# Transportation Impact Assessment Phoenix Homes Subdivision Old Montreal Road 



## ABOUT US

```
WSP CANADA GROUP LTD.
1145 HUNT CLUB ROAD, SUITE 200
OTTAWA, ONTARIO K1V 0Y3
T +1 613-736-7200
F +1 613-836-8710
WSP.COM
```

WSP is one of the world's leading professional services consulting firms. We are dedicated to our local communities and propelled by international brainpower. We are technical experts and strategic advisors including engineers, technicians, scientists, planners, surveyors and environmental specialists, as well as other design, program and construction management professionals. We design lasting solutions in the Buildings, Transportation, Infrastructure, Oil \& Gas, Environment, Geomatics, Mining, Power and Industrial sectors as well as project delivery and strategic consulting services. With over 7,500 talented people across Canada and 36,000 people globally we engineer projects that will help societies grow for generations to come.

## TIA Plan Reports

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

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

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

## CERTIFICATION

1. I have reviewed and have a sound understanding of the objectives, needs and requirements of the City of Ottawa's Official Plan, Transportation Master Plan and the Transportation Impact Assessment (2017) Guidelines;
2. I have a sound knowledge of industry standard practice with respect to the preparation of transportation impact assessment reports, including multi modal level of service review;
3. I have substantial experience (more than 5 years) in undertaking and delivering transportation impact studies (analysis, reporting and geometric design) with strong background knowledge in transportation planning, engineering or traffic operations; and
4. I am either a licensed ${ }^{1}$ or registered ${ }^{2}$ professional in good standing, whose field of expertise [check $\sqrt{ }$ appropriate field(s)] is either transportation engineering $\otimes$ or transportation planning $\square$.
[^0]Dated at Ottawa, ON this 29 day of March 2018. (City)

Name:


Professional Title: Project Manager. Transportation Planning Ar M.DUu
Signature of Individual certifier that $s /$ he meets the above four criteria

## Office Contact Information (Please Print)

Address:
1145 Hunt Club Road. Suite 200
City / Postal Code:
OHawa. ON KIV OY3
Telephone / Extension:
613-690-1178
E-Mail Address:
sarah.j.medonald e wisp. com


## City of Ottawa 2017 TIA Guidelines Screening Form

## 1. Description of Proposed Development

| Municipal Address | $1154,1172,1180$, and 1208 Old Montreal Road |
| :--- | :--- |
| Description of Location | South side of Old Montreal Road, 800 m east of Trim Road |
| Land Use Classification | 16 semi-detached, 467 town/terrace |
| Development Size (units) |  |
| Development Size $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | $2 \times$ full movement $(800 \mathrm{~m}+1000 \mathrm{~m}$ east of Trim), $2 \times$ RIRO $(880 \mathrm{~m}+940 \mathrm{~m}$ e of Trim) |
| Number of Accesses and Locations |  |
| Phase of Development |  |
| Buildout Year |  |

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

## 2. Trip Generation Trigger

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

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

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

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

## 3. Location Triggers

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

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

## 4. Safety Triggers

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

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

## 5. Summary

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

[^1]

# TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCOPING REPORT 

TO: Asad Yousfani, Project Manager, Infrastructure Approvals, City of Ottawa<br>FROM: Sarah McDonald, P. Eng. Project Manager, Transportation Planning, WSP<br>SUBJECT: Phoenix Homes, Proposed Subdivision Old Montreal Road, Ottawa, ON<br>DATE: November 2017

## SCREENING FORM

This Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) is being prepared in support of a Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-Law Amendment Application. The screening form and preliminary site plan are attached.

## DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development is located at 1154, 1172, 1180, and 1208 Old Montreal Road. It is approximately 800 m east of Trim Road and within the general urban area defined by the City of Ottawa's Official Plan. The existing zoning on the properties is:

- Rural Residential (RR7), 1154 and 1180 Old Montreal Road
- RR7(19r), 1172 Old Montreal Road
- Rural Countryside (RU), 1208 Old Montreal Road

The rural exception on 1172 Old Montreal Road notes that the property is developable despite the lack of frontage onto a public street (Zoning By-Law 2008-250 Consolidation, Section.59).

The proposed development by Phoenix Homes includes 432 terrace flats, 35 townhomes, and 16 semi-detached homes. It includes the construction of one new public road and one private street as shown in the attached preliminary development plan (SP-1).

The timeline for the development has not been determined. For the purpose of this TIA it is assumed that the development will be fully occupied in December 2022, five years from now.

The exact number of parking spaces provided has not been determined at the time of this report. However, each of the 12 blocks with terrace flats will have two levels of indoor parking. Additionally, the following surface parking facilities are proposed:

- 25 street parking spaces on the south side of Private Street One
- 16 parking stalls on the north side of Private Street One
- 36 parking stalls for Blocks 9 \& 10; 20 parking stalls adjacent to Block 11
- 12 parking stalls adjacent to Block 12
- 7 parking stalls behind the 5 townhomes that front onto the new public road
- Private driveways at each of the 16 semi-detached homes

There are four proposed accesses to this development from Old Montreal Road as described in Table 1.

Table 1. Development Accesses onto Old Montreal Road

| IDENTIFIER | LOCATION | RESTRICTIONS | PROVIDES ACCESS TO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West Access | Opposite Famille- <br> Laporte Avenue <br> ( 800 m east of Trim) | Full movement | New public road |
| Block 2/3 Parking | 880m east of Trim | Right-In / Right-Out (RIRO) | Second level parking for Block 2 and Block 3 |
| Block 1 Parking | 940m east of Trim | RIRO | Second level parking for Block 1 |
| East Access | 1000 m east of Trim | Full movement | New public road |

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

## ROAD NETWORK

All roads in the study area are under the jurisdiction of the City of Ottawa.
Old Montreal Road is a two-lane arterial road that runs in an east-west direction between Trim Road and Ottawa Road 174 near the eastern edge of the City. The posted speed limit adjacent to the development property is $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

Trim Road is a four-lane divided arterial road that runs in a north-south direction south from Ottawa Road 174. The posted speed limit is $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

Dairy Drive is a two-lane local road that connects to Trim Road at a two-lane roundabout and to Old Montreal Road at stop control. It provides access to business and industry.

Famille-Laporte Avenue is a two-lane collector road that is part of the new Cardinal Creek subdivision. It is directly opposite the development property on Old Montreal Road.

## INTERSECTIONS AND DRIVEWAYS

There are three intersections in the study area:

- Old Montreal Road and Trim Road (two lane roundabout, new summer 2015)
- Old Montreal Road and Dairy Drive (two-way stop control)
- Old Montreal and Famille-Laporte Avenue (one-way stop control, new 2014/2015)

There are a number of private residential driveways along Old Montreal Road in the study area. However, there are no existing commercial accesses.

## CYCLE AND TRANSIT FACILITIES

There are eastbound and westbound cycling lanes on Old Montreal Road from Trim Road to Dairy Drive. There is a paved shoulder that could be used by cyclists from Dairy Drive eastward.

There is a separated sidewalk on the north side of Old Montreal Road between Trim Road and Dairy Drive that can be used by pedestrians.

OC Transpo bus route \#221 travels along Old Montreal Road east of Trim Road, providing a connection between Cumberland and Downtown Ottawa. Bus service on this route includes two westbound trips in the morning and two eastbound trips in the evening.

The Trim Transit Station / Trim Park \& Ride is located at Trim Road and Ottawa Road 174 and is accessible from Dairy Drive. It is served by rapid transit route 95 , route 22, connection route 221, and local route 122. This Park \& Ride can currently accommodate 1,089 vehicles.

## AREA TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES

There does not appear to be existing Area Traffic Management (ATM) measures along this section of Old Montreal Road.

## PEAK HOUR TRAVEL DEMAND BY MODE

The results from the 2011 Origin-Destination (O-D) survey were reviewed to identify the existing peak hour travel demands by mode. Given the proximity of the development near the eastern boundary of the Orléans district, it was assumed that any trip without an O-D of the Rural East district would be to/from the Old Montreal Road / Trim Road intersection. According to the O-D survey, in the AM peak $2 \%$ of all Orléans trips go to Rural East and 5\% originate from Rural East.

Based on the O-D survey, the peak hour travel demands by mode are:

Table 2. Peak Hour Travel Demands

| MODE | AM PEAK <br> (TO/FROM) | PM PEAK <br> (TO/FROM) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Auto Driver | $55 \% / 61 \%$ | $64 \% / 56 \%$ |
| Auto Passenger | $8 \% / 13 \%$ | $21 \% / 11 \%$ |
| Transit | $35 \% / 10 \%$ | $12 \% / 32 \%$ |
| Bicycle | $1 \% / 0 \%$ | $0 \% / 1 \%$ |
| Walk | $0 \% / 0 \%$ | $0 \% / 0 \%$ |
| Other (primarily school <br> bus) | $2 \% / 16 \%$ | $3 \% / 1 \%$ |

## CRASH HISTORY

The past 5-years of crash data (January 2012 - January 2017) for the three intersections in our study area and the section of Old Montreal Road adjacent to the development were obtained from the City of Ottawa and reviewed to determine any trends in collision history. The data available along Old Montreal Road is for the 1500 m section between Grand Chene Cour Du Court and Ted Kelly Lane making it difficult to identify crash trends in the vicinity of the proposed development.

The intersection of Old Montreal Road and Trim Road was reconstructed from a signalized intersection to a two-lane roundabout in the summer of 2015. The crash history of the previous configuration has not been reviewed.

Table 3. Five-Year Review of Crash History (January 2012-January 2017)

PROPERY
LOCATION TOTAL CRASHES DAMANGE ONLY NON-FATAL

| Old Montreal / Trim* | 35 | 32 | 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Old Montreal / Dairy | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Old Montreal / <br> Famille-Laporte | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Old Montreal Segment <br> (Frank Kenny Road to Grand- <br> Chene Cour du Court) | 16 | 12 | 4 |

* reviewed with roundabout configuration only (September 2015 - January 2017)

Some of the crash trends identified from the crash reports include:

## Old Montreal Road / Trim Road

- Majority of crashes occur between 12:00pm and 4:00pm
- $86 \%$ of all crashes occurred during clear weather with dry roads
- 17 angle and 12 sideswipe crashes indicate that drivers are adjusting to entering and manoeuvring through the roundabout
- The average crash rate doubled with the introduction of the roundabout (signalized 1.1 crashes per month, roundabout 2.2 crashes per month)


## Old Montreal Road Segment

- $40 \%$ of crashes occur between $6: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ and 11:00pm
- More than half the crashes occurred on adverse surface conditions (snow, ice, wet)
- 13 of 16 crashes involved a single motor vehicle
- There were no crashes reported between September 2015 and January 2017


## PLANNED CONDITIONS

In the City of Ottawa's 2013 Transportation Master Plan (TMP), the section of Old Montreal Road between Trim Road and the edge of the urban boundary is planned to be widened from two to four lanes by 2031. The widening is proposed to provide capacity for development areas east of Trim Road. To be conservative, this widening will not be included in the traffic impact assessment for this development. This section of Old Montreal Road is designated as part of the cycling Spine Route and as a conceptual future transit corridor in the TMP.

Cardinal Creek Village is a large subdivision being developed opposite our proposed development on the north side of Old Montreal Road. The subdivision will ultimately accommodate 569 single/semi-detached dwellings and 681 attached dwellings, and several large blocks for mixeduse/commercial, school, and parkland purposes. We can use the Transportation Impact Study (October 2013) completed for the development to estimate vehicle trips generated by Cardinal Creek Village.

There is a proposed commercial development at 1015 Dairy Drive to relocate the corporate headquarters of Drytech International (disaster restoration equipment and services). The Transportation Brief (December 2013) for this development can be used to estimate vehicle trips generated by this development. The application file has been pending since February 2014.

There is a proposed commercial development at 1375 Trim Road, in the north-east corner of the Old Montreal Road / Trim Road intersection. The development includes a high-end coffee shop, a restaurant with a drive-thru, a sit-down restaurant, a retail building, and a medical building. One of the proposed accesses is directly onto Old Montreal Road. The Transportation Impact Study (July 2016) can be used to estimate vehicle trips generated by this development. The agreement was registered and final legal clearance given in July 2017.

## STUDY AREA

Our proposed study area includes:

- Old Montreal Road between Trim Road and 200m east of the proposed development
- Three intersections along Old Montreal Road at:
- Trim Road
- Dairy Drive
- Famille-Laporte Avenue


## TIME PERIODS

Our proposed analysis periods for this traffic impact assessment are based on the 2017 turning movement counts at Old Montreal Road and Trim Road. We have selected the AM and PM peak hours: 7:15am - 8:15am and 4:30pm $-5: 30 \mathrm{pm}$.

## HORIZON YEARS

Our assumed horizon years for the traffic analysis are:

- Full occupancy: 2022
- Occupancy plus five years: 2027


## EXEMPTIONS REVIEW

The following table identifies the exemptions to the fourth step (Analysis) of the TIA process.
Table 4.Traffic Impact Module Exemptions

| MODULE | ELEMENT | REQUIRED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.1 Development Design | 4.1.2 Circulation and Access | NO, only required for site plans |
|  | 4.1.3 New Street Networks | YES, plan of subdivision |
| 4.2 Parking | 4.2.1 Parking Supply | NO, only required for site plans |
|  | 4.2.2 Spillover Parking | NO, only required for site plans |
| 4.5 Transportation Demand Management | All elements | NO, no employees or students |
| 4.6 Neighbourhood Traffic <br> Management | 4.6.1 Adjacent <br> Neighbourhoods | NO, does not rely on local or collector streets |
| 4.8 Network Concept | - | NO, will not generate more than 200 person-trips in excess of the established zoning permissions |

TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORECASTING REPORT
TO: Asad Yousfani, Project Manager, Infrastructure Approvals, City of Ottawa
FROM: Sarah McDonald, P. Eng. Project Manager, Transportation Planning, WSP
CC: Paul Black, FOTENN
SUBJECT: Phoenix Homes, Proposed Subdivision Old Montreal Road, Ottawa, ON
DATE: $\quad$ Revised March 9, 2018

## DEVELOPMENT GENERATED TRAFFIC

## TRIP GENERATION

## TRIP GENERATION RATES

Residential trip generation rates were selected from the 2009 TRANS Trip Generation Study. The semi-detached dwellings, townhouses, rowhouses land use from the TRANS Trip Generation Study was used to identify trip generation rates for the proposed development (Table 1).

Table 1. Trip Generation Rates, Semi-Detached, Townhouses, Rowhouses (Land Use 224)
PEAK PERIOD TRANS RATE INBOUND OUTBOUND

| AM | 0.52 | $37 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PM | 0.61 | $53 \%$ | $47 \%$ |

The 2009 TRANS study provides residential mode shares by dwelling type for urban and suburban areas. The travel mode share for suburban areas is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. TRANS Trip Generation Study Suburban Mode Shares for Townhouses

Suite 200
1145 Hunt Club Road
Ottawa, ON, Canada K1V 0Y3
T +1 613 736-7200
F +1 613 736-8710

| TRAVEL MODE | PM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle | $55 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| Transit | $27 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Non-Motorised | $8 \%$ | $6 \%$ |

The development has 538 units whose vehicle trips were estimated using the TRANS trip generation rates (Table 1). To forecast the person trips, the total calculated vehicle trips were
divided by the vehicle percentage (Table 2). The resulting trips generated by this development are shown in the following table.

Table 3. Development Generated Vehicle and Person Trips

| AM |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trips | Total | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit |
| Vehicle | 251 | 93 | 161 | 295 | 156 | 138 |
| Person | 457 | 169 | 292 | 483 | 256 | 227 |

There are no existing trips to deduct since this is a new development and not a redevelopment.
Since this is a residential development, it is not expected to attract any trips from the adjacent roadway (pass-by trips). Furthermore, there will be no synergy (internal capture) since this is a single use development.

## MODE SHARES

The study mode shares were estimated by averaging the peak hour travel demands from the 2011 O-D survey data provided in the TIA Scoping Report. Mode share targets were applied to the person trips calculated in Table 3 to determine the number of peak period trips for each mode.

The following table summarizes the mode share targets and person trips generated by the proposed development.

Table 4. Future Mode Share Targets for the Development (TIA Guidelines Table 5)

|  | MODE | AM | PM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TRAVEL | SHARE | PERSON | PERSON |
| MODE | TARGET | TRIPS | TRIPS |

## TARGET RATIONALE

| Transit | $20 \%$ | 102 | 108 | Limited transit service along corridor, <br> but close to Trim Transit Station. Old <br> Montreal Road is part of a conceptual <br> future transit corridor which will likely <br> not be implemented during our study <br> timeframe. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Walk | $0 \%$ | 0 | 0 | Rural cross section with few amenities <br> within walking distance. |
| Bicycle | $5 \%$ | 25 | 27 | Rural cross section with few amenities <br> within cycling distance. |


| Auto <br> Passenger | $15 \%$ | 76 | 81 | Vehicle occupancy unlikely to deviate <br> significantly from existing O-D <br> tendencies. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Auto Driver | $60 \%$ | 305 | 323 | Rural cross section with no significant <br> transit or pedestrian improvements in <br> our study timeframe. |

## TRIP DISTRIBUTION

According to the O-D survey, in the AM peak 2\% of all Orléans trips go to Rural East and 5\% originate from Rural East. Therefore, to be conservative the assumption was made that $5 \%$ of all trips in both peak periods are to/from the east and the remaining $95 \%$ are to/from the west.

## TRIP ASSIGNMENT

Vehicle trips were assigned to development accesses based on the proximity of dwellings to the two full access entrances and the right-in / right-out parking structure entrances. Intersections turning movements were assigned based on existing traffic patterns. The assignment is shown in the following figure.


Figure 1. Development Trip Assignment

## BACKGROUND NETWORK TRAFFIC

## CHANGES TO THE BACKGROUND TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

The 2016 Ottawa Road 174-Prescott-Russel County Road Study 17 Environmental Assessment proposed widening of OR174 and CR17 to provide an additional arterial lane to address capacity deficiencies across the Frank Kenny screenline. The proposed widening includes:

- Widening OR 174 to 3 lanes in each direction between Highway 417 and Trim Road
- Widening OR 174 to 2 lanes in each direction between Trim Road and Canaan Road
- Widening CR 17 to 2 lanes in each direction between Canaan Road and Landry Road

These measures could reduce volumes on Old Montreal Road by attracting a higher percentage of trips from the City of Clarence Rockland to the OR174 / CR17 corridor.

Alternatively, the widening of Old Montreal Road from two lanes to four lanes east of Trim Road is part of the Network Concept in the City of Ottawa's 2013 Transportation Master Plan. The rationale of this widening is to provide capacity for the development areas east of Trim Road.

To be conservative, neither of these potential changes are considered in the analysis since their timeframes are unknown.

## GENERAL BACKGROUND GROWTH RATES

The background growth rate along Old Montreal Road east of Trim Road is 1.8\%. This is based on an analysis of historical traffic growth.

The 8-hour counts at Old Montreal Road / Trim Road were used to determine the 8-hour traffic volume east of the intersection in 2006, 2010, and 2011. The volumes were then plotted on an $x-y$ scatter chart which identified $1.8 \%$ as the growth rate. Traffic counts from 2017 were available, but included the recent development growth from Cardinal Creek Village which is not representative of sustainable background growth. Future growth from Cardinal Creek Village will be considered as part of the other area development.

## OTHER AREA DEVELOPMENT

We identified three developments in our Scoping Report that could impact our study area:

- Cardinal Creek Village
- 1015 Dairy Drive (Drytech International Headquarters)
- 1375 Trim Road (multi-use commercial development)

Estimated trips for these developments were taken from their TIAs at the appropriate time horizon.


Figure 2. 2022 Background Traffic


Figure 3. 2027 Background Traffic

## DEMAND RATIONALIZATION

## DESCRIPTION OF CAPACITY ISSUE(S)

Total traffic volumes for the 2022 and 2027 time horizons were estimated by:

- Applying a 1.8\% annual growth rate to the 2017 traffic volumes
- Adding trips generated by other area development
- Adding trips generated by the Phoenix development (Figure 1)

The estimated total traffic volumes are shown in the following two figures.


Figure 4. 2022 Total Traffic (Background + Other Development + Development)


Figure 5. 2027 Total Traffic (Background + Other Development + Development)

The directional capacity of Old Montreal Road across the Frank Kenny screenline is 1050 vph (2008 City of Ottawa Road Needs Study). The capacity at the proposed development should also be 1050vph since the same cross section (single lane in each direction) exists at the screenline and through our study area. The directional capacity of Old Montreal Road west of Famille-Laporte will be exceeded in the 2022 total traffic scenario with 1087 AM westbound trips (Figure 4). When considering the 2027 total traffic scenario, the AM westbound trips are expected to decrease to 957 vehicles as a result of the proposed Ottawa Road 174 connection in Cardinal Creek Village. The phasing of Cardinal Creek Village and timing of the proposed OR174 connection introduces uncertainty into the trip forecasting of the 2027 time horizon (background and total traffic). Any deviation from the assumptions of the Cardinal Creek TIA will have an impact on traffic operations in our study area. We applied the Cardinal Creek Village site generated traffic volumes as shown in the Cardinal Creek Village Phases 1-7 TIA (October 2013) Exhibits 10, 11, and 12.

The intersection of Old Montreal Road and Trim Road is a two-lane roundabout and capacity issues are not anticipated (to be confirmed in Step 4 Analysis).

## ADJUSTMENT TO DEVELOPMENT GENERATED DEMANDS

Adjustment to the development generated demands will not reduce peak direction traffic volumes along Old Montreal Road enough to mitigate the long term capacity concerns. It is noted that as the area becomes more urbanised, increases in the active modes of transportation can be expected as well as used to access the future LRT station located to the north of this site. In general, the proposed development will generate approximately 165 and 150 peak direction vehicle trips during the AM and PM hour when the 2027 total traffic volumes along Old Montreal Rd, west of Famille-Laporte are 957 vph and $1,064 \mathrm{vph}$, respectively. Both the current TMP and the OR174/CR17 EA provide support for additional screenline capacity and would provide relief for the potential capacity deficiencies resulting from the Cardinal Creek Village and the planned office commercial development proposed within the broader area.

Adjustments to the background network demand might be able to reduce capacity issues along Old Montreal Road. However, mitigating network capacity concerns such as proposed in the City's TMP and OR174/CR17 EA are considered beyond the scope of this TIA. As indicated previously, these potential capacity issues within the broader study area are discussed and assessed in the OR174/CR17 EA and considered as part of the City's TMP Network Concept.

## TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT STRATEGY REPORT

TO: Asad Yousfani, Project Manager, Infrastructure Approvals, City of Ottawa
FROM: $\quad$ Sarah McDonald, P. Eng. Project Manager, Transportation Planning, WSP
CC: Paul Black, Senior Planner, FOTENN
Michael Boucher, Manager of Planning, Phoenix Homes
Don Stephens, P. Eng, Director, Transportation Planning, WSP
SUBJECT: Proposed Subdivision Old Montreal Road, Ottawa, ON; Phoenix Homes
DATE: March 12, 2018

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This Strategy Report was prepared on behalf of Phoenix Homes in support of a Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-Law Amendment Application. The format and outline of the Strategy Report is based on the City of Ottawa's Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) Guidelines (2017). The purpose of the Strategy Report is to confirm the transportation elements of the development align with the City of Ottawa's broader city-building objectives.

## 2. DEVELOPMENT DESIGN

The proposed development by Phoenix Homes is located at 1154, 1172, 1180, and 1208 Old Montreal Road. It is approximately 800 m east of Trim Road and within the general urban area defined by the City of Ottawa's Official Plan. The development includes 432 terrace flats, 35 townhomes, and 16 semi-detached homes. It includes the construction of one new public road and one private street as shown in the attached preliminary development plan (SP-1).

### 2.1.DESIGN FOR SUSTAINABLE MODES

As required by the TIA Guidelines, the TDM-supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist was completed to assess the opportunity to implement facilities that are supportive of sustainable modes. The checklist should be reassessed as part of the site plan submission when more detailed information is available related to both vehicle and bicycle parking supply and layout. The completed checklist is attached to this report as Appendix A.

Sustainable modes include cycling, walking, and transit. The proposed site accommodates these modes in the following ways:

- Provision for pedestrian sidewalks along the new public road and new private road
- The existing transit stops (two) located on Old Montreal Road adjacent to the proposed development.

A westbound transit stop is located at the northwest corner of the Famille-Laporte Avenue intersection. An eastbound transit stop is located at the northeast corner of the Grand Chène Court intersection that is located approximately 70 m west of the site.

Approximately $87 \%$ and $71 \%$ of the proposed units are within a five minute walk ( 400 m ) of the westbound bus stop and eastbound bus stop, respectively. The following measures could be implemented to improve the percentage of units within walking distance to transit:

- Remove the deviation in the proposed sidewalk north of Block 9, if not otherwise required to comply with 5\% maximum running slope per the Ottawa Accessibility Design Standards (2014)
- The City consider moving the nearby eastbound bus stop from Grand Chène Crescent to the northeast (far-side) corner of the intersection of Old Montreal Road with Famille-Laporte Avenue to reduce the walking distance from both Cardinal Creek Village and the proposed Phoenix development


### 2.2. CIRCULATION AND ACCESS

These design elements are not required for applications involving plans of subdivisions.

### 2.3. NEW STREET NETWORKS

The City of Ottawa's Urban Design Guides for Greenfield Neighbourhoods (2007) provide guidance for neighbourhood design during the subdivision review and zoning process. The TIA Guidelines suggest assessing the planned street network using the methods described in the Urban Design Guide. Guidelines relevant to the TIA process and notes on the planned development are shown in Table 1. Generally, the network design is consistent with a local road designed to distribute traffic from arterial and collector streets to individual properties. The design encourages travel by sustainable modes by providing side walks and connectivity to existing bus stops and paved shoulders for cycling on Old Montreal Road.

Table 1. Urban Design Guidelines Review

| NO. | GUIDELINE DESCRIPTION | PLANNED STREET NETWORK |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | Create a walkable neighbourhood with pathways, trails <br> and sidewalks that are accessible year-round and that <br> connect destinations such as transit stops, commercial <br> areas, schools, community facilities and parks. | The internal street network provides sidewalks that <br> connect to Old Montreal Road. The intersection of <br> Famille Laporte provides access to amenities <br> located within the Cardinal Creek development to <br> the north. |
| 11 | Connect new streets to existing streets in adjacent <br> developments and plan for future connections to land <br> that has yet to be developed. | One of the two proposed full-access movements <br> onto Old Montreal Road is opposite the existing <br> access to Cardinal Creek (Famille-Laporte). <br> There is a proposed connection at the south-east <br> corner of the property to a future development at <br> 1296 Old Montreal Road. |


| NO. | GUIDELINE DESCRIPTION | PLANNED STREET NETWORK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Layer collector streets to be direct and continuous through the neighbourhood so homes are within 400 m of transit and other destinations along them. | $87 \%$ of the proposed units are within 400 m of the westbound bus stop at Famille Laporte. <br> $71 \%$ of the proposed units are within 400 m from the eastbound bus stop at Grand Chène Crescent. |
| 13 | Layout local street patterns so that development blocks are easily walkable - between 150 and 250 m in length | The local street patterns are easily walkable with north-south connections to Old Montreal Road at each end of the development. |
| 21 | Select the most suitable zoning setback and road ROW width for the land use context and road function. Provide sufficient space for the various elements in the front yard, the boulevard, and the road including trees, sidewalks, utilities, cycling facilities, parking and travel lanes | Space for entrances, sidewalks, some on-street parking, and two drive lanes has been included in the proposed development plan. |
| 25 | Design roads at entrances to neighbourhoods to create a sense of arrival with such elements as enhanced landscape treatment in the boulevard and the median. | Inclusion of entrance features to be determined as part of the site planning. |
| 26 | Construct sidewalks on both sides of the street that serve key destinations, such as transit stops, greenspaces, or to community facilities like schools. Select the correct road ROW standard to allow sufficient space for sidewalks and all streetscape elements. | Sidewalks are proposed on at least one side of the street as per the site plan P1. |
| 28 | Design crosswalks in areas with higher pedestrian and vehicular volumes to be visually different form the street surface. Ensure they are universally accessible. | Inclusion of enhanced pedestrian crossing facilities to be determined as part of the site planning. |
| 31 | Create a cycling-supportive neighbourhood with bicycle routes that serve local destinations, and that are linked to the citywide network of bicycle routes. Routes include wide shared-use curb lanes, designated on-road bicycle lanes or multi-use pathways. | Internal road network links to Old Montreal Road that has paved shoulders that can be used by bicycles. |
| 32 | Design pathways, trails and walkways that are connected to the road right-of-way so that they link to a sidewalk and cross at an intersection. | Internal sidewalks all connect to Old Montreal Road at proposed intersections. |


| NO. | GUIDELINE DESCRIPTION | PLANNED STREET NETWORK |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | Construct streets, sidewalks, crosswalks and access to <br> buildings that are universally accessible to a wide <br> range of residents and abilities. Refer to accessibility <br> standards such as the CSA (B651-04) "Accessible <br> design for the built environment". | Accessibility features to be identified as part of the <br> site planning. |

## 3. PARKING

The Scoping Report submitted to the City of Ottawa on November 30, 2017 excluded scope associated with Parking.

## 4. BOUNDARY STREET DESIGN

Old Montreal Road is the only boundary street to the proposed development. The City of Ottawa has not prepared a Complete Street concept for this boundary street. As required by the TIA guidelines, we are providing a high level complete street concept for this boundary street considering mobility, road safety, and neighbourhood traffic management. This complete street concept could be considered as part of a larger study determining the feasibility of widening Old Montreal Road to provide additional arterial capacity in the rural east area of Ottawa.

### 4.1. MOBILITY

The City's Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) targets consider road classification, adjacent land-use designation, and special policy areas. The segment of Old Montreal Road adjacent to the development is an arterial road within the general urban area. It is not an arterial main street, within 600 m of a rapid transit station, or within 300m of a school. The 2013 City of Ottawa Transportation Master Plan also designates this segment of Old Montreal Road as a Full Load Truck Route, a Cycling Spine Route, and a Conceptual Future Transit Corridor. Note that the 2015 MMLOS Guidelines do not specify a transit target for Conceptual Future Transit Corridor, and this study has instead used the target for Isolated Transit Priority Measures.

The resulting MMLOS targets range from ' C ' for pedestrians and cycling to ' D ' for transit and trucks, see Table 2.

Table 2. Segment MMLOS for Old Montreal Road Adjacent to the Proposed Development (2027)

| PLOS | BLOS | TLOS | TKLOS |  | VLOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Target | C | C | D | D | VLOS Not |
| Status Quo | F | E | D | C | Reported <br> for |
| Proposed Development | D | E | D | C | Segments |
| Conceptual Complete Street | C | A | D | A |  |

PLOS $=$ Pedestrian Level of Service, BLOS $=$ Bike Level of Service, TLOS $=$ Transit Level of Service, TkLOS $=$ Truck Level of Service, VLOS = Vehicle Level of Service

The Status Quo option assumes that infrastructure remains as is along Old Montreal Road. The MMLOS was assessed as:

- No sidewalk = PLOS ' F '
- Paved shoulder of 1.8 m which is assessed as a bike lane without parking $=\mathrm{BLOS}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ '
- Transit operating in mixed traffic with limited to no parking = TLOS 'D'
- Bi-directional traffic in two travel lanes of $3.5 \mathrm{~m}=\mathrm{TkLOS}$ ' C '

The Development Buildout option assumes that infrastructure is built as proposed by the current development plan. The MMLOS was assessed as:

- NEW 2.0m sidewalk along Old Montreal Road within the development = PLOS 'D'
$-\quad$ No changes to the cycling infrastructure $=$ BLOS ' E '
- No changes to the existing lane geometry = TLOS 'D' and TkLOS 'C'

The Conceptual Complete Street concept considers the City's Official Plan (which protects Old Montreal Road between Trim Road and the East Urban Community limit for a 37.5 m right-of-way) and City's Transportation Master Plan (which indicates that this section of Old Montreal Road is planned to be widened from two to four lanes by 2031). A conceptual complete street concept could be considered as part of a larger road widening project. Such a project might consider a road design similar to Cross-Section 2 proposed in the City of Ottawa's Arterial Road Cross-sections (Figure 1). This cross section was used to assess the Conceptual Complete Street MMLOS.


Figure 1. City of Ottawa Arterial Road Concept 2 - Separated Cycle Tracks / Sidewalks

### 4.2. ROAD SAFETY

Historical collision records for the study area were reviewed in the Collision Analysis section of the Scoping Report. The analysis reviewed the past 5-years of City of Ottawa crash data (January 2012 January 2017) for roads and intersections within the study area. The data available along Old Montreal Road was for the 1500 m section between Grand Chène Court and Ted Kelly Lane, which makes it difficult to identify specific crash trends in the more limited length of road that borders the proposed development. Following the TIA Guidelines we have identified patterns with six or more crashes in five years along this 1500 m road segment; they include:

- Seven crashes occurred between 6:00pm and 11:00pm

The area reviewed has a rural cross section and illumination is only provided in some sections which could have contributed to the time of day of the seven crashes. The City of Ottawa's Arterial Road Concept 2
(Figure 1) includes illumination on each side of the road.

## 5. ACCESS INTERSECTIONS

### 5.1.LOCATION AND DESIGN OF ACCESS

There are four proposed access points for this development from Old Montreal Road. They are all located at a distance greater than 800 m from the nearest major intersection, which is the existing roundabout located at Montreal and Trim Road.

The existing cross section of Old Montreal Road in this area does not include a median. Therefore access restriction, such as left turn restrictions could be implemented at the two proposed "right-in and right-out" (RIRO) accesses to the Block 1, 2, 3 parking structures include a channelized triangular island similar to the one shown in Figure 2.


Source: Figure 8.9.1 of Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads

Figure 2. Left-Turn Restrictions, Undivided Road

### 5.2. INTERSECTION CONTROL

Traffic control signal warrants following Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) Book 12 (2012) were completed for the four proposed accesses to the development under both scenarios (background and total) and future planning horizons (2022 and 2027).

Justification 7 (future volumes) was used to determine if a signal will be warranted. Justification 7 uses Average Hourly Volumes (AHV), which is defined as follows:

Average Hourly Volume $(A H V)=(A M$ Peak Hour Volume + PM Peak Hour Volume $) / 4$
Based on future volumes, none of the accesses to the proposed development trigger a traffic signal warrant. The traffic signal warrant sheets are provided in Appendix B.

A capacity analysis was completed for both accesses and is provided in Section 9.2.2.

### 5.3.INTERSECTION DESIGN

An auxiliary left-turn lane analysis for the new accesses was completed for the worst case (2027 future total) traffic conditions. The analysis followed the left-turn warrant in the MTO Design Supplement for TAC Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads, June 2017 - Appendix 9A.

In the peak hours, the forecasted number of vehicles making a left turn into one of the site accesses is 3 or less. The percent left-turn volume compared to advancing traffic volumes is $1 \%$. The left-turn warrant charts in the MTO Design Supplement are provided for locations where the perfect left-turn volume compared to advancing traffic volumes is $5 \%$ or higher. Therefore, the implementation of a left-turn lane is not warranted for either of the development accesses. Transportation Demand Management

The Scoping Report submitted to the City of Ottawa on November 30, 2017 excluded scope associated with Transportation Demand Management.

## 6. NEIGHBOURHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The Scoping Report submitted to the City of Ottawa on November 30, 2017 excluded scope associated with Neighbourhood Traffic Management.

## 7. TRANSIT

### 7.1. ROUTE CAPACITY

OC Transpo bus route \#221 travels along Old Montreal Road east of Trim Road, providing a connection between Cumberland and Downtown Ottawa. Bus service on this route includes two westbound trips in the morning and two eastbound trips in the evening.

The Trim Transit Station / Trim Park \& Ride is located at Trim Road and Ottawa Road 174 and is accessible from Dairy Drive. It is served by rapid transit route 95 , route 22, connection route 221, and local route 122. This Park \& Ride can currently accommodate 1,089 vehicles.

The Forecasting Report submitted to the City of Ottawa on December 12, 2017 indicated that this development would generate 102 new transit trips in the AM peak hour and 108 new transit trips in the PM peak hour. Applying the inbound and outbound trip percentages from the Forecasting Report provides an estimate of transit trips generated by this development as presented in the following table.

Table 3. Estimated Transit Trips Generated by Development (AM and PM Peak Hours)

| PEAK HOUR | TOTALTRANSIT <br> TRIPS | INBOUND <br> $\%$ |  | INBOUND <br> $\#$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM | 102 | $37 \%$ | 38 | OUTBOUND <br> $\%$ | OUTBOUND <br> $\#$ |
| PM | 108 | $53 \%$ | 57 | $64 \%$ | 65 |

A measured and need based increase in transit service through the Old Montreal Road corridor should be provided. It is expected that the need for transit services will be driven by Cardinal Creek Village with a smaller ridership contribution from the proposed Phoenix development.

### 7.2.TRANSIT PRIORITY

This is a rural area transitioning into an urban area. It is not a candidate for transit priority measures.

## 8. REVIEW OF NETWORK CONCEPT

The Scoping Report submitted to the City of Ottawa on November 30, 2017 excluded scope associated with the Review of Network Concept.

## 9. INTERSECTION DESIGN

The study area includes three existing network intersections in the study area:

- Old Montreal Road and Trim Road (two lane roundabout)
- Old Montreal Road and Dairy Drive (two-way stop control)
- Old Montreal and Famille-Laporte Avenue (one-way stop control)

The development also proposes two new full-movement accesses:

- the West Access opposing the existing Famille-Laporte Avenue the East Access approximately 200m east of the West Access / Famille-Laporte Avenue intersection
The study area intersections were evaluated in the morning and afternoon (AM and PM) peak hour traffic conditions at the following planning horizons:
- Existing (2017)
- Future Background (2022 and 2027)
- Future Total (2022 and 2027)


### 9.1. INTERSECTION CONTROL

Traffic control signal warrants following Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) Book 12 (2012) Justification 7 were completed the Dairy Drive intersection under both scenarios (background and total) and future planning horizons (2022 and 2027). Traffic signal warrants for the two full movement accesses were presented in Section 5. The warrant calculations are provided in Appendix B.

At the Old Montreal Road and Dairy Drive intersection a traffic signal is not warranted under either future background scenario. However, they are warranted under both future total scenarios. When considering the 2022 background scenario, the Average Hourly Volume (equation in Section 0) on Old Montreal is within

45 vehicles of triggering the traffic signal warrant. This indicates that any proposed development growth on Old Montreal Road that generates vehicular traffic would likely satisfy the warrant.

The following table provides the AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes on Old Montreal Road in the existing, 2022 total, and 2027 total traffic scenarios to compare the estimated traffic contribution from both Cardinal Creek Village and the proposed Phoenix Development. In 2022, Cardinal Creek contributes over $65 \%$ of the new development traffic growth along this corridor. The contribution of Cardinal Creek in 2027 is highly dependant on the availability of the proposed Ottawa Road 174 access; without this new access then the contribution of Cardinal Creek to traffic on Old Montreal Road will increase instead of decrease as presented in the Cardinal Creek TIA and shown below.

Table 4. AM and PM volumes on Old Montreal Road at Dairy Drive

| TRAFFIC 2018 | 2022 | 2027 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Old Montreal Road at Dairy <br> Drive (Total) | $668 /(753)$ | $1321 /(1519)$ | $1155 /(1596)$ |
| Trips to/from Cardinal Creek <br> Village | $159 /(205)$ | $478 /(618)$ | $243 /(293)$ |
| Trips to/from Proposed <br> Development | $0 /(0)$ | $264 /(277)$ | $264 /(277)$ |

Following the OTM Book 12 traffic signal warrants (Justification 7), the Dairy Drive / Old Montreal Road intersection warrants a traffic signal with known development traffic. An upgrade to the intersection should be considered by the City of Ottawa to provide more capacity through the maturing rural east sector

### 9.2. INTERSECTION DESIGN (OPERATIONS)

### 9.2.1. MMLOS ANALYSIS

Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) analysis methodology outlined in the City of Ottawa's MMLOS Guidelines (2015) states that intersection LOS measures are only to be evaluated at signalized intersections. Analysis of Vehicle Level of Service (VLOS) is detailed in Section 9.2.2.

Based on the traffic signal warrants (Section 9.1), Dairy Drive will warrant a traffic signal under 2022 and 2027 total traffic conditions. As discussed in Section 9.1, total traffic volumes are expected to be highest in 2022 at this intersection since the proposed OR 174 connection to Cardinal Creek will not have been constructed. Therefore, we have prepared an MMLOS analysis at this intersection for the 2022 total traffic scenario only since it will represent the worst case. Targets are taken from the General Urban Area Arterial Road Class.

Table 5. Intersection MMLOS for Old Montreal Road / Diary Drive under 2022 Total Traffic Conditions

|  | PLOS | BLOS | TLOS | TKLOS | VLOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Target | C | C | D | D | Section |
| Old Montreal Road / Dairy <br> Drive Intersection | C | F | D | E | 9.2 .2 |

PLOS $=$ Pedestrian Level of Service, BLOS $=$ Bike Level of Service, TLOS $=$ Transit Level of Service, TkLOS $=$ Truck
Level of Service, VLOS = Vehicle Level of Service

### 9.2.2. VEHICLE CAPACITY ANALYSIS

## METHODOLOGY

The existing and future conditions were analyzed using the weekday peak hour traffic volumes presented during the previous Traffic Impact Assessment Forecasting Report.

All intersections in the study area are currently roundabouts or unsignalized (stop controlled) intersections. The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010, assigns the vehicle level of service (VLOS) based on ranges of movement delay, as indicated in Table 6. Delay is the increase in travel time due to an intersection control.

Table 6. Highway Capacity Manual 2010, LOS Criteria

|  | UNSIGNALIED <br> INTERSECTIONS <br> DELAY (SECONDS) | SIGNALIZED <br> INTERSECTIONS <br> DELAY (SECONDS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALOS | $0-10$ | $0-10$ |
| B | $>10-15$ | $>10-20$ |
| C | $>15-25$ | $>20-35$ |
| D | $>25-35$ | $>35-55$ |
| E | $>35-50$ | $>55-80$ |
| F | $>50$ | $>80$ |

The City's MMLOS Guidelines recommend a target VLOS of ' $E$ ' for the City's Central Area, for within 600 m of a rapid transit station, or for within 300 m of a school. The Guidelines recommend a target VLOS of ' $D$ ' for locations, such as the study area, that are not located in the aforementioned policy areas.

The following sections present the results of the intersection capacity analysis. Movement delay and VLOS are shown alongside volume, volume / capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ), and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length. Unsignalized (stopcontrolled) intersections were analyzed using Synchro 9, while the roundabout at Old Montreal Road and Trim Road was analyzed using SIDRA 7. Appendix C contains the detailed Synchro analysis sheets.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS (2017)

The existing (2017) intersection capacity analysis results are summarized in Table 7. Both AM peak hour and PM peak hour are shown within the table, with the PM peak results shown within brackets. All three intersections currently operate with an acceptable VLOS. The highest volume to capacity (v/c) ratios are the southbound movements in the PM peak hour at the Old Montreal Road / Trim Road roundabout. The $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is 0.77 which indicates there is available capacity for future volumes.

Table 7. Intersection Capacity Summary - Existing (2017)

|  | VOLUME |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOVEMENT | (VPH) | DELAY <br> $(\mathrm{SEC})$ | VLOS | V/C | Q50th <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ | Q95th <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ |


| Old Montreal Road and Trim Road <br> (Roundabout) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBL | $21(17)$ | $5.2(16.7)$ | A (C) | $0.03(0.23)$ | - | $0.9(5.6)$ |
| EBT | $24(116)$ | $4.7(15.3)$ | A (C) | $0.03(0.23)$ | - | $0.9(5.6)$ |
| EBR | $42(234)$ | $4.7(24.4)$ | A (C) | $0.05(0.62)$ | - | $1.4(22.6)$ |
| WBL | $98(77)$ | $14.6(5.8)$ | B (A) | $0.30(0.11)$ | - | $8.1(3.0)$ |
| WBT | $130(70)$ | $12.4(6.4)$ | B (A) | $0.30(0.11)$ | - | $8.2(3.1)$ |
| WBR | $147(89)$ | $10.3(5.3)$ | B (A) | $0.29(0.12$ | - | $8.2(3.2)$ |
| NBL | $195(123)$ | $9.3(8.3)$ | A (A) | $0.54(0.40)$ | - | $28.1(14.7)$ |
| NBT | $910(490)$ | $9.1(8.1)$ | A (A) | $0.54(0.40)$ | - | $28.1(14.7)$ |
| NBR | $61(77)$ | $9.2(7.9)$ | A (A) | $0.54(0.40)$ | - | $27.3(14.7)$ |
| SBL | $68(199)$ | $7.2(18.1)$ | A (C) | $0.26(0.77)$ | - | $8.0(67.6)$ |
| SBT | $300(1186)$ | $7.0(17.6)$ | A (C) | $0.26(0.77)$ | - | $8.0(67.6)$ |
| SBR | $23(61)$ | $6.8(17.2)$ | A (C) | $0.26(0.77)$ | - | $7.9(67.2)$ |

Old Montreal Road and Dairy Drive
(Two-Way Stop Control)

| EBL | $14(1)$ | $8.6(7.7)$ | A (A) | $0.02(0.00)$ | - | $0.3(0.0)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBTR | $134(354)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.09(0.23)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |
| WBL | $1(0)$ | $7.5(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.00(0.00)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |
| WBTR | $522(210)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.34(0.14)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |
| NBTLR | $16(15)$ | $15.9(14.2)$ | C (B) | $0.05(0.04)$ | - | $1.1(0.9)$ |
| SBL | $14(190)$ | $15.3(23.6)$ | C (C) | $0.04(0.52)$ | - | $1.0(20.6)$ |
| SBTR | $9(48)$ | $11.6(10.0)$ | B (A) | $0.02(0.07)$ | - | $0.4(1.5)$ |

Old Montreal Road and Famille-Laporte Avenue (Two-Way Stop Control)

| EBL | $57(101)$ | $8.8(7.7)$ | A (A) | $0.06(0.08)$ | - | $1.4(1.8)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBTR | $69(418)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.05(0.27)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |
| WBTLR | $516(132)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.34(0.09)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |
| NBTLR | $0(0)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.00(0.00)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |
| SBTLR | $123(84)$ | $14.6(10.2)$ | B (B) | $0.27(0.12)$ | - | $7.7(3.0)$ |

[^2]
## FUTURE BACKGROUND CONDITIONS (2022)

The 2022 background intersection capacity analysis results are summarized in Table 8. Both AM peak hour and PM peak hour are shown within the table, with the PM peak results shown within brackets. Results that do not meet the City's target VLOS of 'D' are highlighted in red. With the future background and other development traffic the southbound left turning movements at both Trim Road and Dairy Drive are expected to experience a poor LOS in the PM peak hour. Notably drivers making a SBL at Dairy Drive are expected to experience approximately 110 s (just under 2 minutes) of delay with a stop control.

Table 8. Intersection Capacity Summary - Future Background (2022)

|  | VOLUME | DELAY | VLOS | V/C | Q50th <br> MOVEMENT | $(\mathrm{VPH})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | Q95th |
| :---: |
| $(\mathrm{SEC})$ |

## Old Montreal Road and Trim Road

(Roundabout)

| EBL | $67(44)$ | $5.4(29.1)$ | A (D) | $0.09(0.49)$ | - | $2.4(14.1)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBT | $66(234)$ | $5.9(26.3)$ | A (D) | $0.09(0.49)$ | - | $2.4(14.4)$ |
| EBR | $46(256)$ | $4.8(25.0)$ | A (C) | $0.06(0.62)$ | - | $1.5(22.6)$ |
| WBL | $160(130)$ | $21.7(7.8)$ | C (A) | $0.53(0.21)$ | - | $17.7(6.1)$ |
| WBT | $286(173)$ | $19.2(7.2)$ | C (A) | $0.53(0.21)$ | - | $18.1(6.1)$ |
| WBR | $279(167)$ | $15.4(6.3)$ | C (A) | $0.50(0.20)$ | - | $18.2(5.8)$ |
| NBL | $213(134)$ | $11.7(12.7)$ | B (B) | $0.61(0.52)$ | - | $35.7(22.5)$ |
| NBT | $1017(549)$ | $11.5(12.2)$ | B (B) | $0.61(0.52)$ | - | $35.7(22.5)$ |
| NBR | $88(121)$ | $11.2(11.8)$ | B (B) | $0.61(0.52)$ | - | $34.6(22.4)$ |
| SBL | $125(353)$ | $9.3(35.8)$ | A (E) | $0.33(0.92)$ | - | $10.5(129.2)$ |
| SBT | $328(1297)$ | $9.0(34.6)$ | A (D) | $0.33(0.92)$ | - | $10.5(131.1)$ |
| SBR | $25(67)$ | $8.8(34.0)$ | A (D) | $0.33(0.92)$ | - | $10.3(131.1)$ |

Old Montreal Road and Dairy Drive
(Two-Way Stop Control)

| EBL | $40(4)$ | $9.7(8.0)$ | A (A) | $0.05(0.00)$ | - | $1.1(0.1)$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBTR | $216(654)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.13(0.38)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |  |
| WBL | $1(0)$ | $7.7(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.00(0.00)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |  |
| WBTR | $827(380)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.49(0.22)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |  |
| NBTLR | $18(16)$ | $25.1(23.5)$ | C (C) | $0.08(0.08)$ | - | $1.9(1.8)$ |  |
| SBL | $17(211)$ | $24.7(111.3)$ | C (F) | $0.08(1.00)$ | - | $1.9(62.5)$ |  |
| SBTR | $12(79)$ | $14.3(11.5)$ | B (B) | $0.03(0.12)$ | - | $0.7(3.0)$ |  |
| Old Montreal Road and Famille-Laporte Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (Two-Way Stop Control) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBL | $60(99)$ | $9.8(8.1)$ | A (A) | $0.07(0.08)$ | - | $1.7(1.8)$ |  |
| EBTR | $148(736)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.09(0.43)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |  |
| WBTLR | $826(298)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.49(0.18)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |  |
| NBTLR | $0(0)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.00(0.00)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |  |
| SBTLR | $122(84)$ | $19.7(11.9)$ | C (B) | $0.34(0.15)$ | - | $10.3(3.6)$ |  |

Movement Legend:
NB / SB / EB / WB - northbound, southbound, eastbound, westbound
L/ T/ R - left, through, right
Examples: WBL - westbound left-turn, SBTLR - shared southbound through / left-turn / right-turn lane.

## FUTURE BACKGROUND CONDITIONS (2027)

The 2027 background intersection capacity analysis results are summarized in Table 9. Both AM peak hour and PM peak hour are shown within the table, with the PM peak results shown within brackets. Results that do not meet the City's target VLOS of 'D' are highlighted in red. Under 2027 background traffic conditions, all the SB movements at the Trim Road roundabout are expected operate with a LOS ' F ' in the PM peak hour. The EBL movement has a reduction in LOS to an ' $E$ ' as a result of high SB volumes. The SBL movement at Dairy Drive continues to operate with a LOS ' $F$ ' and high delays with a stop control.

Table 9. Intersection Capacity Summary - Future Background (2027)

|  | VOLUME |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOVEMENT | $(\mathrm{VPH})$ | DELAY <br> $(\mathrm{SEC})$ | VLOS | V/C | Q50th <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ | Q95th <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ |


| Old Montreal Road and Trim Road (Roundabout) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBL | 74 (45) | 9.3 (36.1) | A (E) | 0.09 (0.56) | - | 2.6 (16.6) |
| EBT | 56 (246) | 8.9 (32.6) | A (D) | 0.08 (0.56) | - | 2.2 (17.0) |
| EBR | 50 (280) | 8.7 (34.9) | A (D) | 0.06 (0.73) | - | 1.6 (29.9) |
| WBL | 168 (138) | 25.0 (8.5) | D (A) | 0.54 (0.24) | - | 17.8 (6.8) |
| WBT | 241 (180) | 21.6 (7.8) | C (A) | 0.54 (0.24) | - | 18.2 (6.8) |
| WBR | 162 (176) | 12.3 (6.8) | B (A) | 0.32 (0.22) | - | 9.4 (6.4) |
| NBL | 233 (147) | 12.7 (14.5) | B (B) | 0.66 (0.58) | - | 42.9 (27.1) |
| NBT | 1121 (599) | 12.4 (13.9) | B (B) | 0.66 (0.58) | - | 42.9 (27.1) |
| NBR | 103 (129) | 12.2 (13.5) | B (B) | 0.66 (0.58) | - | 41.4 (27.0) |
| SBL | 93 (373) | 9.3 (59.4) | A (F) | 0.34 (1.03) | - | 10.8 (243.8) |
| SBT | 368 (1418) | 8.9 (58.1) | A (F) | 0.34 (1.03) | - | 10.8 (254.6) |
| SBR | 34 (73) | 8.7 (57.3) | A (F) | 0.34 (1.03) | - | 10.6 (254.6) |
| Old Montreal Road and Dairy Drive (Two-Way Stop Control) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBL | 41 (4) | 9.1 (8.1) | A (A) | 0.04 (0.00) | - | 1.0 (0.1) |
| EBTR | 187 (689) | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.11 (0.41) | - | 0.0 (0.0) |
| WBL | 1 (0) | 7.6 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.00 (0.00) | - | 0.0 (0.0) |
| WBTR | 689 (402) | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.41 (0.24) | - | 0.0 (0.0) |
| NBTLR | 19 (17) | 20.3 (25.9) | C (D) | 0.07 (0.09) | - | 1.5 (2.1) |
| SBL | 18 (231) | 19.6 (177.5) | C (F) | 0.07 (1.20) | - | 1.5 (84.0) |
| SBTR | 13 (84) | 12.6 (11.7) | B (B) | 0.03 (0.14) | - | 0.6 (3.3) |
| Old Montreal Road and Famille-Laporte Avenue (Two-Way Stop Control) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBL | 55 (109) | 9.3 (8.1) | A (A) | 0.06 (0.09) | - | 1.4 (2.0) |
| EBTR | 123 (779) | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.07 (0.46) | - | 0.0 (0.0) |
| WBTLR | 722 (311) | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.42 (0.18) | - | 0.0 (0.0) |
| NBTLR | 0 (0) | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.00 (0.00) | - | 0.0 (0.0) |
| SBTLR | 100 (93) | 16.3 (12.4) | C (B) | 0.24 (0.17) | - | 6.6 (4.3) |

[^3]L / T/ R - left, through, right.

## FUTURE TOTAL CONDITIONS (2022)

The 2022 future total (future background plus additional site generated traffic) intersection capacity analysis results are summarized in Table 10. Both AM peak hour and PM peak hour are shown within the table, with the PM peak results shown within brackets. Results that do not meet the City's target VLOS of ' $D$ ' are highlighted in red.

With the addition of the development traffic, the SB movements at Trim Road experience a LOS ' $F$ ' in the 2022 planning horizon instead of the 2027 planning horizon that was anticipated as part of the background traffic analysis.

The delay experienced by vehicles making a SBL at Dairy Drive in the PM period increases from 110s to over 420s. This assumes that regular commuters do not adjust their route based on known conditions; it is unlikely that over 260 drivers will knowingly wait over 7 minutes at an intersection when there are other routes with less delay available.

Vehicles exiting the development at Famille-Laporte will experience high delay in the peak hours due to the existing high volumes along Old Montreal Road. It is likely that some residents will shift their exit point from the west access to the east access based on known traffic conditions. Anticipated delay is lower at the east access since there is not a north leg to the intersection, whichresults in fewer turning movements competing for the same gaps in traffic. Alternative future scenarios for Famille-Laporte, including traffic re-assignment and alternative intersection control, are presented in Section 0.

Table 10. Intersection Capacity Summary - Future Total (2022)

| MOVEMENT | VOLUME <br> (VPH) | DELAY <br> (SEC) | VLOS | V/C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q50th } \\ & \text { (m) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q95th } \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Old Montreal Road and Trim Road (Roundabout) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBL | 67 (44) | 6.4 (36.0) | A (E) | 0.10 (0.57) | - | 2.8 (17.3) |
| EBT | 80 (262) | 5.8 (32.6) | A (D) | 0.10 (0.57) | - | 2.8 (17.6) |
| EBR | 46 (256) | 4.9 (26.2) | A (D) | 0.06 (0.63) | - | 1.5 (23.2) |
| WBL | 188 (167) | 25.2 (8.5) | D (A) | 0.60 (0.26) | - | 21.9 (7.8) |
| WBT | 324 (206) | 22.4 (7.8) | C (A) | 0.60 (0.26) | - | 22.5 (7.8) |
| WBR | 321 (210) | 18.0 (6.9) | C (A) | 0.58 (0.26) | - | 22.9 (7.6) |
| NBL | 213 (134) | 13.5 (14.7) | B (B) | 0.66 (0.57) | - | 42.7 (25.6) |
| NBT | 1017 (549) | 13.2 (14.1) | B (B) | 0.66 (0.57) | - | 42.7 (25.6) |
| NBR | 123 (140) | 12.9 (13.6) | B (B) | 0.66 (0.57) | - | 41.7 (25.6) |
| SBL | 164 (401) | 10.6 (55.6) | B (F) | 0.38 (1.01) | - | 12.8 (208.9) |
| SBT | 328 (1297) | 10.2 (54.2) | B (F) | 0.38 (1.01) | - | 12.8 (217.5) |
| SBR | 25 (67) | 10.0 (53.4) | A (F) | 0.38 (1.01) | - | 12.5 (217.5) |


|  | VOLUME | DELAY | VLOS | V／C | Q50th | Q95th |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOVEMENT | $(\mathrm{VPH})$ | $(\mathrm{SEC})$ |  |  | $(\mathrm{m})$ | $(\mathrm{m})$ |


| Old Montreal Road and Dairy Drive <br> （Signalized） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBL | $40(4)$ | $4.7(6.6)$ | A（A） | $0.22(0.01)$ | $1.3(0.2)$ | $4.7(1.3)$ |  |
| EBTR | $304(741)$ | $4.3(18.0)$ | A（B） | $0.25(0.84)$ | $10.1(50.0)$ | $17.1(117.6)$ |  |
| WBL | 1() | $3.5(0.0)$ | A（A） | $0.00(0.00)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | $0.3(0.0)$ |  |
| WBTR | 733() | $13.7(10.0)$ | B（A） | $0.84(0.57)$ | $60.6(27.2)$ | $110.5(54.9)$ |  |
| NBTLR | 18() | $21.6(12.5)$ | C（B） | $0.07(0.03)$ | $1.7(0.9)$ | $6.7(3.9)$ |  |
| SBL | 27() | $21.9(18.7)$ | C（B） | $0.12(0.64)$ | $2.5(21.4)$ | $8.8(41.1)$ |  |
| SBTR | 12() | $21.3(12.6)$ | C（B） | $0.01(0.06)$ | $0.1(0.2)$ | $4.0(6.9)$ |  |

Old Montreal Road and Famille－Laporte Avenue／West Access
（Two－Way Stop Control）

| EBL | $60(99)$ | $10.1(8.2)$ | B（A） | $0.08(0.08)$ | - | $1.8(1.9)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBTR | $245(884)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A（A） | $0.14(0.52)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |
| WBL | $1(2)$ | $7.7(9.7)$ | A（A） | $0.00(0.00)$ | - | $0.0(0.1)$ |
| WBTR | $895(352)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A（A） | $0.53(0.21)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |
| NBTLR | $103(78)$ | $210.4(133.6)$ | F（F） | $1.19(0.89)$ | - | $51.0(34.0)$ |
| SBTLR | $122(84)$ | $22.9(13.7)$ | C（B） | $0.38(0.17)$ | - | $12.0(4.2)$ |

Old Montreal Road and East Access
（Two－Way Stop Control）

| EBTR | $201(806)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A（A） | $0.12(0.47)$ | - | $0.0(0.0$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WBL | $2(3)$ | $7.6(9.4)$ | A（A） | $0.00(0.00)$ | - | $0.0(0.1)$ |
| WBT | $828(301)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A（A） | $0.49(0.18)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |
| NBLR | $72(55)$ | $22.8(23.8)$ | C（C） | $0.26(0.22)$ | - | $7.2(5.9)$ |

Movement Legend：
NB／SB／EB／WB－northbound，southbound，eastbound，westbound
L／T／R－left，through，right
Examples：WBL－westbound left－turn，SBTLR－shared southbound through／left－turn／right－turn lane．

## FUTURE TOTAL CONDITIONS (2027)

The 2027 future total (future background plus additional site generated traffic) intersection capacity analysis results are summarized in Table 11. Both AM peak hour and PM peak hour are shown within the table, with the PM peak results shown within brackets. Results that do not meet the City's target VLOS of ' $D$ ' are highlighted in red.

Movements that had high delay and a poor LOS in the 2022 total traffic scenario continue to experience high delays.

Table 11. Intersection Capacity Summary - Future Total (2027)

|  | VOLUME | DELAY | VLOS | V/C | Q50th | Q95th |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOVEMENT | $(\mathrm{VPH})$ | $(\mathrm{SEC})$ |  | $(\mathrm{m})$ | $(\mathrm{m})$ |  |

Old Montreal Road and Trim Road
(Roundabout)

| EBL | $74(45)$ | $5.9(35.5)$ | A (E) | $0.10(0.58)$ | - | $2.7(17.7)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBT | $69(274)$ | $6.5(32.2)$ | A (D) | $0.10(0.58)$ | - | $2.8(18.1)$ |
| EBR | $50(280)$ | $5.2(29.3)$ | A (D) | $0.06(0.69)$ | - | $1.7(27.0)$ |
| WBL | $196(175)$ | $29.6(9.3)$ | D (A) | $0.63(0.29)$ | - | $22.4(8.6)$ |
| WBT | $279(213)$ | $25.8(8.5)$ | D (A) | $0.63(0.29)$ | - | $23.1(8.6)$ |
| WBR | $204(219)$ | $14.0(7.5)$ | B (A) | $0.41(0.27)$ | - | $12.8(8.3)$ |
| NBL | $233(147)$ | $14.8(16.1)$ | B (C) | $0.70(0.61)$ | - | $51.9(29.7)$ |
| NBT | $1121(599)$ | $14.4(15.5)$ | B (C) | $0.70(0.61)$ | - | $51.9(29.7)$ |
| NBR | $138(148)$ | $14.1(14.9)$ | B (B) | $0.70(0.61)$ | - | $50.6(29.7)$ |
| SBL | $132(421)$ | $10.6(91.0)$ | B (F) | $0.38(1.12)$ | - | $13.1(374.3)$ |
| SBT | $368(1418)$ | $10.1(89.6)$ | B (F) | $0.38(1.12)$ | - | $13.1(399.6)$ |
| SBR | $34(73)$ | $9.9(89.9)$ | A (F) | $0.38(1.12)$ | - | $12.9(399.6)$ |

Old Montreal Road and Dairy Drive
(Signalized)

| EBL | $41(4)$ | $5.2(6.6)$ | A (A) | $0.20(0.01)$ | $1.3(0.2)$ | $4.7(1.3)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBTR | $275(784)$ | $5.0(11.5)$ | A (B) | $0.25(0.86)$ | $9.0(5.9)$ | $16.5(126.4)$ |
| WBL | $1(0)$ | $4.2(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.00(0.00)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | $0.4(0.0)$ |
| WBTR | $855(531)$ | $8.0(10.2)$ | A (B) | $0.81(0.59)$ | $42.8(30.1)$ | $84.2(58.4)$ |
| NBTLR | $18(17)$ | $16.3(12.9)$ | B (B) | $0.06(0.03)$ | $1.4(0.9)$ | $5.5(4.2)$ |
| SBL | $28(283)$ | $16.6(21.1)$ | B (C) | $0.10(0.69)$ | $2.1(23.8)$ | $7.2(44.5)$ |
| SBTR | $13(84)$ | $16.2(13.0)$ | B (B) | $0.01(0.06)$ | $0.1(0.2)$ | $3.4(7.1)$ |

Old Montreal Road and Famille-Laporte Avenue / West Access
(Two-Way Stop Control)

| (Two-Way Stop Control) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBL | $55(109)$ | $9.6(8.3)$ | A (A) | $0.07(0.09)$ | - | $1.5(2.1)$ |
| EBTR | $221(927)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.13(0.55)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |
| WBL | $1(2)$ | $7.6(9.8)$ | A (A) | $0.00(0.00)$ | - | $0.0(0.1)$ |
| WBTR | $791(365)$ | $0.0(0.0)$ | A (A) | $0.47(0.21)$ | - | $0.0(0.0)$ |
| NBTLR | $102(78)$ | $85.2(185.0)$ | F (F) | $0.79(1.04)$ | - | $33.1(39.3)$ |
| SBTLR | $100(93)$ | $18.6(14.8)$ | C (B) | $0.27(0.20)$ | - | $7.7(5.1)$ |

## "

| MOVEMENT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { VOLUME } \\ & \text { (VPH) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELAY } \\ (\mathrm{SEC}) \end{gathered}$ | VLOS | V/C | Q50th <br> (m) | Q95th <br> (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Old Montreal Road and East Access (Two-Way Stop Control) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EBTR | 177 (849) | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.10 (0.50) | - | 0.0 (0.0) |
| WBL | 2 (3) | 7.6 (9.5) | A (A) | 0.00 (0.00) | - | 0.0 (0.1) |
| WBT | 724 (314) | 0.0 (0.0) | A (A) | 0.43 (0.18) | - | 0.0 (0.0) |
| NBLR | 72 (55) | 19.1 (25.8) | C (D) | 0.22 (0.24) | - | 5.8 (6.4) |

Movement Legend:
NB / SB / EB / WB - northbound, southbound, eastbound, westbound
L / T/ R - left, through, right
Examples: WBL - westbound left-turn, SBTLR - shared southbound through / left-turn / right-turn lane.

## SUMMARY OF VEHICLE CAPACITY ANALYSIS

## Old Montreal Road and Trim Road

- Analysed as a roundabout using the existing lane arrangement for all scenarios
- All southbound and the eastbound left movements operate over capacity in the PM peak hour by 2027 under the background traffic scenario


## Old Montreal Road and Dairy Drive

- Analysed as a two-way stop control under existing, 2022 background, and 2027 background scenarios
- Analysed as a traffic signal under the 2022 total and 2027 total scenarios (the scenarios that traffic signal warrants were met)
- A traffic signal improves the intersection operations by reducing the delay experienced by vehicles making a northbound or southbound left/through movement


## Old Montreal Road and Famille Laporte Avenue

- Analyzed as a two-way stop control using the existing lane arrangement on Old Montreal Road for all scenarios (no traffic signal warrant was met)
- Vehicles making a northbound left movement out of the proposed Phoenix development experience high delay
- Alternative intersection configurations are considered in Section 0


## Old Montreal Road and East Access

- Analyzed as a two-way stop control with no eastbound left turn lane (left turn lane warrant not met)
- Intersection operates with an acceptable level of service for all scenarios


### 9.3. FAMILLE-LAPORTE AVENUE ALTERNATIVES

The analysis of intersection operations for the 2022 and 2027 future total conditions show that vehicles exiting the development at Famille-Laporte will experience high delay in the peak hours due to the existing high volumes along Old Montreal Road and conflicting vehicle movements entering/existing Cardinal Creek Village. Additional alternative scenarios at Famille-Laporte were considered and include

1 Reassignment of traffic from the west full movement access to east full movement access to determine if / when a balanced v/c ratio can be achieved
2 Roundabout (single lane)
3 Traffic signal with east \& west left turn lanes
Reassignment: High delay at Famille-Laporte Avenue under baseline conditions would likely see a redistribution of exiting traffic to the East Access. The northbound approach delay at these two intersections is expected to be approximately equal if $95 \%$ of exiting left-turn traffic uses the East Access. While feasible as an interim measure, this is not a long-term solution.

Roundabout: Roundabouts are not generally implemented along corridors with insufficient gaps in the major traffic flow to accommodate the minor flow or at intersections with significantly unbalanced traffic volumes on the approach roads which is the case at this location, therefore a roundabout was not further considered.

Crash history at this intersection was provided as part of the larger road segment. Of the nine crashes in this area, eight were single motor vehicle and not the head-on, right angle, or left-turn across crashes that indicate that a roundabout may be suitable. There were no fatal crashes.

Roundabouts are suitable for locations where there is a transition from a rural to an urban environment. In the 2022 and 2027 planning horizon it is expected that there will be two new accesses to Cardinal Creek Village to the east within the general urban area.

Traffic Signals: The addition of a traffic signal reduces the average delay for exiting northbound traffic at the West Access to approximately 20s during both peak hours. A signal introduces some minor delays to eastbound and westbound traffic. Overall average intersection delay is comparable to baseline conditions. See Table $\mathbf{1 2}$ for the intersection operations summary.

Table 12. Intersection Capacity Summary - Famille Laporte Avenue Traffic Signal - 2027 Total
MOVEMENT $\quad$ VOLUME $\quad$ DELAY (S) VLOS $\quad$ V/C $\quad$ Q50th (M) $\quad$ Q95th (M)

| Old Montreal Road and Famille-Laporte Avenue / West Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EBL | $55(109)$ | $4.1(3.5)$ | A (A) | $0.12(0.15)$ | $1.9(3.8)$ | $6.1(9.2)$ |  |
| EBTR | $221(927)$ | $4.0(8.7)$ | A (B) | $0.18(0.70)$ | $7.3(58.7)$ | $16.4(111.3)$ |  |
| WBLTR | $791(365)$ | $8.3(3.9)$ | B (A) | $0.64(0.28)$ | $43.4(14.2)$ | $87.7(26.2)$ |  |
| NBTLR | $102(78)$ | $26.6(31.8)$ | C (C) | $0.34(0.29)$ | $5.9(4.9)$ | $16.5(15.2)$ |  |
| SBTLR | $100(93)$ | $24.8(30.3)$ | C (C) | $0.09(0.09)$ | $0.7(0.8)$ | $10.4(11.3)$ |  |

Movement Legend:
NB / SB / EB / WB - northbound, southbound, eastbound, westbound
L / T/ R - left, through, right
Examples: WBL - westbound left-turn, SBTLR - shared southbound through / left-turn / right-turn lane.

Considering the baseline conditions and three alternatives, a traffic signal is most appropriate at this location.

## 10. SUMMARY OF IMPROVEMENTS AND MODIFICATION OPTIONS

### 10.1. CONCLUSIONS

Background traffic analysed includes known developments in the area. The largest known development is the multi-phased Cardinal Creek Village located directly to the north of the proposed Phoenix Development. Cardinal Creek Village is a major generator of traffic in this area. The 2022 planning horizon has indicated that an additional 374 westbound trips during the AM peak hour and 398 eastbound trips during the PM peak hour have been assigned to Old Montreal Road. By the 2027 planning horizon year, the Cardinal Creek Village will have a new signalized connection to Highway 174 approximately 1.5 km east of Trim Road. This new intersection is expected to change internal traffic patterns and reduce the number of trips on Old Montreal Road. Also for the 2027 planning horizon, the Cardinal Creek Village will have added 182 westbound trips during the AM peak hour and 170 eastbound trips during the PM peak hour to Old Montreal Road.

As background traffic continues to increase there is a corresponding decrease in LOS and v/c ratios at existing intersections in the study area. By 2027, SB movements and the EBL movement at the Trim Road / Old Montreal Road roundabout are operating over capacity with a LOS ' $E$ ' or ' $F$ '. This represents a degradation in the LOS when compared with the existing conditions. These reductions in LOS are typical as neighborhoods mature and as greenfields are developed for residential, commercial, or industrial uses.

The development of the Phoenix lands will increase pressures on the intersection LOS when compared to the background traffic scenarios. However, it is noted that new development growth along Old Montreal Road will also place additional pressure on the existing intersection conditions and cause similar reductions in LOS. Specifically, changes to the Cardinal Creek Village development (development plan, access locations, phasing) would impact on the Dairy Drive and Famille Laporte intersection operations.

In conclusion, the proposed development by Phoenix Homes located at 1154, 1172, 1180, and 1208 Old Montreal:
a) is appropriately designed for sustainable modes,
b) is aligned with the City of Ottawa's broader city-building objectives,
c) generates fewer vehicle trips than the Cardinal Creek Village development,
d) can be accommodated with impacts to traffic operations for the 2022 and 2027 planning horizons being managed.

The proposed development is appropriate from a transportation planning perspective taking into consideration the City of Ottawa's Transportation Master Plan, Official Plan, and the recommendations of this report (Section 0).

### 10.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

## 1. Designing for Sustainable Modes

To reduce walking distance to existing transit stops, consider:
a) Removing the deviation in the proposed sidewalk north of Block 9, if not otherwise required to comply with a $5 \%$ running slope.
b) Moving the nearby eastbound bus stop from Grand Chène Crescent to the northeast (far-side) corner of the intersection of Old Montreal Road with Famille-Laporte Avenue.

## Reference: Section 2.1

## 2. Boundary Street Design

No modifications to the boundary street design are required to accommodate this development. The future widening of Old Montreal Road in this area proposed in the City's Transportation Master Plan could provide additional capacity and improved facilities for all transportation modes.

## Reference: Section 4

## 3. Intersection Design

a) Old Montreal Road and Trim Road. No modifications are proposed. It is noted that southbound traffic movements at this location will exceed available intersection capacity without the addition of the proposed development generated traffic.
b) Old Montreal Road and Dairy Drive. The installation of a traffic signal is proposed as part of a City assessment focused on the provision of increased capacity to serve the rural areas located to the east. Alternatively, potential changes either in scale or phasing of the Cardinal Creek Village development (located to the north) would reduce pressure on Old Montreal Road.
c) Old Montreal Road and Famille-Laporte Avenue. The installation of a traffic signal is proposed to provide opportunities for vehicles to make left-turns to and from the north and south legs of the intersection without high levels of delay. The intersection should include accessible pedestrian crosswalks following OTM Book 11 (Pavement Markings) and Book 15 (Pedestrian Crossing Treatments).
d) Right-in / Right-out Accesses. Include a channelized island (Figure 2) to restrict left turns onto Old Montreal Road from the Famille-Laporte Avenue access location.
e) Old Montreal Road and East Access: One-way (northbound) stop control intersection with eastwest accessible pedestrian crosswalk following OTM Book 11 (Pavement Markings) and Book 15 (Pedestrian Crossing Treatments). Westbound left turn volumes are expected to be low and do not require a left turn lane. Traffic signal warrants were not met.

Reference: Sections 0 and 9

## いゆ|"

## 11. ROAD MODIFICATION APPROVAL DRAWINGS

Following the City of Ottawa's acceptance of the TIA Strategy Report, one RMA drawings would be prepared and submitted as follows:

1 Famille Laporte Intersection to be upgraded to a traffic signal with the following lane arrangement (Section 0):

- Eastbound Left (as existing)
- Eastbound Through / Right
- Westbound Left / Through / Right
- Northbound Left / Through / Right
- Southbound Left / Through / Right (as existing)


## APPENDIX



TDM
CHECKLIST

## 1154, 1172, 1180, and 1208 Old Montreal Road

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

## Legend

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

|  | TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: Residential developments |  | Check if completed \& add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1. | WALKING \& CYCLING: ROUTES |  |  |
|  | 1.1 | Building location \& access points |  |  |
| BASIC | 1.1.1 | Locate building close to the street, and do not locate parking areas between the street and building entrances |  | No parking is located between any multi-unit building and the street / sidewalk |
| BASIC | 1.1.2 | Locate building entrances in order to minimize walking distances to sidewalks and transit stops/stations |  | Direct connections ( $<10 \mathrm{~m}$ ) between sidewalk and main building entrances. Majority of multi-unit buildings located closer to Old Montreal Road and nearest transit stop |
| BASIC | 1.1.3 | Locate building doors and windows to ensure visibility of pedestrians from the building, for their security and comfort |  | Building doors and windows face Old Montreal Road or internal site pedestrian facilities |
|  | 1.2 | Facilities for walking \& cycling |  |  |
| REQUIRED | 1.2.1 | Provide convenient, direct access to stations or major stops along rapid transit routes within 600 metres; minimize walking distances from buildings to rapid transit; provide pedestrian-friendly, weather-protected (where possible) environment between rapid transit accesses and building entrances; ensure quality linkages from sidewalks through building entrances to integrated stops/stations (see Official Plan policy 4.3.3) |  | Trim Road is nearest rapid transit station, at approximately 1250 m walking distance. Concrete sidewalks provided on-site to connect to nearest transit stop on Old Montreal Road |
| REQUIRED | 1.2 .2 | Provide safe, direct and attractive pedestrian access from public sidewalks to building entrances through such measures as: reducing distances between public sidewalks and major building entrances; providing walkways from public streets to major building entrances; within a site, providing walkways along the front of adjoining buildings, between adjacent buildings, and connecting areas where people may congregate, such as courtyards and transit stops; and providing |  | Direct connections ( $<10 \mathrm{~m}$ ) between main building entrances and sidewalks on Old Montreal Road or new internal roadways. Sidewalks are located in front of all multi-unit buildings |

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

$\left.$|  | TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Residential developments |  |$\quad$|  |
| :--- |
| add descriptions, explanations |
| or plan/drawing references | \right\rvert\, | 2. | WALKING \& CYCLING: END-OF-TRIP FACILITIES |
| :--- | :--- |


| TDM-supportive design \& infrastructure measures: Residential developments |  |  | Check if completed \& add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4. | RIDESHARING |  |
|  | 4.1 | Pick-up \& drop-off facilities |  |
| BASIC | 4.1.1 | Provide a designated area for carpool drivers (plus taxis and ride-hailing services) to drop off or pick up passengers without using fire lanes or other no-stopping zones | 囚 |
|  | 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) | * |
|  | 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 | * |
|  | 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 | The proposed number of parking spaces will meet the requirements of the City's Zoning By-law |
| 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 | On-road and visitor parking spaces provided for short-term users. |
| 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) | 区 |
| 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) | * |
|  | 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) | To be confirmed during site plan development |

## APPENDIX

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

| SCENARIO | Future Background |  | YEAR | 2022 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJOR ROAD | Old Montreal Road |  | MINOR ROAD | Dairy Drive |  |
| FLOW TYPE | Restricted |  | ROAD TYPE | 1 Lane |  |
| NEW ROAD / INT. | No |  | "T" INT. | No |  |
|  | MINIMUM REQUIREMENT |  |  | COMPLIANCE |  |
| JUSTIFICATION | FLOW | ADJ. FLOW | AHV | \% | OVERALL \% |
| 1A - All Approaches | 470 | 565 | 620 | 110\% | 62\% |
| 1B - Minor Road | 120 | 145 | 90 | 62\% |  |
| 2A - Major Road | 480 | 575 | 530 | 92\% | 92 |
| 2B - Crossing Major Road | 50 | 60 | 65 | 108\% |  |


| SCENARIO | Future Background |  | YEAR | 2022 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJOR ROAD | Old Montreal Road M |  | MINOR ROAD | Famille-Laporte / West Access |  |
| FLOW TYPE | Restricted |  | ROAD TYPE | 1 Lane |  |
| NEW ROAD / INT. | No |  | "T" INT. | No |  |
|  | MINIMUM REQUIREMENT |  | T AHV | COMPLIANCE |  |
| JUSTIFICATION | FLOW | ADJ. FLOW |  | \% | OVERALL \% |
| 1A - All Approaches | 470 | 565 | 595 | 105\% | 34\% |
| 1B - Minor Road | 120 | 145 | 50 | 34\% |  |
| 2A - Major Road | 480 | 575 | 545 | 95\% | 17\% |
| 2B - Crossing Major Road | 50 | 60 | 10 | 17\% |  |


| SCENARIO | Future Background |  | YEAR | 2027 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJOR ROAD | Old Montreal Road M |  | MINOR ROAD | Dairy Drive |  |
| FLOW TYPE | Restricted |  | ROAD TYPE | 1 Lane |  |
| NEW ROAD / INT. | No |  | "T" INT. | No |  |
|  | MINIMUM REQUIREMENT |  |  | COMPLIANCE |  |
| JUSTIFICATION | FLOW | ADJ. FLOW | AHV | \% | OVERALL \% |
| 1A - All Approaches | 470 | 565 | 600 | 106\% | 66\% |
| 1B - Minor Road | 120 | 145 | 95 | 66\% |  |
| 2A - Major Road | 480 | 575 | 505 | 88\% | 88\% |
| 2B - Crossing Major Road | 50 | 60 | 75 | 125\% |  |


| SCENARIO | Future Background |  | YEAR | 2027 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJOR ROAD | Old Montreal Road M |  | MINOR ROAD | Famille-Laporte / West Access |  |
| FLOW TYPE | Restricted |  | ROAD TYPE | 1 Lane |  |
| NEW ROAD / INT. | No |  | "T" INT. | No |  |
|  | MINIMUM REQUIREMENT |  | T AHV | COMPLIANCE |  |
| JUSTIFICATION | FLOW | ADJ. FLOW |  | \% | OVERALL \% |
| 1A - All Approaches | 470 | 565 | 575 | 102\% | 34\% |
| 1B - Minor Road | 120 | 145 | 50 | 34\% |  |
| 2A - Major Road | 480 | 575 | 525 | 91\% | 17\% |
| 2B - Crossing Major Road | 50 | 60 | 10 | 17\% |  |


| SCENARIO | Future Tota |  | YEAR |  | 22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJOR ROAD | Old Montreal R |  | MINOR ROAD |  | Drive |
| FLOW TYPE | Restricted |  | ROAD TYPE |  | ane |
| NEW ROAD / INT. | No |  | "T" INT. |  | o |
|  | MINIMUM | QUIREMENT |  | CO | IANCE |
| JUSTIFICATION | FLOW | ADJ. FLOW | AHV | \% | OVERALL \% |
| 1A - All Approaches | 470 | 565 | 755 | 134\% | 72\% |
| 1B - Minor Road | 120 | 145 | 105 | 72\% |  |
| 2A - Major Road | 480 | 575 | 650 | 113\% | 13\% |
| 2B - Crossing Major Road | 50 | 60 | 85 | 142\% | 13 |


| SCENARIO | Future Total |  | YEAR | 2022 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJOR ROAD | Old Montreal Road |  | MINOR ROAD | Famille-Laporte / West Access |  |
| FLOW TYPE | Restricted |  |  | 1 Lane |  |
| NEW ROAD / INT. | Yes |  | "T" INT. | No |  |
|  | MINIMUM REQUIREMENT |  | T AHV | COMPLIANCE |  |
| JUSTIFICATION | FLOW | ADJ. FLOW |  | \% | OVERALL \% |
| 1A - All Approaches | 470 | 705 | 735 | 104\% | 56\% |
| 1B - Minor Road | 120 | 180 | 100 | 56\% |  |
| 2A - Major Road | 480 | 720 | 635 | 88\% | 73\% |
| 2B - Crossing Major Road | 50 | 75 | 55 | 73\% |  |


| SCENARIO | Future Tot |  | YEAR |  | 22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJOR ROAD | Old Montreal |  | MINOR ROAD |  | Access |
| FLOW TYPE | Restricted |  | ROAD TYPE |  | ane |
| NEW ROAD / INT. | Yes |  | "T" INT. |  | es |
|  | MINIMUM | QUIREMENT |  |  | IANCE |
| JUSTIFICATION | FLOW | ADJ. FLOW | AHV | \% | OVERALL \% |
| 1A - All Approaches | 470 | 705 | 570 | 81\% | 1\% |
| 1B - Minor Road | 120 | 270 | 30 | 11\% | 11\% |
| 2A - Major Road | 480 | 720 | 535 | 74\% |  |
| 2B - Crossing Major Road | 50 | 75 | 30 | 40\% | 40\% |


| SCENARIO | Future Tota |  | YEAR |  | 27 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJOR ROAD | Old Montreal R |  | MINOR ROAD |  | Drive |
| FLOW TYPE | Restricted |  | ROAD TYPE |  | Lane |
| NEW ROAD / INT. | No |  | "T" INT. |  | No |
|  | MINIMUM | QUIREMENT |  | CO | LIANCE |
| JUSTIFICATION | FLOW | ADJ. FLOW | AHV | \% | OVERALL \% |
| 1A - All Approaches | 470 | 565 | 735 | 130\% | 76\% |
| 1B - Minor Road | 120 | 145 | 110 | 76\% |  |
| 2A - Major Road | 480 | 575 | 625 | 109\% | 09\% |
| 2B - Crossing Major Road | 50 | 60 | 90 | 150\% |  |


| SCENARIO | Future Tota |  | YEAR |  | 027 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJOR ROAD | Old Montreal |  | MINOR ROAD | Famille-La | te / West Access |
| FLOW TYPE | Restricted |  | ROAD TYPE |  | Lane |
| NEW ROAD / INT. | Yes |  | "T" INT. |  | No |
|  | MINIMUM | QUIREMENT |  | CO | LIANCE |
| JUSTIFICATION | FLOW | ADJ. FLOW | AHV | \% | OVERALL \% |
| 1A - All Approaches | 470 | 705 | 715 | 101\% |  |
| 1B - Minor Road | 120 | 180 | 95 | 53\% |  |
| 2A - Major Road | 480 | 720 | 620 | 86\% | 73\% |
| 2B - Crossing Major Road | 50 | 75 | 55 | 73\% |  |


| SCENARIO | Future Tot |  | YEAR |  | 27 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJOR ROAD | Old Montreal |  | MINOR ROAD |  | Access |
| FLOW TYPE | Restricted |  | ROAD TYPE |  | ane |
| NEW ROAD / INT. | Yes |  | "T" INT. |  | es |
|  | MINIMUM | QUIREMENT |  |  | IANCE |
| JUSTIFICATION | FLOW | ADJ. FLOW | AHV | \% | OVERALL \% |
| 1A - All Approaches | 470 | 705 | 550 | 78\% | 1\% |
| 1B - Minor Road | 120 | 270 | 30 | 11\% | 11\% |
| 2A - Major Road | 480 | 720 | 520 | 72\% |  |
| 2B - Crossing Major Road | 50 | 75 | 30 | 40\% |  |

## APPENDIX

## DETAILED SYNCHRO SHEETS





| MajorMinor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Confilicting Flow All | 149 | 0 | - | 0 | 836 | 147 |  |  |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | - | 146 |  |  | . |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 690 | $\square$ |  |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.1 | - | - | - | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.4 | . |  |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.4 | - |  |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.2 | - | - | - | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1445 | - | . | - | 340 | 905 |  |  |
| Stage 1 | . | - | - | - | 886 | - |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 502 | - |  |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1444 | - | - | - | 313 | 903 |  |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 313 | - |  |  |
| Stage 1 | \%. | $\bullet$ | - | - | 884 | - |  | $2 \times$ |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 462 | - |  | U- |



| Minor LanelMajor Mumt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR S | BLII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1444 | . | . | I. | 780 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.078 | - | - | - | 0.12 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.7 | - | - | - | 10.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.3 |  |  | 4 | 0.4 |




| Approach EB |
| :--- |
| HCM Control Delay, s 1.5 |
| HCMLOS |






| Minor LaneMMajorMumt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBELI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 813 | . | - | 365 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.074 | - | - | - 0.334 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9.8 | . | - | 19.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | c |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.2 |  | - | 1.4 |



| MajorMinor | Majorl |  |  | ajor |  |  | Minorl |  |  | Minor2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 380 | 0 | 0 | 656 | 0 | 0 | 1066 | 1040 | 654 | 1028 | 1029 | 367 |  |
| Stage 1 | . | - | - | . | - | - | 660 | 660 |  | 365 | 365 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 406 | 380 | - | 663 | 664 | $\cdots$ |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.1 | - | - | 4.1 | - | - | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | . | - | - | . | - | - | 6.1 | 5.5 | . | 6.1 | 5.5 | . |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | . | - | 6.1 | 5.5 |  | 6.1 | 5.5 | $\cdots$ |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.2 | - | - | 2.2 | - | - | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.3 |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1190 | - | - | 941 | - | - | 202 | 232 | 470 | 214 | 236 | 683 |  |
| Stage 1 | . | - | - | . | - | - | 455 | 463 | - | 658 | 627 | . |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 626 | 617 |  | 454 | 461 |  |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1188 | - | - | 939 | . | - | 177 | 231 | 468 | - 210 | 235 | 682 |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | 177 | 231 |  | $\sim 210$ | 235 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | W. | - | - | - | - | - | 453 | 461 |  | 656 | 627 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 553 | 617 | - | 446 | 459 | - | - $=$ |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 23.5 | 84.1 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | C | F |



## Notes

- Volume exceeds capacity \$: Delay exceeds 300s + Computation Not Defined. All major volume in platoon




| MinorLaneMMajor Mum | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBBS | BELnt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1272 | - | . | .. | 608 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.078 | - | - | - | 0.138 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.1 | - | - | - | 11.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile $Q$ (veh) | 0.3 |  |  | 4 | 0.5 |



Approach
HCM Control Delay, s 51.6 WB
HCM LOS




| Minor Lane/Major Mumt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBRS | EBEm1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 889 | . | I. | - | 418 |
| HCM Lane VIC Ratio | 0.062 | - | - | 0 | 0.239 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9.3 | - | - | - | 16.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - | C |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.2 | 7 | - | . | 0.9 |




| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 25.9 | 1333 |
| HCMLOS |  |  | D | F |







| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBE | SBT | SBB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }_{4}$ | $F$ |  | ${ }_{5}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{*}$ |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 40 | 298 | 6 | 1 | 733 | 260 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 11 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 298 | 6 | 1 | 733 | 260 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 11 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 5.2 | 5.2 |  | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |  | 5.2 |  | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.86 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.97 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1729 | 1814 |  | 1721 | 1749 |  |  | 1771 |  | 1723 | 1570 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.15 | 1.00 |  | 0.57 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.86 |  | 0.75 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 277 | 1814 |  | 1042 | 1749 |  |  | 1574 |  | 1353 | 1570 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 100 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 40 | 298 | 6 | 1 | 733 | 260 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 11 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 40 | 303 | 0 | 1 | 979 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 27 | 3 | 0 |
| Conti. Peds. (\#hr) |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 40.5 | 40.5 |  | 40.5 | 40.5 |  |  | 10.2 |  | 10.2 | 10.2 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 40.5 | 40.5 |  | 40.5 | 40.5 |  |  | 10.2 |  | 10.2 | 10.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.66 | 0.66 |  | 0.66 | 0.66 |  |  | 0.17 |  | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |
| Clearance Time ( s ) | 5.2 | 5.2 |  | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |  | 5.2 |  | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 183 | 1202 |  | 690 | 1159 |  |  | 262 |  | 225 | 262 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot |  | 0.17 |  |  | c0.56 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Perm | 0.14 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.01 |  | c0.02 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.22 | 0.25 |  | 0.00 | 0.84 |  |  | 0.07 |  | 0.12 | 0.01 |  |
| Unitorm Delay, dl | 4.1 | 4.2 |  | 3.5 | 7.9 |  |  | 21.4 |  | 21.6 | 21.2 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.6 | 0.1 |  | 0.0 | 5.8 |  |  | 0.1 |  | 0.2 | 0.0 |  |
| Delay (s) | 4.7 | 4.3 |  | 3.5 | 13.7 |  |  | 21.6 |  | 21.9 | 21.3 |  |
| Level of Service | A | A |  | A | B |  |  | c |  | c | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 4.3 |  |  | 13.7 |  |  | 21.6 |  |  | 21.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | c |  |

intersection Summary

| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 11.7 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.70 |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 61.1 | Sum of lost time (s) | 10.4 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 74.9\% | ICU Level of Service | D |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 17.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBA | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBA |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }_{4}$ | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Trafic Vol, vehh | 60 | 219 | 26 | 1 | 874 | 21 | 97 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 115 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 60 | 219 | 26 | 1 | 874 | 21 | 97 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 115 |
| Conficting Peds, \#hr |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | . |  | None | \%. |  | None | . |  | None | . |  | None |
| Storage Length | 1250 | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | $\cdot$ | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Munt Flow | 60 | 219 | 26 | 1 | 874 | 21 | 97 | 0 | 5 | . 7 | 0 | 115 |



| Approach EB |
| :--- |
| HCM Control Delay, S |
| HCMLOS |


| Minor LaneMajor Mvmt | NBLIL | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | BLI 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 92 | 767 | ( | . | 1333 | [. | [. | 321 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 1.109 | 0.078 | - | - | 0.001 | - | - | 0.38 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 210.4 | 10.1 | - | - | 7.7 | A | \%. | 22.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | B | - | - | A | A | - | c |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 6.8 | 0.3 | - | - | 0 | . | . | 1.7 |

Notes
$\sim$ Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300 s. + Computation Not Defined. : All major volume in platoon



| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | A |





| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | A |






|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 6 | - | * | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\frac{1}{\square}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBA | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBE | NBT | NBA | SBL | SBT | SB6 |
| Lane Contigurations | ${ }_{4}$ | $\dagger$ |  | 4 | F |  |  | 4 |  | ${ }_{4}$ | $\dagger$ |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 4 | 741 | 8 | 0 | 461 | 48 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 264 | 3 | 76 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 4 | 741 | 8 | 0 | 461 | 48 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 264 | 3 | 76 |
| Ideal Flow (vphil) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |  | 5.2 |  |  | 5.2 |  | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |
| Lane Util Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |
| Flpb, pedbikes | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 0.86 |  |
| Fil Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 0.97 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1729 | 1817 |  |  | 1794 |  |  | 1710 |  | 1724 | 1523 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.38 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.87 |  | 0.75 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 695 | 1817 |  |  | 1794 |  |  | 1529 |  | 1356 | 1523 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 100 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 4 | 741 | 8 | 0 | 461 | 48 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 264 | 3 | 76 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 4 | 748 | 0 | 0 | 503 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 264 | 26 | 0 |
| Conil Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 24.9 | 24.9 |  |  | 24.9 |  |  | 15.3 |  | 15.3 | 15.3 |  |
| Effective Green, $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{s})$ | 24.9 | 24.9 |  |  | 24.9 |  |  | 15.3 |  | 15.3 | 15.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.49 | 0.49 |  |  | 0.49 |  |  | 0.30 |  | 0.30 | 0.30 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |  | 5.2 |  |  | 5.2 |  | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 342 | 894 |  |  | 882 |  |  | 462 |  | 410 | 460 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot |  | c0.41 |  |  | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01 |  | co. 19 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.01 | 0.84 |  |  | 0.57 |  |  | 0.03 |  | 0.64 | 0.06 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 6.6 | 11.1 |  |  | 9.1 |  |  | 12.4 |  | 15.3 | 12.5 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.0 | 6.9 |  |  | 0.9 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 3.5 | 0.1 |  |
| Delay (s) | 6.6 | 18.0 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  | 12.5 |  | 18.7 | 12.6 |  |
| Level of Service | A | B |  |  | A |  |  | B |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 17.9 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  | 12.5 |  |  | 17.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  |  | 15.2 |  | HCM 2000 | evel of S | ervice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 50.6 |  | Sum of lost | time (s) |  |  | 10.4 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 72.5\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | C |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) $\int_{\text {a }}$ |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Approach |
| :--- |
| HCM Control Delay, S |
| HCMLOS |


| Minor LanelMajor Mumt | NBLn 1 | EBL | EBT | EBA |  | WBT | WBB | SBEn1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 93 | 1215 |  | - | 773 |  |  | 496 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.839 | 0.081 | - | - | 0.003 | - |  | 0.169 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 133.6 | 8.2 |  | . | 9.7 | 0 |  | 13.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | A |  | - | A | A | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 4.6 | 0.3 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0.6 |







| MajorMinor | Majorl |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | - | - | . | 816 |
| Stage 1 | . | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | $\cdots$ |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 6.2 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | . |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 3.3 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 380 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | $\cdot$ |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | ¢. | - | - | - | - | 380 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | \%. | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - |  |






| Approach |
| :--- |
| HCM Control Delay, S |
| O. WB |
| HCM LOS |



|  | * | $\rightarrow$ | \% | 4 | $\downarrow$ | $4$ | 4 | ¢ | P | ( | $\frac{1}{7}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SB1 | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\dagger$ | $F$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | t |  |  | \& |  | 7 | t |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 41 | 268 | 7 | 1 | 576. | 279 | 11 | 8. | 0 | 28 | 1 | 12 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 41 | 268 | 7 | 1 | 576 | 279 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 12 |
| (deal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 5.2 | 5.2 |  | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |  | 5.2 |  | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |
| Lane Uill Factor. | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.86 |  |
| Fil Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 100 |  |  | 0.97 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1729 | 1812 |  | 1722 | 1731 |  |  | 1769 |  | 1724 | 1568 |  |
| Fit Permitted | 0.19 | 1.00 |  | 0.59 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.86 |  | 0.75 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 348 | 1812 |  | 1070 | 1731 |  |  | 1567 |  | 1352 | 1568 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 100 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 100 | 100 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 100 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 41 | 268 | 7 | 1 | 576 | 279 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 12 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 41 | 274 | 0 | 1 | 831 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 28 | 3 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, $\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{s})$ | 29.9 | 29.9 |  | 29.9 | 29.9 |  |  | 10.1 |  | 10.1 | 10.1 |  |
| Effective Green, $g(\mathrm{~s})$ | 29.9 | 29.9 |  | 29.9 | 29.9 |  |  | 10.1 |  | 10.1 | 10.1 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.59 | 0.59 |  | 0.59 | 0.59 |  |  | 0.20 |  | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 5.2 | 5.2 |  | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |  | 5.2 |  | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 206 | 1074 |  | 634 | 1026 |  |  | 314 |  | 270 | 314 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot |  | 0.15 |  |  | c0.48 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Perm | 0.12 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  | 0.01 |  | co. 02 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.25 |  | 0.00 | 0.81 |  |  | 0.06 |  | 0.10 | 0.01 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 4.7 | 4.9 |  | 4.2 | 8.0 |  |  | 16.3 |  | 16.5 | 16.1 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.5 | 0.1 |  | 0.0 | 4.9 |  |  | 0.1 |  | 0.2 | 0.0 |  |
| Delay (s) | 5.2 | 5.0 |  | 4.2 | 13.0 |  |  | 16.4 |  | 16.6 | 16.2 |  |
| Level of Service | A | A |  | A | B |  |  | B |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 5.1 |  |  | 13.0 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| Approach LOS.. |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 11.1 |  | HCM 2000 | evel of | ervice |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 50.4 |  | Sum of los | ime (s) |  |  | 10.4 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 67.4\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | C |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Approach |
| :--- |
| EB |
| HCM Control Delay, S |
| HCM LOS |



| Intersection |  | EBR |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBH |
| Movement | EBT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | ¢ |  | 7 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 189 | 19 | 0 | 793 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 189 | 19 | 0 | 793 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | $\cdot$ | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mumt Flow | 189 | 19 | 0 | 793 | 0 | 0 |



| Minor LanelMajor Mumt | NBLII | EBT | EBR | WBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | S. | . | . | . |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | - | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay ( $s$ ) | 0 | $\bullet$ | - | - |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  |  |  |  |  |











| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.9 | 0.1 | 185 | 14.8 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | F | B |


| Minor LaneMajor Mumt | NBL[n1 | EBL | EBT | EBP | WBE | WBT | WBRS | BLII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 80 | 1202 | . | . | 745 | . |  | 461 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.975 | 0.091 | - | - | 0.003 | - |  | 0.202 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 185 | 8.3 | - | . | 9.8 | 0 | - | 14.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | A | - | - | A | A | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 5.3 | 0.3 |  |  | 0 |  | - | 0.7 |



| MajorMinor | Majorl |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | - | - |  | 883 |
| Stage 1 | - | . | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 6.2 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 3.3 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 348 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | . | - | - | - | - | 348 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | \%. | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |






| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | A |








[^0]:    1,2
    License of registration body that oversees the profession is required to have a code of conduct and ethics guidelines that will ensure appropriate conduct and representation for transportation planning and/or transportation engineering works.

[^1]:    If none of the triggers are satisfied, the TIA Study is complete. If one or more of the triggers is satisfied, the TIA Study must continue into the next stage (Screening and Scoping).

[^2]:    Movement Legend:
    NB / SB / EB / WB - northbound, southbound, eastbound, westbound
    L / T/ R - left, through, right
    Examples: WBL - westbound left-turn, SBTLR - shared southbound through / left-turn / right-turn lane.

[^3]:    Movement Legend: NB / SB / EB / WB - northbound, southbound, eastbound, westbound

