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# PARSONS TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT 

Parsons was retained by Main + Main to prepare a Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) Report in support of a Site Plan Application (SPA), for the future Phase 3 development site at 300 Montgomery Street. Previous TIA Reports have already been submitted to address the transportation requirements of the site (Municipal address of 3 Selkirk St and 2 Montreal Rd), regarding Phase 1 and at full buildout. Given the previous report submissions, it was agreed upon with City staff to provide a TIA Report submission that focuses on any changes to existing conditions, addresses site access plan, and provides trip generation and analysis updates relating to Phase 3 of the development. This report represents the Step 5 Transportation Impact Assessment Report, as outlined in the City Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) Guidelines, 2017.

## 1. SCREENING FORM

The Screening Form was prepared as part of the previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022), which indicated the need to complete a full TIA Report.

## 2. SCOPING REPORT

### 2.1. EXISTING AND PLANNED CONDITIONS

### 2.1.1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proponent is proposing a mixed-use development comprised of three high-rise residential towers ranging between 22 and 32 storeys in height for full build-out. The site's local context and phasing plan are depicted in Figure 1.

The previous TIA Report submission reviewed the following two scenarios:

- A Phase 1 buildout with vehicle access via Montgomery St only.
- A development full-buildout (Phases 1-3) with vehicle access via both Montgomery St and Selkirk St.

The purpose of this report is to review an interim stage, where Phases 1 and 3 are constructed (ahead of Phase 2) and accessed via Montgomery St only. The Phase 3 Site Plan is illustrated in Figure 2, with high quality plans of Phase 3 and the full site provided in Appendix A.

As identified in previous TIA Report submissions, Phase 1 will be comprised of a 22-storey apartment building, containing 294 residential units and 16,037 $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of retail space. Phase 3 site statistics have been updated to propose 380 residential units within the 28 -storey apartment building. At full buildout of Phase 3 , vehicle access for both buildings will be provided through Montgomery St only.

The Montgomery St access will connect to an internal site driveway through which the proposed surface and underground parking spaces can be accessed. The Phase 1 building will provide 274 vehicle parking spaces ( 208 underground and 66 surface) and 308 bicycle parking spaces, as previously indicated. The Phase 3 building will provide 310 vehicle parking spaces within the podium parking structure and 384 bicycle parking spaces.

Figure 1: Local Context


Figure 2: Proposed Phase 3 Site Plan (September 2023)


### 2.1.2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

## AREA ROAD NETWORK

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for a description of the existing road network.

Given the Montreal Road construction works, the following serves as an updated description for the conditions fronting the site:

Montreal Road (Summer 2023) is an east-west arterial roadway with a 4-lane cross-section and auxiliary turn lanes at major intersections. It extends from North River Road in the west to HWY-174 in the east. Beyond North River Road, Montreal Road continues as Rideau Street, and beyond HWY-174, it continues as St. Joseph Boulevard. The former time-of-day bus lanes along Montreal Road have been removed, where a cycle track has been installed in each direction from Vanier Parkway to St. Laurent Boulevard (to be extended to North River Road when construction is complete). On-street parking has typically been removed. The posted speed limit is $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

## EXISTING STUDY AREA INTERSECTIONS

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for a description of the existing study area intersections. Note that previous analysis assumed the future plans for intersections along Montreal Rd to be in place in existing conditions. This report will also assume as such, considering that construction work is near completion.

## EXISTING DRIVEWAYS TO ADJACENT DEVELOPMENTS

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for a description of existing driveways within 200m of the proposed Montgomery St access.

## EXISTING AREA TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for a description of the existing area traffic management measures.

## PEDESTRIAN/CYCLING NETWORK

This section is updated to reflect changes since previous TIA Report submission.

Curbside sidewalks are provided on both sides along North River Road, Montreal Road, McArthur Avenue, and Vanier Parkway. They are also provided on the south side of Selkirk Street, east side of Montgomery Street, and west side of Dundas Street.

Based on City of Ottawa 2013 TMP, North River Rd, Montreal Rd and Vanier Pkwy are designated "Spine" Routes. On-street bike lanes are currently provided within the study area, along McArthur Ave, which also connects to the existing multi-use pathway (MUP) that runs along the Rideau River, west of North River Rd. The existing cycling facilities are shown in Figure 3. Note that the new 2023 City of Ottawa TMP update designates each of North River Rd (between Donald St and Mark Ave), Mark Ave and Montreal Rd (east of Vanier Pkwy) as part of the Cross-Town Bikeway Network.

Figure 3: Existing Pedestrian and Cycling Facilities (Updated)


## TRANSIT NETWORK

This section is updated to reflect changes since previous TIA Report submission.

OC Transpo bus routes currently run along Montreal Road and North River Road with bus stops provided near the Montreal/North River intersection for Frequent Routes \#12 and \#14 and Local Routes \#15 and \#18. Figure 4 illustrates the area transit network and Figure 5 illustrates adjacent transit stops. Along Vanier Pkwy, local route \#9 and \#19 also currently operate.

Figure 4: Area Transit Network


Figure 5: Adjacent Transit Stops


## PEAK HOUR TRAVEL DEMAND

The existing peak hour traffic volumes and pedestrian/cyclist volumes within the study area, are illustrated in Figure 6 and Figure 7, respectively. Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for more information on the data used.


Figure 7: Existing Pedestrian and Cyclist Peak Hour Volumes


EXISTING ROAD SAFETY CONDITIONS
Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for a detailed description of historic collision data within the study area.

### 2.1.3. PLANNED CONDITIONS

## PLANNED STUDY AREA TRANSPORTATION NETWORK CHANGES

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for a detailed description of recent and planned study area modifications.

## Montreal Road Revitalization Project Update

Montreal Road project is currently in its final year of construction. The remaining final stages of construction (2023) will be completed by late summer and will include the following main aspects within the study area:

- Completion of remaining landscaping and streetscaping.
- Construction of southside cycle track on Montreal Rd, between North River Rd and Montgomery St.
- Modifications at the Montreal/North River intersection.
- Implementation of traffic calming measures along North River Rd.

For the purpose of this report, the Montreal Rd construction project is assumed to be completed in existing conditions.

The new 2023 City of Ottawa TMP update includes a cycling project to add "bike lanes where feasible on North River Rd from Montreal Rd to Donald St".

## OTHER AREA DEVELOPMENTS

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for description of adjacent future developments within the study area.

### 2.2. STUDY AREA AND TIME PERIODS

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for a full list of study area intersections. Horizon year 2025 is assumed to be full buildout year for Phase 3, where weekday morning and afternoon peak hour periods will be reviewed.

### 2.3. EXEMPTION REVIEW

Based on the City's TIA guidelines and the subject site, the following modules/elements of the TIA process, summarized in Table 1, are recommended to be exempt in the subsequent steps of the TIA process:

Table 1: Exemptions Review Summary

| Module | Element | Exemption Consideration |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4.1 Development <br> Design | 4.1.3 New Streets <br> Networks | Only required for plans of subdivision. |
| 4.2 Parking | 4.2.2 Spillover <br> Parking | Only required for Site Plans where parking is 15\% below <br> unconstrained demand. |

## 3. FORECASTING

### 3.1. DEVELOPMENT GENERATED TRAVEL DEMAND

### 3.1.1. TRIP GENERATION AND MODE SHARES

## EXISTING SITE TRIP GENERATION

A new ITE Trip Generation Manual (11 th edition) and City of Ottawa TRANS Trip Generation Manual (2020) have been issued since the previous TIA Report Submission (August 2022). As such, the existing site's trip generation will be updated based on the new trip rates and mode share percentages from the two manuals.

As the Eastview Shopping Centre generated trips in existing conditions, it is necessary to account for those trips as a reduction in in the overall future site-generated volumes. The existing site-generated traffic volumes will be approximated using ITE Trip rates and the estimated floor area of the different units within the existing shopping centre. Using GeoOttawa measuring tool, the existing shopping centre is assumed to be composed of the following:

- $\sim 2,840 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(30,570 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of retail space;
- $\sim 340 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(3,660 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ restaurant area comprised of:
- $\sim 170 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,830 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of fast casual restaurant area (closed during morning peak hour);
- $\sim 170 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(1,830 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of fast-food restaurant without drive through area;
- $\sim 1,570 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(16,900 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of high turnover (sit down) restaurant area (closed during morning peak hour); and
- $\sim 1,250 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\left(13,455 \mathrm{ft}^{2}\right)$ of grocery space.

Figure 8 shows the existing shopping centre and the assumed areas, where the total area of the shopping centre is approximately $64,585 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$. Based on the ITE Manual's land use descriptions, the "Shopping Plaza" land use was considered appropriate given the total area of the shopping centre and the available units. The ITE trip generation rates used for the existing property are shown in Table 2.

Figure 8: Existing Eastview Shopping Centre


Table 2: ITE Trip Generation Rates - Existing Shopping Centre

| Land Use | Data Source | Trip Rates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ITE 821 | $\mathrm{T}=1.73(\mathrm{X})$ |
| Note: $T=$ Average Vehicle Trip |  |  |
| $X=1,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of Ground Floor Area |  | $\mathrm{T}=5.19(\mathrm{X})$ |  |

As ITE trip generation surveys only record vehicle trips and typically reflect highly suburban locations (with little to no access by travel modes other than private automobiles), adjustment factors appropriate to the Ottawa study area context were applied to obtain estimates of person trips for the existing site. Our review of TIA Guidelines suggests that a combined factor of approximately 1.28 is considered reasonable to account for typical North American auto occupancy values of approximately 1.15 and combined transit and non-motorized modal shares of less than $10 \%$. The person trip generation for the existing development is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Person Trip Generation - Existing Shopping Centre

| Land Use | Area | AM Peak (Person Trips/hr) |  |  | PM Peak (Person Trips/hr) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |  |
| Shopping Plaza | $64,585 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 88 | 55 | 143 | 210 | 219 | 429 |  |

As shown in Table 3, the existing shopping centre is expected to have generated 143 and 429 person trips during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively. Mode shares for different travel modes were obtained from the 2020 TRANS Trip Generation Manual for Commercial Generators in the Ottawa East district. As such, a breakdown of the trips generated by the different travel modes is provided in Table 4. A pass-by trip percentage was also obtained from the ITE Manual, which indicated a $40 \%$ pass-by trip rate for the PM peak hour only.

Table 4: Existing Site Trip Generation

| Travel Mode | AM Mode Share | AM Peak (Person Trips/h) |  |  | PM Mode Share | PM Peak (Person Trips/h) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In (62\%) | Out (38\%) | Total |  | In (49\%) | Out (51\%) | Total |
| Auto Driver | 58\% | 51 | 31 | 82 | 55\% | 115 | 120 | 235 |
| Auto Passenger | 10\% | 9 | 5 | 14 | 18\% | 38 | 40 | 78 |
| Transit | 15\% | 13 | 8 | 21 | 11\% | 22 | 23 | 46 |
| Cycling | 1\% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1\% | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Walking | 17\% | 15 | 9 | 24 | 15\% | 32 | 34 | 66 |
| Total Person Trips | 100\% | 89 | 54 | 143 | 100\% | 210 | 219 | 429 |
| PM Pass-by (40\%) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | -46 | -48 | -94 |
| Total Auto Trips |  | 51 | 31 | 82 |  | 69 | 72 | 141 |

As shown in Table 4 above, the total estimated existing site-generated vehicle trips are 82 veh/h and 141 veh/h during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively.

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT TRIP GENERATION RATES

Phases 1 and 3 of the proposed development will consist of a total of 674 high-rise apartment units and 16,037 $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ of grocery store/retail space. The trip rates for the land uses are summarized in Table 5.

Note that the trip rates have been updated from previous TIA Report submission to follow the latest industry standards guidelines. The appropriate trip generation rates for high-rise apartment units were obtained from the 2020 TRANS Trip Generation Manual. This Manual provides person-trip rates during the peak AM and PM periods (i.e. $7 \mathrm{am}-9: 30 \mathrm{am}$ and $3: 30 \mathrm{pm}-6 \mathrm{pm}$ ). The peak hour trip generation rates for the retail land uses were obtained from the ITE Trip Generation Manual (11 th edition), assuming the "Supermarket" land use for the total retail area, expected to include a grocery store and small retail units. The "Supermarket" trip rates are considered fairly conservative in this scenario, considering that the small retail units will likely provide minor ancillary use that will likely be utilized by local residents.

Table 5: Vehicle Trip Rates for the Residential and Commercial Uses

| Land Use | Data Source | Trip Rates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak | PM Peak |
| High Rise Apartment | TRANS | $\mathrm{T}=0.8(\mathrm{du})$ | $\mathrm{T}=0.9(\mathrm{du})$ |
| Supermarket | ITE 850 | $\mathrm{~T}=2.86(\mathrm{X})$ | $\mathrm{T}=8.95(\mathrm{X})$ |
| Note: $T=$ Average Vehicle Trip <br> $X=1,000 ~ f t$ <br>  <br>  <br> $d u=d w e l l i n g ~$ units |  |  |  |

## PROPOSED GROCERY STORE AND RETAIL TRIP GENERATION

Using trip rates provided in in Table 5, the person trip generation for the proposed Phase 1 commercial space of the development is summarized in Table 6. The total number of person trips per hour generated by the proposed retail units were multiplied by a factor of 1.28 , as per TIA standards, to account for typical North American auto occupancy values of approximately 1.15 and combined transit and non-motorized modal shares of less than 10\%.

Table 6: Person Trip Generation - Commercial Phase 1

| Land Use | Area | AM Peak (Person Trips/hr) |  | PM Peak (Person Trips/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\ln (59 \%)$ | Out (41\%) | Total | $\ln (50 \%)$ | Out (50\%) |
| Supermarket (Grocery Store and Retail) | $16,037 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 34 | 25 | 59 | 92 | 93 | 185 |

Mode shares for commercial land uses were obtained from the TRANS 2020 Trip Generation Manual, assuming the "Ottawa East" district. The anticipated number of trips for different travel modes are provided in Table 7. A pass-by trip percentage was also obtained from the ITE Manual, which indicated a $24 \%$ pass-by trip rate for the PM peak hour only. As implied by the name, pass-by trips are trips where vehicles travelling along roads bordering the development would make a stop at the "supermarket", rather than travel to it as a destination. As such, they are not considered 'new' trips, but background vehicle trips that are already travelling on the network.

Table 7: Proposed Phase 1 Peak Hour Commercial Trip Generation

| Travel Mode | AM Mode Share | AM Peak (Person Trips/h) |  |  | PM Mode Share | PM Peak (Person Trips/h) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In (59\%) | Out (41\%) | Total |  | In (50\%) | Out (50\%) | Total |
| Auto Driver | 58\% | 20 | 14 | 34 | 55\% | 51 | 51 | 101 |
| Auto Passenger | 10\% | 3 | 2 | 6 | 18\% | 17 | 17 | 34 |
| Transit | 15\% | 5 | 4 | 9 | 11\% | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Cycling | 1\% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1\% | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Walking | 17\% | 6 | 4 | 10 | 15\% | 14 | 14 | 28 |
| Total Person Trips | 100\% | 35 | 24 | 59 | 100\% | 93 | 93 | 185 |
| PM Pass-by (24\%) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | -12 | -12 | -24 |
| Total 'New' Auto Trips |  | 20 | 14 | 34 |  | 39 | 39 | 77 |

As shown in in Table 7, the proposed commercial space of Phase 1 is expected to generate a total of 59 and 185 person trips and 34 and 77 'new' auto trips during the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively.

## PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL TRIP GENERATION

Using the 2020 TRANS Trip Generation Manual rates outlined in Table 5, the total number of trips generated by the proposed residential land uses of the development are calculated for the morning and afternoon peak periods, as shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Projected Phase 1+3 Residential Person Trip Generation - TRANS Model

| Land Use | Dwelling <br> Units | AM Peak Period <br> Person Trips | PM Peak Period <br> Person Trips |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High-Rise Apartments | 674 | 539 | 607 |

The proposed development's residential land use is anticipated to generate a total of approximately 539 and 607 person trips during the morning and afternoon peak 3-hour periods, respectively. The total person trips in Table 8 are then divided into different travel modes using mode share percentages obtained from the 2020 TRANS Manual for the "Ottawa East" district. Table 9 provides the mode share breakdown for different travel modes.

Table 9: High-Rise Apartments Peak Period Trips Mode Share Breakdown

| Travel Mode | Mode <br> Share | AM Peak Period <br> Person Trip | Mode <br> Share | PM Peak Period <br> Person Trips |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auto Driver | $39 \%$ | 212 | $40 \%$ | 243 |
| Auto Passenger | $7 \%$ | 40 | $14 \%$ | 85 |
| Transit | $38 \%$ | 205 | $28 \%$ | 172 |
| Cycling | $2 \%$ | 11 | $3 \%$ | 16 |
| Walking | $13 \%$ | 71 | $15 \%$ | 90 |
| Total Person Trips | $100 \%$ | 539 | $100 \%$ | 607 |

Standard traffic analysis is usually conducted using the morning and afternoon peak hour trips as they represent a worst-case scenario. The 2020 TRANS Manual provides conversions rates from peak period to peak hours for different mode shares, as shown in Table 10 below.

Table 10: Peak Period to Peak Hour Conversion Factors (2020 TRANS Manual)

| Travel Mode | Peak Period to Peak Hour Conversion Factors |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM | PM |
| Auto Driver and Passenger | 0.48 | 0.44 |
| Transit | 0.55 | 0.47 |
| Bike | 0.58 | 0.48 |
| Walk | 0.58 | 0.52 |

Using the conversion rates in Table 10 and the peak 3-hour period trips in Table 9, the peak hour trips for different travel modes can be calculated as shown in Table 11, with inbound and outbound percentages obtained from the TRANS Manual.

Table 11: Proposed Phase 1+3 Peak Hour Residential Trip Generation

| Travel Mode | AM Peak (Person Trips/h) |  |  | PM Peak (Person Trips/h) |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\ln (\mathbf{3 1 \% )}$ | Out (69\%) | Total | $\ln \mathbf{( 5 8 \% )}$ | Out (42\%) | Total |
| Auto Driver | 32 | 70 | 102 | 62 | 45 | 107 |
| Auto Passenger | 6 | 13 | 19 | 22 | 16 | 37 |
| Transit | 35 | 78 | 113 | 47 | 34 | 81 |
| Cycling | 2 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| Walking | 13 | 29 | 41 | 27 | 20 | 47 |
| Total Person Trips | $\mathbf{8 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 0}$ |

A shown in Table 11, the combined Phases 1 and 3 of the proposed development are expected to generate a total of approximately 280 person trips during peak hours, which includes up to 107 vehicle trips, 37 passenger trips, 113 transit trips and 55 active transport trips (walking and biking).

## PROPOSED PHASE 1+3 TOTAL SITE TRIP GENERATION

The total Phase 1 and 3 projected trips for the residential and commercial land uses of the proposed development are summarized below in Table 12, which include the total of the proposed residential and commercial land uses.

Table 12: Phase 1 and 3 Total Site Trip Generation

| Travel Mode | AM Peak (Person Trips/hr) |  |  | PM Peak (Person Trips/hr) |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Auto Driver | 52 | 84 | 136 | 113 | 96 | 208 |
| Auto Passenger | 9 | 15 | 25 | 39 | 33 | 71 |
| Transit | 40 | 82 | 122 | 57 | 44 | 101 |
| Bicycle | 2 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Walk | 19 | 33 | 51 | 41 | 34 | 75 |
| Total Person Trips | 122 | $\mathbf{2 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 5}$ |
| PM Pass-by (24\%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | -12 | -12 | -24 |
| Total 'New' Auto Trips | $\mathbf{5 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 4}$ |

As shown in Table 12, the proposed development is expected to generate a total of 340 to 465 person trips during the morning and afternoon peak hours, which includes 136 to 184 'new' auto trips, 25 to 71 passenger trips, 101 to 122 transit trips and 58 to 85 active transport trips. The total new trips have been reduced as shown in Table 13 by accounting for the existing shopping centre's trips in Table 4.

Table 13: Phase 1 and 3 Total Site Trip Generation, with Reduction from Existing

| Travel Mode | AM Peak (Person Trips/hr) |  |  | PM Peak (Person Trips/hr) |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Auto Driver | 1 | 53 | 54 | -2 | -24 | -27 |
| Auto Passenger | 0 | 10 | 11 | 1 | -7 | -7 |
| Transit | 27 | 74 | 101 | 35 | 21 | 55 |
| Bicycle | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Walk | 4 | 24 | 27 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| Total Person Trips | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | 164 | 197 | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | -8 | $\mathbf{3 6}$ |
| Total 'New' Auto Trips | $\mathbf{1}$ | 53 | 54 | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 3}$ |

As shown in Table 13, after accounting for the existing site's trips, the proposed development is projected to generate approximately 36 to 197 new person-trips per hour in the weekday commute peak hours. This includes 43 to 54 'new' vehicle trips, 55 to 101 new transit trips and 15 to 33 active transport trips. Negative numbers in the table are the result of reductions applied by the no longer existing site-generated trips of the Eastview Shopping Centre.

### 3.1.2.TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

Based on the 2011 OD Survey (Ottawa East district) and the location of adjacent arterial roadways and neighbourhoods, the distribution of site-generated traffic volumes was estimated as follows:

- $50 \%$
- $35 \% / 30 \%$ to/from the east;
- 5/10\%
- $10 \%$
to/from the west;
to/from the north; and,
to/from the south.

The expected 'new' and 'pass-by' site-generated auto trips for Phase 1 and 3 of the proposed development (Table 12) are assigned to the road network as shown in Figure 9. Please note that the negative values represent the pass-by trips. As mentioned previously, access for Phases 1 and 3 is proposed to be provided via Montgomery St only at this interim stage. Existing shopping centre site-generated traffic volumes (Table 4) to be removed from study area volumes are illustrated in Figure 10.

Figure 9: Phase 1+3 'New' and 'Pass-By' Site-Generated Traffic


Figure 10: Existing Site-Generated Traffic


### 3.2. BACKGROUND NETWORK TRAFFIC

### 3.2.1. TRANSPORTATION NETWORK PLANS

Refer to Section 2.1.3.

### 3.2.2. BACKGROUND GROWTH

As indicated in the previous TIA Report submission, a 0\% background growth rate was applied to study area roads.

### 3.2.3. OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for future adjacent development volumes accounted for within the study area.

### 3.3. DEMAND RATIONALIZATION

The total projected volumes of Phases 1 and 3 at 2025 are illustrated in Figure 11, which are composed of existing traffic volumes (Figure 6), combined with future adjacent development traffic (see previous TIA submission), the anticipated site-generated traffic (Figure 9), and reduced by the existing shopping centre's sitegenerated traffic (Figure 10).


## 4. ANALYSIS

### 4.1. DEVELOPMENT DESIGN

### 4.1.1. DESIGN FOR SUSTAINABLE MODES

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for details regarding the proposed pedestrian, cyclists and transit facilities on and off site.

The internal site driveway is expected to be designed to prioritize pedestrians and cyclists by providing wide internal sidewalks and brick paving for travel lanes instead of a typical asphalt pavement. The internal sidewalks will connect to the external sidewalks along Montgomery St and Selkirk St, thereby providing ample connectivity for pedestrians.

Nearest bus stops to the site are at the northeast corner of North River/Selkirk and southeast corner of Montreal/Montgomery intersections, which are located within 100 m and 150 m walking distances from the Phase 3 building, respectively. It is noted that the bus stop located in the northeast corner of North River/Selkirk is within the property limits of the proposed development site and will be accommodated with a concrete pad and a bus shelter in the future.

MONTGOMERY ST AND SELKIRK ST ROADWAY MODIFICATIONS (RMA)
Appendix B provides, while Figure 12 and Figure 13 illustrate, the proposed RMA design for Montgomery Street and Selkirk Street, demonstrating the proposed future designs along the frontage of each of the development roads. Traffic calming measures have been included along Montgomery St as part the designs, adhering to the City of Ottawa's $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ design toolbox. This includes measures such as a speed hump and road narrowing.


Figure 13: Proposed Road Modifications, Montgomery Street to Selkirk Street


For Montgomery St., the following key elements are included:

- A new 2.0 m concrete sidewalk with parallel parking along the site frontage.
- A bulb-out nearest the site access and the Montgomery/Selkirk intersections to book-end parking and narrow travel lanes.
- A speed hump located between the Montgomery St. site access and the Montgomery/Selkirk intersection. The speed hump is located within the school bus drop off zone along the frontage of the Mauril-Bélanger elementary public school.
- A road narrowing which requires modifications to the curb line on one side of Montgomery St., to provide for an improved crosswalk with a shorter crossing distance and relocated STOP-bar.
For Selkirk St., a 1.5 m painted westbound cycle lane and 2.0 m concrete sidewalk will be included along the site frontage, per Councillor request. Through discussions with City staff, this would provide a short-term cycling improvement before resurfacing where a contraflow bike lane can be considered. Parallel parking will be maintained on the opposite side of Selkirk St.


### 4.1.2. CIRCULATION AND ACCESS

Trucks are anticipated to access the site occasionally for the purpose of garbage pick-up, loading/unloading and residential move-ins. Truck movements for Phase 1 of the development were confirmed in previous TIA Report submission. For Phase 3, truck turns have been checked at both the Montgomery St site access, as well as at the proposed garbage pick-up/loading space located at the west corner of the Phase 3 building. The in/out truck turn checks have been provided in Appendix C, which confirmed no anticipated issues for truck movements.

### 4.2. PARKING

Based on City of Ottawa Parking Provisions, Schedule 1A, the proposed development is located in "Area X". A total of 603 vehicle parking spaces and 503 bicycle parking spaces will be provided for Phases 1 and 3 of the proposed development. Of the total, approximately 66 vehicle parking spaces will be provided at surface. Table 14 provides a summary of the required and the proposed parking rates for vehicles and bicycles. As shown in the table, the proposed number of parking spaces meet all parking requirements for vehicle and bicycle parking.

Table 14: Required and Proposed Vehicle and Bicycle Parking Space

| Land Use | Size | Parking Rates |  |  | Required Spaces |  |  | Proposed Spaces |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Base | Visitor | Bicycle | Base | Visitor | Bicycle | Base | Visitor | Bicycle |
| High-Rise Residential | 674 <br> Units | 0.5 per unit, excluding first 12 units | 0.1 per unit, excluding first 12 units, 30 spaces max per building | $\begin{gathered} 0.5 \text { per } \\ \text { unit } \end{gathered}$ | 325 | 60 | 337 | 603 |  | 484 |
| Commercial | $\begin{gathered} 1,490 \\ \mathrm{~m}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.25 \text { per } 100 \\ \mathrm{~m}^{2} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \mathrm{per} \\ & 250 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | 19 | - | 6 |  |  | 19 |
|  |  |  |  | Total | 344 | 60 | 343 |  |  | 503 |

### 4.3. BOUNDARY STREET DESIGN

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for a detailed MMLOS analysis of boundary streets North River Rd, Selkirk St, Montgomery St and Montreal Rd. While some changes have been implemented to the proposed Site Plan and the Montreal Rd construction has been assumed to be completed for existing conditions, no changes are expected to the overall analysis results in this section.

Additionally, the plan remains to provide a westbound bike lane along Selkirk St.

### 4.4. ACCESS INTERSECTION DESIGN

Traffic can access the site via the proposed internal driveway, which will only connect to Montgomery St in the interim, when Phases 1 and 3 are constructed. STOP Control will be provided for vehicles exiting the site at Montgomery St, with a full movement access. The internal site driveway will be approximately 7.8 m wide at the
property line, with an additional $3 m$ wide drop-off/pick-up areas. This access location and design was approved as part of the previous application.

The underground parking garage ramp for Phase 3 will be 6 m wide and located approximately 20 m south of the site access to Montgomery St.

### 4.5. TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

The two residential 'TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure’ and 'TDM Measures’ checklists have been completed for Phase 3 and incorporated as Appendix D.

The following is a summary of some of the TDM Design and Infrastructure elements proposed to support sustainable transportation:

- Buildings located close to the street with parking not located between the entrances and the street;
- Direct and attractive walking routes provided from building entrances to adjacent transit stop on North River Rd;
- Easily accessible sidewalks with connections to the external network of sidewalks and pathways;
- A bike lane will be provided along Selkirk St and the internal site driveway and Montgomery St will be designed for access or circulation by cyclists using a target operating speed of no more than $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$;
- On-site bicycle parking provided indoors;
- Landscaping and benches provided along walking and cycling routes; and,
- Designated drop-off/pick-up areas provided on site.

The following TDM Measures are proposed to support sustainable transportation:

- Local area maps for walking/cycling and transit schedules are to be located at major entrances;
- The proponent will seek to find a bikeshare provider, if available in Ottawa;
- The proponent will seek to contract with car sharing and promote their use to residents;
- Parking costs will be unbundled with monthly rent; and
- A multi-modal travel option information package, including relevant car/bike share opportunities, will be provided to new residents.


### 4.6. NEIGHBOURHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

As part of Phase 1 and 3 buildout, the proposed development's site-generated traffic is expected to utilize local roads Montgomery St, Selkirk St and Dundas St, as part of their access route to/from the development. This section compares the existing and projected (at horizon year 2025) traffic volumes along these roads to the ideal maximum threshold of $120 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ for local roads, as indicated by the TIA Guidelines. Table 15 summarizes the roadway classifications, the TIA Guideline's ideal roadway threshold, and the approximate existing and projected traffic on respective access routes to the site. Note that this analysis does not include roads classified as arterial, such as North River Road, Montreal Road, Vanier Parkway and McArthur Avenue.

Table 15: Roadway Classification and Traffic Volume

| Roadway | Classification | Daily Threshold <br> (veh/day) | Peak Hour <br> Threshold (veh/h) | Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes AM (PM) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1,000 | 120 | $198(327)$ |
| Montgomery Street | Local | 1,000 | 120 | $154(246)$ | $165(394)$ |
| Selkirk Street | Local | 1,000 | 120 | $120(134)$ | $128(152)$ |
| Dundas Street |  |  |  |  |  |

As shown in Table 15, the ideal local road threshold at all three local streets is exceeded in both existing and total projected 2025 conditions. On Selkirk St, the volumes are near the ideal threshold of 300 veh/h for a collector road during the afternoon peak hour. Similarly, volumes on Montgomery St are near the ideal threshold of a collector road during the morning peak hour and exceed that threshold during the afternoon peak hour.

Given the nature of the development, the increase in traffic volumes along the local roadways is inevitable. It is important to note that the thresholds provided in the TIA Guidelines are ideal suggestions but not necessarily a requirement for the purpose of maintaining acceptable traffic operations. Nonetheless, proposed traffic calming measures may help deter some background traffic volumes as discussed in the section below. Additionally, traffic operations will be confirmed along these roadways in both existing and projected conditions in Section 4.9.

## TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

As indicated in Section 4.1.1, proposed future roadway modifications include the provision of traffic calming measures along Montgomery St. These measures include a speed reduction to $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, mid-block speed humps and road narrowing through the use of bulb-outs, all of which are expected to reduce the potential for traffic infiltration (cut-through traffic) along the local roads of Selkirk St, Montgomery St and Dundas St.

With these measures in place, some reduction in future traffic volumes along the local roads may be expected and the majority of the future traffic volumes may consist mostly of traffic from local residents of the area. Therefore, no further modifications are currently proposed to address the existing and future traffic volumes.

### 4.7. TRANSIT

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for information on existing transit ridership data in the study area and assessment of available capacity.

The proponent proposes to construct a bus shelter and pad at the bus stop nearest North River/Selkirk following Phase 2 of the development.

### 4.8. REVIEW OF NETWORK CONCEPT

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for assessment of relevant Screenline in the study area.

### 4.9. INTERSECTION DESIGN

### 4.9.1. INTERSECTION CONTROL

Stop Control will be provided for vehicles exiting the site at the proposed future Montgomery St site access. Given the expected traffic volumes at the site access, the access control is considered appropriate. No changes are proposed to the existing controls of other intersections within the study area.

### 4.9.2. INTERSECTION DESIGN

Synchro 11 Trafficware was used to analyze intersection performance of intersections within the study area. Critical movements at each of the intersections were assessed based on either the movement with the highest volume-to-capacity ratio (for signalized intersections), or the movement experiencing the highest average delay (for unsignalized intersections). It should be noted that, as per the TIA Guidelines, the Peak Hour Factor (PHF) used for analysis was 0.90 in existing conditions and 1.0 in the projected 2025 horizon year conditions.

As indicated previously in this report, the Montreal Rd reconstruction project has been assumed to be completed in both existing and projected 2025 horizon year conditions. In the projected 2025 conditions, phase times were optimized in Synchro for all signalized intersections and no other changes were implemented. The detailed Synchro reports for existing and projected 2025 conditions have been provided in Appendix E.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The following Table 16 provides a summary of the existing traffic operations at study area intersections, based on the existing conditions traffic volumes illustrated in Figure 6.

Table 16: Existing Intersection Performance

| Intersection | Weekday AM Peak (PM Peak) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Critical Movement |  |  | Intersection 'as a whole' |  |  |
|  | LOS | max. v/c or avg. delay (s) | Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | v/c |
| Signalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North River/Montreal | C(E) | 0.77(0.93) | NBL(EBT) | 29.3(47.5) | $B(D)$ | 0.64(0.90) |
| Montgomery/Montreal | A(B) | 0.33(0.66) | WBT(WBT) | 3.8(11.2) | A(B) | 0.32(0.64) |
| Vanier/Montreal | D(E) | 0.89(0.97) | EBT(EBT) | 50.1(49.6) | C(D) | 0.75(0.83) |
| North River/McArthur | B(D) | 0.66(0.86) | SBT(SBT) | 12.9(19.4) | A(B) | 0.51(0.66) |
| Vanier/McArthur | $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{F})$ | 0.99(1.34) | SBT(WBL) | 46.4(72.2) | $E(F)$ | 0.91(1.04) |
| Unsignalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dundas/McArthur | B(C) | 15(21) | SB(SB) | 0.6(0.8) | A(A) | - |
| Mayfield/McArthur | B(B) | 13(15) | SB(SB) | 0.1(0.3) | A(A) | - |
| Selkirk/North River | B(C) | 14(20) | WB(WB) | 1.1(2.7) | A(A) | - |
| Selkirk/Montgomery | B(C) | 11(15) | EB(EB) | 6.6(8.1) | A(A) | - |
| Note: ${ }^{\text {A }}$ Analysis of signa | sume | $F$ of 0.90 and a | aturation flow | e of 1800 ve | ane. |  |

As shown in Table 16, the Vanier/McArthur intersection 'as a whole' and the associated critical movement operate at capacity during the afternoon peak hour. All other signalized intersections 'as a whole' operate at LOS 'D' or better, with critical movements operating at LOS 'E' or better during peak hours.

All unsignalized intersections 'as a whole’ are shown to operate at LOS ‘A', with critical movements from the stop controlled minor roads operating at LOS ' C ' or better during peak hours.

## TOTAL PROJECTED 2025 CONDITIONS

The following Table 17 provides a summary of the total projected 2025 operations at the study area intersections based on the total projected 2025 conditions traffic volumes in Figure 11. As mentioned previously, westbound bike lanes will be added on Selkirk St in ultimate conditions, narrowing the travel lanes to a single 4.3 m wide lane. This modification is reflected in the analysis results below for the intersection of Selkirk/North River.

Table 17: Total Projected 2025 Performance at Study Area Intersections

| Intersection | Weekday AM Peak (PM Peak) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Critical Movement |  |  | Intersection 'as a whole' |  |  |
|  | LOS | max. v/c or avg. delay (s) | Movement | Delay (s) | LOS | v/c |
| Signalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North River/Montreal | D(E) | 0.86(0.99) | NBL(EBT) | 34.8(56.8) | B(E) | 0.70(0.95) |
| Montgomery/Montreal | A(B) | 0.31(0.63) | WBT(WBT) | 5.3(11.9) | A(B) | 0.31(0.62) |
| Vanier/Montreal | D (D) | 0.86(0.88) | EBT(EBT) | 46.1(46.3) | $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{C})$ | 0.69(0.75) |
| North River/McArthur | B(C) | 0.62(0.78) | SBT(SBT) | 12.9(15.8) | A(A) | 0.48(0.60) |
| Vanier/McArthur | D(F) | 0.90(1.04) | NBL(EBR) | 38.5(58.2) | D(F) | 0.83(1.00) |
| Unsignalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dundas/McArthur | B(C) | 14(20) | SB(SB) | 0.6(0.7) | A(A) | - |
| Mayfield/McArthur | $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{C})$ | 14(16) | SB(SB) | 0.5(0.6) | A(A) | - |
| Selkirk/North River | $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{C})$ | 11(18) | WB(WB) | 1.1(2.9) | A(A) | - |
| Selkirk/Montgomery | $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{C})$ | 11(16) | EB(EB) | 6.9(8.3) | A(A) | - |
| Montgomery/Site | B(B) | 10(13) | EB(EB) | 3.2(2.6) | A(A) | - |

As shown in Table 17, the Vanier/McArthur intersection is expected to continue to operate at capacity during the afternoon peak hour both 'as a whole' and with the associated critical movement. However, the operations at this intersection and most other signalized intersections have improved compared to existing conditions due to optimization of phase times and increase of PHF to 1.0. The exception is the intersection of North

River/Montreal, where delays and v/c ratios have increased slightly as a result of the added site-generated traffic volumes.

Operations at unsignalized intersections are similar to existing conditions, with slight changes in delays. The proposed Montgomery St site access 'as a whole' is expected to operate at LOS ' A ' with critical movements operating at LOS ' $B$ ’ during peak hours.

## MULTI-MODAL LEVEL OF SERVICE - SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

Refer to previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022) for a detailed MMLOS analysis of signalized intersections within the study area.

## 5. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results summarized herein, the following transportation related conclusions are offered:

## Proposed Site

- Main + Main is proposing a mixed-use development comprised of 3 high-rise residential towers ranging from 22 to 32 storeys in height, which will be constructed in three phases.
- A TIA Report was previously submitted (August 2022), which reviewed two scenarios:
- A Phase 1 buildout with vehicle access via Montgomery St only.
- A development full buildout (Phases 1-3) with vehicle access via both Montgomery St and Selkirk St.
- This TIA Report was prepared for the purpose of reviewing an interim stage, where Phases 1 and 3 are constructed (ahead of Phase 2) and accessed via Montgomery St only. Phase 3 will consist of 380 residential units and will consist of 310 vehicle parking spaces and 384 bicycle parking spaces, all of which will be located within the underground parking garage. Phase 3 buildout is assumed at horizon year 2025.
- The underground parking garage ramp for the Phase 3 building will be located along an internal site driveway with a full movement access to Montgomery St.
- Truck turns at both the Montgomery St site access and the garbage pick-up/loading space of the Phase 3 building were confirmed to have no significant conflicts or turning issues.
- The combined Phases 1 and 3 are projected to generate approximately 136 veh/h and 184 veh/h during the morning and afternoon peak hours respectively.
- The net increase of trips compared to trip generation of the existing developments is $54 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ and 43 veh/h during the morning and afternoon peak hours respectively.


## Future Study Area Modifications

- The Montreal Rd reconstruction project is in its final year of construction and is anticipated to be completed by late summer of 2023. As such, all modifications related to this project, including intersection and roadway modifications within the study area, have been assumed as an existing condition.
- As part of the development, a westbound bike lane will be provided on the north side on Selkirk Street and an eastbound bike lane will be provided on the south side of Montreal Road based on preferred City design.
- There is ongoing Montgomery St functional design to provide future traffic calming measures along the section at site frontage. Potential traffic calming measures will adhere to the City of Ottawa's $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ design toolbox and may include speed humps, bulb-outs and road narrowing. An opportunity exists to provide traffic calming measures along Selkirk St as well, which will be confirmed through the ongoing RMA plan.


## Existing and Projected 2025 Conditions Analysis

- In existing conditions, the study area intersections operate 'as a whole' with a LOS 'E' or better during peak hours, except for the intersection of Vanier/McArthur, which operates at capacity during the afternoon peak hour. With regards to critical movements, the WBL at the Vanier/McArthur intersection operate at capacity during the afternoon peak hour.
- For the 2025 horizon year, operations at study area intersections are mostly similar or slightly better compared to existing conditions. This is due to optimizing phase times at all signalized intersections and increasing PHF to 1.0 as per TIA Guidelines. However, delays and v/c ratios at the North River/Montreal intersections are expected to increase slightly as a result of the increase in future site-generated traffic.
- Existing and total projected 2025 peak hour traffic volumes on Montgomery St, Selkirk St and Dundas St all exceed the ideal threshold of a local road as set by the TIA Guidelines. However, given the future proposed traffic calming measures along each of Montgomery St and Selkirk St, traffic infiltration from nonlocal traffic is expected to be significantly reduced. Therefore, no further modifications are currently proposed to address the existing and future traffic volumes along the local roads.

Based on the foregoing and as stated in previous TIA Report submissions, the proposed development is recommended to proceed from a transportation perspective.

## APPENDIX A

SITE PLANS AND CITY COMMENT RESPONSES

Date
27-Mar-23
TIA Screening Form

Project
300 Montgomery TIA
909979-10003

| Results of Screening | Yes/No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Development Satisfies the Trip Generation Trigger | Yes |
| Development Satisfies the Location Trigger | No |
| Development Satisfies the Safety Trigger | Yes |


| Module 1.1 - Description of Proposed Development |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Municipal Address | 300 Montgomery Street, Ottawa, ON K1L 7W8 |
| Description of location | Bordering Selkirk to south, N River to west, Montgomery to east |
| Land Use | 28-storey residential tower with parking |
| Development Size | 364 apartment units and 286 parking spaces |
| Number of Accesses and Locations | Single Access to Montgomery |
| Development Phasing | Phase 2 of 3 |
| Buildout Year | 2026 |
| Sketch Plan / Site Plan | See attached |


| Module 1.2 - Trip Generation Trigger |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Land Use Type | Townhomes or Apartments |  |
| Development Size (Phase 2) | 364 | Units |
| Trip Generation Trigger Met? | Yes |  |


| Module 1.3-Location Triggers |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development Proposes a new driveway to a boundary street <br> that is designated as part of the City's Transit Priority, Rapid <br> Transit, or Spine Bicycle Networks (See Sheet 3) | No |
| Development is in a Design Priority Area (DPA) or Transit- <br> oriented Development (TOD) zone. (See Sheet 3) <br> Location Trigger Met? | No |


| Module 1.4 - Safety Triggers |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Posted Speed Limit on any boundary road <br> Horizontal / Vertical Curvature on a boundary street limits <br> sight lines at a proposed driveway | <80 | No |
| A proposed driveway is within the area of influence of an <br> adjacent traffic signal or roundabout (i.e. within 300 m of <br> intersection in rural conditions, or within 150 m of <br> intersection in urban/ suburban conditions) or within auxiliary <br> lanes of an intersection; <br> A proposed driveway makes use of an existing median break <br> that serves an existing site <br> There is a documented history of traffic operations or safety <br> concerns on the boundary streets within 500 m of the <br> development | Yes | No |
| The development includes a drive-thru facility <br> Safety Trigger Met? | Yes |  |




29 September 2023
City of Ottawa
Development Review Services
110 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1
Attention: Wally Dubyk, C.E.T.

## Re: 300 Montgomery Road TIA Report $1^{\text {st }}$ Review Comments - Comment and Response Form

This comment and response form has been prepared to address the $1^{\text {st }}$ Submission Review comments (TIA Report dated July 20, 2023) received on August 24, 2023, with corresponding responses from Parsons.

## TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING

1. As has previously recommended by Transportation Engineering Services, the design of Selkirk Street should move the existing parking lane to the north side of the road and provide a contraflow bike lane on the south side of the road between North River Road and Dundas Street. A contraflow bike lane is consistent with Policy 7-2 of the new TMP (Improve and Expand the Cycling Network), which states that, "where local roads are one-way for vehicles, contraflow cycling facilities (or other options to enable two-way cycling) should be considered, in support of cycling network density and connectivity."

Note that Selkirk Street is two-way between Dundas Street and Montgomery Street. The design shown in Appendix A does not appear to consider two-way operation in this segment of Selkirk Street.

Through discussions with the proponent, the proponent wishes to proceed with the Councillor-request westbound-only bike lane and adjacent sidewalk. This would be an improvement to westbound cycling and the pedestrian environment while maintaining the existing parking arrangement, which was a notable concern throughout the life of the project. This improvement can be implemented in the short term, where the resurfacing can present additional opportunities.

The functional plan depicts the proposed sidewalk and westbound bike lane.
Road resurfacing along Selkirk Street is targeted to start 3-5 years.
Noted. The RMA has been prepared showing the "interim" configuration of a westbound bike lane.

## TRAFFIC ENGINEERING

2. No additional comments beyond previous concerns surrounding trip generation and modal split targets. If transit and active transportation targets are not achieved there will be impacts throughout the transportation network which will impact site accesses. With the high number of parking spaces planned it seems possible that vehicle usage will be higher than forecast.

## Noted.

3. Are any monitoring measures planned post occupancy regarding trip generation and modal splits to
ensure targets are met?
A Phase 1 Monitoring Plan has been submitted with the Phase 3 site plan control for City review.

## TRANSIT SERVICES

1. Throughout the current TIA it references the "previous TIA Report submission (dated August 2022)"

This TIA report serves as an addendum update to previously approved Transportation Impact Assessment which support the Site Plan Control process for Phase 1, and for Full Build-out.
2. How / where will Para transit access the site in Phase 1, and in the final build-out?

Para transit will utilize the Montgomery Access in Phase 1 and Phase 3. The Selkirk access is available by full build-out.
3. Will Para Transpo be able to access what appears to be a passenger pick- up / drop off zone on-site without the need to go over any mountable curbs? And are bollards planned along this drive aisle and would they impede Para operations? From the diagram it appears there are curb edge bollards spaced relatively closely along the on-site drop off lane and these may interfere with access and deployment of the ramp.
Yes, Para Transpo will be able to access the drop-off area ( 3.0 m wide). Bollard dimensions have been included on the site plan and are typically spaced 2.7 m apart.

## Section 2.1.1 Proposed Development:

4. Figure 2: Proposed Site Plan (July 2023): Figure 2 is missing the adjacent bus stop on North River Road, please update to include the bus stop.
Bus stop included on site plan.
Section 2.1.2 Existing Conditions:
Montreal Road
5. Should also note existing bus stops in the area.

Transit stops illustrated on Figure 5.
6. Page 3 of the TIA states: "There are currently time-of-day (TOD) curbside bus lanes along Montreal Road from Montgomery Street to St. Laurent Boulevard. Within the study area, there is a westbound curbside bus lane from Vanier Parkway to Montgomery Street during the morning peak period (7:00-9:00am)."
Please update to reflect current conditions now that more of the Montreal Road constructions works have been completed.
Noted. The TIA Addendum Report has been updated to better reflect the Montreal Road construction works. No updates are proposed to the approved TIA Report.

North River Road
7. Should also note existing bus stops in the area.

Transit stops illustrated on Figure 5.

## Section 2.1.3 Planned Conditions:

Page 13 in the document, page 20 of the pdf:
8. In the top half of the page, it notes "Removal of time-of-day bus lanes" In the "Transit" section in the bottom of the page it notes "It has been confirmed that the peak period bus lanes will be maintained west of Vanier Parkway" (i.e. in the area of this development) These are contradictory statements. Please update the TIA throughout to reflect the correct conditions.

Noted. The TIA Addendum Report has been updated to better reflect the Montreal Road construction works. No updates are proposed to the approved TIA Report.

## Section 3.1.1 Site Trip Generation and Target Mode Shares:

9. Phase 1 Trip Generation, Residential Trip Generation: This section references the October 2020 TRANS Trip Generation Manual in the body of the text, however, seems to be using the 2009 TRANS Trip Generation for Table 10. Why is the 2020 trip generation not used; or at least specified in more detail for all the mode differences? And what are the modifications being made to 2011 OD Survey Modal data made in Table 11? Similar comments apply for Tables 16 and 17.
Comment seems to be regarding tables from the approved Phase 1 TIA report (August, 2022). The Phase 1 TIA was commenced prior to the TRANS 2020 trip generation update.

The Phase 3 TIA has used TRANS 2020 trip generation assumptions per the latest TIA Guidelines.
10. Phase 2 and 3 Trip Generation, Retail Trip Generation: There appear to be several math / rounding errors in Table 14. Trips have been over-assigned to auto modes and under-assigned to transit and active modes. For example, Table 14 shows zero ( 0 ) transit trips in the AM peak period despite being $30 \%$ of the mode share, while at the same time assigning 1 trip to Auto Passenger which is only $10 \%$ mode share. The PM section also appears to be rounding up in favour of auto modes and rounding down on Transit and Active mode trips. Table 14, and any supporting text need to be updated to reflect the proper mode share results. The Phase 1 TIA has been approved as part of the Phase 1 Site Plan Application. Rounding up in favour of auto modes allows the analysis to err on the conservative side when considering the capacity analysis. While the 1 person trip could also be assigned to transit, this change would not materially affect the outcome of the report.

## Section 4.1.1 Design for Sustainable Modes:

11. For the text "With regards to transit, a bus shelter is anticipated to be provided at the existing bus stop in the northeast corner of North River / Selkirk." Please clarify that the applicant is proposing to provide the shelter (and pad) to City of Ottawa standards.
A bus shelter and pad will be constructed to City of Ottawa standards following Phase 2 of the development.

## Phase 1 Roadway Modifications:

Figure 19 and related text: further review of proposed roadway modifications in consideration of Para Transpo service on / via Montgomery Street.
12. From a transit operational perspective, concerns over possible unanticipated movements/ behaviours. How is the termination of the cycle track on Montgomery Street managed? Has protection for future extension of cycling facilities to the east as redevelopment occurs been considered? Is a short bike lane and taper required?
Additional discussions took place following the August 2022 report resulting in an approved RMA for Phase 1. The design below was established to mitigate the noted implications. The Phase 1 RMA is currently in detailed design.


PXO Assessment North River / Selkirk:
13. Pedestrian desire lines / Other considerations: should the nearby bus stop(s) on North River Road also be considered?
The nearby bus stops should also be considered. A PXO is currently not proposed by the development.
New Comments (for Phase 3 circulation TIA report dated July 2023)
14. This TIA notes in section 5 that "Truck turns at both the Montgomery St site access and the garbage pickup/loading space of the Phase 3 building were confirmed to have no conflicts or turning issues." However, the turning templates shown in Appendix C - Truck Turning Templates show the HSU vehicle tracking over part of the short term lay-by parking in front of the Phase 3 building and the space on the opposite side of the roadway (see mark-up)
The noted curbs are depressed and designed for tracking. This is considered acceptable for the occasional loading and waste maneuver.


## PARA TRANSPO COMMENTS:

15. The Phase 3 building has a row of 'traffic / light bollard' in front of the main entrance - what is the spacing of these bollards, and will they impede the Para Transpo operations? Similar to the outstanding Phase 1 building comments - from the diagram it appears there are curb edge bollards spaced relatively closely along the onsite drop off lane and these may interfere with access and deployment of the ramp.
The spacing between bollards is typically 2.7 m . The dimension has been noted on the site plan.
16. Please show how Para Transpo will be able to access the Phase 3 building in the interim and final conditions, including applicable dimensions.
The designated drop off area, which is 3.0 m wide, is available for para-transpo use. The vehicle can park in front of the main residential entry. The access from Montgomery Street will be used during Phase $1 \& 3$.
17. As best as can be scaled from the drawing it appears there is enough of a clear space of bollards between the main entrance and the garbage / loading / moving access, but puts it very close to the apparent interim turn- around and where the HSU will track over the short term lay-by parking.
The spacing between bollards is typically 2.7 m . A depressed curb and TWSI has been provided along the drop-off area.
18. Ideally the Para stop would be in front of the main entrance.

Noted. The drop-off area can be used for Para-Transpo.
19. Please clarify if there are any depressed curbs along the length of the short term lay-by parking to facilitate access for Para Transpo customers who use the rear ramp of the vehicle. It is not clear if the mountable curb will satisfy the City of Ottawa Accessible Design Standards section 3 - Exterior Elements (see also 6.20 Public Transit as applicable)
A depressed curb and TWSI has been provided along the drop-off area.
20. How will the interim operation of the internal roadway turnaround work (before it is extended through to Selkirk as part of Phase 2? It is shown on the diagram as being in front of the garbage / loading / moving area and
shown tracking over sections of the short term lay-by parking and the pedestrian and 'traffic / light bollard' area.
The turn-around area, when required, will operate as a hammerhead configuration. There are opportunities to circulate in front of Phase 1, when required.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

As has previously recommended by Transportation Engineering Services, the design of Selkirk Street should
21. Both Montgomery Street and Selkirk Street are classified as Local Roads. There are no additional protected ROW limits identified in the OP.
Noted.
22. A 3.0 metres $\times 3.0$ metres sight triangle would be required at the intersection of Montgomery Street and Selkirk Street based on Schedule C16 of the Official Plan. The sight triangle area is to be conveyed to the city and is to be shown on all drawings. Should the City decide to widen O'Connor Street the sight triangle would provide an area for relocating the traffic signal pole.
Noted. Included on Site Plan and RMA drawings.
23. The Tactile Walking Surface Indicator (TWSI) should be provided at pedestrian crossings. Under the Integrated Accessibility Standards of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005, and the City of Ottawa Accessibility Design Standards, TWSI's are required for new construction and the redevelopment of elements in public spaces, such as for exterior paths of travel (e.g. sidewalks and at the top of stairs). Noted.
24. The concrete sidewalk is required along Montgomery Street and Selkirk Street and is to meet City standards and be 2.0 metres in width and be continuous along the property frontage.
Noted.
25. The closure of an existing private approach shall reinstate the sidewalk, shoulder, curb, and boulevard to City standards.
Noted.
26. Signs related to the development site are to be placed in accordance with the applicable sign by-law. (Permanent Signs on Private Property By-law No. 2016-326). (Temporary Signs on Private Property By-law No. 2004-239). (Signs on City Roads By-law No. 2003-520). An Encroachment Agreement will be required for any signage on the road allowance.
Noted.
27. The Owner is responsible for identifying the type and location of existing signage that will be removed from within the Right-of-Way to accommodate the development site. The Owner is responsible for providing the General Manager with a detailed drawing identifying the type and position of the existing signs and roadway pavement markings along the site frontage. A separate pavement markings and signage drawings are to be provided.
Noted.
28. Relocating an existing roadway curbing by 30 cm will require a RMA report and approval by the delegated authority. Please confirm if you are triggering an RMA.
Noted. RMA is confirmed for Phase 3 for Selkirk and Montgomery. This has been provided in this submission.
29. The Owner shall be required to enter into maintenance and liability agreement for all pavers, plant and landscaping material placed in the City right-of-way and the Owner shall assume all maintenance and replacement responsibilities in perpetuity.
Noted.
30. Bicycle parking spaces are required as per Section 111 of the Ottawa Comprehensive Zoning By-law. Bicycle parking spaces should be in safe, secure places near main entrances and preferably protected from the weather.
Noted.

## APPENDIX B

MONTGOMERY ST AND SELKIRK ST ROADWAY MODIFICATIONS (RMA)



## APPENDIX C

TRUCK TURNING TEMPLATES



## APPENDIX D

RESIDENTIAL TDM MEASURES CHECKLIST

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

## Legend

$$
\begin{array}{c|l}
\text { REQUIRED } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { The Official Plan or Zoning By-law provides related guidance } \\
\text { that must be followed }
\end{array} \\
\hline \text { BASIC } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { The measure is generally feasible and effective, and in most } \\
\text { cases would benefit the development and its users }
\end{array} \\
\hline \text { BETTER } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { The measure could maximize support for users of sustainable } \\
\text { modes, and optimize development performance }
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$

$\left.$|  | TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Residential developments |  |$\quad$|  |
| :---: |
| add descriptions, explanations |
| or plan/drawing references | \right\rvert\,


|  | TDM-s | upportive design \& infrastructure measures: Residential developments | Check if completed \& add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REQUIRED | 1.2.3 | Provide sidewalks of smooth, well-drained walking surfaces of contrasting materials or treatments to differentiate pedestrian areas from vehicle areas, and provide marked pedestrian crosswalks at intersection sidewalks (see Official Plan policy 4.3.10) | $\square$ |
| REQUIRED | 1.2.4 | Make sidewalks and open space areas easily accessible through features such as gradual grade transition, depressed curbs at street corners and convenient access to extra-wide parking spaces and ramps (see Official Plan policy 4.3.10) | $\nabla$ |
| REQUIRED | 1.2.5 | Include adequately spaced inter-block/street cycling and pedestrian connections to facilitate travel by active transportation. Provide links to the existing or planned network of public sidewalks, multi-use pathways and onroad cycle routes. Where public sidewalks and multi-use pathways intersect with roads, consider providing traffic control devices to give priority to cyclists and pedestrians (see Official Plan policy 4.3.11) | $\nabla$ |
| BASIC | 1.2.6 | Provide safe, direct and attractive walking routes from building entrances to nearby transit stops | $\checkmark$ |
| BASIC | 1.2.7 | Ensure that walking routes to transit stops are secure, visible, lighted, shaded and wind-protected wherever possible | $\square$ |
| BASIC | 1.2.8 | Design roads used for access or circulation by cyclists using a target operating speed of no more than $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, or provide a separated cycling facility | $\square$ |
|  | 1.3 | Amenities for walking \& cycling |  |
| BASIC | 1.3.1 | Provide lighting, landscaping and benches along walking and cycling routes between building entrances and streets, sidewalks and trails | $\square$ |
| BASIC | 1.3.2 | Provide wayfinding signage for site access (where required, e.g. when multiple buildings or entrances exist) and egress (where warranted, such as when directions to reach transit stops/stations, trails or other common destinations are not obvious) | $\square$ |

TDM－supportive design \＆infrastructure measures： Residential developments

2．WALKING \＆CYCLING：END－OF－TRIP FACILITIES

## 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） | 『 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 resident－owned bicycles，plus the expected peak number of visitor cyclists | $\square$ |
|  | 2.2 | Secure bicycle parking |  |
| REQUIRED | 2．2．1 | Where more than 50 bicycle parking spaces are provided for a single residential 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） | 『 |
| BETTER | 2．2．2 | Provide secure bicycle parking spaces equivalent to at least the number of units at condominiums or multi－ family residential developments | $\square$ |

## 2．3 Bicycle repair station

BETTER 2．3．1 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）

## 3．TRANSIT

## 3．1 Customer amenities

BASIC

BASIC

BETTER
3．1．1 Provide shelters，lighting and benches at any on－site transit stops

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

3．1．3 Provide a secure and comfortable interior waiting area by integrating any on－site transit stops into the building

| TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: Residential developments |  |  | Check if completed \& add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4. | RIDESHARING |  |
|  |  | Pick-up \& drop-off facilities |  |
| BASIC | 4.1.1 | Provide a designated area for carpool drivers (plus taxis and ride-hailing services) to drop off or pick up passengers without using fire lanes or other no-stopping zones | $\square$ |
|  | 5. | CARSHARING \& BIKESHARING |  |
|  | 5.1 | Carshare parking spaces |  |
| BETTER | 5.1.1 | Provide up to three carshare parking spaces in an R3, R4 or R5 Zone for specified residential uses (see Zoning By-law Section 94) | $\square$ |
|  | 5.2 | Bikeshare station location |  |
| BETTER | 5.2.1 | Provide a designated bikeshare station area near a major building entrance, preferably lighted and sheltered with a direct walkway connection | $\square$ |
|  | 6. | PARKING |  |
|  | 6.1 | Number of parking spaces |  |
| REQUIRED | 6.1.1 | Do not provide more parking than permitted by zoning, nor less than required by zoning, unless a variance is being applied for | $\square$ |
| BASIC | 6.1.2 | Provide parking for long-term and short-term users that is consistent with mode share targets, considering the potential for visitors to use off-site public parking | $\square$ |
| BASIC | 6.1.3 | Where a site features more than one use, provide shared parking and reduce the cumulative number of parking spaces accordingly (see Zoning By-law Section 104) | $\square$ |
| BETTER | 6.1.4 | Reduce the minimum number of parking spaces required by zoning by one space for each 13 square metres of gross floor area provided as shower rooms, change rooms, locker rooms and other facilities for cyclists in conjunction with bicycle parking (see Zoning By-law Section 111) | $\square$ |
|  | 6.2 | Separate long-term \& short-term parking areas |  |
| BETTER | 6.2.1 | Provide separate areas for short-term and long-term parking (using signage or physical barriers) to permit access controls and simplify enforcement (i.e. to discourage residents from parking in visitor spaces, and vice versa) | $\square$ |

## TDM Measures Checklist:

Residential Developments (multi-family, condominium or subdivision)

## Legend

> | BASIC | $\begin{array}{l}\text { The measure is generally feasible and effective, and in most } \\ > \text { cases would benefit the development and its users }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| BETTER | The measure could maximize support for users of sustainable |
| > modes, and optimize development performance |  |

| TDM measures: 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 |  |
| 1.2 Travel surveys |  |  |  |
| better | 1.2.1 | Conduct periodic surveys to identify travel-related behaviours, attitudes, challenges and solutions, and to track progress |  |
| 2. WALKING AND CYCLING |  |  |  |
| 2.1 Information on walking/cycling routes \& destinations |  |  |  |
| BASIC | 2.1.1 | Display local area maps with walking/cycling access routes and key destinations at major entrances (multi-family, condominium) | $\square$ To be provided at main entries. |
|  | 2.2 | Bicycle skills training |  |
| BETTER | 2.2.1 | Offer on-site cycling courses for residents, or subsidize off-site courses | $\square$ |


| TDM measures: 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 (multi-family, condominium) | $\square$ To be provided at main entries. |
| BETTER |  | 3.1.2 | Provide real-time arrival information display at entrances (multi-family, condominium) | $\square$ |
|  |  | 3.2 | Transit fare incentives |  |
| BASIC | * | 3.2.1 | Offer PRESTO cards preloaded with one monthly transit pass on residence purchase/move-in, to encourage residents to use transit | $\square$ |
| BETTER |  | 3.2.2 | Offer at least one year of free monthly transit passes on residence purchase/move-in | $\square$ |
|  |  | 3.3 | Enhanced public transit service |  |
| BETTER | $\star$ | 3.3.1 | Contract with OC Transpo to provide early transit services until regular services are warranted by occupancy levels (subdivision) | $\square$ |
|  |  | 3.4 | Private transit service |  |
| BETTER |  | 3.4.1 | Provide shuttle service for seniors homes or lifestyle communities (e.g. scheduled mall or supermarket runs) | $\square$ |
|  |  | 4. | CARSHARING \& BIKESHARING |  |
|  |  | 4.1 | Bikeshare stations \& memberships |  |
| BETTER |  | 4.1.1 | Contract with provider to install on-site bikeshare station (multi-family) | $\nabla$ Will be sought for during construction, if available. |
| BETTER |  | 4.1.2 | Provide residents with bikeshare memberships, either free or subsidized (multi-family) | $\square$ |
|  |  | 4.2 | Carshare vehicles \& memberships |  |
| BETTER |  | 4.2.1 | Contract with provider to install on-site carshare vehicles and promote their use by residents | $\checkmark$ Car sharing to be included, provider to be determined. |
| BETTER |  | 4.2.2 | Provide residents with carshare memberships, either free or subsidized | $\square$ |
|  |  | 5. | PARKING |  |
|  |  | 5.1 | Priced parking |  |
| BASIC | $\cdots$ | 5.1.1 | Unbundle parking cost from purchase price (condominium) | $\square$ |
| BASIC | * | 5.1.2 | Unbundle parking cost from monthly rent (multi-family) | $\checkmark$ Residential costs to be unbundled. |

TDM measures: Residential developments $\quad$ Check if proposed \& add descriptions

## 6. TDM MARKETING \& COMMUNICATIONS

### 6.1 Multimodal travel information

6.1.1 Provide a multimodal travel option information $\checkmark$ To be provided on move-in. package to new residents

### 6.2 Personalized trip planning

BETTER $\star$ 6.2.1 Offer personalized trip planning to new residents

## APPENDIX E

SYNCHRO ANALYSIS REPORTS



Splits and Phases: $\quad 2$ : Montgomery \& Montreal


|  | 4 |  | 7 | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | ， | $\frac{1}{\square}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 4 | 「 | \％ | 中t | \％ | 虫t | \％ | 4綰 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 39 | 316 | 150 | 165 | 484 | 183 | 857 | 213 | 1096 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 39 | 316 | 150 | 165 | 484 | 183 | 857 | 213 | 1096 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 43 | 351 | 167 | 183 | 754 | 203 | 1136 | 237 | 1374 |
| Turn Type | pm＋pt | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA | Prot | NA | Prot | NA |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 4 | ， | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 10.7 | 39.6 | 39.6 | 10.7 | 39.6 | 11.1 | 28.9 | 11.1 | 28.9 |
| Total Split（s） | 16.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 16.0 | 40.0 | 29.0 | 55.0 | 29.0 | 55.0 |
| Total Split（\％） | 11．4\％ | 28．6\％ | 28．6\％ | 11．4\％ | 28．6\％ | 20．7\％ | 39．3\％ | 20．7\％ | 39．3\％ |
| Yellow Time（s） | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 2.4 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 5.7 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 5.7 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 5.9 |
| Lead／Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lead | Lag |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | C－Min | None | C－Min |
| Act Efft Green（s） | 39.8 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 46.6 | 37.0 | 20.4 | 51.2 | 22.0 | 52.7 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.28 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.33 | 0.26 | 0.15 | 0.37 | 0.16 | 0.38 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.27 | 0.89 | 0.38 | 0.82 | 0.87 | 0.82 | 0.66 | 0.89 | 0.76 |
| Control Delay | 34.1 | 77.0 | 8.5 | 64.6 | 58.9 | 91.5 | 34.5 | 90.8 | 41.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 34.1 | 77.0 | 8.5 | 64.6 | 58.9 | 91.5 | 34.5 | 90.8 | 41.9 |
| LOS | C | E | A | E | E | F | C | F | D |
| Approach Delay |  | 53.3 |  |  | 60.0 |  | 43.1 |  | 49.1 |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | E |  | D |  | D |
| Queue Length 50th（m） | 7.8 | 92.8 | 0.0 | 36.3 | 101.8 | 59.7 | 55.9 | 64.6 | 124.2 |
| Queue Length 95th（m） | 16.4 | \＃139．7 | 18.3 | \＃69．7 | \＃144．2 | m79．8 | 72.3 | \＃109．4 | 144.1 |
| Internal Link Dist（ $m$ ） |  | 246.0 |  |  | 113.1 |  | 139.9 |  | 106.8 |
| Turn Bay Length（ m ） | 35.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  | 95.0 |  | 90.0 |  |
| Base Capacity（vph） | 190 | 425 | 464 | 222 | 864 | 277 | 1740 | 277 | 1800 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v／c Ratio | 0.23 | 0.83 | 0.36 | 0.82 | 0.87 | 0.73 | 0.65 | 0.86 | 0.76 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length： 140
Actuated Cycle Length： 140
Offset： 102 （73\％），Referenced to phase 2：NBT and 6：SBT，Start of Green
Natural Cycle： 105
Control Type：Actuated－Coordinated
Maximum v／c Ratio： 0.89
Intersection Signal Delay： 50.1
Intersection LOS：D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 91．7\％
ICU Level of Service F
Analysis Period（min） 15
\＃95th percentile volume exceeds capacity，queue may be longer．
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles．
$m$ Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal．
Splits and Phases：4：Vanier \＆Montreal






|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection  <br> Int Delay, S/veh 0.6 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * | ¢ |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 10 | 371 | 258 | 79 | 10 | 16 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 10 | 371 | 258 | 79 | 10 | 16 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 91 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 1 | 11 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 11 | 412 | 287 | 88 | 11 | 18 |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | AT | T |  | KF |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 377 | 337 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 377 | 337 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 419 | 374 | 0 | 4 | 4 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 374 | 0 | - | 0 | 793 |
|  | 374 |  |  |  |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 374 |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 419 |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1184 | - | - | - | 467 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | - | -0.019 |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 0 | - | - | - | 12.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - | 0.1 |




|  | - | $4$ |  | $\frac{1}{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | 4) | 4) | 4 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 36 | 28 | 29 | 44 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 36 | 28 | 29 | 44 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 100 | 69 | 54 | 121 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 28.3\% |  |  |  | IC |
|  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IntersectionInt Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 36 | 36 | 18 | 5 | 28 | 29 | 14 | 29 | 5 | 44 | 44 | 21 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 36 | 36 | 18 | 5 | 28 | 29 | 14 | 29 | 5 | 44 | 44 | 21 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 40 | 40 | 20 | 6 | 31 | 32 | 16 | 32 | 6 | 49 | 49 | 23 |



| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h | 1528 | - | - | 684 | 775 | 1572 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.01 | - | - | 0.146 | 0.089 | 0.031 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.4 | 0 | - | 11.2 | 10.1 | 7.4 | 0 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | B | B | A | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%otile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | - | - |



## Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: North River \& Montreal



Splits and Phases: 2: Montgomery \& Montreal



|  | $4$ | $\rightarrow$ | $7$ |  | $4$ | $4$ | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ <br> SBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | \＆ |  | $\uparrow$ | 「゙ |  | む |  | \＆ |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 4 | 25 | 24 | 11 | 217 | 2 | 148 | 409 | 139 |  |
| Future Volume（vph） | 4 | 25 | 24 | 11 | 217 | 2 | 148 | 409 | 139 |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 39 | 0 | 39 | 241 | 0 | 206 | 0 | 609 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 8 |  | 8 | 2 |  | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Minimum Split（s） | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 31.1 | 31.1 | 31.1 | 31.1 |  |
| Total Split（s） | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 |  |
| Total Split（\％） | 34．7\％ | 34．7\％ | 34．7\％ | 34．7\％ | 34．7\％ | 65．3\％ | 65．3\％ | 65．3\％ | 65．3\％ |  |
| Yellow Time（s） | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |  |
| All－Red Time（s） | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time（s） |  | 5.6 |  | 5.6 | 5.6 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |  |
| Lead／Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | C－Min | C－Min | C－Min | C－Min |  |
| Act Efft Green（s） |  | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 49.3 |  | 49.3 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.19 |  | 0.19 | 0.19 |  | 0.66 |  | 0.66 |  |
| v／c Ratio |  | 0.12 |  | 0.15 | 0.54 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.86 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 20.5 |  | 24.5 | 8.1 |  | 5.7 |  | 28.1 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 20.5 |  | 24.5 | 8.1 |  | 5.7 |  | 28.1 |  |
| LOS |  | C |  | C | A |  | A |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 20.5 |  | 10.4 |  |  | 5.7 |  | 28.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  | B |  |  | A |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th（m） |  | 4.1 |  | 5.0 | 0.0 |  | 6.7 |  | 46.5 |  |
| Queue Length 95th（m） |  | 10.1 |  | 11.0 | 15.5 |  | 20.3 |  | \＃147．0 |  |
| Internal Link Dist（m） |  | 19.4 |  | 126.4 |  |  | 86.5 |  | 58.5 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（ m ） |  |  |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity（vph） |  | 459 |  | 379 | 546 |  | 1113 |  | 708 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v／c Ratio |  | 0.08 |  | 0.10 | 0.44 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.86 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length： 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length： 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset： 0 （0\％），Referenced to phase 2：NBTL and 6：SBTL，Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle： 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type：Actuated－Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v／c Ratio： 0.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay： 19.4 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS：B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 81．9\％ |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service D |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \＃95th percentile volume exceeds capacity，queue may be longer． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two | cycles． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Queue shown is maximum after two cycles．
Splits and Phases：5：North River \＆McArthur




|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | EBT | WBT | SBL |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 474 | 292 | 26 |  |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 474 | 292 | 26 |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 535 | 426 | 33 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $44.8 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Analysis Period (min) 15



|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | SBL |  |
| Lane Configurations | 496 | 384 | 8 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 496 | 384 | 8 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 551 | 427 | 18 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | Free | Free | Stop |  |
| Sign Control |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $37.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |



| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  | Minor2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 427 | 0 | - | 0 | 978 |  |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1132 | - | - | - | 385 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | - | - | 0.046 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 0 | - | - | - | 14.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - | 0.1 |



Analysis Period (min) 15

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | K | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |  | 4.4 |
| Traffic Vol, vehl/ | 115 | 49 | 425 | 0 | 0 | 454 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 115 | 49 | 425 | 0 | 0 | 454 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 2 | 2 | 0 | 66 | 66 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 20 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 128 | 54 | 472 | 0 | 0 | 504 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | 374 | 589 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | 0.342 | 0.092 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | 19.5 | 11.7 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | C | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%otile Q(veh) | - | 1.5 | 0.3 | - |


|  | - |  |  | $\frac{1}{7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | 4. | \& | \& |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 40 | 77 | 87 | 65 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 77 | 87 | 65 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 110 | 189 | 145 | 178 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 40.3\% |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { Intersection }}{\text { Int Delay, S/veh }} 8$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 40 | 40 | 20 | 5 | 77 | 87 | 38 | 87 | 5 | 65 | 65 | 31 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 40 | 40 | 20 | 5 | 77 | 87 | 38 | 87 | 5 | 65 | 65 | 31 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 44 | 44 | 22 | 6 | 86 | 97 | 42 | 97 | 6 | 72 | 72 | 34 |




Splits and Phases: 1: North River \& Montreal


|  | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 4 | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 种 |  | *4 | \% | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 460 | 45 | 689 | 47 | 71 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 460 | 45 | 689 | 47 | 71 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 559 | 0 | 734 | 47 | 71 |
| Turn Type | NA | Perm | NA | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 2 |  | 6 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial ( s ) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 39.9 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 19.5 | 19.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 52.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 65.0\% | 65.0\% | 65.0\% | 35.0\% | 35.0\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.9 |  | 5.9 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Min | C-Min | C-Min | None | None |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 62.1 |  | 62.1 | 10.8 | 10.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.78 |  | 0.78 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.22 |  | 0.31 | 0.21 | 0.28 |
| Control Delay | 3.4 |  | 4.2 | 32.6 | 11.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.5 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 3.8 |  | 4.2 | 32.6 | 11.2 |
| LOS | A |  | A | C | B |
| Approach Delay | 3.8 |  | 4.2 | 19.7 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 10.2 |  | 16.5 | 6.5 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 18.6 |  | 29.1 | 15.1 | 10.3 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) | 52.9 |  | 246.0 | 77.9 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 2538 |  | 2338 | 476 | 454 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 1448 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.51 |  | 0.31 | 0.10 | 0.16 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBT and 6:WBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.31 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 5.3 |  |  |  |  | section LOS: A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 74.2\% |  |  |  |  | Level of Service D |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 2: Montgomery \& Montreal



Splits and Phases: 4: Vanier \& Montreal




7: McArthur \& Dundas


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{T}$ | $\mathbf{T}$ |  | Tr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 12 | 369 | 266 | 89 | 10 | 16 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 12 | 369 | 266 | 89 | 10 | 16 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 91 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 1 | 11 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 12 | 369 | 266 | 89 | 10 | 16 |



| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1028 | - | - | - | 427 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.012 | - | - | - | 0.061 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.5 | 0 | - | - | 14 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - | 0.2 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | EBT | WBT | SBL |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 375 | 356 | 23 |  |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 375 | 356 | 23 |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 375 | 356 | 27 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{T}$ | $\mathbf{T}$ |  | Tr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 375 | 356 | 0 | 23 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 375 | 356 | 0 | 23 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 375 | 356 | 0 | 23 | 4 |



| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1203 | - | - | - | 416 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | - | - | 0.065 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 0 | - | - | - | 14.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - | 0.2 |


|  | $\%$ |  | 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | NBT | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | */ | 4 | 4中 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 27 | 254 | 395 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 27 | 254 | 395 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 73 | 254 | 395 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop | Free | Free |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 25.3\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Fr |  | 4 |  |  | 4中 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 27 | 46 | 254 | 0 | 0 | 395 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 27 | 46 | 254 | 0 | 0 | 395 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 3 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 110 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 27 | 46 | 254 | 0 | 0 | 395 |



| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | WBLn1 | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | 675 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | 0.108 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | 11 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | 0.4 | - |

11: Montgomery \& Selkirk 06/12/2023


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | 4) |  |  | 4 |  |  | 4) |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 46 | 36 | 18 | 9 | 40 | 45 | 14 | 29 | 5 | 44 | 59 | 21 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 46 | 36 | 18 | 9 | 40 | 45 | 14 | 29 | 5 | 44 | 59 | 21 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 46 | 36 | 18 | 9 | 40 | 45 | 14 | 29 | 5 | 44 | 59 | 21 |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | T |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 67 | 17 | 13 | 71 | 105 | 39 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 67 | 17 | 13 | 71 | 105 | 39 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 67 | 17 | 13 | 71 | 105 | 39 |



| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1390 | - | 743 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.009 | - | 0.113 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.6 | 0 | 10.5 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | 0.4 | - | - |




Splits and Phases: 2: Montgomery \& Montreal



|  | $\Rightarrow$ | - | $\%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations |  | t |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | t |  | t |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 4 | 25 | 24 | 11 | 236 | 2 | 170 | 405 | 139 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 4 | 25 | 24 | 11 | 236 | 2 | 170 | 405 | 139 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 236 | 0 | 208 | 0 | 545 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  | 6 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 8 |  | 8 | 2 |  | 6 |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 31.1 | 31.1 | 31.1 | 31.1 |
| Total Split (s) | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 49.4 | 49.4 | 49.4 | 49.4 |
| Total Split (\%) | 34.1\% | 34.1\% | 34.1\% | 34.1\% | 34.1\% | 65.9\% | 65.9\% | 65.9\% | 65.9\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.6 |  | 5.6 | 5.6 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | C-Min | C-Min | C-Min | C-Min |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 49.3 |  | 49.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.19 |  | 0.19 | 0.19 |  | 0.66 |  | 0.66 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.11 |  | 0.14 | 0.54 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.78 |
| Control Delay |  | 20.5 |  | 24.3 | 8.5 |  | 5.8 |  | 22.0 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 20.5 |  | 24.3 | 8.5 |  | 5.8 |  | 22.0 |
| LOS |  | C |  | C | A |  | A |  | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 20.5 |  | 10.5 |  |  | 5.8 |  | 22.0 |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  | B |  |  | A |  | C |
| Queue Length 50th (m) |  | 3.7 |  | 4.5 | 0.0 |  | 6.9 |  | 37.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) |  | 9.4 |  | 10.2 | 15.5 |  | 20.7 |  | \#127.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 19.4 |  | 126.4 |  |  | 86.5 |  | 58.5 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 444 |  | 370 | 521 |  | 1113 |  | 696 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.08 |  | 0.09 | 0.45 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.78 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 15.8 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: B |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 82.5\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service E |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. ${ }_{\text {Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 5: North River \& McArthur




7: McArthur \& Dundas


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{T}$ | $\mathbf{T}$ |  | Tr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 11 | 470 | 311 | 114 | 26 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 11 | 470 | 311 | 114 | 26 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 76 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 9 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 11 | 470 | 311 | 114 | 26 | 4 |



| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 995 | - | - | - | 274 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.011 | - | - | - | 0.109 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.7 | 0 | - | - | 19.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - | C |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - | 0.4 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 492 | 424 | 24 |  |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 492 | 424 | 24 |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | Free | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Sign Control |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 | 4 |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 492 | 424 | 0 | 24 | 8 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 492 | 424 | 0 | 24 | 8 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 492 | 424 | 0 | 24 | 8 |



|  | WBL | NBT | SBT |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | 115 | 466 | 450 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 115 | 466 | 450 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 172 | 466 | 450 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | Stop | Free | Free |  |
| Sign Control |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | 4 |  |  | 4中 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 115 | 57 | 466 | 0 | 0 | 450 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 115 | 57 | 466 | 0 | 0 | 450 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 2 | 2 | 0 | 85 | 85 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 115 | 57 | 466 | 0 | 0 | 450 |



| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | WBLn1 | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | 442 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | 0.389 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | 18.2 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | C | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | 1.8 | - |

11：Montgomery \＆Selkirk 06／12／2023

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\longleftarrow$ | 4 | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | む | む | む | む |  |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 40 | 85 | 87 | 78 |  |  |
| Future Volume（yph） | 40 | 85 | 87 | 78 |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 122 | 191 | 130 | 174 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free |  |  |
| $\frac{\text { Intersection Summary }}{\text { Contro Type：Unsignaized }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Uitilization 43．5\％Analysis Period（min） 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | * |  |  | 4) |  |  | 4) |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 62 | 40 | 20 | 8 | 85 | 98 | 38 | 87 | 5 | 65 | 78 | 31 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 62 | 40 | 20 | 8 | 85 | 98 | 38 | 87 | 5 | 65 | 78 | 31 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 62 | 40 | 20 | 8 | 85 | 98 | 38 | 87 | 5 | 65 | 78 | 31 |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | RT |  |  | $\mathbf{A}$ | T |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 79 | 17 | 25 | 181 | 153 | 88 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 79 | 17 | 25 | 181 | 153 | 88 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 79 | 17 | 25 | 181 | 153 | 88 |



