Fall 2019, proposed an additional 256 townhomes and 180 single homes. The existing Mer Bleue Road/Decoeur Drive "T" intersection will be modified to provide for a fourth (west) leg that would provide access the future Trailsedge North development;
- Orleans Family Health Hub - EUC Phase 3 (TIS, HDR, March 2018) envisions a medical facility at the north-east corner of the Mer Bleue Road/Brian Coburn Boulevard roundabout. The development holds the promise of potential longer-term on-site expansion. The initial phase of the development would provide 350 jobs and was originally anticipated to be constructed in 2016. It is anticipated (as a result of community demand for health services) that the medical facility will be expanded in the next 20 -to- 30 years to provide for approximately 1,500 jobs;
- Mer Bleue Expansion Area (IBI MTS, April 2017): This area is located to the south and east of the proposed site. It proposes approximately 3,600 residential units, $175,000 \mathrm{SF}$ of institutional development and approximately 4 hectares of commercial development by the time of ultimate build-out. This development will largely affect background traffic growth along existing corridors such as Navan Road, Mer Bleue Drive and Renaud Road corridors. The Summerside West Phase 4-6 TIA (Parsons, 2018) was referenced for the adjacent background traffic;
- East Urban Community, Phase 2 (Delcan CTS, August 2013): The EUC Phase 2 lands are located south of Renaud Road to south of Navan Road. It is anticipated that the full buildout would include approximately 1,400 residential units and approximately $635,000 \mathrm{SF}$ of mixed-use development. It is anticipated that the Phase 2 lands will build-out from south-to-north, and therefore largely impact Navan Road and the Mer Bleue Road corridors over the next decade.


### 2.0 Traffic Forecast Area and Time Periods

### 2.1 The Traffic Forecast Area

The proposed 6429 Renaud Road development meets the trip generation triggers requiring both a Design Review and Network.

The traffic forecast area is proposed to include Fern Casey Street, Couloir Road, Street No. 23, and Brian Coburn Blvd as Boundary Streets for analysis.

Therefore, the traffic forecast area will address the following intersections:

- Brian Coburn Boulevard/Mer Bleue Road (Roundabout);
- Brian Coburn Boulevard / Fern Casey Street (Roundabout);
- Brian Coburn Boulevard / Navan Road (Roundabout);
- Mer Bleue Road / Future Decoeur-Copperhead Street (2029 - Roundabout²);
- Mer Bleue Road / Renaud Road (Un-signalized);
- Renaud Road / Fern Casey Street (Un-signalized);
- Renaud Road / Navan Road (signalized); and
- Fern Casey Street / Couloir Road - Axis Way (Un-signalized).


### 2.2 Time Periods

The forecast area includes an analysis of the morning and afternoon peak hours of travel demand as they were envisioned to represent the "worst-case" scenario in terms of traffic volumes.

### 2.3 Horizon Years

The forecast report leads to an analysis of a full build-out year (understood to be the 2024 horizon year) and a build-out-plus-five-year (assumed to be 2029) horizon.

### 3.0 ExEmption Review

Table 3.1 is an extract from the TIA Guidelines (2017) in regard to possible reduction in scope of work.
Castleglenn would request the City of Ottawa to provide exemptions for Elements 4.1.3, 4.2.2, 4.61 and Module 4.8 as indicated within Table 3-1.

It's recognized that subsequent to the review of this traffic study report, the inclusions/exemptions could be revised ahead of the Step 4: Analysis report.

Table 3-1: Exemptions as per TIA Guidelines

| Module | Element | Exemption Considerations | Include Module in TIA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Review Component |  |  |  |
| 4.1 Development Design | 4.1.2 Circulation and Access | Required for site plan. | Yes |
|  | 4.1.3 New Street Networks | Only required for plans of subdivision | No |
| 4.2 Parking | 4.2.1 Parking Supply | Required for site plan. | Yes |
|  | 4.2.2 Spillover Parking | Parking supply not anticipated to exceed minimum | No |
| Network Impact Component |  |  |  |
| 4.5 Transportation Demand Management | All elements |  | Yes |
| 4.6 Neighbourhood Traffic Management | 4.6.1 Adjacent Neighbourhoods | The development trips are not anticipated to exceed ATM thresholds for Fern Casey Street (which is a major collector). | Yes |
| 4.8 Network Concept |  | The proposed development is not anticipated to generate 200-person-trips more than the permitted zoning | No |

### 4.0 Forecasting

### 4.1 Development-Generated Travel Demand

The proposed development is situated outside the Greenbelt in a predominately suburban area. The development is residential in nature with 90 back-to-back townhomes and 96 mid-rise dwellings. The future zoning is intended to be "R4F" which"allows a mix of residential building forms ranged from detached to low rise apartment dwellings, in some cases limited to four units, and in no case more than four storeys, in areas designated as General Urban Area in the Official Plan".

### 4.1.1 Auto Trip Generation

Table 4-1 summarizes the auto trip generation rates that were used for this assessment. The trip generation rates were referenced from Table 6.3 of the TRANS Trip Generation Residential Trip Rates Study (2009). Vehicle trip directional splits were referenced from Table 6.2 of the "TRANS Trip Generation Study". The "Low-Rise Condominium" (LU Code 231) was adopted for the "Mid-Rise Terrace Flats" stacked units as it is more conservative than the "Low-Rise Apartments" (LU Code 221) trip generation rates.

Table 4-1: Trip Generation Rates adopted for the 6429 Renaud Road Development

| Land Use | Source | Independent <br> Variable | Morning Peak Hour |  | Afternoon Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rate |  | Out \% | Rate | In \% | Out \% |  |  |
| Semi-Detached <br> Dwellings, <br> Townhouses, <br> Rowhouses | TRANS <br> (Table 6.2, 6.3) <br> ITE LU 224 | Dwelling Units | 0.54 | $37 \%$ | $63 \%$ | 0.71 | $53 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Low-Rise <br> Condominiums | TRANS <br> (Table 6.2, 6.3) <br> ITE LU 231 | Dwelling Units | 0.60 | $31 \%$ | $69 \%$ | 0.66 | $56 \%$ | $44 \%$ |

Table 4-2 demonstrates the anticipated auto vehicle trips generated by the proposed development assuming full build-out.

Table 4-2: Base Auto Trips Generated By 6429 Renaud Road Development

| Land Use | Source | Size | Morning Peak Hour (veh/hr) |  |  | Afternoon Peak Hour (veh/hr) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Back-to-Back Townhouses | TRANS | 90 Dwelling Units | 18 | 32 | 50 | 35 | 30 | 65 |
| Mid-Rise Terrace Flats | TRANS | 96 Dwelling Units | 18 | 40 | 58 | 35 | 28 | 63 |
| Total Auto Trips-per-Hour |  |  | 36 | 72 | 108 | 70 | 58 | 128 |

### 4.1.2 Estimate of Total Development Generated Person Trips

The base auto trips generated by the development were then converted to an equivalent number of persontrips.

Table 3.13 of the "TRANS Trip Generation Study" was referenced for applicable mode share rates for the townhouse and terrace dwelling components of the development. The apartment mode share in Table 3.13 of the TRANS Study was used for the terrace dwellings, as there was no mode share specific to the lowrise condominium dwelling unit type. Table 4-3 and Table 4-4 summarize the mode share conversion from auto-trips to person-trips for the proposed townhouse and terrace flat units.

Table 4-3: Mode Share: Person Trips-per-Hour: Townhouses

| Travel Mode | Mode <br> Share ${ }^{1}$ | Morning Peak Hour (person trips/hr) |  |  | Mode Share ${ }^{1}$ | Afternoon Peak Hour (person trips/hr) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | Total |  | In | Out | Total |
| Auto Driver | 55\% | 18 | 32 | 50 | 61\% | 35 | 30 | 65 |
| Auto Passenger | 10\% | 3 | 6 | 9 | 11\% | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| Transit | 27\% | 9 | 16 | 25 | 22\% | 13 | 11 | 24 |
| Non-Motorized | 8\% | 3 | 5 | 7 | 6\% | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Total | 100\% | 33 | 58 | 91 | 100\% | 57 | 49 | 106 |

1. Mode Share Percentages referenced from Table 3.13 of the "TRANS Trip Generation Study"

Table 4-4: Mode Share: Person Trips-per-Hour: Mid-Rise Terrace Flats

| Travel Mode | Mode Share ${ }^{1}$ | Morning Peak Hour (person trips/hr) |  |  | Mode <br> Share ${ }^{1}$ | Afternoon Peak Hour (person trips/hr) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | Total |  | In | Out | Total |
| Auto Driver | 44\% | 18 | 40 | 58 | 44\% | 35 | 28 | 63 |
| Auto Passenger | 9\% | 4 | 8 | 12 | 14\% | 11 | 9 | 20 |
| Transit | 34\% | 14 | 31 | 45 | 33\% | 26 | 21 | 47 |
| Non-Motorized | 13\% | 6 | 12 | 17 | 9\% | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Total | 100\% | 41 | 91 | 132 | 100\% | 78 | 64 | 144 |

1. Mode Share Percentages referenced from Table 3.13 of the "TRANS Trip Generation Study"

### 4.1.3 Existing and Future Mode Shares

The values were referenced from the "East Urban Community (EUC) Phase 3 Area Community Design Plan - Master Transportation Study" (Table 9.3 and Table 9.4 CastleGlenn, May 2020). The future mode shares would likely involve an increase in transit mode share due to the:

- Planned isolated transit improvements along Innes Road and Brian Coburn Boulevard as mentioned in Section 1.3,
- Use of the Chapel Hill Park and Ride at Navan Road and Brian Coburn Boulevard;
- Extension of the LRT to east of Jeanne d'Arc Blvd, and;
- the assumption that the Cumberland Transitway would not be in place by either the build-out or build-out +5-year horizon.

Table 4-5 summarizes the existing and future mode shares adopted for the proposed development, as well as a rationale for the assumed future mode shares.

Table 4-5: Existing and Future Mode Shares

| Land Use | Travel Mode | Peak Existing Mode Shares |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Forecast } \\ (2024 \text { and } 2029) \end{gathered}$ | Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM | $A M \& P M$ |  |
| Back-toBack Townhomes | Auto Driver | 55\% | 65\% | 60\% | Auto mode assumed to be similar to existing mode share |
|  | Auto Passenger | 20\% | 20\% | 15\% |  |
|  | Transit | 15\% | 10\% | 20\% | Increase in Transit due to Trim Rd. Extension, isolated transit improvements |
|  | Non-Motorized | 10\% | 5\% | 5\% |  |
| Mid-Rise <br> Terrace Flats | Auto Driver | 55\% | 65\% | 60\% | Auto mode assumed to be similar to existing mode share |
|  | Auto Passenger | 20\% | 20\% | 15\% |  |
|  | Transit | 15\% | 10\% | 20\% | Increase in Transit due to Trim Rd. Extension, isolated transit improvements |
|  | Non-Motorized | 10\% | 5\% | 5\% |  |

### 4.1.4 Projected Development Trips by Mode

Table 4-6 summarizes the full build-out traffic demand generated by the proposed development for each separate residential component as well as the total number of trips generated.

A review of the table indicates that the development is anticipated to generate:

- approximately 140 additional passenger vehicles trips in the morning peak hour;
- approximately 150 additional passenger vehicles trips in the afternoon peak hour; and
- 44-to-50 additional transit trips during the peak hour of travel demand (which would be expected to use north-south bus routes to access the LRT extension to Trim Rd).

Table 4-6: Summary of Traffic Generation - 6429 Renaud Road (Person Trips per Hour)

| Residential Component: Back-to-Back Townhouses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Travel Mode | Mode Share | Morning Peak Hour |  |  | Mode Share | Afternoon Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  | In | Out | Total |  | In | Out | Total |
| Auto Driver (Passenger Vehicles) | 60\% | 19 | 34 | 55 | 60\% | 34 | 30 | 64 |
| Auto Passenger | 15\% | 5 | 9 | 14 | 15\% | 9 | 7 | 16 |
| Transit | 20\% | 7 | 12 | 18 | 20\% | 11 | 10 | 21 |
| Non-Motorized | 5\% | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5\% | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Total | 100\% | 33 | 58 | 92 | 100\% | 57 | 49 | 106 |
| Residential Component: Mid-Rise Terrace Dwellings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel Mode | Mode Share | Morning Peak Hour |  |  | Mode Share | Afternoon Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  | In | Out | Total |  | In | Out | Total |
| Auto Driver (Passenger Vehicles) | 60\% | 25 | 55 | 79 | 60\% | 47 | 39 | 86 |
| Auto Passenger | 15\% | 6 | 14 | 20 | 15\% | 12 | 9 | 21 |
| Transit | 20\% | 8 | 19 | 26 | 20\% | 16 | 13 | 29 |
| Non-Motorized | 5\% | 2 | 5 | 7 | 5\% | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| Total Person Trips/Hour | 100\% | 41 | 93 | 132 | 100\% | 79 | 64 | 143 |
| Total Residential - Summary of Traffic Generation by all Modes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel Mode |  | Morning Peak Hour |  |  |  | Afternoon Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  | In | Out | Total |  | In | Out | Total |
| Auto Driver (Passenger Vehicle Trips) |  | 44 | 89 | 134 |  | 81 | 69 | 150 |
| Auto Passenger |  | 11 | 23 | 34 |  | 21 | 16 | 37 |
| Transit |  | 15 | 31 | 44 |  | 27 | 23 | 50 |
| Non-Motorized |  | 4 | 8 | 12 |  | 7 | 5 | 12 |
| Total |  | 74 | 151 | 224 |  | 136 | 113 | 249 |

## Zoning: A Worst-Case Density Discussion

This traffic study report is intended to support a Major Zoning By-Law Amendment from the existing Development Reserve (DR) zoning to a proposed Residential Fourth Density Zone (R4F). The R4 zoning designation permits a wide variety of residential land uses ranging from single detached dwellings to lowrise apartment units. For analyses purposes, a worst-case traffic generation scenario was considered where it was assumed that the entirety of the 19 residential blocks could be developed as either:

- "Terrace Flats" Stacked Units; Build-out of this type of unit would result in 230 units and the application of a lower trip rate. Assuming the Suburban trip rate from TRANS Table 6.3 for "Low-Rise Condominiums", this scenario would generate approximately 207 vehicle trips and 345 person trips during the afternoon peak hour; or
- "Back-to-Back Townhouse" Units; Build-out of this type of unit would result in up to 160 townhouse units and the application of a larger trip generation rate. Assuming the Suburban trip rate from Trans Table 6.3 for "Townhouses", this scenario would generate approximately 112 vehicle trips and 186 person-trips during the afternoon peak hour.

It is evident that the "Terrace Flats" unit would pose a worst-case trip generation scenario for the R4 zoning, given its higher density of development. When the worst-case is compared to the proposed site plan, the worst-case zoning would produce:

- An additional 90 person-trip and 50 two-way vehicle trips in the morning peak hour; and
- An additional 104 person-trips and 67 two-way vehicle trips in the afternoon peak hour.

Should the worst-case density occur for this zoning, it is anticipated to put a negligible-to-minor strain on the supporting roadway and transit service frequency. The "worst-case" is very unlikely to occur as the site plan is being applied for at the same time as the zoning by-law amendment and as such the density of proposed development is fixed.

### 4.1.5 Trip Reduction Factors

Pass-by and internalization reductions were excluded from the analysis as the site is entirely residential.

### 4.1.6 Trip Distribution

The traffic distribution developed for the proposed site involved a review of existing travel patterns, and local planning documents such as the EUC Phase 3 MTS (Castleglenn, 2020) and the Trailsedge East MTS (Castleglenn, 2018). Table 4-7 summarizes the traffic distribution adopted for the proposed site. Exhibit 4-1 illustrates the distribution of traffic at each intersection.

Table 4-7: Assumed Traffic Distribution

| To/From | Residential Traffic <br> Distribution |
| :---: | :---: |
| North | $34 \%$ |
| East | $17 \%$ |


| To/From | Residential Traffic <br> Distribution |
| :---: | :---: |
| South | $5 \%$ |
| West | $44 \%$ |

### 4.1.7 Trip Assignment

The traffic distribution values illustrated within Exhibit 4-1 were used to develop both the 2024 forecast (build-out) and 2029 forecast (build-out +5 years). A "shortest path" principle was adopted as the procedure to assign auto traffic generated by the development to the surrounding network._ The following network assumptions were made during the assignment:

- The Renaud Road/Navan Road intersection remains open in 2029 with full access;
- The Brian Coburn Boulevard/Navan Road intersection remains a 3-leg roundabout;
- EUC Phase 3 and the corresponding north leg of the Fern Casey Street/Brian Coburn Boulevard intersection was assumed to not have been constructed by the build-out horizon (2029); and
- The Copperhead Street connection from Trailsedge Phase 3 would be in place by 2029 to form a 4-leg roundabout intersection with Mer Bleue and Decoeur Drive


Exhibit 4-1: 6429 Renaud Road: Traffic Distribution

### 4.1.8 Site Traffic Volumes

Exhibit 4-2 illustrates the full build-out traffic generated by the proposed Blocks 193 and 194 ( 6429 Renaud Road) development.


Exhibit 4-2: Site Generated Traffic Volumes: Full Build-Out

### 5.0 Background Network Traffic

### 5.1 Historical Background Growth Rate

The 2011 and 2031 Long-Range Transportation Model was reviewed to determine an appropriate background growth rate to be applied for the study area. The average 20-year growth rate was found to be approximately $1 \%$ across the Innes Road- Brian Coburn Boulevard-Renaud Road screenline. A review of background traffic growth generated by adjacent developments was found to exceed $4 \%$ across the same screenline. Therefore, the assumed background development growth could be considered aggressive resulting in a conservative estimate in background traffic growth solely from adjacent developments.

Therefore, no additional background growth beyond that already accounted for within the adjacent development initiatives was superimposed upon the roadway network.

### 5.2 Surrounding Development Traffic Generation

Appendix " $D$ " contains exhibits that illustrate the anticipated impact of the adjacent developments as referenced from relevant traffic studies. The East Urban Community, Phase 3 lands and the Richcraft Trailsedge, Phase 4 lands would occur beyond the 2029 time-horizon and were not addressed within the horizons of this traffic study report.

### 5.2.1 Richcraft Trailsedge East: Stage 3

The Trailsedge East CTS (Castleglenn, 2018) was reviewed to appreciate the effect that this planned development would have upon the Trailsedge area south of the proposed 6429 Renaud Road development. Richcraft also indicated a revised build-out and unit schedule.

Table 5-1 summarizes the adopted 2024 and 2029 Trailsedge Phase 3 cumulative residential dwelling unit forecasts, the associated traffic generation rates and inbound/outbound percentages. The 2029 horizon year represents full build-out of the Trailsedge East Phase 3 development.

Table 5-1: Trailsedge Phase 3 Development and Trips Rates

| Land Use | Source | Independent Variable | Horizon Year |  | Morning Peak Hour |  |  | Afternoon Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2024 | 2029 | Rate | In | Out | Rate | In | Out |
| Single-Detached Dwellings | $\begin{gathered} \text { TRANS } \\ \text { (Table } \\ 6.2,6.3 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Dwelling <br> Units | 171 | 343 | 0.7 | 29\% | 71\% | 0.9 | 62\% | 38\% |
| Townhouses | $\begin{gathered} \text { TRANS } \\ \text { (Table } \\ 6.2,6.3 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | Dwelling <br> Units | 435 | 712 | 0.54 | 37\% | 63\% | 0.71 | 53\% | 47\% |

### 5.2.2 Stage 6 - Minto Avalon West \& 2336 Tenth Line Road (Mer Bleue Road/Decoeur Drive):

Castleglenn Consultants has produced two technical letters, in addition to addendum letter reports for Avalon West Stage 5 (August, 2016) and Stage 6 (November, 2017), on behalf of Minto Communities Canada. These technical reports included

- "Minto Avalon Network Analysis - Impacts of Delay in Completion of Brian Coburn Boulevard / Jerome Jodoin Drive Roundabout" (October, 2019) and
- "Minto Avalon Network Analysis - Mer Bleue Road \& Decoeur Rd Improvements" (October, 2019).

These reports indicate that, between 2019 and 2023:

- an additional 256 townhomes and 180 single homes remain to be occupied/closed within the Avalon Stage 6 development; and
- the 2336 Tenth Line Condo Development (located southeast of Mer Bleue and Decoeur Drive intersection) is anticipated to have first occupancy by June 2020 and have full occupancy by Fall 2021 (60 units);

The 2019 letter reports were directly referenced to develop the 2024 and 2029 background traffic volumes.

### 5.2.3 Orleans Family Health Hub - EUC Phase 3

The 2225 Mer Bleue Road - Orleans Health Hub Transportation Impact Study (HDR, March 2018) was reviewed to determine the traffic impact of this development on the area roadway network. This report indicated that by the anticipated build-out year, that the health hub would employ 206 employees (109 full-time employees and 97 part-time learners). The anticipated build-out year of this health clinic was expected to occur in $2021^{3}$.

### 5.2.4 Mer Bleue Expansion Area - Summerside Phase 4-to-6

The Summerside West Phase 4-6 TIA Strategy Report (Parsons, September 2018) was reviewed to determine the traffic impact of the Mer Bleue Expansion Area that is expected to be developed by the build-out year and build-out plus 5-year time horizons. In Phase 4 of this proposed development, 145 single family homes, and 100 dwelling units of townhomes are anticipated. In Phase 5-6, 257 single family homes and 236 dwelling units of townhomes are anticipated. Phase 4 was assumed to be in place by 2020, while the anticipated build-out of Phase 5-6 was assumed to occur by 2024.

The adjacent Summerside Phase 1-3 development traffic volumes from the Summerside Phase 4-6 TIA were also incorporated into the background traffic volumes.

[^0]
### 5.2.5 East Urban Community, Phase 2 Lands

The "Draft Gloucester East Urban Community Phase II Community Transportation Study" (Delcan, 2013) and the EUC Phase 3 MTS (Castlgelenn, 2020) were reviewed to determine the relevant traffic generation and distribution for this area. In following with the EUC Phase 3 MTS, it was assumed that $20 \%$ of the EUC Phase 2 lands ( 146 singles, 126 townhouses) are occupied by 2024 while $40 \%$ of the EUC Phase 2 lands (291 singles, 252 townhouses) are occupied by 2029.

The south leg of the Renaud Road / Fern Casey Street intersection was assumed operational by 2024.

### 6.0 DEMAND RATIONALIZATION

This section rationalizes the future travel demands for the area to determine if there are any auto capacity limitations within the transportation network. The following sections detail an intersection capacity analysis undertaken assuming:

- Existing 2020 traffic conditions;
- Forecast 2024 background traffic without the proposed development; and
- Forecast 2029 background traffic without the proposed development.

All intersection capacity analysis was undertaken with Synchro ${ }^{\text {TM }} 10$ traffic software for signal control and STOP-control intersections and with SIDRA ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ Intersections for roundabout intersections.

### 6.1 Existing Network Constraints

Table 6-1 summarizes the existing (2020) intersection capacity analysis. The level of service for the traffic signal control intersections are based on Section 6.1 of the City of Ottawa MMLOS Guidelines. The table indicates that no capacity constraints are evident within the existing network. All intersections are anticipated to operate with an auto LOS equal to-or-better-than "C", which exceeds the LOS target of "D" for this area.

Table 6-1: Existing (2020) Intersection Capacity Analysis - Critical Movement Summary

| Intersection | Weekday AM Peak (PM Peak) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Critical Movement |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |  |
|  | Approach / Movement | Delay (seconds) | LOS | v/c | Delay (seconds) | LOS | v/c |
| Signalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Navan Road \& Renaud Road | $\begin{gathered} \hline W B-T h / R T \\ (S B-T h / R T) \end{gathered}$ | 31 (22) | C (C) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.78 \\ (0.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25.6 \\ (16.5) \end{gathered}$ | C (B) | 0.71 (0.67) |
| STOP-Controlled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fern Casey \& Axis Way "T" intersection | $\begin{gathered} E B-L T / T h / R T \\ (E B-L T / T h / R T) \end{gathered}$ | 12 (12) | B (B) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.04 \\ (0.05) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Renaud Rd \& Fern Casey | $\begin{gathered} \hline S B-L T / R T \\ (S B-L T / R T) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 10 (9) | B (A) | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Mer Bleue Rd \& Renaud Rd | $\begin{gathered} E B-L T / R T \\ (E B-L T / R T) \end{gathered}$ | 11 (19) | B (C) | $\begin{gathered} 0.31 \\ (0.65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Mer Bleue Rd \& Deceour <br> " T " intersection | $\begin{gathered} \text { WB-LT/RT } \\ (W B-L T / R T) \end{gathered}$ | 11 (13) | B (B) | $\begin{gathered} 0.31 \\ (0.10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brian Coburn Boulevard \& Mer Bleue | WB Approach (SB Approach) | 21.1 (9.0) | E (A) | $\begin{gathered} 0.98 \\ (0.42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 14.5 (7.8) | E (A) | 0.98 (0.56) |
| Brian Coburn Blvd \& Fern Casey <br> "T" intersection | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB Approach } \\ & \text { (WB Approach) } \end{aligned}$ | 6.3 (6.5) | A (A) | 0.15(0.22) | 5.7 (5.7) | A (A) | 0.44 (0.22) |
| Brian Coburn Blvd \& Navan Road | WB Approach (NB Approach) | 14.1 (8.7) | C (A) | $\begin{gathered} 0.79 \\ (0.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 9.5 (8.3) | C (D) | 0.79 (0.81) |

### 6.2 Future Network Constraints: Without the Proposed Site

### 6.2.1 Build-Out (2024) Background Traffic Analysis

Exhibit 6-1 illustrates the 2024 forecast traffic conditions assuming the proposed development is not in place and Table 6-2 summarizes the resulting intersection capacity analysis. The level of service for the traffic signal control intersections are based on Section 6.1 of the City of Ottawa MMLOS Guidelines.

Table 6-2 indicates the majority of intersections would operate at, or better than, the Auto MMLOS target of "D", with exception of the following critical movements and intersections:

- The Mer Bleue Road / Renaud Road STOP-controlled intersection was found to operate with a LOS "F" in the afternoon peak hour.
- The Brian Coburn Boulevard / Mer Bleue Road roundabout intersection was found to operate with a poor LOS "F" on the westbound approach during the morning peak period. This level of service is attributed to traffic originating from east of the area; and
- The Brian Coburn Boulevard/Navan Road roundabout intersection was found to operate with a poor LOS " $F$ " in both the afternoon and morning peak periods of travel demand;

Table 6-2: Forecast (2024) Intersection Capacity Analysis - Critical Movement Summary

| Intersection | Weekday AM Peak (PM Peak) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Critical Movement |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |  |
|  | Approach / Movement | Delay (seconds) | LOS | v/c | Delay (seconds) | LOS | v/c |
| Signalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Navan Road \& Renaud Road | $\begin{gathered} \text { WB-Th/RT } \\ (W B-T h / R T) \end{gathered}$ | 50 (28) | E (C) | 0.96 (0.74) | 37 (20) | D (B) | 0.88 (0.70) |
| STOP-Controlled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Renaud Rd \& Fern Casey ${ }^{1}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB-LT/Th/RT } \\ (N B-L T / T h / R T) \end{gathered}$ | 19 (33) | C (D) | 0.22 (0.26) | - | - | - |
| Fern Casey \& Axis Way/Couloir Road | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB-LT/Th/RT } \\ (E B-L T / T h / R T) \end{gathered}$ | 15 (16) | B (C) | 0.09 (0.10) | - | - | - |
| Mer Bleue Rd \& Renaud Rd | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB-LT/Th } \\ (E B-L T / R T) \end{gathered}$ | 20 (112) | C (F) | 0.70 (1.15) | - | - | - |
| Mer Bleue Rd \& Decoeur <br> "T" intersection ${ }^{1}$ | $\begin{gathered} W B-L T / R T \\ (W B-L T / R T) \end{gathered}$ | 20 (31) | C (D) | 0.35 (0.41) | - | - | - |
| Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brian Coburn Boulevard \& Mer Bleue | WB Approach (EB Approach) | 71.8 (8.9) | F (A) | 1.13 (0.50) | 33.1 (7.8) | F (B) | 1.13 (0.63) |
| Brian Coburn Blvd \& Fern Casey "T" intersection | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB Approach } \\ & \text { (WB Approach) } \end{aligned}$ | 6.6 (7.2) | A (A) | 0.21 (0.26) | 6.0 (6.2) | A (A) | 0.43 (0.30) |
| Brian Coburn Blvd \& Navan Road | WB Approach (NB Approach) | $\begin{gathered} 21.7 \\ (10.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | E (B) | 0.91 (0.66) | 12.4 (9.0) | E (E) | 0.91 (0.93) |

1. Both the Renaud Road/Fern Casey and Mer Bleue/Decoeur Road intersections are scheduled for intersection improvements in the near-term


Morning (Afternoon) - Vehicles-Per-Hour
Exhibit 6-1: 2024 Forecast Traffic - Background Traffic (No Development)

### 6.2.2 Build-Out + 5-Years (2029) Background Analysis

Exhibit 6-2 illustrates the 2029 forecast traffic conditions assuming the proposed development is not in place and Table 6-3 summarizes the resulting intersection capacity analysis. The level of service for the traffic signal control intersections and roundabouts are based on Section 6.1 of the City of Ottawa MMLOS Guidelines.

Table 6-3: Forecast (2029) Intersection Capacity Analysis - Critical Movement Summary

| Intersection | Weekday AM Peak (PM Peak) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Critical Movement |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |  |
|  | Approach / Movement | Delay (seconds) | LOS | v/c | Delay (seconds) | LOS | v/c |
| Signalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Navan Road \& Renaud Road | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} W B-T h / R T \\ (W B-T h / R T) \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 77 \\ (32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{F} \\ (\mathrm{C}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{1 . 0 5} \\ (0.79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 55 \\ (24) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{F} \\ (\mathrm{C}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1.01 \\ (0.77) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| STOP-Controlled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Renaud Rd \& Fern Casey | $\begin{gathered} \hline N B-L T / T h / R T \\ (N B-L T / T h / R T) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 37 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} \\ (\mathrm{~F}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.51 \\ (0.53) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Fern Casey \& Axis WayCouloir Road <br> "4-Leg" intersection | WB-LT/Th/RT (EB-LT/Th/RT) | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (21) \end{gathered}$ | C <br> (C) | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Mer Bleue Rd \& Renaud Rd | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB-LT/RT } \\ (S B-T h / R T) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (129) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{C} \\ (\mathbf{F}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.74 \\ (\mathbf{1 . 2 0}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brian Coburn Boulevard \& Mer Bleue | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB Approach } \\ & \text { (EB Approach) } \end{aligned}$ | 98.2 (9.5) | F (A) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{1 . 1 9} \\ (0.55) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 41.9 (8.0) | F (B) | 1.19 (0.65) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB Approach }^{1} \\ {\text { (SB Approach })^{1}}^{1} \end{gathered}$ | 8.7 (7.7) | A (A) | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 6.9 (7.3) | A (A) | 0.52 (0.52) |
| Brian Coburn Blvd \& Fern Casey <br> "T" intersection | WB Approach (WB Approach) | 6.6 (7.6) | A (A) | $\begin{gathered} 0.46 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | 6.3 (6.5) | A (A) | 0.46 (0.34) |
| Brian Coburn Blvd \& Navan Road | WB Approach (SB Approach) | 45.3 (14.4) | F (E) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{1 . 0 3} \\ (0.99) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.3 \\ (13.0) \end{gathered}$ | F (E) | 1.03 (0.99) |
|  | WB Approach $^{2}$ (NB Approach) $^{2}$ | 8.7 (7.9) | A (A) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.45 \\ (0.48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 7.3 (7.4) | A (A) | 0.55 (0.52) |
| Mer Bleue Rd \& Decoeur Drive / Copperhead St. | EB Approach <br> (EB Approach) | 10.1 (10.7) | A (A) | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 6.0 (5.8) | A (A) | 0.55 (0.62) |

1. Assumes a 4lane Brian Coburn Blvd West and East Approaches at Mer Bleue Road
2. Assumes a 4lane Brian Coburn Blvd West Approach and 4-lane Navan Road North of Brian Coburn.

Overall, the area intersections were found to operate with lower levels of service and greater delays than the 2024 forecast analysis. The table indicates that all traffic signals and roundabout intersections would operate better than the Auto MMLOS target of "D" assuming a 4-lane Brian Coburn Boulevard corridor.


Morning (Afternoon) - Vehicles-Per-Hour
Exhibit 6-2: 2029 Forecast Traffic - Background Traffic (No Development)

Analysis of the forecast 2029 traffic conditions indicate that the following turning movements are anticipated to become critical due to the increase in background traffic growth:

- The Navan Road / Renaud Road signal-controlled intersection was found to operate with poor levels-of-service " $F$ " during the morning peak hour of travel demand. The City is in the process of evaluating the proposed interim and ultimate solution for the configuration of this intersection; and
- The Renaud Road / Fern Casey Street intersection assuming a 4-leg STOP-controlled configuration was found to operate with unacceptable LOS "F" during the afternoon peak hour of travel demand due to the increase of traffic from the EUC Phase II areas south of Renaud Road. A review of the EUC Phase II MTS was found to indicate that traffic signal control with auxiliary lanes was recommended for this intersection.

Assuming a 4-lane Brian Coburn Boulevard configuration indicated satisfactory intersection operations, however, the widening of Brian Coburn Boulevard is not anticipated to occur beyond the (2031) Official Plan horizon year.

### 6.3 Development Generated Demand

As indicated within Table 4-6, the proposed development is anticipated to generate:

- 134 passenger vehicle trips during the morning peak period; and
- 150 passenger vehicle trips during the afternoon peak period.

Exhibit 4-1 indicated:

- Up to $85 \%$ of the proposed development traffic is destined to the Brian Coburn Boulevard corridor, which is the nearest arterial corridor to the development. Brian Coburn Boulevard provides access to areas to the west, north and east of the development; and
- The remaining $15 \%$ of development traffic is destined to and from the Renaud Road corridor, which provides access to rural areas to the south and an alternate route to the downtown core through Renaud road.

Given the low traffic generation associated with the proposed development, the incremental impact of the proposed development upon the Brian Coburn Boulevard corridor was thought from the outset to result in a low-to-minor incremental traffic impact as the corridor functions as the primary east-west arterial for the development and is ultimately planned to be widened.

### 6.4 Reduction in Future Demand

The resulting 2024 and 2029 background traffic forecast intersection capacity analysis indicated that the intersections along Brian Coburn Boulevard are above capacity in the westbound direction during the afternoon peak hour of travel demand. However, the following reductions in travel demand could be considered to occur by the 2024 forecast year:

- Change in Trip Time: Motorist may have the option of changing the time they leave for work or complete retail trips. It was envisioned that $10 \%$ of east-west trips along Brian Coburn Boulevard This would cause a "flattening" of the peak hour, and increase the duration of the peak periods of travel demand; and
- Reduction in Auto Modal Share: The advent of the LRT extension to Trim by 2024 would likely involve an increased transit share for the Orleans community. A 5\% auto reduction to background traffic is proposed to account for a shift from the auto mode share to a transit mode share between opening of the LRT in 2024 which would coincide with the 2024 build-out horizon year. A greater transit share could be warranted once the advent of the Brian Coburn/Cumberland Transitway dedicated facilities have been realized.

The advent of these travel demand rationalization measures could enable sufficient capacity at the Brian Coburn Boulevard / Mer Bleue Road roundabout intersection to better accommodate anticipated future background traffic growth.

### 7.0 ANALYSIS and TIA Strategy

### 7.1 Development Design

The following section reviews the transportation network elements within the vicinity of the proposed development to ensure they provide efficient access for all users.

### 7.1.1 Design for Sustainable Modes

The City of Ottawa's TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist and TDM Measures Checklist for Multi-Family Residential Developments were completed for the proposed development (See Appendix "G"). The development was found to offer excellent pedestrian linkages throughout the site in addition to a plentiful supply of bicycle parking stalls that would support sustainable active modes of travel. As regards cycling parking accommodations, safe and secure indoor bike storage is to be afforded to residents. A total of 50 bike parking stations are to be provided, all of which are located within a secure indoor building near the amenity area.

Exhibit 7-1 illustrates the site location relative to two OC Transpo stops (Transit Stop 8139 (Route 225 NB) Transit Stop 8138 (Route 225 SB), located at the intersection of Fern Casey Street / Crevasse Road.


Exhibit 7-1: Site Location and OC Transpo Stops within 400m of Centroid

The exhibit illustrates a 400 m radii originating from the centre of the Terrace Flats development representing the accessible walking distance to transit services. The exhibit indicates that both the nearest existing transit stops are at the limit of the 400 m walking standard for OC Transpo transit stop locations. In the long term, a future BRT station is anticipated to be located north of Brian Coburn Boulevard near the intersection with Fern Casey Street.

The northern half of the site is more than 400 m from the nearest transit stop location. Route 225 currently circulates along Brian Coburn Boulevard to reach Fern Casey Street. In the short-term, transit stops could be arranged at the intersection of Fern Casey Street and Couloir Road.

### 7.1.2 Circulation and Access

There are no anticipated impacts to the surrounding roadways as all municipal services and deliveries are anticipated to be accommodated on-site. The site plan also indicates:

- Waste collection refuse would be provided within the Amenity Area Building which is accessed from a garbage bay from an internal road. It is anticipated that waste pick-up will be completed from a parallel-park arrangement at the curb front; and
- Emergency services can access the site from either Couloir Road, Street No. 23 or Fern Casey Street. A fire truck route has been designated within the proposed site.


### 7.2 PARKING

### 7.2.1 Motor Vehicle Parking

Table 7-1 summarizes the parking requirements and on-site parking supply for the proposed development. The development is located within Area "C' of Schedule 1A (Zoning By-law No.2008-250) and is entirely residential in nature. The table indicates the proposed 136 stall on-site parking supply would satisfy the parking requirements for the proposed mid-rise terrace dwelling component of the development.

Table 7-1: Parking Requirements: Mid-Rise Terrace Dwellings


1. Referenced from Area "C' of Schedule 1A (Zoning By-law No.2008-250)

The back-to-back townhouse component of the development is planned to provide an individual garage and driveway access for each of the 90 dwelling units, which also satisfies the parking requirements. No
visitor parking is required based on Section 102(4) of the Zoning By-law. It is forecast that there would be no parking spillover on adjacent roadways.

### 7.2.2 Bicycle Parking

A review of By-Law Section 111 indicates:

- 0.50 bicycle parking spaces are required per-dwelling-unit for the mid-rise terrace dwellings. Therefore, 48 bicycle spaces ( 96 units) would be required for this portion of the development; and
- No bicycle parking is required for the back-to-back townhomes since a garage/carport is provided.

The proposed site plan provides for 50 bicycle stalls, which will be located in an interior bicycle storage area located near the amenity area for the development. This supply of bicycle parking exceeds the 48 minimum bicycle stall requirement.

### 7.3 Boundary Street Design

### 7.3.1 Mobility - Segment MMLOS Analysis

The Multi-Modal Level-of-Service (MMLOS) guidelines were used to evaluate the segment level of service for all modes of transportations within the immediate study area. The following four boundary road segments were considered with this analysis:

- Fern Casey Street (between Axis Way and Brian Coburn Boulevard);
- Chemin du Coulour Road (fronting the site);
- Brian Coburn Boulevard (fronting the site); and
- Street No. 23 (fronting the site);

At the time of this study, a complete street design remains to be developed for these roadways. Table 7-2 summarizes the segment MMLOS analysis fronting the proposed development assuming the existing configurations of Fern Casey Street, Coulour Road, and Brian Coburn Boulevard. The table incorporates the following analysis assumptions:

- The target MMLOS has been referenced from Exhibit 22 of the City of Ottawa Multi Modal Level of Service Guidelines (September 2015). The MMLOS targets are based on the "Mixed-Use Centre Official Plan area" as the proposed development is located within the Mer Bleue Mixed-Use Area;
- The proposed development does not propose significant roadway widenings or changes to the sidewalk/boulevard arrangements within the study area;
- For the pedestrian and bike LOS analysis, the operating speed along Brian Coburn Boulevard, Fern Casey Street and Couloir Road has been assumed to be $10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ greater than the roadway posted speed ${ }^{4}$; and

[^1]- The Street No. 23 corridor is anticipated to be constructed as part of the Blocks 193 and 194 (6429 Renaud Road) site plan application. For the interim, this facility would serve as a local connection to the back-to-back townhomes along the eastern edge of the proposed development. The roadway is to be designed and constructed according to preliminary guidelines to achieve a $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ operating/design speed. Street No. 23 would feature a 1.8 m sidewalk with parking along both sides of the roadway.

Table 7-2: Segment MMLOS for Boundary Streets at Build-Out (2029)

| Performance Measure | Roadway Segments Adjacent to the Development |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Northbound Fern Casey Street | Westbound Couloir Road | Eastbound Brian Coburn Blvd. | Southbound Street No. 23 |
| Pedestrian LOS (PLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Sidewalk Width (m) | 2.0 | >2.0 | 3.7 | 1.8 |
| Boulevard Width (m) | $>3$ | 0 | 2.5 | 0 |
| Average Daily Curb Lane Traffic Volume | ~4,300 | 1,800 | 3,400 | 150 |
| Presence of On-Street Parking | No | Yes | No | N/A |
| Operating Speed (km/h) <br> Posted $+10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 70 | 50 | 80 | 30 |
| Segment PLOS | D | B | D | A |
| Target PLOS | C | C | C | C |
| Bicycle LOS (BLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Bikeway Type | Bike Lanes | Mixed Traffic | Physically Separated Bikeway (Multi-Use Path) | Mixed Traffic |
| Travel Lanes | 2 | 2 | N/A | 2 (residential) |
| Bike Lane Width (m) | $>2 \mathrm{~m}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Operating Speed (km/h) Posted $+10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 70 | 50 | N/A | 30 |
| Bike Lane Blockage | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Segment BLOS | E | B | A | A |
| Target BLOS | B | B | D | D |
| Transit LOS (TLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Facility Type | Mixed Traffic | N/A | Mixed Traffic | N/A |
| Level/Exposure to Parking/Driveway Friction | Limited |  | Limited |  |
| Posted Speed Limit (km/h) | 60 |  | 70 |  |
| Segment TLOS | D |  | D |  |
| Target TLOS | N/A |  | D |  |
| Truck LOS (TkLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Number of lanes (in each direction) | N/A | N/A | 1 | N/A |
| Curb Lane Width (m) | N/A | N/A | $\sim 3.5$ | N/A |
| Segment TkLOS | N/A | N/A | C | N/A |
| Target TkLOS | N/A | N/A | D | N/A |

The following sections provide an overview of the modal levels of service (LOS) results indicated within Table 7-2 and serves to identify the deficiencies and their possible remedies for consideration.

## Pedestrian LOS (PLOS)

- A forecast PLOS of "D" resulted at the Brian Coburn Boulevard roadway segment which exceeds the target PLOS "C". The PLOS "D is directly attributable to the operating speed of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ and the forecast 2029 traffic volumes along Brian Coburn Boulevard corridor. The existing 3.2 m wide multiuse pathways that runs along the south side of Brian Coburn Boulevard is a facility likely to be used by pedestrians. The calculated PLOS may not account for the presence of this facility and the boulevard separation and may not be considered as being as a deficiency. A reduction in the speed limit from $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ to $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ could result in the desired PLOS " C " if deemed to be appropriate. This improvement could be implemented with a future widening of Brian Coburn Boulevard;
- A forecast PLOS "D" along Fern Casey north of the Fern Casey Street/Couloir Road intersection. A PLOS "C" could be achieved by a $25 \%$ reduction in daily forecast traffic volumes, the addition of onstreet parking or a reduction in the $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ speed limit. A reduction to $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ would result in a PLOS "B", exceeding the target.


## Bicycle LOS (BLOS)

- A forecast BLOS of "E" resulted at the Fern Casey Street roadway segment which exceeds the target BLOS "B" for a "Local Cycling Route". The BLOS "E" is directly attributable to the operating speed of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ along Fern Casey Street adjacent to the dedicated bike lanes. A reduction in the speed limit to $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ would result in a BLOS "A";
- To achieve a satisfactory BLOS "B", the Couloir Road corridor was found to require a posted speed limit no more than $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$, a mixed-traffic arrangement and no marked centerline.


## Transit LOS

- The TLOS analysis did not find any deficiencies in the roadway segments bordering the development. No additional transit improvements are planned within this study horizon that would affect the TLOS;


### 7.4 ACCESS INTERSECTIONS DESIGN

### 7.4.1 Location and Design of Site Access

The proposed site would be accommodated by three new accesses that include the:

- Fern Casey Right-In/Right-Out Access: This access would be YIELD-controlled with signage facing the minor leg approach. The centerline of the access is located approximately 130 m from the Tenth Line Road / Gerry Lalonde Drive intersection. A clear throat length of greater than 30m is provided;
- Chemin du Couloir Road Full Movement Access: This access would be STOP-controlled with signage facing the minor leg approach. The centreline of the access is located approximately 80 m east
of the Fern Casey / Couloir Road intersection and 35m west of the Couloir Road / Street No. 23 intersection; and
- Street No. 23 Full Movement Access: This access would be STOP-controlled with signage facing the minor leg approach. The centreline of the access is located approximately 220 m north of the Couloir Road / Street No. 23 intersection. This access is anticipated to receive low traffic volumes as it is a local access internal to the subdivision.


### 7.4.2 Intersection Control

As indicated in Section 7.4.1:

- The Fern Casey Street right-in right-out access will be YIELD-controlled on the minor leg with freeflow conditions along Fern Casey Street;
- The Couloir Road access would be STOP-controlled on the minor leg with free-flow conditions along Couloir Road; and
- The local Street No. 23 access would be STOP-controlled on the minor leg with free-flow conditions along Street No. 23.


### 7.4.3 Intersection Design

Table 7-3 summarizes the results of a Synchro ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ analysis of the two proposed site accesses assuming 2029 forecast traffic volumes. For this analysis, excessive queue lengths, a LOS "E" or a v/c ratio greater than 0.90 was considered unacceptable.

Table 7-3: Summary of Traffic (2029) Operations: Proposed Site Accesses

| Intersection | Weekday Morning Peak Hour (Afternoon Peak Hour) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Critical Movement |  |  |  |  |
|  | Approach / Movement | Queue Length (m) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (seconds) } \end{gathered}$ | LOS | v/c |
| Fern Casey Street \& RI-RO Access | $\begin{gathered} \hline W B-R T \\ (W B-R T) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \\ (0.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11.9 \\ (11.1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { B } \\ \text { (B) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.07 \\ & (0.1) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Couloir Road \& Site Access | $\begin{gathered} \hline S B-L T / R T \\ (S B-L T / R T) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \\ (0.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9.7 \\ (9.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | A <br> (A) | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Couloir Road and Street No. 23 Access | $\begin{gathered} S B-L T / R T \\ (S B-L T / R T) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.4 \\ (8.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A} \\ (\mathrm{~A}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ |

Table 7-3 indicates satisfactory traffic operations of at least LOS "C" for all outbound movements at all three site accesses during the during both the morning and afternoon peak hours of travel demand.

### 7.5 Transportation Demand Management

### 7.5.1 Context for TDM

The proposed development is located in South Orleans within the East Urban Community (EUC) Phase III lands. It is entirely residential in nature and would consist of 90 back-to-back townhouse units and 96 mid-rise terrace dwellings. The development is designated a Design Priority Area as it is contained within the Mer Bleue Mixed-Use Centre Lands. The majority of the person trips generated by the site are anticipated to be work related.

A review of the TAZ was found to indicate a daily transit share of approximately $10 \%$-to- $15 \%$ for all trip purposes. The 5-year target transit modal share was set at $20 \%$ as an auto mode share, a moderate increase when compared to the 2011 OD survey. With the opening of the Chapel Hill Park and Ride, the future advent of the LRT extension and encouraging higher density residential development, it remains plausible that these mode shares can be achieved.

### 7.5.2 Need and Opportunity

The proposed development is located adjacent to Brian Coburn Boulevard, a continuous east-west arterial that provides connections to Renaud Road in the west and Trim Road in the east. Failure to meet the modal share targets would likely increase traffic along Brian Coburn Boulevard, particularly to-and-from the inner urban areas, but overall would have a low-risk of severe impacts on the surrounding roadways.

The proposed development is supporting the mode share targets by providing:

- direct and convenient sidewalk access to adjacent transit stops;
- pedestrian connectivity throughout the entire development;
- 50 indoor bicycle stalls for the mid-rise terrace dwelling units, which exceeds the minimum of 48 required stalls; and
- the required amount of parking based on City of Ottawa By-Law requirements.


### 7.5.3 TDM Program

The City of Ottawa's TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist and TDM Measures Checklist for Multi-Family Residential Developments were completed for the proposed development (See Appendix "G"). The TDM checklist was completed for the proposed development. The development was found to provide excellent pedestrian linkages throughout the site and a significant number of bicycle parking stalls to support sustainable modes. The cycle stalls have been provided in a secure facility for the terrace dwelling units of the development.

Based on the TDM Measures checklist, the proponent is to consider:

- Offering PRESTO cards preloaded with one monthly transit pass on residence purchase/move-in, to encourage residents to use transit;
- Unbundling parking from rent, if applicable; and
- Offering a multi-modal package, such as transit route maps, as part of a move in package for new residents/tenants.


### 7.6 Neighbourhood Traffic Management

The purpose of this module is to identify the impact of the proposed development on collector and local roadways. The development is located on the southeast quadrant of the Brian Coburn Boulevard / Fern Casey Street roundabout intersection, with access to Fern Casey Street and Couloir Road.

The following collector and major collector roadways are impacted by the proposed development:

- Fern Casey Street, which is classified as a major collector, connects the proposed development and the adjacent Trailsedge developments to Brian Coburn Boulevard in the north and Renaud Road to the south; and
- Chemin du Couloir Road which is classified as a collector roadway. Couloir Road is an east west roadway that connects the proposed development and the adjacent Trailsedge developments to Fern Casey Street.


### 7.6.1 Adjacent Neighbourhoods

A review of site generated traffic and the site traffic assignment was found to indicate that:

- $85 \%$ of the site generated travel demand would utilize the major collector segment along Fern Casey Street south of Brian Coburn Boulevard. This traffic assignment was found to result in an increase of approximately 80 vehicles-per-hour-to-130 vehicles-per-hour in the peak northbound direction during the morning peak period and afternoon peak period, respectively;
- the remaining $15 \%$ of all site generated traffic would utilize Fern Casey south of Couloir Road. This was found to result in an increase of approximately 10 vehicles-per-hour-to- 25 vehicles-perhour in the peak southbound direction during the morning peak period and afternoon peak period, respectively; and
- $56 \%$ of outbound and $92 \%$ of inbound traffic would utilize Couloir Road to access the development. This was found to result in an increase in up to 40-to-80 vehicle-per-hour increase in the inbound

According to the City of Ottawa TIA Guidelines:

- A Collector Road would carry a maximum of 2,500 vehicles-per-day, or 300 vehicles during the peak hour; and
- A Major Collector Roadway would carry a maximum of 5,000 vehicles per day, or 600 vehicles during the peak hour.

It is assumed that these thresholds refer to the peak direction of travel.

Table $7-4$ summarizes the forecast 2029 background traffic and the forecast 2029 design traffic assuming the full build-out of the development at the key collector roadways within the study area.

Inspection of the table and the three key study area links found to indicate that the forecast full-build out traffic volumes:

- along Fern Casey Street south of Brian Coburn Boulevard remains below the 600 vph threshold during the afternoon peak hour in the southbound direction;
- along Fern Casey Casey south of Couloir Road does not exceed the Major Collector threshold; and
- along Chemin du Couloir Road, while significant, remain below the 300 vph threshold for a collector.

Table 7-4: 2029 Forecast Background and Design Traffic
Major Collector and Collector Roads

| Roadway Segment | Weekday AM Peak (PM Peak) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southbound Inbound | Northbound Outbound |
| Fern Casey Street-Major Collector |  |  |
| South of Brian Coburn Boulevard | Background: 313 (390) <br> With Development: 384 (516) | Background: 471 (326) <br> With Development: 345 (319) |
| South of Couloir Road | Background: 323 (301) With Development: 371 (360) | Background: 345 (319) <br> With Development:352 (329) |
| Roadway Segment | Eastbound Inbound | Westbound Outbound |
| Chemin du Couloir Road - Collector |  |  |
| East of Fern Casey | Background: 55 (90) <br> With Development: 140 (236) | Background: 68 (61) <br> With Development: 182 (195) |

It is therefore anticipated that the role and function of the Fern Casey Street corridor and the Couloir Road corridor will remain unchanged as both segments serve as primary accesses between the development and the arterial network. This study does not recommend additional Neighbourhood Traffic Management measures as it would impact the only route provided to the proposed development, particularly before additional roadway linkages are provided.

### 7.7 Transit

### 7.7.1 Route Capacity

The study adopted a transit mode share of $20 \%$ for the proposed development. The forecast transit activity (See Table 4-6) associated with the proposed development was estimated to be in the order of approximately 50 persons trips during the peak hours of travel demand. The transit mode share discussed in Section 6.4: Demand Rationalization applies to the Orleans community as a whole, and was not accounted for in the analysis below as these trips could well occur outside the study area.

Route 225 is anticipated to be the primary existing transit route that would be used by residents to commute north or east-west of the proposed development. The route runs north-south on Fern Casey Street and east-west on Brian Coburn Boulevard and is nearest the proposed development. Route 225 operates with 20-minute headways during the morning and afternoon peak periods in the respective peak directions. While it could prove prudent to provide additional routes with greater headway and scheduled during the mid-day period to promote transit activity in the area, it is likely that the demand for transit may not warrant such route frequency. This level of demand should be evaluated subsequent to the LRT extension to Trim Road.

A standard and articulated bus capacity is between 40 and 70 people, respectively. Therefore, the Route 225 capacity would range from 120-to-210 persons per peak hour, per direction.

The route capacity analysis indicated:

- During the morning peak hour, in the outbound direction, the development transit trips would occupy between $15 \%$-to- $26 \%$ of available route capacity; and
- During the afternoon peak hour, in the inbound direction, the development transit trips would occupy between $13 \%$-to- $23 \%$ of the available route capacity.

Therefore, Route 225 would likely have sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed development without unnecessary constraints and at the current headway. The route capacity could be further enhanced by providing a 15 -minute headway for the route.

### 7.7.2 Transit Priority

The proposed development would utilize existing transit infrastructure that includes transit stops along Fern Casey Street. The development is not anticipated to impact transit travel times of the existing Route 234 or trigger the need for transit priority measures within the study area.

### 7.8 Intersection Design

An assessment of the study area intersections was undertaken to determine their operational characteristics such as levels-of-service, delay, volume-to-capacity ratios and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths. The intersection capacity analysis was undertaken using Synchro $10^{\mathrm{TM}}$ intersection capacity analysis software for traffic signals and STOP-controlled intersections. Sidra roundabout capacity analysis was utilized to assess the future operations of the roundabouts existing and planned within the study area.

Appendix " $I$ " provides the Synchro results for both morning and afternoon peak hours of travel demand assuming the 2024 and 2029 design traffic forecasts. The design traffic forecasts incorporate the Demand Rationalization demand reductions from Section 6.4.

### 7.8.1 2024 Forecast Auto Capacity Analysis

Table 7-5 provides a summary of the intersection capacity analysis results representing the morning and afternoon peak hours of travel demand at the time (2024) of the anticipated "Build-Out" of the proposed development. The table indicates the most critical movement at each study area intersection based on level-of-service (v/c ratio for traffic signals, delay for non-signalized). For roundabouts, the critical movement was selected based on delay, and level-of-service was based on the v/c ratio as per the MMLOS guidelines.

The City of Ottawa MMLOS Guidelines indicate a target auto LOS of "D" for overall intersection operations within the "General Urban Area".

The following intersections were found not to meet the target auto LOS "D":

- The Navan Road / Renaud Road traffic signal-controlled intersection was found to operate with an overall acceptable level-of-service, however the critical movement was found to be the WB$\mathrm{Th} / \mathrm{RT}$ which was forecast to operate with a LOS "E" during the morning peak hour;
- The Mer Bleue Road / Renaud Road STOP-controlled intersection was forecast to exhibit an EB approach that would operate at a forecast LOS " $F$ " during the afternoon peak hour. A traffic signal warrant analysis was conducted that indicated additional improvements are warranted, whether in the form of a traffic signal or roundabout. This analysis suggests that improvements are likely warranted within the next 5-to-10 years to assure satisfactory levels-of-service. These improvements are likely to come in advance of the Mer Bleue widening and realignment;
- Both the Brian Coburn Boulevard / Mer Bleue Road roundabout intersection and the Brian Coburn Boulevard / Navan Road roundabout intersection were forecast to operate at a LOS "F" during the AM peak hour despite the reduction in background travel demand along Brian Coburn Boulevard.

Table 7-5: 2024 "Build-Out" Forecast Traffic Operations

| Intersection | Weekday AM Peak (PM Peak) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Critical Movement |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |  |
|  | Approach / Movement | Delay (seconds) | LOS | v/c | Delay (seconds) | LOS | v/c |
| Signalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Navan Road \& Renaud Road | $\begin{gathered} \text { WB-Th/RT } \\ (W B-T h / R T) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 54 \\ (28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{E} \\ (\mathrm{C}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 9 8} \\ (0.74) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 39 \\ (21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{D} \\ (\mathrm{C}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.89 \\ (0.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| STOP-Controlled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Renaud Rd \& Fern Casey | $\begin{gathered} \hline N B-L T / T h / R T \\ (N B-L T / T h / R T) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 23 \\ (35) \end{gathered}$ | C (D) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.27 \\ (0.27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Fern Casey \& Axis Way/Couloir Road | $\begin{gathered} E B-L T / T h / R T \\ (E B-L T / T h / R T) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | C (C) | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Mer Bleue Rd \& Renaud Rd | $\begin{gathered} \hline N B-L T / T h \\ (E B-L T / R T) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (\mathbf{1 1 0 )} \end{gathered}$ | C (F) | $\begin{gathered} 0.75 \\ \mathbf{( 1 . 1 5 )} \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Mer Bleue Rd \& Deceour <br> "T" intersection | $\begin{gathered} \text { WB-LT/RT } \\ (W B-L T / R T) \end{gathered}$ | 22 (31) | C (D) | $\begin{gathered} 0.38 \\ (0.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brian Coburn Boulevard \& Mer Bleue | WB Approach (EB Approach) | 84.6 (10.3) | F (B) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1.16 \\ (0.62) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 37.7 (8.2) | F (B) | 1.16 (0.65) |
| Brian Coburn Blvd \& Fern Casey <br> "T" intersection | WB Approach (WB Approach) | 6.6 (7.7) | A (A) | $\begin{gathered} 0.46 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | 6.3 (6.5) | A (A) | 0.46 (0.33) |
| Brian Coburn Blvd \& Navan Road | WB Approach (NB Approach) | 28.1 (11.0) | E (B) | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 9 6} \\ (0.68) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 15.1 (9.2) | E (E) | 0.96 (0.94) |

### 7.8.2 2029 Forecast Auto Capacity Analysis

Table 7-6 summarizes the intersection capacity analysis for the 2029 "Build-Out +5 year" morning and afternoon peak hours of travel demand. The table indicates the most critical movement at each study area intersection based on level-of-service (v/c ratio for traffic signals, delay for non-signalized). For roundabouts, the critical movement was selected based on delay, and level-of-service was based on the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio as per the MMLOS guidelines. The 2029 forecast assumes full build-out of the proposed Blocks 193 and 194 development as well as the adjacent developments.

Table 7-6: 2029 Forecast (5-Years Beyond Build-Out) Traffic Operations

| Intersection | Weekday AM Peak (PM Peak) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Critical Movement |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |  |
|  | Approach / Movement | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (seconds) } \end{gathered}$ | LOS | v/c | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (seconds) } \end{gathered}$ | LOS | v/c |
| Signalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Navan Road \& Renaud Road | $\begin{gathered} \text { WB-Th/RT } \\ (W B-T h / R T) \end{gathered}$ | 174 (36) | F (D) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{1 . 1 7} \\ (0.82) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 76 (25) | F (C) | 1.13 (0.80) |
| Renaud Rd \& Fern Casey | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB-Th/RT } \\ & (E B-T h / R T) \end{aligned}$ | 22 (7) | B (B) | $\begin{gathered} 0.69 \\ (0.62) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 17 (7) | A (A) | 0.33 (0.47) |
| Mer Bleue Rd \& Renaud Rd | EB-LT (EB-LT) | 25 (21) | B (C) | $\begin{gathered} 0.65 \\ (0.80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 11 (16) | A (B) | 0.45 (0.70) |
| STOP-Controlled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fern Casey \& Axis WayCouloir Road <br> "4-Leg" intersection | WB-LT/Th/RT (EB-LT/Th/RT) | 24 (30) | C (D) | $\begin{gathered} 0.49 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | - | - | - |
| Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brian Coburn Boulevard \& Mer Bleue | WB Approach (EB Approach) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{1 1 2 . 2} \\ & (11.1) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | F (B) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{1 . 2 2} \\ (0.67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 67.1 (8.4) | F (B) | 1.22 (0.69) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB Approach }^{I} \\ {\text { (EB Approach })^{I}}^{1} \end{gathered}$ | 8.8 (8.1) | A (A) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.17 \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 7.0 (7.4) | A (A) | 0.53 (0.54) |
| Brian Coburn Blvd \& Fern Casey "T" intersection | WB Approach (WB Approach) | 7.0 (8.0) | A (A) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.50 \\ (0.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 6.5 (6.8) | A (A) | 0.50 (0.37) |
|  | NB Approach ${ }^{2}$ <br> (WB Approach) ${ }^{2}$ | 6.8 (7.8) | A (A) | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | 6.3 (6.6) | A (A) | 0.25 (0.22) |
| Brian Coburn Blvd \& Navan Road | WB Approach (SB Approach) | 62.8 (19.5) | F (F) | $\begin{gathered} 1.09 \\ (1.01) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28.3 \\ (16.1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | F (F) | 1.09 (1.01) |
|  | WB Approach $^{3}$ (NB Approach) $^{3}$ | 8.8 (8.0) | A (A) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.47 \\ (0.48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 7.4 (7.4) | A (A) | 0.56 (0.53) |
| Mer Bleue Rd \& Deceour Drive / Axis Way | EB Approach (EB Approach) | 10.1 (10.7) | A (A) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.12 \\ (0.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 6.0 (5.8) | A (B) | 0.55 (0.62) |

1. Assumes a 4lane Brian Coburn Blvd West and East Approaches at Mer Bleue Road
2. Assumes a 4lane Brian Coburn Blvd West and East Approach at Fern Casey St.
3. Approach and 4lane Brian Coburn Blvd West Approach and 4-lane Navan Road North of Brian Coburn.

Table 7-6 indicates an overall decrease in the level of service for the study area intersections. The following critical movements at intersections within the study area were found to be below the target auto LOS of "D" for intersection operations as specified within the City of Ottawa MMLOS Guidelines:

- The Navan Road / Renaud Road traffic-signal controlled intersection was found to operate with an overall poor level-of-service during both peak hours of travel demand. The provision of a dedicated WB-RT to separate the thru traffic would serve to remedy the issue. However, the configuration of this intersection remains to be confirmed by the City given that, at one time, a relocated roundabout was determined to be the preferred option with the west leg of the intersection realigned into the Trailsedge Way development.

A review of the intersections along Brian Coburn Boulevard indicated acceptable levels-of-service after the widening of Brian Coburn to a 4-lane cross section. This suggest that congested conditions along

Brian Coburn Boulevard may be experienced over the next decade in the absence of the future widening of the corridor.

### 7.8.3 Multi-Modal LOS Analysis

The intersection MMLOS is only applicable to traffic-signal controlled intersections, of which the Navan Road / Renaud Road intersection is the only intersection in the study area to be configured as such.

Table 7-7 summarizes the intersection MMLOS results for the Navan Road / Renaud Road traffic-signal controlled intersection and indicates:

- the pedestrian levels of service, based on a PETSI points analysis. To determine the total number of lanes crossed within the PETSI analysis, the crossing distance was measured and divided 3.5 to reflect the typical travel lane width at an intersection. The PETSI analysis also considered a channelized right turn as a single lane;
- the transit level of service that is based on forecast 2029 delay results from the Synchro ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ analysis;
- the bicycle level of service that is based on the critical left-turn maneuvers; and
- the truck level of service analysis based on existing geometry and the number of receiving lanes.

Table 7-7: MMLOS Analysis Results Summary: Navan Road / Renaud Road

|  | Navan Road/Renaud Road - Intersection Leg |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | West Leg - <br> Renaud Road | East Leg Renaud Road | North Leg - <br> Navan <br> Road | South Leg - <br> Navan Road |
| Pedestrian LOS (PLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Leg PLOS | F | E | E | E |
| Intersection PLOS | F |  |  |  |
| Target PLOS | C |  |  |  |
| Bicycle LOS (BLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Leg BLOS | E | F | F | F |
| Intersection BLOS | F |  | F |  |
| Target BLOS | D |  | C |  |
| Transit LOS (TLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection TLOS | C | F | C | C |
| Target TLOS | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Truck LOS (TkLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Leg BLOS | E | E | F | E |
| Intersection BLOS | E |  | F |  |
| Target BLOS | E | E | D | D |

Appendix "H" provides detailed calculations for the MMLOS analysis for each study area intersection.
The following sections review the critical intersections by mode of transportation.

## Pedestrian Level of Service (PLOS)

The PETSI analysis indicated that the intersection PLOS for the Navan Road / Renaud Road intersection was below the target PLOS of "C".

A review of analysis of the intersection legs was found to indicate:

- The west leg of the intersection was found to be the critical leg in terms of PLOS as it was found to achieve a PLOS " $F$ " as pedestrians are required to cross approximately 27 m of distance ( $\sim 8$ lanes) given the angle of the cross walk to Renaud Road;
- The east, north and south legs of the intersection were found to achieve a PLOS "E"

To achieve the PLOS target of "C", significant improvements including the reduction in number of lanes would be required. These improvements would likely not be suitable for an intersection in a suburban area such as Renaud Road / Navan Road.

## Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS)

The BLOS analysis indicated that the overall Navan Road / Renaud Road intersection BLOS was "F", which is below the target BLOS of "C/D" for the intersection. A $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ posted speed would be required
to achieve the target BLOS "C/D" for the intersection. A combination of operating speed changes and pocket bike lanes or bike lanes on the north/south legs would improve the BLOS to "C".

The above improvements are not recommended to be implemented and are only provided as a reference to potential future measures to meet LOS targets should upgrades be required at this intersection.

## Transit Level of Service (TLOS)

The Navan Road / Renaud Road intersection is frequented by OC Transpo Routes 225 (EB-LT/WB-Th) and 228 (NB-LT/EB-RT). However, the Navan Road and Renaud Road intersection does not have any existing or planned rapid transit or transit priority measures, therefore no target TLOS is applicable.

Calculation of the Navan Road / Renaud Road intersection TLOS was found to indicate:

- The west, north and south legs of the intersection were found to operate with TLOS "C", with control delay below 30 seconds;
- The east leg of the intersection was found to operate at TLOS "F" due to the control delay in the WBTh direction in the AM and PM peak hour, with control delay greater than 40 seconds.


## Truck Level of Service (TkLOS)

Navan Road is a designated restricted loads truck route. Therefore, the TkLOS target for these corridors was determined to be a TkLOS "D". Inspection of the TkLOS analysis was found to indicate:

- Renaud Road was found to operate at TkLOS "E", due to the presence of a single receiving lane and modest turning radii;
- Navan Road was found to operate at an overall TkLOS "F" due to the presence of a single receiving lane and small turning radii on the north leg of the intersection. However, truck turns would accommodate north of the Navan Road / Renaud Road intersection at the intersection of Navan Road / Page Road.

Conclusion: The City of Ottawa has plans in place to ultimately widen Navan road to a 4-lane configuration and the Navan Road/Renaud Road East intersection is to be relocated and designed as a roundabout. The east leg of Renaud Road is to be realigned into the Trailsedge Way subdivision. These significant modifications will address the above modal deficiencies.

### 8.0 TIA STRATEGY

The following transportation infrastructure improvements are recommended:

- The Street No. 23 corridor be constructed as part of the Block 193 and 194 ( 6429 Renaud Road) application. The roadway is to be designed and constructed according to a $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ operating speed with a 1.8 m sidewalk;
- A lower speed limit along Fern Casey Street of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ which would be suitable for the school zone nearest the Renaud Road corridor. This would serve to meet both the pedestrian and cyclist level of service targets for the area;
- The Renaud Road / Fern Casey Street intersection receive traffic signal control improvements when the south leg becomes open to traffic and the traffic volumes at the intersection warrant future improvements;
- The Mer Bleue Road / Renaud Road intersection receive traffic signal control improvements within the next 5-to-10 years, likely in advanced of any widening that could take place in the area;
- Intersection improvements to the Mer Bleue Road / Copperhead Street-Decoeur Drive intersection given the advent of the east leg of the intersection, and sufficient development occur on the east side of Mer Bleue Road, which is anticipated to occur within the next decade with the advent of Trailsedge East Phase $3^{5}$. A roundabout configuration would be suitable at this intersection provided sufficient right-of-way exists to accommodate the current design proposal, however, a traffic signal remains a viable alternative given the land constraints ${ }^{6}$; and
- The City of Ottawa consider the four-lane widening of the Brian Coburn Boulevard corridor within the next 10 -to- 15 -years to meet the demands of the developments within the study area.


### 8.1 Conclusion

The proposed development of Blocks 193 and 194 development ( 6429 Renaud Road) would consist of 186 residential dwelling, of which 90 will be back-to-back townhomes, and 96 will be mid-rise terrace dwellings. It is recommended that the City of Ottawa be encouraged to assemble the appropriate conditions that would permit the development application for the development to proceed.

Yours truly,


Principal Engineer
Castleglenn Consultants Inc.


[^2] 6 Mer Bleue Road and Decoeur Drive Functional Design and Option Analysis Rev. 1, Robinson Consultants, August $21^{\text {st }} 2019$
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## Appendix A: Certification Form for TIA Study Project Manager

## TIA Plan Reports

On 14 June 2017, the Council of the City of Ottawa adopted new Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) Guidelines. In adopting the guidelines, Council established a requirement for those preparing and delivering transportation impact assessments and reports to sign a letter of certification.

Individuals submitting TIA reports will be responsible for all aspects of development-related transportation assessment and reporting, and undertaking such work, in accordance and compliance with the City of Ottawa's Official Plan, the Transportation Master Plan and the Transportation Impact Assessment (2017) Guidelines.

By submitting the attached TIA report (and any associated documents) and signing this document, the individual acknowledges that $\mathrm{s} /$ he meets the four criteria listed below.

## CERTIFICATION

1. I have reviewed and have a sound understanding of the objectives, needs and requirements of the City of Ottawa's Official Plan, Transportation Master Plan and the Transportation Impact Assessment (2017) Guidelines;
2. I have a sound knowledge of industry standard practice with respect to the preparation of transportation impact assessment reports, including multi modal level of service review;
3. I have substantial experience (more than 5 years) in undertaking and delivering transportation impact studies (analysis, reporting and geometric design) with strong background knowledge in transportation planning, engineering or traffic operations; and
4. I am either a licensed ${ }^{1}$ or registered ${ }^{2}$ professional in good standing, whose field of expertise [check $\sqrt{ }$ appropriate field(s)] is either transportation engineering ${ }^{\text {B }}$ or transportation planning 旦

1,2 License of registration body that oversees the profession is required to have a code of conduct and ethics guidelines that will ensure appropriate conduct and representation for transportation planning and/or transportation engineering works.
Dated at $\qquad$ this $\qquad$ day of May 2020. (City)

Name:

## Arthur Gordon

(Please Print)

Professional Title:

## Principal Engineer

Signature of Individual certifier that $s /$ he meets the above four criteria

## Office Contact Information (Please Print)

Address: Sutie 200-2460 Lancaster Road

City / Postal Code: Ottawa / K1B 4S5

Telephone / Extension: 613-731-4052

E-Mail Address: agordon@castleglenn.ca

Stamp

|  |
| :---: |

Appendix B: Screening Form

## City of Ottawa 2017 TIA Guidelines Screening Form

## Ms. Josiane Gervais

June 04, 2020
Project Manager, City of Ottawa
110 Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa, ON, K1G 6J9

Please see below the completed screening form for the proposed mid-high density residential development located in Trailsedge, Orleans. The proposed 6429 Renaud Road (Blocks 193 \& 194) development is located southeast of the Brian Coburn Blvd / Fern Casey Street intersection, and is to be composed of:

- 84 back-to-back townhomes, located on the eastern side of the development; and
- 108 mid-rise terrace dwelling units

In summary, the 192 residential units was found to meet the trip generation trigger. Therefore, the 6429 Renaud Road TIA would address the Design review and Network Impact modules.

## 1. Description of Proposed Development

| Municipal Address | 6429 Renaud Road; <br> Trailsedge Block 193 \& 194 Orleans, Ottawa |
| :--- | :--- |
| Description of Location | Located within the EUC Phase 3 lands at the southeast <br> quadrant of the Brian Coburn Blvd / Fern Casey Street <br> roundabout intersection |
| Mid-High Density Residential; |  |
| Land Use Classification | 84 townhouse dwelling units <br> 108 mid-rise dwelling units |
| Development Size (units) | N/A |

## 2. Trip Generation Trigger

The development site plan indicates:

- 84 back-to-back townhomes, located on the eastern side of the development; and
- 108 mid-rise terrace dwelling units

The site is proposed to be accommodated by driveways for the townhomes and 152 auto stalls for the mid-rise residential homes. A total of 56 bicycle parking stations are provided for the $108 \mathrm{mid}-$ rise dwelling units. The site is currently greenfield.

Land Use Type
Residential Dwelling Units (Apartments / Townhomes

## Development Size

192 Units

The proposed residential development size exceeds the minimum development size threshold. Therefore, a full TIA would be required to support the site plan control application.

| Table 2: Trip Generation Trigger |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Land Use Type | Minimum Development Size |
| Single-family homes | 40 units |
| Townhomes or apartments | 90 units |
| Office | $3,500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Industrial | $5,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Fast-food restaurant or coffee shop | $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Destination retail | $1,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Gas station or convenience market | $75 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |

## 3. Location Triggers

|  | Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Does the development propose a new driveway to a boundary street that is <br> designated as part of the City's Transit Priority, Rapid Transit or Spine <br> Bicycle Networks? |  | X |
| Is the development in a Design Priority Area (DPA) or Transit-oriented <br> Development (TOD) zone? * | X |  |

*DPA and TOD are identified in the City of Ottawa Official Plan (DPA in Section 2.5.1 and Schedules A and B; TOD in Annex 6). See Chapter 4 for a list of City of Ottawa Planning and Engineering documents that support the completion of TIA).

The Terrace Flats development is located with the East Urban Community MUC lands and is part of the Meer Bleue Mixed Use Centre lands. Therefore the Location Trigger is satisfied.

## 4. Safety Triggers

|  | Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Are posted speed limits on a boundary street are $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ or greater? |  | X |
| Are there any horizontal/vertical curvatures on a boundary street limits <br> sight lines at a proposed driveway? |  | X |
| Is the proposed driveway within the area of influence of an adjacent traffic <br> signal or roundabout (i.e. within 300 m of intersection in rural conditions, or <br> within 150 m of intersection in urban/ suburban conditions)? | X <br> (adjacent <br> roundabout) |  |
| Is the proposed driveway within auxiliary lanes of an intersection? |  | X |
| Does the proposed driveway make use of an existing median break that <br> serves an existing site? |  | X |
| Is there is a documented history of traffic operations or safety concerns on <br> the boundary streets within 500 m of the development? | X |  |
| Does the development include a drive-thru facility? | X |  |

The development proposes an access approximately 110 m south of the Brian Coburn Blvd / Fern Casey Street roundabout. The desired configuration is unknown at this time.

Therefore, the Safety Trigger is satisfied.

## 5. Summary

| Does the development satisfy the Trip Generation Trigger? | Yes | No |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Does the development satisfy the Location Trigger? | X |  |
| Does the development satisfy the Safety Trigger? | X |  |

Please review the above screening form information and let us know if you have any comments or questions before proceeding to Step 2: Scoping.

Yours truly,

Mr. Arthur Gordon B.A. P.Eng
Principal Engineer
Castleglenn Consultants Inc.


Mr . Jake Berube L.Eng. EIT
Traffic Planning Specialist Castleglenn Consultants Inc.

Appendix C: Existing Traffic Volumes and Collisions

Transportation Services - Traffic Services
Collision Details Report - Public Version
From: January 1, 2014 To: December 31, 2018
Location: BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ FERN CASEY ST
Traffic Control: Roundabout
Total Collisions: 3

| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface <br> Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuver Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2018-Feb-25, Sun,09:22 | Freezing Rain | SMV other | P.D. only | Ice | West | Slowing or stopping Automobile, station wagon | Skidding/sliding | 0 |  |
| 2018-Mar-24, Sat,18:55 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | North | Merging <br> Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon <br> Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
| Other motor vehicle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Location: BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ MER BLEUE RD
Traffic Control: Stop sign
Total Collisions: 9

| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuver Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015-Apr-14, Tue, 15:51 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | West | Turning left Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Stopped Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Sep-24, Thu,17:33 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | North | Slowing or stopping Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Stopped Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Jan-04, Mon,19:37 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | South | Going ahead Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Slowing or stopping Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Oct-04, Tue,07:15 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | West | Slowing or stopping Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | West | Stopped Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2017-Feb-07, Tue,22:38 | Snow | SMV other | P.D. only | Loose snow | South | Going ahead Automobile, station wagon | Skidding/sliding | 0 |
| 2017-Mar-08, Wed,07:20 | Freezing Rain | SMV other | P.D. only | Ice | South | Slowing or stopping Automobile, station wagon | Pole (utility, power) | 0 |
| 2017-Mar-30, Thu,20:52 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | North | Going ahead Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead Passenger van | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2017-Sep-27, Wed, 18:30 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East | Going ahead Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Slowing or stopping Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2018-Jun-22, Fri, 10:17 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East | Slowing or stopping Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Stopped Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |

Transportation Services - Traffic Services
Collision Details Report - Public Version
From: January 1, 2014 To: December 31, 2018
Location: BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ NAVAN RD
Traffic Control: Roundabout
Total Collisions: 4

| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuv | Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2018-Feb-25, Sun,08:30 | Freezing Rain | SMV other | P.D. only | Ice | West | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Curb | 0 |
| 2018-Apr-05, Thu,07:25 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | North <br> East | Merging <br> Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle <br> Other motor vehicle | 0 |
| 2018-Aug-09, Thu,13:04 | Clear | Approaching | P.D. only | Dry | West <br> East | Going ahead Going ahead | Unknown <br> Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle <br> Other motor vehicle | 0 |
| 2018-Nov-16, Fri, 10:47 | Clear | Rear end | Non-fatal injury | Dry | East <br> East | Unknown <br> Stopped | Unknown <br> Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle <br> Other motor vehicle | 0 |

Location: FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD
Traffic Control: Stop sign Total Collisions: 2

| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuver Vehicle type |  | First Event | No. Ped |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2016-Dec-20, Tue,08:03 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Loose snow | South | Turning left | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2018-Feb-03, Sat,18:19 | Snow | Angle | P.D. only | Loose snow | South | Turning right | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |

Location: RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD
Traffic Control: Stop sign Total Collisions: 3

| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuv | Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2016-Aug-14, Sun,08:47 | Clear | SMV other | P.D. only | Dry | East | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Ran off road | 0 |
| 2017-Feb-03, Fri, 16:33 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | South <br> East | Going ahead Turning left | Automobile, station wagon Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle <br> Other motor vehicle | 0 |
| 2017-Mar-02, Thu,16:06 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | South <br> South | Slowing or stopping Unknown |  | Other motor vehicle <br> Other motor vehicle | 0 |

Transportation Services - Traffic Services
Collision Details Report - Public Version
From: January 1, 2014 To: December 31, 2018

| Location: RENAUD RD @ NAVAN RD |  |  |  |  | Total Collisions: 14 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traffic Control: Traffic signal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuv | Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |
| 2014-Mar-10, Mon,22:19 | Snow | SMV other | P.D. only | Loose snow | North | Turning right | Pick-up truck | Skidding/sliding | 0 |
| 2014-Apr-22, Tue,16:50 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | North | Going ahead | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Turning right | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2014-Apr-28, Mon,05:42 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | West | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | West | Stopped | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Feb-04, Wed, 10:37 | Snow | SMV other | P.D. only | Loose snow | North | Turning right | Automobile, station wagon | Skidding/sliding | 0 |
| 2015-Mar-04, Wed,07:29 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Slush | North | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Stopped | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Apr-14, Tue,12:35 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | East | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Oct-05, Mon,17:25 | Clear | Rear end | Non-fatal injury | Dry | East | Turning right | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Turning right | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Jan-05, Tue, 18:41 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Jan-07, Thu,16:17 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East | Slowing or stopping Automobile, station wagon Slowing or stopping Pick-up truck |  | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East |  |  | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2017-Oct-19, Thu,13:03 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | North | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Unknown | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2017-Oct-24, Tue,07:24 | Rain | SMV other | Non-fatal injury | Wet | West | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Pedestrian | 1 |
| 2018-Jul-17, Tue,21:43 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | South | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | West | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2018-Aug-31, Fri,09:20 | Clear | Angle | Non-fatal injury | Dry | North | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Slowing or stopping Automobile, station wagon |  | Other motor vehicle |  |

Transportation Services - Traffic Services
Collision Details Report - Public Version
From: January 1, 2014 To: December 31, 2018

| Location: RENAUD RD @ NAVAN RD |  |  |  |  | Total Collisions: 14 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traffic Control: Traffic signal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuv | Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |
| 2014-Mar-10, Mon,22:19 | Snow | SMV other | P.D. only | Loose snow | North | Turning right | Pick-up truck | Skidding/sliding | 0 |
| 2014-Apr-22, Tue,16:50 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | North | Going ahead | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Turning right | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2014-Apr-28, Mon,05:42 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | West | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | West | Stopped | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Feb-04, Wed, 10:37 | Snow | SMV other | P.D. only | Loose snow | North | Turning right | Automobile, station wagon | Skidding/sliding | 0 |
| 2015-Mar-04, Wed,07:29 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Slush | North | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Stopped | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Apr-14, Tue,12:35 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | East | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Oct-05, Mon,17:25 | Clear | Rear end | Non-fatal injury | Dry | East | Turning right | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Turning right | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Jan-05, Tue, 18:41 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Jan-07, Thu,16:17 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East | Slowing or stopping Automobile, station wagon Slowing or stopping Pick-up truck |  | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East |  |  | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2017-Oct-19, Thu,13:03 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | North | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Unknown | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2017-Oct-24, Tue,07:24 | Rain | SMV other | Non-fatal injury | Wet | West | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Pedestrian | 1 |
| 2018-Jul-17, Tue,21:43 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | South | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | West | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2018-Aug-31, Fri,09:20 | Clear | Angle | Non-fatal injury | Dry | North | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Slowing or stopping Automobile, station wagon |  | Other motor vehicle |  |

Transportation Services - Traffic Services
Collision Details Report - Public Version

| Location: RENAUD RD @ NAVAN RDTraffic Control: Traffic signal |  |  |  |  | Total Collisions: 14 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuver Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |
| 2018-Dec-10, Mon,10:05 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East <br> East | Slowing or stopping Automobile, station wagon <br> Going ahead Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle Other motor vehicle | 0 |

City Operations - Transportation Services

## Collision Details Report - Public Version

From: January 1, 2013 To: December 31, 2017
Location: BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ MER BLEUE RD

| Traffic Control: Roundabout |  |  |  |  | Total Collisions: 9 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuv | Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |
| 2013-Nov-23, Sat, 13:09 | Snow | Angle | P.D. only | Ice | West | Turning right | Automobile, station wagon | Skidding/sliding |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Sep-24, Thu, 17:33 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | North | Slowing or stopping Pick-up truck |  | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Stopped | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Apr-14, Tue,15:51 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | West | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Stopped | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Jan-04, Mon, 19:37 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Slowing or stopping | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Oct-04, Tue,07:15 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | West | Slowing or stoppin | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | West | Stopped | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2017-Mar-08, Wed,07:20 | Freezing Rain | SMV other | P.D. only | Ice | South | Slowing or stoppin | Automobile, station wagon | Pole (utility, power) |  |


| 2017-Mar-30, Thu,20:52 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | North <br> East | Going ahead <br> Going ahead | Pick-up truck <br> Passenger van | Other motor vehicle <br> Other motor vehicle |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017-Feb-07, Tue,22:38 | Snow | SMV other | P.D. only | Loose snow | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Skidding/sliding |  |
| 2017-Sep-27, Wed, 18:30 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Slowing or stopping | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| Location: FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Control: Stop sign |  |  |  |  | Total Collisions: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuver | Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |
| 2016-Dec-20, Tue,08:03 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Loose snow | South | Turning left | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| Location: RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Control: Stop sign |  |  |  |  | Total Collisions: 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuver | Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |
| 2013-Nov-04, Mon,21:45 | Clear | SMV other | P.D. only | Dry | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Animal - wild |  |
| 2016-Aug-14, Sun,08:47 | Clear | SMV other | P.D. only | Dry | East | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Ran off road |  |
| 2017-Mar-02, Thu,16:06 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | South | Slowing or stopping | Unknown | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Stopped | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |



|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014-Mar-10, Mon,22:19 | Snow | SMV other | P.D. only | Loose snow | North | Turning right | Pick-up truck | Skidding/sliding |
| 2014-Apr-28, Mon,05:42 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | West | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | West | Stopped | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2014-Apr-22, Tue, 16:50 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | North | Going ahead | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Turning right | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle |
| 2015-Feb-04, Wed, 10:37 | Snow | SMV other | P.D. only | Loose snow | North | Turning right | Automobile, station wagon | Skidding/sliding |
| 2015-Mar-04, Wed,07:29 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Slush | North | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Stopped | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2015-Apr-14, Tue, 12:35 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | East | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2015-Oct-05, Mon, 17:25 | Clear | Rear end | Non-fatal injury | Dry | East | Turning right | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Turning right | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2016-Jan-05, Tue, 18:41 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
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## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram
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WO No:
38897
Device: Miovision

## Full Study Summary (8 HR Standard)

Survey Date: Tuesday, October 29, 2019
Total Observed U-Turns
AADT Factor $\begin{array}{rlll}\text { Northbound: } & 0 & \text { Southbound: } & 0 \\ \text { Eastbound: } & 0 & \text { Westbound: } & 0\end{array}$

## NAVAN RD

RENAUD RD


Note: These values are calculated by multiplying the totals by the appropriate expansion factor. 1.39

| AVG 12Hr | 512 | 1874 | 304 | 2690 | 639 | 2047 | 36 | 2722 | 5412 | 1148 | 1895 | 709 | 3752 | 212 | 1335 | 638 | 2185 | 5937 | 11349 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Equivalent 12 hr. totals by the AADT factor. . 90

| AVG 24Hr | 671 | 2455 | 398 | 3524 | 837 | 2682 | 47 | 3566 | 7090 | 1504 | 2482 | 929 | 4915 | 278 | 1749 | 836 | 2863 | 7778 | 14868 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Average Daily 12 hr. totals by 12 to 24 expansion factor.
Note: U-Turns provided for approach totals. Refer to 'U-Turn' Report for specific breakdown.

## ( Ottawa <br> Transportation Services - Traffic Services <br> Turning Movement Count - Study Results <br> RENAUD RD @ NAVAN RD

Survey Date: Tuesday, October 29, 2019

WO No:
Device:
38897
Miovision

## Full Study 15 Minute Increments

NAVAN RD
RENAUD RD
Northbound Southbound Eastbound Westbound

| Time Period |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { w } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N} \\ \text { TOT } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{S} \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT |  |  |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 36 | 77 | 10 | 123 | 6 | 22 | 0 | 28 | 151 | 19 | 18 | 6 | 43 | 3 | 92 | 30 | 125 | 168 | 319 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 36 | 84 | 11 | 131 | 6 | 36 | 0 | 42 | 173 | 26 | 12 | 11 | 49 | 13 | 98 | 28 | 139 | 188 | 361 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 26 | 79 | 4 | 109 | 13 | 26 | 1 | 40 | 149 | 35 | 47 | 7 | 89 | 9 | 78 | 21 | 108 | 197 | 346 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 26 | 81 | 6 | 113 | 22 | 26 | 1 | 49 | 162 | 29 | 33 | 9 | 71 | 6 | 69 | 29 | 104 | 175 | 337 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 25 | 64 | 12 | 101 | 14 | 32 | 1 | 47 | 148 | 24 | 29 | 4 | 57 | 3 | 45 | 21 | 69 | 126 | 274 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 27 | 67 | 8 | 102 | 9 | 31 | 0 | 40 | 142 | 26 | 38 | 4 | 68 | 4 | 58 | 24 | 86 | 154 | 296 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 20 | 54 | 9 | 83 | 9 | 29 | 0 | 38 | 121 | 32 | 41 | 9 | 82 | 5 | 49 | 24 | 78 | 160 | 281 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 22 | 56 | 7 | 85 | 9 | 27 | 1 | 37 | 122 | 33 | 27 | 9 | 69 | 6 | 43 | 22 | 71 | 140 | 262 |
| 09:00 | 09:15 | 20 | 50 | 7 | 77 | 8 | 33 | 0 | 41 | 118 | 23 | 27 | 5 | 55 | 6 | 24 | 22 | 52 | 107 | 225 |
| 09:15 | 09:30 | 3 | 50 | 2 | 55 | 9 | 43 | 2 | 54 | 109 | 15 | 18 | 3 | 36 | 2 | 23 | 13 | 38 | 74 | 183 |
| 09:30 | 09:45 | 6 | 46 | 10 | 62 | 6 | 34 | 1 | 41 | 103 | 17 | 18 | 4 | 39 | 1 | 13 | 16 | 30 | 69 | 172 |
| 09:45 | 10:00 | 3 | 36 | 7 | 46 | 7 | 35 | 3 | 45 | 91 | 13 | 25 | 9 | 47 | 3 | 13 | 16 | 32 | 79 | 170 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 7 | 44 | 1 | 52 | 8 | 41 | 2 | 51 | 103 | 11 | 16 | 8 | 35 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 20 | 55 | 158 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 4 | 39 | 7 | 50 | 12 | 28 | 0 | 40 | 90 | 17 | 16 | 6 | 39 | 1 | 18 | 12 | 31 | 70 | 160 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 8 | 36 | 5 | 49 | 10 | 36 | 1 | 47 | 96 | 25 | 19 | 6 | 50 | 3 | 23 | 10 | 36 | 86 | 182 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 9 | 34 | 10 | 53 | 16 | 36 | 0 | 52 | 105 | 19 | 22 | 7 | 48 | 6 | 11 | 14 | 31 | 79 | 184 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 4 | 40 | 6 | 50 | 8 | 49 | 3 | 60 | 110 | 16 | 17 | 8 | 41 | 3 | 25 | 17 | 45 | 86 | 196 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 6 | 30 | 6 | 42 | 13 | 48 | 1 | 62 | 104 | 15 | 26 | 13 | 54 | 4 | 14 | 9 | 27 | 81 | 185 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 5 | 42 | 8 | 55 | 12 | 27 | 1 | 40 | 95 | 19 | 28 | 10 | 57 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 25 | 82 | 177 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 6 | 41 | 6 | 53 | 10 | 40 | 0 | 50 | 103 | 17 | 25 | 8 | 50 | 6 | 18 | 8 | 32 | 82 | 185 |
| 15:00 | 15:15 | 9 | 44 | 10 | 63 | 10 | 62 | 2 | 74 | 137 | 30 | 39 | 27 | 96 | 4 | 15 | 11 | 30 | 126 | 263 |
| 15:15 | 15:30 | 10 | 50 | 11 | 71 | 25 | 61 | 0 | 86 | 157 | 37 | 76 | 33 | 146 | 10 | 36 | 19 | 65 | 211 | 368 |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 12 | 40 | 7 | 59 | 13 | 77 | 2 | 92 | 151 | 28 | 73 | 27 | 128 | 11 | 30 | 13 | 54 | 182 | 333 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 9 | 42 | 7 | 58 | 20 | 84 | 1 | 105 | 163 | 47 | 78 | 40 | 165 | 7 | 25 | 7 | 39 | 204 | 367 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 10 | 38 | 8 | 56 | 21 | 96 | 2 | 119 | 175 | 42 | 106 | 37 | 185 | 4 | 30 | 11 | 45 | 230 | 405 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 11 | 46 | 12 | 69 | 27 | 106 | 1 | 134 | 203 | 38 | 75 | 45 | 158 | 8 | 31 | 12 | 51 | 209 | 412 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 8 | 24 | 10 | 42 | 24 | 86 | 0 | 110 | 152 | 48 | 101 | 41 | 190 | 5 | 29 | 14 | 48 | 238 | 390 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 8 | 30 | 11 | 49 | 32 | 80 | 1 | 113 | 162 | 61 | 101 | 34 | 196 | 9 | 29 | 17 | 55 | 251 | 413 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 10 | 37 | 5 | 52 | 29 | 90 | 0 | 119 | 171 | 37 | 95 | 34 | 166 | 7 | 28 | 7 | 42 | 208 | 379 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 4 | 33 | 2 | 39 | 22 | 85 | 0 | 107 | 146 | 45 | 106 | 39 | 190 | 3 | 25 | 15 | 43 | 233 | 379 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 8 | 34 | 6 | 48 | 42 | 74 | 1 | 117 | 165 | 44 | 85 | 40 | 169 | 6 | 32 | 17 | 55 | 224 | 389 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 11 | 30 | 12 | 53 | 39 | 56 | 1 | 96 | 149 | 29 | 78 | 24 | 131 | 4 | 22 | 15 | 41 | 172 | 321 |
| Total: |  | 409 | 1498 | 243 | 2150 | 511 | 1636 | 29 | 2176 | 4326 | 917 | 1515 | 567 | 2999 | 170 | 1067 | 510 | 1747 | 4326 | 9,072 |

Note: U-Turns are included in Totals.

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Study Results <br> RENAUD RD @ NAVAN RD

| Survey Date: Tuesday, October 29, 2019 | WO No: | 38897 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time: $07: 00$ | Device: | Miovision |


| Time Period |  | Full Study Cyclist Volume |  |  |  |  |  | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NAVAN RD |  |  | RENAUD RD |  |  |  |
|  |  | Northbound | Southbound | Street Total | Eastbound | Westbound | Street Total |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 09:00 | 09:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:15 | 09:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:30 | 09:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:45 | 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00 | 15:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 15:15 | 15:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total |  | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 12 |

## Turning Movement Count - Study Results <br> RENAUD RD @ NAVAN RD

| Survey Date: Tuesday, October 29, 2019 | Wo No: | 38897 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time: $07: 00$ | Device: | Miovision |

## Full Study Pedestrian Volume <br> NAVAN RD <br> RENAUD RD

| Time Period |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NB Approach <br> (E or W Crossing) | SB Approach <br> (E or W Crossing) | Total | EB Approach <br> (N or S Crossing) | WB Approach <br> (N or S Crossing) | Total | Grand Total |


| 07:00 07:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:15 07:30 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| 07:30 07:45 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 07:45 08:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 08:00 08:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:15 08:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30 08:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:45 09:00 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 09:00 09:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:15 09:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:30 09:45 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 09:45 10:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 11:30 11:45 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 11:45 12:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00 12:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12:15 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 12:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 13:00 13:15 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 13:15 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00 15:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15 15:30 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 15:30 15:45 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 15:45 16:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 16:00 16:15 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| 16:15 16:30 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 16:30 16:45 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 16:45 17:00 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| 17:00 17:15 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 17:15 17:30 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 17:30 17:45 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 17:45 18:00 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| Total .......... | 22 | 21 | 43 | 8 | 13 | 21 | 64 |

## ( (Ottawa <br> Transportation Services - Traffic Services <br> Turning Movement Count - Study Results RENAUD RD @ NAVAN RD

Survey Date: Tuesday, October 29, 2019 Start Time: 07:00

WO No:
Device:
Miovision

Full Study Heavy Vehicles
NAVAN RD
RENAUD RD
Northbound
Southbound
Eastbound
Westbound

| Time Period |  | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N} \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { S } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { W } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 22 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 18 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 30 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 26 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 27 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 24 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 35 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 30 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 26 |
| 09:00 | 09:15 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 |
| 09:15 | 09:30 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 19 |
| 09:30 | 09:45 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 12 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 20 |
| 09:45 | 10:00 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 21 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 17 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 16 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 17 |
| 15:00 | 15:15 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 18 |
| 15:15 | 15:30 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 22 |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 22 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 27 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 |
| Total: | None | 12 | 172 | 20 | 204 | 18 | 204 | 0 | 222 | 426 | 52 | 35 | 14 | 101 | 20 | 24 | 8 | 52 | 153 | 579 |

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

Turning Movement Count - Study Results

## RENAUD RD @ NAVAN RD

Survey Date: Tuesday, October 29, 2019
Start Time: 07:00

WO No:
38897
Device: Miovision

Full Study 15 Minute U-Turn Total
NAVAN RD
RENAUD RD

| Time Period |  | Northbound U-Turn Total | Southbound U-Turn Total | Eastbound U-Turn Total | Westbound U-Turn Total | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00 | 09:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:15 | 09:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:30 | 09:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:45 | 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00 | 15:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15 | 15:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD

Survey Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 38121
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD

Survey Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 38121
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD

Survey Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 38121
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD

Survey Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 38121
Device: Miovision


Comments

## RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD

Survey Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018
WO\#: 38121
Device: Miovision


Comments

Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report

RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD
Survey Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018

| Total Observed U-Turns |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northbound: | 0 | Southbound: | 2 |
| Eastbound: | 0 | Westbound: | 0 |

AADT Factor

Full Study
MER BLEUE RD
RENAUD RD

|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 07:00 08:00 | 67 | 148 | 0 | 215 | 0 | 42 | 147 | 189 | 404 | 103 | 0 | 17 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 524 |
| 08:00 09:00 | 21 | 131 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 68 | 86 | 154 | 306 | 128 | 0 | 14 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 448 |
| 09:00 10:00 | 10 | 128 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 76 | 50 | 126 | 264 | 84 | 0 | 12 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 360 |
| 11:30 12:30 | 10 | 137 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 108 | 62 | 170 | 317 | 104 | 0 | 9 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 430 |
| 12:30 13:30 | 5 | 96 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 127 | 47 | 174 | 275 | 90 | 0 | 10 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 375 |
| 15:00 16:00 | 11 | 123 | 0 | 134 | 0 | 151 | 62 | 213 | 347 | 183 | 0 | 31 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 | 561 |
| 16:00 17:00 | 21 | 121 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 178 | 62 | 240 | 382 | 235 | 0 | 42 | 277 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 277 | 659 |
| 17:00 18:00 | 13 | 126 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 179 | 78 | 257 | 396 | 243 | 0 | 25 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 268 | 664 |
| Sub Total | 158 | 1010 | 0 | 1168 | 0 | 929 | 594 | 1523 | 2691 | 1170 | 0 | 160 | 1330 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1330 | 4021 |
| U Turns |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 158 | 1010 | 0 | 1168 | 0 | 929 | 594 | 1525 | 2693 | 1170 | 0 | 160 | 1330 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1330 | 4023 |
| EQ 12Hr | 220 | 1404 | 0 | 1624 | 0 | 1291 | 826 | 2120 | 3744 | 1626 | 0 | 222 | 1849 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1849 | 5593 |

Note: These values are calculated by multiplying the totals by the appropriate expansion factor.
1.39

| AVG 12Hr | 198 | 1264 | 0 | 1461 | 0 | 1162 | 743 | 1908 | 3369 | 1464 | 0 | 200 | 1664 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1664 | 5033 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Equivalent 12 hr . totals by the AADT factor. . 90

| AVG 24Hr | 259 | 1655 | 0 | 1914 | 0 | 1522 | 973 | 2499 | 4413 | 1917 | 0 | 262 | 2180 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2180 | 6593 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Average Daily 12 hr. totals by 12 to 24 expansion factor. 1.31

## Comments:

Note: U-Turns provided for approach totals. Refer to 'U-Turn' Report for specific breakdown.

Survey Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018

MER BLEUE RD
Northbound Southbound

| Time P | Period | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N} \\ \text { TOT } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{S} \\ \text { TOT } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } \\ \text { TOT } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { W } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 11 | 20 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 4 | 29 | 33 | 64 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 81 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 22 | 37 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 14 | 44 | 58 | 117 | 23 | 0 | 5 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 145 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 20 | 52 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 12 | 38 | 50 | 122 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 146 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 14 | 39 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 12 | 36 | 48 | 101 | 42 | 0 | 9 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 152 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 7 | 28 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 22 | 25 | 47 | 82 | 26 | 0 | 4 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 112 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 8 | 29 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 15 | 20 | 35 | 72 | 30 | 0 | 2 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 104 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 2 | 33 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 13 | 25 | 38 | 73 | 31 | 0 | 5 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 109 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 4 | 41 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 18 | 16 | 34 | 79 | 41 | 0 | 3 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 123 |
| 09:00 | 09:15 | 5 | 35 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 18 | 12 | 30 | 70 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 90 |
| 09:15 | 09:30 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 25 | 52 | 19 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 75 |
| 09:30 | 09:45 | 4 | 40 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 25 | 15 | 40 | 84 | 23 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 110 |
| 09:45 | 10:00 | 1 | 26 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 18 | 13 | 31 | 58 | 23 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 85 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 2 | 39 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 30 | 15 | 45 | 86 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 107 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 3 | 31 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 26 | 18 | 44 | 78 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 103 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 22 | 18 | 40 | 71 | 31 | 0 | 4 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 106 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 3 | 38 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 30 | 11 | 41 | 82 | 29 | 0 | 3 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 114 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 3 | 22 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 33 | 16 | 49 | 74 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 91 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 37 | 10 | 47 | 75 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 98 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 29 | 11 | 40 | 66 | 27 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 96 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 28 | 10 | 38 | 60 | 25 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 90 |
| 15:00 | 15:15 | 1 | 28 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 34 | 20 | 54 | 83 | 40 | 0 | 3 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 126 |
| 15:15 | 15:30 | 5 | 31 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 45 | 14 | 59 | 95 | 45 | 0 | 6 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 146 |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 3 | 29 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 34 | 11 | 45 | 77 | 52 | 0 | 13 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 142 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 2 | 35 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 38 | 17 | 55 | 92 | 46 | 0 | 9 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 147 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 5 | 29 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 52 | 22 | 74 | 108 | 48 | 0 | 10 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 166 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 5 | 28 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 43 | 13 | 56 | 89 | 66 | 0 | 14 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 169 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 7 | 34 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 43 | 12 | 56 | 97 | 67 | 0 | 9 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 173 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 4 | 30 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 40 | 15 | 55 | 89 | 54 | 0 | 9 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 152 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 5 | 36 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 53 | 26 | 79 | 120 | 64 | 0 | 3 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 187 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 5 | 31 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 40 | 17 | 57 | 93 | 74 | 0 | 9 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 176 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 2 | 26 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 54 | 12 | 66 | 94 | 62 | 0 | 8 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 164 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 32 | 23 | 56 | 90 | 43 | 0 | 5 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 138 |
| TOTAL |  | 158 | 1010 | 0 | 1168 | 0 | 929 | 594 | 1525 | 2693 | 1170 | 0 | 160 | 1330 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1330 | 4023 |

Note: U-Turns are included in Totals.

Transportation Services - Traffic Services
Turning Movement Count - Cyclist Volume Report
RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD
Count Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

| Time Period | MER BLEUE RD |  |  | RENAUD RD |  |  | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Northbound | Southbound | Street Total | Eastbound | Westbound | Street Total |  |
| 07:00 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total .......... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Comment:

## Turning Movement Count - Heavy Vehicle Report

RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD

Survey Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018
MER BLEUE RD

| Time Period |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { w } \\ \text { TOT } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N} \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{S} \\ \mathrm{TOT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT |  |  |  |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 33 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 51 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 27 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 35 |
| 09:00 | 10:00 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 |
| 11:30 | 12:30 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17 |
| 12:30 | 13:30 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 15 |
| 15:00 | 16:00 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 15 | 2 | 17 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 34 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 |
| Sub Total |  | 20 | 44 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 49 | 29 | 78 | 142 | 41 | 0 | 28 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 211 |
| U-Turns (Heavy Vehicles) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tot |  | 20 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 29 | 78 | 142 | 41 | 0 | 28 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 211 |

Heavy Vehicles include Buses, Single-Unit Trucks and Articulated Trucks. Further, they ARE included in the Turning Movement Count Summary.

Transportation Services - Traffic Services
Turning Movement Count - Pedestrian Volume Report
RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD
Count Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018 Start Time: 07:00

| Time Period | NB Approach (E or W Crossing) | SB Approach (E or W Crossing) | Total | EB Approach ( N or S Crossing) | WB Approach ( N or S Crossing) | Total | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:00 07:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:15 07:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:30 07:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:45 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00 08:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:15 08:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30 08:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:45 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 08:00 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 09:00 09:15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 09:15 09:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:30 09:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:45 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00 10:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 11:30 11:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:45 12:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00 12:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:15 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 12:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00 13:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:15 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00 15:15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 15:15 15:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30 15:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00 16:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 16:00 16:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15 16:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 16:30 16:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 17:00 17:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15 17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30 17:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total .......... | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |

Comment:

Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - 15 Min U-Turn Total Report RENAUD RD @ MER BLEUE RD

| Survey Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Period |  | Northbound <br> U-Turn Total | Southbound U-Turn Total | Eastbound U-Turn Total | Westbound <br> U-Turn Total | Total |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00 | 09:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:15 | 09:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:30 | 09:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:45 | 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00 | 15:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15 | 15:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
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## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD

Survey Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 37829
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD

Survey Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 37829
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD

Survey Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 37829
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD

Survey Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 37829
Device: Miovision


Comments

## FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD

Survey Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018
WO\#:
37829
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report

FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD
Survey Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018

| Total Observed U-Turns |  |  |  | AADT Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northbound: | 0 | Southbound: | 4 | .90 |
| Eastbound: | 3 | Westbound: | 1 |  |

## Full Study

| Full Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FERN CASEY ST |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | RENAUD RD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | thbour | und |  |  | thb | und |  |  |  | Eastbour |  |  |  | Vestb | und |  |  |  |
| Period | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| 07:00 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 115 | 123 | 123 | 95 | 107 | 0 | 202 | 0 | 127 | 30 | 157 | 359 | 482 |
| 08:00 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 72 | 75 | 75 | 70 | 123 | 0 | 193 | 0 | 89 | 13 | 102 | 295 | 370 |
| 09:00 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 54 | 57 | 57 | 59 | 91 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 52 | 11 | 63 | 213 | 270 |
| 11:30 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 60 | 67 | 67 | 38 | 106 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 56 | 6 | 62 | 206 | 273 |
| 12:30 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 58 | 65 | 65 | 54 | 94 | 0 | 148 | 0 | 63 | 7 | 70 | 218 | 283 |
| 15:00 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 96 | 105 | 105 | 111 | 204 | 0 | 315 | 0 | 76 | 2 | 78 | 393 | 498 |
| 16:00 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 108 | 116 | 116 | 136 | 263 | 0 | 399 | 0 | 65 | 3 | 68 | 467 | 583 |
| 17:00 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 110 | 114 | 114 | 141 | 250 | 0 | 391 | 0 | 53 | 1 | 54 | 445 | 559 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 673 | 722 | 722 | 704 | 1238 | 0 | 1942 | 0 | 581 | 73 | 654 | 2596 | 3318 |
| U Turns |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 673 | 726 | 726 | 704 | 1238 | 0 | 1945 | 0 | 581 | 73 | 655 | 2600 | 3326 |
| EQ 12Hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 935 | 1009 | 1009 | 979 | 1721 | 0 | 2704 | 0 | 808 | 101 | 910 | 3614 | 4623 |
| Note: These values are calculated by multiplying the totals by the appropriate expansion factor. 1.39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG 12Hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 842 | 908 | 908 | 881 | 1549 | 0 | 2433 | 0 | 727 | 91 | 819 | 3252 | 4160 |
| Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Equivalent 12 hr . totals by the AADT factor. . 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG 24Hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 1103 | 1190 | 1190 | 1154 | 2029 | 0 | 3187 | 0 | 952 | 120 | 1073 | 4260 | 5450 |
| Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Average Daily 12 hr . totals by 12 to 24 expansion factor. $\mathbf{1 . 3 1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Comments:

Note: U-Turns provided for approach totals. Refer to 'U-Turn' Report for specific breakdown.

| Survey Date: | Wednesday, May 16, 2018 | Total Observed U-Turns |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Northbound: | 0 | Southbound: | 4 |
|  |  | Eastbound: | 3 | Westbound: | 1 |
|  | FERN CASEY ST |  |  | RENAUD RD |  |


|  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { w } \\ \text { TOT } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time P | Period | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N} \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{S} \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT |  |  |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 30 | 4 | 34 | 71 | 97 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 24 | 27 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 33 | 6 | 39 | 91 | 122 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 33 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 30 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 27 | 8 | 35 | 101 | 135 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 26 | 33 | 33 | 18 | 31 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 37 | 12 | 50 | 99 | 132 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 17 | 34 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 26 | 6 | 32 | 83 | 108 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 14 | 24 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 25 | 2 | 27 | 65 | 88 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 23 | 43 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 31 | 97 | 115 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 50 | 59 |
| 09:00 | 09:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 22 | 28 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 70 | 80 |
| 09:15 | 09:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 12 | 21 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 13 | 47 | 63 |
| 09:30 | 09:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 37 | 55 |
| 09:45 | 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 27 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 18 | 60 | 73 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 13 | 24 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 15 | 2 | 17 | 54 | 72 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 16 | 44 | 59 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 7 | 34 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 57 | 72 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 20 | 20 | 8 | 30 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 13 | 51 | 71 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 12 | 8 | 28 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 21 | 57 | 69 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 17 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 62 | 79 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 19 | 44 | 69 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 30 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 55 | 67 |
| 15:00 | 15:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 28 | 30 | 30 | 15 | 35 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 26 | 76 | 106 |
| 15:15 | 15:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 22 | 22 | 34 | 56 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 18 | 108 | 130 |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 25 | 25 | 35 | 50 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 105 | 130 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 28 | 28 | 27 | 63 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 14 | 104 | 132 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 27 | 30 | 30 | 36 | 61 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 108 | 138 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 28 | 28 | 41 | 59 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 16 | 116 | 144 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 26 | 26 | 29 | 62 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 23 | 114 | 140 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 33 | 33 | 30 | 81 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 129 | 162 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 32 | 65 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 111 | 140 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 32 | 32 | 33 | 71 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 14 | 118 | 150 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 25 | 28 | 28 | 37 | 50 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 99 | 127 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 39 | 64 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 117 | 142 |


| TOTAL: | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{0}$ | 49 | 0 | 673 | $\mathbf{7 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 6}$ | 704 | 1238 | 0 | $\mathbf{1 9 4 5}$ | 0 | 581 | 73 | $\mathbf{6 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 2 6}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Note: U-Turns are included in Totals.
Comment:

Transportation Services - Traffic Services
Turning Movement Count - Cyclist Volume Report

## FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD

Count Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

| Time Period | FERN CASEY ST |  |  | RENAUD RD |  |  | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Northbound | Southbound | Street Total | Eastbound | Westbound | Street Total |  |
| 07:00 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 08:00 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 09:00 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 15:00 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 17:00 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total .......... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 9 |

Comment:

## FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD

Survey Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018

FERN CASEY ST

| Time Period |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { w } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N} \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{S} \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT |  |  |  |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 21 | 26 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 20 |
| 09:00 | 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 16 | 17 |
| 11:30 | 12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 7 |
| 12:30 | 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 13 |
| 15:00 | 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 10 |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 15 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Sub | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 18 | 18 | 16 | 40 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 33 | 5 | 38 | 94 | 112 |
| U-Turns (Heavy Vehicles) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 18 | 18 | 16 | 40 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 33 | 5 | 38 | 94 | 112 |

Heavy Vehicles include Buses, Single-Unit Trucks and Articulated Trucks. Further, they ARE included in the Turning Movement Count Summary.

Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Pedestrian Volume Report

FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD
Count Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 Start Time: 07:00

| Time Period |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | NB Approach <br> (E or W Crossing) | SB Approach <br> (E or W Crossing) | Total | EB Approach <br> (N or S Crossing) | WB Approach <br> (N or S Crossing) | Total | Grand Total |

Comment:

## Turning Movement Count - 15 Min U-Turn Total Report

FERN CASEY ST @ RENAUD RD

| Survey Date: <br> Time Period |  | Wednesday, May 16, 2018 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Northbound U-Turn Total | Southbound U-Turn Total | Eastbound U-Turn Total | Westbound U-Turn Total | Total |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00 | 09:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:15 | 09:30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 09:30 | 09:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:45 | 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 15:00 | 15:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15 | 15:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 8 |

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ NAVAN RD

Survey Date: Thursday, July 19, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 38030
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ NAVAN RD

Survey Date: Thursday, July 19, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 38030
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ NAVAN RD

Survey Date: Thursday, July 19, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 38030
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Peak Hour Diagram

## BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ NAVAN RD

Survey Date: Thursday, July 19, 2018
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 38030
Device: Miovision


Comments

## BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ NAVAN RD

Survey Date: Thursday, July 19, 2018
WO\#: 38030
Device: Miovision


Comments

Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report

BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ NAVAN RD
Survey Date: Thursday, July 19, 2018

| Total Observed U-Turns |  |  | AADT Factor |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Northbound: | 8 | Southbound: | 12 | .90 |
| Eastbound: | 0 | Westbound: | 0 |  |

## Full Study

| Full Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAVAN RD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BRIAN COBURN BLVD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | orthb | und |  |  | outhb | und |  |  |  | stb |  |  |  | estb | ound |  |  |  |
| Period | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| 07:00 08:00 | 0 | 487 | 13 | 500 | 72 | 203 | 0 | 275 | 775 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 449 | 591 | 591 | 1366 |
| 08:00 09:00 | 0 | 423 | 35 | 458 | 70 | 221 | 0 | 291 | 749 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 381 | 488 | 488 | 1237 |
| 09:00 10:00 | 0 | 327 | 30 | 357 | 55 | 230 | 0 | 285 | 642 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 162 | 208 | 208 | 850 |
| 11:30 12:30 | 0 | 280 | 33 | 313 | 89 | 281 | 0 | 370 | 683 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 142 | 183 | 183 | 866 |
| 12:30 13:30 | 0 | 246 | 34 | 280 | 92 | 252 | 0 | 344 | 624 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 108 | 159 | 159 | 783 |
| 15:00 16:00 | 0 | 281 | 61 | 342 | 253 | 415 | 0 | 668 | 1010 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 124 | 193 | 193 | 1203 |
| 16:00 17:00 | 0 | 301 | 82 | 383 | 397 | 540 | 0 | 937 | 1320 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 136 | 231 | 231 | 1551 |
| 17:00 18:00 | 0 | 307 | 90 | 397 | 356 | 501 | 0 | 857 | 1254 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 143 | 203 | 203 | 1457 |
| Sub Total | 0 | 2652 | 378 | 3030 | 1384 | 2643 | 0 | 4027 | 7057 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 611 | 0 | 1645 | 2256 | 2256 | 9313 |
| U Turns |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  | 12 | 20 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Total | 0 | 2652 | 378 | 3038 | 1384 | 2643 | 0 | 4039 | 7077 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 611 | 0 | 1645 | 2256 | 2256 | 9333 |
| EQ 12Hr | 0 | 3686 | 525 | 4223 | 1924 | 3674 | 0 | 5614 | 9837 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 849 | 0 | 2287 | 3136 | 3136 | 12973 |
| Note: These values are calculated by multiplying the totals by the appropriate expansion factor. $\mathbf{1 . 3 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG 12Hr | 0 | 3318 | 473 | 3801 | 1731 | 3306 | 0 | 5053 | 8854 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 764 | 0 | 2058 | 2822 | 2822 | 11676 |
| Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Equivalent 12 hr . totals by the AADT factor. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG 24Hr | 0 | 4346 | 619 | 4979 | 2268 | 4331 | 0 | 6619 | 11598 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1001 | 0 | 2696 | 3697 | 3697 | 15295 |
| Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Average Daily 12 hr . totals by 12 to 24 expansion factor. $\mathbf{1 . 3 1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Comments:

Note: U-Turns provided for approach totals. Refer to 'U-Turn' Report for specific breakdown.

# BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ NAVAN RD 

| Survey Date: | Thursday, July 19, 2018 | Total Observed U-Turns |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Northbound: | 8 | Southbound: |  |  |
|  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound: | 0 | Westbound: | 0 |  |  |


|  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { W } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time P | Period | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N} \\ \mathrm{TOT} \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{S} \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT |  |  |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 0 | 117 | 4 | 121 | 17 | 45 | 0 | 62 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 117 | 147 | 147 | 330 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 0 | 130 | 2 | 132 | 16 | 49 | 0 | 65 | 197 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 140 | 183 | 183 | 380 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 0 | 118 | 2 | 121 | 25 | 41 | 0 | 66 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 110 | 147 | 147 | 334 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 0 | 122 | 5 | 127 | 14 | 68 | 0 | 82 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 82 | 114 | 114 | 323 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 0 | 102 | 7 | 109 | 17 | 65 | 0 | 83 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 112 | 142 | 142 | 334 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 0 | 104 | 11 | 115 | 18 | 55 | 0 | 73 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 101 | 132 | 132 | 320 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 0 | 108 | 7 | 115 | 25 | 51 | 0 | 76 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 96 | 122 | 122 | 313 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 0 | 109 | 10 | 122 | 10 | 50 | 0 | 60 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 72 | 92 | 92 | 274 |
| 09:00 | 09:15 | 0 | 78 | 6 | 84 | 12 | 70 | 0 | 83 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 58 | 78 | 78 | 245 |
| 09:15 | 09:30 | 0 | 85 | 6 | 91 | 12 | 46 | 0 | 58 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 42 | 50 | 50 | 199 |
| 09:30 | 09:45 | 0 | 86 | 9 | 95 | 13 | 59 | 0 | 72 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 27 | 33 | 33 | 200 |
| 09:45 | 10:00 | 0 | 78 | 9 | 87 | 18 | 55 | 0 | 73 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 35 | 47 | 47 | 207 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 0 | 77 | 9 | 86 | 24 | 56 | 0 | 81 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 38 | 50 | 50 | 217 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 0 | 70 | 6 | 77 | 14 | 70 | 0 | 84 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 39 | 47 | 47 | 208 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 0 | 65 | 12 | 77 | 27 | 76 | 0 | 105 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 31 | 48 | 48 | 230 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 0 | 68 | 6 | 74 | 24 | 79 | 0 | 104 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 34 | 38 | 38 | 216 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 0 | 59 | 6 | 65 | 20 | 51 | 0 | 71 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 24 | 38 | 38 | 174 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 0 | 72 | 10 | 83 | 23 | 59 | 0 | 83 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 25 | 37 | 37 | 203 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 0 | 48 | 11 | 59 | 33 | 73 | 0 | 107 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 34 | 45 | 45 | 211 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 0 | 67 | 7 | 74 | 16 | 69 | 0 | 85 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 25 | 39 | 39 | 198 |
| 15:00 | 15:15 | 0 | 68 | 11 | 80 | 44 | 91 | 0 | 135 | 215 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 32 | 48 | 48 | 263 |
| 15:15 | 15:30 | 0 | 70 | 18 | 88 | 60 | 94 | 0 | 154 | 242 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 36 | 49 | 49 | 291 |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 0 | 70 | 13 | 83 | 62 | 102 | 0 | 165 | 248 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 27 | 44 | 44 | 292 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 0 | 73 | 19 | 92 | 87 | 128 | 0 | 215 | 307 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 29 | 52 | 52 | 359 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 0 | 80 | 15 | 95 | 82 | 129 | 0 | 212 | 307 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 28 | 49 | 49 | 356 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 87 | 25 | 112 | 91 | 140 | 0 | 231 | 343 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 37 | 61 | 61 | 404 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 64 | 22 | 87 | 113 | 138 | 0 | 252 | 339 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 43 | 68 | 68 | 407 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 70 | 20 | 90 | 111 | 133 | 0 | 244 | 334 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 28 | 53 | 53 | 387 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 61 | 25 | 86 | 110 | 142 | 0 | 253 | 339 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 36 | 52 | 52 | 391 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 74 | 33 | 107 | 93 | 113 | 0 | 206 | 313 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 27 | 48 | 48 | 361 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 82 | 21 | 103 | 90 | 139 | 0 | 229 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 46 | 58 | 58 | 390 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 90 | 11 | 101 | 63 | 107 | 0 | 170 | 271 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 34 | 45 | 45 | 316 |

Note: U-Turns are included in Totals.
Comment:

Transportation Services - Traffic Services
Turning Movement Count - Cyclist Volume Report

## BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ NAVAN RD

Count Date: Thursday, July 19, $2018 \quad$ Start Time: 07:00

| Time Period | NAVAN RD |  |  | BRIAN COBURN BLVD |  |  | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Northbound | Southbound | Street Total | Eastbound | Westbound | Street Total |  |
| 07:00 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00 09:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 09:00 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 12:30 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 12:30 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 15:00 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total .......... | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 |

Comment:

Survey Date: Thursday, July 19, 2018


Heavy Vehicles include Buses, Single-Unit Trucks and Articulated Trucks. Further, they ARE included in the Turning Movement Count Summary

Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - Pedestrian Volume Report

BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ NAVAN RD
Count Date: Thursday, July 19, 2018 Start Time: 07:00

| Time Period |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | NB Approach <br> (E or W Crossing) | SB Approach <br> (E or W Crossing) | Total | EB Approach <br> (N or S Crossing) | WB Approach <br> (N or S Crossing) | Total | Grand Total |

Comment:

Transportation Services - Traffic Services

## Turning Movement Count - 15 Min U-Turn Total Report BRIAN COBURN BLVD @ NAVAN RD

| Survey Date: <br> Time Period |  | Thursday, July 19, 2018 |  | Eastbound U-Turn Total | Westbound U-Turn Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Northbound U-Turn Total | Southbound U-Turn Total |  |  |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 09:00 | 09:15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 09:15 | 09:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:30 | 09:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:45 | 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00 | 15:15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 15:15 | 15:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | 8 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

## Appendix D: Adjacent Development Traffic Volume Exhibits and Extracts














Appendix E: Synchro Intersection Capacity Analysis
Existing, Background 2024 Forecast, Background 2029 Forecast


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity AnalysisExisting (2020) Analysis - 6429 Renaud Road 3: Fern Casey \& Axis Way


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity AnalysisExisting (2020) Analysis - 6429 Renaud Road
6: Mer Bleue Rd \& Renaud Rd

|  | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4 | $\frac{1}{\square}$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 183 | 9 | 25 | 187 | 82 | 112 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 183 | 9 | 25 | 187 | 82 | 112 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 203 | 10 | 28 | 208 | 91 | 124 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 213 | 236 | 215 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 203 | 28 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 10 | 0 | 124 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.21 | 0.10 | -0.31 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 5.2 | 4.9 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 648 | 708 | 757 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 10.4 | 10.1 | 9.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 10.4 | 10.1 | 9.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | B | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 9.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 44.9\% |  | CU Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |



HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis Existing (2020) Analysis - 6429 Renaud Road 15: Navan Rd \& Renaud Rd

Morning Peak Hour



HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity AnalysisExisting (2020) Analysis - 6429 Renaud Road 3: Fern Casey \& Axis Way

|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\dagger$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 71 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 71 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 27 | O | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 0 | 183 | 79 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC, conflicting volume | 394 | 394 | 222 | 355 | 433 | 171 | 262 |  |  | 171 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 394 | 394 | 222 | 355 | 433 | 171 | 262 |  |  | 171 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 95 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 566 | 543 | 817 | 599 | 516 | 873 | 1302 |  |  | 1406 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 28 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 262 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 572 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 11.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 11.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 23.7\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | * | $\checkmark$ | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ | $\pm$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 356 | 24 | 13 | 168 | 189 | 130 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 356 | 24 | 13 | 168 | 189 | 130 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 396 | 27 | 14 | 187 | 210 | 144 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 423 | 201 | 354 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 396 | 14 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 27 | 0 | 144 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.20 | 0.10 | -0.21 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 5.6 | 5.9 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.66 | 0.33 | 0.52 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 615 | 561 | 638 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 18.9 | 11.7 | 14.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 18.9 | 11.7 | 14.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C | B | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 15.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 49.7\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |



HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis Existing (2020) Analysis - 6429 Renaud Road 15: Navan Rd \& Renaud Rd


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2024 Background Traffic 1: Renaud Rd \& Fern Casey

|  | $y$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 | ( | $\pm$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1 /}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |  | ¢ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 个 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 115 | 182 | 11 | 5 | 164 | 43 | 37 | 19 | 19 | 29 | 5 | 147 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 115 | 182 | 11 | 5 | 164 | 43 | 37 | 19 | 19 | 29 | 5 | 147 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 115 | 182 | 11 | 5 | 164 | 43 | 37 | 19 | 19 | 29 | 5 | 147 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 207 |  |  | 193 |  |  | 741 | 634 | 188 | 636 | 618 | 186 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 207 |  |  | 193 |  |  | 741 | 634 | 188 | 636 | 618 | 186 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 92 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 85 | 95 | 98 | 92 | 99 | 83 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1364 |  |  | 1380 |  |  | 254 | 362 | 855 | 342 | 369 | 857 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 115 | 193 | 5 | 207 | 75 | 29 | 152 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 115 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 37 | 29 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 11 | 0 | 43 | 19 | 0 | 147 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1364 | 1700 | 1380 | 1700 | 340 | 342 | 821 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.08 | 0.19 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 2.1 | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 7.9 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 18.5 | 16.5 | 10.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  | C | C | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 2.9 |  | 0.2 |  | 18.5 | 11.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | C | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 5.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 46.2\% |  | U Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2024 Background Traffic 3: Fern Casey \& Axis Way


|  | 4 | \% | 4 | 4 | $\downarrow$ | $\pm$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | * ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 236 | 42 | 74 | 378 | 188 | 218 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 236 | 42 | 74 | 378 | 188 | 218 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 236 | 42 | 74 | 378 | 188 | 218 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 278 | 452 | 406 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 236 | 74 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 42 | 0 | 218 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.13 | 0.11 | -0.29 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.2 | 5.6 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.48 | 0.70 | 0.59 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 526 | 627 | 659 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 14.9 | 20.4 | 15.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 14.9 | 20.4 | 15.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | C | C |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 17.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 76.4\% |  | CU Level | Service | D |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |




HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2024 Background Traffic 1: Renaud Rd \& Fern Casey

|  | $4$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $4$ | 4 | 4 | 7 | $*$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \& |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 162 | 429 | 39 | 20 | 174 | 9 | 23 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 20 | 146 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 162 | 429 | 39 | 20 | 174 | 9 | 23 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 20 | 146 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 162 | 429 | 39 | 20 | 174 | 9 | 23 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 20 | 146 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 183 |  |  | 468 |  |  | 1142 | 996 | 448 | 988 | 1010 | 178 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 183 |  |  | 468 |  |  | 1142 | 996 | 448 | 988 | 1010 | 178 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 88 |  |  | 98 |  |  | 81 | 95 | 98 | 97 | 90 | 83 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1392 |  |  | 1094 |  |  | 123 | 212 | 610 | 192 | 208 | 864 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 162 | 468 | 20 | 183 | 45 | 6 | 166 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 162 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 23 | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 39 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 146 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1392 | 1700 | 1094 | 1700 | 175 | 192 | 626 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.12 | 0.28 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.26 | 0.03 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 0.7 | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 7.9 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 32.5 | 24.4 | 12.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  | D | C | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 2.0 |  | 0.8 |  | 32.5 | 13.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | D | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 4.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 57.0\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2024 Background Traffic 3: Fern Casey \& Axis Way


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2024 Background Traffic 6: Mer Bleue Rd \& Renaud Rd PM Peak

|  | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 450 | 81 | 74 | 378 | 415 | 204 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 450 | 81 | 74 | 378 | 415 | 204 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 450 | 81 | 74 | 378 | 415 | 204 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 531 | 452 | 619 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 450 | 74 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 81 | 0 | 204 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.13 | 0.11 | -0.16 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 7.0 | 7.1 | 6.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 1.03 | 0.89 | 1.15 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 519 | 504 | 551 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 74.1 | 44.2 | 111.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 74.1 | 44.2 | 111.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F | E | F |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 80.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 103.0\% |  | CU Level | Service | G |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |




C Critical Lane Group

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2029 Background Traffic 1: Renaud Rd \& Fern Casey

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | 4 |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | * | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | * | f |  | * | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 134 | 200 | 16 | 8 | 298 | 54 | 56 | 28 | 28 | 9 | 8 | 182 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 134 | 200 | 16 | 8 | 298 | 54 | 56 | 28 | 28 | 9 | 8 | 182 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 134 | 200 | 16 | 8 | 298 | 54 | 56 | 28 | 28 | 9 | 8 | 182 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC, conflicting volume | 352 |  |  | 216 |  |  | 976 | 844 | 208 | 851 | 825 | 325 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 352 |  |  | 216 |  |  | 976 | 844 | 208 | 851 | 825 | 325 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 89 |  |  | 99 |  |  | 63 | 89 | 97 | 96 | 97 | 75 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1207 |  |  | 1354 |  |  | 153 | 265 | 832 | 227 | 272 | 716 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 134 | 216 | 8 | 352 | 112 | 9 | 190 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 134 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 56 | 9 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 16 | 0 | 54 | 28 | 0 | 182 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1207 | 1700 | 1354 | 1700 | 222 | 227 | 670 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.21 | 0.51 | 0.04 | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 19.6 | 0.9 | 8.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.4 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 36.7 | 21.5 | 12.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  | E | C | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 3.2 |  | 0.2 |  | 36.7 | 12.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | E | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 60.1\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd-2029 Background Traffic 3: Fern Casey \& Axis Way


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2029 Background Traffic 6: Mer Bleue Rd \& Renaud Rd AM Peak

|  | 4 | 7 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 1 | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 257 | 56 | 82 | 382 | 228 | 196 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 257 | 56 | 82 | 382 | 228 | 196 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 257 | 56 | 82 | 382 | 228 | 196 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 313 | 464 | 424 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 257 | 82 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 56 | 0 | 196 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.10 | 0.11 | -0.24 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.4 | 5.8 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.55 | 0.74 | 0.65 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 522 | 606 | 618 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 16.9 | 23.6 | 18.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 16.9 | 23.6 | 18.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C | C | C |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 19.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 80.0\% |  | Level | Service | D |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2029 Background Traffic 8: Axis Way/Decoeur \& Mer Bleue

|  | * | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | \% |  | $\frac{1}{1}$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | * ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |  |  | ¢4 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 101 | 8 | 20 | 70 | 20 | 57 | 5 | 706 | 26 | 25 | 305 | 33 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 101 | 8 | 20 | 70 | 20 | 57 | 5 | 706 | 26 | 25 | 305 | 33 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 101 | 8 | 20 | 70 | 20 | 57 | 5 | 706 | 26 | 25 | 305 | 33 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 802 | 1114 | 169 | 956 | 1117 | 366 | 338 |  |  | 732 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 802 | 1114 | 169 | 956 | 1117 | 366 | 338 |  |  | 732 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 55 | 96 | 98 | 64 | 90 | 91 | 100 |  |  | 97 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 226 | 200 | 845 | 196 | 199 | 631 | 1218 |  |  | 868 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 129 | 70 | 77 | 358 | 379 | 178 | 186 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 101 | 70 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 20 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 252 | 196 | 404 | 1218 | 1700 | 868 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.51 | 0.36 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.03 | 0.11 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 20.3 | 11.5 | 5.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 33.3 | 33.2 | 16.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | D | D | C | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 33.3 | 24.2 |  | 0.1 |  | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | D | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 51.3\% |  | U Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2029 Background Traffic 1: Renaud Rd \& Fern Casey

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | 4 |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | \% | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 199 | 400 | 59 | 30 | 200 | 18 | 34 | 17 | 17 | 6 | 30 | 178 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 199 | 400 | 59 | 30 | 200 | 18 | 34 | 17 | 17 | 6 | 30 | 178 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 199 | 400 | 59 | 30 | 200 | 18 | 34 | 17 | 17 | 6 | 30 | 178 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC, conflicting volume | 218 |  |  | 459 |  |  | 1280 | 1106 | 430 | 1092 | 1126 | 209 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 218 |  |  | 459 |  |  | 1280 | 1106 | 430 | 1092 | 1126 | 209 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| po queue free \% | 85 |  |  | 97 |  |  | 60 | 90 | 97 | 96 | 82 | 79 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1352 |  |  | 1102 |  |  | 84 | 175 | 626 | 150 | 170 | 831 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 199 | 459 | 30 | 218 | 68 | 6 | 208 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 199 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 34 | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 59 | 0 | 18 | 17 | 0 | 178 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1352 | 1700 | 1102 | 1700 | 129 | 150 | 532 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.15 | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.53 | 0.04 | 0.39 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 19.1 | 0.9 | 14.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.1 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 60.4 | 29.9 | 16.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  | F | D | C |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 2.5 |  | 1.0 |  | 60.4 | 16.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | F | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 60.0\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2029 Background Traffic 3: Fern Casey \& Axis Way


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2029 Background Traffic 6: Mer Bleue Rd \& Renaud Rd PM Peak

|  | 4 |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\dagger$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 465 | 92 | 75 | 383 | 422 | 222 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 465 | 92 | 75 | 383 | 422 | 222 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 465 | 92 | 75 | 383 | 422 | 222 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 557 | 458 | 644 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 465 | 75 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 92 | 0 | 222 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.12 | 0.11 | -0.17 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 7.0 | 7.1 | 6.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 1.08 | 0.90 | 1.20 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 526 | 495 | 543 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 89.5 | 46.1 | 129.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 89.5 | 46.1 | 129.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F | E | F |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 93.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 106.5\% |  | CU Level | Service | G |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6429 Renaud Rd - 2029 Background Traffic 8: Axis Way/Decoeur \& Mer Bleue



Appendix F: Sidra Intersection Capacity Analysis
Existing, Background 2024 Forecast, Background 2029 Forecast

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: Existing AM - Brian Coburn / Fern Casey
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles <br> veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Belcourt men er kin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 66 | 2.0 | 0.154 | 10.0 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.4 | 0.26 | 0.54 | 56.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 139 | 2.0 | 0.154 | 4.6 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.4 | 0.26 | 0.54 | 57.8 |
| Appr |  | 204 | 2.0 | 0.154 | 6.3 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.4 | 0.26 | 0.54 | 57.5 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 127 | 2.0 | 0.443 | 10.0 | LOS A | 3.5 | 27.0 | 0.31 | 0.47 | 59.0 |
| 6 | T1 | 523 | 2.0 | 0.443 | 4.8 | LOS A | 3.5 | 27.0 | 0.31 | 0.47 | 60.1 |
| Approach |  | 650 | 2.0 | 0.443 | 5.8 | LOS A | 3.5 | 27.0 | 0.31 | 0.47 | 59.9 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 12 | T1 | 90 | 2.0 | 0.204 | 5.0 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.6 | 0.32 | 0.49 | 60.9 |
| 12 |  | 171 | 2.0 | 0.204 | 4.8 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.6 | 0.32 | 0.49 | 55.7 |
| Approach |  | 261 | 2.0 | 0.204 | 4.9 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.6 | 0.32 | 0.49 | 58.1 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1116 | 2.0 | 0.443 | 5.7 | LOS A | 3.5 | 27.0 | 0.30 | 0.49 | 59.2 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Degree of Saturation (SIDRA METHOD).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on degree of saturation per movement
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on worst degree of saturation for any vehicle movement.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 6.1 | Copyright © 2000-2015 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
Organisation: CASTLEGLENN CONSULTANTS | Processed: Thursday, July 23, 2020 3:43:40 PM
Project: R:ICastleGlenn\Projects\Ontario Projects\Ottawal7252 - Terrace Flats - Richcraft TE TIAITraffic\CDP Sidra Analysis\Terrace Flats Existing Analysis.sip6

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: Existing AM - BCB/Mer Bleue

New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 11 | 3.0 | 0.130 | 10.9 | LOS B | 0.5 | 3.9 | 0.38 | 0.50 | 59.4 |
| 8 | T1 | 194 | 3.0 | 0.130 | 5.1 | LOS A | 0.5 | 3.9 | 0.38 | 0.51 | 59.4 |
| 18 | R2 | 93 | 3.0 | 0.130 | 5.0 | LOS A | 0.5 | 3.9 | 0.37 | 0.52 | 57.9 |
| Appr |  | 299 | 3.0 | 0.130 | 5.3 | LOS A | 0.5 | 3.9 | 0.38 | 0.51 | 59.0 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 53 | 3.0 | 0.976 | 26.6 | LOS C | 27.4 | 213.3 | 1.00 | 1.35 | 48.5 |
| 6 | T1 | 520 | 3.0 | 0.976 | 20.9 | LOS C | 27.4 | 213.3 | 1.00 | 1.35 | 48.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 481 | 3.0 | 0.976 | 20.6 | LOS C | 27.4 | 213.3 | 1.00 | 1.35 | 47.2 |
| Appr |  | 1054 | 3.0 | 0.976 | 21.1 | LOS C | 27.4 | 213.3 | 1.00 | 1.35 | 47.8 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 97 | 3.0 | 0.211 | 11.7 | LOS B | 0.9 | 7.3 | 0.62 | 0.73 | 56.4 |
| 4 | T1 | 146 | 3.0 | 0.211 | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.7 | 0.61 | 0.65 | 57.5 |
| 14 | R2 | 119 | 3.0 | 0.211 | 5.5 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.7 | 0.61 | 0.58 | 56.8 |
| Appr |  | 361 | 3.0 | 0.211 | 7.3 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.7 | 0.61 | 0.65 | 57.0 |
| West: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 106 | 3.0 | 0.229 | 11.1 | LOS B | 1.0 | 7.7 | 0.44 | 0.63 | 57.7 |
| 2 | T1 | 106 | 3.0 | 0.229 | 5.4 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.7 | 0.44 | 0.63 | 57.5 |
| 12 | R2 | 18 | 3.0 | 0.229 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.7 | 0.44 | 0.63 | 55.8 |
| Approach |  | 229 | 3.0 | 0.229 | 8.0 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.7 | 0.44 | 0.63 | 57.4 |
| All Ve |  | 1943 | 3.0 | 0.976 | 14.5 | LOS B | 27.4 | 213.3 | 0.77 | 1.01 | 51.9 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 6.1 | Copyright © 2000-2015 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: Existing AM - Brian Coburn / Navan

New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 524 | 3.0 | 0.406 | 5.6 | LOS A | 3.1 | 24.2 | 0.35 | 0.48 | 57.4 |
| 18 | R2 | 18 | 3.0 | 0.406 | 5.2 | LOS A | 3.1 | 24.2 | 0.35 | 0.48 | 56.2 |
| Appr |  | 542 | 3.0 | 0.406 | 5.6 | LOS A | 3.1 | 24.2 | 0.35 | 0.48 | 57.4 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 158 | 3.0 | 0.787 | 17.3 | LOS B | 8.6 | 66.9 | 0.95 | 1.16 | 51.3 |
| 16 | R2 | 493 | 3.0 | 0.787 | 13.1 | LOS B | 8.6 | 66.9 | 0.95 | 1.16 | 50.6 |
| Approach |  | 651 | 3.0 | 0.787 | 14.1 | LOS B | 8.6 | 66.9 | 0.95 | 1.16 | 50.8 |
| North: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 80 | 3.0 | 0.291 | 9.9 | LOS A | 1.9 | 15.0 | 0.46 | 0.58 | 55.9 |
| 4 | T1 | 248 | 3.0 | 0.291 | 6.0 | LOS A | 1.9 | 15.0 | 0.46 | 0.58 | 56.3 |
| Appr |  | 328 | 3.0 | 0.291 | 6.9 | LOS A | 1.9 | 15.0 | 0.46 | 0.58 | 56.2 |
| All V |  | 1521 | 3.0 | 0.787 | 9.5 | LOS A | 8.6 | 66.9 | 0.63 | 0.79 | 54.1 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: Existing PM - Brian Coburn / Fern Casey
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles <br> veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 17 | 2.0 | 0.162 | 10.3 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.4 | 0.35 | 0.54 | 57.5 |
| 18 | R2 | 181 | 2.0 | 0.162 | 4.9 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.4 | 0.35 | 0.54 | 58.5 |
| Appr |  | 198 | 2.0 | 0.162 | 5.3 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.4 | 0.35 | 0.54 | 58.4 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 133 | 2.0 | 0.221 | 9.7 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.7 | 0.11 | 0.51 | 59.2 |
| 6 | T1 | 218 | 2.0 | 0.221 | 4.5 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.7 | 0.11 | 0.51 | 60.2 |
| Approach |  | 351 | 2.0 | 0.221 | 6.5 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.7 | 0.11 | 0.51 | 59.9 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1 | 154 | 2.0 | 0.220 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.0 | 0.32 | 0.49 | 60.8 |
| 12 | R2 | 129 | 2.0 | 0.220 | 4.8 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.0 | 0.32 | 0.49 | 55.5 |
| Appr |  | 283 | 2.0 | 0.220 | 5.0 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.0 | 0.32 | 0.49 | 59.1 |
| All V |  | 832 | 2.0 | 0.221 | 5.7 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.7 | 0.24 | 0.51 | 59.3 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Degree of Saturation (SIDRA METHOD).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on degree of saturation per movement
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on worst degree of saturation for any vehicle movement.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: Existing PM - BCB/Mer Bleue

New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles $\qquad$ | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 30 | 3.0 | 0.299 | 12.5 | LOS B | 1.1 | 8.8 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 57.8 |
| 8 | T1 | 373 | 3.0 | 0.299 | 6.4 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.0 | 0.60 | 0.64 | 58.1 |
| 18 | R2 | 109 | 3.0 | 0.299 | 6.0 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.0 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 56.7 |
| Appr |  | 512 | 3.0 | 0.299 | 6.7 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.0 | 0.60 | 0.63 | 57.8 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 41 | 3.0 | 0.559 | 12.8 | LOS B | 3.6 | 27.8 | 0.68 | 0.79 | 58.3 |
| 6 | T1 | 172 | 3.0 | 0.559 | 7.1 | LOS A | 3.6 | 27.8 | 0.68 | 0.79 | 58.1 |
| 16 | R2 | 297 | 3.0 | 0.559 | 6.8 | LOS A | 3.6 | 27.8 | 0.68 | 0.79 | 56.4 |
| Appr |  | 510 | 3.0 | 0.559 | 7.4 | LOS A | 3.6 | 27.8 | 0.68 | 0.79 | 57.1 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 526 | 3.0 | 0.416 | 10.8 | LOS B | 2.4 | 18.9 | 0.49 | 0.70 | 55.0 |
| 4 | T1 | 111 | 3.0 | 0.264 | 5.3 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.7 | 0.44 | 0.55 | 59.6 |
| 14 | R2 | 149 | 3.0 | 0.264 | 5.3 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.7 | 0.44 | 0.55 | 57.6 |
| Approach |  | 786 | 3.0 | 0.416 | 9.0 | LOS A | 2.4 | 18.9 | 0.47 | 0.65 | 56.1 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 28 | 3.0 | 0.419 | 12.8 | LOS B | 1.9 | 14.9 | 0.64 | 0.70 | 57.8 |
| 2 | T1 | 296 | 3.0 | 0.419 | 7.1 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.9 | 0.64 | 0.70 | 57.7 |
| 12 | R2 | 12 | 3.0 | 0.419 | 6.8 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.9 | 0.64 | 0.70 | 56.0 |
| Appr |  | 336 | 3.0 | 0.419 | 7.6 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.9 | 0.64 | 0.70 | 57.6 |
| All Ve |  | 2143 | 3.0 | 0.559 | 7.8 | LOS A | 3.6 | 27.8 | 0.58 | 0.69 | 56.9 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: Existing PM - Brian Coburn / Navan

New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| South: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 313 | 3.0 | 0.524 | 8.8 | LOS A | 3.7 | 28.8 | 0.79 | 0.88 | 55.5 |
| 18 | R2 | 102 | 3.0 | 0.524 | 8.4 | LOS A | 3.7 | 28.8 | 0.79 | 0.88 | 54.3 |
| Appr |  | 416 | 3.0 | 0.524 | 8.7 | LOS A | 3.7 | 28.8 | 0.79 | 0.88 | 55.2 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 100 | 3.0 | 0.277 | 10.7 | LOS B | 1.5 | 12.1 | 0.57 | 0.72 | 55.7 |
| 16 | R2 | 160 | 3.0 | 0.277 | 6.4 | LOS A | 1.5 | 12.1 | 0.57 | 0.72 | 54.9 |
| Approach |  | 260 | 3.0 | 0.277 | 8.0 | LOS A | 1.5 | 12.1 | 0.57 | 0.72 | 55.2 |
| North: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 472 | 3.0 | 0.811 | 10.4 | LOS B | 14.4 | 111.8 | 0.91 | 0.57 | 53.9 |
| 4 | T1 | 614 | 3.0 | 0.811 | 6.5 | LOS A | 14.4 | 111.8 | 0.91 | 0.57 | 54.2 |
| Appr |  | 1087 | 3.0 | 0.811 | 8.2 | LOS A | 14.4 | 111.8 | 0.91 | 0.57 | 54.1 |
| All Ve |  | 1762 | 3.0 | 0.811 | 8.3 | LOS A | 14.4 | 111.8 | 0.83 | 0.67 | 54.5 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Background AM - Mer Bleue/Decoeur
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dem Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 8 | 3.0 | 0.546 | 10.8 | LOS B | 4.8 | 37.4 | 0.52 | 0.47 | 58.7 |
| 8 | T1 | 706 | 3.0 | 0.546 | 5.0 | LOS A | 4.8 | 37.4 | 0.52 | 0.47 | 58.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 26 | 3.0 | 0.546 | 4.8 | LOS A | 4.8 | 37.4 | 0.52 | 0.47 | 56.9 |
| Appr |  | 740 | 3.0 | 0.546 | 5.1 | LOS A | 4.8 | 37.4 | 0.52 | 0.47 | 58.5 |
| East: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 70 | 3.0 | 0.194 | 12.6 | LOS B | 0.8 | 6.6 | 0.66 | 0.82 | 56.7 |
| 6 | T1 | 20 | 3.0 | 0.194 | 6.8 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.6 | 0.66 | 0.82 | 56.6 |
| 16 | R2 | 57 | 3.0 | 0.194 | 6.6 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.6 | 0.66 | 0.82 | 55.0 |
| Appr |  | 147 | 3.0 | 0.194 | 9.5 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.6 | 0.66 | 0.82 | 56.0 |
| North: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 25 | 3.0 | 0.266 | 10.4 | LOS B | 1.7 | 13.5 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 59.7 |
| 4 | T1 | 305 | 3.0 | 0.266 | 4.6 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.5 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 59.6 |
| 14 | R2 | 33 | 3.0 | 0.266 | 4.4 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.5 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 57.8 |
| Approach |  | 363 | 3.0 | 0.266 | 4.9 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.5 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 59.4 |
| West: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 101 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 11.4 | LOS B | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.49 | 0.71 | 56.0 |
| 2 | T1 | 8 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 5.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.49 | 0.71 | 55.9 |
| 12 | R2 | 20 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 5.5 | LOS A | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.49 | 0.71 | 54.3 |
| Appr |  | 129 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 10.1 | LOS B | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.49 | 0.71 | 55.7 |
| All V |  | 1379 | 3.0 | 0.546 | 6.0 | LOS A | 4.8 | 37.4 | 0.48 | 0.53 | 58.2 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 6.1 | Copyright © 2000-2015 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
Organisation: CASTLEGLENN CONSULTANTS | Processed: Monday, December 07, 2020 3:34:58 PM
Project: R:ICastleGlennlProjectslOntario ProjectslOttawal7252-Terrace Flats - Richcraft TE TIAlTrafficlSidral2029 Background103-Terrace Flats 2029
Background AM Analysis.sip6

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Background AM - Brian Coburn (2-lane) / Fern Casey
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Belcourt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 148 | 2.0 | 0.262 | 10.0 | LOS B | 1.6 | 12.5 | 0.29 | 0.55 | 56.0 |
| 18 | R2 | 212 | 2.0 | 0.262 | 4.6 | LOS A | 1.6 | 12.5 | 0.29 | 0.55 | 57.4 |
| Appr |  | 360 | 2.0 | 0.262 | 6.8 | LOS A | 1.6 | 12.5 | 0.29 | 0.55 | 56.9 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 151 | 2.0 | 0.462 | 10.5 | LOS B | 3.4 | 26.3 | 0.47 | 0.55 | 58.1 |
| 6 | T1 | 451 | 2.0 | 0.462 | 5.4 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.3 | 0.47 | 0.55 | 59.3 |
| Approach |  | 602 | 2.0 | 0.462 | 6.6 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.3 | 0.47 | 0.55 | 59.1 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1R2 | 85 | 2.0 | 0.226 | 5.2 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.0 | 0.37 | 0.51 | 60.8 |
| 12 |  | 195 | 2.0 | 0.226 | 4.9 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.0 | 0.37 | 0.51 | 55.4 |
| Approach |  | 280 | 2.0 | 0.226 | 5.0 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.0 | 0.37 | 0.51 | 57.7 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1242 | 2.0 | 0.462 | 6.3 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.3 | 0.39 | 0.54 | 58.3 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2029 Background AM - Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn (2-lane)

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back of <br> Vehicles <br> veh | Queue <br> Distance | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 17 | 2.0 | 0.312 | 11.5 | LOS B | 1.4 | 10.6 | 0.51 | 0.53 | 60.4 |
| 8 | T1 | 566 | 2.0 | 0.312 | 5.4 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.8 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 58.7 |
| 18 | R2 | 104 | 2.0 | 0.312 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.8 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 57.0 |
| Appr |  | 687 | 2.0 | 0.312 | 5.5 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.8 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 58.5 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 51 | 2.0 | 1.187 | 103.9 | LOS F | 60.5 | 467.5 | 1.00 | 3.37 | 23.4 |
| 6 | T1 | 450 | 2.0 | 1.187 | 98.0 | LOS F | 60.5 | 467.5 | 1.00 | 3.37 | 29.3 |
| 16 | R2 | 468 | 2.0 | 1.187 | 97.9 | LOS F | 60.5 | 467.5 | 1.00 | 3.37 | 23.9 |
| Appr |  | 969 | 2.0 | 1.187 | 98.2 | LOS F | 60.5 | 467.5 | 1.00 | 3.37 | 26.5 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 151 | 2.0 | 0.282 | 11.4 | LOS B | 1.4 | 10.6 | 0.58 | 0.69 | 56.9 |
| 4 | T1 | 284 | 2.0 | 0.282 | 5.3 | LOS A | 1.4 | 11.0 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 57.7 |
| 14 | R2 | 135 | 2.0 | 0.282 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.4 | 11.0 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 59.1 |
| Approach |  | 570 | 2.0 | 0.282 | 6.9 | LOS A | 1.4 | 11.0 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 57.9 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 167 | 2.0 | 0.317 | 11.7 | LOS B | 1.4 | 10.7 | 0.55 | 0.72 | 58.9 |
| 2 | T1 | 111 | 2.0 | 0.317 | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.7 | 0.55 | 0.72 | 58.8 |
| 12 | R2 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.317 | 5.7 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.7 | 0.55 | 0.72 | 57.2 |
| Appr |  | 293 | 2.0 | 0.317 | 9.2 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.7 | 0.55 | 0.72 | 58.8 |
| All V |  | 2519 | 2.0 | 1.187 | 41.9 | LOS D | 60.5 | 467.5 | 0.71 | 1.66 | 39.4 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Background AM - Brian Coburn (2-lane) / Navan
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Navan ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 676 | 3.0 | 0.590 | 6.5 | LOS A | 5.2 | 40.4 | 0.65 | 0.61 | 56.0 |
| 18 | R2 | 15 | 3.0 | 0.590 | 6.1 | LOS A | 5.2 | 40.4 | 0.65 | 0.61 | 54.8 |
| Appr |  | 691 | 3.0 | 0.590 | 6.5 | LOS A | 5.2 | 40.4 | 0.65 | 0.61 | 56.0 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 135 | 3.0 | 1.034 | 48.7 | LOS F | 25.5 | 199.0 | 1.00 | 1.91 | 35.7 |
| 16 | R2 | 571 | 3.0 | 1.034 | 44.5 | LOS F | 25.5 | 199.0 | 1.00 | 1.91 | 35.4 |
| Approach |  | 706 | 3.0 | 1.034 | 45.3 | LOS D | 25.5 | 199.0 | 1.00 | 1.91 | 35.4 |
| North: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 178 | 3.0 | 0.405 | 9.8 | LOS A | 3.2 | 25.0 | 0.49 | 0.59 | 55.5 |
| 4 | T1 | 307 | 3.0 | 0.405 | 5.9 | LOS A | 3.2 | 25.0 | 0.49 | 0.59 | 55.9 |
| Appr |  | 485 | 3.0 | 0.405 | 7.3 | LOS A | 3.2 | 25.0 | 0.49 | 0.59 | 55.8 |
| All V |  | 1882 | 3.0 | 1.034 | 21.3 | LOS C | 25.5 | 199.0 | 0.74 | 1.09 | 46.0 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Background AM - Brian Coburn / Navan (4-lane)
New Site
Roundabout


Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2029 Background AM - Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn (4-lane)

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back of Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 17 | 2.0 | 0.309 | 11.5 | LOS B | 1.3 | 10.2 | 0.50 | 0.53 | 60.5 |
| 8 | T1 | 566 | 2.0 | 0.309 | 5.4 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.4 | 0.49 | 0.52 | 58.8 |
| 18 | R2 | 104 | 2.0 | 0.309 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.4 | 0.48 | 0.51 | 57.1 |
| Appr |  | 687 | 2.0 | 0.309 | 5.5 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.4 | 0.49 | 0.52 | 58.6 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 51 | 2.0 | 0.516 | 13.3 | LOS B | 2.7 | 20.5 | 0.69 | 0.76 | 56.9 |
| 6 | T1 | 450 | 2.0 | 0.516 | 7.2 | LOS A | 2.8 | 21.4 | 0.69 | 0.76 | 59.5 |
| 16 | R2 | 468 | 2.0 | 0.516 | 6.6 | LOS A | 2.8 | 21.4 | 0.68 | 0.77 | 56.8 |
| Appr |  | 969 | 2.0 | 0.516 | 7.3 | LOS A | 2.8 | 21.4 | 0.68 | 0.76 | 58.2 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 151 | 2.0 | 0.280 | 11.7 | LOS B | 1.2 | 9.4 | 0.55 | 0.71 | 56.9 |
| 4 | T1 | 284 | 2.0 | 0.280 | 5.4 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.7 | 0.54 | 0.61 | 57.9 |
| 14 | R2 | 135 | 2.0 | 0.280 | 5.2 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.7 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 59.2 |
| Approach |  | 570 | 2.0 | 0.280 | 7.0 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.7 | 0.55 | 0.62 | 58.0 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 167 | 2.0 | 0.147 | 11.1 | LOS B | 0.6 | 4.4 | 0.46 | 0.74 | 57.6 |
| 2 | T1 | 111 | 2.0 | 0.132 | 5.4 | LOS A | 0.5 | 3.8 | 0.47 | 0.52 | 60.8 |
| 12 | R2 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.132 | 5.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 3.8 | 0.47 | 0.52 | 59.0 |
| Appr |  | 293 | 2.0 | 0.147 | 8.7 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.4 | 0.46 | 0.65 | 58.8 |
| All V |  | 2519 | 2.0 | 0.516 | 6.9 | LOS A | 2.8 | 21.4 | 0.57 | 0.65 | 58.4 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Background PM - Mer Bleue/Decoeur
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 16 | 3.0 | 0.618 | 11.1 | LOS B | 5.9 | 45.8 | 0.63 | 0.51 | 58.1 |
| 8 | T1 | 753 | 3.0 | 0.618 | 5.3 | LOS A | 5.9 | 45.8 | 0.63 | 0.51 | 58.0 |
| 18 | R2 | 47 | 3.0 | 0.618 | 5.1 | LOS A | 5.9 | 45.8 | 0.63 | 0.51 | 56.3 |
| Appr |  | 816 | 3.0 | 0.618 | 5.4 | LOS A | 5.9 | 45.8 | 0.63 | 0.51 | 57.9 |
| East: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 55 | 3.0 | 0.146 | 12.5 | LOS B | 0.6 | 5.0 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 56.5 |
| 6 | T1 | 11 | 3.0 | 0.146 | 6.7 | LOS A | 0.6 | 5.0 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 56.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 38 | 3.0 | 0.146 | 6.6 | LOS A | 0.6 | 5.0 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 54.8 |
| Appr |  | 104 | 3.0 | 0.146 | 9.8 | LOS A | 0.6 | 5.0 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 55.8 |
| North: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 65 | 3.0 | 0.554 | 10.5 | LOS B | 5.6 | 43.5 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 59.0 |
| 4 | T1 | 676 | 3.0 | 0.554 | 4.7 | LOS A | 5.6 | 43.5 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 58.8 |
| 14 | R2 | 64 | 3.0 | 0.554 | 4.5 | LOS A | 5.6 | 43.5 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 57.1 |
| Approach |  | 805 | 3.0 | 0.554 | 5.1 | LOS A | 5.6 | 43.5 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 58.7 |
| West: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 77 | 3.0 | 0.143 | 12.5 | LOS B | 0.6 | 4.7 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 55.8 |
| 2 | T1 | 19 | 3.0 | 0.143 | 6.7 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.7 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 55.7 |
| 12 | R2 | 15 | 3.0 | 0.143 | 6.5 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.7 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 54.2 |
| Appr |  | 111 | 3.0 | 0.143 | 10.7 | LOS B | 0.6 | 4.7 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 55.6 |
| All V |  | 1836 | 3.0 | 0.618 | 5.8 | LOS A | 5.9 | 45.8 | 0.55 | 0.52 | 58.0 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Background PM - Brian Coburn / Fern Casey
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 76 | 2.0 | 0.234 | 10.4 | LOS B | 1.3 | 10.3 | 0.39 | 0.58 | 56.3 |
| 18 | R2 | 210 | 2.0 | 0.234 | 5.0 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.3 | 0.39 | 0.58 | 57.6 |
| Appr |  | 286 | 2.0 | 0.234 | 6.4 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.3 | 0.39 | 0.58 | 57.4 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 221 | 2.0 | 0.295 | 10.0 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.9 | 0.28 | 0.55 | 57.9 |
| 6 | T1 | 194 | 2.0 | 0.295 | 4.8 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.9 | 0.28 | 0.55 | 59.2 |
| Approach |  | 415 | 2.0 | 0.295 | 7.6 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.9 | 0.28 | 0.55 | 58.6 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 212 | T1R2 | 162 | 2.0 | 0.339 | 5.6 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.4 | 0.48 | 0.57 | 60.3 |
|  |  | 237 | 2.0 | 0.339 | 5.3 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.4 | 0.48 | 0.57 | 54.8 |
| Approach |  | 399 | 2.0 | 0.339 | 5.5 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.4 | 0.48 | 0.57 | 57.7 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1100 | 2.0 | 0.339 | 6.5 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.4 | 0.38 | 0.56 | 58.0 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2029 Background PM - Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.442 | 13.3 | LOS B | 2.0 | 15.4 | 0.68 | 0.73 | 59.5 |
| 8 | T1 | 614 | 2.0 | 0.442 | 6.8 | LOS A | 2.1 | 16.2 | 0.68 | 0.69 | 57.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 111 | 2.0 | 0.442 | 6.3 | LOS A | 2.1 | 16.2 | 0.67 | 0.65 | 56.0 |
| Appr |  | 755 | 2.0 | 0.442 | 7.0 | LOS A | 2.1 | 16.2 | 0.68 | 0.69 | 57.5 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 58 | 2.0 | 0.654 | 14.4 | LOS B | 4.2 | 32.7 | 0.79 | 0.94 | 56.6 |
| 6 | T1 | 175 | 2.0 | 0.654 | 8.5 | LOS A | 4.2 | 32.7 | 0.79 | 0.94 | 59.1 |
| 16 | R2 | 288 | 2.0 | 0.654 | 8.4 | LOS A | 4.2 | 32.7 | 0.79 | 0.94 | 55.4 |
| Appr |  | 521 | 2.0 | 0.654 | 9.1 | LOS A | 4.2 | 32.7 | 0.79 | 0.94 | 57.0 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 547 | 2.0 | 0.530 | 11.3 | LOS B | 3.5 | 27.4 | 0.60 | 0.73 | 55.2 |
| 4 | T1 | 520 | 2.0 | 0.530 | 5.1 | LOS A | 3.7 | 28.3 | 0.59 | 0.52 | 58.1 |
| 14 | R2 | 213 | 2.0 | 0.530 | 5.0 | LOS A | 3.7 | 28.3 | 0.59 | 0.50 | 58.9 |
| Approach |  | 1280 | 2.0 | 0.530 | 7.7 | LOS A | 3.7 | 28.3 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 57.0 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 72 | 2.0 | 0.546 | 14.3 | LOS B | 2.6 | 20.0 | 0.75 | 0.87 | 58.9 |
| 2 | T1 | 277 | 2.0 | 0.546 | 8.3 | LOS A | 2.6 | 20.0 | 0.75 | 0.87 | 58.7 |
| 12 | R2 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.546 | 8.2 | LOS A | 2.6 | 20.0 | 0.75 | 0.87 | 57.1 |
| Appr |  | 359 | 2.0 | 0.546 | 9.5 | LOS A | 2.6 | 20.0 | 0.75 | 0.87 | 58.7 |
| All V |  | 2915 | 2.0 | 0.654 | 8.0 | LOS A | 4.2 | 32.7 | 0.67 | 0.72 | 57.4 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2029 Background PM - Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \hline \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue <br> Distance $\qquad$ m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue sec per ven kin kin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.432 | 13.2 | LOS B | 1.9 | 14.7 | 0.67 | 0.73 | 59.5 |
| 8 | T1 | 614 | 2.0 | 0.432 | 6.8 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.4 | 0.66 | 0.69 | 57.7 |
| 18 | R2 | 111 | 2.0 | 0.432 | 6.2 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.4 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 56.1 |
| Appr |  | 755 | 2.0 | 0.432 | 6.9 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.4 | 0.66 | 0.68 | 57.6 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 58 | 2.0 | 0.284 | 12.1 | LOS B | 1.1 | 8.8 | 0.60 | 0.66 | 57.1 |
| 6 | T1 | 175 | 2.0 | 0.284 | 6.1 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.8 | 0.60 | 0.66 | 59.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 288 | 2.0 | 0.284 | 5.7 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.2 | 0.58 | 0.64 | 57.3 |
| Appr |  | 521 | 2.0 | 0.284 | 6.6 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.2 | 0.59 | 0.65 | 58.1 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 547 | 2.0 | 0.523 | 11.3 | LOS B | 3.3 | 25.8 | 0.57 | 0.72 | 55.3 |
| 4 | T1 | 520 | 2.0 | 0.523 | 5.1 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.6 | 0.56 | 0.52 | 58.3 |
| 14 | R2 | 213 | 2.0 | 0.523 | 5.0 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.6 | 0.56 | 0.50 | 59.1 |
| Approach |  | 1280 | 2.0 | 0.523 | 7.7 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.6 | 0.57 | 0.61 | 57.2 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 72 | 2.0 | 0.234 | 12.8 | LOS B | 0.8 | 6.4 | 0.64 | 0.76 | 58.7 |
| 2 | T1 | 277 | 2.0 | 0.234 | 6.1 | LOS A | 0.9 | 6.7 | 0.63 | 0.61 | 59.6 |
| 12 | R2 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.234 | 6.0 | LOS A | 0.9 | 6.7 | 0.62 | 0.55 | 58.3 |
| Appr |  | 359 | 2.0 | 0.234 | 7.5 | LOS A | 0.9 | 6.7 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 59.4 |
| All Ve |  | 2915 | 2.0 | 0.523 | 7.3 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.6 | 0.60 | 0.64 | 57.8 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2029 Background PM - Brian Coburn / Navan

New Site
Roundabout


Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2029 Background PM - Brian Coburn / Navan

New Site
Roundabout


Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2024 Background AM - Brian Coburn / Fern Casey
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg. } \\ & \text { Satn } \\ & \text { v/c } \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Belcourt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 107 | 2.0 | 0.210 | 10.0 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.3 | 0.27 | 0.55 | 56.3 |
| 18 | R2 | 179 | 2.0 | 0.210 | 4.6 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.3 | 0.27 | 0.55 | 57.6 |
| Appr |  | 286 | 2.0 | 0.210 | 6.6 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.3 | 0.27 | 0.55 | 57.2 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 134 | 2.0 | 0.427 | 10.2 | LOS B | 3.1 | 24.1 | 0.38 | 0.51 | 58.5 |
| 6 | T1 | 451 | 2.0 | 0.427 | 5.1 | LOS A | 3.1 | 24.1 | 0.38 | 0.51 | 59.7 |
| Approach |  | 585 | 2.0 | 0.427 | 6.3 | LOS A | 3.1 | 24.1 | 0.38 | 0.51 | 59.5 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1R2 | 85 | 2.0 | 0.208 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.0 | 0.34 | 0.50 | 60.9 |
| 12 |  | 179 | 2.0 | 0.208 | 4.8 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.0 | 0.34 | 0.50 | 55.6 |
| Approach |  | 264 | 2.0 | 0.208 | 4.9 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.0 | 0.34 | 0.50 | 57.9 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1135 | 2.0 | 0.427 | 6.0 | LOS A | 3.1 | 24.1 | 0.34 | 0.52 | 58.7 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2024 Background AM - Brian Coburn / Navan
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dem Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue <br> Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Navan sec eer veen km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 625 | 3.0 | 0.537 | 6.3 | LOS A | 4.5 | 34.7 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 56.3 |
| 18 | R2 | 15 | 3.0 | 0.537 | 5.9 | LOS A | 4.5 | 34.7 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 55.1 |
| Appr |  | 640 | 3.0 | 0.537 | 6.3 | LOS A | 4.5 | 34.7 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 56.3 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 135 | 3.0 | 0.914 | 25.1 | LOS C | 13.4 | 104.3 | 1.00 | 1.38 | 46.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 530 | 3.0 | 0.914 | 20.8 | LOS C | 13.4 | 104.3 | 1.00 | 1.38 | 45.8 |
| Approach |  | 665 | 3.0 | 0.914 | 21.7 | LOS C | 13.4 | 104.3 | 1.00 | 1.38 | 45.9 |
| North: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 162 | 3.0 | 0.374 | 9.8 | LOS A | 2.8 | 22.1 | 0.48 | 0.59 | 55.6 |
| 4 | T1 | 281 | 3.0 | 0.374 | 5.9 | LOS A | 2.8 | 22.1 | 0.48 | 0.59 | 56.0 |
| Appr |  | 443 | 3.0 | 0.374 | 7.3 | LOS A | 2.8 | 22.1 | 0.48 | 0.59 | 55.8 |
| All V |  | 1748 | 3.0 | 0.914 | 12.4 | LOS B | 13.4 | 104.3 | 0.71 | 0.89 | 51.8 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2024 Background AM - Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back of <br> Vehicles <br> veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 17 | 2.0 | 0.276 | 11.4 | LOS B | 1.2 | 9.1 | 0.48 | 0.52 | 60.6 |
| 8 | T1 | 510 | 2.0 | 0.276 | 5.2 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.2 | 0.47 | 0.51 | 58.9 |
| 18 | R2 | 92 | 2.0 | 0.276 | 5.0 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.2 | 0.46 | 0.50 | 57.2 |
| Appr |  | 619 | 2.0 | 0.276 | 5.4 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.2 | 0.47 | 0.51 | 58.7 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 51 | 2.0 | 1.125 | 77.5 | LOS F | 48.3 | 373.0 | 1.00 | 2.80 | 28.4 |
| 6 | T1 | 447 | 2.0 | 1.125 | 71.5 | LOS F | 48.3 | 373.0 | 1.00 | 2.80 | 34.5 |
| 16 | R2 | 468 | 2.0 | 1.125 | 71.4 | LOS F | 48.3 | 373.0 | 1.00 | 2.80 | 28.7 |
| Appr |  | 966 | 2.0 | 1.125 | 71.8 | LOS E | 48.3 | 373.0 | 1.00 | 2.80 | 31.6 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 151 | 2.0 | 0.268 | 11.5 | LOS B | 1.3 | 9.9 | 0.58 | 0.71 | 56.7 |
| 4 | T1 | 260 | 2.0 | 0.268 | 5.3 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.3 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 57.7 |
| 14 | R2 | 122 | 2.0 | 0.268 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.3 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 59.1 |
| Approach |  | 533 | 2.0 | 0.268 | 7.0 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.3 | 0.57 | 0.61 | 57.8 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 141 | 2.0 | 0.280 | 11.6 | LOS B | 1.2 | 9.2 | 0.52 | 0.70 | 59.1 |
| 2 | T1 | 106 | 2.0 | 0.280 | 5.7 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.2 | 0.52 | 0.70 | 59.0 |
| 12 | R2 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.280 | 5.6 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.2 | 0.52 | 0.70 | 57.4 |
| Appr |  | 262 | 2.0 | 0.280 | 8.9 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.2 | 0.52 | 0.70 | 59.0 |
| All V |  | 2380 | 2.0 | 1.125 | 33.1 | LOS C | 48.3 | 373.0 | 0.71 | 1.48 | 43.0 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2024 Background PM - Brian Coburn / Fern Casey
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles $\qquad$ | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Belcourt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 49 | 2.0 | 0.197 | 10.3 | LOS B | 1.1 | 8.2 | 0.37 | 0.56 | 56.7 |
| 18 | R2 | 190 | 2.0 | 0.197 | 4.9 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.2 | 0.37 | 0.56 | 57.9 |
| Appro |  | 239 | 2.0 | 0.197 | 6.0 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.2 | 0.37 | 0.56 | 57.8 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 184 | 2.0 | 0.258 | 9.8 | LOS A | 1.6 | 12.7 | 0.21 | 0.53 | 58.3 |
| 6 | T1 | 194 | 2.0 | 0.258 | 4.7 | LOS A | 1.6 | 12.7 | 0.21 | 0.53 | 59.6 |
| Approach |  | 378 | 2.0 | 0.258 | 7.2 | LOS A | 1.6 | 12.7 | 0.21 | 0.53 | 59.0 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1 | 162 | 2.0 | 0.300 | 5.4 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.2 | 0.42 | 0.53 | 60.5 |
| 12 | R2 | 206 | 2.0 | 0.300 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.2 | 0.42 | 0.53 | 55.1 |
| Approach |  | 368 | 2.0 | 0.300 | 5.2 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.2 | 0.42 | 0.53 | 58.2 |
| All Vehicles |  | 985 | 2.0 | 0.300 | 6.2 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.2 | 0.33 | 0.54 | 58.4 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2024 Background PM- Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles <br> veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue sec per ven k kmin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.407 | 13.0 | LOS B | 1.8 | 13.7 | 0.66 | 0.71 | 59.6 |
| 8 | T1 | 573 | 2.0 | 0.407 | 6.6 | LOS A | 1.8 | 14.3 | 0.66 | 0.67 | 57.7 |
| 18 | R2 | 102 | 2.0 | 0.407 | 6.1 | LOS A | 1.8 | 14.3 | 0.65 | 0.63 | 56.1 |
| Appr |  | 705 | 2.0 | 0.407 | 6.8 | LOS A | 1.8 | 14.3 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 57.6 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 58 | 2.0 | 0.625 | 14.0 | LOS B | 4.0 | 30.7 | 0.77 | 0.91 | 57.0 |
| 6 | T1 | 169 | 2.0 | 0.625 | 8.1 | LOS A | 4.0 | 30.7 | 0.77 | 0.91 | 59.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 288 | 2.0 | 0.625 | 8.0 | LOS A | 4.0 | 30.7 | 0.77 | 0.91 | 55.6 |
| Appr |  | 515 | 2.0 | 0.625 | 8.7 | LOS A | 4.0 | 30.7 | 0.77 | 0.91 | 57.2 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 547 | 2.0 | 0.495 | 11.2 | LOS B | 3.1 | 24.3 | 0.57 | 0.73 | 55.0 |
| 4 | T1 | 473 | 2.0 | 0.495 | 5.0 | LOS A | 3.3 | 25.2 | 0.55 | 0.50 | 58.5 |
| 14 | R2 | 182 | 2.0 | 0.495 | 4.9 | LOS A | 3.3 | 25.2 | 0.55 | 0.49 | 59.1 |
| Approach |  | 1202 | 2.0 | 0.495 | 7.8 | LOS A | 3.3 | 25.2 | 0.56 | 0.60 | 57.0 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 55 | 2.0 | 0.499 | 13.9 | LOS B | 2.3 | 17.6 | 0.73 | 0.82 | 59.1 |
| 2 | T1 | 274 | 2.0 | 0.499 | 8.0 | LOS A | 2.3 | 17.6 | 0.73 | 0.82 | 59.0 |
| 12 | R2 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.499 | 7.9 | LOS A | 2.3 | 17.6 | 0.73 | 0.82 | 57.4 |
| Appr |  | 339 | 2.0 | 0.499 | 8.9 | LOS A | 2.3 | 17.6 | 0.73 | 0.82 | 59.0 |
| All V |  | 2761 | 2.0 | 0.625 | 7.8 | LOS A | 4.0 | 30.7 | 0.64 | 0.70 | 57.5 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2024 Background PM - Brian Coburn / Navan

New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Navan 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 393 | 3.0 | 0.658 | 10.7 | LOS B | 5.5 | 42.7 | 0.90 | 1.04 | 54.3 |
| 18 | R2 | 87 | 3.0 | 0.658 | 10.3 | LOS B | 5.5 | 42.7 | 0.90 | 1.04 | 53.2 |
| Appr |  | 480 | 3.0 | 0.658 | 10.6 | LOS B | 5.5 | 42.7 | 0.90 | 1.04 | 54.1 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 86 | 3.0 | 0.335 | 11.1 | LOS B | 1.9 | 14.9 | 0.65 | 0.79 | 55.7 |
| 16 | R2 | 202 | 3.0 | 0.335 | 6.8 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.9 | 0.65 | 0.79 | 54.9 |
| Approach |  | 288 | 3.0 | 0.335 | 8.1 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.9 | 0.65 | 0.79 | 55.2 |
| North: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 535 | 3.0 | 0.925 | 10.9 | LOS B | 28.7 | 223.4 | 1.00 | 0.54 | 53.6 |
| 4 | T1 | 742 | 3.0 | 0.925 | 7.0 | LOS A | 28.7 | 223.4 | 1.00 | 0.54 | 53.9 |
| Appr |  | 1277 | 3.0 | 0.925 | 8.7 | LOS A | 28.7 | 223.4 | 1.00 | 0.54 | 53.8 |
| All V |  | 2045 | 3.0 | 0.925 | 9.0 | LOS A | 28.7 | 223.4 | 0.93 | 0.69 | 54.1 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

Appendix G:TDM Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist

# TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist: Residential Developments (multi-family or condominium) 

## Legend

| REQUIRED | The Official Plan or Zoning By-law provides related guidance <br> that must be followed |
| :---: | :--- |
| BASIC | The measure is generally feasible and effective, and in most <br> cases would benefit the development and its users |
| BETTER | The measure could maximize support for users of sustainable <br> modes, and optimize development performance |

$\left.\begin{array}{|ll|l|l|}\hline & \text { TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: } \\ \text { Residential developments }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\text { Check if completed \& } \\ \text { add descriptions, explanations } \\ \text { or plan/drawing references }\end{array}\right\}$

|  | TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: Residential developments |  | Check if completed \& add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | weather protection through canopies, colonnades, and other design elements wherever possible (see Official Plan policy 4.3.12) |  |  |
| REQUIRED | $1.2 .3$ | Provide sidewalks of smooth, well-drained walking surfaces of contrasting materials or treatments to differentiate pedestrian areas from vehicle areas, and provide marked pedestrian crosswalks at intersection sidewalks (see Official Plan policy 4.3.10) |  | Sidewalks to be continuous. Pedestrian Areas crossing local linkages to be demarcated |
| REQUIRED | $1.2 .4$ | Make sidewalks and open space areas easily accessible through features such as gradual grade transition, depressed curbs at street corners and convenient access to extra-wide parking spaces and ramps (see Official Plan policy 4.3.10) |  | Amenity area central and accessible to the development, bordered by sidewalks |
| REQUIRED | 1.2.5 | Include adequately spaced inter-block/street cycling and pedestrian connections to facilitate travel by active transportation. Provide links to the existing or planned network of public sidewalks, multi-use pathways and onroad cycle routes. Where public sidewalks and multi-use pathways intersect with roads, consider providing traffic control devices to give priority to cyclists and pedestrians (see Official Plan policy 4.3.11) |  | Pedestrian connections provided internal to development and between residential buildings. Allows connections to Brian Coburn add Fern Casey |
| BASIC | 1.2.6 | Provide safe, direct and attractive walking routes from building entrances to nearby transit stops |  | Direct walking route to transit stops via sidewalk and boulevard along Fern Casey Street and Brian Coburn Boulevard |
| BASIC | 1.2.7 | Ensure that walking routes to transit stops are secure, visible, lighted, shaded and wind-protected wherever possible | 区 | Walking routes have adequate street lights and visibility |
| BASIC | 1.2.8 | Design roads used for access or circulation by cyclists using a target operating speed of no more than $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, or provide a separated cycling facility |  | Noted for detailed design according to future Design Guidelines and Strategic Road Safety Action Plan Update |
|  | 1.3 | Amenities for walking \& cycling |  |  |
| BASIC | 1.3.1 | Provide lighting, landscaping and benches along walking and cycling routes between building entrances and streets, sidewalks and trails | $\square$ |  |
| BASIC | $1.3 .2$ | Provide wayfinding signage for site access (where required, e.g. when multiple buildings or entrances exist) and egress (where warranted, such as when directions to reach transit stops/stations, trails or other common destinations are not obvious) | $\square$ |  |

$\left.\begin{array}{|lll|l|}\hline & \text { TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: } \\ \text { Residential developments }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l}\text { Check if completed \& } \\ \text { add descriptions, explanations } \\ \text { or plan/drawing references }\end{array}\right\}$

|  | TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: Residential developments |  | Check if completed \& add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4. | RIDESHARING |  |
|  | 4.1 | Pick-up \& drop-off facilities |  |
| BASIC | 4.1.1 | Provide a designated area for carpool drivers (plus taxis and ride-hailing services) to drop off or pick up passengers without using fire lanes or other no-stopping zones | $\square$ |
|  | 5. | CARSHARING \& BIKESHARING |  |
|  | 5.1 | Carshare parking spaces |  |
| BETTER | $5.1 .1$ | Provide up to three carshare parking spaces in an R3, R4 or R5 Zone for specified residential uses (see Zoning By-law Section 94) | $\square$ |
|  | 5.2 | Bikeshare station location |  |
| BETTER | 5.2.1 | Provide a designated bikeshare station area near a major building entrance, preferably lighted and sheltered with a direct walkway connection | $\square$ |
|  | 6. | PARKING |  |
|  | 6.1 | Number of parking spaces |  |
| REQUIRED | 6.1.1 | Do not provide more parking than permitted by zoning, nor less than required by zoning, unless a variance is being applied for | $\boxtimes$ Parking meets minimum required spaces |
| BASIC | 6.1.2 | Provide parking for long-term and short-term users that is consistent with mode share targets, considering the potential for visitors to use off-site public parking | $\square$ |
| BASIC | $6.1 .3$ | Where a site features more than one use, provide shared parking and reduce the cumulative number of parking spaces accordingly (see Zoning By-law Section 104) | $\square$ |
| BETTER | $6.1 .4$ | Reduce the minimum number of parking spaces required by zoning by one space for each 13 square metres of gross floor area provided as shower rooms, change rooms, locker rooms and other facilities for cyclists in conjunction with bicycle parking (see Zoning By-law Section 111) | $\square$ |
|  | 6.2 | Separate long-term \& short-term parking areas |  |
| better | $6.2 .1$ | Provide separate areas for short-term and long-term parking (using signage or physical barriers) to permit access controls and simplify enforcement (i.e. to discourage residents from parking in visitor spaces, and vice versa) | $\square$ |

## TDM Measures Checklist:

Residential Developments (multi-family, condominium or subdivision)



|  | TDM measures: Residential developments |  |  <br> add descriptions |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6. | TDM MARKETING \& COMMUNICATIONS |  |  |

Appendix H: Multi-Modal Level of Service Analysis Details

Table 1: 6429 Renaud Road - Multi-Modal Level of Service - Navan Road and Renaud Road

|  | Intersection Leg |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | West Leg - Renaud Road | East Leg - Renaud Road | North Leg - Navan Road | South Leg - Navan Road |
| Pedestrian LOS (PLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Total Travel Lanes | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Median > 2.4 m | No | No | No | No |
| Island Refuge | No | No | No | No |
| Left Turn Type | Permissive | Permissive | Permissive | Permissive |
| Right Turn Type | Permissive | Permissive | Permissive | Permissive |
| Right Turns on Red | Allowed | Allowed | Allowed | Allowed |
| Leading Pedestrian Interval | No | No | No | No |
| Corner Radius | 10 to 15 m | 10 to 15 m | 3 to 5 m | 10 to 15 m |
| Right Turn Channel | No Right Turn Channel (-4) | No Right Turn Channel (-4) | No Right Turn Channel (-4) | Conventional Right Turn Channel without receiving lane (0) |
| Crosswalk Treatment | Standard Transverse | Standard <br> Transverse | Standard Transverse | Standard Transverse |
| PETSI Points | -16 | 33 | 35 | 37 |
| Existing Pedestrian Delay (s) | 24 | 24 | 28 | 28 |
| Intersection PLOS | F | E | E | E |
| Target PLOS | C | C | C | C |
| Bicycle LOS (BLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Bikeway Type | Pocket Bike Lane | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic |
| Left Turn Lane Configuration of Approach | One lane crossed | One lane crossed | One lane crossed | One lane crossed |
| Right Turn Lane Configuration of Approach | Exclusive RT, right of bike lane | Shared $\mathrm{Th} / \mathrm{RT}$ | Shared Th/RT | Exclusive RT |
| Length of Right Turn Lane | > 50 | N/A | N/A | 25-50 |
| Turning Speed of Right Turning Vehicles | $<25$ | $<25$ | $<25$ | $<25$ |
| Operating Speed (km/h) | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Intersection BLOS | E | F | F | F |
| Target BLOS | D | D | C | C |
| Transit LOS (TLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Delay (2024 Development + Background) | 19.4 (EB-Th, PM) | $\begin{gathered} 41.0 \text { (WB-Th/RT, } \\ \text { AM) } \end{gathered}$ | $28.4(\mathrm{SB}-\mathrm{Th} / \mathrm{RT}$, $\mathrm{AM})$ $26.1(\mathrm{SB}-\mathrm{Th} / \mathrm{RT}, \mathrm{PM})$ | 19.3 (NB-Th/RT, PM) |
| Delay (2029 Development + Background) | 25.8 (EB-Th, PM) | $\begin{gathered} 51.4 \text { (WB-Th/RT, } \\ \text { AM) } \end{gathered}$ | $28.4(\mathrm{SB}-\mathrm{Th} / \mathrm{RT}$, $\mathrm{AM})$ $26.3(\mathrm{SB}-\mathrm{Th} / \mathrm{RT}, \mathrm{PM})$ | 20.0 (NB-Th/RT, PM) |
| Intersection TLOS | C | F | C | C |
| Target TLOS | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Truck LOS (TkLOS) |  |  |  |  |
| Effective Corner Radius $(\mathrm{m})$ | 10 to 15 m | 10 to 15 m | 3 to 5 m | 10 to 15 m |
| Number of Receiving <br> Lanes on Departing Leg | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Intersection TkLOS | E | E | F | E |
| Target TkLOS | No Target | No Target | D | D |

# Appendix I: Synchro Intersection Capacity Analyis 2024 Design Forecast, 2029 Design Forecast 

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\cdots$ | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | \% | * | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | 7 | F |  |  | \$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 119 | 182 | 11 | 5 | 264 | 45 | 37 | 19 | 19 | 9 | 5 | 156 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 119 | 182 | 11 | 5 | 264 | 45 | 37 | 19 | 19 | 9 | 5 | 156 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 119 | 182 | 11 | 5 | 264 | 45 | 37 | 19 | 19 | 9 | 5 | 156 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 309 |  |  | 193 |  |  | 858 | 744 | 188 | 745 | 728 | 286 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 309 |  |  | 193 |  |  | 858 | 744 | 188 | 745 | 728 | 286 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { tC, single (s) } & 4.1 & 4.1 & 7.1 & 6.5 & 6.2 & 7.1\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 90 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 82 | 94 | 98 | 97 | 98 | 79 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1252 |  |  | 1380 |  |  | 201 | 309 | 855 | 285 | 316 | 753 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 119 | 193 | 5 | 309 | 75 | 9 | 161 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 119 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 37 | 9 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 11 | 0 | 45 | 19 | 0 | 156 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1252 | 1700 | 1380 | 1700 | 280 | 285 | 722 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.22 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.7 | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.2 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 22.5 | 18.1 | 11.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  | C | C | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 3.1 |  | 0.1 |  | 22.5 | 11.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | C | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 5.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 52.7\% |  | U Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | V | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | \% | , | $\frac{1}{7}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 26 | 4 | 5 | 44 | 1 | 73 | 2 | 243 | 26 | 69 | 288 | 12 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 26 | 4 | 5 | 44 | 1 | 73 | 2 | 243 | 26 | 69 | 288 | 12 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 26 | 4 | 5 | 44 | 1 | 73 | 2 | 243 | 26 | 69 | 288 | 12 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 752 | 705 | 294 | 693 | 698 | 256 | 300 |  |  | 269 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 752 | 705 | 294 | 693 | 698 | 256 | 300 |  |  | 269 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 91 | 99 | 99 | 87 | 100 | 91 | 100 |  |  | 95 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 283 | 341 | 745 | 337 | 344 | 783 | 1261 |  |  | 1295 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 35 | 118 | 2 | 269 | 69 | 300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 26 | 44 | 2 | 0 | 69 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 5 | 73 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 317 | 521 | 1261 | 1700 | 1295 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.11 | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.05 | 0.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 2.8 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 17.8 | 13.9 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | C | B | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 17.8 | 13.9 | 0.1 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 37.4\% |  | U Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | 4 | $\cdots$ | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 257 | 61 | 84 | 382 | 228 | 196 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 257 | 61 | 84 | 382 | 228 | 196 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 257 | 61 | 84 | 382 | 228 | 196 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 318 | 466 | 424 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 257 | 84 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 61 | 0 | 196 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.09 | 0.11 | -0.24 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.4 | 5.8 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, $x$ | 0.56 | 0.75 | 0.65 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 523 | 601 | 616 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 17.2 | 24.1 | 18.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 17.2 | 24.1 | 18.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C | C | C |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 20.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 80.4\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | D |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |





|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | V | 6 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | \% | , | $\frac{1}{7}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | \% |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 26 | 4 | 5 | 62 | 1 | 135 | 2 | 271 | 24 | 69 | 296 | 12 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 26 | 4 | 5 | 62 | 1 | 135 | 2 | 271 | 24 | 69 | 296 | 12 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 26 | 4 | 5 | 62 | 1 | 135 | 2 | 271 | 24 | 69 | 296 | 12 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 850 | 739 | 302 | 728 | 733 | 283 | 308 |  |  | 295 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 850 | 739 | 302 | 728 | 733 | 283 | 308 |  |  | 295 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 88 | 99 | 99 | 81 | 100 | 82 | 100 |  |  | 95 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 220 | 326 | 738 | 319 | 328 | 756 | 1253 |  |  | 1266 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 35 | 198 | 2 | 295 | 69 | 308 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 26 | 62 | 2 | 0 | 69 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 5 | 135 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 255 | 527 | 1253 | 1700 | 1266 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.14 | 0.38 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.05 | 0.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.6 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 21.4 | 15.9 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | C | C | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 21.4 | 15.9 | 0.1 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 4.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 42.7\% |  | U Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | $\downarrow$ | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\dagger$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 295 | 32 | 69 | 374 | 208 | 194 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 295 | 32 | 69 | 374 | 208 | 194 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 295 | 32 | 69 | 374 | 208 | 194 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 327 | 443 | 402 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 295 | 69 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 32 | 0 | 194 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.17 | 0.11 | -0.26 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.3 | 5.8 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.57 | 0.71 | 0.62 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 526 | 600 | 625 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 17.5 | 21.8 | 17.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 17.5 | 21.8 | 17.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C | C | C |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 18.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 78.2\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | D |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |




C Critical Lane Group



|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \% | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ | ( | 1 | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  |  | \$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 169 | 429 | 39 | 20 | 174 | 13 | 23 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 161 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 169 | 429 | 39 | 20 | 174 | 13 | 23 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 161 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 169 | 429 | 39 | 20 | 174 | 13 | 23 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 161 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 187 |  |  | 468 |  |  | 1172 | 1014 | 448 | 1004 | 1026 | 180 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 187 | 468 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 448 |  | 1026 | 180 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 88 |  |  | 98 |  |  | 80 | 95 | 98 | 92 | 90 | 81 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1387 |  |  | 1094 |  |  | 114 | 206 | 610 | 186 | 202 | 862 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 169 | 468 | 20 | 187 | 45 | 14 | 181 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 169 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 23 | 14 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 39 | 0 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 161 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1387 | 1700 | 1094 | 1700 | 165 | 186 | 634 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.12 | 0.28 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.27 | 0.08 | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 1.8 | 8.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 34.9 | 25.9 | 12.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  | D | D | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 2.1 |  | 0.8 |  | 34.9 | 13.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | D | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 57.9\% |  | U Level | Service |  |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | 4 | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 4 | 1 | $\pm$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 个 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 450 | 88 | 64 | 375 | 415 | 204 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 450 | 88 | 64 | 375 | 415 | 204 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 450 | 88 | 64 | 375 | 415 | 204 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 538 | 439 | 619 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 450 | 64 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 88 | 0 | 204 |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | 0.12 | 0.11 | -0.16 |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.9 | 7.1 | 6.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, $x$ | 1.04 | 0.86 | 1.15 |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 523 | 503 | 551 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 76.2 | 40.4 | 109.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 76.2 | 40.4 | 109.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F | E | F |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 79.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 102.7\% |  | CU Level | Service | G |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



c Critical Lane Group


|  | $\psi$ |  | 4 | 9 | $\frac{1}{7}$ | $\pm$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 4 | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 257 | 61 | 84 | 382 | 228 | 196 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 257 | 61 | 84 | 382 | 228 | 196 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |  |
| Total Lost time (s) | 5.2 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1679 | 1517 | 1695 | 1733 | 1784 | 1517 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.62 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1679 | 1517 | 1100 | 1733 | 1784 | 1517 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 257 | 61 | 84 | 382 | 228 | 196 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 257 | 14 | 84 | 382 | 228 | 115 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 5\% | 2\% | 2\% |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | Perm | NA | NA | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  |  | 2 | 6 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 14.3 | 14.3 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 35.7 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 14.3 | 14.3 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 35.7 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.59 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 5.2 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 395 | 357 | 646 | 1019 | 1049 | 892 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.15 |  |  | c0.22 | 0.13 |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | 0.01 | 0.08 |  |  | 0.08 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.65 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.37 | 0.22 | 0.13 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 20.9 | 17.9 | 5.6 | 6.6 | 5.9 | 5.6 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 0.3 |  |
| Delay (s) | 24.8 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 7.7 | 6.4 | 5.9 |  |
| Level of Service | C | B | A | A | A | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 23.5 |  |  | 7.4 | 6.1 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A | A |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  |  | 11.2 |  | M 2000 | evel of Service | B |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.45 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 60.7 |  | of lo | me (s) | 10.7 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 46.1\% |  | Leve | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |







C Critical Lane Group

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | \% | ( | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 31 | 2 | 3 | 74 | 4 | 117 | 4 | 220 | 64 | 169 | 283 | 87 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 31 | 2 | 3 | 74 | 4 | 117 | 4 | 220 | 64 | 169 | 283 | 87 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 31 | 2 | 3 | 74 | 4 | 117 | 4 | 220 | 64 | 169 | 283 | 87 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 1012 | 956 | 326 | 885 | 968 | 252 | 370 |  |  | 284 |  |  |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 1012 | 956 | 326 | 885 | 968 | 252 | 370 |  |  | 284 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 81 | 99 | 100 | 69 | 98 | 85 | 100 |  |  | 87 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 164 | 223 | 715 | 235 | 220 | 787 | 1189 |  |  | 1278 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 36 | 195 | 4 | 284 | 169 | 370 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 31 | 74 | 4 | 0 | 169 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 3 | 117 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 178 | 405 | 1189 | 1700 | 1278 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.20 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 5.5 | 19.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 30.3 | 21.9 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | D | C | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 30.3 | 21.9 | 0.1 |  | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | D | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 47.6\% |  | U Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |









Appendix J: Sidra Intersection Capacity Analysis 2024 Design Forecast, 2029 Design Forecast

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2024 Design AM - Brian Coburn / Fern Casey
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Mov } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg. } \\ & \text { Satn } \\ & \text { v/c } \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Belcourt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 138 | 2.0 | 0.264 | 10.0 | LOS B | 1.6 | 12.6 | 0.29 | 0.55 | 56.1 |
| 18 | R2 | 225 | 2.0 | 0.264 | 4.6 | LOS A | 1.6 | 12.6 | 0.29 | 0.55 | 57.5 |
| Appr |  | 363 | 2.0 | 0.264 | 6.6 | LOS A | 1.6 | 12.6 | 0.29 | 0.55 | 57.1 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 157 | 2.0 | 0.461 | 10.4 | LOS B | 3.4 | 26.5 | 0.45 | 0.55 | 58.1 |
| 6 | T1 | 451 | 2.0 | 0.461 | 5.3 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.5 | 0.45 | 0.55 | 59.4 |
| Approach |  | 608 | 2.0 | 0.461 | 6.6 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.5 | 0.45 | 0.55 | 59.1 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1R2 | $\begin{array}{r} 85 \\ 194 \end{array}$ | 2.0 | 0.227 | 5.2 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.9 | 0.38 | 0.52 | 60.8 |
| 12 |  |  | 2.0 | 0.227 | 4.9 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.9 | 0.38 | 0.52 | 55.4 |
| Approach |  | 279 | 2.0 | 0.227 | 5.0 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.9 | 0.38 | 0.52 | 57.7 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1250 | 2.0 | 0.461 | 6.3 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.5 | 0.39 | 0.54 | 58.3 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2024 Design AM - Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \hline \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dem Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 17 | 2.0 | 0.284 | 11.5 | LOS B | 1.2 | 9.3 | 0.50 | 0.53 | 60.5 |
| 8 | T1 | 510 | 2.0 | 0.284 | 5.4 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.5 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 58.8 |
| 18 | R2 | 92 | 2.0 | 0.284 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.5 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 57.1 |
| Appr |  | 619 | 2.0 | 0.284 | 5.5 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.5 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 58.6 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 51 | 2.0 | 1.155 | 90.3 | LOS F | 54.7 | 423.0 | 1.00 | 3.08 | 25.7 |
| 6 | T1 | 455 | 2.0 | 1.155 | 84.3 | LOS F | 54.7 | 423.0 | 1.00 | 3.08 | 31.8 |
| 16 | R2 | 468 | 2.0 | 1.155 | 84.3 | LOS F | 54.7 | 423.0 | 1.00 | 3.08 | 26.1 |
| Appr |  | 974 | 2.0 | 1.155 | 84.6 | LOS F | 54.7 | 423.0 | 1.00 | 3.08 | 29.0 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 151 | 2.0 | 0.274 | 11.5 | LOS B | 1.3 | 10.2 | 0.58 | 0.70 | 56.8 |
| 4 | T1 | 260 | 2.0 | 0.274 | 5.3 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.7 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 57.7 |
| 14 | R2 | 137 | 2.0 | 0.274 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.7 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 59.1 |
| Approach |  | 548 | 2.0 | 0.274 | 7.0 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.7 | 0.57 | 0.61 | 57.9 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 171 | 2.0 | 0.327 | 11.7 | LOS B | 1.5 | 11.2 | 0.55 | 0.71 | 59.0 |
| 2 | T1 | 121 | 2.0 | 0.327 | 5.7 | LOS A | 1.5 | 11.2 | 0.55 | 0.71 | 58.9 |
| 12 | R2 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.327 | 5.6 | LOS A | 1.5 | 11.2 | 0.55 | 0.71 | 57.3 |
| Appr |  | 307 | 2.0 | 0.327 | 9.0 | LOS A | 1.5 | 11.2 | 0.55 | 0.71 | 58.9 |
| All Ve |  | 2448 | 2.0 | 1.155 | 37.7 | LOS D | 54.7 | 423.0 | 0.72 | 1.58 | 41.1 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2024 Design AM - Brian Coburn / Navan
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dem Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue <br> Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 625 | 3.0 | 0.548 | 6.4 | LOS A | 4.5 | 35.2 | 0.60 | 0.61 | 56.2 |
| 18 | R2 | 15 | 3.0 | 0.548 | 6.0 | LOS A | 4.5 | 35.2 | 0.60 | 0.61 | 55.0 |
| Appr |  | 640 | 3.0 | 0.548 | 6.4 | LOS A | 4.5 | 35.2 | 0.60 | 0.61 | 56.2 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 135 | 3.0 | 0.963 | 31.5 | LOS C | 17.6 | 137.2 | 1.00 | 1.54 | 42.9 |
| 16 | R2 | 561 | 3.0 | 0.963 | 27.2 | LOS C | 17.6 | 137.2 | 1.00 | 1.54 | 42.4 |
| Approach |  | 696 | 3.0 | 0.963 | 28.1 | LOS C | 17.6 | 137.2 | 1.00 | 1.54 | 42.5 |
| North: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 177 | 3.0 | 0.386 | 9.8 | LOS A | 3.0 | 23.2 | 0.49 | 0.59 | 55.5 |
| 4 | T1 | 281 | 3.0 | 0.386 | 5.9 | LOS A | 3.0 | 23.2 | 0.49 | 0.59 | 55.9 |
| Appr |  | 458 | 3.0 | 0.386 | 7.4 | LOS A | 3.0 | 23.2 | 0.49 | 0.59 | 55.7 |
| All Ve |  | 1794 | 3.0 | 0.963 | 15.1 | LOS B | 17.6 | 137.2 | 0.73 | 0.96 | 49.9 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2024 Design PM - Brian Coburn / Fern Casey
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles $\qquad$ | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Belcourt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 100 | 2.0 | 0.296 | 10.4 | LOS B | 1.8 | 14.0 | 0.42 | 0.58 | 56.1 |
| 18 | R2 | 267 | 2.0 | 0.296 | 5.0 | LOS A | 1.8 | 14.0 | 0.42 | 0.58 | 57.5 |
| Appro |  | 367 | 2.0 | 0.296 | 6.5 | LOS A | 1.8 | 14.0 | 0.42 | 0.58 | 57.3 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 218 | 2.0 | 0.304 | 10.1 | LOS B | 2.0 | 15.2 | 0.33 | 0.56 | 57.8 |
| 6 | T1 | 194 | 2.0 | 0.304 | 5.0 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.2 | 0.33 | 0.56 | 59.0 |
| Approach |  | 412 | 2.0 | 0.304 | 7.7 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.2 | 0.33 | 0.56 | 58.4 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1 | 162 | 2.0 | 0.332 | 5.6 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.2 | 0.47 | 0.56 | 60.3 |
| 12 | R2 | 229 | 2.0 | 0.332 | 5.3 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.2 | 0.47 | 0.56 | 54.8 |
| Approach |  | 391 | 2.0 | 0.332 | 5.4 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.2 | 0.47 | 0.56 | 57.8 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1170 | 2.0 | 0.332 | 6.5 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.2 | 0.41 | 0.57 | 57.9 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2024 Design PM- Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \hline \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue <br> Distance $\qquad$ m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.418 | 13.3 | LOS B | 1.8 | 13.9 | 0.68 | 0.73 | 59.5 |
| 8 | T1 | 573 | 2.0 | 0.418 | 6.8 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.6 | 0.67 | 0.69 | 57.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 102 | 2.0 | 0.418 | 6.2 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.6 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 56.1 |
| Appr |  | 705 | 2.0 | 0.418 | 7.0 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.6 | 0.67 | 0.68 | 57.5 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 58 | 2.0 | 0.654 | 14.4 | LOS B | 4.2 | 32.7 | 0.79 | 0.94 | 56.7 |
| 6 | T1 | 180 | 2.0 | 0.654 | 8.5 | LOS A | 4.2 | 32.7 | 0.79 | 0.94 | 59.1 |
| 16 | R2 | 288 | 2.0 | 0.654 | 8.4 | LOS A | 4.2 | 32.7 | 0.79 | 0.94 | 55.4 |
| Appr |  | 526 | 2.0 | 0.654 | 9.1 | LOS A | 4.2 | 32.7 | 0.79 | 0.94 | 57.0 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 547 | 2.0 | 0.510 | 11.3 | LOS B | 3.3 | 25.4 | 0.59 | 0.73 | 55.1 |
| 4 | T1 | 473 | 2.0 | 0.510 | 5.0 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.3 | 0.57 | 0.51 | 58.4 |
| 14 | R2 | 205 | 2.0 | 0.510 | 5.0 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.3 | 0.57 | 0.50 | 59.0 |
| Approach |  | 1225 | 2.0 | 0.510 | 7.8 | LOS A | 3.4 | 26.3 | 0.58 | 0.61 | 57.0 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 106 | 2.0 | 0.615 | 14.8 | LOS B | 3.2 | 24.6 | 0.78 | 0.93 | 58.5 |
| 2 | T1 | 299 | 2.0 | 0.615 | 8.8 | LOS A | 3.2 | 24.6 | 0.78 | 0.93 | 58.4 |
| 12 | R2 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.615 | 8.7 | LOS A | 3.2 | 24.6 | 0.78 | 0.93 | 56.8 |
| Appr |  | 415 | 2.0 | 0.615 | 10.3 | LOS B | 3.2 | 24.6 | 0.78 | 0.93 | 58.4 |
| All Ve |  | 2871 | 2.0 | 0.654 | 8.2 | LOS A | 4.2 | 32.7 | 0.67 | 0.73 | 57.4 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2024 Design PM - Brian Coburn / Navan
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dem Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue <br> Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 393 | 3.0 | 0.675 | 11.1 | LOS B | 5.7 | 44.2 | 0.92 | 1.05 | 54.0 |
| 18 | R2 | 87 | 3.0 | 0.675 | 10.7 | LOS B | 5.7 | 44.2 | 0.92 | 1.05 | 52.9 |
| Appr |  | 480 | 3.0 | 0.675 | 11.0 | LOS B | 5.7 | 44.2 | 0.92 | 1.05 | 53.8 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 86 | 3.0 | 0.395 | 11.2 | LOS B | 2.4 | 18.5 | 0.69 | 0.81 | 55.8 |
| 16 | R2 | 253 | 3.0 | 0.395 | 7.0 | LOS A | 2.4 | 18.5 | 0.69 | 0.81 | 55.0 |
| Approach |  | 339 | 3.0 | 0.395 | 8.0 | LOS A | 2.4 | 18.5 | 0.69 | 0.81 | 55.2 |
| North: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 558 | 3.0 | 0.942 | 11.1 | LOS B | 32.2 | 251.3 | 1.00 | 0.54 | 53.6 |
| 4 | T1 | 742 | 3.0 | 0.942 | 7.2 | LOS A | 32.2 | 251.3 | 1.00 | 0.54 | 53.9 |
| Appr |  | 1300 | 3.0 | 0.942 | 8.9 | LOS A | 32.2 | 251.3 | 1.00 | 0.54 | 53.8 |
| All V |  | 2119 | 3.0 | 0.942 | 9.2 | LOS A | 32.2 | 251.3 | 0.93 | 0.70 | 54.0 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Development AM - Mer Bleue/Decoeur
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dem Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 8 | 3.0 | 0.546 | 10.8 | LOS B | 4.8 | 37.4 | 0.52 | 0.47 | 58.7 |
| 8 | T1 | 706 | 3.0 | 0.546 | 5.0 | LOS A | 4.8 | 37.4 | 0.52 | 0.47 | 58.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 26 | 3.0 | 0.546 | 4.8 | LOS A | 4.8 | 37.4 | 0.52 | 0.47 | 56.9 |
| Appr |  | 740 | 3.0 | 0.546 | 5.1 | LOS A | 4.8 | 37.4 | 0.52 | 0.47 | 58.5 |
| East: Decoeur |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 70 | 3.0 | 0.194 | 12.6 | LOS B | 0.8 | 6.6 | 0.66 | 0.82 | 56.7 |
| 6 | T1 | 20 | 3.0 | 0.194 | 6.8 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.6 | 0.66 | 0.82 | 56.6 |
| 16 | R2 | 57 | 3.0 | 0.194 | 6.6 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.6 | 0.66 | 0.82 | 55.0 |
| Appr |  | 147 | 3.0 | 0.194 | 9.5 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.6 | 0.66 | 0.82 | 56.0 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 25 | 3.0 | 0.266 | 10.4 | LOS B | 1.7 | 13.5 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 59.7 |
| 4 | T1 | 305 | 3.0 | 0.266 | 4.6 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.5 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 59.6 |
| 14 | R2 | 33 | 3.0 | 0.266 | 4.4 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.5 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 57.8 |
| Approach |  | 363 | 3.0 | 0.266 | 4.9 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.5 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 59.4 |
| West: Axis Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 101 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 11.4 | LOS B | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.49 | 0.71 | 56.0 |
| 2 | T1 | 8 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 5.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.49 | 0.71 | 55.9 |
| 12 | R2 | 20 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 5.5 | LOS A | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.49 | 0.71 | 54.3 |
| Appr |  | 129 | 3.0 | 0.124 | 10.1 | LOS B | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.49 | 0.71 | 55.7 |
| All V |  | 1379 | 3.0 | 0.546 | 6.0 | LOS A | 4.8 | 37.4 | 0.48 | 0.53 | 58.2 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Development AM - Brian Coburn / Fern Casey (2-lane)
New Site
Roundabout


Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Development AM - Brian Coburn / Fern Casey (4-Iane BCB)
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dem Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue <br> Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Belcourt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 179 | 2.0 | 0.163 | 9.9 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.6 | 0.22 | 0.62 | 53.9 |
| 18 | R2 | 257 | 2.0 | 0.163 | 4.7 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.7 | 0.21 | 0.51 | 58.5 |
| Appr |  | 436 | 2.0 | 0.163 | 6.8 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.7 | 0.21 | 0.55 | 56.9 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 174 | 2.0 | 0.253 | 10.3 | LOS B | 1.1 | 8.8 | 0.33 | 0.61 | 57.6 |
| 6 | T1 | 451 | 2.0 | 0.253 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.9 | 0.33 | 0.51 | 60.1 |
| Approach |  | 625 | 2.0 | 0.253 | 6.5 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.9 | 0.33 | 0.54 | 59.4 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { T1 } \\ & \text { R2 } \end{aligned}$ | 85210 | 2.0 | 0.089 | 5.3 | LOS A | 0.3 | 2.7 | 0.32 | 0.48 | 60.6 |
| 12 |  |  | 2.0 | 0.168 | 5.0 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.6 | 0.31 | 0.53 | 55.6 |
| Approach |  | 295 | 2.0 | 0.168 | 5.1 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.6 | 0.31 | 0.52 | 57.6 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1356 | 2.0 | 0.253 | 6.3 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.9 | 0.29 | 0.54 | 58.4 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2029 Development AM - Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn (2-lane)

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back of Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 17 | 2.0 | 0.323 | 11.6 | LOS B | 1.4 | 10.9 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 60.3 |
| 8 | T1 | 566 | 2.0 | 0.323 | 5.5 | LOS A | 1.4 | 11.2 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 58.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 104 | 2.0 | 0.323 | 5.2 | LOS A | 1.4 | 11.2 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 56.9 |
| Appr |  | 687 | 2.0 | 0.323 | 5.6 | LOS A | 1.4 | 11.2 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 58.4 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 51 | 2.0 | 1.219 | 117.9 | LOS F | 67.1 | 518.6 | 1.00 | 3.65 | 21.4 |
| 6 | T1 | 458 | 2.0 | 1.219 | 111.9 | LOS F | 67.1 | 518.6 | 1.00 | 3.65 | 27.2 |
| 16 | R2 | 468 | 2.0 | 1.219 | 111.8 | LOS F | 67.1 | 518.6 | 1.00 | 3.65 | 21.9 |
| Appr |  | 977 | 2.0 | 1.219 | 112.2 | LOS F | 67.1 | 518.6 | 1.00 | 3.65 | 24.5 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 151 | 2.0 | 0.288 | 11.4 | LOS B | 1.4 | 10.9 | 0.58 | 0.69 | 56.9 |
| 4 | T1 | 284 | 2.0 | 0.288 | 5.3 | LOS A | 1.5 | 11.4 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 57.7 |
| 14 | R2 | 150 | 2.0 | 0.288 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.5 | 11.4 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 59.1 |
| Approach |  | 585 | 2.0 | 0.288 | 6.8 | LOS A | 1.5 | 11.4 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 58.0 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 198 | 2.0 | 0.369 | 11.8 | LOS B | 1.7 | 13.0 | 0.57 | 0.73 | 58.8 |
| 2 | T1 | 128 | 2.0 | 0.369 | 5.9 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.0 | 0.57 | 0.73 | 58.7 |
| 12 | R2 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.369 | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.0 | 0.57 | 0.73 | 57.1 |
| Appr |  | 341 | 2.0 | 0.369 | 9.3 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.0 | 0.57 | 0.73 | 58.7 |
| All V |  | 2590 | 2.0 | 1.219 | 46.6 | LOS D | 67.1 | 518.6 | 0.72 | 1.75 | 37.8 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Development AM - Brian Coburn / Navan (2-lane)
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue <br> Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 676 | 3.0 | 0.601 | 6.6 | LOS A | 5.3 | 40.9 | 0.67 | 0.63 | 55.9 |
| 18 | R2 | 15 | 3.0 | 0.601 | 6.3 | LOS A | 5.3 | 40.9 | 0.67 | 0.63 | 54.7 |
| Appr |  | 691 | 3.0 | 0.601 | 6.6 | LOS A | 5.3 | 40.9 | 0.67 | 0.63 | 55.9 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 135 | 3.0 | 1.086 | 66.3 | LOS F | 34.1 | 265.6 | 1.00 | 2.25 | 30.5 |
| 16 | R2 | 601 | 3.0 | 1.086 | 62.0 | LOS F | 34.1 | 265.6 | 1.00 | 2.25 | 30.2 |
| Approach |  | 736 | 3.0 | 1.086 | 62.8 | LOS E | 34.1 | 265.6 | 1.00 | 2.25 | 30.3 |
| North: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 193 | 3.0 | 0.413 | 9.8 | LOS A | 3.3 | 26.0 | 0.49 | 0.58 | 55.5 |
| 4 | T1 | 307 | 3.0 | 0.413 | 5.9 | LOS A | 3.3 | 26.0 | 0.49 | 0.58 | 55.9 |
| Appr |  | 500 | 3.0 | 0.413 | 7.4 | LOS A | 3.3 | 26.0 | 0.49 | 0.58 | 55.7 |
| All V |  | 1927 | 3.0 | 1.086 | 28.3 | LOS C | 34.1 | 265.6 | 0.75 | 1.24 | 42.3 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Development AM - Brian Coburn / Navan (4-lane)
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue <br> Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 676 | 3.0 | 0.557 | 6.1 | LOS A | 3.8 | 29.7 | 0.52 | 0.58 | 56.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 15 | 3.0 | 0.022 | 6.5 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.35 | 0.58 | 56.3 |
| Appr |  | 691 | 3.0 | 0.557 | 6.1 | LOS A | 3.8 | 29.7 | 0.52 | 0.58 | 56.5 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 135 | 3.0 | 0.472 | 12.2 | LOS B | 2.4 | 18.6 | 0.70 | 0.92 | 54.6 |
| 16 | R2 | 601 | 3.0 | 0.472 | 8.1 | LOS A | 2.4 | 18.9 | 0.69 | 0.90 | 54.5 |
| Approach |  | 736 | 3.0 | 0.472 | 8.8 | LOS A | 2.4 | 18.9 | 0.69 | 0.91 | 54.5 |
| North: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 193 | 3.0 | 0.211 | 9.5 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.2 | 0.32 | 0.63 | 55.0 |
| 4 | T1 | 307 | 3.0 | 0.211 | 5.6 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.3 | 0.32 | 0.53 | 57.1 |
| Appr |  | 500 | 3.0 | 0.211 | 7.1 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.3 | 0.32 | 0.57 | 56.3 |
| All Ve |  | 1927 | 3.0 | 0.557 | 7.4 | LOS A | 3.8 | 29.7 | 0.54 | 0.70 | 55.7 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2029 Development AM - Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn (4-lane)

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 17 | 2.0 | 0.317 | 11.6 | LOS B | 1.3 | 10.4 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 60.4 |
| 8 | T1 | 566 | 2.0 | 0.317 | 5.5 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.6 | 0.51 | 0.53 | 58.7 |
| 18 | R2 | 104 | 2.0 | 0.317 | 5.2 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.6 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 57.0 |
| Appr |  | 687 | 2.0 | 0.317 | 5.6 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.6 | 0.51 | 0.53 | 58.5 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 51 | 2.0 | 0.529 | 13.5 | LOS B | 2.7 | 21.1 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 56.8 |
| 6 | T1 | 458 | 2.0 | 0.529 | 7.4 | LOS A | 2.9 | 22.1 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 59.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 468 | 2.0 | 0.529 | 6.7 | LOS A | 2.9 | 22.1 | 0.69 | 0.78 | 56.7 |
| Appr |  | 977 | 2.0 | 0.529 | 7.4 | LOS A | 2.9 | 22.1 | 0.69 | 0.78 | 58.2 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 151 | 2.0 | 0.290 | 11.7 | LOS B | 1.3 | 9.7 | 0.56 | 0.71 | 57.0 |
| 4 | T1 | 284 | 2.0 | 0.290 | 5.5 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.1 | 0.55 | 0.62 | 57.8 |
| 14 | R2 | 150 | 2.0 | 0.290 | 5.3 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.1 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 59.2 |
| Approach |  | 585 | 2.0 | 0.290 | 7.0 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.1 | 0.55 | 0.62 | 58.0 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 198 | 2.0 | 0.174 | 11.1 | LOS B | 0.7 | 5.4 | 0.47 | 0.74 | 57.6 |
| 2 | T1 | 126 | 2.0 | 0.149 | 5.5 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.4 | 0.48 | 0.52 | 60.7 |
| 12 | R2 | 15 | 2.0 | 0.149 | 5.6 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.4 | 0.48 | 0.52 | 59.0 |
| Appr |  | 339 | 2.0 | 0.174 | 8.8 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.4 | 0.47 | 0.65 | 58.7 |
| All Ve |  | 2588 | 2.0 | 0.529 | 7.0 | LOS A | 2.9 | 22.1 | 0.58 | 0.66 | 58.3 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Development PM - Brian Coburn / Fern Casey (2-lane)
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Belcourt mer per |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 127 | 2.0 | 0.333 | 10.4 | LOS B | 2.2 | 16.6 | 0.44 | 0.59 | 55.9 |
| 18 | R2 | 287 | 2.0 | 0.333 | 5.0 | LOS A | 2.2 | 16.6 | 0.44 | 0.59 | 57.3 |
| Appr |  | 414 | 2.0 | 0.333 | 6.7 | LOS A | 2.2 | 16.6 | 0.44 | 0.59 | 57.0 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 255 | 2.0 | 0.343 | 10.3 | LOS B | 2.3 | 17.6 | 0.39 | 0.59 | 57.4 |
| 6 | T1 | 194 | 2.0 | 0.343 | 5.1 | LOS A | 2.3 | 17.6 | 0.39 | 0.59 | 58.7 |
| Approach |  | 449 | 2.0 | 0.343 | 8.0 | LOS A | 2.3 | 17.6 | 0.39 | 0.59 | 58.0 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 212 | T1R2 | 162 | 2.0 | 0.372 | 5.8 | LOS A | 2.3 | 17.5 | 0.53 | 0.60 | 60.2 |
|  |  | 260 | 2.0 | 0.372 | 5.5 | LOS A | 2.3 | 17.5 | 0.53 | 0.60 | 54.5 |
| Approach |  | 422 | 2.0 | 0.372 | 5.7 | LOS A | 2.3 | 17.5 | 0.53 | 0.60 | 57.4 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1285 | 2.0 | 0.372 | 6.8 | LOS A | 2.3 | 17.6 | 0.45 | 0.59 | 57.5 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2029 Development PM - Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn (2-lane)

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.455 | 13.5 | LOS B | 2.0 | 15.7 | 0.70 | 0.76 | 59.4 |
| 8 | T1 | 614 | 2.0 | 0.455 | 7.0 | LOS A | 2.1 | 16.6 | 0.69 | 0.71 | 57.5 |
| 18 | R2 | 111 | 2.0 | 0.455 | 6.4 | LOS A | 2.1 | 16.6 | 0.69 | 0.67 | 56.0 |
| Appr |  | 755 | 2.0 | 0.455 | 7.2 | LOS A | 2.1 | 16.6 | 0.69 | 0.71 | 57.4 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 58 | 2.0 | 0.685 | 14.9 | LOS B | 4.5 | 34.9 | 0.82 | 0.97 | 56.3 |
| 6 | T1 | 186 | 2.0 | 0.685 | 8.9 | LOS A | 4.5 | 34.9 | 0.82 | 0.97 | 58.9 |
| 16 | R2 | 288 | 2.0 | 0.685 | 8.9 | LOS A | 4.5 | 34.9 | 0.82 | 0.97 | 55.1 |
| Appr |  | 532 | 2.0 | 0.685 | 9.6 | LOS A | 4.5 | 34.9 | 0.82 | 0.97 | 56.8 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 547 | 2.0 | 0.545 | 11.5 | LOS B | 3.8 | 29.3 | 0.62 | 0.74 | 55.2 |
| 4 | T1 | 520 | 2.0 | 0.545 | 5.2 | LOS A | 3.8 | 29.6 | 0.61 | 0.54 | 57.9 |
| 14 | R2 | 236 | 2.0 | 0.545 | 5.0 | LOS A | 3.8 | 29.6 | 0.61 | 0.51 | 58.9 |
| Approach |  | 1303 | 2.0 | 0.545 | 7.8 | LOS A | 3.8 | 29.6 | 0.61 | 0.62 | 57.0 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 123 | 2.0 | 0.667 | 15.3 | LOS B | 3.6 | 28.0 | 0.81 | 0.98 | 58.2 |
| 2 | T1 | 302 | 2.0 | 0.667 | 9.4 | LOS A | 3.6 | 28.0 | 0.81 | 0.98 | 58.1 |
| 12 | R2 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.667 | 9.3 | LOS A | 3.6 | 28.0 | 0.81 | 0.98 | 56.5 |
| Appr |  | 435 | 2.0 | 0.667 | 11.1 | LOS B | 3.6 | 28.0 | 0.81 | 0.98 | 58.1 |
| All Ve |  | 3025 | 2.0 | 0.685 | 8.4 | LOS A | 4.5 | 34.9 | 0.70 | 0.76 | 57.2 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Development PM - Brian Coburn / Navan (2-lane)
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dem Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue <br> Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 430 | 3.0 | 0.749 | 12.6 | LOS B | 7.0 | 54.4 | 0.97 | 1.12 | 52.8 |
| 18 | R2 | 87 | 3.0 | 0.749 | 12.3 | LOS B | 7.0 | 54.4 | 0.97 | 1.12 | 51.7 |
| Appr |  | 517 | 3.0 | 0.749 | 12.6 | LOS B | 7.0 | 54.4 | 0.97 | 1.12 | 52.6 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 86 | 3.0 | 0.447 | 11.8 | LOS B | 2.9 | 22.4 | 0.74 | 0.86 | 55.6 |
| 16 | R2 | 281 | 3.0 | 0.447 | 7.5 | LOS A | 2.9 | 22.4 | 0.74 | 0.86 | 54.8 |
| Approach |  | 367 | 3.0 | 0.447 | 8.5 | LOS A | 2.9 | 22.4 | 0.74 | 0.86 | 55.0 |
| North: Navan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 588 | 3.0 | 1.008 | 21.7 | LOS F | 66.7 | 519.5 | 1.00 | 0.65 | 47.9 |
| 4 | T1 | 807 | 3.0 | 1.008 | 17.8 | LOS F | 66.7 | 519.5 | 1.00 | 0.65 | 48.1 |
| Approach |  | 1395 | 3.0 | 1.008 | 19.5 | LOS B | 66.7 | 519.5 | 1.00 | 0.65 | 48.0 |
| All Vehicles |  | 2279 | 3.0 | 1.008 | 16.1 | LOS B | 66.7 | 519.5 | 0.95 | 0.79 | 50.0 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Development PM - Mer Bleue/Decoeur (2-lane)
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dem Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 16 | 3.0 | 0.618 | 11.1 | LOS B | 5.9 | 45.8 | 0.63 | 0.51 | 58.1 |
| 8 | T1 | 753 | 3.0 | 0.618 | 5.3 | LOS A | 5.9 | 45.8 | 0.63 | 0.51 | 58.0 |
| 18 | R2 | 47 | 3.0 | 0.618 | 5.1 | LOS A | 5.9 | 45.8 | 0.63 | 0.51 | 56.3 |
| Appr |  | 816 | 3.0 | 0.618 | 5.4 | LOS A | 5.9 | 45.8 | 0.63 | 0.51 | 57.9 |
| East: Decoeur |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 55 | 3.0 | 0.146 | 12.5 | LOS B | 0.6 | 5.0 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 56.5 |
| 6 | T1 | 11 | 3.0 | 0.146 | 6.7 | LOS A | 0.6 | 5.0 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 56.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 38 | 3.0 | 0.146 | 6.6 | LOS A | 0.6 | 5.0 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 54.8 |
| Appr |  | 104 | 3.0 | 0.146 | 9.8 | LOS A | 0.6 | 5.0 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 55.8 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 65 | 3.0 | 0.554 | 10.5 | LOS B | 5.6 | 43.5 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 59.0 |
| 4 | T1 | 676 | 3.0 | 0.554 | 4.7 | LOS A | 5.6 | 43.5 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 58.8 |
| 14 | R2 | 64 | 3.0 | 0.554 | 4.5 | LOS A | 5.6 | 43.5 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 57.1 |
| Approach |  | 805 | 3.0 | 0.554 | 5.1 | LOS A | 5.6 | 43.5 | 0.45 | 0.46 | 58.7 |
| West: Axis Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 77 | 3.0 | 0.143 | 12.5 | LOS B | 0.6 | 4.7 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 55.8 |
| 2 | T1 | 19 | 3.0 | 0.143 | 6.7 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.7 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 55.7 |
| 12 | R2 | 15 | 3.0 | 0.143 | 6.5 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.7 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 54.2 |
| Appr |  | 111 | 3.0 | 0.143 | 10.7 | LOS B | 0.6 | 4.7 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 55.6 |
| All Ve |  | 1836 | 3.0 | 0.618 | 5.8 | LOS A | 5.9 | 45.8 | 0.55 | 0.52 | 58.0 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Development PM - Brian Coburn / Fern Casey (4-lane)
New Site
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dema Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Belcourt mer per |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 127 | 2.0 | 0.168 | 10.2 | LOS B | 0.7 | 5.7 | 0.31 | 0.62 | 54.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 287 | 2.0 | 0.168 | 5.0 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.7 | 0.30 | 0.55 | 58.0 |
| Appr |  | 414 | 2.0 | 0.168 | 6.5 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.7 | 0.30 | 0.57 | 57.2 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 255 | 2.0 | 0.193 | 10.0 | LOS B | 0.9 | 6.7 | 0.27 | 0.64 | 56.2 |
| 6 | T1 | 194 | 2.0 | 0.163 | 4.9 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.4 | 0.27 | 0.45 | 60.8 |
| Approach |  | 449 | 2.0 | 0.193 | 7.8 | LOS A | 0.9 | 6.7 | 0.27 | 0.56 | 58.3 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 212 | T1R2 | 162 | 2.0 | 0.158 | 5.5 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.8 | 0.37 | 0.51 | 60.3 |
|  |  | 260 | 2.0 | 0.218 | 5.2 | LOS A | 0.9 | 7.2 | 0.37 | 0.58 | 55.3 |
| Approach |  | 422 | 2.0 | 0.218 | 5.3 | LOS A | 0.9 | 7.2 | 0.37 | 0.55 | 57.9 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1285 | 2.0 | 0.218 | 6.6 | LOS A | 0.9 | 7.2 | 0.31 | 0.56 | 57.8 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 2029 Development PM - Mer Bleue / Brian Coburn (4-lane)

Roundabout with 1 \& 2-lane approaches and circulating road
MUTCD (FHWA 2009) example number: 3C-4
Roundabout Guide (TRB 2010) example number: A-3
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Dem Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | $95 \%$ Back <br> Vehicles <br> veh | Queue <br> Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 30 | 2.0 | 0.442 | 13.5 | LOS B | 1.9 | 14.9 | 0.68 | 0.75 | 59.5 |
| 8 | T1 | 614 | 2.0 | 0.442 | 6.9 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.6 | 0.67 | 0.71 | 57.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 111 | 2.0 | 0.442 | 6.4 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.6 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 56.1 |
| Appr |  | 755 | 2.0 | 0.442 | 7.1 | LOS A | 2.0 | 15.6 | 0.67 | 0.70 | 57.5 |
| East: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 58 | 2.0 | 0.297 | 12.2 | LOS B | 1.2 | 9.1 | 0.61 | 0.66 | 57.0 |
| 6 | T1 | 186 | 2.0 | 0.297 | 6.2 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.5 | 0.61 | 0.66 | 59.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 288 | 2.0 | 0.297 | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.5 | 0.60 | 0.65 | 57.2 |
| Appr |  | 532 | 2.0 | 0.297 | 6.6 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.5 | 0.60 | 0.66 | 58.1 |
| North: Mer Bleue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 547 | 2.0 | 0.537 | 11.4 | LOS B | 3.5 | 27.3 | 0.59 | 0.74 | 55.3 |
| 4 | T1 | 520 | 2.0 | 0.537 | 5.1 | LOS A | 3.6 | 27.6 | 0.58 | 0.54 | 58.1 |
| 14 | R2 | 236 | 2.0 | 0.537 | 5.0 | LOS A | 3.6 | 27.6 | 0.58 | 0.51 | 59.0 |
| Appr |  | 1303 | 2.0 | 0.537 | 7.8 | LOS A | 3.6 | 27.6 | 0.58 | 0.62 | 57.1 |
| West: Brian Coburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 123 | 2.0 | 0.285 | 12.9 | LOS B | 1.0 | 8.1 | 0.66 | 0.83 | 58.1 |
| 2 | T1 | 302 | 2.0 | 0.285 | 6.1 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.5 | 0.65 | 0.61 | 59.5 |
| 12 | R2 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.285 | 6.1 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.5 | 0.64 | 0.56 | 58.2 |
| Approach |  | 435 | 2.0 | 0.285 | 8.1 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.5 | 0.65 | 0.67 | 59.1 |
| All Ve |  | 3025 | 2.0 | 0.537 | 7.4 | LOS A | 3.6 | 27.6 | 0.62 | 0.65 | 57.7 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2029 Development PM - Brian Coburn / Navan (4-lane)
New Site
Roundabout


Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.


[^0]:    3 https://www.obj.ca/article/ellisdon-puts-shovels-ground-new-orleans-health-hub

[^1]:    4 Section 2.5, "Addendum to MMLOS Guidelines", City of Ottawa, May 2017.

[^2]:    5 Proposed TrailsEdge East Development - Community Transportation Study, Castleglenn Consultants Inc, November 2016.

[^3]:    Exhibit 6: Existing 2017 Traffic Volumes

