## GHD <br> 

## Traffic Impact Study

2255718 Ontario Ltd.

25 January 2024



## Executive Summary

GHD Limited is pleased to provide the following Traffic Impact Study for a proposed residential development located on land with the municipal address of 621 Dundas Street East in the City of Belleville.
This report determines the site related traffic and subsequent traffic related impacts on the adjacent road network and site driveways during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. These impacts are based on the projected future background traffic and road network conditions derived for a 2025, 2027 2029, 2034, and 2039 future planning horizon years.

Based on the approved Terms of Reference, the following existing intersections were included in the study area:
> Dundas Street East and Haig Road/Proposed Site Access (unsignalized)
The proposed site plan consists of a total of 599 dwelling units proposed within nine blocks. The dwelling type and unit count per block are as follows:
> Block A: 185 dwelling units within 2 mid-rise buildings
> Block B: 80 stacked townhouse dwelling units
> Block $\mathrm{C}: 36$ bungalow townhouse dwelling units
> Block D: 7 detached townhouse dwelling units
> Block E: 40 2-storey townhouse dwelling units and 36 bungalow townhouse dwelling units
> Block F: 72 back-to-back dwelling units
> Block G: 96 stacked townhouse dwelling units
> Block H: 29 detached dwelling units
> Block I: 18 2-storey townhouse dwelling units
Access to the subject site is proposed via a full-moves access on the south leg of the existing intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road.

Based on ITE Trip Generation rates using Land Use Codes 210, 215, 220, and 221, the full build-out of the subject site is expected to generate 342 two-way vehicle trips during the a.m. peak hour consisting of 82 inbound and 260 outbound trips. During the p.m. peak hour, it is expected to generate 388 new two-way vehicle trips consisting of 242 inbound and 146 outbound trips.

Under existing traffic conditions, the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is operating at acceptable v/c ratios and levels of service during the a.m. peak and p.m. peak hours.

Under future background 2025, 2027, 2029 and 2034 traffic conditions, including corridor growth, the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is reported to continue to operate at satisfactory levels of capacity and delays will all movements operating at LOS of E or better.
Under the future total 2025 condition, with the addition of site generated traffic from Blocks A and F, the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is reported to continue to operate at a satisfactory levels of capacity, delays and queuing. The highest $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is reported during the p.m. peak hour for the southbound left turn which is reported to operate at a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio of 0.55 LOS D .
Under the future total 2027 condition, with the addition of site generated traffic which also includes Block B, E, G and I, the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is reported to continue to operate at mostly satisfactory levels, with the exception of the northbound and southbound left-turn movements during the p.m. peak hour which are reported to operate at a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio of 0.80 LOS F and 0.95 LOS F respectively.

Under the future total 2029 condition, with the addition of site generated traffic included for Blocks C, D and H, the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is reported to continue to operate at mostly satisfactory levels, however the northbound and southbound left-turn movements during the p.m. peak hour continue to report increased delays with the northbound left operating at 1.15 LOS F and the southbound left at 1.19 LOS F.

Despite signal warrants not being satisfied at the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road, it is recommended that the intersection be signalized to provide the required capacity for both the north and south legs exiting onto Dunda Street. The intersection was analyzed using a 90-second cycle length which resulted in reduced delays at the intersection without any impacts of queuing on Dundas Street or the adjacent railway crossing.

Under the future total 2029, 2034 and 2039 traffic scenarios, the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is reported to operate at satisfactory $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios, delays and queuing as a signalized intersection.

The reported queuing along Dundas Street from the introduction of the traffic signal control is not expected to negatively impact the adjacent railway crossing to the west of the intersection as the reported $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths are not reported to extend to the at-grade crossing.

Application of the City of Belleville By-Law parking rates to the subject site results in a requirement of a minimum of 737 vehicle parking spaces for the subject site.

The City of Belleville is currently undergoing a Zoning By-law Consolidation to update and consolidate the three existing By-laws currently governing the City. Application of the City's Draft By-law rates to the subject site results in a requirement of a minimum of 670 vehicle parking spaces ( 552 resident and 118 visitor spaces), 100 bicycle parking spaces, and two loading spaces for the mid-rise buildings.

The subject site provides a total of 846 vehicular parking spaces, exceeding the By-law requirement for the overall site. However, Block F falls short one parking space when reviewing the By-law requirement for each block with the shortfall being accommodated by sharing visitor parking between all blocks.

GHD assessed the site circulation for an emergency vehicle and waste collection vehicle and confirmed no issues with the site circulation.

The traffic study confirms that the proposed residential development is expected to have a minimal impact on the future capacity of the adjacent road network with the recommended signalization of the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road.

We trust that this satisfies your requirements, but do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if you have any questions.

Sincerely,


Rafael Andrenacci, B.Eng
Transportation Planner


William Maria, P. Eng.
Transportation Planning Lead
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## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Retainer and Objective

GHD Limited was retained to prepare a Traffic Impact Study for a proposed residential development located on land municipally known as 621 Dundas Street East in the City of Bellville

The site location is illustrated in Figure 1.
The purpose of this study is to:

- Establish baseline traffic conditions for the study area in 2023 and determine future background operating conditions for a future planning horizon in 2025, 2027, 2029, 2034, and 2039.
- Estimate the site trips generated by the proposed development and distribute the traffic to the adjacent road network.
- Determine future operating traffic conditions during the weekday peek periods through intersection capacity analysis.
- Conduct a site access and swept path review of the proposed site plan.


Google
Figure 1 Site Location

### 1.2 Study Team

The GHD team involved in the preparation of the study are:
> William Maria, P. Eng., Transportation Planning Lead
> Rafael Andrenacci, B.Eng., Transportation Planner

## 2. Site Characteristics

### 2.1 Study Area

As per the agreed Terms of Reference for the study attached in Appendix A, the following intersections were included in the study area:

- Dundas Street East and Haig Road/Proposed Site Access


### 2.2 Proposed Development Content

A site plan prepared by Cynthia Zahoruk Architects is shown in Figure 2 and provided in Appendix B. A total of 599 dwelling units are proposed within 8 blocks. The dwelling type and unit count are as follows:
> Block A: 185 dwelling units within 2 mid-rise buildings
> Block B: 80 stacked townhouse dwelling units
> Block C: 36 bungalow townhouse dwelling units
> Block D: 7 detached townhouse dwelling units
> Block E: 40 2-storey townhouse dwelling units and 36 bungalow townhouse dwelling units
> Block F: 72 back-to-back dwelling units
> Block G: 96 stacked townhouse dwelling units
> Block H: 29 detached dwelling units
> Block I: 18 2-storey townhouse dwelling units
Access to the subject site is proposed via a full-moves access which will form the south leg of the existing intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road.


Figure 2 Proposed Site Plan

## 3. Existing Conditions

### 3.1 Existing Road Network

Dundas Street East is an east/west arterial road under the jurisdiction of the City of Belleville. Within the study area it has a four-lane cross-section with a wide landscaped centre median. Its intersection with Haig Road is unsignalized
with the stop-control only provided along the minor approach. The posted speed limit along Dundas Street East is 60 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$. The CP rail crosses Dundas Street East west of its intersection with Haig Road.
Haig Road is a north/south collector road under the jurisdiction of the City of Belleville. Within the study area it has a two-lane cross-section. Its intersection with Dundas Street East is unsignalized with an auxiliary left-turn lane in the southbound direction with stop-control provided along the minor approach. The assumed posted speed limit along Haig Road is $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. The CP rail crosses Haig Road north of its intersection with Dundas Street East.

The existing lane configurations and intersection control are shown in the figure below.


Figure 3 Existing Lane Configuration and Traffic Controls
East of the subject site is an existing vacant industrial building which has a right-in/out access located at the eastern property line of the subject site. This access will be restrained as part of this proposal given its proximity to the proposed full moves access opposite Haig Road and will be improved as needed as part of the detailed design of the future intersection.

### 3.2 Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Pedestrian facilities are currently provided along both sides of Haig Road within the study area. The sidewalk on the north side of Dundas Street East is only provided to the west of the rail line.

There is currently no cycling infrastructure within the study area.


Figure 4 Existing Active Transportation Facilities

### 3.3 Transit Services

Belleville Transit operates a single transit route within the study area. Route 2 operates in a counter clockwise direction along a series of roads including Dundas Street East, Haig Road, Victoria Avenue, Humewood Drive, Pine Street, and Victoria Street. The route operates with a 30 -minute headway during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The nearest transit stops are located to the west of the rail line along Dundas Street ( 250 metres) and to the north of the rail line on Haig Road ( 250 metres).


Figure 5 Existing Transit Routes and Transit Stops

### 3.4 Existing Traffic Data

GHD contracted Spectrum Traffic Inc. to conduct updated turning movement counts at all the study intersections in October 2023. The baseline 2023 volumes are summarized in Figure 6 below with the full turning movement counts provided in Appendix C.


Figure 6 Baseline 2023 Traffic Volumes

## 4. Future Conditions

### 4.1 Study Horizon Year

As agreed with City staff in the Terms of Reference, future horizon years of 2025, 2027, 2039, 2034, and 2039 were selected for the analysis of future traffic conditions, consisting of the build-out years of each of the three phases in addition to a period of five and ten years post build-out.

### 4.2 Corridor Growth

GHD reviewed the census data for the City of Belleville in addition to population and employment projections outlined the City's Transportation Master Plan. Census data included 2011, 2016, and 2021 in addition to the population and employment projects for 2031. The growth rates ranged from $0.5 \%$ to $1.7 \%$ with the comparison between the 2021 census data and the 2031 population projection resulting in a $1.4 \%$ per annum growth rate. As the comparison between the 2021 population and the projected 2031 population ( $1.4 \%$ per annum) provides the closest representation of potential population growth during the horizon years, GHD used a $1.5 \%$ per annum growth rate to project the future traffic volumes along Dundas Street East and Haig Road up to the 2039 horizon year. This approach has been approved by City staff.

The various growth rates that were reviewed are summarized in the table below and provides information for both employment and population growth.

Table 1 Growth Rates

| Type | Year 1 | Year 2 | Growth Rate, per annum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employment | $31,670(2011)$ | $41,870(2031)$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Population | $50,990(2011)$ | $63,450(2031)$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| Population | $50,716(2016)$ | $55,071(2021)$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Population | $55,071(2021)$ | $63,450(2031)$ | $1.4 \%$ |

### 4.3 Background Development Traffic

GHD completed a review of the City's current and active development applications and did not identify any planned background developments located near the subject site that would contribute traffic volumes to the study intersections.

### 4.4 Future Background Traffic Volumes

The background traffic volumes for the 2025, 2027, 20329, 2034, and 2039 horizon year were derived by applying the respective growth rates to the 2023 traffic volumes. The resulting 2025, 2027, 2029, 2034 and 2039 future background traffic volumes are summarized in the following figures.


Figure 72025 Future Background Traffic Volumes


Figure 82027 Future Background Traffic Volumes

|  | Haig Road |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (87) | (0) | (81) | R | 70 | (84) |  |
|  | 98 | 0 | 66 | $\leqslant$ | 513 | (540) |  |
|  | $k$ | $\downarrow$ | צ | 1 | 0 | (0) |  |
|  | (78) | 45 | $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ | K | $\uparrow$ | $\pi$ |  |
|  | (645) | 308 | $\rightarrow$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | (0) | 0 | $y$ | (0) | (0) | (0) |  |
| LEGEND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XX AM Peak Hour Volumes <br> (XX) PM Peak Hour Volumes <br> Traffic Signal |  | Proposed Site Access |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 92029 Future Background Traffic Volumes


Figure 102034 Future Background Traffic Volumes


Figure 112039 Future Background Traffic Volumes

## 5. Site Generated Traffic

### 5.1 Site Trip Generation

The proposed development is comprised of a total of 599 dwelling units. The subject site consists of a series of nine blocks with various dwelling types. The unit type and unit breakdown for each block is as follows:
$>$ Block A: 185 dwelling units within two mid-rise buildings
> Block B: 80 stacked townhouse dwelling units
> Block C: 36 bungalow townhouse dwelling units
> Block D: 6 detached townhouse dwelling units
$>$ Block E: 36 bungalow townhouse dwelling units and 40 2-storey townhouse dwelling units
> Block F: 72 back-to-back dwelling units
> Block G: 96 stacked townhouse dwelling units
$>$ Block H: 18 detached dwelling units
$>$ Block I: 18 2-storey townhouse dwelling units
Site traffic generated by the proposed development for the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours was estimated by applying the trip rates provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition. Based on the definitions provided by the ITE, Land Use Code (LUC) 210 (Single-Family Detached) was used for the detached dwelling units, LUC 215 (Single-family Attached) for the bungalow townhouse dwellings, LUC 220 (multifamily housing, low-rise) for all remaining townhouse dwellings, and LUC 221 (multifamily housing, mid-rise) was used for the units within the 6-storey apartments.
A comparison of the fitted curve equations and average rates for each individual Land Use Code was completed, whichever calculation resulted in a greater trip generation was used as a conservative measure.

As previously stated in Section 4.1., the subject site is anticipated to be built out in three phases. The first phase, assumed to be built-out by 2025, consists of blocks A and F. The second phase, assumed to be built-out by 2027, consists of Blocks B, E, G, and I. The third and final phase, assumed to be built-out by 2029, consists of the remaining Blocks C, D, and H. The assumed phasing is preliminary and subject to change.
No modal split was applied to the estimated trip generation.
Table 2 summarizes the estimated trip generation for the subject site.

Table 2

| Block and Land Use Code | Horizon Year | Dwelling <br> Units | Parameters | Peak Hour Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Weekday AM |  |  | Weekday PM |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Block A - <br> Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) <br> - (LUC 221) | 2025 | 185 units | Trip Rate | 0.081 | 0.287 | 0.368 | 0.238 | 0.151 | 0.3892 |
|  |  |  | Trip Ratio | 23\% | 77\% | 100\% | 61\% | 39\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | Gross Trips | 15 | 53 | 68 | 44 | 28 | 72 |
| Block B - <br> Multifamily <br> Housing (Low-Rise) <br> - (LUC 220) | 2027 | 80 units | Trip Rate | 0.150 | 0.450 | 0.600 | 0.438 | 0.250 | 0.688 |
|  |  |  | Trip Ratio | 24\% | 76\% | 100\% | 63\% | 37\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | Gross Trips | 12 | 36 | 48 | 35 | 20 | 55 |
| Block C - <br> Single- <br> Family <br> Attached <br> (LUC 215) | 2029 | 36 units | Trip Rate | 0.111 | 0.361 | 0.472 | 0.333 | 0.250 | 0.583 |
|  |  |  | Trip Ratio | 25\% | 75\% | 100\% | 59\% | 41\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | Gross Trips | 4 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 9 | 21 |
| Block D - <br> Single- <br> Family <br> Detached <br> (LUC 210) | 2029 | 7 units | Trip Rate | 0.286 | 0.714 | 1.000 | 0.714 | 0.429 | 1.143 |
|  |  |  | Trip Ratio | 25\% | 75\% | 100\% | 63\% | 37\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | Gross Trips | 2 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| Block E- <br> Single- <br> Family <br> Attached <br> (LUC 215) | 2027 | 36 units | Trip Rate | 0.111 | 0.361 | 0.472 | 0.333 | 0.250 | 0.583 |
|  |  |  | Trip Ratio | 25\% | 75\% | 100\% | 59\% | 41\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | Gross Trips | 4 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 9 | 21 |
| Block E - <br> Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) - (LUC 220) | 2027 | 40 units | Trip Rate | 0.200 | 0.675 | 0.875 | 0.600 | 0.350 | 0.950 |
|  |  |  | Trip Ratio | 24\% | 76\% | 100\% | 63\% | 37\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | Gross Trips | 8 | 27 | 35 | 24 | 14 | 38 |
| Block F - <br> Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) <br> - (LUC 220) | 2025 | 72 units | Trip Rate | 0.153 | 0.472 | 0.625 | 0.458 | 0.264 | 0.722 |
|  |  |  | Trip Ratio | 24\% | 76\% | 100\% | 63\% | 37\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | Gross Trips | 11 | 34 | 45 | 33 | 19 | 52 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Block G - } \\ \text { Multifamily } \\ \text { Housing } \\ \text { (Low-Rise) } \\ \text { - (LUC 220) } \end{gathered}$ | 2027 | 96 units | Trip Rate | 0.135 | 0.417 | 0.552 | 0.406 | 0.240 | 0.646 |
|  |  |  | Trip Ratio | 24\% | 76\% | 100\% | 63\% | 37\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | Gross Trips | 13 | 40 | 53 | 39 | 23 | 62 |
| Block H- | 2029 | 29 units | Trip Rate | 0.207 | 0.621 | 0.828 | 0.690 | 0.379 | 1.069 |


| Single- <br> Family <br> Detached <br> LUC 210) |  | Trip Ratio | $25 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Block I- <br> Multifamily <br> Housing <br> (Low-Rise) <br> (LUC 220) | 2027 | Gross Trips | 6 | 18 | 24 | 20 | 11 | 31 |

The proposed development is expected to generate a total of 342 two-way vehicle trips during the a.m. peak hour consisting of 82 inbound and 260 outbound trips. During the p.m. peak hour, it is expected to generate 388 new two-way vehicle trips consisting of 242 inbound and 146 outbound trips.

### 5.2 Site Traffic Distribution and Assignment

The site generated traffic for the subject site was distributed based on the existing travel patterns at the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road from the updated 2023 turning movement counts.

The directional distribution was completed for passenger vehicles and is provided in Table 3 and with the site generated traffic assignment to the study area road network for the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours provided in Figures 12 to 14.

Table 3 Site Traffic Distribution - Passenger Vehicles

| Peak <br> Period | Direction | North <br> (Jane Street) | South <br> (Jane Street) | South <br> (Cranston Park <br> Avenue) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM | Inbound | $10 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
|  | Outbound | $10 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| PM | Inbound | $10 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
|  | Outbound | $10 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $5 \%$ |



Figure 12 Total Site Trips (2025)


Figure 13 Total Site Trips (2027)


Figure 14 Total Site Trips (2029 - Full Build-Out)

## 6. Future Total Traffic

The future total traffic conditions in the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours for the 2025, 2027, 2029, 2034, and 2034 planning horizon was derived by combining the projected future background traffic with the corresponding estimated site generated traffic. The resulting traffic volumes are presented in the following figures.


Figure 152025 Future Total Traffic Volumes

| Haig Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (85) | (21) | (79) | F | 68 | (82) |  |
|  | 96 | 11 | 64 | 4 | 498 | (524) |  |
|  | $k$ | $\downarrow$ | v | $k$ | 39 | (82) |  |
|  | (75) | 44 | $\pi$ | F | $\uparrow$ | $\lambda$ |  |
|  | (626) | 299 | $\Rightarrow$ | 123 | 22 | 78 |  |
|  | (103) | 21 | y | (49) | (12) | (62) |  |
| LEGEND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XX AM Peak Hour Volumes <br> (XX) PM Peak Hour Volumes Traffic Signal |  | Site Access |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 162027 Future Total Traffic Volumes


Figure 172029 Future Total Traffic Volumes


Figure 182034 Future Total Traffic Volumes

|  | Haig Road |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (102) | (24) | (94) | F | 81 | (98) |  |
|  | 114 | 12 | 76 | 6 | 595 | (627) |  |
|  | 1 | $\downarrow$ | v | 1 | 45 | (97) |  |
|  | (90) | 52 | 7 | F | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  |
|  | (749) | 358 | $\Rightarrow$ | 143 | 26 | 91 |  |
|  | (121) | 25 | v | (58) | (15) | (73) |  |
| LEGEND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XX AM Peak Hour Volumes <br> (XX) PM Peak Hour Volumes Traffic Signal |  | Site Access |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 19
2039 Future Total Traffic Volumes

## 7. Capacity Analysis

The capacity analysis identifies how well the intersections and driveways are operating. The analysis contained within this report utilized the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000 procedure within the Synchro Version 11 Software package. The reported intersection volume-to-capacity ratios ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) are a measure of the saturation volume for each turning movement, while the levels-of-service (LOS) are a measure of the average delay for each turning movement. Queuing characteristics are reported as the predicted 95th percentile queue for each turning movement. Both pedestrian crossing volumes and heavy vehicle proportions are included in the analyses. The peak hour factors from the counts were used to analyze existing traffic conditions. Existing peak hour factors were also used for future traffic conditions.

The analysis includes identification and required modifications and improvements (if any) at intersections where the addition of background growth or background growth plus site-generated traffic volumes causes the following:
'Critical' intersections and movements for a signalized intersection include:

- V/C ratios for overall intersections operations, through movements, or shared through/turning movements increase to 0.85 or above;
- $\quad \mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratios for exclusive movements increase to 0.95 or above; or
- $\quad 95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length for individual movements that are projected to, or exceed, the storage length.
'Critical' intersections and movements for an unsignalized intersection include:
- Level of Services (LOS), based on average delay per vehicle, on individual movements exceeds LOS "E"; or
- Queue length for individual movements that exceeds the available queue storage.

The following tables summarize the HCM capacity results for the study intersections during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours under existing (2023), future background (2025, 2027, 2029, 2034, 2039) and future total (2025, 2027, 2029, 2034, 2039) traffic conditions. The detailed calculation sheets are provided in Appendix D.

### 7.1 Dundas Street East and Haig Road/Proposed Site Access

Capacity analysis at this intersection during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours for the existing, future background, and future total traffic conditions are summarized in the following table.

Table 4 Capacity analysis of Dundas Street East and Haig Road/Proposed Site Access

| Scenario | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | V/C (LOS) seconds | $95^{\text {th }} \%$ Que. | V/C (LOS) seconds | $95^{\text {th }} \%$ Que |
| Existing 2023 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.05() 9 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.12() 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.06() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.2() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.14() 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0.63(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.21() 0 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.25(C) 23 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.14() 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.07() 9 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.24() 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.12() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.2() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.15() 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0.63(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.21() 0 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.4(\mathrm{C}) 36 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.12() 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=15 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |
| Future Background 2025 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.05() 9 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.12() 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.06() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.21() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.14() 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0.63(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.21() 0 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.26(C) 24 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.14() 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.08() 9 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.24() 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.12() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.2() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.15() 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0.63(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.21() 0 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.43(\mathrm{C}) 39 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.12() 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=15 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Future Total } \\ & 2025 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.05() 9 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.12() 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.07() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0.01() 8 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.21() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.14() 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0.23(\mathrm{C}) 26 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.08() 13 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.32(\mathrm{C}) 31 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.16() 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.08() 9 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.24() 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.14() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0.03() 9 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.2() 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.15() 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0.17(\mathrm{D}) 45 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.08 \text { () } 16 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.55(\mathrm{D}) 57 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.19() 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=20 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |

AM Peak Hour
Scenario
V/C (LOS) seconds
$95^{\text {th }} \%$ Que.
EBL $=0.05$ () 9
EBT $=0.13() 0$
EBTR $=0.06$ () 0
WBL $=0$ () 0
$\mathrm{WBT}=0.21$ () 0
WBTR $=0.15() 0$
NBL $=0.63$ (A) 0
NBTR $=0.21$ () 0
SBL $=0.28$ (C) 26
SBTR $=0.15$ () 11
$\mathrm{EBL}=0.05() 9$
EBT = 0.13 () 0
EBTR $=0.08$ () 0
$\mathrm{WBL}=0.03() 8$
Future Total 2027

Future
Background 2029

|  |
| :---: |
|  |
|  |
| Future Total |
| 2029 |



|  | SB |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | O |

Future Total 2029 -

Signalized

EBL = 5 m
EBT $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
EBTR $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B L=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B T=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B T R=0 \mathrm{~m}$
NBL $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
NBTR $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
SBL $=10 \mathrm{~m}$ SBTR $=5 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$E B T R=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B L=5 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B T=0 \mathrm{~m}$
WBTR $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{NBL}=35 \mathrm{~m}$
NBTR $=10 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{SBL}=20 \mathrm{~m}$
$S B T R=10 \mathrm{~m}$

| $\mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| :--- | :--- |

$E B T=0 \mathrm{~m}$
EBTR $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B L=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B T=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B T R=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{NBL}=0 \mathrm{~m}$
NBTR $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
SBL $=10 \mathrm{~m}$
SBTR = 5 m
$\mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m}$
$E B T=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B L=5 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B T=0 \mathrm{~m}$
WBTR $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
NBL $=55 \mathrm{~m}$
NBTR $=10 \mathrm{~m}$
SBL $=25 \mathrm{~m}$
SBTR $=10 \mathrm{~m}$
$E B L=10 \mathrm{~m}$
$E B T R=15 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B L=10 \mathrm{~m}$ WBTR $=30 \mathrm{~m}$ $\mathrm{NBL}=20 \mathrm{~m}$ NBTR $=10 \mathrm{~m}$ SBL $=10 \mathrm{~m}$ SBTR $=10 \mathrm{~m}$

V/C (LOS) seconds
$95^{\text {th }} \%$ Que
$\mathrm{EBL}=0.08() 9 \quad \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m}$

$$
\mathrm{EBT}=0.25() 0
$$

EBTR $=0.13$ () 0
$W B L=0() 0$
$W B T=0.21() 0$
WBTR $=0.15() 0$
NBL $=0.63$ (A) 0
NBTR $=0.21$ () 0
SBL $=0.47$ (D) 43
SBTR = 0.12 () 11
$\mathrm{EBL}=0.08() 9 \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{EBT}=0.25() 0 \quad \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{EBTR}=0.19$ () $0 \quad \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{WBL}=0.1$ () $10 \quad \mathrm{WBL}=5 \mathrm{~m}$
WBT $=0.21() 0 \quad W B T=0 \mathrm{~m}$
WBTR $=0.15() 0 \quad W B T R=0 \mathrm{~m}$
NBL $=0.77$ (F) 157
NBTR = 0.24 () 20
SBL $=0.93$ (F) 165

| SBTR $=0.38$ () 25 | $S B L=4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| SBTR $=15 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |

$\mathrm{EBL}=0.09$ () $9 \quad \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{EBT}=0.26() 0 \quad E B T=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$E B T R=0.13() 0 \quad E B T R=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{WBL}=0() 0 \quad \mathrm{WBL}=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B T=0.22() 0$
$W B T R=0.16() 0$
$\mathrm{NBL}=0.63(\mathrm{~A}) 0$
NBTR $=0.21() 0$
SBL = 0.5 (D) 48
SBTR $=0.13$ () 11
EBL $=0.09$ () 9
$E B T=0.26$ () 0
$E B T R=0.2() 0$
WBL $=0.12() 10$
WBT $=0.22$ () 0
WBTR $=0.16$ () 0
NBL = 1.15 (F) 304
NBTR = 0.33 () 24
SBL = 1.19 (F) 273
SBTR $=0.47$ () 32
Overall: 0.35 (B) 11
EBL $=0.34$ (B) 11
EBTR $=0.6$ (B) 12
WBL $=0.53$ (B) 14
WBTR $=0.49$ (B) 11
NBL $=0.1$ (A) 7
NBTR $=0.06(\mathrm{~A}) 7$
SBL $=0.14(A) 8$
SBTR $=0.09(A) 7$
$W B T=0 \mathrm{~m}$
WBTR $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{NBL}=0 \mathrm{~m}$
NBTR $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
SBL $=20 \mathrm{~m}$
SBTR $=5 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m}$
EBTR $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B L=5 \mathrm{~m}$
WBT $=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B T R=0 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{NBL}=40 \mathrm{~m}$
NBTR $=10 \mathrm{~m}$
SBL $=50 \mathrm{~m}$
SBTR $=20 \mathrm{~m}$
$E B L=15 \mathrm{~m}$
$E B T R=35 \mathrm{~m}$
$W B L=20 \mathrm{~m}$
WBTR $=30 \mathrm{~m}$
NBL $=10 \mathrm{~m}$
NBTR $=10 \mathrm{~m}$
SBL $=10 \mathrm{~m}$
$S B T R=10 \mathrm{~m}$

| Scenario | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | V/C (LOS) seconds | $95^{\text {th }} \%$ Que. | V/C (LOS) seconds | $95^{\text {th }}$ \% Que |
| Future Background 2034 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.06(\mathrm{~A}) 9 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.14(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.07(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.24(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.17 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0.63(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.21(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.37(\mathrm{C}) 33 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.17(\mathrm{~A}) 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=15 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.1(\mathrm{~A}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.28(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.14(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.23(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.17 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0.63(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.21(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.63(\mathrm{E}) 67 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.15(\mathrm{~A}) 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=25 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |
| Future Total $2034$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.06(\mathrm{~A}) 9 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.14(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.09(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0.04(\mathrm{~A}) 8 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.24(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.17 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=1.07(\mathrm{~F}) 156 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.3(\mathrm{~A}) 17 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.73(\mathrm{E}) 101 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.26(\mathrm{~A}) 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=65 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=30 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=10 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.1(\mathrm{~A}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.28(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.21 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0.12(\mathrm{~A}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.23 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.17 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=1.46 \text { (F) } 460 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.35 \text { (A) } 27 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=\mathbf{1 . 5 2} \text { (F) } 419 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.54 \text { (A) } 39 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=45 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=15 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=60 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=25 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |
| Future Total $2034 \text { - }$ <br> Signalized | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall: } 0.4(\mathrm{~B}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{EBL}=0.26(\mathrm{~B}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.32(\mathrm{~B}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0.14(\mathrm{~A}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.58 \text { (B) } 12 \\ & \text { NBL }=0.27 \text { (A) } 8 \\ & \text { NBTR }=0.1 \text { (A) } 7 \\ & \text { SBL }=0.14 \text { (A) } 7 \\ & \text { SBTR }=0.09(\mathrm{~A}) 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=20 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=30 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=20 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=10 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall: } 0.37(B) 11 \\ & \hline \text { EBL }=0.38(B) 11 \\ & E B T R=0.62 \text { (B) } 12 \\ & \text { WBL }=0.54(B) 14 \\ & \text { WBTR }=0.51 \text { (B) } 11 \\ & \text { NBL }=0.11 \text { (A) } 8 \\ & \text { NBTR }=0.06 \text { (A) } 8 \\ & \text { SBL }=0.16 \text { (A) } 8 \\ & \text { SBTR }=0.09 \text { (A) } 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=15 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=40 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=20 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=30 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=10 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |
| Future Background 2039 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.07(\mathrm{~A}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.15(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.08(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.25(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.18 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0.63(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.21(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.47(\mathrm{C}) 42 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.2(\mathrm{~A}) 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=20 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.11(\mathrm{~A}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.3(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.15(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.25(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.18 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0.63 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.21 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.8 \text { (F) } 103 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.16 \text { (A) } 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=35 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=5 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |
| Future Total $2039$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.07(\mathrm{~A}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.15(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.09(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0.04(\mathrm{~A}) 8 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.25(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.18 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=1.25(\mathrm{~F}) 232 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.33 \text { (A) } 19 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=0.93(\mathrm{~F}) 161 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.29 \text { (A) } 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=75 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=40 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=10 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=0.11(\mathrm{~A}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0.3(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0.22(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=0.13(\mathrm{~A}) 10 \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0.25(\mathrm{~A}) 0 \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0.18 \text { (A) } 0 \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=1.97(\mathrm{~F}) 738 \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=0.4(\mathrm{~A}) 32 \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=\mathbf{2 . 0 2}(\mathrm{F}) 663 \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=0.64(\mathrm{~A}) 50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBT}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=55 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=15 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=75 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=30 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |


| Scenario | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | V/C (LOS) seconds | $95^{\text {th }} \%$ Que. | V/C (LOS) seconds | $95^{\text {th }}$ \% Que |
| Future Total 2039 Signalized | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Overall: } 0.42(\mathrm{~B}) 10}{\mathrm{EBL}=0.3(\mathrm{~B}) 11} \\ & \text { EBTR }=0.34(\mathrm{~B}) 10 \\ & \text { WBL }=0.14(\mathrm{~A}) 10 \\ & \text { WBTR }=0.6 \text { (B) } 12 \\ & \text { NBL }=0.28 \text { (A) } 9 \\ & \text { NBTR }=0.1 \text { (A) } 7 \\ & \text { SBL }=0.16 \text { (A) } 8 \\ & \text { SBTR }=0.09 \text { (A) } 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=20 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=35 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=20 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=10 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Overall: } 0.37(\mathrm{~A}) 8}{\mathrm{EBL}=0.19(\mathrm{~A}) 4} \\ & \text { EBTR }=0.34 \text { (A) } 4 \\ & \text { WBL }=0.22 \text { (A) } 4 \\ & \text { WBTR }=0.28 \text { (A) } 4 \\ & \text { NBL }=0.33 \text { (C) } 31 \\ & \text { NBTR }=0.1 \text { (C) } 29 \\ & \text { SBL }=0.51 \text { (C) } 33 \\ & \text { SBTR }=0.16 \text { (C) } 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL}=10 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{EBTR}=35 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}=15 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{WBTR}=30 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBL}=20 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{NBTR}=15 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}=25 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \mathrm{SBTR}=20 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ |

Under existing traffic conditions, the intersection is operating at a satisfactory level with the largest delay occurring in the southbound left-turn movement with a 23 second delay during the a.m. peak hour and 36 second delay during the p.m. peak hour. The movement also operates a $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length of 10 metres and 15 metres during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour, respectively. Based on field observations, it was confirmed that vehicles in the eastbound direction turning left onto Haig Road would complete the turn in two stages due to the width of the median allowing them to wait for a gap without blocking through traffic. As a result, the Synchro was modeled with an exclusive left-turn lane with a 5-metre storage length to better represent the operation of the intersection.

With the addition of corridor growth under the 2025 future background condition, the intersection continues to operate at a satisfactory level with the southbound left-turn movement continuing to report the greatest delay with a 24 second delay during the a.m. peak hour and 39 second delay during the p.m. peak hour.

With the addition of site generated traffic and the site access as the southern leg of the intersection under the 2025 future total condition, the greatest delay continues to be reported in the southbound left-turn movement with a 31 and 57 second delay during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour, respectively.

With the addition of corridor growth under the 2027 future background condition, the intersection continues to operate at a satisfactory level with the southbound left-turn movement continuing to report the greatest delay with a 26 second delay during the a.m. peak hour and 43 second delay during the p.m. peak hour.

With the addition of site generated traffic and the site access as the southern leg of the intersection under the 2027 future total condition, the delays for the southbound left-turn movement are reported to be 53 and 165 seconds during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour, respectively. However, the northbound left-turn movement during the a.m. peak hour operates with the greatest delay and is reported at 66 seconds, while the p.m. peak hour reports a 157 second delay.

With the addition of corridor growth under the 2029 future background condition, the intersection continues to operate at a satisfactory level with the southbound left-turn movement continuing to report the greatest delay with a 28 second delay during the a.m. peak hour and 48 second delay during the p.m. peak hour.

With the addition of site generated traffic and the site access as the southern leg of the intersection under the 2029 future total condition, the intersection begins to report movements exceeding the theoretical capacity during the p.m. with $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios over 1.00 . During the p.m. peak hour, the northbound left-turn movement from the proposed site access reports a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio of 1.15 LOS F and a 304 second delay while the southbound left-turn movement reports a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio of 1.19 LOS F with a 273 second delay.
If the intersection is signalized with a 90 second delay, the future total 2029 condition is reporting the intersection operating with an overall $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio of 0.38 LOS A during the a.m. peak hour and 0.35 LOS B during the p.m. peak hour. Additionally, the eastbound through/right-turn movement reports a $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length of 10 metres and 35 metres during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively. This projected queuing is acceptable and does not extend to the rail tracks.

With the addition of corridor growth under the 2034 future background condition, the intersection continues to operate at a satisfactory level with the southbound left-turn movement continuing to report the greatest delay with a 33 second delay during the a.m. peak hour and 67 second delay during the p.m. peak hour.
With the addition of site generated traffic, the intersection begins to report $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios exceeding the theoretical capacity during the a.m. peak hour with the northbound left-turn movement reporting a v/c ratio of 1.07 LOS F and a 156 second delay, while the southbound left-turn movement reports a 101 second delay. During the p.m. peak hour, the intersection continues to report v/c ratios exceeding 1.00 during the p.m. peak hour (1.46 LOS F and 460 second delay for the northbound left-turn movement and 1.52 LOS F and 419 second delay for the southbound left-turn movement).

Like the 2029 future total scenario, the signalization of the intersection would improve and significantly reduce the v/c ratios and delays while not impacting the queueing in the eastbound movements towards the railway tracks.

With the addition of corridor growth under the 2039 future background condition, the intersection continues to operate at a satisfactory level with the southbound left-turn movement continuing to report the greatest delay with a 42 second delay during the a.m. peak hour while reporting a 103 second delay during the p.m. peak hour.

With the addition of site generated traffic, the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios continue to increase in the northbound and southbound leftturn movements during the p.m. peak hour while the northbound left-turn movement begins to exceed capacity during the a.m. peak hour.

As reported under the future total 2029 and 2034 scenarios, the signalization of the intersection provides the required capacity during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

It is recommended that the intersection be signalized after Phase 1 of construction to provide the necessary capacity for turning movements onto Dundas Street from the subject site.

## 8. Signal Warrant

A signal warrant was completed for the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road/Site Access and is provided in Appendix E. Under the 2039 future total conditions, traffic signals are not warranted for the intersection. However, signalization is recommended to address capacity and delay issues. It is recommended that the City monitor the operation of the intersection and implement traffic signals once the delays and queuing along Haig Road/the site necessitate the change in traffic control.

## 9. Parking Review

GHD reviewed the City's current Zoning By-Law parking and loading requirements for the subject site.

### 9.1 City of Belleville Zoning By-law 10245

### 9.1.1 Vehicular Parking

Under the City of Belleville's Zoning By-law 10245, the minimum parking requirement are found in Section 14, The minimum By-law requirement for the subject site is as follows:

- a detached one family dwelling, a duplex or semi-detached dwelling, or horizontal multiple attached dwelling where each unit fronts on a public street and has its own garage and driveway and where not in the form of group housing
- 1 parking space for each dwelling unit
- All other dwellings not listed
- 1.25 parking spaces for each dwelling unit

The subject site consists of the following unit types:

- 185 mid-rise dwelling units
- 72 bungalow townhouse dwelling units
- 58 2-storey townhouse dwelling units
- 72 back-to-back dwelling units
- 176 stacked townhouse dwelling units
- 36 detached dwelling units

By definition, Blocks $C$, $D$, and I would fall under the first dwelling types, requiring 1 parking space per unit. All remaining Blocks would require 1.25 parking spaces per unit. The minimum By-law requirement for the subject site is as follows:

- a detached one family dwelling, a duplex or semi-detached dwelling, or horizontal multiple attached dwelling where each unit fronts on a public street and has its own garage and driveway and where not in the form of group housing
- 1 parking space for each dwelling unit $x 61$ dwelling units $=61$ parking spaces
- All other dwellings not listed
- 1.25 parking spaces for each dwelling unit $\times 538$ dwelling units $=673$ parking spaces

In total, 734 vehicle parking spaces are required under the City's By-law 10245.

### 9.2 Consolidated Zoning By-law Draft

The City of Belleville is currently undergoing a Zoning By-law Consolidation to update and Consolidate the City's three existing By-laws. GHD also reviewed the City's draft consolidated Zoning By-Law parking and loading requirements for the subject site.

### 9.2.1 Vehicular Parking

Under the City's draft Consolidated Zoning By-law, the minimum parking requirement are found in Section 15.2, Table 15-2A. The minimum By-law requirement for the subject site is as follows:

- One-unit dwelling
- 1.0 parking spaces per dwelling unit
- Townhouse dwelling
- 1.0 parking spaces per dwelling unit, plus
- 1.0 parking spaces per for every 5 townhouses
- Multi-unit dwelling (greater than 4 units)
- 0.75 dwelling units, plus
- 1.0 parking space per 5 units for visitors

The minimum parking required for the subject site is as follows:

- One-unit dwelling
- 1.0 parking spaces per dwelling unit $\times 36$ units $=36$ parking spaces
- Townhouse dwelling
- 1.0 parking spaces per dwelling unit, $\times 378$ units $=378$ spaces, plus
- 1.0 parking spaces per for every 5 townhouses $\times 378$ units $=76$ spaces
- Multi-unit dwelling (greater than 4 units)
- 0.75 dwelling units, $\times 185$ units $=139$ spaces, plus
- 1.0 parking space per 5 units $\times 185$ spaces $=37$ spaces, for visitors

In total, 666 vehicle parking spaces are required under the City's Draft By-law, consisting of 553 resident spaces and 113 visitor spaces.

### 9.2.2 Bicycle Parking

Under the City's draft Consolidated Zoning By-law, the minimum bicycle parking requirements are found in Section 15.7. The minimum By-law requirement for the subject site is as follows:

- Multi-unit dwelling
- 0.5 spaces per dwelling unit

The minimum bicycle parking required for the subject site is as follows:

- Multi-unit dwelling
- 0.5 spaces per dwelling unit $\times 199$ dwelling units $=100$ bicycle parking spaces

In total, 100 bicycle parking spaces are required under the City's Draft By-law.

### 9.2.3 Loading Space

Under the City's draft Consolidated Zoning By-law, the minimum loading space requirements are found in Section 15.5. The minimum requirement for multi-unit buildings is provided in Section 15.5.(2), which require at least one offstreet loading space per mixed used or multi-unit building exceed four storeys in height. With two proposed 7 -storey mid-rise buildings proposed in Block A, the subject site is required to provide 2 loading spaces (1 per building).

### 9.3 Proposed Site Parking

Parking is provided for the subject site as follows:
> Block A: 211 spaces ( 1.14 spaces per unit)
> Block B: 96 spaces ( 1.2 spaces per unit)
> Block C: 72 spaces (2 spaces per unit)
> Block D: 14 spaces (2 spaces per unit)
> Block E: 172 spaces (2 spaces per unit, plus 22 visitor spaces)
> Block F: 86 spaces ( 1.19 spaces per unit)
> Block G: 125 spaces ( 1.30 spaces per unit)
> Block H: 58 spaces (2 spaces per unit)
> Block I: 36 spaces (2 spaces per unit)

In total, the subject site proposes to provide 892 parking spaces which exceeds the minimum requirements based on Bylaw 10245 and the City's draft consolidated Zoning By-Law.
The following table summarizes the minimum By-law requirements and the proposed parking supply for the subject site.

Table 5 Parking Requirements and Provisions

| Block | Provision | By-law Requirement | Draft By-law Requirement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Block A | 211 spaces ( 1.14 spaces per unit) | 1.25 spaces per unit | 0.95 spaces per unit <br> ( 0.75 spaces per unit - residents, <br> 0.2 spaces per unit - visitors) |
| Block B | 96 spaces (1.2 spaces per unit) | 1.25 spaces per unit | 1.2 spaces per unit (1.0 spaces per unit - residents, 0.2 spaces per unit - visitors) 96 spaces |
| Block C | 72 spaces (2 spaces per unit) | 1.00 spaces per unit | 1.2 spaces per unit (1.0 spaces per unit - residents, 0.2 spaces per unit - visitors) |
| Block D | 14 spaces (2 spaces per unit) | 1.00 spaces per unit | 1.0 spaces per unit |
| Block E | 172 spaces ( 2 spaces per unit, plus 22 spaces) | 1.25 spaces per unit | 1.2 spaces per unit (1.0 spaces per unit - residents, 0.2 spaces per unit - visitors) |
| Block F | 86 spaces (1.19 spaces per unit) | 1.25 spaces per unit | 1.2 spaces per unit (1.0 spaces per unit - residents, 0.2 spaces per unit - visitors) 87 spaces |
| Block G | 125 spaces ( 1.30 spaces per unit) | 1.25 spaces per unit | 1.2 spaces per unit <br> (1.0 spaces per unit - residents, <br> 0.2 spaces per unit - visitors) |
| Block H | 58 spaces (2 spaces per unit) | 1.25 spaces per unit | 1.0 spaces per unit |
| Block I | 36 spaces (2 spaces per unit) | 1.00 spaces per unit | 1.2 spaces per unit <br> (1.0 spaces per unit - residents, <br> 0.2 spaces per unit - visitors) |

The proposed parking supply meets or exceeds the City's Draft Zoning Bylaw requirement for vehicle parking with the exception of Block F which is short one parking space. However, the overall parking supply for all blocks exceeds the total parking supply required and therefore, the shortfall can be accommodated by sharing visitor parking between all blocks.

### 9.4 Vehicle Swept Path Analysis

GHD undertook a vehicle swept path analysis to assess the site plan circulation for an emergency and waste collection vehicles within the site. The results of the analysis are provided in Appendix F and illustrate that the site can sufficiently accommodate the aforementioned design vehicles with no issues.

A fire truck was analyzed entering the site from the driveway and circulating the site in drawing AT-101. Drawing AT102 illustrates the path of the fire truck exiting the site. No conflicts were found with the manoeuvres.

The front-load waste collection vehicle was analyzed entering the site and circulating the site for the mid-rise buildings in drawing AT-103. Drawing AT-104 illustrates the path of the waste truck exiting the site. No conflicts were found with the manoeuvres.

The rear-load waste collection vehicle was analyzed entering the site and circulating the site for the remaining dwelling units in drawing AT-105 and AT 106. No conflicts were found with the manoeuvres.

## 10. Conclusion

The proposed site plan consists of a total of 599 dwelling units proposed within 9 blocks. The dwelling type and unit count per block are as follows:
> Block A: 185 dwelling units within 2 mid-rise buildings
> Block B: 80 stacked townhouse dwelling units
> Block C: 36 bungalow townhouse dwelling units
> Block D: 7 detached townhouse dwelling units
> Block E: 36 bungalow townhouse dwelling units and 40 2-storey townhouse dwelling units
> Block F: 72 back-to-back dwelling units
> Block G: 96 stacked townhouse dwelling units
> Block H: 29 detached dwelling units
> Block I: 18 2-storey townhouse dwelling units
Access to the subject site is proposed via a full-moves access on the south leg of the existing intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road.
Based on ITE Trip Generation rates using Land Use Codes 210, 215, 220, and 221, the full build-out of the subject site is expected to generate 342 two-way vehicle trips during the a.m. peak hour consisting of 82 inbound and 260 outbound trips. During the p.m. peak hour, it is expected to generate 388 new two-way vehicle trips consisting of 242 inbound and 146 outbound trips.

Under existing traffic conditions, the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is operating at acceptable v/c ratios and levels of service during the a.m. peak and p.m. peak hours.

Under future background 2025, 2027, 2029 and 2034 traffic conditions, including corridor growth, the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is reported to continue to operate at satisfactory levels of capacity and delays will all movements operating at LOS of E or better.

Under the future total 2025 condition, with the addition of site generated traffic from Blocks A and F, the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is reported to continue to operate at a satisfactory levels of capacity, delays and queuing. The highest $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio is reported during the p.m. peak hour for the southbound left turn which is reported to operate at a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio of 0.55 LOS D.

Under the future total 2027 condition, with the addition of site generated traffic which also includes Block B, E, G and I, the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is reported to continue to operate at mostly satisfactory levels, with the exception of the northbound and southbound left-turn movements during the p.m. peak hour which are reported to operate at a $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio of 0.80 LOS F and 0.95 LOS F respectively.
Under the future total 2029 condition, with the addition of site generated traffic included for Blocks C, D and H , the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is reported to continue to operate at mostly satisfactory levels, however the northbound and southbound left-turn movements during the p.m. peak hour continue to report increased delays with the northbound left operating at 1.14 LOS F and the southbound left at 1.16 LOS F.

Despite signal warrants not being satisfied at the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road, it is recommended that the intersection be signalized to provide the required capacity for both the north and south legs exiting onto Dunda Street. The intersection was analyzed using a 90 -second cycle length which resulted in reduced delays at the intersection without any impacts of queuing on Dundas Street or the adjacent railway crossing.

Under the future total 2029, 2034 and 2039 traffic scenarios, the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road is reported to operate at satisfactory $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios, delays and queuing as a signalized intersection.

The reported queuing along Dundas Street from the introduction of the traffic signal control is not expected to negatively impact the adjacent railway crossing to the west of the intersection as the reported $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths are not reported to extend to the at-grade crossing.

Application of the City of Belleville By-Law parking rates to the subject site results in a requirement of a minimum of 734 vehicle parking spaces for the subject site.

The City of Belleville is currently undergoing a Zoning By-law Consolidation to update and consolidate the three existing By-laws currently governing the City. Application of the City's Draft By-law rates to the subject site results in a requirement of a minimum of 666 vehicle parking spaces ( 553 resident and 113 visitor spaces), 100 bicycle parking spaces, and two loading spaces for the mid-rise buildings.

Based on the consolidation of all development blocks, the subject site proposes to provide 892 parking spaces which exceeds the minimum requirements based on By-law 10245 and the City's draft consolidated Zoning By-Law.
However, on an individual block basis, Block F is short one parking space. However, the since overall parking supply for all blocks exceeds the total parking supply required, the shortfall can be accommodated by sharing visitor parking between all blocks.

GHD assessed the site circulation for an emergency vehicle and waste collection vehicle and confirmed no issues with the site circulation.

The traffic study confirms that the proposed residential development is expected to have a minimal impact on the future capacity of the adjacent road network with the recommended signalization of the intersection of Dundas Street East and Haig Road.

Appendices

Appendix A
Terms of Reference

## Raf Andrenacci

| From: | Will Maria |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, October 10, 2023 8:42 AM |
| To: | Raf Andrenacci |
| Subject: | FW: FW: Terms of Reference for Traffic Study - 621 Dundas Street East |
| DISABLEFILINGSTATUS: | 0 |

Will

## William C. Maria, P.Eng.

Transportation Planning Lead

## GHD Ltd.

T: 9058144397 | C: 6472298541 | F: 9058908499 | E: will.maria@ghd.com
100 Milverton Drive Suite 404, Mississauga, ON L5R 4H1 \| www.ghd.com

WATER \| ENERGY \& RESOURCES \| ENVIRONMENT \| PROPERTY \& BUILDINGS \| TRANSPORTATION
Please consider our environment before printing this email

From: Kim Harrison-McMillan [gracisondev@gmail.com](mailto:gracisondev@gmail.com)
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2023 9:09 AM
To: Will Maria [william.maria@ghd.com](mailto:william.maria@ghd.com)
Cc: Roland Roovers [Roland.Roovers@ghd.com](mailto:Roland.Roovers@ghd.com)
Subject: Fwd: FW: Terms of Reference for Traffic Study - 621 Dundas Street East

Hi Will,

See email below and advise if you have any concerns with the items listed below. Is a 10 year build out typical?
Kim
---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Gliddon, Jarrod < JGliddon@belleville.ca>
Date: Mon, Sep 25, 2023 at 9:04 AM
Subject: RE: FW: Terms of Reference for Traffic Study - 621 Dundas Street East
To: Kim Harrison-McMillan [gracisondev@gmail.com](mailto:gracisondev@gmail.com)
Cc: Jianopoulos, Nathan [njianopoulos@belleville.ca](mailto:njianopoulos@belleville.ca)

Hi Kim,

Please add the following to the scope of work for the Traffic Impact Study:

- Due to the proximity of the CP Rail crossings on Haig Rd and on Dundas St, the new intersection shall be reviewed, and rationale shall be included to support the location of the new intersection and what impacts it will have on queue lengths when a train is crossing at peak hours.
- Include a 10-year projection post-build out, with growth assumptions supported by historic traffic data.

Any questions, let me know.

Thanks,

Jarrod

From: Gliddon, Jarrod
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2023 4:29 PM
To: Reid, Joseph [jreid@belleville.ca](mailto:jreid@belleville.ca); Kim Harrison-McMillan [gracisondev@gmail.com](mailto:gracisondev@gmail.com)
Subject: RE: FW: Terms of Reference for Traffic Study - 621 Dundas Street East

Hi Kim/Joe,

Approvals department is reviewing the TOR and will follow up next week with our comments.

Have a great weekend.

Thanks,

Jarrod

From: Reid, Joseph [ireid@belleville.ca](mailto:ireid@belleville.ca)
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2023 2:10 PM
To: Kim Harrison-McMillan [gracisondev@gmail.com](mailto:gracisondev@gmail.com)
Cc: Gliddon, Jarrod [JGliddon@belleville.ca](mailto:JGliddon@belleville.ca); Chan, Andrew [achan@belleville.ca](mailto:achan@belleville.ca)
Subject: RE: FW: Terms of Reference for Traffic Study - 621 Dundas Street East

Question, why am I being asked to approve the TOR?

From: Kim Harrison-McMillan [gracisondev@gmail.com](mailto:gracisondev@gmail.com)
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2023 10:31 AM
To: Reid, Joseph [jreid@belleville.ca](mailto:jreid@belleville.ca)
Cc: Gliddon, Jarrod [JGliddon@belleville.ca](mailto:JGliddon@belleville.ca); Chan, Andrew [achan@belleville.ca](mailto:achan@belleville.ca)
Subject: Fwd: FW: Terms of Reference for Traffic Study - 621 Dundas Street East

CAUTION: This email is from an external source. Do NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe!

Hi Joseph,

Please see the email below.

We are eager to commence the traffic counts and receive approval of the TOR as we are targeting a submission to the City next month.

If you can please advise on your timing, it would be appreciated.

Thank you,

Kim
---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Will Maria < William.Maria@ghd.com>
Date: Wed, Sep 13, 2023 at 1:53 PM
Subject: FW: Terms of Reference for Traffic Study - 621 Dundas Street East
To: Kim Harrison-McMillan [gracisondev@gmail.com](mailto:gracisondev@gmail.com)

As requested, attached is our Terms of Reference for the project.
It was originally sent last Wednesday however, it did bounce back to us the first time and was resent again.

Will

## William C. Maria, P.Eng.

Transportation Planning Lead

## GHD Ltd.

T: 9058144397 | C: 6472298541 | F: 9058908499 | E: will.maria@ghd.com

100 Milverton Drive Suite 404, Mississauga, ON L5R 4H1 | www.ghd.com

WATER \| ENERGY \& RESOURCES \| ENVIRONMENT \| PROPERTY \& BUILDINGS \| TRANSPORTATION
Please consider our environment before printing this email

From: Will Maria
Sent: Wednesday, September 6, 2023 4:04 PM
To: jreid@belleville.ca
Cc: Raf Andrenacci [Raf.Andrenacci@ghd.com](mailto:Raf.Andrenacci@ghd.com)
Subject: Terms of Reference for Traffic Study - 621 Dundas Street East

Hi Joseph, GHD has been retained to prepare a traffic study for a proposed residential development located 621 Dundas Street East.

Please review the attached terms of reference and let us know if you require any additional scope.
Thanks,

Will

## William C. Maria, P.Eng.

## Transportation Planning Lead

## GHD Ltd.

T: 9058144397 | C: 6472298541 | F: 9058908499 | E: will.maria@ghd.com

100 Milverton Drive Suite 404, Mississauga, ON L5R 4H1 | www.ghd.com

WATER \| ENERGY \& RESOURCES \| ENVIRONMENT \| PROPERTY \& BUILDINGS \| TRANSPORTATION
Please consider our environment before printing this email

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email, including any attachments, is confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately, and please delete it; you should not copy it or use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. GHD and its affiliates reserve the right to monitor and modify all email communications through their networks.

Kim Harrison-McMillan, BES, MCIP, RPP
President

Gracison Developments Incorporated
T: 647-808-3955
E: gracisondev@gmail.com

Gracison Developments Incorporated
T: 647-808-3955
E: gracisondev@gmail.com

Our ref: TPP-23-049

August 21, 2023
Joseph Reid
General Manager, Transportation \& Operational Services
169 Front Street
Belleville, Ontario K8N 2 Y8
613-967-3200 x3313
joseph.reid@belleville.ca

## Subject: Terms of Reference for Traffic Impact Study for Proposed Residential Development at 621 Dundas Street East, Belleville

Dear Mr. Reid,

GHD Limited is pleased to provide the following Terms of Reference to prepare a Traffic Impact Study report / Services for the proposed residential development. The subject development is located at 621 Dundas Street, generally south of Dundas Street in the vicinity of Haig Road in the City of Belleville.

The assignment is to estimate the development site traffic and determine the impact of site and future total traffic on the study intersections. The current site plan consists of approximately 600 residential units consisting of apartments, townhouses, and single unit dwellings. Access to the development is provided to Dundas Street via the extension of Haig Road. The preliminary site plan is provided in Appendix A.

## 1. Scope of Work / Terms of Reference

## Traffic Impact Study

The study procedures and analytical methods used in the TIS will comply with the accepted guidelines for preparation of traffic impact studies from the City of Belleville and will involve input from City staff. As is common practice, we will further define our approach and review with staff any technical assumptions and analytical parameters before commencement.

Based on the latest information provided, our preliminary investigation, and our interpretation of what is required for the study, our proposed scope of work is as follows:

1. Consult with City staff to confirm technical assumptions to including study intersections be used in the analysis (Terms of Reference) and to obtain needful background data.
2. Confirm with the Project Team all pertinent site statistics to be used in the analysis including number and type of residential units. The site plan identifies apartments, townhouses and single detached units.
3. Confirm with staff the study intersections to be included in the study. Our proposed study intersections for analysis include:

## Existing intersection:

$>$ Dundas Street East and Haig Road (STOP controlled).

## Future intersection:

$>$ Dundas Street East and Haig Road and the proposed development access.
4. Recent (within 1-2 years old) traffic counts of the Dundas Street East and Haig Road intersection will be requested from the City. If the age of data is not acceptable to the City (ie. too old) then GHD will collect new traffic counts at the existing study intersection during the weekday am and pm peak hours (anticipated to be between 7 to 9 am and 4 to 6 pm . We will confirm the hours and timing of the traffic data collection with staff prior to commencing the work.
5. Prepare a baseline (2023) model of traffic operations of the study intersections using Synchro software for the critical peak hours.
6. Future background traffic volumes will be assessed for future planning horizons consistent with Belleville's requirements.
For example, Project Team deems first occupancies in 2025, then the planning horizons are 2025 and 2030. However, due to the large number of units (approximately 600 units), the Project Team realistically will have a phased approach. Again, example, 200 units by 2025, next 200 units by 2027 and the final 200 units by 2029. If this is the case, that the development will be constructed in phases, then we will allow for 3 phases.
> Year of Phase 1 occupancy ("opening day")
> Year of Phase 2 occupancy
> Year of Phase 3 occupancy, and
$>5$-years beyond Phase 3 occupancy.
7. Trip generation estimates for the proposed development will be completed using rates published by the ITE Trip Generation 11th Edition for each of the 3 phases.
8. The directional distribution of traffic approaching and departing the site will be determined based on existing local travel patterns and first principles, and site traffic will be assigned in accordance with our interpretation of these various patterns.
9. Conduct intersection capacity analysis using Synchro software for existing and future (background and total) traffic conditions during the critical peak hours. The site impact analysis will be performed at the study intersections and will examine operating characteristics including standing queue lengths.
10. Identify the transportation system requirements and other measures required to ensure the acceptable operation of the study intersections, including auxiliary turning lanes and other transportation infrastructure improvements. We will consider if traffic signals are required and
when. The objectives are to ensure that sufficient intersection capacity is available to accommodate the additional site generated traffic on the adjacent road network so that the adjacent lands/activities are not adversely affected.

## 2. Acceptance/Approval

Should you find these Terms of Reference acceptable in its current form or with comments, please communicate as such in an email to the undersigned.
If you wish to discuss any aspect of the Terms of Reference, please feel free to contact Mr. Roland Roovers. We appreciate the opportunity to present this scope of work. We trust that the above noted information is suitable for your purposes at this time and look forward to your comments / acceptance of the Terms of Reference on this project.
Sincerely,
GHD

Roland Roovers, P.Eng.
Senior Manager, Transportation Planning
+1905 752-4348
roland.roovers@ghd.com
Attach. Appendix A

RR/NC

Appendix B
Site Plan


Appendix C Traffic Data

Turning Movement Count (1. DUNDAS ST E \& HAIG RD)

| Start Time | N Approach HAIG RD |  |  |  |  |  | E Approach DUNDAS STE |  |  |  |  |  | S Approach SOUTH DRIVEWAY |  |  |  |  |  | W Approach DUNDAS STE |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {Int. Total }}$ ( 15 min | $\underset{(1 \mathrm{hr})}{\text { Int. Total }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Right } \\ & \mathrm{N}: \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Thru | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Left } \\ & \mathrm{N}: \mathrm{E} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTurn } \\ & \text { N:N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Peds } \\ & N: \end{aligned}$ | Approach Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Right } \\ & \text { E:N } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { Thru }}{\text { T:W }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Left } \\ & \text { E:S } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTurn } \\ & \text { E:E } \end{aligned}$ | Peds <br> E: | Approach Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Right } \\ & \text { S: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Thru } \\ \text { S:N } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Left } \\ & \text { Si:W } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTurn } \\ & \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{S} \end{aligned}$ | Peds | Approach Total | Right W:S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Thru } \\ & \text { W:E } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Left } \\ & \mathrm{W}: N \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTurn } \\ & W \cdot W \end{aligned}$ | Peds | Approach Total |  |  |
| 07:00:00 | 17 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 6 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 57 | 145 |  |
| 07:15:00 | 30 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 38 | 9 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 70 | 211 |  |
| 07:30:00 | 22 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 15 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 237 |  |
| 07:45:00 | 24 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 22 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 82 | 274 | 867 |
| 08:00:00 | 24 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 12 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 94 | 243 | 965 |
| 08:15:00 | 20 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 15 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 88 | 252 | 1006 |
| 08:30:00 | 15 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 14 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 225 | 994 |
| 08:45:00 | 25 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 12 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 252 | 972 |
| "*BREAK" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16:00:00 | 15 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 18 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 177 | 350 |  |
| 16:15:00 | 17 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 14 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 334 |  |
| 16:30:00 | 27 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 46 | 21 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 128 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 148 | 350 |  |
| 16:45:00 | 21 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 24 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 169 | 353 | 1387 |
| 17:00:00 | 14 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 11 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 135 | 283 | 1320 |
| 17:15:00 | 22 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 16 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 154 | 329 | 1315 |
| 17:30:00 | 15 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 29 | ${ }^{21}$ | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 97 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 109 | 268 | 1233 |
| 17:45:00 | 13 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | ${ }^{23}$ | 22 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 113 | 247 | 1127 |
| Grand Total | 321 | 0 | 251 | 1 | 4 | 573 | 252 | 1716 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1968 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1599 | 185 | 26 | 2 | 1810 | 4353 | - |
| Approach\% | 56\% | 0\% | 43.8\% | 0.2\% |  | - | 12.8\% | 87.2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | - | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | - | 0\% | 88.3\% | 10.2\% | 1.4\% |  | - | - | - |
| Totals \% | 7.4\% | 0\% | 5.8\% | 0\% |  | 13.2\% | 5.8\% | 39.4\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 45.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 36.7\% | 4.2\% | 0.6\% |  | 41.6\% | - | - |
| Heavy | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 |  | - | 19 | 34 | 0 | 0 |  | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - | 0 | ${ }^{43}$ | 9 | 0 |  | - | - | - |
| Heavy \% | 0.6\% | 0\% | 2.8\% | 0\% |  | - | 7.5\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | - | 0\% | 2.7\% | 4.9\% | 0\% |  | - | - | - |
| Bicycles | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |

Bicycle \%

| Peak Hour: 07:30 AM-08:30 AM Weather: Broken Clouds (6.87 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | N Approach HAIG RD |  |  |  |  |  | E Approach DUNDAS STE |  |  |  |  |  | SApproachSOUTH DRIVEWAY |  |  |  |  |  | W Approach DUNDASSTE |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total ( 15 min ) |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | UTurn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | UTurn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | UTurn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | UTurn | Peds | Approach Total |  |
| 07:30:00 | 22 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 15 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 237 |
| 07:45:00 | 24 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 22 | ${ }^{133}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 82 | 274 |
| 08:00:00 | 24 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 12 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 94 | 243 |
| 08:15:00 | 20 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 15 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 88 | 252 |
| Grand Total | 90 | 0 | 59 | 1 | 0 | 150 | 64 | 469 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 282 | 36 | 5 | 0 | 323 | 1006 |
| Approach\% | 60\% | 0\% | 39.3\% | 0.7\% |  | - | 12\% | 88\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | - | 0\% | 87.3\% | 11.1\% | 1.5\% |  | - | - |
| Totals \% | 8.9\% | 0\% | 5.9\% | 0.1\% |  | 14.9\% | 6.4\% | 46.6\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 53\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 28\% | 3.6\% | 0.5\% |  | 32.1\% | - |
| PHF | 0.94 | 0 | 0.92 | 0.25 |  | 0.96 | 0.73 | 0.88 | 0 | 0 |  | 0.86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.86 | 0.82 | 0.42 |  | 0.86 | . |
| Heavy | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  | 6 | 12 | 21 | 0 | 0 |  | ${ }_{33}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 18 | 2 | $\bigcirc$ |  | 20 | - |
| Heavy \% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 8.5\% | 0\% |  | 4\% | 18.8\% | 4.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 6.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 6.4\% | 5.6\% | 0\% |  | 6.2\% | . |
| Lights | 89 | 0 | 54 | 1 |  | 144 | 52 | 448 | ${ }_{0}$ | 0 |  | 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | ${ }^{264}$ | ${ }_{34}$ | 5 |  | 303 | - |
| Lights \% | 98.9\% | 0\% | 91.5\% | 100\% |  | 96\% | 81.3\% | 95.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 93.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 93.6\% | 94.4\% | 100\% |  | 93.\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 3 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 |  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks \% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 3.4\% | 0\% |  | 2\% | 3.1\% | 2.6\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 2.6\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 2.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 2.2\% | $\cdot$ |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 3 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 |  | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 |  | 11 | - |
| Buses \% | 0\% | 0\% | 5.1\% | 0\% |  | 2\% | 15.6\% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 3.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 3.2\% | 5.6\% | 0\% |  | 3.4\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | - |
| Articulated Trucks \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.6\% | $\cdot$ |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| Bicycles on Road \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Pedestrians\% | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | 0\% |  | - | $\cdot$ | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | $\cdot$ |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk\% | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |


| Peak Hour: 04:00 PM - 05:00 PM Weather: Few Clouds ( $15.35{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | N Approach HAIG RD |  |  |  |  |  | E Approach DUNDAS STE |  |  |  |  |  | SApproachSOUTH DRIVEWAY |  |  |  |  |  | W Approach DUNDASSTE |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. Total } \\ & (15 \mathrm{~min}) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | UTurn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | UTurn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | UTurn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | UTurn | Peds | Approach Total |  |
| 16:00:00 | 15 | 0 | ${ }^{23}$ | 0 | 0 | 38 | 18 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 177 | 350 |
| 16:15:00 | 17 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | ${ }^{3}$ | 14 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 334 |
| 16:30:00 | 27 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 46 | 21 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 128 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 148 | 350 |
| 16:45:00 | 21 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 24 | ${ }^{123}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 169 | 353 |
| Grand Total | 80 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 1 | 154 | 77 | 494 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 571 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 590 | ${ }^{63}$ | 8 | 1 | 661 | 1387 |
| Approach\% | 51.9\% | 0\% | 48.1\% | 0\% |  | - | 13.5\% | 86.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | - | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | - | 0\% | 899\% | 9.5\% | 1.2\% |  | - | - |
| Totals \% | 5.8\% | 0\% | 5.3\% | 0\% |  | 11.1\% | 5.6\% | 35.6\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 41.2\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.1\% | 0\% | 42.5\% | 4.5\% | 0.6\% |  | 47.7\% | - |
| PHF | 0.74 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 |  | 0.84 | 0.8 | 0.92 | 0 | 0 |  | 0.92 | 0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 |  | 0.25 | 0 | 0.92 | 0.88 | 0.67 |  | 0.93 | - |
| Heavy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 |  | 7 | - |
| Heavy \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 3.9\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | 4.8\% | 0\% |  | 1.1\% | - |
| Lights | 80 | 0 | 74 | 0 |  | 154 | 74 | 490 | 0 | 0 |  | 564 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 586 | 60 | 8 |  | 654 | - |
| Lights \% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 100\% | 96.1\% | 99.2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 98.\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 99.3\% | 95.2\% | 100\% |  | 98.9\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 2 | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 1.6\% | 0\% |  | 0.3\% | - |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  | 4 | - |
| Buses \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 2.6\% | 0.6\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 3.2\% | 0\% |  | 0.6\% | - |
| Ariculated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | - |
| Articulated Trucks \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | $\cdot$ |
| Bicycles on Road \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | $\cdot$ |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Pedestrians\% | - | - | - | - | 33.3\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | $\cdot$ |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | $\cdot$ |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk\% | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 33.3\% |  | - | - | - | - | 33.3\% |  | - |



Peak Hour: 04:00 PM - 05:00 PM
Weather: Few Clouds $\left(15.35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$


Appendix D Synchro Outputs



|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个t |  | \% | 个t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 71 | 590 | 0 | 0 | 494 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 80 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 71 | 590 | 0 | 0 | 494 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 80 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (m) | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 70.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.980 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1738 | 3614 | 0 | 1921 | 3527 | 0 | 1921 | 1921 | 0 | 1825 | 1633 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1738 | 3614 | 0 | 1921 | 3527 | 0 | 1921 | 1921 | 0 | 1825 | 1633 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 246.3 |  |  | 240.1 |  |  | 117.4 |  |  | 185.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 18.5 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 8.8 |  |  | 13.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 72 | 602 | 0 | 0 | 504 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 82 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 72 | 602 | 0 | 0 | 583 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 82 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 35.4\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 中t |  | \% | 个t |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 71 | 590 | 0 | 0 | 494 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 80 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 71 | 590 | 0 | 0 | 494 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 80 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 72 | 602 | 0 | 0 | 504 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 82 |
| Pedestrians |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 |  |  | 1.1 |  |
| Percent Blockage |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 584 |  |  | 603 |  |  | 1082 | 1331 | 302 | 990 | 1292 | 294 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 584 |  |  | 603 |  |  | 1082 | 1331 | 302 | 990 | 1292 | 294 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s)p0 queue free \% | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
|  | 93 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 60 | 100 | 88 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 965 |  |  | 983 |  |  | 145 | 144 | 699 | 192 | 152 | 708 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | EB 3 | WB 1 | WB 2 | WB 3 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 72 | 401 | 201 | 0 | 336 | 247 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 82 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume RightcSH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 |  |  |
|  | 965 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 192 | 708 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity 0 | 0.07 | 0.24 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.15 | 2.01 | 0.43 | 0.40 | 0.12 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th ( m ) | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.4 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 35.6 | 10.8 |  |  |
| Lane LOS <br> Approach Delay (s) | A |  |  |  |  |  | A | A | E | B |  |  |
|  | 1.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 22.7 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | C |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 35.4\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 中 ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  | 7 | 个t |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 42 | 290 | 0 | 0 | 483 | 65 | O | O | 0 | 61 | - | 92 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 42 | 290 | 0 | 0 | 483 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 92 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 46 | 315 | 0 | 0 | 525 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 100 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 596 |  |  | 315 |  |  | 770 | 1003 | 158 | 810 | 968 | 298 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 596 |  |  | 315 |  |  | 770 | 1003 | 158 | 810 | 968 | 298 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 95 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 74 | 100 | 86 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 949 |  |  | 1257 |  |  | 243 | 232 | 866 | 250 | 244 | 701 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | EB 3 | WB 1 | WB 2 | WB 3 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 46 | 210 | 105 | 0 | 350 | 246 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 100 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| cSH | 949 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 250 | 701 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.14 | 1.26 | 0.33 | 0.26 | 0.14 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 3.8 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.5 | 11.0 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  | A | A | C | B |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 1.1 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 16.4 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | C |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 34.5\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 个t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 73 | 607 | 0 | 0 | 508 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 82 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 73 | 607 | 0 | 0 | 508 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 82 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (m) | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 70.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (m) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.980 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1738 | 3614 | 0 | 1921 | 3528 | 0 | 1921 | 1921 | 0 | 1825 | 1633 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1738 | 3614 | 0 | 1921 | 3528 | 0 | 1921 | 1921 | 0 | 1825 | 1633 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 246.3 |  |  | 240.1 |  |  | 117.4 |  |  | 185.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 18.5 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 8.8 |  |  | 13.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 74 | 619 | 0 | 0 | 518 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 84 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 74 | 619 | 0 | 0 | 599 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 84 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 36.1\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 个t |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 73 | 607 | 39 | 31 | 508 | 79 | 19 | 5 | 24 | 76 | 8 | 82 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 73 | 607 | 39 | 31 | 508 | 79 | 19 | 5 | 24 | 76 | 8 | 82 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (m) | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 70.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (m) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.991 |  |  | 0.980 |  |  | 0.876 |  |  | 0.863 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1738 | 3584 | 0 | 1825 | 3528 | 0 | 1825 | 1683 | 0 | 1825 | 1658 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1738 | 3584 | 0 | 1825 | 3528 | 0 | 1825 | 1683 | 0 | 1825 | 1658 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 246.3 |  |  | 240.1 |  |  | 117.4 |  |  | 185.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 18.5 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 8.8 |  |  | 13.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 74 | 619 | 40 | 32 | 518 | 81 | 19 | 5 | 24 | 78 | 8 | 84 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 74 | 659 | 0 | 32 | 599 | 0 | 19 | 29 | 0 | 78 | 92 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( m ) |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 42.3\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 性 |  | * | 㘖 |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 75 | 626 | 0 | 0 | 524 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 84 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 75 | 626 | 0 | 0 | 524 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 84 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (m) | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 70.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (m) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.980 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1738 | 3614 | 0 | 1921 | 3528 | 0 | 1921 | 1921 | 0 | 1825 | 1633 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1738 | 3614 | 0 | 1921 | 3528 | 0 | 1921 | 1921 | 0 | 1825 | 1633 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 246.3 |  |  | 240.1 |  |  | 117.4 |  |  | 185.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 18.5 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 8.8 |  |  | 13.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 77 | 639 | 0 | 0 | 535 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 86 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 77 | 639 | 0 | 0 | 618 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 86 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | her |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 36.8\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | p |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个t |  | \% | 个t |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 75 | 626 | 103 | 82 | 524 | 81 | 49 | 12 | 62 | 78 | 21 | 84 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 75 | 626 | 103 | 82 | 524 | 81 | 49 | 12 | 62 | 78 | 21 | 84 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (m) | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 70.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.980 |  |  | 0.874 |  |  | 0.879 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1738 | 3543 | 0 | 1825 | 3528 | 0 | 1825 | 1679 | 0 | 1825 | 1689 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1738 | 3543 | 0 | 1825 | 3528 | 0 | 1825 | 1679 | 0 | 1825 | 1689 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 246.3 |  |  | 240.1 |  |  | 117.4 |  |  | 185.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 18.5 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 8.8 |  |  | 13.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 77 | 639 | 105 | 84 | 535 | 83 | 50 | 12 | 63 | 80 | 21 | 86 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 77 | 744 | 0 | 84 | 618 | 0 | 50 | 75 | 0 | 80 | 107 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | her |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 46.2\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 个 ${ }_{\text {d }}$ |  | 7 | 个t |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 44 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 512 | 69 | O | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 98 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 44 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 512 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 98 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 48 | 335 | 0 | 0 | 557 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 107 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 632 |  |  | 335 |  |  | 816 | 1063 | 168 | 858 | 1026 | 316 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 632 |  |  | 335 |  |  | 816 | 1063 | 168 | 858 | 1026 | 316 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 95 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 69 | 100 | 84 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 920 |  |  | 1236 |  |  | 220 | 213 | 854 | 230 | 224 | 683 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | EB 3 | WB 1 | WB 2 | WB 3 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 48 | 223 | 112 | 0 | 371 | 261 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 107 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |  |  |
| cSH | 920 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 230 | 683 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.15 | 1.26 | 0.33 | 0.31 | 0.16 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 4.2 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.5 | 11.3 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  | A | A | D | B |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 1.1 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 17.7 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | C |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 35.8\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 个 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  | \％ | 性 |  | \％ | 个 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 44 | 308 | 25 | 45 | 512 | 69 | 143 | 26 | 91 | 65 | 12 | 98 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 44 | 308 | 25 | 45 | 512 | 69 | 143 | 26 | 91 | 65 | 12 | 98 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（m） | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 70.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length（ m ） | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Utill．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.989 |  |  | 0.982 |  |  | 0.883 |  |  | 0.866 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1722 | 3420 | 0 | 1825 | 3361 | 0 | 1825 | 1696 | 0 | 1674 | 1649 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1722 | 3420 | 0 | 1825 | 3361 | 0 | 1825 | 1696 | 0 | 1674 | 1649 | 0 |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 246.3 |  |  | 240.1 |  |  | 117.4 |  |  | 185.9 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 18.5 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 8.8 |  |  | 13.9 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 6\％ | 6\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 5\％ | 19\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 9\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 48 | 335 | 27 | 49 | 557 | 75 | 155 | 28 | 99 | 71 | 13 | 107 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 48 | 362 | 0 | 49 | 632 | 0 | 155 | 127 | 0 | 71 | 120 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type：Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type：Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 44．3\％Analysis Period（min） 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 中t |  | \% | 个t |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 77 | 645 | 121 | 97 | 540 | 84 | 58 | 15 | 73 | 80 | 24 | 87 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 77 | 645 | 121 | 97 | 540 | 84 | 58 | 15 | 73 | 80 | 24 | 87 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (m) | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 70.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.976 |  |  | 0.980 |  |  | 0.875 |  |  | 0.882 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1738 | 3533 | 0 | 1825 | 3528 | 0 | 1825 | 1681 | 0 | 1825 | 1694 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1738 | 3533 | 0 | 1825 | 3528 | 0 | 1825 | 1681 | 0 | 1825 | 1694 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 246.3 |  |  | 240.1 |  |  | 117.4 |  |  | 185.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 18.5 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 8.8 |  |  | 13.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 79 | 658 | 123 | 99 | 551 | 86 | 59 | 15 | 74 | 82 | 24 | 89 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 79 | 781 | 0 | 99 | 637 | 0 | 59 | 89 | 0 | 82 | 113 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 48.3\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个 ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  | 7 | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 7 | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | 7 | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 48 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 552 | 75 | O | , | 0 | 70 | 0 | 106 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 48 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 552 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 106 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 52 | 361 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 115 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 682 |  |  | 361 |  |  | 880 | 1147 | 180 | 926 | 1106 | 341 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 682 |  |  | 361 |  |  | 880 | 1147 | 180 | 926 | 1106 | 341 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 94 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 63 | 100 | 83 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 880 |  |  | 1209 |  |  | 193 | 189 | 837 | 204 | 200 | 658 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | EB 3 | WB 1 | WB 2 | WB 3 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 52 | 241 | 120 | 0 | 400 | 282 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 115 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |  |  |
| cSH | 880 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 204 | 658 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.17 | 1.26 | 0.33 | 0.37 | 0.17 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.3 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.8 | 11.6 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  | A | A | D | B |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 1.2 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 20.1 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | C |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 37.5\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |






|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | p |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个t |  | \% | 个t |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 83 | 694 | 121 | 97 | 581 | 90 | 58 | 15 | 73 | 87 | 24 | 94 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 83 | 694 | 121 | 97 | 581 | 90 | 58 | 15 | 73 | 87 | 24 | 94 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (m) | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 70.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.978 |  |  | 0.980 |  |  | 0.875 |  |  | 0.880 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1738 | 3540 | 0 | 1825 | 3528 | 0 | 1825 | 1681 | 0 | 1825 | 1691 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1738 | 3540 | 0 | 1825 | 3528 | 0 | 1825 | 1681 | 0 | 1825 | 1691 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 246.3 |  |  | 240.1 |  |  | 117.4 |  |  | 185.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 18.5 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 8.8 |  |  | 13.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 85 | 708 | 123 | 99 | 593 | 92 | 59 | 15 | 74 | 89 | 24 | 96 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 85 | 831 | 0 | 99 | 685 | 0 | 59 | 89 | 0 | 89 | 120 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | her |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 50.0\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 中 ${ }_{\text {d }}$ |  | 7 | 个t |  | 7 | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | 7 | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 52 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 595 | 81 | O | , | 0 | 76 | 0 | 114 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 52 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 595 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 114 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 57 | 388 | 0 | 0 | 647 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 124 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 735 |  |  | 388 |  |  | 950 | 1237 | 194 | 999 | 1193 | 368 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 735 |  |  | 388 |  |  | 950 | 1237 | 194 | 999 | 1193 | 368 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 93 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 53 | 100 | 80 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 840 |  |  | 1182 |  |  | 166 | 165 | 821 | 178 | 176 | 632 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | EB 3 | WB 1 | WB 2 | WB 3 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 57 | 259 | 129 | 0 | 431 | 304 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 124 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |  |  |
| cSH | 840 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 178 | 632 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.07 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.18 | 1.26 | 0.33 | 0.47 | 0.20 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.8 | 5.5 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 41.7 | 12.1 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  | A | A | E | B |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 1.2 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 23.9 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | C |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 39.4\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | 4 |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | - | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 性 |  | \% | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \% | f |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 90 | 748 | 0 | 0 | 626 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 101 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 90 | 748 | 0 | 0 | 626 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 101 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (m) | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 70.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.980 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1738 | 3614 | 0 | 1921 | 3528 | 0 | 1921 | 1921 | 0 | 1825 | 1633 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1738 | 3614 | 0 | 1921 | 3528 | 0 | 1921 | 1921 | 0 | 1825 | 1633 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 246.3 |  |  | 240.1 |  |  | 117.4 |  |  | 185.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 18.5 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 8.8 |  |  | 13.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 92 | 763 | 0 | 0 | 639 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 103 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 92 | 763 | 0 | 0 | 738 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 103 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 42.0\% ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $>$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 郎 |  | ${ }_{1}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 90 | 748 | 0 | 0 | 626 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 101 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 90 | 748 | 0 | 0 | 626 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 101 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 92 | 763 | 0 | 0 | 639 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 103 |
| Pedestrians |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 |  |  | 1.1 |  |
| Percent Blockage |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 739 |  |  | 764 |  |  | 1372 | 1687 | 382 | 1255 | 1638 | 371 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 739 |  |  | 764 |  |  | 1372 | 1687 | 382 | 1255 | 1638 | 371 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 89 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 20 | 100 | 84 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 843 |  |  | 857 |  |  | 82 | 84 | 621 | 119 | 90 | 631 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | EB 3 | WB 1 | WB 2 | WB 3 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 92 | 509 | 254 | 0 | 426 | 312 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 103 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |  |  |
| cSH | 843 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 119 | 631 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.11 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.18 | 2.01 | 0.43 | 0.80 | 0.16 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 35.3 | 4.4 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 103.3 | 11.8 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  | A | A | F | B |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 1.1 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 55.7 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | F |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 6.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 42.0\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | p |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 个t |  | \% | 个t |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 90 | 748 | 121 | 97 | 626 | 97 | 58 | 15 | 73 | 93 | 24 | 101 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 90 | 748 | 121 | 97 | 626 | 97 | 58 | 15 | 73 | 93 | 24 | 101 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (m) | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 70.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.980 |  |  | 0.875 |  |  | 0.878 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1738 | 3543 | 0 | 1825 | 3528 | 0 | 1825 | 1681 | 0 | 1825 | 1687 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1738 | 3543 | 0 | 1825 | 3528 | 0 | 1825 | 1681 | 0 | 1825 | 1687 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |  | 48 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 246.3 |  |  | 240.1 |  |  | 117.4 |  |  | 185.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 18.5 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 8.8 |  |  | 13.9 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 92 | 763 | 123 | 99 | 639 | 99 | 59 | 15 | 74 | 95 | 24 | 103 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 92 | 886 | 0 | 99 | 738 | 0 | 59 | 89 | 0 | 95 | 127 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 54.4\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Appendix E Signal Warrant Analysis

## Analysis Sheet

Intersection: Dundas Street East and Haig Road/Site Access Analysis Period: Future Total 2039
Signal Warrant Analysis Date: November 3, 2023

## Justification 7-1: Minimum Vehicle Volumes

Restricted Flow Urban Conditions


## Justification 7-2: Delay to Cross Traffic

Restricted Flow Urban Conditions


## Results Sheet

Intersection: Dundas Street East and Haig Road/Site Access
Signal Warrant Analysis Date: November 3, 2023

## Analysis Period: Future Total 2039

Analyst: GHD

## Summary Results

| Justification |  |  | Compliance | Signal Justified? |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | YES | NO |
| 7-1. Minimum Vehicular Volume | A | Total Volume |  | 108.5\% | X | $\checkmark$ |
|  | B | Crossing Volume | 120.0\% |  |  |
| 7-2. Delay toCrossTraffic | A | Main Road | 91.3\% | X | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | B | Crossing Road | 120.0\% |  |  |  |

Appendix F AutoTURN Swept Path Analysis
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