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## 1 SCREENING

This Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) has been prepared to support the Site Plan Control application for the development at located at the southwest corner of Kilbirnie Drive and Robin Easey Avenue (municipally addressed as 1045 Kilbirnie Drive in Ottawa. The TIA follows the City of Ottawa (the City) TIA Guidelines (2017) which potentially includes five steps:
1 Screening
2 Scoping
3 Forecasting
4 Analysis
5 TIA Submission
The Screening Step determines the need to continue with a Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) Study. The development is assessed against three triggers: trip generation, location, and safety to identify the next step of the study. If one or more of the triggers is satisfied, the Scoping Step must be completed. If none of the triggers are satisfied, the TIA is deemed complete. If one or more triggers are satisfied, specific TIA components are required to be carried out depending on the combination of triggers (Table 1-1) that have been satisfied.

The proposed development at 1045 Kilbirnie Drive satisfied the Trip Generation trigger indicating that, as part of Steps Two through Five of the TIA process, the Design Review and Network Impact components should be completed. For reference, the completed Screening Form is provided in Appendix A.

Table 1-1. Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) Screening Triggers

|  | TIA TRIGGERS SATISFIED |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Next Step of the TIA Process | Trip Generation | Location | Safety |
| Design Review and Network Impact | Yes | No | No |

## 2 SCOPING

### 2.1 SCREENING FORM

The completed Screening Form is provided in Appendix A.

### 2.2 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The Conseil des écoles publiques de l'Est Ontario (CEPEO) is planning to construct a new elementary school located in the developing Quinn's Pint neighbourhood in Barrhaven-Sud, Ottawa. The proposed development site, located at 1045 Kilbirnie Drive, is currently vacant and undeveloped with a site area of approximately 2.43 ha $\left(24,316 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\right)$. Residential uses have been approved and developments are occurring on land to the north, south and east of the subject site, while land to the west is yet to be developed. The subject site is bounded by local roads Robin Easey Avenue and Kilbirnie Drive to the east and to the north respectively, and zoned as Minor Institutional Zone, Sub-zone A (I1A) and Residential Third Density Zone, Subzone YY (R3YY). As per the I1A zone, a school and a daycare are permitted uses.

The proposed development will include a building, with a Gross Floor Area (GFA) of approximately 4,781 $\mathrm{m}^{2}$, providing capacity for 800 students and consisting of one (1) library, one (1) gymnasium, one (1) multi-purpose room, 12 portable classrooms, and 20 classrooms among which five (5) classrooms will be for daycare use. The most up-to-date draft site plan (September 2, 2022) is attached as Appendix B. The proposed vehicle access includes a passenger vehicle access from Robin Easey Avenue to the 61-space surface parking lot and off-street drop-off area. School bus laybys will be provided on the south side of Kilbirnie Drive and west side of Robin Easey Avenue with a portion of the layby area on Robin Easey Avenue being dedicated for on-street passenger car dropoffs. Fifty parking spaces will be provided for bicycles within the subject site. Figure 2-1 illustrates the Study Area Context.

The development will be built as a single phase with an estimated date of completion in 2023.


Figure 2-1. Site Area Context

### 2.3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

### 2.3.1 ROADWAYS

The existing roadways in proximity to the subject development site that will be considered in the TIA are all cityowned roadways and include those listed below. The road classifications for City of Ottawa roadways are defined in the City of Ottawa Official Plan, 2013, Volume 1, Section 7, Annex 1 Road Classifications and Rights-of-Way.

Greenbank Road is a north-south roadway classified as Arterial north of Barnsdale Road, with a posted speed limit of $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. North of Kilbirnie Drive, Greenbank has been constructed as an undivided two-lane urban arterial road, while south of Kilbirnie Drive, it remains with a rural arterial road cross-section with no sidewalk and paved shoulders on both sides.

Kilbirnie Drive in the close vicinity of the subject development site currently runs on an east-west alignment from west of Cedardown Private and terminates at Alex Polowin Avenue. It is designated as a Local Road per the City of

Ottawa Transportation Master Plan (2013), while the Barrhaven South Community Development Plan shows it is classified as a Collector Road. Kilbirnie Drive is an undivided roadway with a 22.0 m road right-of-way featuring an urban collector road cross-section with monolithic sidewalks on both sides. Residential driveways front onto the roadway. The speed limit is unposted but assumed to be $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

Alex Polowin Avenue is a Local Road with 18.0m right-of-way running on a north-south alignment with sidewalks on both sides.

Robin Easey Avenue is a Local Road with 18.0m right-of-way running along the east frontage of the subject development site on a north-south alignment. The subject development will have a driveway and a layby area on the west side of Robin Easey Avenue.

### 2.3.2 INTERSECTIONS

There are three existing intersections adjacent to the development site along Kilbirnie Drive as described in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1. Description of Study Area Intersections
INTERSECTION (DESCRIPTION)
LANE CONFIGURATION

## Kilbirnie Drive and Greenbank Road ${ }^{1}$

- Signalized intersection
- One left turn lane, one through lane and one right turn lane in the southbound and northbound directions
- One left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane in both the eastbound and westbound directions
- Crosswalks on all approaches
- Bidirectional crossride on the west leg


Kilbirnie Drive and River Mist Road

- All-way stop controlled intersection
- Two-way traffic on all four approaches with no centre-line markings
- No crosswalk on any of the four approaches


INTERSECTION (DESCRIPTION)

## Kilbirnie Drive and Alex Polowin Avenue

- All-way stop controlled intersection
- Two-way traffic on all four approaches with no centre-line markings
- No crosswalk on any of the four approaches


1. Intersection modifications at Greenbank Road and Kilbirnie Drive started in November 2020 and completed in summer 2021 per the information from the City of Ottawa's website. The new intersection configuration illustrated above is from Appendix F, 2535 River Mist Road TIA (March 2021) prepared by Novatech. Google Streetview is yet to be updated.

### 2.3.3 DRIVEWAYS

Based on Google Streetview and Property Parcels layer from GeoOttawa, the existing and approved driveways within 200 m from the subject development site include the following:

- Approximately 40 residential driveways fronting onto the north side of Kilbirnie Drive
- 17 residential driveways fronting onto the east side of Alex Polowin Avenue
- Approximately 31 residential driveways on both sides of Robin Easey Avenue

There are other residential driveways on the local roads (i.e. Galmoy Way, Teelin Circle) within a 200 m vicinity of the development site. Those driveways are not anticipated to be directly affected by the proposed school development.

### 2.3.4 PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLING FACILITIES

Greenbank Road north of Kilbirnie Drive has a multi-use-pathway (MUP) on the west side and a boulevard sidewalk on the east side, except for a section of approximately 100 m south of Dundonald Drive where there is no buffer between the travel lane and sidewalk. Collector roads in proximity of the subject development site, including Kilbirnie Drive and River Mist Road, have sidewalks on both sides. The local roads within 200m area from the subject site have either a sidewalk on one side (i.e. Alex Polowin Avenue) or do not have a sidewalk.
Greenbank Road is identified as a Spine Cycling Route north of Barnsdale Road, and currently has an on-road curbside bike lane on the east side for northbound cyclists.

### 2.3.5 TRANSIT FACILITIES

OC Transpo Route 75 and Route 675 provides transit services along Kilbirnie Drive and River Mist Road.

- Route 75 is a Rapid Route running between Minto Recreation Centre (Cambrian) and Tunney's Pasture Station. Route 75's travel segment between Minto Recreation Centre (Cambrian) and Barrhaven Centre operates seven days a week with a 15 -minute frequency during weekday peak hours and 30 -minute frequency during weekday off-peak hours and on weekends. Between Barrhaven Centre and Tunney's Pasture, Route 75 operates at 15 -minute frequencies throughout the day, and 10 -minute frequencies in the peak direction during peak periods.
- Route 675 is a school route traveling between Minto Recreation Complex in Barrhaven South and Bell High School. Route 675 only operates twice per weekday starting from the terminal stations in the morning and afternoon respectively. No service is provided by Route 675 on weekends.

Bus stops closest to the subject development sites are Bus Stop \#2807 and Bus Stop \#2808 located at the northwest and northeast corners of Kilbirnie Drive and River Mist Road intersection respectively. Bus Stop \#2809 and Bus Stop \#2810 located at the intersection of Kilbirnie Drive and Breakstone Road are also with 400 m walking distance from the development site.

Figure 2-2 highlights the OC Transpo bus routes on adjacent roadways in proximity of the proposed development.


Figure 2-2: OC Transpo Bus Routes (Source: OC Transpo Network Map)

### 2.3.6 AREA TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES

The subject development site is within a developing neighbourhood with limited existing traffic management measures implemented. The existing area traffic management measures identified adjacent to the proposed development site include:

- School Zone designation along the segment of River Mist Road in the vicinity of St. Benedict School
- Curb extension on the north, south and west approaches of the Kilbirnie Drive and River Mist Road intersection


### 2.3.7 PEAK HOUR TRAVEL DEMANDS

The TRANS Committee was established to co-ordinate transportation planning efforts among various planning agencies located within the National Capital Region. The proposed development is located in South Nepean, corresponding to the TRANS District 425. The complete TRANS O-D results (including a map of the district area) is provided in Appendix C. The most recent Origin-Destination (O-D) survey was completed by TRANS in the Fall of 2011. The TRANS trip data for South Nepean is summarized in Table 2-2.

Table 2-2. Peak Hour Trips by Primary Travel Mode - TRANS District 425 South Nepean

| TRAVEL MODE | AM PEAK PERIOD (6:30 A.M. - 8:59 A.M.) |  | PM PEAK PERIOD (3:30 P.M. - 5:59 P.M.) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FROM <br> DISTRICT | TO DISTRICT | WITHIN <br> DISTRICT | FROM <br> DISTRICT | TO DISTRICT | WITHIN <br> DISTRICT |
|  | $60 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| Auto-Passenger | $19 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Transit | $27 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Bicycle | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Walk | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Other | $4 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Total Vehicles | $\mathbf{2 4 , 1 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 2 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 1 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 , 5 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 , 4 2 0}$ |

Source: TRANS 2011 O-D Survey Report, District 425 - South Nepean
Based on the Trans 2011 O-D Survey, the majority of the population use personal vehicles as their main source of transport to and from the district. During both AM and PM peak hour periods, auto-driver and auto-passenger modes account for between $76 \%$ to $93 \%$ of the total vehicles that are travelling to and from the South Nepean district. The remaining $7 \%$ to $24 \%$ are split between transit, bicycle, walk, or other modes of transportation.

Within the district, travel modes are more diversified. People tend to less rely on auto modes for travelling and would choose other modes especially by walking and other modes.
The existing peak hour turning movement volumes at the Greenbank Road and Kilbirnie intersection are presented in Figure 2-3. The traffic counts were collected by the City of Ottawa on March 3, 2020; the AM and PM peak hours from this count at 7:45-8:45 AM and 4:45-5:45 PM.
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Figure 2-3
Existing Traffic (2020)

### 2.3.8 FIVE-YEAR COLLISION HISTORY

The boundary road for the proposed development is Kilbirnie Drive between Greenbank Road and Robin Easey Avenue. The latest past five years (January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2019) collision history available on the City of Ottawa Open Data website were reviewed, which provides yearly total collisions by location. Table 2-3 summarizes the five-year collision history on the boundary road.

More detailed five-year collision data will be required to identify if any collision pattern and/or safety concern exists. A more thorough collision review will be conducted upon the request from the City.
Table 2-3. Five-Year Collision History Summary (2015-2019)

|  | Location | Pedestrian <br> Collisions | Cyclist <br> Collisions | Total Collisions by Year |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Segment: | Kilbirnie Drive [Greenbank <br> Road - Breakstone Road] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |  |
| Intersection: | Greenbank Road @ Kilbirnie <br> Drive | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |

### 2.4 PLANNED CONDITIONS

### 2.4.1 CHANGES TO THE STUDY AREA TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

The City of Ottawa Official Plan, Transportation Master Plan (TMP) (2013), and Barrhaven South Community Design Plan were reviewed to identify potential future roadway upgrades in the vicinity of the subject development site.

Greenbank Road will be widened to a four-lane cross-section between Cambrian Road and Jockvale Road to accommodate growth within South Nepean as identified in the City of Ottawa Transportation Master Plan (2013). South of Cambrian Road, Greenbank Road will be realigned to run north-south to the west of the subject development site. The Greenbank Realignment and Southwest Transitway Extension project is underway. Per the updated functional design released by the City in summer 2021, a new Park and Ride facility is planned to be located on the south side of Kilbirnie Avenue, west of the future realigned Greenbank Road. The new Greenbank Road alignment from St Joseph's High School to Barnsdale Road will have four lanes and two median bus rapid transit lanes with the bus lanes ending at the new Park and Ride facility. The construction is planned to start in 2030 or later based on budget availability.
Kilbirnie Drive will be extended westwards to connect to the realigned Greenbank Road as part of the Quinn's Pointe Phase 2 Subdivision.

There are no other major changes expected to the study area transportation network.

### 2.4.2 OTHER STUDY AREA DEVELOPMENTS

Two developments are noted in the City of Ottawa's Development Application Search tool developments that are likely to occur within the proposed horizon years of the subject development and could have direct influences on the study area are noted below:

- 989 Kilbirnie Drive (App\# D07-12-20-0181): A Site Plan Control application for a two-storey elementary school and daycare with a GFA of $6,500 \mathrm{~m} 2$ and 121 parking spaces. The build-out horizon is anticipated to be in 2022. The supporting TIA (March 2021) was prepared by Novatech.
- 3718 Greenbank Road (App\# D07-16-21-0024): A Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision application for residential development consisting of a mix of 228 stacked townhouse units. The anticipated full build-out and occupancy horizon is 2024 . The supporting TIA (June 2021) was prepared by CGH Transportation Inc.
- 3960 Greenbank Road - Quinn's Pointe Phase 2: A TIA dated October 2018 was prepared by Stantec in support of this application. Based on the TIA the development will contain 536 single detached houses, 493 townhouses, 100 apartment units, and two elementary schools with a combined $59,000 \mathrm{ft} 2$ GFA.


### 2.5 STUDY AREA AND TIME PERIOD

The limits for the Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) study area and study intersections are shown in Figure 2-4. The boundary roads Kilbirnie Drive and Robin Easey Avenue will be reviewed. Three intersections along Kilbirnie Drive at Robin Easey Avenue, Alex Polowin Avenue and Greenbank Road will be assessed.


Figure 2-4: Study Area
It is noted that the afternoon peak of elementary schools is usually earlier than the regular PM peak hour of the roadway network, therefore the impact of the school will be mainly reflected during the morning peak which generally aligns with the regular AM peak. The study time periods identified for the traffic analysis are weekday

AM and PM peak hours as these represent the time periods with the highest traffic volumes that would govern the design of study area roadways and intersections.

These periods will be consistent with the AM and PM peak hours identified in the latest turning movement counts that were collected at the Kilbirnie Drive and River Mist Road intersection on October 25, 2018, and at the Kilbirnie Drive and Greenbank Road intersection on March 3, 2020.

The peak periods will be checked against more recent turning movement counts if any is available from the City.

### 2.6 HORIZON YEARS

The proposed facility is expected to be completed in one phase with a target build-out year of 2023. In accordance with the City of Ottawa TIA Guidelines (2017), the following horizons will be considered for analysis.

- 2023, which represents the anticipated buildout horizon,
- 2028, which represents the buildout year plus five years.


### 2.7 EXEMPTIONS REVIEW

Based on the review of the development and network conditions, the following elements shown in Table 2-4 qualify for an exemption from this Transportation Impact Assessment.

Table 2-4. Exemptions Summary

| MODULE | ELEMENT | EXEMPTIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DESIGN REVIEW COMPONENT |  |  |
| 4.1 Development Design | 4.1.2 Circulation and Access | Not Exempted. <br> This element is only required for site plans. |
|  | 4.1.3 New Street Networks | Exempted <br> This element is only required for plans of subdivision. |
| 4.2 Parking | 4.2.1 Parking Supply | Not Exempted. <br> This element is required for site plans. |
|  | 4.2.2 Spillover Parking | Exempted <br> This element is only required for site plans where parking supply is $15 \%$ below unconstrained demand. |
| NETWORK IMPACT COMPONENT |  |  |
| 4.5 Transportation Demand Management | All Elements | Not Exempted <br> Not required for site plans expected to have fewer than 60 employees and/or students on location at any given time. |
| 4.6 Neighborhood Traffic Management | 4.6.1 Adjacent Neighbourhoods | Not Exempted <br> Required when the development relies on local or collector access and total volumes exceed ATM capacity threshold. |
| 4.8 Network Concept |  | Exempted <br> Required when proposed development generates more than 200 person-trips during the peak hour in excess of the equivalent volume permitted by established zoning. |

Based on the above, the TIA report will include the following modules:

- Module 4.1: Development Design
- Module 4.2: Parking
- Module 4.3: Boundary Streets
- Module 4.4: Access Design
- Module 4.5: Transportation Demand Management
- Module 4.6: Neighbourhood Traffic Management
- Module 4.7: Transit
- Module 4.9: Intersection Design


## 3 FORECASTING

### 3.1 DEVELOPMENT GENERATED TRAFFIC

### 3.1.1 TRIP GENERATION

The proposed development consists of two primary trip generator land uses which are elementary school and daycare services. Trips generated by the elementary school and daycare service have been estimated based on the most up-to-date information provided by the school board. The elementary school is anticipated to provide capacity for 751 students, while the daycare service will provide capacity for 49 children. A total of 51 staff, including teachers, custodians, and office staff, are expected to work for the school and daycare. There is a plan for future addition to the school providing extra capacity for 200 students, but this addition was not included in this TIA study as it is not part of the current Site Plan Application and no timeline has been defined.

CEPEO has indicated that operation hours of the elementary school will be from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM, and the daycare will operate between 6:00 AM to 5:00 PM. The start and end time of the school and daycare service generally align with the peak hours of the adjacent street traffic.

## SCHOOL PERSON TRIP GENERATION (STUDENTS)

Trip generation for the student population at the proposed school has been developed using first principles analysis based on information provided by CEPEO. The 2020 TRANS Trip Generation Manual does include mode share assumptions for elementary and high schools but recommends that mode shares be developed on a site-specific basis if additional information is available from the school or school board. Information from CEPEO indicates that approximately $85 \%$ of the student population is anticipated to arrive by school bus, with the remainder by other modes. These remaining trips have been split as $10 \%$ by auto and $5 \%$ by active transportation modes, recognizing a portion of the student population will be within walking distance of the school.
SCHOOL PERSON TRIP GENERATION (STAFF)
Staff trip generation to the proposed school is based on the anticipated 51 staff. The Mode share for these trips has been based on the Employment Generator Mode Shares from the 2020 TRANS Trip Generation Manual for the South Nepean District.

## DAYCARE PERSON TRIP GENERATION

Daycare person Trip Generation is based on the capacity of 49 children provided by CEPEO. A $100 \%$ auto passenger mode share has been adopted for daycare children, assuming that all children will be dropped off by parents.

TOTAL PERSON TRIP GENERATION AND MODE SHARE
Table 3-1 provides a summary of the person trip generation for all of the uses on the site.

Table 3-1: Proposed School Site Person Trip Generation and Mode Share

|  | AUTO DRIVER | $\begin{gathered} \text { AUTO } \\ \text { PASSENGER } \end{gathered}$ | SCHOOL BUS | PUBLIC <br> TRANSIT | WALKING \& CYCLING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mode Shares |  |  |  |  |
| School Students | 0\% | 10\% | 85\% | 0\% | 5\% |
| Staff | 80\% | 10\% | 0\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| Daycare Children | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | Person Trips |  |  |  |  |
| School Students | 0 | 75 | 638 | 0 | 38 |
| Staff | 41 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Daycare Children | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL PERSON TRIPS | 41 | 129 | 638 | 3 | 41 |

## CONVERSION TO VEHICLE TRIPS

The person trip generation above represents the student and staff trip generation in terms of arrivals to the school site in the morning and departures in the afternoon but do no reflect the vehicle volumes added to the surrounding road network. The conversion of the person trips to vehicle trips is based on the following:

- Auto passenger trips for student and daycare drop-offs represent one auto arrival and one auto departure from the site during the AM and PM peak hours. Vehicle trips were calculated from the auto passenger person trips assuming a vehicle occupancy of 1.2, reflecting some families who will drop off multiple children in one trip.
- Auto driver trips by staff represent one vehicle arrival in the morning and one departure in the afternoon. Staff auto trips have been calculated based on a vehicle occupancy of 1.0. No additional vehicle trips have been added to reflect staff auto passenger trips as it is anticipated these will be combined with staff auto driver arrivals (carpooling).
- School bus capacity ranges from 48-72 students based on 2-3 students per seat. School bus volumes have been estimated based on an average of 60 students per bus.


## PEAK HOUR DISTRIBUTION

The person trip generation above is based on total trips made by the students and staff to and from the site. CEPEO has indicated that operation hours of the elementary school will be from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM, and the daycare will operate between 6:00 AM to 5:00 PM. It is anticipated that the school hours provided represent before and after care in addition to classes; most CEPEO schools in Ottawa operate with morning and afternoon bell times at approximately 8:30-9:00 AM and 3:00 PM. While school student arrivals will be concentrated just before and after the opening and closing bells, trips by staff, before and after care students and daycare children may be more distributed. Given the commuter peak hours of 7:45-8:45 AM and 4:45-5:45 PM from the provided traffic count, the
proportions of the site generated vehicle trips falling within the commuter peak hours have been estimated based on the following:

- $80 \%$ of auto trips arriving during the AM peak hour, reflecting a portion of the staff arrivals, before school care and daycare drop-offs that arrive earlier in the morning.
- $50 \%$ of auto trips departing the school during the PM peak hour, reflecting a wider distribution of parent pickup between the end of the school day and end of daycare and after school programs and a wider distribution in staff departure times at the end of the day.
- $100 \%$ of school bus arrivals during the AM peak hour, corresponding with a concentration in drop-offs just before the morning bell.
- $0 \%$ of bus departures during the PM peak hour, reflecting that bus departures will occur at the end of the school day before the commuter PM peak hour.


## DAYCARE DIVERTED TRIP ESTIMATION

In many cases, school and daycare drop-offs by parents will be planned as part of a parent's commute; these diverted trips will be reflected in the background traffic volumes on the road network but will divert to the school before continuing on their original path. The Trip Generation Manual $3^{\text {rd }}$ Edition indicates an average diverted trip proportion of $56 \%$ specific to daycare centres; this proportion has been applied as diverted trips in the site generated traffic. The same handbook does not indicate a diverted trip proportion for the elementary school land use; to be conservative, this analysis is based on all auto trips generated by the school to be primary trips added to the road network.

## TOTAL VEHICLE TRIPS

The total peak hour vehicle trips generated by the proposed school are summarized in Table 3-2.
Table 3-2: Total Site Vehicle Trip Generation

|  | AM PEAK HOUR |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IN | OUT | IN | OUT |
| Auto Trips | 115 | 83 | 52 | 72 |
| School Buses | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| Diverted Auto Trips (included <br> in total above) | 18 | 18 | 11 | 11 |

### 3.1.2 TRIP DISTRIBUTION

The overall trip distribution of the site generated trips has been adopted from existing traffic patterns and the TIA for 989 Kilbirnie Drive prepared by Novatech. While the catchment of the proposed school was not provided, the prominence of students on school buses suggests that the catchment area will extend beyond the local neighbourhood, and thus trip distribution based on overall commuter patterns is an appropriate estimate. Based on the surrounding road network configuration and existing traffic patterns, the overall distribution has been assigned to the network as follows:

- Inbound / Outbound Trip Distribution (2023)
- $5 \%$ to/from Kilbirnie Drive to the west (when available 2028, via Robin Easey Avenue to/from the south in 2023).
- $15 \%$ to/from Kilbirnie Drive to the east
- $25 \%$ to/from the south via Greenbank Road
- $55 \%$ to/from the north via Greenbank Road
- Site Access Distribution
- The proposed site plan includes school bus loading bays on both the west side of Robin Easey Avenue and south side of Kilbirnie Drive. School buses have been assigned to the network with $50 \%$ serving each of the bus bay areas. Southbound buses have been assigned to return to Kilbirnie Drive on departure by going around the block to Alex Polowin Avenue.
- Student drop off by parents will be possible using the pickup and drop-off areas on Robin Easey Avenue and within the school parking lot. As school traffic may create difficulty in vehicles returning north to Kilbirnie Drive after pickup or drop-off, $25 \%$ of the outbound traffic has also been assigned to go around the block and return to Kilbirnie Drive via Alex Polowin Avenue.
- Diverted trips have been assumed to originate from existing traffic volumes along Greenbank Road.

Figure 3-1 shows the development generated trips assigned to the study intersections.


### 3.2 BACKGROUND NETWORK TRAFFIC

### 3.2.1 CHANGES TO THE BACKGROUND TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Kilbirnie Drive will be extended westwards to eventually connect to the realigned Greenbank Road as part of the Quinn's Pointe Subdivision (3960 Greenbank Road). While the realigned Greenbank Road is not expected to be constructed within the timeframe examined by this study, there may be potential for a connection to additional residential development to the west as the community continues to grow. The background networks for this analysis have been adapted from the 989 Kilbirnie Drive TIA and are based the existing Kilbirnie cul-de-sac in place during the 2023 scenario and a connection to the west implemented by the 2028 scenario.

### 3.2.2 GENERAL BACKGROUND GROWTH RATES

A 2.0\% annual growth in traffic on study area arterial road (Greenbank Road) was adopted to account for traffic generated by future development that is not currently within the development application process (Section 2.4.2). The $2.0 \%$ increase was consistent with growth assumption used in approved TIA studies prepared supporting the other area developments.

### 3.2.3 OTHER AREA DEVELOPMENTS

Other study area developments that would influence on the subject TIA were summarized in Section 2.4.2. The estimated traffic generated by those developments were detailed in the respective TIA report which also identified other developments anticipated to occur within the same horizon years; the estimated trips were added in the 2023 and 2028 background traffic volumes. Table 3-3 summarizes the other area developments that were accounted for in the background traffic volumes of each future study horizon. The relevant excerpts from the approved TIA are included in Appendix D.

Table 3-3: Area Developments Built-out by 2023 and 2028

2023 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC
2028 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC

| - | Subdivision at 3960 Greenbank Road: Phase 1 and half of <br>  <br> Phase 2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | Subdivision at 3718 Greenbank Road: full build-out |
| - | Development at 989 Kilbirnie Drive: full build-out |
|  |  |

- Subdivision at 3960 Greenbank Road: full build-out
- Subdivision at 3718 Greenbank Road: full build-out
- Subdivision at 3713 Borrisokane Road: full build-out
- Development at 989 Kilbirnie Drive: full buildout


### 3.3 DEMAND RATIONALIZATION

### 3.3.1 DESCRIPTION OF CAPACITY ISSUES

The projected 2023 and 2028 background traffic are shown in Figure 3-2 and Figure 3-3. Total traffic volumes for the 2023 and 2028 planning horizons were estimated by:

- Applying a $\%$ background growth rate to the existing traffic volumes along Greenbank Road
- Adding trips generated by other area developments
- Adding trips generated by the proposed development

The 2023 and 2028 total traffic volumes are shown on Figure 3-4 and Figure 3-5.

### 3.3.2 ADJUSTMENT TO DEVELOPMENT GENERATED TRAVEL DEMANDS

Adjustments to development generated demands have not been proposed since the trips generated by the proposed development are not expected to adversely impact the adjacent transportation network. A detailed assessment of intersection and roadway capacities by using Synchro (version 11) for 2023 and 2028 horizons will be carried out in Section 4 as part of upon the City's approval of the Forecasting Report.

### 3.3.3 ADJUSTMENTS TO BACKGROUND NETWORK TRAVEL DEMANDS

Adjustments to background network demands have not been proposed since the traffic forecasting analysis indicates that the future transportation roadway network within the study area will have capacity to accommodate the addition of development generated traffic.

A detailed intersection capacity and operation assessment to identify if there would be any new over-capacity movement within the study area because of the proposed development will be completed and documented in the Strategy Report (Section 4).
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### 4.1 DEVELOPMENT DESIGN

### 4.1.1 DESIGN FOR SUSTAINABLE MODES

The City of Ottawa's TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist for Non-Residential Developments was completed to assess the opportunity to implement facilities that are supportive of sustainable modes, including cycling, walking and transit. The completed checklist is attached as Appendix E.
As indicated in the TDM checklist and shown on the site plan (Appendix B), the proposed site accommodates sustainable modes in the following ways:

- 50 dedicated bicycle parking spaces .
- Walking distance between site and nearest transit stop is within 400 m .
- Sidewalks are expected to be constructed on Kilbirnie Drive and Robin Easey Avenue fronting the school property. These sidewalks will be depressed continuous facilities to facilitate pedestrian movement and accessibility.
- Provision of pedestrian walkways (represented as a depressed concrete sidewalk) at the vehicle access on Robin Easey Avenue and crossing the drop-off area in the parking lot
It is assumed that upon completion that the intersection of Kilbirnie Drive / Robin Easey Avenue will be all-way stop controlled for pedestrian safety and that crosswalks will be provided at all legs.


### 4.1.2 CIRCULATION AND SITE ACCESS

The proposed school drop-off area, which is situated in the parking lot, is designed to operate with traffic circulation in a counter-clockwise direction. Unidirectional vehicle movements are indicated in the site plan at the east and north sides of the drop-off area and bidirectional vehicle movements are permitted on the west side of the drop-off area to access parking spaces. School staff and parents dropping off and picking up students will primarily utilize the site access off Robin Easey Avenue and parking lot/drop-off area.

Site circulation at the proposed access and drop-off area was assessed using AutoTURN 11 to confirm the suitability of the layout for a variety of design vehicles. The results are provided in Table 4-1 and the AutoTURN swept paths are provided in Appendix F.
Table 4-1: Swept Path Assessment

## DESIGN VEHICLE VEHICLE REPRESENTING

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| HSU |  |
| (TAC 2017) | Municipal Services / Waste Removal |
|  |  |

## FINDINGS

Access: The proposed access configuration on Robin Easey Avenue can accommodate the inbound and outbound movements of an HSU design vehicle (rear loading) without impacting any built features but will require the vehicle to encroach on the opposing vehicle lane for inbound movements.

Circulation: An HSU design vehicle will be able to maneuver to and from the waste containers located at the south-west corner of the drop-off area without conflicting with curbs upon reversing into the drop-off area. Parking spaces will not be impacted.

## DESIGN VEHICLE

VEHICLE REPRESENTING

| 2020 Blue Bird Vision |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (AutoTurn City-Transit) | School Bus | Access: The proposed access configuration on Robin Easey <br> Avenue can accommodate the movements of a school bus <br> without impacting any built features but will require the <br> vehicle to encroach on the opposing vehicle lane for inbound <br> movements. |
| Circulation: A school bus will be able to maneuver around <br> the drop-off area without conflicting with curbs. In addition, <br> parking spaces will not be impacted. School buses will be <br> utilizing the laybys on the south side of Kilbirnie Drive and <br> west side of Robin Easey Avenue only, but in the event of <br> additional school bus circulation measures in the future (ex. <br> school expansion or changes to the transportation network), a <br> school bus will be able to properly circulate around the drop- <br> off area if necessary. |  |  |

It is to be noted that the fire truck access route is from Kilbirnie Drive and shall conform to Ontario's Building Code. In other words, the parking lot and drop-off area will not be part of the fire route for the school building itself and a fire truck's main access point will be to the principal building entrance on Robin Easey Avenue. For the portables, however, the main fire access point will be through the parking lot. Parked school buses on the on-street layby may be considered an obstruction to the fire route or access to the fire hydrant in front of the school. A form of programming should be implemented to have school staff move school buses out of the layby area in the event of an emergency.

### 4.2 PARKING

### 4.2.1 PARKING SUPPLY

Based on the location of the proposed development, the minimum parking space requirements will be assessed in accordance with the Suburban Area (Area 'C') as part of Schedule 1A to the City of Ottawa's Zoning By-Law 2008250. The Zoning By-Law requires that a school and daycare in Area ' C ' provide a minimum parking space rate of 1.5 per classroom (includes portables) and 2 per 100 sq . m. of gross floor area, respectively. In addition, the Zoning By-Law requires that bicycle parking is provided for a school and daycare at a bicycle parking space rate of 1 per 100 sq . m. of gross floor area and 1 per 250 sq . m. of gross floor area, respectively.
The minimum parking space rates can be found in Section 101 of the Zoning By-Law and off-street motor vehicle parking must be provided for any land use at the rate set out in Table 101. Bicycle parking spaces rates and provisions can be found in Section 111 of the Zoning By-Law and bicycle parking must be provided for the land uses and at the rate set out in Table 111A.

The minimum parking supply requirements for this development compared with the proposed parking supply are highlighted in Table 4-2 below.

Table 4-2: Minimum Zoning By-Law Requirements for Parking and Proposed Development Parking Supply
PARKING TYPE LAND USE SIZE REQUIRED SPACES PROVIDED SPACES

| Auto Parking | School | 20 classrooms, <br> 12 portables | 48 | 61 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Daycare | 360 GFA | 7 | 5 |
|  | School | $4,421 \mathrm{GFA}$ | 44 | 50 |
|  | Daycare | 360 GFA | 1 |  |

Based on the provided number of auto and bicycle parking spaces for the proposed development, the auto parking supply exceeds the minimum requirements of the Zoning By-Law by 6 parking spaces (including barrier-free parking spaces) and the bicycle parking supply exceeds the minimum requirements of the Zoning By-Law by 5 bicycle parking spaces. It is noted that the parking rate used for the site plan slightly differs from the Zoning ByLaw rate such that the minimum required parking spaces determined within the site plan exceeds that of the Zoning By-Law.

### 4.3 BOUNDARY STREETS DESIGN

### 4.3.1 MOBILITY

The City of Ottawa's Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) targets consider road classification, adjacent landuse designation, and special policy areas and are intended to evaluate how the proposed school users will be accommodated by the boundary streets bordering the site to the north and east.

### 4.3.1.1 KILBIRNIE DRIVE

The segment of Kilbirnie Drive within the study area is identified as a Local Road per the City of Ottawa Transportation Master Plan (2013) and a Collector Road per the Barrhaven South Community Development Plan. In addition, it is considered to have a General Urban Area land-use designation according to Schedule B - Urban Plan Policy of the City of Ottawa's Official Plan. However, it is noted that the roadway is located within 300 m of a school (St. Benedict School, proposed elementary school located at 989 Kilbirnie Drive, and the proposed school itself) and the applicable MMLOS targets utilized reflect the policy area instead of the land use designation. The resulting MMLOS targets and segment scores for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit during the future background conditions (2023 build-out year) are included in Table 4-3 below and the detailed MMLOS spreadsheets are provided in Appendix G. It is to be noted that there is no target set for trucks and auto LOS is only reported for intersections and that the LOS targets for Collector and Local Roads are the same in this case.
Table 4-3: Segment MMLOS along Kilbirnie Drive between Robin Easey Avenue and Greenbank Road

\left.| SCENARIO | PLOS | BLOS | TLOS | TKLOS | VLOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS Target | A | B | D | No target | Not reported for |
| segments |  |  |  |  |  |$\right]$| Future Background |
| :--- |
| (2023) LOS |

The future background (2023) LOS is based on the existing conditions remaining in place along Kilbirnie Drive. The Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS) is the only target that is met, and the Pedestrian Level of Service (PLOS) and Transit Level of Service (TLOS) do not meet the City of Ottawa targets. This can be attributed to the following:

- No boulevard width to provide separation between pedestrian and vehicles, with operating speeds being between $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ and $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.
- Transit route along Kilbirnie Drive between Greenbank Road and River Mist Road operates in mixed traffic and there is moderate driveway friction with the presence of residential driveways on both the north and south sides of Kilbirnie Drive.

Based on the Planning Rationale prepared by Fotenn Consultants in support of Plan of Subdivision and Zoning Bylaw Amendment applications for Phase 2 of Minto's Quinn's Pointe community in which the proposed school is located, the proposed street network is intended to be designed and integrated with the surrounding transportation network. Kilbirnie Drive is identified as a Collector Road in the Plan of Subdivision and aligns with the collector streets identified in the Community Design Plan. Figure 4-1 illustrates a proposed cross-section for collector streets within the community, specifically for the westward expansion of Kilbirnie Drive. The segment MMLOS for such a cross-section would improve the LOS results along Kilbirnie Drive for pedestrians and bicycles with the presence of a wide boulevard between vehicle lanes and sidewalks/multi-use paths, as well as a physically separated bikeway.


Figure 4-1: Proposed Cross-Section for 24m Collector Streets (Source: Quinn's Pointe- Phase 2 Plan of Subdivision + Zoning By-Law Amendment Planning Rationale (Fotenn Consultants, 2018))

If the existing road right-of-way is insufficient to improve or expand pedestrian/cycling facilities, pedestrian comfort and safety can be further supplemented with traffic calming measures such as reduced speed zones. Provided that the subdivision that the proposed school is in is a recent and ongoing development, road modifications will most likely not be considered for some time.

### 4.3.1.2 ROBIN EASEY AVENUE

The segment of Robin Easey Avenue within the study area is a Local Road and is considered to have a General Urban Area land-use designation according to Schedule B - Urban Plan Policy of the City of Ottawa's Official Plan. However, it is noted that the roadway is located within 300 m of a school (proposed elementary school located at 989 Kilbirnie Drive and the proposed school itself) and the applicable MMLOS targets utilized reflect the policy area instead of the land use designation. The resulting MMLOS targets and segment scores for pedestrians and bicycles
during the future background conditions (2023 build-out year) are included in Table 4-4 below and the detailed MMLOS spreadsheets are provided in Appendix G. Due to the underdeveloped nature of Robin Easey Avenue at the time of this report, the road configuration was based on the site plan which includes sidewalks fronting the school property. It is to be noted that there is no evaluation for transit as no transit routes run along Robin Easey Avenue, there is no target set for trucks, and auto LOS is only reported for intersections.

Table 4-4: Segment MMLOS along Robin Easey Avenue between Kilbirnie Drive and Proposed School Access

| SCENARIO | PLO | BLO | TLO | TKLOS | VLOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS Target | A | B | D | No target | Not reported for segments |
| Future Background (2023) LOS | B | B | - | - |  |

The BLOS is the only target that is met, and the PLOS is below the target by one grade level. This can be attributed to there being no boulevard width to provide separation between pedestrian and vehicles and operating speeds likely being between $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ and $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

### 4.3.2 ROAD SAFETY

### 4.3.2.1 KILBIRNIE DRIVE

Historical collision records for the study area were obtained from the City of Ottawa for the 5-years between January 2015 through December 2019. The TIA Guidelines indicate that patterns with six or more collisions should be identified. In this timeframe, there were three collisions along Kilbirnie Drive between Breakstone Road and Greenbank Road. Therefore, no collision reduction measures have been identified for this section of roadway.

### 4.3.2.2 ROBIN EASEY AVENUE

No collisions have been documented along Robin Easey Avenue between Kilbirnie Drive and the proposed site access due to the underdeveloped nature of the road. Therefore, no collision reduction measures have been identified for this section of roadway.

### 4.4 ACCESS INTERSECTIONS DESIGN

### 4.4.1 LOCATION AND DESIGN OF ACCESS

There is one access point proposed for this development and is indicated in the site plan (Appendix B). It is located off of Robin Easey Avenue at the south-east corner of the site. The three-legged access is proposed as a two-way, full movement access with stop-control on the side approach (access) and free-flow conditions for the north and south approaches along Robin Easey Avenue.

A design compliance check was carried out for the proposed school access for a variety of interrelated design elements for driveways following the Transportation Association of Canada's (TAC) Geometric Design Guidelines for Canadian Roads (2017). The design compliance check is summarized in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5: Access Intersection Design Elements

| DESIGN ELEMENTS | MINIMUM REQUIRED | ROBIN EASEY AVENUE ACCESS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Access Type | - | Full Movement |
| One-way vs. Two-way Operation | $>750$ veh $/ \mathrm{d}$ or $>100$ peak hour trips $=$ high volume two-way driveway | $>100$ peak hour trips Two-way |
| Entrance Width* <br> (Two-way) | Residential: $2.0 \mathrm{~m}-7.3 \mathrm{~m}$ <br> Commercial: $7.2 \mathrm{~m}-12.0 \mathrm{~m}$ <br> Industrial: $9.0 \mathrm{~m}-15.0 \mathrm{~m}$ <br> 6.0 m for a parking lot (City of Ottawa Zoning By-law) | 9.5 m |
| Right Turn Radius* | $\begin{gathered} \text { Residential: } 3.0 \mathrm{~m}-4.5 \mathrm{~m} \\ \text { Commercial: } 4.5 \mathrm{~m}-12.0 \mathrm{~m} \\ \text { Industrial: } 9.0 \mathrm{~m}-15.0 \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | 6.0m |
| Corner Clearance | 15m for Local Roads | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| Sight Distance (Intersections with Stop Control on Minor Road) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Case B1 - Left Turns from Minor Road }= \\ & 105 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \begin{array}{c} \text { Case B2 - Right Turns from Minor Road } \\ =95 \mathrm{~m} \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | No obstructions; be advised of retaining wall on either side of site access and parked vehicles on the west side of Robin Easey Avenue. |
| Throat Length | N/A | Located on a local road 40 m |
| Angle of Intersection | At or near $90^{\circ}$ | Access intersects Robin Easey Avenue at $90^{\circ}$ |
| Proximity to Adjacent Driveways | N/A | No private driveways along the west side of Robin Easey Avenue between Kilbirnie Road and the proposed school access |
| Pedestrian + Cycling Crossing Considerations | Small curb return radii (must be suitable for design turning vehicle) with narrow driveway to minimize crossing distance | 9.5 m pedestrian crossing (depressed and continuous concrete sidewalk through access) <br> No cycling crossing |

*Minimum requirements for institutional developments are not listed in TAC 2017.
Overall, the design elements for the site access on Robin Easey Avenue meet the minimum requirements of TAC 2017 to be considered as good design practice.

### 4.4.2 INTERSECTION CONTROL

Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) Book 12 (2012) Justification 7 includes two warrants (1 and 2) for signalization with two evaluation criteria (A and B) for each:

- $\quad 1 \mathrm{~A}-$ total volume entering the intersection from all approaches.
- 1 B - total volume entering the intersection from the minor approaches only.
- $2 \mathrm{~A}-$ total volume entering the intersection from the main road only.
- 2 B - total volume crossing major road, calculated as the left turns from the minor approaches, pedestrian crossings, highest through volume from one of the minor approaches and $50 \%$ of the heavier left turn from the main road if it exceeds 120 vehicles $/ \mathrm{hr}$ and the opposing traffic exceeds $720 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$.

Signalization can be warranted based on Warrant 1 or 2, but only if both conditions A and B are $100 \%$ met.
Based on Section 3.1.1, the site is estimated to generate 115 and 83 auto vehicle trips in and out of access during the AM Peak Hour, respectively. During the PM Peak Hour, the site is estimated to generate 52 and 72 auto vehicle trips in and out of the access, respectively.
Provided that the school access is considered a T-intersection with one vehicle travel lane in both directions and that it is a future intersection, thresholds are raised for the consideration of traffic signals as a result of using average hourly volumes instead of eight-hour volumes as they are unavailable.

In accordance with OTM Book 12, the site generated volumes listed above are below the minimum requirements for a traffic signal based on Justification 7 - Projected Volumes, as shown in Table 4-6. Therefore, the projected site generated volumes indicate that signalization at the access intersection is not warranted since the volumes fall below the minimum requirements when considering the adjusted volume thresholds for all evaluation criteria.
Table 4-6: OTM Book 12 Signal Warrant Justification 7 - Proposed School

| MINIMUM REQUIREMENT <br> JUSTIFICATION 7 FLOW $^{1}$ |  | ADJ. FLOW |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |

The proposed school access will be located on a low-volume local road such that stop-control on the minor road (site access) is sufficient.

### 4.4.3 INTERSECTION DESIGN

According to the City of Ottawa's MMLOS Guidelines (2015), only signalized intersections are evaluated against the LOS measures for intersections. As such, no formal evaluation has been applied to the proposed site access due to its unsignalized traffic control.

### 4.5 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

### 4.5.1 CONTEXT FOR TDM

The proposed elementary school is anticipated to have 751 students and the on-site daycare service will accommodate 49 children. In addition, a total of 51 staff, including teachers, custodians, and office staff, are expected to work for the school and daycare.

The development is not located within a Design Priority Area (DPA) or Transit-oriented Development (TOD) zone and the majority of staff ( $80 \%$ ) will be auto drivers and the majority of students $(85 \%)$ will arrive and depart by school bus. Between all school users, approximately $15 \%$ are anticipated to be auto passengers, $5 \%$ to use active modes (walking and cycling), and less than $1 \%$ to take public transit.

The school board (CEPEO) has indicated that operation hours of the elementary school will be from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM, and the daycare will operate between 6:00 AM to 5:00 PM. The start and end time of the school and daycare service generally align with the peak hours of the adjacent street traffic.

### 4.5.2 NEED AND OPPORTUNITY

The existing road network has available capacity should the mode share targets not be met, as indicated in Section 4.9.2.

### 4.5.3 TDM PROGRAM

The TDM Measures Checklist for non-residential developments was completed to allow and encourage travel by sustainable modes to and from the proposed development at the time of occupancy. The completed checklist is provided in Appendix E.

The following TDM measures are recommended for the proposed development:

- Display local area maps with walking/cycling access routes and key destinations at major entrances
- Display relevant transit schedules and route maps at entrances


### 4.6 NEIGHBOURHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

### 4.6.1 ADJACENT NEIGHBOURHOODS

The proposed school is located within a mixed-use community that is part of Quinn's Pointe - Phase 2 and the access routes to and from the proposed development contain local and collector roads. As per the City of Ottawa Area Traffic Management (ATM) guidelines, the thresholds for local roads and collector roads are a maximum of 1,000 vehicles per day or 120 vehicles during the peak hour and a maximum of 2,500 vehicles per day or 300 vehicles during the peak hour, respectively. The 2023 and 2028 total traffic volumes, as shown in Figure 3-4 and Figure 3-5, indicate that the addition of development-related traffic to these access roads (Kilbirnie Drive and Robin Easey Avenue) will be above their road classification threshold during the peak hour. However, the 2023 and 2028 future background volumes, as shown in Figure 3-2 and Figure 3-3, indicate that these thresholds are exceeded for Kilbirnie Drive prior to adding development-generated trips.

Despite the road classification vehicle thresholds being exceeded, the Multi-Modal Level of Service Analysis (MMLOS) and intersection capacity analysis provided in Section 4.9.2 indicate that the Vehicle LOS target for the study area is met and that the study area intersections operate at a LOS of B or better. Based on this, the proposed school is expected to have a minimal impact on the access roads.

In conjunction with the TIA prepared for 989 Kilbirnie Drive by Novatech, no change to the existing road classification is required as Kilbirnie Drive is intended to serve as a collector road for Phase 2 of Quinn's Pointe Subdivision. Therefore, a Neighbourhood Traffic Management plan is not required.

### 4.7 TRANSIT

Based on Section 3.1.1, the proposed school is anticipated to generate only 3 person trips from the $5 \%$ of staff expected to use public transit and the existing transit routes do not coincide with the boundary street segments bordering the proposed site. Therefore, transit service will not be impacted according to development-generated demand.

### 4.8 REVIEW OF NETWORK CONCEPT

This module has been exempted based on Section 2.7.

### 4.9 INTERSECTION DESIGN

### 4.9.1 INTERSECTION CONTROL

Of the three study area intersections analyzed, the intersection of Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive is signalized and the intersections of Kilbirnie Drive / Alex Polowin Avenue and Kilbirnie Drive / Robin Easey Avenue are all-way stop-controlled. The detailed performance analysis provided in Section 4.8 .2 below indicates that all three study area intersections and their associated vehicle movements operate at a LOS of B or better for both the AM and PM Peak Hours of all scenarios (i.e., existing, future background and future total). Due to the traffic operations at each intersection performing well below the capacity with the current intersection control, this suggests that there is no need to modify the intersection control to serve the future background and future total traffic demands.

### 4.9.2 INTERSECTION DESIGN

### 4.9.2.1 MULTI-MODAL LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

A Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) analysis was carried out in accordance with the methodology outlined in the City of Ottawa's MMLOS Guidelines (2015). The Guidelines state that intersection LOS measures are to be evaluated at signalized intersections. Within the study area, Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive is the only intersection that is signalized. The MMLOS analysis evaluates the existing conditions (2020), future background (2023 and 2028) and future total (2023 and 2028) time horizon to provide a comparison between the baseline and future condition (beyond the development period).
The intersection of Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive was evaluated as an Arterial within a General Urban Area with the corresponding LOS targets taken from Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS Guidelines. The intersection MMLOS results are summarized in Table 4-7. It is noted that prior to its completed modification in 2021, the intersection of Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive previously was a two-way stop-controlled intersection.
As there are no additional/planned modifications to the intersection configuration of Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive between the existing conditions and up to and including the 2028 future conditions, there is no change in PLOS, BLOS and TkLOS as they are primarily dependent on road infrastructure elements and additionally the signal timing plan for PLOS. TLOS and VLOS are based on average signal delay and volume to capacity ratio, respectively. Based on the anticipated traffic volumes between the existing conditions and up to and including the 2028 future conditions, there is no change in TLOS and VLOS.

Table 4-7: Summary of Intersection Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) Analysis - Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive

| PCENARIO |
| :--- |
| BLOS TLOS TKLOS VLOS   <br> Target C C D E D <br> Existing Conditions <br> $(2020)$ D E C E A <br> Future Background <br> $(2023)$ D E C E A <br> Future Background <br> (2028) D E C E A <br> Future Total (2023) D E C E A <br> Future Total (2028) D E C E A |

The Pedestrian Level of Service (PLOS) target of ' $C$ ' was not met. The target could be met if the signal timing plan was altered such that the effective walk time is increased to more than 11 seconds. It is noted that the pedestrian volume is currently low at this intersection.

The Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS) target of 'C' was not met. The target could be met if cycling facilities such as a curb bike lane or multi-use path were provided on Greenbank Road and Kilbirnie Drive, like the multi-use path that is currently provided from the north approach.

The Transit Level of Service (TLOS) target of 'D' was met. The two transit routes (75 and 675) that utilize the intersection only travel eastbound and westbound along Kilbirnie Drive.

The Truck Level of Service (TkLOS) target of 'E' was met. Greenbank Road and Kilbirnie Drive are not designated City of Ottawa truck routes, so the LOS target is relatively low.

The Vehicle Level of Service (VLOS) target of 'D' was met.

### 4.9.2.2 DETAILED PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

The existing and future conditions were analyzed based upon the weekday peak hour traffic volumes presented in Sections 2.3.7 and 3.3.3. The City of Ottawa's MMLOS Guidelines assigns the vehicle level of service (VLOS) based on ranges of volume to capacity ratio, as indicated in Table 4-8. The VLOS for the intersection of Greenbank Road and Kilbirnie Drive was evaluated using the volume to capacity ratio.

Table 4-8: City of Ottawa MMLOS Guidelines, LOS Criteria - Signalized Intersections

| VLOS | VOLUME TO CAPACITY |
| :---: | :---: |
| RATIO |  |
| A | $0-0.60$ |
| B | $0.61-0.70$ |
| C | $0.71-0.80$ |
| D | $0.80-0.90$ |
| E | $0.91-1.00$ |
| F | $>1.00$ |

For all-way stop control intersections, VLOS is based on control delay, as indicated in Table 4-9. The VLOS for the intersections of Kilbirnie Drive / Alex Polowin Avenue and Kilbirnie Drive / Robin Easey Avenue were evaluated using the control delay.

Table 4-9: Highway Capacity Manual 2010, LOS Criteria - All-Way Stop Control Intersections

| VLOS | CONTROL DELAY (S) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $0-10$ |
| B | $>10-15$ |
| C | $>15-25$ |
| D | $>25-35$ |
| E | $>35-50$ |
| F | $>50$ |

The following tables present the results of the intersection capacity analysis. All intersections were analyzed using Synchro 11 following the analysis parameters in the TIA Guidelines. Appendix H contains the detailed Synchro analysis sheets.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing conditions (2020) intersection operations analysis results are summarized in Table 4-10. The intersection of Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie within the study area and its respective vehicle movements currently operates with an acceptable VLOS (LOS A) that is well below capacity.
Table 4-10: Summary of Traffic Operations Analysis - Existing Conditions (2020)

| MOVEMENT | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | V/C | Delay (s) | 95th \%ile <br> Queue (m) | LOS | V/C | Delay (s) | 95th \%ile <br> Queue (m) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive

| EBL | A | 0.46 | 37.1 | 22.0 | $A$ | 0.28 | 33.0 | 14.1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBTR | A | 0.41 | 10.5 | 14.0 | A | 0.24 | 12.5 | 8.9 |
| WBL | A | 0.38 | 34.3 | 18.5 | A | 0.14 | 29.2 | 8.6 |
| WBTR | A | 0.38 | 10.7 | 13.1 | A | 0.29 | 14.0 | 10.7 |
| NBL | A | 0.32 | 38.4 | 16.8 | A | 0.56 | 40.4 | 36.1 |
| NBT | A | 0.10 | 10.8 | 20.7 | A | 0.16 | 13.0 | 35.6 |
| NBR | A | 0.02 | 0.1 | 0.0 | A | 0.08 | 0.8 | 1.9 |
| SBL | A | 0.20 | 36.9 | 11.6 | A | 0.42 | 38.8 | 24.5 |


| SBT | A | 0.14 | 12.5 | 29.4 | A | 0.13 | 14.5 | 27.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SBR | A | 0.05 | 0.1 | 0.0 | A | 0.09 | 1.4 | 3.0 |
| Intersection LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Movement LOS is based on Synchro V/C ratios and the LOS thresholds in Section 6.1 of the City of Ottawa's Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) Guidelines for signalized intersections. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. \# - volume for the 95th percentile exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The overall intersection LOS is based on the V/C ratio from the HCM 2000 Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis report that is generated from Synchro. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## FUTURE BACKGROUND

Compared to the existing conditions, the VLOS for the study area intersections and their respective vehicle movements remain unchanged during the 2023 future background condition. During the 2028 future background condition, the VLOS remains unchanged, except for the eastbound left movement at the intersection of Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive that drops from a VLOS A to a VLOS B. The 2023 and 2028 future background intersection operations analysis results are summarized in Table 4-11 and Table 4-12, respectively.
Table 4-11: Summary of Traffic Operations Analysis - Future Background (2023)

|  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOVEMENT | LOS | V/C | Delay (s) | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }} \%$ ile <br> Queue (m) | LOS | V/C | Delay (s) | 95 $^{\text {th }} \%$ ile Queue (m) |
| Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBL | A | 0.60 | 41.0 | 31.8 | A | 0.43 | 36.1 | 21.1 |
| EBTR | A | 0.49 | 9.4 | 17.2 | A | 0.37 | 13.1 | 13.7 |
| WBL | A | 0.35 | 32.4 | 17.5 | A | 0.12 | 27.7 | 8.2 |
| WBTR | A | 0.40 | 13.1 | 16.8 | A | 0.27 | 14.3 | 11.0 |
| NBL | A | 0.47 | 40.3 | 25.3 | A | 0.60 | 39.5 | \#52.5 |
| NBT | A | 0.17 | 11.5 | 32.5 | A | 0.20 | 14.2 | 40.4 |
| NBR | A | 0.02 | 0.1 | 0.0 | A | 0.09 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| SBL | A | 0.19 | 36.7 | 10.6 | A | 0.42 | 39.5 | 22.6 |


| SBT | A | 0.17 | 15.9 | 33.0 | A | 0.22 | 17.6 | 37.2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SBR | A | 0.12 | 1.7 | 3.6 | A | 0.19 | 4.1 | 9.9 |
| Intersection <br> LOS | $\mathbf{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Kilbirnie Drive / Alex Polowin Avenue

| EBLTR | A | 0.03 | 7.3 | - | A | 0.02 | 7.2 | - |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WBLTR | A | 0.07 | 7.4 | - | A | 0.13 | 7.6 | - |
| NBLTR | A | 0.07 | 6.9 | - | A | 0.05 | 7.0 | - |
| SBLTR | A | 0.06 | 7.6 | - | $A$ | 0.04 | 7.5 | - |
| Intersection <br> LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Kilbirnie Drive / Robin Easey Avenue

| EBTR | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WBLT | A | 0.02 | 7.3 | - | A | 0.03 | 7.3 | - |
| NBLR | A | 0.03 | 6.5 | - | A | 0.02 | 6.4 | - |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |

## Notes:

1. Movement LOS is based on Synchro V/C ratios and the LOS thresholds in Section 6.1 of the City of Ottawa's Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) Guidelines for signalized intersections.
2. \# - volume for the 95 th percentile exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
3. The overall intersection LOS is based on the V/C ratio from the HCM 2000 Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis report that is generated from Synchro.

Table 4-12: Summary of Traffic Operations Analysis - Future Background (2028)

|  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | V/C | Delay (s) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95 }{ }^{\text {th }} \% \text { \%ile } \\ & \text { Queue (m) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | V/C | Delay (s) | $\begin{aligned} & 95^{\text {th }} \% \text { \%ile } \\ & \text { Queue (m) } \end{aligned}$ |


| Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBL | B | 0.62 | 41.6 | 33.5 | A | 0.45 | 36.4 | 22.1 |
| EBTR | A | 0.52 | 9.4 | 18.3 | A | 0.39 | 12.6 | 14.5 |
| WBL | A | 0.38 | 33.9 | 17.8 | A | 0.12 | 27.5 | 8.2 |
| WBTR | A | 0.40 | 13.0 | 16.9 | A | 0.26 | 14.1 | 11.0 |
| NBL | A | 0.49 | 40.6 | 26.9 | A | 0.58 | 37.0 | \#64.0 |
| NBT | A | 0.23 | 12.1 | 43.9 | A | 0.26 | 14.8 | 52.5 |
| NBR | A | 0.02 | 0.1 | 0.0 | A | 0.09 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| SBL | A | 0.19 | 36.7 | 10.6 | A | 0.42 | 39.5 | 22.6 |
| SBT | A | 0.23 | 16.7 | 42.7 | A | 0.33 | 20.0 | 50.9 |
| SBR | A | 0.09 | 0.3 | 0.6 | A | 0.21 | 4.8 | 11.4 |
| Intersection LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kilbirnie Drive / Alex Polowin Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBLTR | A | 0.11 | 7.8 | - | A | 0.07 | 7.6 | - |
| WBLTR | A | 0.09 | 7.6 | - | A | 0.20 | 8.1 | - |
| NBLTR | A | 0.08 | 7.2 | - | A | 0.06 | 7.3 | - |
| SBLTR | A | 0.06 | 7.8 | - | A | 0.05 | 7.7 | - |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Kilbirnie Drive / Robin Easey Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBTR | A | 0.08 | 7.4 | - | A | 0.05 | 7.1 | - |
| WBLT | A | 0.11 | 7.6 | - | A | 0.04 | 7.3 | - |
| NBLR | A | 0.04 | 6.9 | - | A | 0.03 | 6.8 | - |


| Intersection <br> LOS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Notes: |
| 1. Movement LOS is based on Synchro V/C ratios and the LOS thresholds in Section 6.1 of the City of Ottawa's Multi-Modal |
| Level of Service (MMLOS) Guidelines for signalized intersections. |
| 2. \# - volume for the 95th percentile exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |
| 3. The overall intersection LOS is based on the V/C ratio from the HCM 2000 Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis report |
| that is generated from Synchro. |

## FUTURE TOTAL

Compared to the 2023 future background condition, the VLOS for the study area intersections and their respective vehicle movements remain unchanged during the 2023 future total condition (inclusion of vehicle trips generated from the proposed school), except for the eastbound left movement at the intersection of Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive that drops from a VLOS A to a VLOS B. The eastbound left-turn storage lane length is sufficient to accommodate vehicle queues. The 2023 future background intersection operations analysis results are summarized in Table 4-13.

Table 4-13: Summary of Traffic Operations Analysis - Future Total (2023)

| MOVEMENT | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | V/C | Delay (s) | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }} \%$ ile <br> Queue (m) | LOS | V/C | Delay (s) | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }} \%$ ile <br> Queue (m) |
| Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBL | B | 0.70 | 42.9 | 42.2 | A | 0.57 | 39.5 | 30.1 |
| EBTR | A | 0.50 | 8.9 | 19.5 | A | 0.41 | 13.0 | 16.7 |
| WBL | A | 0.31 | 28.5 | 16.8 | A | 0.11 | 26.1 | 8.2 |
| WBTR | A | 0.41 | 13.3 | 19.6 | A | 0.27 | 14.8 | 12.7 |
| NBL | A | 0.59 | 44.7 | \#35.2 | A | 0.59 | 38.2 | \#57.9 |
| NBT | A | 0.18 | 13.5 | 34.8 | A | 0.23 | 15.5 | 41.2 |
| NBR | A | 0.03 | 0.1 | 0.0 | A | 0.10 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| SBL | A | 0.19 | 36.7 | 10.6 | A | 0.42 | 39.5 | 22.6 |
| SBT | A | 0.19 | 18.3 | 31.9 | A | 0.25 | 20.0 | 36.8 |


| SBR | A | 0.23 | 4.8 | 12.8 | A | 0.26 | 5.1 | 12.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Kilbirnie Drive / Alex Polowin Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBLTR | A | 0.12 | 8.0 | - | A | 0.08 | 7.7 | - |
| WBLTR | A | 0.22 | 8.5 | - | A | 0.19 | 8.1 | - |
| NBLTR | A | 0.10 | 7.6 | - | A | 0.07 | 7.3 | - |
| SBLTR | A | 0.06 | 8.1 | - | A | 0.04 | 7.8 | - |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Kilbirnie Drive / Robin Easey Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBTR | A | 0.01 | 7.0 | - | A | 0.00 | 6.6 | - |
| WBLT | A | 0.16 | 8.2 | - | A | 0.08 | 7.7 | - |
| NBLR | A | 0.10 | 7.1 | - | A | 0.07 | 6.8 | - |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Movement LOS is based on Synchro V/C ratios and the LOS thresholds in Section 6.1 of the City of Ottawa's Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) Guidelines for signalized intersections. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. \# - volume for the 95th percentile exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The overall intersection LOS is based on the V/C ratio from the HCM 2000 Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis report that is generated from Synchro. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Compared to the 2028 future background condition, the VLOS for the study area intersections and their respective vehicle movements remain unchanged during the 2028 future total condition (inclusion of vehicle trips generated from the proposed school), except for the northbound left movement at the intersection of Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive that drops from a VLOS A to a VLOS B. The northbound left-turn storage lane length is sufficient to accommodate vehicle queues. The 2028 future background intersection operations analysis results are summarized in Table 4-14.

Table 4-14: Summary of Traffic Operations Analysis - Future Total (2028)

| MOVEMENT | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | V/C | Delay (s) | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }} \%$ ile <br> Queue (m) | LOS | V/C | Delay (s) | $\mathbf{9 5}^{\text {th }} \% \text { ile }$ <br> Queue (m) |
| Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBL | B | 0.70 | 42.2 | 42.9 | A | 0.57 | 39.7 | 31.1 |
| EBTR | A | 0.53 | 8.6 | 20.1 | A | 0.43 | 12.4 | 17.4 |
| WBL | A | 0.33 | 28.7 | 16.7 | A | 0.11 | 26.0 | 8.2 |
| WBTR | A | 0.40 | 12.9 | 19.2 | A | 0.27 | 14.6 | 12.7 |
| NBL | B | 0.62 | 47.1 | \#43.5 | A | 0.58 | 36.1 | \#69.4 |
| NBT | A | 0.24 | 14.4 | 46.5 | A | 0.29 | 16.2 | 51.9 |
| NBR | A | 0.03 | 0.1 | 0.0 | A | 0.10 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| SBL | A | 0.19 | 36.7 | 10.6 | A | 0.42 | 39.5 | 22.6 |
| SBT | A | 0.26 | 19.7 | 40.3 | A | 0.38 | 23.1 | 49.2 |
| SBR | A | 0.23 | 5.2 | 12.0 | A | 0.29 | 5.4 | 13.0 |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Kilbirnie Drive / Alex Polowin Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBLTR | A | 0.20 | 8.6 | - | A | 0.13 | 8.1 | - |
| WBLTR | A | 0.25 | 8.9 | - | A | 0.27 | 8.7 | - |
| NBLTR | A | 0.11 | 7.8 | - | A | 0.08 | 7.7 | - |
| SBLTR | A | 0.07 | 8.4 | - | A | 0.05 | 8.0 | - |
| Intersection LOS | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Kilbirnie Drive / Robin Easey Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| EBTR | A | 0.10 | 7.8 | - | $A$ | 0.05 | 7.3 | - |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WBLT | A | 0.26 | 8.9 | - | A | 0.10 | 7.8 | - |
| NBLR | A | 0.11 | 7.6 | - | A | 0.08 | 7.0 | - |
| Intersection <br> LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Movement LOS is based on Synchro V/C ratios and the LOS thresholds in Section 6.1 of the City of Ottawa's Multi-Modal <br> Level of Service (MMLOS) Guidelines for signalized intersections. <br> 2. \# - volume for the 95th percentile exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. <br> 3. The overall intersection LOS is based on the V/C ratio from the HCM 2000 Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis report <br> that is generated from Synchro. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 4.10 SUMMARY OF IMPROVEMENTS INDICATED AND MODIFICATION OPTIONS

A summary of transportation improvements proposed as part of this Transportation Impact Assessment carried out and the proposed modifications are presented as follows:

## 1. Development Design

- Sustainable modes have been accounted for on-site through the provision of internal sidewalks, bicycle parking, and direct connections and access to an existing adjacent transit stop.
- The site plan was assessed using AutoTurn 11 for various design vehicles (waste removal and school bus) accessing and circulating around the site. The AutoTurn swept paths indicate that the site access on Robin Easey Avenue can accommodate the movements of these design vehicles entering and exiting the site without conflicting with built features but encroach on the opposing vehicle lane. The drop-off area can accommodate the wide turning movements of these design vehicles when circulating around it without conflicting with the curb.
- While school buses will not be using the drop-off area in the parking lot and will instead be using the boundary street laybys, the drop-off area can accommodate school bus movements if circulation patterns change in the future.


## 2. Parking

- The 61 auto parking and 50 bicycle parking spaces provided in the site plan meet the minimum requirements of the City of Ottawa's Zoning By-Law.


## 3. Boundary Streets Design

- Kilbirnie Drive and Robin Easey Avenue do not meet the Pedestrian LOS target of A for a policy area of being within 300 m of a school. Pedestrian comfort and safety can be further supplemented by traffic calming measures such as reduced speed zones.


## 4. Access Intersections Design

- The site access on Robin Easey Avenue meets the requirements set out for driveways in TAC 2017 to be considered as part of good design practice.
- In accordance with OTM Book 12, the site generated volumes are below the minimum requirements for a traffic signal to be warranted based on Justification 7 - Projected Volumes.
- Stop-control on the minor road (site access) is sufficient.

5. Transportation Demand Management

- The existing road network has available capacity should the mode share targets not be met.
- The TDM measures recommended for the proposed development include displaying local area maps with walking/cycling access routes and transit schedules with route maps.


## 6. Neighbourhood Traffic Management

- Despite the future traffic volumes along the access routes being above the thresholds for local and collector roads during the peak hour, the proposed school will have a minimal impact on the access roads since the traffic operations are well below the capacity (LOS B or better).

7. Transit

- Transit service along Kilbirnie Drive (east of River Mist Road) will not be impacted according to the low development-generated demand estimated of school staff.


## 8. Intersection Design

- Intersection of Greenbank Road / Kilbirnie Drive (signalized): No proposed modifications. Control type, configuration, and capacity are sufficient.
- Intersection of Kilbirnie Drive / Alex Polowin Avenue (stop-control): No proposed modifications. Control type, configuration, and capacity are sufficient.
- Intersection of Kilbirnie Drive / Robin Easey Avenue (stop-control): No proposed modifications. Control type, configuration, and capacity are sufficient.

Based on the results of this Transportation Impact Assessment, the transportation network surrounding the proposed elementary school by CEPEO located at 1045 Kilbirnie Drive can accommodate the development without adverse impacts to future traffic operations during the 2023 built-out year and 2028 planning horizon.

APPENDIX

A
SCREENING FORM

## City of Ottawa 2017 TIA Guidelines Screening Form

## 1. Description of Proposed Development

| Municipal Address | N/A - Barrhaven-Sud Elementary School |
| :--- | :--- |
| Description of Location | Located at the south-west corner of Kilbirnie Dr and Robin Easey Ave |
| Land Use Classification | Institutional - School |
| Development Size (units) | 800 students and staff |
| Development Size $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | 5,455 (building area) |
| Number of Accesses and Locations | One vehcile access from Robin Easey Avenue |
| Phase of Development | Single Phase |
| Buildout Year | 2023 |

If available, please attach a sketch of the development or site plan to this form.

## 2. Trip Generation Trigger

Considering the Development's Land Use type and Size (as filled out in the previous section), please refer to the Trip Generation Trigger checks below.

| 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 | $75 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |

* If the development has a land use type other than what is presented in the table above, estimates of person-trip generation may be made based on average trip generation characteristics represented in the current edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual.

If the proposed development size is greater than the sizes identified above, the Trip Generation Trigger is satisfied.

800 students and staff will trigger in excess of 60 person trips to the site.

## 3. Location Triggers

Does the development propose a new driveway to a boundary street that is
designated as part of the City's Transit Priority, Rapid Transit or Spine
Bicycle Networks?
Is the development in a Design Priority Area (DPA) or Transit-oriented
Development (TOD) zone?*
*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).

If any of the above questions were answered with 'Yes,' the Location Trigger is satisfied.

## 4. Safety Triggers

Are posted speed limits on a boundary street are $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ or greater?
Are there any horizontal/vertical curvatures on a boundary street limits sight lines at a proposed driveway?

Is the proposed driveway within the area of influence of an adjacent traffic signal or roundabout (i.e. within 300 m of intersection in rural conditions, or within 150 m of intersection in urban/ suburban conditions)?

Is the proposed driveway within auxiliary lanes of an intersection?
Does the proposed driveway make use of an existing median break that serves an existing site?

Is there is a documented history of traffic operations or safety concerns on the boundary streets within 500 m of the development?

Does the development include a drive-thru facility?


## If any of the above questions were answered with 'Yes,' the Safety Trigger is satisfied.

## 5. Summary



## If none of the triggers are satisfied, the TIA Study is complete. If one or more of the triggers is satisfied, the TIA Study must continue into the next stage (Screening and Scoping).

## APPENDIX

 PLAN
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 TRANS O-D SURVEY
## South Nepean

## Demographic Characteristics




[^1]
## Travel Patterns



Trips by Trip Purpose

| 24 Hours | From District | To District |  | Within District |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Work or related | 25,640 | $41 \%$ | 5,290 | $8 \%$ | 4,680 | $6 \%$ |
| School | 5,310 | $8 \%$ | 1,430 | $2 \%$ | 10,610 | $13 \%$ |
| Shopping | 4,940 | $8 \%$ | 4,220 | $7 \%$ | 12,840 | $16 \%$ |
| Leisure | 6,960 | $11 \%$ | 4,020 | $6 \%$ | 5,760 | $7 \%$ |
| Medical | 1,720 | $3 \%$ | 900 | $1 \%$ | 840 | $1 \%$ |
| Pick-up / drive passenger | 4,040 | $6 \%$ | 3,920 | $6 \%$ | 7,530 | $9 \%$ |
| Return Home | 11,460 | $18 \%$ | 40,960 | $65 \%$ | 34,630 | $43 \%$ |
| Other | 2,640 | $4 \%$ | 2,090 | $3 \%$ | 3,020 | $4 \%$ |
| Total: | 62,710 | $100 \%$ | 62,830 | $100 \%$ | 79,910 | $100 \%$ |


| AM Peak (06:30-08:59) | From District | To District |  | Within District |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Work or related | 18,160 | $75 \%$ | 2,890 | $47 \%$ | 2,120 | $12 \%$ |
| School | 3,280 | $14 \%$ | 1,170 | $19 \%$ | 9,180 | $53 \%$ |
| Shopping | 180 | $1 \%$ | 70 | $1 \%$ | 720 | $4 \%$ |
| Leisure | 350 | $1 \%$ | 230 | $4 \%$ | 220 | $1 \%$ |
| Medical | 400 | $2 \%$ | 60 | $1 \%$ | 100 | $1 \%$ |
| Pick-up / drive passenger | 1,060 | $4 \%$ | 770 | $13 \%$ | 2,860 | $17 \%$ |
| Return Home | 210 | $1 \%$ | 640 | $10 \%$ | 1,070 | $6 \%$ |
| Other | 520 | $2 \%$ | 290 | $5 \%$ | 990 | $6 \%$ |
| Total: | 24,160 | $100 \%$ | 6,120 | $100 \%$ | 17,260 | $100 \%$ |


| PM Peak (15:30-17:59) | From District | To District |  | Within District |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Work or related | 410 | $5 \%$ | 290 | $1 \%$ | 410 | $2 \%$ |
| School | 250 | $3 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 50 | $0 \%$ |
| Shopping | 900 | $11 \%$ | 1,090 | $5 \%$ | 2,090 | $11 \%$ |
| Leisure | 1,420 | $17 \%$ | 790 | $3 \%$ | 1,840 | $10 \%$ |
| Medical | 190 | $2 \%$ | 230 | $1 \%$ | 90 | $0 \%$ |
| Pick-up / drive passenger | 820 | $10 \%$ | 1,700 | $7 \%$ | 1,610 | $9 \%$ |
| Return Home | 3,800 | $47 \%$ | 18,990 | $81 \%$ | 11,810 | $64 \%$ |
| Other | 360 | $4 \%$ | 490 | $2 \%$ | 540 | $3 \%$ |
| Total: | 8,150 | $100 \%$ | 23,580 | $100 \%$ | 18,440 | $100 \%$ |


| Peak Period (\%) | Total: | \% of 24 Hours | Within District (\%) |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 Hours | 205,450 |  | $39 \%$ |
| AM Peak Period | 47,540 | $23 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| PM Peak Period | 50,170 | $24 \%$ | $37 \%$ |


| AM Peak Period (6:30-8:59) | Destinations of Trips From | Origins of Trips To |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | District | \% Total | District | \% Total |
| Ottawa Centre | 3,820 | 9\% | 30 | 0\% |
| Ottawa Inner Area | 2,270 | 5\% | 340 | 1\% |
| Ottawa East | 630 | 2\% | 50 | 0\% |
| Beacon Hill | 370 | 1\% | 50 | 0\% |
| Alta Vista | 2,360 | 6\% | 460 | 2\% |
| Hunt Club | 920 - | 2\% | 440 | 2\% |
| Merivale | 4,310 | 10\% | 790 | 3\% |
| Ottawa West | 1,830 | 4\% | 160 | 1\% |
| Bayshore / Cedarview | 3,230 | 8\% | 700 | 3\% |
| Orléans | 330 | 1\% | 200 | 1\% |
| Rural East | 20 | 0\% | 60 | 0\% |
| Rural Southeast | 250 | 1\% | 580 | 2\% |
| South Gloucester / Leitrim | 100 | 0\% | 310 | 1\% |
| South Nepean | 17,260 | 42\% | 17,260 | 74\% |
| Rural Southwest | 580 | 1\% | 970 | 4\% |
| Kanata / Stittsvile | 1,800 | 4\% | 690 | 3\% |
| Rural West | 80 | 0\% | $30 \mid$ | 0\% |
| Île de Hull | 840 | 2\% | 50 | 0\% |
| Hull Périphérie | 260 | 1\% | 40 \| | 0\% |
| Plateau | 0 | 0\% | 40 | 0\% |
| Aylmer | 60 | 0\% | 40 \| | 0\% |
| Rural Northwest | 40 | 0\% | 40 | 0\% |
| Pointe Gatineau | 0 - | 0\% | 0 - | 0\% |
| Gatineau Est | 0 - | 0\% | $20 \mid$ | 0\% |
| Rural Northeast | 10 | 0\% | 20 | 0\% |
| Buckingham / Masson-Angers | 20 - | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Ontario Sub-Total: | 40,160 | 97\% | 23,120 | 99\% |
| Québec Sub-Total: | 1,230 | 3\% | 250 | 1\% |
| Total: | 41,390 | 100\% | 23,370 | 100\% |

Trips by Primary Travel Mode

| 24 Hours | From District | To District |  |  | Within District |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Auto Driver | 41,340 | $66 \%$ | 41,280 | $66 \%$ | 39,110 | $49 \%$ |
| Auto Passenger | 9,400 | $15 \%$ | 10,030 | $16 \%$ | 15,320 | $19 \%$ |
| Transit | 9,990 | $16 \%$ | 9,520 | $15 \%$ | 2,260 | $3 \%$ |
| Bicycle | 310 | $0 \%$ | 320 | $1 \%$ | 960 | $1 \%$ |
| Walk | 80 | $0 \%$ | 170 | $0 \%$ | 13,060 | $16 \%$ |
| Other | 1,600 | $3 \%$ | 1,520 | $2 \%$ | 9,210 | $12 \%$ |
| Total: | 62,720 | $100 \%$ | 62,840 | $100 \%$ | 79,920 | $100 \%$ |


| AM Peak (06:30-08:59) | From District | To District |  | Within District |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Auto Driver | 14,570 | $60 \%$ | 4,360 | $71 \%$ | 5,800 | $34 \%$ |
| Auto Passenger | 1,930 | $8 \%$ | 780 | $13 \%$ | 3,210 | $19 \%$ |
| Transit | 6,610 | $27 \%$ | 330 | $5 \%$ | 730 | $4 \%$ |
| Bicycle | 80 | $0 \%$ | 50 | $1 \%$ | 320 | $2 \%$ |
| Walk | 20 | $0 \%$ | 10 | $0 \%$ | 3,000 | $17 \%$ |
| Other | 930 | $4 \%$ | 590 | $10 \%$ | 4,200 | $24 \%$ |
| Total: | 24,140 | $100 \%$ | 6,120 | $100 \%$ | 17,260 | $100 \%$ |


| PM Peak (15:30-17:59) | From District |  | To District | Within District |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Auto Driver | 5,840 | $72 \%$ | 14,640 | $62 \%$ | 8,420 | $46 \%$ |
| Auto Passenger | 1,730 | $21 \%$ | 2,680 | $11 \%$ | 3,930 | $21 \%$ |
| Transit | 350 | $4 \%$ | 5,770 | $24 \%$ | 650 | $4 \%$ |
| Bicycle | 80 | $1 \%$ | 110 | $0 \%$ | 150 | $1 \%$ |
| Walk | 30 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 3,680 | $20 \%$ |
| Other | 100 | $1 \%$ | 380 | $2 \%$ | 1,590 | $9 \%$ |
| Total: | 8,130 | $100 \%$ | 23,580 | $100 \%$ | 18,420 | $100 \%$ |


| Avg Vehicle Occupancy | From District | To District | Within District |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 Hours | 1.23 | 1.24 | 1.39 |
| AM Peak Period | 1.13 | 1.18 | 1.55 |
| PM Peak Period | 1.30 | 1.18 | 1.47 |


| Transit Modal Split | From District | To District | Within District |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 Hours | $16 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| AM Peak Period | $29 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| PM Peak Period | $4 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $5 \%$ |

## APPENDIX



Figure 6: 2022 Background Traffic


Figure 7: 2027 Background Traffic


Figure 8: 2022 Total Traffic


Figure 9: 2027 Total Traffic
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## TDM

CHECKLISTS

# TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist: <br> Non-Residential Developments (office, institutional, retail or industrial) 

| REQUIRED | Legend |
| :---: | :--- |
| The Official Plan or Zoning By-law provides related guidance |  |
| that must be followed |  |

TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: Non-residential developments

## 1. WALKING \& CYCLING: ROUTES

### 1.1 Building location \& access points

BASIC 1.1.1 Locate building close to the street, and do not locate parking areas between the street and building entrances

BASIC

BASIC
1.1.3 Locate building doors and windows to ensure visibility of pedestrians from the building, for their security and comfort

### 1.2 Facilities for walking \& cycling

1.2.1 Provide convenient, direct access to stations or major stops along rapid transit routes within 600 metres; minimize walking distances from buildings to rapid transit; provide pedestrian-friendly, weather-protected (where possible) environment between rapid transit accesses and building entrances; ensure quality linkages from sidewalks through building entrances to integrated stops/stations (see Official Plan policy 4.3.3)

REQUIRED
1.2.2 Provide safe, direct and attractive pedestrian access from public sidewalks to building entrances through such measures as: reducing distances between public sidewalks and major building entrances; providing walkways from public streets to major building entrances; within a site, providing walkways along the front of adjoining buildings, between adjacent buildings, and connecting areas where people may congregate, such as courtyards and transit stops; and providing weather protection through canopies, colonnades, and other design elements wherever possible (see Official Plan policy 4.3.12)

Bus Stops \#2807 and \#2808 are located within 400 m of site.

|  | TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: Non-residential developments |  | Check if completed \& add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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) | $\square$ |  |
| 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) | $\nabla$ |  |
| 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) | $\nabla$ |  |
| BASIC | 1.2.6 | Provide safe, direct and attractive walking routes from building entrances to nearby transit stops | $\nabla$ |  |
| BASIC | 1.2.7 | Ensure that walking routes to transit stops are secure, visible, lighted, shaded and wind-protected wherever possible | $\nabla$ |  |
| 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 | $\square$ | N/A |
|  | 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 | $\square$ | N/A |
| 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) | $\square$ | N/A |



| TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: Non-residential developments |  |  | Check if completed \& add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3. | TRANSIT |  |  |
|  | 3.1 | Customer amenities |  |  |
| BASIC | 3.1.1 | Provide shelters, lighting and benches at any on-site transit stops | $\square$ | Nearest transit stop located off-site |
| BASIC | 3.1.2 | Where the site abuts an off-site transit stop and insufficient space exists for a transit shelter in the public right-of-way, protect land for a shelter and/or install a shelter | $\square$ |  |
| BETTER | 3.1.3 | Provide a secure and comfortable interior waiting area by integrating any on-site transit stops into the building | $\square$ | N/A |
|  |  | 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 | $\square$ |  |
|  | 4.2 | Carpool parking |  |  |
| BASIC | 4.2.1 | Provide signed parking spaces for carpools in a priority location close to a major building entrance, sufficient in number to accommodate the mode share target for carpools | $\square$ | N/A |
| BETTER | 4.2.2 | At large developments, provide spaces for carpools in a separate, access-controlled parking area to simplify enforcement | $\square$ | N/A |
|  |  | CARSHARING \& BIKESHARING |  |  |
|  | 5.1 | Carshare parking spaces |  |  |
| BETTER | 5.1.1 | Provide carshare parking spaces in permitted nonresidential zones, occupying either required or provided parking spaces (see Zoning By-law Section 94) | $\square$ | N/A |
|  | 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 | $\square$ | N/A |



## TDM Measures Checklist: <br> Non-Residential Developments (office, institutional, retail or industrial)

## Legend

BASIC The measure is generally feasible and effective, and in most cases would benefit the development and its users
BETTER
The measure could maximize support for users of sustainable modes, and optimize development performance

The measure is one of the most dependably effective tools to encourage the use of sustainable modes


| TDM measures: Non-residential developments |  |  | Check if proposed \& add descriptions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3. | TRANSIT |  |
|  | 3.1 | Transit information |  |
| BASIC | 3.1.1 | Display relevant transit schedules and route maps at entrances | $\nabla$ |
| BASIC | 3.1.2 | Provide online links to OC Transpo and STO information | $\square$ |
| BETTER | 3.1.3 | Provide real-time arrival information display at entrances | $\square$ |
|  | 3.2 | Transit fare incentives |  |
|  |  | Commuter travel |  |
| BETTER | 3.2.1 | Offer preloaded PRESTO cards to encourage commuters to use transit | $\square$ |
| BETTER | * 3.2.2 | Subsidize or reimburse monthly transit pass purchases by employees | $\square$ |
|  |  | Visitor travel |  |
| BETTER | 3.2.3 | Arrange inclusion of same-day transit fare in price of tickets (e.g. for festivals, concerts, games) | $\square$ |
|  | 3.3 | Enhanced public transit service |  |
|  |  | Commuter travel |  |
| better | 3.3.1 | Contract with OC Transpo to provide enhanced transit services (e.g. for shift changes, weekends) | $\square$ |
|  |  | Visitor travel |  |
| BETTER | 3.3.2 | Contract with OC Transpo to provide enhanced transit services (e.g. for festivals, concerts, games) | $\square$ |
|  | 3.4 | Private transit service |  |
|  |  | Commuter travel |  |
| BETTER | 3.4.1 | Provide shuttle service when OC Transpo cannot offer sufficient quality or capacity to serve demand (e.g. for shift changes, weekends) | $\square$ |
|  |  | Visitor travel |  |
| BETTER | 3.4.2 | Provide shuttle service when OC Transpo cannot offer sufficient quality or capacity to serve demand (e.g. for festivals, concerts, games) | $\square$ |


| TDM measures: Non-residential developments |  |  | Check if proposed \& add descriptions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4. | RIDESHARING |  |  |
|  | 4.1 | Ridematching service |  |  |
|  |  | Commuter travel |  |  |
| basic | * 4.1.1 | Provide a dedicated ridematching portal at OttawaRideMatch.com | $\square$ |  |
|  | 4.2 | Carpool parking price incentives |  |  |
|  |  | Commuter travel |  |  |
| better | 4.2.1 | Provide discounts on parking costs for registered carpools | $\square$ |  |
|  | 4.3 | Vanpool service |  |  |
|  |  | Commuter travel |  |  |
| BETTER | 4.3.1 | Provide a vanpooling service for long-distance commuters | $\square$ |  |
|  | 5. | CARSHARING \& BIKESHARING |  |  |
|  | 5.1 | Bikeshare stations \& memberships |  |  |
| BETTER | 5.1.1 | Contract with provider to install on-site bikeshare station for use by commuters and visitors | $\square$ |  |
|  |  | Commuter travel |  |  |
| BETTER | 5.1.2 | Provide employees with bikeshare memberships for local business travel | $\square$ |  |
|  | 5.2 | Carshare vehicles \& memberships |  |  |
|  |  | Commuter travel |  |  |
| BETTER | 5.2.1 | Contract with provider to install on-site carshare vehicles and promote their use by tenants | $\square$ |  |
| BETTER | 5.2.2 | Provide employees with carshare memberships for local business travel | $\square$ |  |
|  | 6. | PARKING |  |  |
|  | 6.1 | Priced parking |  |  |
|  |  | Commuter travel |  |  |
| BASIC | * 6.1.1 | Charge for long-term parking (daily, weekly, monthly) | $\square$ |  |
| BASIC | 6.1.2 | Unbundle parking cost from lease rates at multi-tenant sites | $\square$ |  |
|  |  | Visitor travel |  |  |
| BETTER | 6.1.3 | Charge for short-term parking (hourly) | $\square$ |  |


| TDM measures: Non-residential developments |  |  | Check if proposed \& add descriptions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7. | TDM MARKETING \& COMMUNICATIONS |  |
|  |  | Multimodal travel information |  |
| Commuter travel |  |  |  |
| BASIC | * 7.1.1 | Provide a multimodal travel option information package to new/relocating employees and students | $\square$ |
| Visitor travel |  |  |  |
| better | * 7.1.2 | Include multimodal travel option information in invitations or advertising that attract visitors or customers (e.g. for festivals, concerts, games) | $\square$ |
| 7.2 |  | Personalized trip planning |  |
| Commuter travel |  |  |  |
| BETTER | * 7.2.1 | Offer personalized trip planning to new/relocating employees | $\square$ |
| 7.3 |  | Promotions |  |
| Commuter travel |  |  |  |
| better | 7.3.1 | Deliver promotions and incentives to maintain awareness, build understanding, and encourage trial of sustainable modes | $\square$ |
| 8. OTHER INCENTIVES \& AMENITIES |  |  |  |
| 8.1 |  | Emergency ride home |  |
| Commuter travel |  |  |  |
| BETTER | * 8.1.1 | Provide emergency ride home service to non-driving commuters | $\square$ |
| 8.2 |  | Alternative work arrangements |  |
| Commuter travel |  |  |  |
| BASIC | * 8.2.1 | Encourage flexible work hours | $\square$ |
| BETTER | 8.2.2 | Encourage compressed workweeks | $\square$ |
| better | + 8.2.3 | Encourage telework | $\square$ |
|  |  | Local business travel options |  |
| Commuter travel |  |  |  |
| BASIC | * 8.3.1 | Provide local business travel options that minimize the need for employees to bring a personal car to work | $\square$ |
| 8.4 |  | Commuter incentives |  |
| Commuter travel |  |  |  |
| BETTER | 8.4.1 | Offer employees a taxable, mode-neutral commuting allowance | $\square$ |
|  | 8.5 | On-site amenities |  |
|  |  | Commuter travel |  |
| better | 8.5.1 | Provide on-site amenities/services to minimize mid-day or mid-commute errands | $\square$ |

## APPENDIX
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Multi-Modal Level of Service - Segments Form
Consultant
Scenario
Comments 2023 Future Background AM/PM Project Boundary
Comments
Boundary Streets - Kilbirnie Drive

219-00014-01 2022-05-16
$\square$

| SEGMENTS |  | Kilbirnie Dr. |  |  | Alex Polowin Ave to River Mist Rd |  | River Mist Rd to Belleek Ln |  | Belleek Ln to Breakstone Rd |  | Breakstone Rd to Greenbank Rd |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Section } \\ \hline 11 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Section } \\ \hline 12 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | EB | WB | EB | WB | EB | WB | EB | WB |  |  |
|  | Sidewalk Width Boulevard Width | B | $\begin{aligned} & \geq 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & <0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \geq 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & <0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \geq 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & <0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \geq 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & <0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \geq 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & <0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \geq 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & <0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \geq 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & <0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \geq 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & <0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \geq 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & <0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \geq 2 \mathrm{~m} \\ & <0.5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | Avg Daily Curb Lane Traffic Volume |  | $\leq 3000$ | $\leq 3000$ | $\leq 3000$ | $\leq 3000$ | $\leq 3000$ | $\leq 3000$ | $\leq 3000$ | $\leq 3000$ | $\leq 3000$ | $\leq 3000$ |  |  |
|  | Operating Speed On-Street Parking |  | $\begin{gathered} >30 \text { to } 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h} \\ \text { yes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >30 \text { to } 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h} \\ \text { yes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >30 \text { to } 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h} \\ \text { yes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >30 \text { to } 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h} \\ \text { yes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >30 \text { to } 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h} \\ \text { yes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & >30 \text { to } 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h} \\ & \text { no } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} >30 \text { to } 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h} \\ \text { yes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >30 \text { to } 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h} \\ \text { no } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & >30 \text { to } 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h} \\ & \text { yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & >30 \text { to } 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h} \\ & \text { no } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | Exposure to Traffic PLoS |  | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | - | . |
|  | Effective Sidewalk Width |  | 2.0 m | 2.0 m | 2.0 m | 2.0 m | 2.0 m | 2.0 m | 2.0 m | 2.0 m | 2.0 m | 2.0 m |  |  |
|  | Pedestrian Volume |  | 250 ped/hr | 250 ped/hr | 250 pedhr | 250 ped/hr | 250 ped/hr | 250 ped/hr | 250 ped/hr | 250 ped/hr | 250 ped/hr | 250 ped/hr |  |  |
|  | Crowding PLos |  | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | - | - |
|  | Level of Service |  | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | - | - |
| $$ | Type of Cycling Facility | B | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Trafic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Trafic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic |  |  |
|  | Number of Travel Lanes |  | $\leq 2$ (no centreline) | $\leq 2$ (no centreline) | $\leq 2$ (no centreline) | $\leq 2$ (no centreline) | $\leq 2$ (no centreline) | $\leq 2$ (no centreline) | $\leq 2$ (no centreline) | $\leq 2$ (no centreline) | $\leq 2$ (no centreline) | $\leq 2$ (no centreline) |  |  |
|  | Operating Speed |  | $>40$ to $<50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $>40$ to $<50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $>40$ to $<50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $>40$ to $<50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $>40$ to $<50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $>40$ to $<50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $>40$ to $<50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $>40$ to $<50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $>40$ to $<50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $>40$ to $<50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
|  | \# of Lanes \& Operating Speed Los |  | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | - | - |
|  | Bike Lane (+ Parking Lane) Wioth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bike Lane Width Los |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Bike Lane Blockages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Blockage LoS |  | - | . | . | . | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Median Refuge Width (no median $=<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ ) |  | $<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ refuge | $<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ refuge | $<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ refuge | $<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ refuge | $<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ refuge | $<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ refuge | $<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ refuge | $<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ refuge | $<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ refuge | $<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ refuge |  |  |
|  | No. of Lanes at Unsignalized Crossing |  | $\leq 3$ lanes | $\leq 3$ lanes | $\leq 3$ lanes | $\leq 3$ lanes | $\leq 3$ lanes | $\leq 3$ lanes | $\leq 3$ lanes | $\leq 3$ lanes | $\leq 3$ lanes | $\leq 3$ lanes |  |  |
|  | Sidestreet Operating Speed |  | $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
|  | Unsignalized Crossing - Lowest LoS |  | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | - | $\cdot$ |
|  | Level of Service |  | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | - | - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{4}{\omega} \\ & \text { N} \\ & \text { NiN } \end{aligned}$ | Facility Type | E | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Trafic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Trafic |  |  |
|  | Friction or Ratio Transit:Posted Speed |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{Vt} V \mathrm{p} \leq 0.6$ | $\mathrm{V} t \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{p}} \leq 0.6$ | $\mathrm{V} t \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{p}} \leq 0.6$ | V tVp $\leq 0.6$ | $\mathrm{Vt} \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{p}} \leq 0.6$ | $\mathrm{V} t / \mathrm{p} \leq 0.6$ |  |  |
|  | Level of Service |  | - | - | - | - | E | E | E | E | E | E | - | - |
| 들 | Truck Lane Width | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Travel Lanes per Direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Level of Service |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| $\stackrel{8}{3}$ | Level of Service | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Multi-Modal Level of Service - Segments Form

| Consultant | WSP Canada Inc. | Project |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Scenario | Date |
| Comments | 2023 Future Background AM/PM |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

219-00014-01 2022-05-16




APPENDIX

## H SYNCHRO <br> RESULTS

|  | $\prime$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{1}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 74 | 10 | 109 | 60 |  | 94 | 42 | 89 | 15 | 24 | 130 | 35 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 74 | 10 | 109 | 60 | 9 | 94 | 42 | 89 | 15 | 24 | 130 | 35 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (m) | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 604.0 |  |  | 83.3 |  |  | 244.0 |  |  | 281.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 43.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 14.6 |  |  | 16.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 50\% | 1\% | 2\% | 64\% | 2\% | 17\% | 8\% | 34\% | 13\% | 2\% | 18\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Trafic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 82 | 132 | 0 | 67 | 114 | 0 | 47 | 99 | 17 | 27 | 144 | 39 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 8.1 | 49.5 | 49.5 | 7.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.15 | 0.15 |  | 0.15 | 0.15 |  | 0.10 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.09 | 0.58 | 0.58 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.46 | 0.41 |  | 0.38 | 0.38 |  | 0.32 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.05 |
| Control Delay | 37.1 | 10.5 |  | 34.3 | 10.7 |  | 38.4 | 10.8 | 0.1 | 36.9 | 12.5 | 0.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 37.1 | 10.5 |  | 34.3 | 10.7 |  | 38.4 | 10.8 | 0.1 | 36.9 | 12.5 | 0.1 |
| LOS | D | B |  | C | B |  | D | B | A | D | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 20.7 |  |  | 19.4 |  |  | 17.6 |  |  | 13.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 12.4 | 1.6 |  | 10.0 | 1.4 |  | 7.1 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 11.0 | 0.0 |


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | , | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 22.0 | 14.0 |  | 18.5 | 13.1 |  | 16.8 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 29.4 | 0.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 580.0 |  |  | 59.3 |  |  | 220.0 |  |  | 257.7 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 40.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  |  | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 393 | 556 |  | 389 | 537 |  | 184 | 1030 | 740 | 187 | 1014 | 782 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.21 | 0.24 |  | 0.17 | 0.21 |  | 0.26 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.05 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Area Type: Other

Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 80
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.46

| Intersection Signal Delay: 17.7 | Intersection LOS: B |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $50.1 \%$ | ICU Level of Service A |
| Analysis Period $(\min ) 15$ |  |

Splits and Phases: $\quad 3:$ Greenbank Road \& Kilbirnie Dr


|  | $\prime$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 42 | 5 | 42 | 22 | 12 | 47 | 120 | 154 | 66 | 73 | 112 | 71 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 42 | 5 | 42 | 22 | 12 | 47 | 120 | 154 | 66 | 73 | 112 | 71 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (m) | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 604.0 |  |  | 83.3 |  |  | 244.0 |  |  | 281.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 43.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 14.6 |  |  | 16.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 60\% | 8\% | 2\% | 59\% | 2\% | 2\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Trafic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 47 | 53 | 0 | 24 | 65 | 0 | 133 | 171 | 73 | 81 | 124 | 79 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.5 | 10.5 |  | 10.5 | 10.5 |  | 11.4 | 47.6 | 47.6 | 9.1 | 41.6 | 41.6 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.13 | 0.13 |  | 0.13 | 0.13 |  | 0.14 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.11 | 0.52 | 0.52 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.28 | 0.24 |  | 0.14 | 0.29 |  | 0.56 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.42 | 0.13 | 0.09 |
| Control Delay | 33.0 | 12.5 |  | 29.2 | 14.0 |  | 40.4 | 13.0 | 0.8 | 38.8 | 14.5 | 1.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 33.0 | 12.5 |  | 29.2 | 14.0 |  | 40.4 | 13.0 | 0.8 | 38.8 | 14.5 | 1.4 |
| LOS | C | B |  | C | B |  | D | B | A | D | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 22.1 |  |  | 18.1 |  |  | 20.3 |  |  | 17.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 7.1 | 0.9 |  | 3.6 | 1.9 |  | 20.0 | 12.8 | 0.0 | 12.3 | 9.8 | 0.0 |



|  | $\prime$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 125 | 14 | 188 | 60 | 32 | 94 | 85 | 167 | 17 | 24 | 152 | 82 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 125 | 14 | 188 | 60 | 32 | 94 | 85 | 167 | 17 | 24 | 152 | 82 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (m) | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 604.0 |  |  | 83.3 |  |  | 244.0 |  |  | 281.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 43.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 14.6 |  |  | 16.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 50\% | 1\% | 2\% | 64\% | 2\% | 17\% | 8\% | 34\% | 13\% | 2\% | 18\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Trafic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 125 | 202 | 0 | 60 | 126 | 0 | 85 | 167 | 17 | 24 | 152 | 82 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 14.2 | 14.2 |  | 14.2 | 14.2 |  | 9.9 | 47.4 | 47.4 | 6.9 | 39.5 | 39.5 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.18 | 0.18 |  | 0.18 | 0.18 |  | 0.12 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.09 | 0.49 | 0.49 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.60 | 0.49 |  | 0.35 | 0.40 |  | 0.47 | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.12 |
| Control Delay | 41.0 | 9.4 |  | 32.4 | 13.1 |  | 40.3 | 11.5 | 0.1 | 36.7 | 15.9 | 1.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 41.0 | 9.4 |  | 32.4 | 13.1 |  | 40.3 | 11.5 | 0.1 | 36.7 | 15.9 | 1.7 |
| LOS | D | A |  | C | B |  | D | B | A | D | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 21.5 |  |  | 19.3 |  |  | 19.9 |  |  | 13.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 18.7 | 1.9 |  | 8.6 | 4.4 |  | 12.9 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 13.5 | 0.0 |


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | , | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 31.8 | 17.2 |  | 17.5 | 16.8 |  | 25.3 | 32.5 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 33.0 | 3.6 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 580.0 |  |  | 59.3 |  |  | 220.0 |  |  | 257.7 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 40.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  |  | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 389 | 602 |  | 321 | 503 |  | 202 | 988 | 716 | 187 | 871 | 690 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.32 | 0.34 |  | 0.19 | 0.25 |  | 0.42 | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.12 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Area Type: <br> Other

Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 80
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.60

| Intersection Signal Delay: 18.7 | Intersection LOS: B |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $62.7 \%$ | ICU Level of Service B |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |

Splits and Phases: $\quad$ 3: Greenbank Road \& Kilbirnie Dr


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | > | , | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 2 | 25 | 3 | 30 | 10 | 24 | 3 | 5 | 60 | 40 | 5 | 2 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2 | 25 | 3 | 30 | 10 | 24 | 3 | 5 | 60 | 40 | 5 | 2 |
| 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) | 2 | 25 | 3 | 30 | 10 | 24 | 3 | 5 | 60 | 40 | 5 | 2 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 30 | 64 | 68 | 47 |
| Volume Left (vph) | 2 | 30 | 3 | 40 |
| Volume Right (vph) | 3 | 24 | 60 | 2 |
| Hadj (s) | -0.01 | -0.10 | -0.49 | 0.18 |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.2 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 4.3 |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 829 | 856 | 945 | 805 |
| Control Delay (s) | 7.3 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 7.6 |
| Approach Delay (s) | 7.3 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 7.6 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | A |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 7.3 |  |  |
| Level of Service | A | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $26.6 \%$ |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |


|  | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\hat{1}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 30 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 0 | 15 | 30 |
| Volume Leff (vph) | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Hadj (s) | 0.00 | 0.23 | -0.57 |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.4 |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.03 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 900 | 849 | 1060 |
| Control Delay (s) | 7.0 | 7.3 | 6.5 |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 7.3 | 6.5 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 6.7 |  | A |
| Level of Service | A | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $13.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\hat{1}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 79 | 20 | 80 | 22 | 16 | 47 | 173 | 191 | 66 | 73 | 172 | 120 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 79 | 20 | 80 | 22 | 16 | 47 | 173 | 191 | 66 | 73 | 172 | 120 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (m) | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 604.0 |  |  | 83.3 |  |  | 244.0 |  |  | 281.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 43.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 14.6 |  |  | 16.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 50\% | 1\% | 2\% | 64\% | 2\% | 17\% | 8\% | 34\% | 13\% | 2\% | 18\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Trafic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 79 | 100 | 0 | 22 | 63 | 0 | 173 | 191 | 66 | 73 | 172 | 120 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effict Green (s) | 11.8 | 11.8 |  | 11.7 | 11.7 |  | 15.8 | 46.2 | 46.2 | 9.2 | 36.1 | 36.1 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.15 | 0.15 |  | 0.15 | 0.15 |  | 0.20 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.12 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.43 | 0.37 |  | 0.12 | 0.27 |  | 0.60 | 0.20 | 0.09 | 0.42 | 0.22 | 0.19 |
| Control Delay | 36.1 | 13.1 |  | 27.7 | 14.3 |  | 39.5 | 14.2 | 0.5 | 39.5 | 17.6 | 4.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 36.1 | 13.1 |  | 27.7 | 14.3 |  | 39.5 | 14.2 | 0.5 | 39.5 | 17.6 | 4.1 |
| LOS | D | B |  | C | B |  | D | B | A | D | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 23.3 |  |  | 17.7 |  |  | 22.2 |  |  | 17.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 11.9 | 2.9 |  | 3.2 | 2.3 |  | 24.8 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 17.1 | 0.0 |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 21.1 | 13.7 |  | 8.2 | 11.0 |  | \#52.5 | 40.4 | 0.9 | 22.6 | 37.2 | 9.9 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 580.0 |  |  | 59.3 |  |  | 220.0 |  |  | 257.7 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 40.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  |  | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 412 | 515 |  | 400 | 472 |  | 288 | 963 | 701 | 201 | 797 | 643 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.19 | 0.19 |  | 0.06 | 0.13 |  | 0.60 | 0.20 | 0.09 | 0.36 | 0.22 | 0.19 |

## Area Type: <br> Other

Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 80
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.60
Intersection Signal Delay: 20.4 Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 56.3\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftrightarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 2 | 15 | 3 | 55 | 15 | 46 | 4 | 5 | 40 | 25 | 5 | 3 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2 | 15 | 3 | 55 | 15 | 46 | 4 | 5 | 40 | 25 | 5 | 3 |
| 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) | 2 | 15 | 3 | 55 | 15 | 46 |  | 5 | 40 | 25 | 5 | 3 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 20 | 116 | 49 | 33 |
| Volume Left (vph) | 2 | 55 | 4 | 25 |
| Volume Right (vph) | 3 | 46 | 40 | 3 |
| Hadj (s) | -0.04 | -0.11 | -0.44 | 0.13 |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.4 |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 0.04 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 841 | 882 | 907 | 794 |
| Control Delay (s) | 7.2 | 7.6 | 7.0 | 7.5 |
| Approach Delay (s) | 7.2 | 7.6 | 7.0 | 7.5 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | A |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 7.4 |  |  |
| Level of Service | A | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $29.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |



| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 0 | 22 | 20 |
| Volume Left (vph) | 0 | 22 | 0 |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Hadj (s) | 0.00 | 0.23 | -0.57 |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.4 |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 900 | 854 | 1053 |
| Control Delay (s) | 7.0 | 7.3 | 6.4 |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 7.3 | 6.4 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 6.9 |  |  |
| Level of Service | A |  | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $13.3 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |


|  | $\prime$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 132 | 15 | 213 | 60 | 33 | 94 | 92 | 228 | 17 | 24 | 200 | 64 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 132 | 15 | 213 | 60 | 33 | 94 | 92 | 228 | 17 | 24 | 200 | 64 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (m) | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 604.0 |  |  | 83.3 |  |  | 244.0 |  |  | 281.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 43.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 14.6 |  |  | 16.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 50\% | 1\% | 2\% | 64\% | 2\% | 17\% | 8\% | 34\% | 13\% | 2\% | 18\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Trafic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 132 | 228 | 0 | 60 | 127 | 0 | 92 | 228 | 17 | 24 | 200 | 64 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 14.5 | 14.5 |  | 14.5 | 14.5 |  | 10.2 | 47.1 | 47.1 | 6.9 | 38.9 | 38.9 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.18 | 0.18 |  | 0.18 | 0.18 |  | 0.13 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.09 | 0.49 | 0.49 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.62 | 0.52 |  | 0.38 | 0.40 |  | 0.49 | 0.23 | 0.02 | 0.19 | 0.23 | 0.09 |
| Control Delay | 41.6 | 9.4 |  | 33.9 | 13.0 |  | 40.6 | 12.1 | 0.1 | 36.7 | 16.7 | 0.3 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 41.6 | 9.4 |  | 33.9 | 13.0 |  | 40.6 | 12.1 | 0.1 | 36.7 | 16.7 | 0.3 |
| LOS | D | A |  | C | B |  | D | B | A | D | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 21.2 |  |  | 19.7 |  |  | 19.3 |  |  | 14.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 19.7 | 2.0 |  | 8.6 | 4.5 |  | 13.9 | 12.3 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 18.7 | 0.0 |



|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftrightarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | b | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 85 | 5 | 30 | 27 | 24 | 5 | 5 | 60 | 40 | 5 | 5 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 85 | 5 | 30 | 27 | 24 | 5 | 5 | 60 | 40 | 5 | 5 |
| 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) | 5 | 85 | 5 | 30 | 27 | 24 | 5 | 5 | 60 | 40 | 5 | 5 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 95 | 81 | 70 | 50 |
| Volume Left (vph) | 5 | 30 | 5 | 40 |
| Volume Right (vph) | 5 | 24 | 60 | 5 |
| Hadj (s) | 0.01 | -0.07 | -0.47 | 0.13 |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.3 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.5 |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.06 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 817 | 818 | 877 | 755 |
| Control Delay (s) | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 7.8 |
| Approach Delay (s) | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 7.8 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | A |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 7.6 |  |  |
| Level of Service | A | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $27.7 \%$ |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |



|  | $\prime$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 83 | 20 | 94 | 22 | 16 | 47 | 199 | 250 | 66 | 73 | 239 | 128 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 83 | 20 | 94 | 22 | 16 | 47 | 199 | 250 | 66 | 73 | 239 | 128 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (m) | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 604.0 |  |  | 83.3 |  |  | 244.0 |  |  | 281.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 43.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 14.6 |  |  | 16.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 50\% | 1\% | 2\% | 64\% | 2\% | 17\% | 8\% | 34\% | 13\% | 2\% | 18\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Trafic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 83 | 114 | 0 | 22 | 63 | 0 | 199 | 250 | 66 | 73 | 239 | 128 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 11.9 | 11.9 |  | 18.7 | 46.1 | 46.1 | 9.2 | 33.0 | 33.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.15 | 0.15 |  | 0.15 | 0.15 |  | 0.23 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.12 | 0.41 | 0.41 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.45 | 0.39 |  | 0.12 | 0.26 |  | 0.58 | 0.26 | 0.09 | 0.42 | 0.33 | 0.21 |
| Control Delay | 36.4 | 12.6 |  | 27.5 | 14.1 |  | 37.0 | 14.8 | 0.5 | 39.5 | 20.0 | 4.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 36.4 | 12.6 |  | 27.5 | 14.1 |  | 37.0 | 14.8 | 0.5 | 39.5 | 20.0 | 4.8 |
| LOS | D | B |  | C | B |  | D | B | A | D | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 22.6 |  |  | 17.6 |  |  | 21.5 |  |  | 18.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 12.5 | 2.9 |  | 3.2 | 2.3 |  | 27.9 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 26.4 | 0.0 |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 1 | $\leftrightarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 22.1 | 14.5 |  | 8.2 | 11.0 |  | \#64.0 | 52.5 | 0.9 | 22.6 | 50.9 | 11.4 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 580.0 |  |  | 59.3 |  |  | 220.0 |  |  | 257.7 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 40.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  |  | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 412 | 527 |  | 396 | 472 |  | 341 | 960 | 699 | 201 | 728 | 599 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.22 |  | 0.06 | 0.13 |  | 0.58 | 0.26 | 0.09 | 0.36 | 0.33 | 0.21 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Area Type: <br> Other

Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 80
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.58
Intersection Signal Delay: $20.5 \quad$ Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 58.0\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | , | - | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 5 | 48 | 5 | 46 | 78 | 55 | 8 | 5 | 40 | 25 | 5 | 7 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 48 | 5 | 46 | 78 | 55 | 8 | 5 | 40 | 25 | 5 | 7 |
| 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) | 5 | 48 | 5 | 46 | 78 | 55 | 8 | 5 | 40 | 25 | 5 | 7 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 58 | 179 | 53 | 37 |
| Volume Leff (vph) | 5 | 46 | 8 | 25 |
| Volume Right (vph) | 5 | 55 | 40 | 7 |
| Hadj (s) | 0.00 | -0.10 | -0.39 | 0.06 |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.5 |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.07 | 0.20 | 0.06 | 0.05 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 812 | 864 | 828 | 741 |
| Control Delay (s) | 7.6 | 8.1 | 7.3 | 7.7 |
| Approach Delay (s) | 7.6 | 8.1 | 7.3 | 7.7 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | A |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 7.8 |  |  |
| Level of Service | A | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $31.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |



|  | $\prime$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 176 | 28 | 211 | 60 | 51 | 94 | 117 | 168 | 17 | 24 | 146 | 151 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 176 | 28 | 211 | 60 | 51 | 94 | 117 | 168 | 17 | 24 | 146 | 151 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (m) | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 604.0 |  |  | 83.3 |  |  | 244.0 |  |  | 281.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 43.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 14.6 |  |  | 16.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 50\% | 1\% | 2\% | 64\% | 2\% | 17\% | 8\% | 34\% | 13\% | 2\% | 18\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Trafic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 176 | 239 | 0 | 60 | 145 | 0 | 117 | 168 | 17 | 24 | 146 | 151 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 17.3 | 17.3 |  | 17.3 | 17.3 |  | 10.9 | 44.3 | 44.3 | 6.9 | 35.6 | 35.6 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.22 | 0.22 |  | 0.22 | 0.22 |  | 0.14 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.09 | 0.44 | 0.44 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.70 | 0.50 |  | 0.31 | 0.41 |  | 0.59 | 0.18 | 0.03 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.23 |
| Control Delay | 42.9 | 8.9 |  | 28.5 | 13.3 |  | 44.7 | 13.5 | 0.1 | 36.7 | 18.3 | 4.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 42.9 | 8.9 |  | 28.5 | 13.3 |  | 44.7 | 13.5 | 0.1 | 36.7 | 18.3 | 4.8 |
| LOS | D | A |  | C | B |  | D | B | A | D | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 23.3 |  |  | 17.8 |  |  | 24.8 |  |  | 13.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 26.1 | 3.6 |  | 8.1 | 6.7 |  | 17.5 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 14.9 | 0.0 |


|  | $\downarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 42.2 | 19.5 |  | 16.8 | 19.6 |  | \#35.2 | 34.8 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 31.9 | 12.8 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 580.0 |  |  | 59.3 |  |  | 220.0 |  |  | 257.7 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 40.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  |  | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 382 | 612 |  | 292 | 490 |  | 209 | 922 | 676 | 187 | 785 | 646 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.46 | 0.39 |  | 0.21 | 0.30 |  | 0.56 | 0.18 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.19 | 0.23 |

## Area Type: <br> Other

Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 80
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.70
Intersection Signal Delay: 20.2 Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 66.5\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | b | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 2 | 90 | 3 | 30 | 130 | 24 | 3 | 5 | 83 | 40 | 5 | 2 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2 | 90 | 3 | 30 | 130 | 24 | 3 | 5 | 83 | 40 | 5 | 2 |
| 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) | 2 | 90 | 3 | 30 | 130 | 24 | 3 | 5 | 83 | 40 | 5 | 2 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 95 | 184 | 91 | 47 |
| Volume Left (vph) | 2 | 30 | 3 | 40 |
| Volume Right (vph) | 3 | 24 | 83 | 2 |
| Hadj (s) | 0.02 | -0.01 | -0.51 | 0.18 |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.8 |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.10 | 0.06 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 777 | 798 | 819 | 692 |
| Contro Delay (s) | 8.0 | 8.5 | 7.6 | 8.1 |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.0 | 8.5 | 7.6 | 8.1 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | A |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 8.2 |  |  |
| Level of Service | A | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $33.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |



|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 119 | 31 | 98 | 22 | 24 | 47 | 186 | 196 | 66 | 73 | 170 | 149 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 119 | 31 | 98 | 22 | 24 | 47 | 186 | 196 | 66 | 73 | 170 | 149 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (m) | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 604.0 |  |  | 83.3 |  |  | 244.0 |  |  | 281.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 43.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 14.6 |  |  | 16.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 50\% | 1\% | 2\% | 64\% | 2\% | 17\% | 8\% | 34\% | 13\% | 2\% | 18\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Trafic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 119 | 129 | 0 | 22 | 71 | 0 | 186 | 196 | 66 | 73 | 170 | 149 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effict Green (s) | 13.6 | 13.6 |  | 13.6 | 13.6 |  | 17.2 | 40.7 | 40.7 | 9.2 | 30.4 | 30.4 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.17 | 0.17 |  | 0.17 | 0.17 |  | 0.22 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.12 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.57 | 0.41 |  | 0.11 | 0.27 |  | 0.59 | 0.23 | 0.10 | 0.42 | 0.25 | 0.26 |
| Control Delay | 39.5 | 13.0 |  | 26.1 | 14.8 |  | 38.2 | 15.5 | 0.5 | 39.5 | 20.0 | 5.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 39.5 | 13.0 |  | 26.1 | 14.8 |  | 38.2 | 15.5 | 0.5 | 39.5 | 20.0 | 5.1 |
| LOS | D | B |  | C | B |  | D | B | A | D | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 25.7 |  |  | 17.5 |  |  | 22.7 |  |  | 18.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 17.9 | 4.3 |  | 3.0 | 3.3 |  | 26.4 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 18.5 | 0.0 |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 30.1 | 16.7 |  | 8.2 | 12.7 |  | \#57.9 | 41.2 | 0.9 | 22.6 | 36.8 | 12.8 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) |  | 580.0 |  |  | 59.3 |  |  | 220.0 |  |  | 257.7 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 40.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  |  | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 409 | 522 |  | 390 | 460 |  | 314 | 849 | 633 | 201 | 670 | 572 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.29 | 0.25 |  | 0.06 | 0.15 |  | 0.59 | 0.23 | 0.10 | 0.36 | 0.25 | 0.26 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Area Type: <br> Other

Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 80
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.59
Intersection Signal Delay: 21.3 Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 64.2\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


|  | $\star$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\dagger$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 2 | 65 | 3 | 55 | 64 | 46 | 4 | 5 | 58 | 25 | 5 | 3 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2 | 65 | 3 | 55 | 64 | 46 | 4 | 5 | 58 | 25 | 5 | 3 |
| 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) | 2 | 65 | 3 | 55 | 64 | 46 | 4 | 5 | 58 | 25 | 5 | 3 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 70 | 165 | 67 | 33 |
| Volume Leff (vph) | 2 | 55 | 4 | 25 |
| Volume Right (vph) | 3 | 46 | 58 | 3 |
| Hadj (s) | 0.01 | -0.07 | -0.47 | 0.13 |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.6 |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.08 | 0.19 | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 807 | 849 | 847 | 727 |
| Control Delay (s) | 7.7 | 8.1 | 7.3 | 7.8 |
| Approach Delay (s) | 7.7 | 8.1 | 7.3 | 7.8 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | A |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 7.8 |  |  |
| Level of Service | A | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $31.7 \%$ |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |



| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 3 | 71 | 74 |
| Volume Left (vph) | 0 | 71 | 4 |
| Volume Right (vph) | 3 | 0 | 70 |
| Hadj (s) | -0.57 | 0.23 | -0.52 |
| Departure Headway (s) | 3.5 | 4.3 | 3.5 |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.07 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 983 | 824 | 984 |
| Control Delay (s) | 6.6 | 7.7 | 6.8 |
| Approach Delay (s) | 6.6 | 7.7 | 6.8 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 7.2 |  |  |
| Level of Service | A |  | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $22.3 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 4 | F | \% | 个 | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 183 | 29 | 236 | 60 | 52 | 94 | 124 | 222 | 17 | 24 | 188 | 133 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 183 | 29 | 236 | 60 | 52 | 94 | 124 | 222 | 17 | 24 | 188 | 133 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (m) | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) |  | 604.0 |  |  | 83.3 |  |  | 244.0 |  |  | 281.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 43.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 14.6 |  |  | 16.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 50\% | 1\% | 2\% | 64\% | 2\% | 17\% | 8\% | 34\% | 13\% | 2\% | 18\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 183 | 265 | 0 | 60 | 146 | 0 | 124 | 222 | 17 | 24 | 188 | 133 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 11.0 | 43.6 | 43.6 | 6.9 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.22 | 0.22 |  | 0.22 | 0.22 |  | 0.14 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.09 | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.70 | 0.53 |  | 0.33 | 0.40 |  | 0.62 | 0.24 | 0.03 | 0.19 | 0.26 | 0.23 |
| Control Delay | 42.2 | 8.6 |  | 28.7 | 12.9 |  | 47.1 | 14.4 | 0.1 | 36.7 | 19.7 | 5.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 42.2 | 8.6 |  | 28.7 | 12.9 |  | 47.1 | 14.4 | 0.1 | 36.7 | 19.7 | 5.2 |
| LOS | D | A |  | C | B |  | D | B | A | D | B | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 22.4 |  |  | 17.5 |  |  | 24.9 |  |  | 15.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 27.1 | 3.7 |  | 8.1 | 6.8 |  | 18.6 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 20.2 | 0.0 |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 42.9 | 20.1 |  | 16.7 | 19.2 |  | \#43.5 | 46.5 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 40.3 | 12.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 580.0 |  |  | 59.3 |  |  | 220.0 |  |  | 257.7 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 40.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  |  | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 382 | 630 |  | 266 | 489 |  | 210 | 909 | 669 | 187 | 710 | 588 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.48 | 0.42 |  | 0.23 | 0.30 |  | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.26 | 0.23 |

## Area Type: <br> Other

Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 80
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.70
Intersection Signal Delay: 20.5 Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 68.4\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftrightarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | b | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 150 | 5 | 30 | 147 | 24 | 5 | 5 | 83 | 40 | 5 | 5 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 150 | 5 | 30 | 147 | 24 | 5 | 5 | 83 | 40 | 5 | 5 |
| 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) | 5 | 150 | 5 | 30 | 147 | 24 | 5 | 5 | 83 | 40 | 5 | 5 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 160 | 201 | 93 | 50 |
| Volume Left (vph) | 5 | 30 | 5 | 40 |
| Volume Right (vph) | 5 | 24 | 83 | 5 |
| Hadj (s) | 0.02 | -0.01 | -0.49 | 0.13 |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 5.0 |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.20 | 0.25 | 0.11 | 0.07 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 770 | 778 | 767 | 660 |
| Contro Delay (s) | 8.6 | 8.9 | 7.8 | 8.4 |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.6 | 8.9 | 7.8 | 8.4 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | A |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 8.5 |  | A |
| Level of Service | A | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $40.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |


|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | 7 |  | 4 | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | * ${ }^{\text {r }}$ |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 71 | 11 | 129 | 84 | 10 | 89 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 71 | 11 | 129 | 84 | 10 | 89 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 71 | 11 | 129 | 84 | 10 | 89 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 82 | 213 | 99 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 0 | 129 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 11 | 0 | 89 |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | -0.05 | 0.16 | -0.49 |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.1 |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.10 | 0.26 | 0.11 |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 809 | 797 | 822 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 7.8 | 8.9 | 7.6 |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 7.8 | 8.9 | 7.6 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |  |  |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 8.3 |  |  |
| Level of Service | A | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $31.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |


|  | $\prime$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 123 | 31 | 112 | 22 | 24 | 47 | 212 | 247 | 66 | 73 | 231 | 157 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 123 | 31 | 112 | 22 | 24 | 47 | 212 | 247 | 66 | 73 | 231 | 157 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Grade (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Storage Length (m) | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 604.0 |  |  | 83.3 |  |  | 244.0 |  |  | 281.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 43.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 14.6 |  |  | 16.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 50\% | 1\% | 2\% | 64\% | 2\% | 17\% | 8\% | 34\% | 13\% | 2\% | 18\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Trafic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 123 | 143 | 0 | 22 | 71 | 0 | 212 | 247 | 66 | 73 | 231 | 157 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 41.3\% | 41.3\% |  | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% | 20.0\% | 38.8\% | 38.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 3.3 | 3.3 |  | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 13.8 | 13.8 |  | 13.8 | 13.8 |  | 20.1 | 40.5 | 40.5 | 9.2 | 27.3 | 27.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.17 | 0.17 |  | 0.17 | 0.17 |  | 0.25 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.12 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.57 | 0.43 |  | 0.11 | 0.27 |  | 0.58 | 0.29 | 0.10 | 0.42 | 0.38 | 0.29 |
| Control Delay | 39.7 | 12.4 |  | 26.0 | 14.6 |  | 36.1 | 16.2 | 0.5 | 39.5 | 23.1 | 5.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 39.7 | 12.4 |  | 26.0 | 14.6 |  | 36.1 | 16.2 | 0.5 | 39.5 | 23.1 | 5.4 |
| LOS | D | B |  | C | B |  | D | B | A | D | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 25.0 |  |  | 17.3 |  |  | 22.3 |  |  | 19.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 18.4 | 4.3 |  | 3.0 | 3.3 |  | 29.4 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 27.6 | 0.0 |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 31.1 | 17.4 |  | 8.2 | 12.7 |  | \#69.4 | 51.9 | 0.9 | 22.6 | 49.2 | 13.0 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) |  | 580.0 |  |  | 59.3 |  |  | 220.0 |  |  | 257.7 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 40.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  |  | 120.0 |  | 70.0 | 120.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 409 | 535 |  | 385 | 460 |  | 367 | 844 | 630 | 201 | 602 | 534 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.30 | 0.27 |  | 0.06 | 0.15 |  | 0.58 | 0.29 | 0.10 | 0.36 | 0.38 | 0.29 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Area Type: <br> Other

Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 80
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.58
Intersection Signal Delay: 21.6 Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 65.7\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 98 | 5 | 46 | 127 | 55 | 8 | 5 | 58 | 25 | 5 | 7 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 98 | 5 | 46 | 127 | 55 | 8 | 5 | 58 | 25 | 5 | 7 |
| 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) | 5 | 98 | 5 | 46 | 127 | 55 | 8 | 5 | 58 | 25 | 5 | 7 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 108 | 228 | 71 | 37 |
| Volume Leff (vph) | 5 | 46 | 8 | 25 |
| Volume Right (vph) | 5 | 55 | 58 | 7 |
| Hadj (s) | 0.02 | -0.07 | -0.43 | 0.06 |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.8 |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.13 | 0.27 | 0.08 | 0.05 |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 786 | 825 | 778 | 689 |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.1 | 8.7 | 7.7 | 8.0 |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.1 | 8.7 | 7.7 | 8.0 |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A | A |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Delay | 8.3 |  |  |
| Level of Service | A | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $35.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |




[^0]:    City Of Ottawa
    Infrastructure Services and Community
    Sustainability
    Planning and Growth Management
    110 Laurier Avenue West, 4th fl.
    Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1
    Tel. : 613-580-2424
    Fax: 613-560-6006

[^1]:    * In 2005 data was only collected for household members aged $11^{+}$therefore these results cannot be compared to the 2011 data.

