

CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)

Transportation Impact Assessment

Proposed Expansion of Paul-Desmarais High School in the Community of Stittsville

Certification

- 1. I have reviewed and have a sound understanding of the objectives, needs, and requirements of the City of Ottawa's Official Plan and the Transportation Impact Assessment (2017) Guidelines;
- 2. I have a sound knowledge of industry standard practice with respect to the presentation of transportation impact assessment reports, including multimodal level of service review;
- 3. I have substantial experience (more than 5 years) in undertaking and delivering transportation impact studies (analysis, reporting and geometric design) with strong background knowledge in transportation planning, engineering, or traffic operations; and,
- 4. I am either a licensed or registered professional in good standing, whose field of expertise is either transportation engineering or transportation planning.

Signature of individual certifier that s/he meets the above four criteria.



Doug Green, P.Eng. Project Manager

Cell: (613) 608-1778 dgreen@dillon.ca

Table of Contents

| 1.0 | Screening | g 1 |
|-----|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| | 1.1 | Summary of Development1 |
| | 1.2 | Trip Generation Trigger1 |
| | 1.3 | Location Triggers2 |
| | 1.4 | Safety Triggers2 |
| | 1.5 | Summary3 |
| 2.0 | Scoping | 4 |
| | 2.1 | Existing and Planned Conditions4 |
| | 2.2 | Study Area and Time Periods19 |
| | 2.3 | Exemptions Review20 |
| 3.0 | Forecasti | ng 22 |
| | 3.1 | Development-Generated Travel Demand22 |
| | 3.2 | Background Network Travel Demand23 |
| | 3.3 | Demand Rationalization25 |
| | 3.4 | Total Future Traffic Forecasts |
| 4.0 | Analysis | 27 |
| | 4.1 | Development Design |
| | 4.2 | Parking |
| | 4.3 | Boundary Street Design |
| | 4.4 | Access Intersection Design29 |
| | 4.5 | Transportation Demand Management31 |
| | 4.6 | Neighbourhood Traffic Management31 |
| | 4.7 | Transit |
| | 4.8 | Review of Network Concept31 |
| | 4.9 | Intersection Design |

CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)



Summary and Conclusions

Figures

| Figure 1: Wide Area Location Context | 4 |
|--|----|
| Figure 2: Local Area Context | 5 |
| Figure 3: Existing and Proposed Site Plan | 6 |
| Figure 4: Intersection of Robert Grant Ave and Abbott St E. | 7 |
| Figure 5: Intersection of Abbott St E and Iber Rd | 8 |
| Figure 6: Cycling Facilities | 9 |
| Figure 7: Pedestrian Facilities | 9 |
| Figure 8: Driveways within 200 meters on Boundary Roads | 10 |
| Figure 9: Existing Transit Service | 11 |
| Figure 10: Existing Bus Stop Locations | 11 |
| Figure 11: Existing Traffic Volumes | 12 |
| Figure 12: Existing Lane Configurations | 13 |
| Figure 13: 2031 Road Network Concept | 15 |
| Figure 14: City of Ottawa Ultimate Cycling Network | 16 |
| Figure 15: Rapid Transit and Transit Priority Network - 2031 Affordable Network | 17 |
| Figure 16: Rapid Transit and Transit Priority Network – Ultimate Network | 17 |
| Figure 17: Background Developments (5618 Hazeldean Road Transportation Impact Study, May | |
| 2020) | 18 |
| Figure 18: Future Study Intersections | 20 |
| Figure 19: Future School Bus Traffic Volumes | 23 |
| Figure 20: Future 2030 Background Volumes | 25 |
| Figure 21: Future Total 2030 Volumes | 26 |
| Figure 22: Future Lane Configurations | 32 |

Tables

| Table 1: Existing Pedestrian Activity | 13 |
|---|----|
| Table 2: Existing Cycling Activity | 13 |
| Table 3: Collisions by Location and Year | 14 |
| Table 4: Exemptions Review | 20 |
| Table 5: MMLOS Conditions – Segments | 29 |
| Table 6: Site Driveway and Abbott Street East Intersection Operations | 30 |
| Table 7: Proposed Site Driveway and Robert Grant Avenue Intersection Operations | 31 |
| Table 8: Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue Intersection Operations | 33 |
| Table 9: Abbott Street East and Iber Road Intersection Operations | 34 |

CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)

Transportation Impact Assessment – Proposed Expansion of Paul-Desmarais High School in the Community of Stittsville October 2022-22-4505



5.0

36

| Table 10: Robert Grant Avenue and Street 8 | 35 |
|--|----|
| Table 11: Robert Grant Avenue and Cransbill Road / Street 15 Intersection Operations | 35 |

Appendices

| А | Parking Calculations |
|---|--|
| В | Kizell Lands Volume Figure |
| С | Level of Service Descriptions |
| D | Intersection Performance Worksheets |
| E | TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist |
| | |



1.0 Screening

1.1 Summary of Development

| Municipal Address | 5315 Abbott Street East, Ottawa | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Description of Location | The site is located in the community of Stittsville on the northwest corner | | | | |
| | of Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue. Access to the school is | | | | |
| | currently provided on Abbott Street East which is classified as a Major | | | | |
| | Collector roadway. The school is within the City's urban boundary. | | | | |
| Land Use Classification | I1A [2129] – Minor Institutional Zone | | | | |
| Development Size | École secondaire catholique Paul-Desmarais is an existing middle and high | | | | |
| | school with an enrolment of 1,250 students, 100 staff members, and 22 | | | | |
| | portable classrooms (portables). | | | | |
| | The CECCE proposal is to replace the existing portables with the | | | | |
| | construction of new school classrooms. A new pavilion is also planned, | | | | |
| | connecting to the existing inflatable dome. The pavilion will accommodate | | | | |
| | two new classrooms, increasing the total new classroom to 18. The | | | | |
| | number of students and staff at the school are expected to remain the | | | | |
| | same. | | | | |
| Number of Accesses and | The existing bus loop is planned to be maintained however a new bus loop | | | | |
| Locations | is being constructed with access to the planned extension of Robert Grant | | | | |
| | Avenue. The new bus loop will spread the bus traffic over the two access | | | | |
| | locations, being Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue. | | | | |
| | The existing and future staff and student parking lot access will remain on | | | | |
| | Abbott Street East. | | | | |
| Phases of Development | 1 | | | | |
| Build-out Year | 2024 (Start of Construction, June 2023) | | | | |
| | | | | | |

1.2 Trip Generation Trigger

The proposed expansion of Paul-Desmarais High School is anticipated to maintain the number of students and staff trips during the peak hour, the number of site trips is expected to remain the same as existing, which exceeds 60 person trips. A traffic impact study was not previously completed for this site.



| Land Use Type | Minimum Development Size | Yes | No | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----|----|--|
| Single-Family Homes | 40 units | | x | |
| Townhomes or Apartments | 90 units | | x | |
| Office | 3,500 sq.m. | | x | |
| Industrial | 5,000 sq.m. | | x | |
| Fast-Food Restaurant or Coffee Shop | 100 sq.m. | | x | |
| Destination Retail | 1,000 sq.m. | | x | |
| Gas Station or Convenience Market | 75 sq.m. | | x | |
| Other | 60 person trips or more during weekday peak hours | x | | |

1.3 Location Triggers

| Criteria | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| 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? | | x |
| Is the development in a <u>Design Priority Area</u> (DPA) or Transit-oriented Development (TOD) zone?* | x | |

1.4 Safety Triggers

| Criteria | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| Are posted speed limits on a boundary street 80 km/hr or greater? | | x |
| Are there any horizontal/vertical curvatures on a boundary street limits sight lines at a proposed driveway? | | x |
| 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)? | x | |
| Is the proposed driveway within auxiliary lanes of an intersection? | | х |
| Does the proposed driveway make use of an existing median break that serves an existing site? | | x |
| Is there is a documented history of traffic operations or safety concerns on the boundary streets within 500 m of the development? | x | |
| The intersection of Abbott Street East at Iber Road operates over capacity at certain periods of the day and requires a Police Point Duty officer to control traffic. There have also been parking issues on Abbott Street, however additional signage and | | |
| bylaw enforcement have been implemented. | | |
| Does the development include a drive-thru facility? | | X |

CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)



1.5 Summary

| Criteria | Yes | No |
|---|-----|----|
| Does the development satisfy the Trip Generation Trigger? | x | |
| Does the development satisfy the Location Trigger? | | x |
| Does the development satisfy the Safety Trigger? | x | |

Since the development satisfies the trip generation and safety trigger, both the design review component and the network impact component will be addressed in the TIA.

CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)



2.0 Scoping

2.1 Existing and Planned Conditions

2.1.1 Proposed Development

École Secondaire Catholique Paul-Desmarais ('Paul-Desmarais Secondary School') is an existing middle and high school with an enrolment of 1,250 students, 100 staff members, and 22 portable classrooms (portables). The school is located on the northwest corner of Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue within the Fernbank Community Design Plan (CDP). The existing site provides 123 parking spaces for vehicles and 90 bike parking spaces.

The CECCE is proposing to construct 16 new classrooms, while reducing the number of portables (from 22 to approximately 6). A new pavilion is also planned, connecting to the existing inflatable dome.

Robert Grant Avenue is planned to be extended from Abbott Street East to north of Hazeldean Road. Numerous residential / mixed use developments are proposed or under construction in the area. There is an existing bus loop at the school and a new additional bus loop is planned to be constructed with access being provided to the planned extension of Robert Grant Avenue. The existing parking lot will remain accessible via Abbott Street East. No additional trips are expected to be generated by the school based on the proposed upgrades. The number of students and staff will remain the same, before and after the school modifications. The wide area context is provided in **Figure 1** and the local area context is provided in **Figure 2**.



Figure 1: Wide Area Location Context





Figure 2: Local Area Context

The existing conditions study area intersections include three (3) intersections under consideration for this study are as follows,

- Abbott Street East & Iber Road
- Abbot Street East & Robert Grant Avenue
- Abbot Street East & Existing Access

The study area intersections were chosen based on the understanding that the no additional trips will be generated by upgrades taking place at the school. The traffic circulation surrounding the school will be the most critical element of the analysis as there will be minimal impact to the surrounding road network intersections. The school buses will divided between the existing and proposed bus loops. The existing and proposed site plan is provided in **Figure 3**.





CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)



| Iber Road | Iber Road runs nominally north-south and is classified as a Major Collector |
|-----------|---|
| | and is under the jurisdiction of the City of Ottawa. The roadway has a two- |
| | lane cross-section and a posted speed limit of 50 kilometers per hour. |

2.1.2.2 Existing Intersections

The lane configurations and the traffic control for each of the study intersections is provided below.

Abbott Street East / Robert Grant Avenue

This intersection is a single lane roundabout with an advisory speed of 30 kilometers per hour. The north approach is currently unconstructed. A view of the intersection is provided in **Figure 4**.



Figure 4: Intersection of Robert Grant Ave and Abbott St E.



Abbott Street East / Iber Road

This intersection is a three-legged stop-controlled intersection. Auxiliary left turn lanes are provided on the north approach and the west approach. A path connecting Abbott Street and the Trans Canada Trail is located to the south of the intersection and leads to the west pedestrian crossing. A view of the intersection is provided in **Figure 5**.



Figure 5: Intersection of Abbott St E and Iber Rd

2.1.2.3 Walking and Cycling

A sidewalk is provided on the north side of Abbott Street, west of Robert Grant Ave. To the east, the south side of Abbott Street East has been reconstructed with a sidewalk and cycle track. The urbanization of the north side of Abbott Street East has not yet been completed. The Trans Canada Trail runs parallel to Abbott Street to the south. Sidewalks and cycle tracks are provided on Robert Grant Ave to the south of Abbott Street. A figure showing the cycling facilities is provided in **Figure 6** and pedestrian facilities is provided in **Figure 7**.





CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)



2.1.2.4 Existing Driveways

The school currently borders only Abbott Street East, a driveway access is provided to access the school. There are no other driveways within 200 meters of the subject site. **Figure 8** illustrates the existing driveways within 200 m of proposed site driveway.



The existing public transit operations in proximity to the school are shown in **Figure 9** and the nearby bus stops are shown in **Figure 10**. Route 62 currently serves the school. The bus stops are approximately 240 metres from the school's main entrance.





Figure 9: Existing Transit Service



Figure 10: Existing Bus Stop Locations





CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)





Figure 12: Existing Lane Configurations

 Table 1 and Table 2 document the existing pedestrian and cycling activity, respectively.

Table 1: Existing Pedestrian Activity

| Intersection | | AM peak hour | | | | PM peak hour | | | | |
|---|-----|--------------|------|------|-------|--------------|-------|------|------|-------|
| | | South | West | East | Total | North | South | West | East | Total |
| | leg | leg | leg | leg | | leg | leg | leg | leg | |
| Abbott Street East at Iber Road | | - | 0 | 0 | 4 | 76 | - | 29 | 11 | 116 |
| Abbott Street East at Robert Grant Avenue | | 33 | 33 | 7 | 114 | 159 | 96 | 190 | 29 | 474 |
| Abbott Street East at Site Driveway | | - | 0 | 0 | 26 | 105 | - | 2 | 2 | 109 |

Table 2: Existing Cycling Activity

| Intersection | AM peak hour PM peak hour | | our | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----|-----|----|-------|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | WB | EB | SB | NB | Total | WB | EB | SB | NB | Total |
| Abbott Street East at Iber Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 57 |
| Abbott Street East at Robert Grant Avenue | 29 | 6 | 2 | 29 | 66 | 13 | 34 | 44 | 9 | 100 |
| Abbott Street East at Site Driveway | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

2.1.2.8 Collision History

The collision history along boundary roads of the site was accessed from the City of Ottawa's open data portal. The sites selected for analysis were the intersections of Iber Rd & Abbott Street East and the intersection of Abbott Street East & Robert Grant Avenue, as well as the midblock segment between these intersections. The collisions by location and year are provided in **Table 3**. The data indicates a total of nine (9) collisions over the five-year period between calendar year 2016 and 2020.

CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE) Transportation Impact Assessment – Proposed Expansion of Paul-Desmarais High School in the Community of Stittsville



October 2022-22-4505

Table 3: Collisions by Location and Year

| Location | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| ABBOTT ST @ IBER RD | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 |
| ABBOTT ST @ ROBERT GRANT AVE | | | 1 | 2 | |
| ABBOTT ST E between IBER RD & ROBERT GRANT AVE | | | 1 | | |

2.1.3 Planned Conditions

2.1.3.1 Road Network Improvements

Figure 13 shows the 2031 Network Concept proposed in the 2013 TMP for the area surrounding Paul-Desmarais Secondary School. Notable proposed road network changes include the extension of Robert Grant Avenue from Fernbank Road to north of Hazeldean Road. The segment between Fernbank Road and Abbott Road East has already been constructed at the time of writing this report, and the segment between Abbott Road East and Hazeldean Road is expected to be constructed in calendar year 2022. Robert Grant Avenue is classified as an Arterial roadway under the jurisdiction of the City of Ottawa. It is currently consists of a two-lane cross-section however, it will ultimately be widened to a 4-lane crosssection.













These background developments are described in the Kizell Lands Community Transportation Study

CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)



(CTS) (*5618 Hazeldean Road Transportation Impact Study, May 2020*). For the purposes of this study, the "Scenario 1" future development assumptions from the Kizell Lands CTS were used for analysis. This scenario includes the density assumptions and full build-out date of 2028, as described in the Fernbank CDP. The future background development are as follows:

- 288 Single Detached Dwellings
- 469 Townhouse Dwellings
- 878 Multi-Family Housing Dwellings (Low Rise)
- 297 Apartment Units (High Density)
- 191 Apartments and 140,910 ft² of Retail (Mixed Use)
- 580 Student Elementary School
- 325 Parking Space Parking and Ride

Figure 17 illustrates the location of the background developments as shown in the Kizell Lands CTS.



Figure 17: Background Developments (5618 Hazeldean Road Transportation Impact Study, May 2020)

Further, the City's development application search tool was accessed to verify other developments that may be unaccounted in the previous traffic study noted above. Three development applications were identified as follows:

- A planned development of four six-storey apartment buildings consisting of 354 dwelling units along with 7,353 square feet of commercial space being proposed at 360 Bobolink Ridge;
- A planned development of 76 townhome units proposed at 585 Bobolink Ridge;

CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)



- A planned development of 112 townhome dwellings proposed at 723 Putney Crescent;
- A new elementary school proposed at 755 Cope Drive.

2.2 Study Area and Time Periods

The study area for the future planned conditions consists of the following intersections:

- 1. Iber Road & Abbott Street East
- 2. Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue.
- 3. Abbott Street East and Existing Paul-Desmarais School Access
- 4. Robert Grant Avenue and proposed bus loop access
- 5. Robert Grant Avenue and Street 14
- 6. Robert Grant Avenue and Street 8
- 7. Robert Grant Avenue and Cransbill Road

The study area was selected based on the understanding that there are no new additional trips generated by the Paul-Desmarais school. The traffic circulation surrounding the school will be the most critical element of the analysis as there will be minimal impact to the greater road network and study intersections. The future road network and the proposed study intersections are shown in **Figure 18**.

The selected time periods for analysis are the weekday AM peak period of the adjacent roadway and the PM peak period of the school driveway (i.e. the AM and PM school pickup and drop-off hours), since these are the time periods when the school generates the most traffic.

The proposed development is anticipated to be open for the 2024 school year however, the surrounding developments will not be built out until 2030. Therefore, this analysis will examine the full build-out 2030 future horizon year.







Figure 18: Future Study Intersections

2.3 Exemptions Review

Table 4 summarizes the exemptions review table from the City of Ottawa's 2017 Transportation ImpactAssessment Guidelines. Module 4.2.2 is not included since there are 123 parking spaces provided ascompared with the required 114 parking spaces. Parking calculations are provided in Appendix A.

Module 4.6 was not included since the school is not anticipated to generate new vehicle trips.

| Module | Element | Exemption Consideration | Status |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|----------|
| 4.1 Development | 4.1.2 Circulation | Only required for site plans | Included |
| Design | and Access | | |
| | 4.1.3 New | Only required for plans of subdivision | Not |
| | Street Networks | | included |
| 4.2 Parking | 4.2.1 Parking | Only required for site plans | Included |
| | Supply | | |
| | 4.2.2 Spillover | Only required for site plans where parking supply is 15% | Not |
| | Parking | below unconstrained demand | included |

Table 4: Exemptions Review

CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)



| Module | Element | Exemption Consideration | Status |
|---------------------|----------------|--|----------|
| 4.5 Transportation | All Elements | Not required for site plans expected to have fewer than 60 | included |
| Demand | | employees and/or students on location at any given time | |
| Management | | | |
| 4.6 Neighbourhood | 4.6.1 Adjacent | Only required when the development relies on Local or | Not |
| Traffic Management | Neighbourhoods | Collector streets for access and total volumes exceed ATM | included |
| | | capacity thresholds | |
| 4.8 Network Concept | | Only required when proposed development generates | Not |
| | | more than 200 person trips during the peak hour in excess | included |
| | | of the equivalent volume permitted by established zoning | |
| 4.9 Intersection | All Elements | Not required if site generation trigger is not met | Included |
| Design | | | |

CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)



3.0 Forecasting

3.1 Development-Generated Travel Demand

The forecast traffic volumes within the study area will consist of trips generated by background land use, and changes to the school bus traffic patterns with the new bus loop to Robert Grant Avenue. No new additional trips are to be generated by the Paul-Desmarais High School; however, there will be changes to how school buses access the school as they will be divided between the existing and the proposed bus loop access.

The background traffic volume growth will be generated by the lands contained within the Kizell Lands CTS and additional developments noted in **Section 2.1.3.4**.

3.1.1 Paul-Desmarais School Trips

The school will generate no new additional trips as a result of the proposed school modifications. However, a new bus loop will be constructed connecting to the extension of Robert Grant Avenue. The new school bus loop will be used in addition to the existing school access on Abbott Street East. The number of school buses will be split between the two accesses based on their routes.

The number of school buses using the new bus loop will be managed to eliminate northbound left turns from Robert Grant Avenue. The school bus routes, volumes, and schedules were observed. The school buses destined to the school from the north will utilize the new access on Robert Grant Avenue. The school buses arriving from the west, south and the east will continue to utilize the existing access on Abbott Street East. The forecast school bus volumes are shown in **Figure 19**.





3.2 Background Network Travel Demand

3.2.1 Transportation Network Plans

The Robert Grant Avenue extension is planned to be constructed as a two-lane arterial in the fall of 2022, being front ended by the adjacent developers. The City's 2013 Transportation Master Plan identifies the widening of Robert Grant Avenue from a two-lane cross section to a four-lane cross section, however timing of the widening of Robert Grant Avenue is unknown.

There are no other network modifications which will directly impact the study area road network.



| 3.2.2 | Background Traffic Volume Growth |
|-------|--|
| | Background traffic growth was determined based on the Kizell Lands CTS undertaken in June 2020. The study utilized a 2% growth rate and included several background developments within the study area. The Kizell Lands CTS forecast the 2030 traffic volumes. |
| | The Kizell Lands CTS forecast the weekday AM and PM commuter peak hour traffic volumes. This report evaluates the impacts during peak school hours, which generally overlap the weekday AM peak hour but occur earlier during the PM period, between 3:15 and 4:15 PM. Therefore, the Kizell PM peak hour traffic volumes were scaled down to 81% of the peak commuter hour to reflect the off-peak characteristics at the end of the school day. The traffic volumes from the Kizell Lands CTS is provided in Appendix B . |
| 3.2.3 | Other Background Developments |
| | Other developments which were not included in the Kizell Lands CTS were added from the City's development application portal. These other developments included the following: |
| | A planned development of four six-storey apartment buildings consisting of 354 dwelling units along with 7,353 square feet of commercial space being proposed at 360 Bobolink Ridge; A planned development of 76 townhome units proposed at 585 Bobolink Ridge; A planned development of 112 townhome dwellings proposed at 723 Putney Crescent; A new elementary school proposed at 755 Cope Drive. The trips generated by these developments were determined through the TRANS Trip Generation Manual methodology or otherwise obtained from the respective traffic study for each development. Similar to the methodology applied to the PM peak hour Kizell traffic volumes, the PM background development traffic volumes were reduced to 81% of the peak PM commuter hour traffic volumes to reflect the traffic on the roadway at the end of the school day, between 3:15 and 4:15 PM. |
| 3.2.4 | Traffic Volumes |
| | The future 2030 background traffic volumes are provided in Figure 20 . |





3.3 Demand Rationalization

The proposed modifications to the school site are not anticipated to increase traffic volumes on adjacent roadways. Traffic volumes along Abbott Drive East or on Robert Grant Avenue are not anticipated to exceed capacity. For these reasons demand rationalization was not undertaken.



3.4 Total Future Traffic Forecasts

The total future volumes for the AM and PM peak periods are provided in **Figure 21**. The total traffic volumes include the redistribution of school bus traffic, which is the only difference between the background and total traffic volumes.



CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)



| 4.0 | Analysis |
|-------|--|
| 4.1 | Development Design |
| 4.1.1 | Design for Sustainable Modes |
| | Bicycle facilities – A total of 90 bicycle parking spaces are provided at the school. Direct and convenient paved surfaces are provided to access the school from the bike parking areas. |
| | Pedestrian access and circulation – The sidewalk and paved surfaces around the school provide direct access to the main school entrance. The bus loops provide sidewalk connections to the school student entrance. Paved surfaces around the school also provide direct and convenient access from the existing staff parking lot, existing bicycle parking areas, and drop-off/pick-up lay-by area to the school entrances. |
| | Transit facilities – OC Transpo stops are provided adjacent to the site at the intersection of Abbott Street East and Iber Road. The transit stops are connected to the school by sidewalks on the north side of Abbott Street East. An existing school bus loop is provided north of the on-site parking lot. An additional bus loop will be added north of the school building, connecting to the Robert Grant Avenue extension. The existing and new bus loop will be connected to the school through pedestrian walkways. |
| 4.1.2 | Circulation and Access |
| | The school has one driveway to Abbott Street East on the west side of the school, which is intended for staff parking and access to the existing school bus loop to the north of the parking lot. A driveway to Robert Grant Avenue connecting to the proposed new bus loop will be added on the east side of the site, between the school and soccer field. An on-street parent drop-off/pick-up lay-by on Abbott Street East is provided. |
| | School bus loops – The existing school bus loop provides approximately 205 metres of bus storage space plus there is an additional 100 metres within the parking lot area. At approximately 3:40 PM (approximately 10 minutes following the end of the day bell), the school closes the inbound driveway to the parking lot and a traffic control person directs traffic on Abbott Street to aid in the departure of busses from the parking lot. The new bus loop will provide in excess of an additional 150 metres of bus storage (and the school has the opportunity to manage which school buses will access the new bus loop. |
| | Parent drop-off/pick-up – The parent drop-off/pick-up lay-by is located on the north side of Abbott Street. The lay-by parking bay provides 60 metres of storage space for approximately 8 vehicles. In the AM peak hour, video data at the Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue roundabout showed a quick turnover rate in the lay-by, with maximum utilization peaking at 100% between 8:55 AM to 9:05 AM. During the PM peak hour, parents picking up at the 3:30 bell time start arriving at 3:00 PM and were observed waiting until 3:30 PM with minimal turnover. Vehicles began turning over at 3:30 PM |



when the majority of students exited the school.

Waste collection – There are no proposed changes to the existing parking lot where the waste collection occurs. The school board has not reported any waste collection operational issues, it is assumed that waste collection will continue to operate without issues.

4.2 Parking

4.2.1 Parking Supply

Automobile Parking – There are no new trips generated by the proposed modifications to the school. The number of students and staff will remain as per the existing operations. As per City of Ottawa Zoning By-law 2008-250 (Section 101), 112 parking spaces are required and there are 123 provided, exceeding the zoning by-law requirement.

Bicycle Parking – As per City of Ottawa Zoning By-law 2016-249 (Section 111), the minimum bicycle parking rate is one bicycle parking space per 100 m² of gross floor area. Therefore, 90 bicycle parking spaces¹ are required and 90 bicycle parking spaces are provided.

4.3 Boundary Street Design

4.3.1 Mobility

The Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) was evaluated for Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue to assist with developing a concept that maximizes the achievement of the MMLOS objectives. Since the development is within 300 metres of a school (the site itself), the MMLOS targets are subject to the school policy area. Note that there are no targets for trucks on a collector roadway within the school policy area, and there are no targets for auto traffic between intersections (there are targets for auto traffic at signalized intersections only, there are no signalized intersections within proximity of the site).

Table 5 presents the MMLOS conditions for roadway segments adjacent the school on Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue. This MMLOS analysis is based on the existing conditions on Abbott Street East and the planned conditions of Robert Grant Avenue adjacent the school site. Abbott Street East is provided with a parking lay-by and sidewalk on the north side of the roadway. Abbott Street East has a posted speed limit of 50 km/h (40 km/h during school hours) and the posted speed limit on Robert Grant Avenue is assumed as 60 km/h.

The analysis shows that all MMLOS targets are met for cycling, transit, and truck modes on Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue. The MMLOS targets for pedestrians are not met and could only be met if



¹ 4,647sq.m gross school floor area x 1 bicycle parking space / 100 sq.m = 47 bicycle parking spaces

the speed limit on both roads were reduced to 30 km/h <u>and</u> if a boulevard of at least 0.5 metres wide was added beside the sidewalk on Abbott Street East.

| Travel Mode | Criteria | Target | Abbott Street East (North Side) | Robert Grant Avenue Arterial Road |
|----------------|----------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | Collector Road | |
| Pedestrian | Sidewalk width | A | 2.0 metres | 2.0 metres |
| LOS | Boulevard width |] [| 0 metres | > 2.0 metres |
| | AADT < 3000 | 1 | No | No |
| | On-Street Parking | | No | No |
| | Operating Speed | 1 | > 30 or <50 km/h | > 50 or 60 km/h |
| | Level of Service | 1 | С | С |
| Cycling | Type of facility | D | Mixed traffic | Bike Lane Not Adjacent |
| LOS | | | | Parking Lane |
| | Number of travel | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | lanes/direction | | | |
| | Operating speed | 1 | ≤ 40 km/h | 60 km/h |
| | Level of Service | 1 | Α | С |
| Transit | Type of facility | D | Mixed traffic | No target |
| LOS | Parking/driveway friction | | Limited / Low | |
| | Level of Service | 1 | D | - |
| Truck | Curb lane width | E | No target | > 3.7 metres |
| LOS | More than two travel lanes | 1 | | No |
| | Level of Service | 1 | | В |

Table 5: MMLOS Conditions – Segments

4.3.2 Road Safety

The collision history in Section 2.1.2.8 indicates very few collisions have occurred in proximity to the school over the past five years. The extension of Robert Grant Avenue between Abbott Street and Hazeldean Road is being designed to current City of Ottawa standards. The terrain is flat and sight lines from the school driveways should be clear.

4.4 Access Intersection Design

4.4.1 Location and Design of Driveway

The proposed site bus loop driveway is located on Robert Grant Avenue, providing a single lane in and out of the site. The site driveway is approximately 10 metres wide and provides a clear throat distance of greater than 15 metres from the property line. The proposed width exceeds the typical City of Ottawa Private Approach Bylaw (#2003-447, Section 25) requirements of 9 metres, by 1 metre. It is noted that



the By-Law Section 25.1.e indicates that a private approach may exceed 9 metres in width to permit offstreet bus loading areas, therefore the design meets the requirements of the by-law. The driveway is located with clear sightline; no safety concerns were identified.

4.4.2 Intersection Control

The proposed site driveway will serve only school buses and will experience minimal volume throughout the day except for the morning and afternoon drop-off and pickup periods. Stop sign controls facing vehicles exiting the site are not required however could be considered by the school board.

4.4.3 Access Intersection Design

Table 6 summarizes the traffic operations for the intersection of Abbott Street East and the existing site driveway for the weekday AM and PM peak hours, for existing conditions and the 2030 horizon year. **Appendix C** contains the City of Ottawa LOS definitions and **Appendix D** contains the intersection performance worksheets. Assuming single lane approaches and stop conditions exiting the school, the driveway intersection will operate at a LOS A with minimal delay. The level-of-service (LOS) of traffic signal-controlled intersections in the City of Ottawa is based on the volume to capacity (v/c) ratio.

| Existing Conditions | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) | | | |
| SB LR | 18.8 (20.1) | C (C) | 0.17 (0.41) | 5 (16) | | | |
| WB TR | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.31 (0.22) | 0 (0) | | | |
| EB LT | 2.6 (0.5) | A (A) | 0.08 (0.02) | 2 (1) | | | |
| | | Total Future 2030 | 1 | | | | |
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) | | | |
| SB LR | 33.5 (23.3) | D (C) | 0.25 (0.42) | 7 (16) | | | |
| WB TR | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.28 (0.29) | 1 (0) | | | |
| EB LT | 1.9 (0.5) | A (A) | 0.07 (0.02) | 0 (0) | | | |

Table 6: Site Driveway and Abbott Street East Intersection Operations

Note: Results are presented in the format AM (PM) peak hour; Q95th (m) indicates the 95th percentile queues, LOS is an abbreviation for Level-of-Service, EB = eastbound, WB = westbound, SB = southbound; LTR = left, through, right movements for single/shared lane approaches.

Table 7 summarizes the operation of the proposed bus-loop driveway to Robert Grant Avenue. Robert

 Grant Avenue does not currently exist, therefore only the forecast 2030 traffic operations are provided.





| Total Future 2030 | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------|-------|-------------|-----------|--|--|
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) | | |
| SB TR | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.26 (0.42) | 0.0 (0.0) | | |
| NB LT | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.0 (0.0) | | |
| EB LR | 28.5 (33.7) | D (D) | 0.11 (0.16) | 2.8 (4.4) | | |

Table 7: Proposed Site Driveway and Robert Grant Avenue Intersection Operations

Note: Results are presented in the format AM (PM) peak hour; Q95th (m) indicates the 95th percentile queues, LOS is an abbreviation for Level-of-Service, EB = eastbound, WB = westbound, SB = southbound; LTR = left, through, right movements for single lane

4.5 Transportation Demand Management

Appendix E contains the TDM checklists. From the TDM checklists, some recommendations are as follows:

- Display relevant transit schedules and route maps at entrances;
- Provide links to OC Transpo and STO information on the school board website; and,
- Provide shower and lockers for staff use (these measures are provided).

The school board should also consider offering preloaded PRESTO cards to encourage commuters to use transit, or provide reimbursement of monthly transit passes for employees. It is noted that a very large percentage of the student population are bused to the site on school buses.

4.6 Neighbourhood Traffic Management

The proposed changes to the school will not generate any additional trips. Therefore, neighbourhood traffic management is deemed unnecessary.

4.7 Transit

The proposed changes to the school will not generate any new trips, therefore transit service will not be impacted.

4.8 Review of Network Concept

A review of the network concept is not included within this study. The network concept review is only required when a proposed development generates more than 200 person trips during the peak hour in excess of the equivalent volume permitted by established zoning. The proposed school is in keeping with the proposed zoning.




CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)

Transportation Impact Assessment – Proposed Expansion of Paul-Desmarais High School in the Community of Stittsville October 2022-22-4505



4.9.1 Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue

The roundabout intersection is forecast to operate below an acceptable LOS in future, as indicated in **Table 8**. The results are based on the Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition methodology for roundabouts. The school impact on the intersection is negligible. The City should monitor the operations of the roundabout over time and consider the need for a two-lane northbound entry to address future demands. It is noted that Robert Grant Avenue is planned to widen to a four-lane cross section in the future, which will increase the capacity of the roadway. The roundabout analysis utilized a saturated flow of 1960 vehicles per hour per lane, consistent with the Kizell Lands Transportation Study.

| | | Existing | | |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) |
| EB | 5.0 (6.8) | A (A) | 0.22 (0.37) | 1 (2) |
| WB | 5.5 (5.3) | A (A) | 0.18 (0.18) | 1 (1) |
| NB | 6.3 (5.8) | A (A) | 0.35 (0.29) | 2 (1) |
| SB | 4.5 (4.1) | A (A) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0 (0) |
| | Futu | re Background 2030 | | |
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) |
| EB | 36.3 (12.9) | E (B) | <mark>0.92</mark> (0.52) | 13 (3) |
| WB | 23.9 (14.5) | C (B) | 0.71 (0.58) | 6 (4) |
| NB | 182 (14.8) | F (B) | 1.33 (0.66) | 32 (5) |
| SB | 9.7 (16.0) | A (C) | 0.45 (0.71) | 2 (6) |
| | Т | otal Future 2030 | | |
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) |
| EB | 36.3 (12.9) | E (B) | <mark>0.92</mark> (0.52) | 13 (3) |
| WB | 23.9 (14.5) | C (B) | 0.71 (0.58) | 6 (4) |
| NB | 182 (14.8) | F (B) | 1.33 (0.66) | 32 (5) |
| SB | 9.7 (16.0) | A (C) | 0.45 (0.71) | 2 (6) |

Table 8: Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue Intersection Operations

Note: Results are presented in the format AM (PM) peak hour; Q95th (m) indicates the 95th percentile queues, LOS is an abbreviation for Level-of-Service, EB = eastbound, WB = westbound, SB = southbound; LTR = left, through, right movements for single lane

4.9.2 Abbott Street East and Iber Road

The intersection is forecast to operate below an acceptable LOS in future, as indicated in **Table 9**. The modifications of the school will have a negligible impact on the intersection. Intersection modifications or traffic control modifications are required to address auto traffic demands. In 2030, the intersection may require signalization, which should include separate left-turn lanes in the eastbound and southbound directions. Alternatively, a roundabout should be considered at this location.



| | | Existing | | |
|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) |
| | AM (PM) | AM (PM) | AM (PM) | AM (PM) |
| EB LT | 19.4 (22.4) | C (C) | 0.62 (0.67) | - |
| WB TR | 25.5 (22.3) | D (C) | 0.78 (0.70) | - |
| SB LR | 22.3 (47.1) | C (E) | 0.70 <mark>(0.93)</mark> | - |
| | Fut | ure Background 203 | 0 | |
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) |
| EB LT | 90.5 (12.6) | F (B) | 1.08 (0.36) | - |
| WB TR | 34.4 (23.2) | D (C) | 0.83 (0.76) | - |
| SB LR | 144 (19.3) | F (C) | 1.23 (0.65) | - |
| | | Total Future 2030 | | |
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) |
| EB LT | 88.9 (12.5) | F (B) | 1.08 (0.36) | - |
| WB TR | 31.9 (21.8) | D (C) | 0.80 (0.74) | - |
| SB LR | 134 (19.0) | F (C) | 1.21 (0.65) | - |
| | Total I | Future 2030 (Signali | zed) | |
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) |
| EB L | 15.9 (8.6) | B (A) | 0.53 (0.40) | 34 (14) |
| EB T | 19.0 (7.1) | B (A) | 0.71 (0.20) | 92 (13) |
| WB TR | 16.4 (8.9) | В (А) | 0.62 (0.53) | 74 (26) |
| SB L | 17.3 (8.2) | В (А) | 0.75 (0.48) | 103 (31) |
| SB R | 8.8 (6.6) | A (A) | 0.07 (0.09) | 7 (7) |
| | 1 | | 1 | |

Table 9: Abbott Street East and Iber Road Intersection Operations

4.9.3 Robert Grant Avenue and Street 8

The Street 8 Stop controlled intersection is forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS in future, as indicated in **Table 10**. The school impact on the intersection is negligible. Intersection modifications or traffic control modifications are not required to address auto traffic demands.



| | Future Backgro | ound 2030 | |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C |
| WB LR | 16.9 (13.7) | C (B) | 0.11 (0.05) |
| NB TR | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.53 (0.42) |
| SB LT | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.00 (0.00) |
| | Total Futur | e 2030 | |
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C |
| WB LR | 17.1 (13.9) | C (B) | 0.12 (0.05) |
| NB TR | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.54 (0.43) |
| SB LT | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.00 (0.00) |

Table 10: Robert Grant Avenue and Street 8

4.9.4 Robert Grant Avenue and Cransbill Road / Street 15

The proposed roundabout is forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS in future, as indicated in **Table 11**. The results are based on the Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition methodology for roundabouts. The northbound movement operates with a delay of 28 seconds during the AM peak period and a volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.88. The school impact on the intersection is negligible. Intersection modifications or traffic control modifications are not required to address auto traffic demands.

| | Futur | e Background 2030 | | |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------|
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) |
| EB | 6.8 (8.2) | A (A) | 0.28 (0.19) | 1 (1) |
| WB | 11.1 (6.9) | B (A) | 0.24 (0.11) | 1 (0) |
| NB | 27.0 (12.3) | D (B) | 0.87 (0.64) | 12 (5) |
| SB | 6.1 (11.9) | A (B) | 0.34 (0.67) | 2 (6) |
| | Т | otal Future 2030 | | |
| Approach/ Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | V/C | Q95th (m) |
| EB | 6.9 (8.3) | A (A) | 0.28 (0.19) | 1 (1) |
| WB | 11.2 (7.0) | B (A) | 0.24 (0.12) | 0 (0) |
| NB | 28.2 (12.7) | D (B) | 0.88 (0.65) | 5 (5) |
| SB | 6.2 (12.3) | A (B) | 0.35 (0.68) | 6 (6) |

Table 11: Robert Grant Avenue and Cransbill Road / Street 15 Intersection Operations

DILLON CONSULTING

CONSEIL DES ECOLES CATHOLIQUES DU CENTRE-EST (CECCE)

Transportation Impact Assessment – Proposed Expansion of Paul-Desmarais High School in the Community of Stittsville October 2022-22-4505

5.0 Summary and Conclusions

École Secondaire Catholique Paul-Desmarais ('Paul-Desmarais Secondary School') is an existing middle and high school with an enrolment of 1,250 students, 100 staff members, and 22 portable classrooms (portables). The school is located on the northwest corner of Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue within the Fernbank Community Design Plan (CDP). There is an existing bus loop at the school and a new additional bus loop is planned to be constructed, with access planned to the extension of Robert Grant Avenue.

The existing school driveway and access to the parking lot will remain accessible via Abbott Street East. The modifications to the school are not expected to impact the school student or staff population. The existing vehicle and bicycle parking is adequate and meets the requirements set by the City of Ottawa.

The existing school bus loop provides approximately 205 metres of storage space and the proposed bus loop will provide an additional 150 metres of storage space. There is also a Passenger Pickup Drop-Off lay-by area situated in front of the school which provides 60 metres of storage space, for eight (8) vehicles. In the AM peak hour, video data at the Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue roundabout showed a quick turnover rate in the lay-by, with maximum utilization peaking at 100% between 8:55 AM to 9:05 AM. During the PM peak hour, layby area was full between 3:00 and 3:30 PM. Students start exiting the school at 3:30 PM, at which point turnover within the lay-by occurred.

It is forecast that Abbott Street East and Robert Grant Avenue will meet the MMLOS targets for cycling, transit, and trucks; however, both roadways will only achieve a pedestrian LOS C whereas the target is LOS A. The MMLOS pedestrian target could only be met if the speed limit on both roads were reduced to 30 km/h and if a boulevard of at least 0.5 metre wide was provided between the Abbott Street East sidewalk and the roadway.

The school driveway to Abbott Street East is anticipated to operate at LOS A with minimal delay during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The intersection operates adequately under the existing condition. It is noted that the school currently provides a traffic control person following the afternoon bell to stop traffic on Abbott Street to allow the 28 school buses to exit. With the additional bus loop, there will be fewer school buses accessing Abbott Street. The school should continue to monitor the driveway operations.

The roundabout intersection of Robert Grant Avenue at Abbott Street is forecast to operate below an acceptable LOS in future, as indicated in Table 8. The results are based on the Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition methodology for roundabouts. The school impact on the intersection is negligible. The City should monitor the operations of the roundabout over time and consider the need for a two-lane northbound entry to address future demands. It is noted that Robert Grant Avenue is planned to widen to a four-lane cross section in the future, which will increase the capacity of the roadway.



The Abbott Street East and Iber Road intersection is expected to operate at LOS F under future conditions. The proposed changes to the school bus routes have negligible impacts on the performance of the intersection. The City should monitor the intersection over time. Future improvement should consider include implementing a traffic control signal with separate eastbound and southbound left turn lanes; or, provide a roundabout.

The intersection of Robert Grant Avenue and Street 8 is forecasted to operate with LOS A.

The proposed roundabout of Robert Grant Avenue at Cransbill Avenue / Street 15 is forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS in future, as indicated in Table 11. The results are based on the Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition methodology for roundabouts. The northbound movement operates with a delay of 28 seconds during the AM peak period and a volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.88. The school impact on the intersection is negligible. Intersection modifications or traffic control modifications are not required to address auto traffic demands.



Appendix A

Parking Calculations



MOTOR VEHICLE PARKING, BICYCLE PARKING, LOADING SPACES

Parking requirements as per Part 4 - Parking, Queuing and Loading Provisions, Area C on Schedule 1, Urban and Area. Bicycle parking requirements as per Part 4, Section 111. Loading spaces requirements as per Part 4, Table 113A and 113B.

| | PARKI | NG CALCULA | TIONS | |
|------------|----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| MOTOR VEHI | CLE PARKING: EXISTI | NG SCHOOL, ADDIT | ON, DOME, PORTAE | BLES, PAVILION |
| REQUIRED | USE | No. Class | Spaces per | Spaces required |
| | Middle School | 18 | 1.5/Class | 27 |
| | Middle School Portables | 2 | 1.5/Class | 3 |
| | High School | 35 | 2/Class | 70 |
| | High School Portables | 4 | 2/Class | 8 |
| | Athletic Facility | 1 surface | 4/Suraface | 4 |
| | TOTAL REQUIRED F | ARKING SPACES | | 112 Spaces |
| | TOTAL REQUIRED E | ARRIER FREE SPAC | ES | 2 Spaces |
| PROVIDED | SPACES @ 5.2mD X | 2.6mW | | 121 Spaces |
| | BARRIER FREE SPA | CES @ 5.2mD X 3.67 | mW | 2 Spaces |
| | TOTAL SPACES PRO | OVIDED | | 123 Spaces |
| | | | | |
| | BICYC | LE PARKING (0.6 m) | (1.8m) | |
| REQUIRED | USE | GROSS AREA | SPACES PER | SPACES REQ'D |
| | School | 8,217.1 m2 | 1 / 100 m2 | 83 Spaces |
| | Athletic Facility | 10,165.6 m2 | 1 / 1500 m2 | 7 Spaces |
| | TOTAL REQUIRED F | PARKING SPACES | | 90 Spaces |
| PROVIDED | School | | | 90 Spaces |
| | Athletic Facility | | | 0 Spaces |
| | TOTAL SPACES PRO | OVIDED | | 90 Spaces |
| | | | | |
| | LOADI | NG SPACES (3.5 m X | 7.0 m) | |
| REQUIRED | USE | GROSS AREA | TABLE 113A | SPACES REQ'D |
| | School | 8,217.1 m2 | Column VI | 1 Spaces |
| | Athletic Facility | 10,165.6 m2 | Column VII | 2 Spaces |
| | TOTAL REQUIRED F | PARKING SPACES | | 3 Spaces |
| PROVIDED | School | | | 2 Spaces |
| | Athletic Facility | | | 2 Spaces |
| | TOTAL SPACES PRO | OVIDED | | 4 Spaces |

Appendix B

Kizell Lands Volume Figure







Appendix C

Level of Service Descriptions





LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS AT UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS $^{(1)}$

The term "level of service" implies a qualitative measure of traffic flow at an intersection. It is dependent upon the vehicle delay and vehicle queue lengths at approaches. The level of service at unsignalized intersections is often related to the delay accumulated by flows on the minor streets, caused by all other conflicting movements. The following table describes the characteristics of each level.

| Level of Service | Features |
|------------------|---|
| Α | Little or no traffic delay occurs. Approaches appear open, turning movements are easily made, and drivers have freedom of operation. |
| В | Short traffic delays occur. Many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted in terms of freedom of operation. |
| С | Average traffic delays occur. Operations are generally stable, but drivers emerging from the minor street may experience difficulty in completing their movement. This may occasionally impact on the stability of flow on the major street. |
| D | Long traffic delays occur. Motorists emerging from the minor street experience significant restriction and frustration. Drivers on the major street will experience congestion and delay as drivers emerging from the minor street interfere with the major through movements. |
| Ε | Very long traffic delays occur. Operations approach the capacity of the intersection. |
| F | Saturation occurs, with vehicle demand exceeding the available capacity. Very long traffic delays occur. |

Highway Capacity Manual - Special Report No. 209, Transportation Research Board, 1985.

LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS AT SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

To assist in clarifying the arithmetic analysis associated with traffic engineering, it is often useful to refer to "Level of Service". The term Level of Service implies a qualitative measure of traffic flow at an intersection. It is dependent upon vehicle delay and vehicle queue lengths at the approaches. Specifically, Level of Service criteria are stated in terms of the average stopped delay per vehicle for a 15-minute analysis period. The following table describes the characteristics of each level:

| <u>Level of</u> | Features | Stopped Delay per |
|-----------------|---|-------------------|
| A | At this level of service, almost no signal phase is fully utilized by traffic. Very seldom does a vehicle wait longer than one red indication. The approach appears open, turning movements are easily made and drivers have freedom of operation. | ≤ 10 |
| В | At this level, an occasional signal phase is fully utilized and many phases approach full use. Many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within platoons of vehicles approaching the intersection. | > 10-20 |
| С | At this level, the operation is stable though with more frequent fully utilized signal phases. Drivers feel more restricted and occasionally may have to wait more than one red signal indication, and queues may develop behind turning vehicles. This level is normally employed in urban intersection design. | > 20-35 |
| D | At this level, the motorist experiences increasing restriction and instability of flow. There are substantial delays to approaching vehicles during short peaks within the peak period, but there are enough cycles with lower demand to permit occasional clearance of developing queues and prevent excessive backups. | > 35-55 |
| Ε | At this level, capacity is reached. There are long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection and delays to vehicles may extend to several signal cycles. | > 55-80 |
| F | At this level, saturation occurs, with vehicle demand exceeding the available capacity. | > 80 |

Appendix D

Intersection Performance Worksheets





Existing Conditions

| | ٦ | - | - | • | × | - | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------|-------|-------|------|-----------|------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | | | | | | | | | |
| Lane Configurations | 202 | 4 | 1, | | Y | 0011 | | | | | | | | | |
| Sign Control | | Stop | Stop | | Stop | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 215 | 86 | 146 | 280 | 182 | 168 | | | | | | | | | |
| Future Volume (vph) | 215 | 86 | 146 | 280 | 182 | 168 | | | | | | | | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | | | | | | | | | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 247 | 99 | 168 | 322 | 209 | 193 | | | | | | | | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total (vph) | 346 | 490 | 402 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Left (vph) | 247 | 0 | 209 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 322 | 193 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hadj (s) | 0.31 | -0.26 | -0.03 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.5 | 5.7 | 6.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.62 | 0.78 | 0.70 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 535 | 607 | 551 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 19.4 | 25.5 | 22.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 19.4 | 25.5 | 22.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | С | D | С | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay | | | 22.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service | | | С | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilizat | tion | | 75.4% | IC | U Level o | of Service | | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | ≯ | _ | > | ~ | - | • | • | ŧ | * | 5 | T | 1 |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|-------|------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | - | • | • | | | ` | I | | | • | • |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 66 | 173 | 49 | 107 | 0 | 303 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 66 | 173 | 49 | 107 | 0 | 303 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 72 | 188 | 53 | 116 | 0 | 329 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 260 | | | 169 | | | 419 | | | 0 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 53 | | | 329 | | | 72 | | | 498 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 1329 | | | 1069 | | | 1309 | | | 935 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.20 | | | 0.16 | | | 0.32 | | | 0.00 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 1110 | | | 876 | | | 1092 | | | 756 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.23 | | | 0.19 | | | 0.38 | | | 0.00 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 0.32 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | | 0.38 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | | | 69.1% | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | | С | | | |

| Intersection | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 5.7 | | | |
| Intersection LOS | А | | | |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 260 | 169 | 419 | 0 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 288 | 172 | 440 | 0 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 53 | 349 | 74 | 521 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 468 | 165 | 267 | 0 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | 33 | 7 | 41 | 33 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 0.995 | 0.999 | 0.994 | 0.995 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 5.0 | 5.5 | 6.3 | 0.0 |
| Approach LOS | A | А | А | |
| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| RT Channelized | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 288 | 172 | 440 | 0 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1307 | 967 | 1280 | 811 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.902 | 0.980 | 0.952 | 1.000 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 260 | 169 | 419 | 0 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1174 | 946 | 1212 | 807 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.221 | 0.178 | 0.346 | 0.000 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 5.0 | 5.5 | 6.3 | 4.5 |
| LOS | A | А | А | A |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |

| | ۶ | - | + | • | 1 | ∢ | |
|-------------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|-----------|------------|--|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | |
| Lane Configurations | | स् | f, | | ¥ | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 58 | 250 | 385 | 38 | 14 | 30 | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 58 | 250 | 385 | 38 | 14 | 30 | |
| Sign Control | | Free | Free | | Stop | | |
| Grade | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 72 | 309 | 475 | 47 | 17 | 37 | |
| Pedestrians | | | | | 26 | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | 3.6 | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | 1.2 | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | 2 | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | | |
| Median type | | None | None | | | | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 548 | | | | 978 | 524 | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 548 | | | | 978 | 524 | |
| tC, single (s) | 4.4 | | | | 7.0 | 6.9 | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 2.5 | | | | 4.0 | 3.9 | |
| p0 queue free % | 92 | | | | 91 | 91 | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 860 | | | | 199 | 431 | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | |
| Volume Total | 381 | 522 | 54 | | | | |
| Volume Left | 72 | 0 | 17 | | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 47 | 37 | | | | |
| cSH | 860 | 1700 | 315 | | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.08 | 0.31 | 0.17 | | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 2.2 | 0.0 | 4.9 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 2.6 | 0.0 | 18.8 | | | | |
| Lane LOS | А | | С | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 2.6 | 0.0 | 18.8 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | С | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | |
| Average Delav | | | 2.1 | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliza | ation | | 54.6% | IC | U Level c | of Service | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | |

Intersection Sign configuration not allowed in HCM analysis.

| | < | • | † | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | |
|------------------------------|--------|------|----------|------|---------|------------|--|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | |
| Lane Configurations | ¥ | | 1. | | | 4 | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Sign Control | Stop | - | Free | - | - | Free | |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | None | | | None | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | | | 4.1 | | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | | | 2.2 | | |
| p0 queue free % | 100 | 100 | | | 100 | | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1029 | 1091 | | | 1636 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | |
| Volume Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | |
| Lane LOS | А | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | А | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 0.0 | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | zation | | 13.3% | IC | U Level | of Service | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | |

| Eviating | Valumaa |
|----------|---------|
| EXISTING | volumes |

| | ≯ | - | \mathbf{i} | 1 | - | • | 1 | † | 1 | 1 | ↓ I | - |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|-----------|------------|------|----------|------|------|------|------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 1385 | | | 1385 | | | 1385 | | | 1385 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 1161 | | | 1161 | | | 1161 | | | 1161 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | | | 0.0% | IC | U Level o | of Service | | | А | | | |

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Intersection LOS | - | | | | | |
| Approach | E | В | WB | | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.00 | 00 | 1.000 | - | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach LOS | | - | - | | - | - |
| Lane | Left | Left | | Left | Le | eft |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | | LTR | LT | R |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | | LTR | LT | R |
| RT Channelized | | | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | | 1.000 | 1.00 | 00 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | | 2.609 | 2.60 |)9 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | | 4.976 | 4.97 | '6 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1380 | 1380 | | 1380 | 138 | 30 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 1.000 | 1.000 | | 1.000 | 1.00 | 00 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1380 | 1380 | | 1380 | 138 | 80 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.000 | 0.000 | | 0.000 | 0.00 | 00 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 2.6 | 2.6 | | 2.6 | 2 | .6 |
| LOS | А | A | | А | | A |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |

| | ∕ | - | + | • | × . | 1 | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|------------|------------|---|------|
| Movement | FBI | FBT | WBT | WBR | SBI | SBR | | |
| Lane Configurations | | ្ត | 1. | | ¥ | 0.511 | | |
| Sign Control | | Stop | Stop | | Stop | | | |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 224 | 98 | 82 | 285 | 300 | 195 | | |
| Future Volume (vph) | 224 | 98 | 82 | 285 | 300 | 195 | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 246 | 108 | 90 | 313 | 330 | 214 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | |
| Volume Total (vph) | 354 | 403 | 544 | | | | | |
| Volume Left (vph) | 246 | 0 | 330 | | | | | |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 313 | 214 | | | | | |
| Hadj (s) | 0.21 | -0.31 | -0.04 | | | | | |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.8 | 6.2 | 6.2 | | | | | |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.67 | 0.70 | 0.93 | | | | | |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 517 | 550 | 574 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 22.4 | 22.3 | 47.1 | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 22.4 | 22.3 | 47.1 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | С | С | E | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | |
| Delay | | | 32.7 | | | | | |
| Level of Service | | | D | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | ation | | 83.8% | IC | CU Level c | of Service | E | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | | |

| | ٠ | _ | \sim | 1 | - | • | • | ŧ | * | 1 | T | 1 |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|--------|------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | - | | • | • | | - | `` | | | | • | |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 105 | 291 | 83 | 76 | 0 | 228 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 105 | 291 | 83 | 76 | 0 | 228 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 114 | 316 | 90 | 83 | 0 | 248 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 430 | | | 173 | | | 328 | | | 0 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 90 | | | 248 | | | 114 | | | 421 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 1291 | | | 1140 | | | 1267 | | | 994 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.33 | | | 0.15 | | | 0.26 | | | 0.00 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 1076 | | | 939 | | | 1054 | | | 808 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.40 | | | 0.18 | | | 0.31 | | | 0.00 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 0.33 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | | 0.40 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | | | 75.2% | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | | D | | | |

| Intersection | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 6.2 | | | | |
| Intersection LOS | А | | | | |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB | |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 430 | 173 | 328 | 0 | |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 462 | 185 | 344 | 0 | |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 92 | 263 | 124 | 448 | |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 356 | 205 | 430 | 0 | |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | 75 | 43 | 94 | 13 | |
| Ped Cap Adj | 0.990 | 0.994 | 0.987 | 0.998 | |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 6.8 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 0.0 | |
| Approach LOS | А | А | А | - | |
| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left | |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR | |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR | |
| RT Channelized | | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 462 | 185 | 344 | 0 | |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1256 | 1055 | 1216 | 874 | |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.930 | 0.935 | 0.953 | 1.000 | |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 430 | 173 | 328 | 0 | |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1157 | 981 | 1144 | 872 | |
| V/C Ratio | 0.372 | 0.176 | 0.287 | 0.000 | |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 6.8 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 4.1 | |
| LOS | А | А | А | А | |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |

| | ۶ | - | + | • | 1 | 1 | |
|------------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|------|-----------|--|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | |
| Lane Configurations | | ર્સ | ¢Î, | | Y | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 13 | 373 | 321 | 13 | 32 | 59 | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 13 | 373 | 321 | 13 | 32 | 59 | |
| Sign Control | | Free | Free | | Stop | | |
| Grade | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.55 | 0.55 | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 15 | 444 | 365 | 15 | 58 | 107 | |
| Pedestrians | | | | | 44 | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | 3.6 | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | 1.2 | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | 4 | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | | |
| Median type | | None | None | | | | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 424 | | | | 890 | 416 | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 424 | | | | 890 | 416 | |
| tC, single (s) | 4.4 | | | | 6.7 | 6.5 | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 2.5 | | | | 3.8 | 3.6 | |
| p0 queue free % | 98 | | | | 78 | 81 | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 960 | | | | 264 | 555 | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | |
| Volume Total | 459 | 380 | 165 | | | | |
| Volume Left | 15 | 0 | 58 | | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 15 | 107 | | | | |
| cSH | 960 | 1700 | 401 | | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.02 | 0.22 | 0.41 | | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.4 | 0.0 | 15.8 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.5 | 0.0 | 20.1 | | | | |
| Lane LOS | А | | С | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.5 | 0.0 | 20.1 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | С | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2 5 | | | | |
| Intersection Canacity Litilization | n | | 3.5 | 10 | | f Sorvico | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 44.270 15 | IC. | | JEIVICE | |

| Movement EBL EBR NBL NBT SBT SBR Lane Configurations Y Image: Configuration of the second of the seco |
|---|
| Lane Configurations Y Image: Configuration in the ima |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Future Volume (Veh/h) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Sign Control Stop Free Free Free Grade 0% 0% 0% Peak Hour Factor 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 Hourly flow rate (vph) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Peak Hour Factor 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 Hourly flow rate (vph) 0 0 0 0 0 0 Peak Hour Factor 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 Hourly flow rate (vph) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage Image: Control Image: Contro |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) 0 0 0 0 0 Sign Control Stop Free Free Free Grade 0% 0% 0% 0% Peak Hour Factor 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 Hourly flow rate (vph) 0 0 0 0 0 0 Pedestrians |
| Sign Control Stop Free Free Grade 0% |
| Grade 0% 0% 0% Peak Hour Factor 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 Hourly flow rate (vph) 0 0 0 0 0 0 Hourly flow rate (vph) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Pedestrians |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph)0000000PedestriansLane Width (m)Lane Width (m)Walking Speed (m/s)Percent BlockageRight turn flare (veh)Median typeNoneNoneMedian storage veh)Upstream signal (m)pX, platoon unblockedvC, conflicting volume00vC1, stage 1 conf volvC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh) Median type None Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 0 0 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol V |
| Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh) Median type None None Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 0 0 0 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh) Median type None None None Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 0 0 0 0 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh) Median type None None Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 0 0 0 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type None Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 0 0 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| Median typeNoneNoneMedian storage veh)Upstream signal (m)Upstream signal (m)VC, platoon unblockedvC, conflicting volume00vC1, stage 1 conf volVC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 0 0 0 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 0 0 0 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 0 0 0 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| vC, conflicting volume 0 0 0 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |
| |
| vCu, unblocked vol 0 0 0 |
| tC, single (s) 6.4 6.2 4.1 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |
| tF (s) 3.5 3.3 2.2 |
| p0 queue free % 100 100 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) 1029 1091 1636 |
| Direction, Lane # EB 1 NB 1 SB 1 |
| Volume Total 0 0 0 |
| Volume Left 0 0 0 |
| Volume Right 0 0 0 |
| cSH 1700 1700 1700 |
| Volume to Capacity 0.00 0.00 0.00 |
| Oueue Length 95th (m) 0.0 0.0 0.0 |
| Control Delay (s) 0.0 0.0 0.0 |
| Lane LOS A |
| Approach Delay (s) 0.0 0.0 0.0 |
| Approach LOS A |
| Intersection Summon |
| |
| Intersection Canacity Utilization 12.2% ICUL evel of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |

| | < | • | † | 1 | 1 | Ŧ |
|------------------------------|--------|------|----------|------|---------|------------|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ¥ | | î, | | | ភ |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | | Free | | | Free |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | None | | | None |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | | | 4.1 | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | | | 2.2 | |
| p0 queue free % | 100 | 100 | | | 100 | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1029 | 1091 | | | 1636 | |
| Direction, Lane # | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | |
| Volume Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Lane LOS | А | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | А | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 0.0 | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | zation | | 13.3% | IC | U Level | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

| | ⊁ | | \mathbf{r} | | + | • | • | Ť | - | 1 | Ţ | ~ |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|------------|------------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| N 4 | | | | | | |) NDI | | ſ | | | CDD |
| Movement | FRL | FRI | FRK | WBL | WRI | WBK | NBL | NRI | NBK | SBL | SRI | SBK |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 1385 | | | 1385 | | | 1385 | | | 1385 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 1161 | | | 1161 | | | 1161 | | | 1161 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | | | 0.00 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | | | 0.0% | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | | A | | | |

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Intersection LOS | - | | | | | |
| Approach | E | 3 | WB | | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | | C | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | | C | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | | C | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | | C | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | | C | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.00 | C | 1.000 | 1. | .000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach LOS | | - | - | | - | - |
| Lane | Left | Left | | Left | Left | |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | | LTR | LTR | |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | | LTR | LTR | |
| RT Channelized | | | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | | 1.000 | 1.000 | |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | | 2.609 | 2.609 | |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | | 4.976 | 4.976 | |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1380 | 1380 | | 1380 | 1380 | |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 1.000 | 1.000 | | 1.000 | 1.000 | |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1380 | 1380 | | 1380 | 1380 | |
| V/C Ratio | 0.000 | 0.000 | | 0.000 | 0.000 | |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 2.6 | 2.6 | | 2.6 | 2.6 | |
| LOS | А | A | | А | A | |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |

Future Background

| | ۶ | - | - | • | 1 | 1 |
|-----------------------------------|------|-------|-------|------|-----------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | र्च | f, | | Y | |
| Sign Control | | Stop | Stop | | Stop | |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 108 | 372 | 145 | 239 | 464 | 84 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 108 | 372 | 145 | 239 | 464 | 84 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 124 | 428 | 167 | 275 | 533 | 97 |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | |
| Volume Total (vph) | 552 | 442 | 630 | | | |
| Volume Left (vph) | 124 | 0 | 533 | | | |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 275 | 97 | | | |
| Hadj (s) | 0.28 | -0.24 | 0.27 | | | |
| Departure Headway (s) | 7.1 | 6.7 | 7.0 | | | |
| Degree Utilization, x | 1.08 | 0.83 | 1.23 | | | |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 521 | 528 | 518 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 90.5 | 34.4 | 144.3 | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 90.5 | 34.4 | 144.3 | | | |
| Approach LOS | F | D | F | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Delay | | | 96.1 | | | |
| Level of Service | | | F | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | on | | 93.3% | IC | U Level o | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

Future Background Volumes

| | ≯ | - | \mathbf{N} | - | + | • | • | t t | 1 | 1 | Ţ | - |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|-------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | - | • | • | | | , | • | ' | | • | |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 283 | 438 | 70 | 106 | 218 | 71 | 104 | 474 | 178 | 119 | 207 | 70 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 283 | 438 | 70 | 106 | 218 | 71 | 104 | 474 | 178 | 119 | 207 | 70 |
| 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) | 283 | 438 | 70 | 106 | 218 | 71 | 104 | 474 | 178 | 119 | 207 | 70 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 791 | | | 395 | | | 756 | | | 396 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 432 | | | 861 | | | 840 | | | 428 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 985 | | | 697 | | | 709 | | | 989 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.80 | | | 0.57 | | | 1.07 | | | 0.40 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 801 | | | 547 | | | 558 | | | 804 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.99 | | | 0.72 | | | 1.36 | | | 0.49 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 1.07 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | | 1.36 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | า | | 114.0% | IC | CU Level of | of Service | | | Н | | | |

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 76.7 | | | | | |
| Intersection LOS | F | | | | | |
| Approach | E | В | WB | NE | } | SB |
| Entry Lanes | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 79 |)1 | 395 | 756 |) | 396 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 8 | 4 | 402 | 764 | ļ | 396 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 43 | 32 | 867 | 853 | 3 | 441 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 40 |)5 | 750 | 393 | 3 | 828 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | | 33 | 7 | 41 | | 33 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 0.99 | 95 | 0.999 | 0.994 | l 0. | 995 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 36 | .3 | 23.9 | 181.6 |) | 9.7 |
| Approach LOS | | E | С | F | | А |
| Lane | Left | Left | | Left | Left | |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | | LTR | LTR | |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | | LTR | LTR | |
| RT Channelized | | | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | | 1.000 | 1.000 | |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | | 2.609 | 2.609 | |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | | 4.976 | 4.976 | |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 814 | 402 | | 764 | 396 | |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 888 | 570 | | 578 | 880 | |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.972 | 0.984 | | 0.990 | 1.000 | |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 791 | 395 | | 756 | 396 | |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 859 | 560 | | 569 | 876 | |
| V/C Ratio | 0.921 | 0.706 | | 1.329 | 0.452 | |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 36.3 | 23.9 | | 181.6 | 9.7 | |
| LOS | E | С | | F | А | |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 13 | 6 | | 32 | 2 | |

| | ٦ | - | + | • | 1 | ∢ |
|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------|------|-----------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | د ا | î, | | ¥ | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 58 | 778 | 354 | 38 | 13 | 30 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 58 | 778 | 354 | 38 | 13 | 30 |
| Sign Control | | Free | Free | | Stop | |
| Grade | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 72 | 960 | 437 | 47 | 16 | 37 |
| Pedestrians | | | | | 26 | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | 3.6 | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | 1.2 | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | 2 | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | |
| Median type | | None | None | | | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 510 | | | | 1590 | 486 |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 510 | | | | 1590 | 486 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.4 | | | | 7.0 | 6.9 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 2.5 | | | | 4.0 | 3.9 |
| p0 queue free % | 92 | | | | 80 | 92 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 890 | | | | 79 | 455 |
| Direction. Lane # | FB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | |
| Volume Total | 1032 | 484 | 53 | | | |
| Volume Left | 72 | 0 | 16 | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 47 | 37 | | | |
| rSH | 890 | 1700 | 187 | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.28 | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 21 | 0.0 | 8.9 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 2.3 | 0.0 | 31.7 | | | |
| LaneLOS | A | 0.0 | D | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 2.3 | 0.0 | 31.7 | | | |
| Approach LOS | 210 | 010 | D | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 27 | | | |
| Average Delay | zation | | 2.0 | | | f Conder |
| Analysis Dariad (min) | Zation | | ŏZ.3% | IC | U Level C | JI SEIVICE |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |
Intersection Sign configuration not allowed in HCM analysis.

| | - | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ŧ |
|-------------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|------|------------|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ¥ | | 1. | | | <u>ل</u> ا |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 36 | 823 | 5 | 0 | 317 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 36 | 823 | 5 | 0 | 317 |
| Sign Control | Stop | | Free | 0 | Ŭ | Free |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (yph) | 0.72 | 39 | 895 | 5 | 0.72 | 345 |
| Pedestrians | 0 | 57 | 075 | 5 | 0 | 0-10 |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | |
| Porcont Blockago | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | Nono | | | Nono |
| Modian storago vob) | | | NULLE | | | NULLE |
| Unstroam signal (m) | | | | | | |
| nV platoon upblocked | | | | | | |
| μ , platoon unblocked | 1040 | 000 | | | 000 | |
| vC, connicting volume | 1242 | 090 | | | 900 | |
| vC1, stage 1 confivel | | | | | | |
| VCZ, Staye Z CUTII VUI | 1010 | 000 | | | 000 | |
| | 1242 | 898 | | | 900 | |
| IC, Single (S) | 0.4 | 0.2 | | | 4.1 | |
| IC, Z Slage (S) | 2 5 | 2.2 | | | 2.2 | |
| IF (S) | 3.5 | 3.3 | | | 2.2 | |
| pu queue free % | 100 | 89 | | | 100 | |
| civi capacity (ven/n) | 195 | 341 | | | /63 | |
| Direction, Lane # | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | |
| Volume Total | 39 | 900 | 345 | | | |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Volume Right | 39 | 5 | 0 | | | |
| cSH | 341 | 1700 | 763 | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.11 | 0.53 | 0.00 | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 16.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Lane LOS | С | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 16.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | С | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 0.5 | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Litiliz | ation | | 56.0% | IC | | of Sorvico |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | IC. | | |
| Analysis Peniuu (IIIIII) | | | 10 | | | |

Future Background Volumes

| | ≯ | - | \mathbf{r} | 1 | - | • | 1 | † | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | - |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|------------|------------|------|----------|------|------|------|------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 193 | 54 | 6 | 21 | 45 | 50 | 33 | 809 | 14 | 88 | 291 | 50 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 193 | 54 | 6 | 21 | 45 | 50 | 33 | 809 | 14 | 88 | 291 | 50 |
| 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) | 193 | 54 | 6 | 21 | 45 | 50 | 33 | 809 | 14 | 88 | 291 | 50 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 253 | | | 116 | | | 856 | | | 429 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 400 | | | 1035 | | | 335 | | | 99 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 1011 | | | 605 | | | 1064 | | | 1282 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.25 | | | 0.19 | | | 0.80 | | | 0.33 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 823 | | | 468 | | | 871 | | | 1068 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.31 | | | 0.25 | | | 0.98 | | | 0.40 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 0.80 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | | 0.98 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | | | 82.9% | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | | E | | | |

| Intersection | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 17.4 | | | |
| Intersection LOS | С | | | |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 253 | 116 | 856 | 429 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 253 | 116 | 856 | 429 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 400 | 1035 | 335 | 99 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 128 | 156 | 318 | 1052 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 6.8 | 11.1 | 27.0 | 6.1 |
| Approach LOS | А | В | D | А |
| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| RT Channelized | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 253 | 116 | 856 | 429 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 918 | 480 | 981 | 1247 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 253 | 116 | 856 | 429 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 918 | 480 | 981 | 1247 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.276 | 0.242 | 0.873 | 0.344 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 6.8 | 11.1 | 27.0 | 6.1 |
| LOS | A | В | D | А |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 1 | 1 | 12 | 2 |

| | ∕ | - | - | • | × | 1 | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|-----------|------------|--|--|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | | |
| Lane Configurations | | र्स | f, | | Y | | | |
| Sign Control | | Stop | Stop | | Stop | | | |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 83 | 107 | 122 | 353 | 252 | 110 | | |
| Future Volume (vph) | 83 | 107 | 122 | 353 | 252 | 110 | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 91 | 118 | 134 | 388 | 277 | 121 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | |
| Volume Total (vph) | 209 | 522 | 398 | | | | | |
| Volume Left (vph) | 91 | 0 | 277 | | | | | |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 388 | 121 | | | | | |
| Hadj (s) | 0.18 | -0.29 | 0.03 | | | | | |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.2 | 5.3 | 5.9 | | | | | |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.36 | 0.76 | 0.65 | | | | | |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 539 | 663 | 579 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 12.6 | 23.2 | 19.3 | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 12.6 | 23.2 | 19.3 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | В | С | С | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | |
| Delay | | | 19.8 | | | | | |
| Level of Service | | | С | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | ation | | 74.0% | IC | U Level c | of Service | | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | | |

Future Background Volumes

| | ⊁ | - | \mathbf{i} | 1 | - | • | • | t t | / | × | Ļ | 1 |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|----------|------|
| Movomont | FRI | FRT | FRD | • \//RI | \//RT | W/RD | NRI | NRT | NRD | SBI | • CRT | CBD |
| Right Turn Channelized | LDL | LDI | LDIX | VVDL | | WDR | NDL | NDI | NDI | JDL | | JUN |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 143 | 153 | 83 | 41 | 231 | 143 | 45 | 376 | 163 | 103 | 427 | 158 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 143 | 153 | 83 | 41 | 231 | 143 | 45 | 376 | 163 | 103 | 427 | 158 |
| 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) | 143 | 153 | 83 | 41 | 231 | 143 | 45 | 376 | 163 | 103 | 427 | 158 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 379 | | | 415 | | | 584 | | | 688 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 571 | | | 564 | | | 399 | | | 317 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 882 | | | 887 | | | 1012 | | | 1080 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.43 | | | 0.47 | | | 0.58 | | | 0.64 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 709 | | | 713 | | | 824 | | | 885 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.53 | | | 0.58 | | | 0.71 | | | 0.78 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 0.64 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | | 0.78 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | | | 116.0% | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | | Н | | | |

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 14.8 | | | | | |
| Intersection LOS | В | | | | | |
| Approach | EE | } | WB | NB | SE | , |
| Entry Lanes | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 379 |) | 415 | 584 | 688 | 5 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 399 |) | 444 | 589 | 688 | } |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 572 |) | 567 | 413 | 349 |) |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 465 | -) | 435 | 558 | 662 |) |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | 75 | 5 | 43 | 94 | 13 | 5 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 0.990 |) | 0.994 | 0.987 | 0.998 | } |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 12.9 |) | 14.5 | 14.8 | 16.0 |) |
| Approach LOS | E | 3 | В | В | C | , , |
| Lane | Left | Left | | Left | Left | |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | | LTR | LTR | |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | | LTR | LTR | |
| RT Channelized | | | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | | 1.000 | 1.000 | |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | | 2.609 | 2.609 | |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | | 4.976 | 4.976 | |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 399 | 444 | | 589 | 688 | |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 770 | 774 | | 906 | 967 | |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.950 | 0.935 | | 0.992 | 1.000 | |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 379 | 415 | | 584 | 688 | |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 724 | 720 | | 886 | 965 | |
| V/C Ratio | 0.524 | 0.577 | | 0.659 | 0.713 | |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 12.9 | 14.5 | | 14.8 | 16.0 | |
| LOS | В | В | | В | С | |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 3 | 4 | | 5 | 6 | |

| | ≯ | - | ← | • | 1 | ∢ | |
|-----------------------------|--------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------------|--|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | |
| Lane Configurations | | र्स | ţ, | | Y | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 13 | 346 | 420 | 13 | 32 | 59 | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 13 | 346 | 420 | 13 | 32 | 59 | |
| Sign Control | | Free | Free | | Stop | | |
| Grade | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.55 | 0.55 | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 15 | 412 | 477 | 15 | 58 | 107 | |
| Pedestrians | | | | | 44 | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | 3.6 | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | 1.2 | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | 4 | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | | |
| Median type | | None | None | | | | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 536 | | | | 970 | 528 | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 536 | | | | 970 | 528 | |
| tC, single (s) | 4.4 | | | | 6.7 | 6.5 | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 2.5 | | | | 3.8 | 3.6 | |
| p0 queue free % | 98 | | | | 75 | 78 | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 868 | | | | 236 | 477 | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | |
| Volume Total | 427 | 492 | 165 | | | | |
| Volume Left | 15 | 0 | 58 | | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 15 | 107 | | | | |
| rSH | 868 | 1700 | 351 | | | | |
| Volume to Canacity | 0.02 | 0.29 | 0.47 | | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.02 | 0.0 | 10.17 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 24.0 | | | | |
| | Δ | 0.0 | 24.0 | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.5 | 0.0 | 24.0 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.0 C | | | | |
| | | | U | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 3.9 | | | (A | |
| Intersection Capacity Utili | zation | | 42.7% | IC | U Level c | of Service | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | |

| | ۶ | $\mathbf{\hat{z}}$ | • | t | Ļ | ∢ |
|------------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|------|------------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ۲ | | | र्भ | ţ, | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 663 | 649 | 0 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 663 | 649 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | | | Free | Free | |
| Grade | 0% | | | 0% | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 721 | 705 | 0 |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | | None | None | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1426 | 705 | 705 | | | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1426 | 705 | 705 | | | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 | | | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 | | | |
| p0 queue free % | 100 | 100 | 100 | | | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 151 | 440 | 902 | | | |
| Direction Lane # | FR 1 | NR 1 | SR 1 | | | |
| Volume Total | 0 | 721 | 705 | | | |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | ,03 | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| rSH | 1700 | 902 | 1700 | | | |
| Volume to Canacity | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.41 | | | |
| Ouque Length 95th (m) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.41 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Annroach Delay (s) | 0 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| | A | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 0.0 | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | ation | | 40.2% | IC | CU Level o | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

| | ✓ | • | † | 1 | 1 | Ŧ |
|------------------------------|--------|------|----------|------|-----------|------------|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ¥ | | 1. | | | র |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 19 | 653 | 9 | 0 | 649 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 19 | 653 | 9 | 0 | 649 |
| Sign Control | Stop | | Free | | | Free |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 21 | 710 | 10 | 0 | 705 |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | None | | | None |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1420 | 715 | | | 720 | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1420 | 715 | | | 720 | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | | | 4.1 | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | | | 2.2 | |
| p0 queue free % | 100 | 95 | | | 100 | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 152 | 434 | | | 891 | |
| Direction. Lane # | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | |
| Volume Total | 21 | 720 | 705 | | | |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Volume Right | 21 | 10 | 0 | | | |
| cSH | 434 | 1700 | 891 | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.05 | 0.42 | 0.00 | | | |
| Oueue Length 95th (m) | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 13.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Lane LOS | В | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 13.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | В | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 0.2 | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | zation | | 46.9% | IC | U Level o | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

| | ⊁ | - | \mathbf{i} | • | - | • | • | Ť | ~ | 5 | Ļ | ~ |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|-----------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 99 | 12 | 5 | 37 | 12 | 24 | 51 | 597 | 25 | 150 | 610 | 77 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 99 | 12 | 5 | 37 | 12 | 24 | 51 | 597 | 25 | 150 | 610 | 77 |
| 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) | 99 | 12 | 5 | 37 | 12 | 24 | 51 | 597 | 25 | 150 | 610 | 77 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 116 | | | 73 | | | 673 | | | 837 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 797 | | | 747 | | | 261 | | | 100 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 735 | | | 765 | | | 1129 | | | 1281 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.16 | | | 0.10 | | | 0.60 | | | 0.65 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 580 | | | 606 | | | 929 | | | 1067 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.20 | | | 0.12 | | | 0.72 | | | 0.78 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 0.65 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | | 0.78 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | | | 95.6% | IC | U Level o | of Service | | | F | | | |

| Intersection | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 11.6 | | | |
| Intersection LOS | В | | | |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 116 | 73 | 673 | 837 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 116 | 73 | 673 | 837 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 797 | 747 | 261 | 100 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 140 | 187 | 652 | 720 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 8.2 | 6.9 | 12.3 | 11.9 |
| Approach LOS | А | А | В | В |
| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| RT Channelized | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 116 | 73 | 673 | 837 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 612 | 644 | 1057 | 1246 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 116 | 73 | 673 | 837 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 612 | 644 | 1057 | 1246 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.190 | 0.113 | 0.636 | 0.672 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 8.2 | 6.9 | 12.3 | 11.9 |
| LOS | А | А | В | В |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 |

Future Total

| | ≯ | - | - | • | 1 | - |
|-------------------------------|------|-------|----------|------|-----------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | ŧ | el el | | ¥ | |
| Sign Control | | Stop | Stop | | Stop | |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 108 | 372 | 145 | 228 | 454 | 84 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 108 | 372 | 145 | 228 | 454 | 84 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 124 | 428 | 167 | 262 | 522 | 97 |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | |
| Volume Total (vph) | 552 | 429 | 619 | | | |
| Volume Left (vph) | 124 | 0 | 522 | | | |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 262 | 97 | | | |
| Hadj (s) | 0.28 | -0.23 | 0.26 | | | |
| Departure Headway (s) | 7.0 | 6.8 | 7.0 | | | |
| Degree Utilization, x | 1.08 | 0.80 | 1.21 | | | |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 522 | 527 | 519 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 88.9 | 31.9 | 133.8 | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 88.9 | 31.9 | 133.8 | | | |
| Approach LOS | F | D | F | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Delay | | | 91.0 | | | |
| Level of Service | | | F | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliza | tion | | 92.0% | IC | U Level o | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

| | ⊁ | + | ~ | • | + | * | • | Ť | ~ | 1 | Ţ | ~ |
|-----------------------------------|------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|------------|------|------|------|------|----------|------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | • WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | • SBT | SBR |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 283 | 438 | 70 | 106 | 218 | 71 | 104 | 474 | 178 | 119 | 207 | 70 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 283 | 438 | 70 | 106 | 218 | 71 | 104 | 474 | 178 | 119 | 207 | 70 |
| 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) | 283 | 438 | 70 | 106 | 218 | 71 | 104 | 474 | 178 | 119 | 207 | 70 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 791 | | | 395 | | | 756 | | | 396 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 432 | | | 861 | | | 840 | | | 428 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 9 85 | | | 697 | | | 709 | | | 989 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.80 | | | 0.57 | | | 1.07 | | | 0.40 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 801 | | | 547 | | | 558 | | | 804 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.99 | | | 0.72 | | | 1.36 | | | 0.49 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 1.07 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | | 1.36 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | | | 114.0% | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | | Н | | | |

| Intersection | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 76.7 | | | |
| Intersection LOS | F | | | |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 791 | 395 | 756 | 396 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 814 | 402 | 764 | 396 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 432 | 867 | 853 | 441 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 405 | 750 | 393 | 828 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | 33 | 7 | 41 | 33 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 0.995 | 0.999 | 0.994 | 0.995 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 36.3 | 23.9 | 181.6 | 9.7 |
| Approach LOS | E | С | F | А |
| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| RT Channelized | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 814 | 402 | 764 | 396 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 888 | 570 | 578 | 880 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.972 | 0.984 | 0.990 | 1.000 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 791 | 395 | 756 | 396 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 859 | 560 | 569 | 876 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.921 | 0.706 | 1.329 | 0.452 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 36.3 | 23.9 | 181.6 | 9.7 |
| LOS | E | С | F | А |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 13 | 6 | 32 | 2 |

| | ≯ | - | ← | • | 1 | ∢ | |
|---------------------------------|------|--------|-------|------|-----------|------------|---|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | |
| Lane Configurations | | ۍ ۲ | î, | | ¥. | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 48 | 778 | 354 | 38 | 13 | 20 | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 48 | 778 | 354 | 38 | 13 | 20 | |
| Sign Control | | Free | Free | | Stop | | |
| Grade | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 59 | 960 | 437 | 47 | 16 | 25 | |
| Pedestrians | | | | | 26 | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | 3.6 | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | 1.2 | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | 2 | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | | |
| Median type | | None | None | | | | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 510 | | | | 1564 | 486 | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 510 | | | | 1564 | 486 | |
| tC, single (s) | 4.4 | | | | 7.0 | 6.9 | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 2.5 | | | | 4.0 | 3.9 | |
| p0 queue free % | 93 | | | | 81 | 95 | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 890 | | | | 84 | 455 | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | |
| Volume Total | 1019 | 484 | 41 | | | | |
| Volume Left | 59 | 0 | 16 | | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 47 | 25 | | | | |
| cSH | 890 | 1700 | 167 | | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.07 | 0.28 | 0.25 | | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.7 | 0.0 | 7.4 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 1.9 | 0.0 | 33.5 | | | | |
| Lane LOS | А | | D | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 1.9 | 0.0 | 33.5 | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | D | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 2.1 | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilizati | on | | 81.7% | IC | U Level o | of Service | D |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | |

| | ≯ | $\mathbf{\hat{v}}$ | • | Ť | Ļ | ∢ |
|----------------------------------|------|--------------------|-------|------|------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ۲ | | | र्स | đ, | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 10 | 0 | 0 | 828 | 396 | 10 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 10 | 0 | 0 | 828 | 396 | 10 |
| Sign Control | Stop | | | Free | Free | |
| Grade | 0% | | | 0% | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.55 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 18 | 0 | 0 | 900 | 430 | 11 |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | | None | None | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1336 | 436 | 441 | | | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1336 | 436 | 441 | | | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 | | | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 | | | |
| p0 queue free % | 89 | 100 | 100 | | | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 171 | 625 | 1130 | | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | |
| Volume Total | 18 | 900 | 441 | | | |
| Volume Left | 18 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 11 | | | |
| cSH | 171 | 1130 | 1700 | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.26 | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 28.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Lane LOS | D | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 28.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | D | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 0.4 | | | |
| Intersection Canacity Litilizati | ion | | 56.0% | IC | | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

| | ✓ | • | † | 1 | 1 | Ŧ |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|------|----------|------|---------|------------|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ¥ | | 1. | | | ្ត |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 36 | 833 | 5 | 0 | 327 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 36 | 833 | 5 | 0 | 327 |
| Sian Control | Stop | | Free | - | - | Free |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 39 | 905 | 5 | 0 | 355 |
| Pedestrians | - | | | - | - | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | None | | | None |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1262 | 908 | | | 910 | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1262 | 908 | | | 910 | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | | | 4.1 | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | | | 2.2 | |
| p0 queue free % | 100 | 88 | | | 100 | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 189 | 337 | | | 757 | |
| Direction, Lane # | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | |
| Volume Total | .39 | 910 | 355 | | | |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Volume Right | 39 | 5 | 0 | | | |
| cSH | 337 | 1700 | 757 | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.12 | 0.54 | 0.00 | | | |
| Oueue Length 95th (m) | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 17.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Lane LOS | С | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 17.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | С | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 0.5 | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utili | zation | | 56.6% | IC | U Level | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

| | ≯ | - | \mathbf{r} | 1 | - | • | 1 | † | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | - |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|--------------|------|----------|------------|------|----------|------|------|------|------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 193 | 54 | 6 | 21 | 45 | 50 | 33 | 819 | 14 | 88 | 301 | 50 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 193 | 54 | 6 | 21 | 45 | 50 | 33 | 819 | 14 | 88 | 301 | 50 |
| 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) | 193 | 54 | 6 | 21 | 45 | 50 | 33 | 819 | 14 | 88 | 301 | 50 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 253 | | | 116 | | | 866 | | | 439 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 410 | | | 1045 | | | 335 | | | 99 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 1003 | | | 600 | | | 1064 | | | 1282 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.25 | | | 0.19 | | | 0.81 | | | 0.34 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 816 | | | 463 | | | 871 | | | 1068 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.31 | | | 0.25 | | | 0.99 | | | 0.41 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 0.81 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | | 0.99 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | | | 83.5% | IC | CU Level | of Service | | | E | | | |

| Intersection | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 18.0 | | | |
| Intersection LOS | С | | | |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 253 | 116 | 866 | 439 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 253 | 116 | 866 | 439 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 410 | 1045 | 335 | 99 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 128 | 156 | 328 | 1062 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 6.9 | 11.2 | 28.2 | 6.2 |
| Approach LOS | А | В | D | А |
| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| RT Channelized | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 253 | 116 | 866 | 439 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 908 | 475 | 981 | 1247 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 253 | 116 | 866 | 439 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 908 | 475 | 981 | 1247 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.279 | 0.244 | 0.883 | 0.352 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 6.9 | 11.2 | 28.2 | 6.2 |
| LOS | А | В | D | A |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 1 | 1 | 12 | 2 |

| | ≯ | - | - | • | 1 | 1 | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|------|------------|-----------------|---|-----|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | | |
| Lane Configurations | 5 | * | 1. | | 3 | 1 | | |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 108 | 372 | 145 | 228 | 454 | 84 | | |
| Future Volume (vph) | 108 | 372 | 145 | 228 | 454 | 84 | | |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | | |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | | 4.5 | 4.5 | | |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.92 | | 1.00 | 0.85 | | |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 0.95 | 1.00 | | |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1594 | 1552 | 1508 | | 1527 | 1443 | | |
| Flt Permitted | 0.36 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 0.95 | 1.00 | | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 606 | 1552 | 1508 | | 1527 | 1443 | | |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | | |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 124 | 428 | 167 | 262 | 522 | 97 | | |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 53 | | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 124 | 428 | 364 | 0 | 522 | 44 | | |
| Confl. Peds. (#/hr) | 4 | | | 4 | | | | |
| Heavy Vehicles (%) | 7% | 16% | 9% | 7% | 12% | 6% | | |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | NA | | Prot | Perm | | |
| Protected Phases | | 4 | 8 | | 6 | | | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 | | | | | 6 | | |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 22.4 | 22.4 | 22.4 | | 26.5 | 26.5 | | |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 22.4 | 22.4 | 22.4 | | 26.5 | 26.5 | | |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | | 0.46 | 0.46 | | |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | | 4.5 | 4.5 | | |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | | |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 234 | 600 | 583 | | 698 | 660 | | |
| v/s Ratio Prot | | c0.28 | 0.24 | | c0.34 | | | |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.20 | | | | | 0.03 | | |
| v/c Ratio | 0.53 | 0.71 | 0.62 | | 0.75 | 0.07 | | |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 13.7 | 15.0 | 14.3 | | 12.9 | 8.8 | | |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 2.2 | 4.0 | 2.1 | | 4.4 | 0.0 | | |
| Delay (s) | 15.9 | 19.0 | 16.4 | | 17.3 | 8.8 | | |
| Level of Service | В | В | В | | В | A | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | | 18.3 | 16.4 | | 16.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | В | В | | В | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | | | 16.9 | Н | CM 2000 | Level of Servic | e | В |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacit | tv ratio | | 0.73 | | | | | - |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | ., | | 57.9 | S | um of lost | t time (s) | | 9.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | on | | 67.2% | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | С |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | | |

c Critical Lane Group

| | ٠ | - | - | * | 4 | 1 |
|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------|------|-----------|------------|
| Movement | FBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | 4 | 1. | | V | OBIX |
| Sign Control | | Stop | Stop | | Stop | |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 83 | 107 | 122 | 340 | 252 | 110 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 83 | 107 | 122 | 340 | 252 | 110 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 91 | 118 | 134 | 374 | 277 | 121 |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | |
| Volume Total (vph) | 209 | 508 | 398 | | | |
| Volume Left (vph) | 91 | 0 | 277 | | | |
| Volume Right (vph) | 0 | 374 | 121 | | | |
| Hadj (s) | 0.18 | -0.29 | 0.03 | | | |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.2 | 5.3 | 5.9 | | | |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.36 | 0.74 | 0.65 | | | |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 542 | 663 | 583 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 12.5 | 21.8 | 19.0 | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 12.5 | 21.8 | 19.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | В | С | С | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Delay | | | 19.1 | | | |
| Level of Service | | | С | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilizati | on | | 73.2% | IC | U Level c | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

| | ≁ | + | * | 4 | + | * | 1 | t | 1 | 1 | ţ | ~ |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|--------|------|-----------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 143 | 153 | 83 | 41 | 231 | 143 | 45 | 376 | 163 | 103 | 427 | 158 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 143 | 153 | 83 | 41 | 231 | 143 | 45 | 376 | 163 | 103 | 427 | 158 |
| 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) | 143 | 153 | 83 | 41 | 231 | 143 | 45 | 376 | 163 | 103 | 427 | 158 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 379 | | | 415 | | | 584 | | | 688 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 571 | | | 564 | | | 399 | | | 317 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 882 | | | 887 | | | 1012 | | | 1080 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.43 | | | 0.47 | | | 0.58 | | | 0.64 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 709 | | | 713 | | | 824 | | | 885 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.53 | | | 0.58 | | | 0.71 | | | 0.78 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 0.64 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | | 0.78 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | | | 116.0% | IC | U Level o | of Service | | | Н | | | |

| Intersection | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 14.8 | | | |
| Intersection LOS | В | | | |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 379 | 415 | 584 | 688 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 399 | 444 | 589 | 688 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 572 | 567 | 413 | 349 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 465 | 435 | 558 | 662 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | 75 | 43 | 94 | 13 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 0.990 | 0.994 | 0.987 | 0.998 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 12.9 | 14.5 | 14.8 | 16.0 |
| Approach LOS | В | В | В | С |
| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| RT Channelized | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 399 | 444 | 589 | 688 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 770 | 774 | 906 | 967 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.950 | 0.935 | 0.992 | 1.000 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 379 | 415 | 584 | 688 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 724 | 720 | 886 | 965 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.524 | 0.577 | 0.659 | 0.713 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 12.9 | 14.5 | 14.8 | 16.0 |
| LOS | В | В | В | С |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| | ٦ | - | + | • | 4 | 1 |
|------------------------------|----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | र्स | ţ, | | Y | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 13 | 346 | 420 | 13 | 32 | 46 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 13 | 346 | 420 | 13 | 32 | 46 |
| Sign Control | | Free | Free | | Stop | |
| Grade | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.55 | 0.55 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 15 | 412 | 477 | 15 | 58 | 84 |
| Pedestrians | | | | | 44 | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | 3.6 | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | 1.2 | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | 4 | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | |
| Median type | | None | None | | | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 536 | | | | 970 | 528 |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 536 | | | | 970 | 528 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.4 | | | | 6.7 | 6.5 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 2.5 | | | | 3.8 | 3.6 |
| p0 queue free % | 98 | | | | 75 | 82 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 868 | | | | 236 | 477 |
| Direction Lane # | FR 1 | WR 1 | SB 1 | | | |
| Volume Total | /07 | /02 | 1/2 | | | |
| | 427 | 492 | 5Q | | | |
| Volume Dight | 10 | 15 | 00 Q/ | | | |
| | 0 | 1700 | 04 336 | | | |
| Volume to Canacity | 000 | 0.20 | 0.42 | | | |
| Ouque Length 05th (m) | 0.02 | 0.29 | 16.2 | | | |
| Control Doloy (s) | 0.4 | 0.0 | 10.2 | | | |
| Lang LOS | 0.5 | 0.0 | 23.3 | | | |
| Approach Delay (c) | A O F | 0.0 | 22.3 | | | |
| Approach LOS | 0.5 | 0.0 | 23.3 | | | |
| | | | U | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 3.3 | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | zation | | 41.8% | IC | U Level c | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

| | ٠ | 7 | 1 | Ť | ţ | ~ |
|------------------------------|-------------|------|-------|------|-----------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Y | | | et. | ţ, | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 13 | 0 | 0 | 663 | 649 | 13 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 13 | 0 | 0 | 663 | 649 | 13 |
| Sign Control | Stop | | | Free | Free | |
| Grade | 0% | | | 0% | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 24 | 0 | 0 | 721 | 705 | 14 |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | | None | None | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1433 | 712 | 719 | | | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1433 | 712 | 719 | | | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 | | | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 | | | |
| p0 queue free % | 84 | 100 | 100 | | | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 149 | 436 | 892 | | | |
| Direction Lane # | FB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | |
| Volume Total | 24 | 721 | 719 | | | |
| Volume Left | 24 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 14 | | | |
| cSH | 149 | 892 | 1700 | | | |
| Volume to Canacity | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.42 | | | |
| Oueue Length 95th (m) | 4.4 | 0.00 | 0.42 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 33.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| | 55.7 D | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Annroach Delay (s) | 33.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | ט. <i>ו</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| | U | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | 0.0 | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 0.6 | | | (0 · |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | zation | | 46.9% | IC | U Level c | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

| | - | * | † | 1 | 1 | ŧ |
|----------------------------|---------|------|----------|------|-----------|------------|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ¥ | | ţ, | | | é. |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 19 | 666 | 9 | 0 | 662 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 0 | 19 | 666 | 9 | 0 | 662 |
| Sign Control | Stop | | Free | | | Free |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 21 | 724 | 10 | 0 | 720 |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | None | | | None |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | |
| pX. platoon unblocked | | | | | | |
| vC. conflicting volume | 1449 | 729 | | | 734 | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | • | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1449 | 729 | | | 734 | |
| tC. single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | | | 4.1 | |
| tC. 2 stage (s) | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | | | 2.2 | |
| p0 queue free % | 100 | 95 | | | 100 | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 146 | 426 | | | 880 | |
| Direction Lone # | \//D 1 | ND 1 | CD 1 | | | |
| Valumo Total | | | 700 | | | |
| | 21 | / 34 | 720 | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | 21 | 10 | 0 | | | |
| CSH | 426 | 1/00 | 880 | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.05 | 0.43 | 0.00 | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 13.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Lane LOS | В | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 13.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | В | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 0.2 | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Util | ization | | 47.6% | IC | U Level o | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

| | ٠ | → | 7 | 1 | + | • | 1 | Ť | 1 | 4 | ţ | ~ |
|-----------------------------------|------|----------|-------|------|-----------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Right Turn Channelized | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 99 | 12 | 5 | 37 | 12 | 24 | 51 | 610 | 25 | 150 | 623 | 77 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 99 | 12 | 5 | 37 | 12 | 24 | 51 | 610 | 25 | 150 | 623 | 77 |
| 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) | 99 | 12 | 5 | 37 | 12 | 24 | 51 | 610 | 25 | 150 | 623 | 77 |
| Approach Volume (veh/h) | | 116 | | | 73 | | | 686 | | | 850 | |
| Crossing Volume (veh/h) | | 810 | | | 760 | | | 261 | | | 100 | |
| High Capacity (veh/h) | | 727 | | | 757 | | | 1129 | | | 1281 | |
| High v/c (veh/h) | | 0.16 | | | 0.10 | | | 0.61 | | | 0.66 | |
| Low Capacity (veh/h) | | 573 | | | 599 | | | 929 | | | 1067 | |
| Low v/c (veh/h) | | 0.20 | | | 0.12 | | | 0.74 | | | 0.80 | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c High | | | 0.66 | | | | | | | | | |
| Maximum v/c Low | | 0.80 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | | | 96.7% | IC | U Level o | of Service | | | F | | | |

| Intersection | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 11.9 | | | |
| Intersection LOS | В | | | |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 116 | 73 | 686 | 850 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 116 | 73 | 686 | 850 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 810 | 760 | 261 | 100 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 140 | 187 | 665 | 733 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, #/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 8.3 | 7.0 | 12.7 | 12.3 |
| Approach LOS | А | A | В | В |
| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Left |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| RT Channelized | | | | |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 | 2.609 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 | 4.976 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 116 | 73 | 686 | 850 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 604 | 636 | 1057 | 1246 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 116 | 73 | 686 | 850 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 604 | 636 | 1057 | 1246 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.192 | 0.115 | 0.649 | 0.682 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 8.3 | 7.0 | 12.7 | 12.3 |
| LOS | A | А | В | В |
| 95th %tile Queue, veh | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 |

| | ۶ | - | - | • | 1 | ∢ | | |
|--------------------------------|------------|----------|-------|------|------------|----------------|----|--|
| Movement | FBI | FBT | WRT | WBR | SBI | SBR | | |
| Lane Configurations | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | 1 | WDR | 502 | 7 | | |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 83 | 107 | 122 | 340 | 252 | 110 | | |
| Future Volume (vph) | 83 | 107 | 122 | 340 | 252 | 110 | | |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | | |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | | 4.5 | 4.5 | | |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | | 1.00 | 0.94 | | |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.90 | | 1.00 | 0.85 | | |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 0.95 | 1.00 | | |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1660 | 1682 | 1455 | | 1629 | 1393 | | |
| Flt Permitted | 0.38 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 0.95 | 1.00 | | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 666 | 1682 | 1455 | | 1629 | 1393 | | |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | | |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 91 | 118 | 134 | 374 | 277 | 121 | | |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 243 | 0 | 0 | 78 | | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 91 | 118 | 265 | 0 | 277 | 43 | | |
| Confl. Peds. (#/hr) | | | | 11 | | 33 | | |
| Confl. Bikes (#/hr) | | | | | | 15 | | |
| Heavy Vehicles (%) | 3% | 7% | 9% | 9% | 5% | 3% | | |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | NA | | Prot | Perm | | |
| Protected Phases | | 4 | 8 | | 6 | | | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 | | | | | 6 | | |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 10.5 | 10.5 | 10.5 | | 10.8 | 10.8 | | |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 10.5 | 10.5 | 10.5 | | 10.8 | 10.8 | | |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 | | 0.36 | 0.36 | | |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | | 4.5 | 4.5 | | |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | | |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 230 | 582 | 504 | | 580 | 496 | | |
| v/s Ratio Prot | | 0.07 | c0.18 | | c0.17 | | | |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.14 | | | | | 0.03 | | |
| v/c Ratio | 0.40 | 0.20 | 0.53 | | 0.48 | 0.09 | | |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 7.9 | | 7.6 | 6.5 | | |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | | |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 1.0 | | 0.6 | 0.1 | | |
| Delay (s) | 8.6 | /.1 | 8.9 | | 8.2 | 6.6 | | |
| Level of Service | A | A | A | | A | A | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | | 7.8 | 8.9 | | 1.1 | | | |
| Approach LUS | | A | A | | А | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | | | 8.3 | H | CM 2000 | Level of Servi | ce | |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capac | city ratio | | 0.50 | | | | | |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | | | 30.3 | Si | um of lost | time (s) | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utilizat | tion | | 60.7% | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | | |
| c Critical Lane Group | | | | | | | | |

Appendix E

TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist





TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist:

Non-Residential Developments (office, institutional, retail or industrial)

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

| | TDM-s | supportive design & infrastructure measures: Non-residential developments | Check if completed & add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references |
|----------|-------|---|--|
| | 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 | 1.1.2 | Locate building entrances in order to minimize walking distances to sidewalks and transit stops/stations | |
| 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 | |
| REQUIRED | 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 <i>Plan policy 4.3.12</i>) | |

| | TDM-s | 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) | |
| 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) | |
| 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 on- road 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) | |
| BASIC | 1.2.6 | Provide safe, direct and attractive walking routes from building entrances to nearby transit stops | |
| BASIC | 1.2.7 | Ensure that walking routes to transit stops are secure, visible, lighted, shaded and wind-protected wherever possible | |
| BASIC | 1.2.8 | Design roads used for access or circulation by cyclists using a target operating speed of no more than 30 km/h, or provide a separated cycling facility | □ N/A for site plan application. |
| | 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 | N/A site is located near street |
| 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) | □ N/A school site |

| | TDM-s | supportive design & infrastructure measures: Non-residential developments | Check if completed & add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references |
|----------|-------|---|--|
| | 2. | WALKING & CYCLING: END-OF-TRIP FACILI | TIES |
| | 2.1 | Bicycle parking | |
| REQUIRED | 2.1.1 | Provide bicycle parking in highly visible and lighted areas, sheltered from the weather wherever possible (see Official Plan policy 4.3.6) | Bicycle parking is located at north and south ends of school. |
| REQUIRED | 2.1.2 | Provide the number of bicycle parking spaces specified for various land uses in different parts of Ottawa; provide convenient access to main entrances or well- used areas (see Zoning By-law Section 111) | |
| REQUIRED | 2.1.3 | Ensure that bicycle parking spaces and access aisles meet minimum dimensions; that no more than 50% of spaces are vertical spaces; and that parking racks are securely anchored (see Zoning By-law Section 111) | |
| BASIC | 2.1.4 | Provide bicycle parking spaces equivalent to the expected number of commuter cyclists (assuming the cycling mode share target is met), plus the expected peak number of customer/visitor cyclists | |
| BETTER | 2.1.5 | Provide bicycle parking spaces equivalent to the expected number of commuter and customer/visitor cyclists, plus an additional buffer (e.g. 25 percent extra) to encourage other cyclists and ensure adequate capacity in peak cycling season | |
| | 2.2 | Secure bicycle parking | |
| REQUIRED | 2.2.1 | Where more than 50 bicycle parking spaces are provided for a single office building, locate at least 25% of spaces within a building/structure, a secure area (e.g. supervised parking lot or enclosure) or bicycle lockers (see Zoning By-law Section 111) | □ N/A for school |
| BETTER | 2.2.2 | Provide secure bicycle parking spaces equivalent to the expected number of commuter cyclists (assuming the cycling mode share target is met) | □ N/A for school |
| | 2.3 | Shower & change facilities | |
| BASIC | 2.3.1 | Provide shower and change facilities for the use of active commuters | Shower provided for staff. |
| BETTER | 2.3.2 | In addition to shower and change facilities, provide dedicated lockers, grooming stations, drying racks and laundry facilities for the use of active commuters | |
| | 2.4 | Bicycle repair station | |
| BETTER | 2.4.1 | Provide a permanent bike repair station, with commonly used tools and an air pump, adjacent to the main bicycle parking area (or secure bicycle parking area, if provided) | □ N/A for school |

| | TDM-s | 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 | N/A, shelter already provided |
| 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 | N/A, shelter already provided |
| BETTER | 3.1.3 | Provide a secure and comfortable interior waiting area by integrating any on-site transit stops into the building | □ N/A for school |
| | 4. | RIDESHARING | |
| | 4.1 | Pick-up & drop-off facilities | |
| BASIC | 4.1.1 | Provide a designated area for carpool drivers (plus taxis and ride-hailing services) to drop off or pick up passengers without using fire lanes or other no-stopping zones | □ N/A for school |
| | 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 | □ N/A for school |
| BETTER | 4.2.2 | At large developments, provide spaces for carpools in a separate, access-controlled parking area to simplify enforcement | □ N/A for school |
| | 5. | CARSHARING & BIKESHARING | |
| | 5.1 | Carshare parking spaces | |
| BETTER | 5.1.1 | Provide carshare parking spaces in permitted non- residential zones, occupying either required or provided parking spaces (see Zoning By-law Section 94) | □ N/A for school |
| | 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 | □ N/A for school |
| TDM-supportive design & infrastructure measures: Non-residential developments | | supportive design & infrastructure measures: Non-residential developments | Check if completed & add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references |
|--|-------|---|--|
| | 6. | PARKING | |
| | 6.1 | Number of parking spaces | |
| REQUIRED | 6.1.1 | Do not provide more parking than permitted by zoning, nor less than required by zoning, unless a variance is being applied for | N/A parking meets zoning requirements |
| BASIC | 6.1.2 | Provide parking for long-term and short-term users that is consistent with mode share targets, considering the potential for visitors to use off-site public parking | □ N/A for school |
| BASIC | 6.1.3 | Where a site features more than one use, provide shared parking and reduce the cumulative number of parking spaces accordingly (see Zoning By-law Section 104) | □ N/A for school |
| BETTER | 6.1.4 | Reduce the minimum number of parking spaces required by zoning by one space for each 13 square metres of gross floor area provided as shower rooms, change rooms, locker rooms and other facilities for cyclists in conjunction with bicycle parking <i>(see Zoning By-law Section 111)</i> | □ N/A for school |
| | 6.2 | Separate long-term & short-term parking areas | |
| BETTER | 6.2.1 | Separate short-term and long-term parking areas using signage or physical barriers, to permit access controls and simplify enforcement (i.e. to discourage employees from parking in visitor spaces, and vice versa) | □ N/A for school |
| | 7. | OTHER | |
| | 7.1 | On-site amenities to minimize off-site trips | |
| BETTER | 7.1.1 | Provide on-site amenities to minimize mid-day or mid-commute errands | □ N/A for school |

TDM Measures Checklist:

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 |
|----------|-------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | 1. | TDM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | |
| | 1.1 | Program coordinator | |
| BASIC ★ | 1.1.1 | Designate an internal coordinator, or contract with an external coordinator | □ N/A for school |
| | 1.2 | Travel surveys | |
| BETTER | 1.2.1 | Conduct periodic surveys to identify travel-related behaviours, attitudes, challenges and solutions, and to track progress | □ N/A for school |
| | 2. | WALKING AND CYCLING | |
| | 2.1 | Information on walking/cycling routes & destination | ations |
| BASIC | 2.1.1 | Display local area maps with walking/cycling access routes and key destinations at major entrances | □ N/A for school |
| | 2.2 | Bicycle skills training | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BETTER ★ | 2.2.1 | Offer on-site cycling courses for commuters, or subsidize off-site courses | □ N/A for school |
| | 2.3 | Valet bike parking | |
| | | Visitor travel | |
| BETTER | 2.3.1 | Offer secure valet bike parking during public events when demand exceeds fixed supply (e.g. for festivals, concerts, games) | □ N/A for school |

| | 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 | Recommended |
| BASIC | 3.1.2 | Provide online links to OC Transpo and STO information | Recommended |
| BETTER | 3.1.3 | Provide real-time arrival information display at entrances | N/A for school |
| | 3.2 | Transit fare incentives | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BETTER | 3.2.1 | Offer preloaded PRESTO cards to encourage commuters to use transit | Recommended |
| BETTER | ★ 3.2.2 | Subsidize or reimburse monthly transit pass purchases by employees | Recommended |
| | | Visitor travel | |
| BETTER | 3.2.3 | Arrange inclusion of same-day transit fare in price of tickets (e.g. for festivals, concerts, games) | N/A for school |
| | 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) | N/A for school |
| | | Visitor travel | |
| BETTER | 3.3.2 | Contract with OC Transpo to provide enhanced transit services (e.g. for festivals, concerts, games) | N/A for school |
| | 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) | N/A for school |
| | | 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) | N/A for school |

| | 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 | N/A for school |
| | 4.2 | Carpool parking price incentives | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BETTER | 4.2.1 | Provide discounts on parking costs for registered carpools | N/A for school |
| | 4.3 | Vanpool service | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BETTER | 4.3.1 | Provide a vanpooling service for long-distance commuters | N/A for school |
| | 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 | N/A for school |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BETTER | 5.1.2 | Provide employees with bikeshare memberships for local business travel | N/A for school |
| | 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 | □ N/A for school |
| BETTER | 5.2.2 | Provide employees with carshare memberships for local business travel | N/A for school |
| | 6. | PARKING | |
| | 6.1 | Priced parking | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BASIC 🖌 | 6.1.1 | Charge for long-term parking (daily, weekly, monthly) | N/A for school |
| BASIC | 6.1.2 | Unbundle parking cost from lease rates at multi-tenant sites | N/A for school |
| | | Visitor travel | |
| BETTER | 6.1.3 | Charge for short-term parking (hourly) | N/A for school |

TDM Measures Checklist

Version 1.0 (30 June 2017)

| | TDM | measures: Non-residential developments | Check if proposed & add descriptions |
|----------|-------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | 7. | TDM MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS | |
| | 7.1 | Multimodal travel information | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BASIC ★ | 7.1.1 | Provide a multimodal travel option information package to new/relocating employees and students | □ N/A for school |
| | | 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) | □ N/A for school |
| | 7.2 | Personalized trip planning | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BETTER ★ | 7.2.1 | Offer personalized trip planning to new/relocating employees | □ N/A for school |
| | 7.3 | Promotions | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BETTER | 7.3.1 | Deliver promotions and incentives to maintain awareness, build understanding, and encourage trial of sustainable modes | □ N/A for school |
| | 8. | OTHER INCENTIVES & AMENITIES | |
| | 8.1 | Emergency ride home | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BETTER ★ | 8.1.1 | Provide emergency ride home service to non-driving commuters | □ N/A for school |
| | 8.2 | Alternative work arrangements | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BASIC ★ | 8.2.1 | Encourage flexible work hours | N/A for school |
| BETTER | 8.2.2 | Encourage compressed workweeks | N/A for school |
| BETTER ★ | 8.2.3 | Encourage telework | N/A for school |
| | 8.3 | 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 | □ N/A for school |
| | 8.4 | Commuter incentives | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BETTER | 8.4.1 | Offer employees a taxable, mode-neutral commuting allowance | □ N/A for school |
| | 8.5 | On-site amenities | |
| | | Commuter travel | |
| BETTER | 8.5.1 | Provide on-site amenities/services to minimize mid-day or mid-commute errands | □ N/A for school |