

1265 Teron Road, Kanata Ontario Megha Holdings Inc.

Transportation Impact Assessment

December 3, 2020

BT Eng Project 19-032



Table of Contents

Intro	luction1
1	Screening2
1.1	Summary of Development2
1.2	Trip Generation Triggers2
1.3	Location Triggers
1.4	Safety Triggers
1.5	Summary
2	Scoping4
2.1	Existing and Planned Conditions4
2.2	Study Area and Time Period11
2.3	Exemption Review11
3	Forecasting12
3.1	Development-Generated Travel Demand12
3.2	Background Network Travel Demand15
3.3	Demand Rationalization16
4	Analysis
4.1	Development Design
4.2	Parking
4.3	Boundary Street Design
4.4	Access Intersection Design 22
4.5	Transportation Demand Management (TDM)23
4.6	Neighbourhood Traffic Management24
4.7	Transit
4.8	Review of Network Concept 25
4.9	Intersection Design
Conc	usion
Reco	nmendations



List of Figures

Figure 1: Project Location	. 1
Figure 2: Public Transportation Network near the Project Site	. 5
Figure 3: Sidewalk and Pathways near the Project Site	. 6
Figure 4: Existing Turning Movement Volumes, AM (PM) Peak Hour	. 7
Figure 5: Number of Collisions per Year at March Road / Teron Road	. 9
Figure 6: Types of Collisions at March Road / Teron Road	. 9
Figure 7: Intersection Collision Diagram – March Road / Teron Road	10
Figure 8: Auto Trip Generation, AM (PM) Peak Hour1	14
Figure 9: 2025 Background Turning Movement Volumes, AM (PM) Peak Hour	15
Figure 10: Background Development Traffic, AM (PM) Peak Hour	16
Figure 11: 2025 Total Projected Turning Movement Volumes, AM (PM) Peak Hour	17
Figure 12: Swept Path Analysis – WB-19 Trucks Accessing Loading Bays and Leaving the Site	19
Figure 13: Swept Path Analysis – WB-19 Trucks Entering the Site	19
Figure 14: Left-Turn Lane Warrant Chart – Proposed Access on Teron Road, 2025 Total Traffic	23
Figure 15: Left-Turn Lane Warrant Chart – Carling Avenue Westbound at Teron Road,	
2025 Background Traffic	25



List of Tables

Table 1: Description of Proposed Development	2
Table 2: Trip Generation Triggers	2
Table 3: Location Triggers	3
Table 4: Safety Triggers	3
Table 5: Summary of TIA Triggers	4
Table 6: Possible TIA Exemptions	12
Table 7: Trip Generation	13
Table 8: Target Level of Services for Road Segment	20
Table 9: Pedestrian Level of Service on Teron Road	21
Table 10: Truck Level of Service on Teron Road	22
Table 11: Auto Levels of Service at the Proposed Site Access	23
Table 12: Existing or Planned Road Classes and Designations for each Transportation Mode	26
Table 13: Target LOS for each Transportation Mode	26
Table 14: Pedestrian Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections	27
Table 15: Bicycle Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections	29
Table 16: Transit Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections	31
Table 17: Truck Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections	32
Table 18: Auto Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections	33
Table 19: Auto Levels of Service at a Stop-Controlled Intersection	

Appendices

Appendix A	TIA Certification
Appendix B	Site Plan
Appendix C	Traffic Count Reports
Appendix D	Collision Details Report
Appendix E	O-D Survey – Kanata-Stittsville
Appendix F	TRANS Regional Model
Appendix G	TDM Checklists
Appendix H	Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis
Appendix I	Synchro Traffic Analysis Reports



Introduction

The purpose of this report is to assess the transportation impact of a proposed industrial building located at 1265 Teron Road, on the south side of Teron Road near March Road in Kanata, Ottawa, Ontario. The project site is shown on **Figure 1**.



Figure 1: Project Location

The format of this report is consistent with the City of Ottawa's Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) Guidelines (2017).



1 Screening

1.1 Summary of Development

Table 1 presents a description of the proposed development. A detailed layout is included in Appendix B.

Municipal Address	1265 Teron Road, Kanata, K2K 1X2		
Description of Location	South side of Teron Road, halfway (approx. 300 m) between March Road and Carling Avenue		
Land Use Classification	General Industrial Zone, IG6 Subzone		
Development Size (units)	n/a		
Development Size (m²)	9,281 m ²		
Number of Accesses and Locations	1 proposed full access on Teron Road		
Phase of Development	Phase 1 of 1		
Buildout Year	2020		

Table 1: Description of Proposed Development

1.2 Trip Generation Triggers

A TIA is warranted if the proposed development is anticipated to generate a significant number of persontrips that may affect the performance of the transportation network. **Table 2** presents the trip generation triggers.

Land Use Type	Minimum Development Size	Proposed Development Size
Single-family homes	40 units	-
Townhomes or apartments	90 units	-
Office	3,500 m²	-
Industrial	5,000 m²	9,281 m²
Fast-food restaurant or coffee shop	100 m²	-
Destination retail	1,000 m²	-
Gas station or convenience market	75 m²	_

Table 2: Trip Generation Triggers



The proposed land uses exceed the trip generation threshold for an industrial development. Therefore, a TIA is **warranted** based on trip generation.

1.3 Location Triggers

A TIA may be warranted based on location. **Table 3** presents the location triggers.

Table 3: Location Triggers

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

Based on the information above, a TIA is **not warranted** based on location.

1.4 Safety Triggers

A TIA may be warranted based on safety. Table 4 presents the safety triggers.

Table 4: Safety Triggers

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

Based on the information above, a TIA is **not warranted** based on safety.

1.5 Summary

A TIA is warranted if any of the justifications in **Table 5** are met.



Table 5: Summary of TIA Triggers

Trigger Category	Yes/No
Does the development satisfy one of the trip generation triggers?	Yes
Does the development satisfy one of the location triggers?	No
Does the development satisfy one of the safety triggers?	No

Based on the information above, a TIA is warranted.

2 Scoping

2.1 Existing and Planned Conditions

2.1.1 Proposed Development

The project consists of the construction of a 1-storey industrial building with a total area of 9,281 m² (99,900 sq. ft.) and an off-street parking lot with a capacity of 90 spaces. A site plan is provided in **Appendix B**.

The building is expected to serve as a warehouse with some office use. The estimated year of occupancy is 2020.

The project site will be accessed by a single full-access driveway on Teron Road, located as shown on the site plan. A sidewalk will be built from the building to the edge of the roadway.

2.1.2 Existing Conditions

2.1.2.1 Roadways

Between March Road and Carling Avenue, Teron Road is a rural 2-lane undivided local roadway in a light industrial setting. The intersection with March Road is fully signalized while the intersection with Carling Avenue is Stop-controlled on the northbound approach. Beyond March Road, Teron Road becomes an urban residential collector road. The posted speed limit is 50 km/h.

March Road is a divided multi-lane arterial roadway and truck route serving Kanata North and connecting to Highway 417. Its posted speed limit is 80 km/h. Beyond Highway 417, March Road becomes Eagleson Road, a divided arterial road serving Kanata South.

Near the study area, Carling Avenue is an undivided arterial roadway extending from March Road through the Greenbelt. It is also a truck route with restricted loads. Beyond Moodie Drive, Carling Road becomes a multi-lane arterial extending to the city core and connecting to several north-south arterials.



2.1.2.2 Public Transportation

Figure 2 illustrates the available public transportation service near the project site. There is no service in front of the project site but several major bus routes are present at walking distance, including Rapid bus Route 63 and local bus Route 64, both providing frequent service in both directions between Kanata North and the LRT at Tunney's Pasture. Connexion bus 266 also provides a fast service between Kanata North and Tunney's Pasture, but only during peak hours in peak directions (toward downtown in the morning, Kanata North in the afternoon). The nearest bus stops to access bus routes 63, 64 and 266 in any direction are located on March Road just north of Teron Road, at a walking distance of 420 to 440 m from the proposed development.



Figure 2: Public Transportation Network near the Project Site

Two local bus routes are also available on nearby Herzberg Road: Route 66, connecting to Tunney's Pasture via Carling Avenue and Moodie Station, and Route 166, connecting to Eagleson Station. These 2 routes operate only during peak hours in the peak direction (both toward Kanata North in the morning).



2.1.2.3 Active Transportation Network

As shown on **Figure 3**, there is no sidewalk provided on Teron Road between March Road and Carling Avenue and a sidewalk is provided only on a segment of Carling Avenue near March Road.

Sidewalks are provided on March Road north of Teron Road and on Teron Road west of March Road. A pathway also exists along March Road south of Teron Road, providing an additional access to the residential community west of March Road.

Bicycle lanes and paved shoulders are provided on March Road, Carling Avenue, Herzberg Road and Teron Road west of March Road. NCC's Watts Creek Pathway and Greenbelt Pathway can both be accessed via Carling Avenue east of Herzberg Road.



Figure 3: Sidewalk and Pathways near the Project Site



2.1.2.4 Existing Traffic Volumes

Traffic count reports were acquired from the City of Ottawa for the following intersections:

- March Road / Herzberg Road (August 10, 2016);
- March Road / Teron Road (April 11, 2017);
- March Road / Carling Avenue (August 10, 2016);
- Carling Avenue / Teron Road (June 23, 2010); and
- Carling Avenue / Herzberg Road (August 10, 2016).

The traffic data for the intersection at Carling Avenue / Teron Road is 9 years old. Therefore, BTE conducted a turning movement count at that location on November 19, 2019, capturing the morning and afternoon peak hours.

Figure 4 presents the existing traffic volumes near the project site. Traffic count reports are provided in **Appendix C**.



Figure 4: Existing Turning Movement Volumes, AM (PM) Peak Hour



It was observed during the traffic count at Carling Avenue / Teron Road that the northbound left-turn movement is busier than anticipated during the morning peak hour, with a queue that lasted the entire peak hour. It is suspected that Teron Road is used as a bypass route by drivers coming from the south and heading toward the Kanata North Business Park.

The traffic count reports reveal that pedestrian and cycling volumes are generally very low (less than 10), with the following exceptions:

- March Road / Carling Avenue: 18 northbound cyclists and 20 pedestrians on the east crosswalk were counted during the morning peak hour, and 10 southbound cyclists during the afternoon peak hour;
- Carling Avenue / Herzberg Road: 32 westbound cyclists were counted during the morning peak hour, and 29 eastbound and 19 southbound cyclists during the afternoon peak hour.

2.1.2.5 Collision History

The City of Ottawa provided a detailed collision report for the area near the project site, including Teron Road between March Road and Carling Avenue, for a 5-year period from January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2018. No fatal collisions were recorded during that period. A detailed collision history report is available in **Appendix D**.

Only 3 collisions were reported on Teron Road between March Road and Carling Avenue, 2 of them involving an improper turning movement (one causing injury) and a third one involving only one vehicle.

Five collisions were reported at the intersection of Carling Avenue / Teron Road. Two of them involved injuries. Three collisions were rear ends, one involved a turning vehicle, and one involved only one vehicle.

Thirty-two (32) collisions were reported at the intersection of March Road / Teron Road, an average of 6.4 per year. **Figure 5** illustrates the number of collisions per year. **Figure 6** illustrates the number of collisions for each different type recorded at this intersection.





Figure 5: Number of Collisions per Year at March Road / Teron Road



Figure 6: Types of Collisions at March Road / Teron Road

Figure 7 illustrates the types of collisions and the direction of the involved vehicles for each collision at the intersection of March Road / Teron Road.





Figure 7: Intersection Collision Diagram – March Road / Teron Road

The vast majority of collisions occurred during clear weather (only 1 instance with snow, 5 with rain) and during daytime. Two collisions involved only one vehicle, including one collision with a pedestrian causing injury.

The number of collisions at March Road / Teron Road appears to have increased from 2014 to 2018, albeit not consistently. The number of rear-end collisions is higher than any other type of collision, but this is not unusual for a signalized intersection. It is noted that this intersection is located on a curve and that March Road has a high posted speed limit (80 km/h). Otherwise, no discernable pattern is evident that would indicate a deficiency.

2.1.3 Planned Conditions

2.1.3.1 Background Developments

According to the City of Ottawa's Development Application Search tool, several developments are planned in the vicinity of the project site.

One proposed development, submitted in 2014, consists of 2 light industrial/office buildings located at 1285 Teron Road but no details are available at this time.

A 3-unit commercial building is also planned at the corner of March Road and Teron Road (329 March Road) and a 2-story office building with a 1,600 m² footprint is planned at 56 Steacie Drive. These two projects are not expected to have a significant impact on traffic near the project site.

A residential development and a mixed-use development totalling 139 residential units and 1,068 m² (11,500 sq. ft.) of commercial floor area including a sit-down restaurant are planned at 1131 and 1151



Teron Road, respectively. The project's transportation impact assessment concludes that these developments will not have a major influence on the performance on the nearby intersections.

2.1.3.2 Roadways

The 2013 Transportation Master Plan indicates that no change to the road capacity is planned near the project site within the 2031 planning horizon.

2.1.3.3 Public Transportation

The 2013 Transportation Master Plan identifies March Road as a bus rapid transit (BRT) corridor as part of the 2031 Affordable Network, with a planned bus station at the intersection of March Road and Teron Road.

2.1.3.4 Active Transportation

No cycling or pedestrian facilities are currently planned near the project site.

2.2 Study Area and Time Period

2.2.1 Study Area

For the purpose of this analysis, the study area includes the project site driveways as well as the following intersections:

- March Road / Herzberg Road;
- March Road / Teron Road;
- March Road / Carling Avenue;
- Carling Avenue / Teron Road; and
- Carling Avenue / Herzberg Road.

2.2.2 Time Periods

The proposed development is expected to be in operation during normal business hours. The critical peak periods are expected to be the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours.

2.2.3 Horizon Year

The buildout year of the project is 2020. Therefore, the year 2025 (5 years after buildout) is used as a reference for analysis.

2.3 Exemption Review

Table 6 presents the elements of the TIA Guidelines that can be exempted from the analysis.



Table 6: Possible TIA Exemptions

Element	Exemption	Exempt?
4.1.2 Circulation and Access	Only required for site plans	No
4.1.3 New Street Networks	Only required for plans of subdivision	Yes
4.2.1 Parking Supply	Only required for site plans	No
4.2.2 Spillover Parking	Only required for site plans where parking supply is 15% below unconstrained demand	Yes
4.5 Transportation Demand Management	Not required for site plans expected to have fewer than 60 employees and/or students on location at any given time	Νο
4.6.1 Adjacent Neighbourhoods Only required when the development relies on local or collector streets for access and total volumes exceed ATM capacity thresholds		
4.8 Network Concept	Only required when the proposed development generates more than 200 person-trips during the peak hour in excess of the equivalent volume permitted by established zoning	Yes

Note: The proposed development's only access is on a roadway classified as a local street. However, the item "4.6.1 Adjacent Neighbourhoods" is considered exempt because the development is consistent with the industrial character of the neighbourhood (akin to developing a residential building on a residential street) and because the anticipated trip demand is not high enough to significantly impact the safety and quality of life of the other road users. In fact, the addition of a single driveway on Teron Road would actually reinforce its purpose as a "local street" (i.e. to facilitate access), compared to the purpose of an arterial roadway (to facilitate movement).

3 Forecasting

3.1 Development-Generated Travel Demand

3.1.1 Trip Generation and Mode Shares

3.1.1.1 Employees

The developer has indicated that the proposed development will have up to 75 employees. According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual 10th Edition, a warehouse (ITE code 150), described as primarily devoted to the storage of materials but occasionally provided with office and maintenance areas, is expected to generate 0.61 and 0.66 vehicular trips per employee, i.e. 45 and 50 vehicular trips, during the morning and the afternoon peak hours respectively.

Assuming a 10% non-auto mode share and an average vehicle occupancy of 1.15, these values amount to 59 and 63 person trips during the morning and the afternoon peak hours respectively.



The information contained in the 2011 TRANS O-D Survey Report for the Kanata-Stittsville district (provided in **Appendix E**) has been used to determine the modal distribution for an average peak period. The resulting number of trips for each peak hour is presented in **Table 7**. The proportions of entering and exiting trips are based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual.

		Morning Peak Hour Trips		Aftern	oon Peak Hou	ır Trips	
	Modal		Entering	Exiting		Entering	Exiting
Mode	Distribution	Total	(72%)	(28%)	Total	(36%)	(65%)
Auto Driver	64%	37	27	10	41	15	26
Auto Passenger	17%	10	7	3	11	4	7
Transit User	11%	7	5	2	7	2	5
Cyclist	1%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pedestrian	7%	4	3	1	4	1	3
Total	100%	59	42	16	63	23	41

Table 7: Trip Generation

3.1.1.2 Trucks

The developer has indicated that there will be an average of 2 truck deliveries per day and a maximum of 5 truck deliveries per day. For the purpose of this assessment, it is assumed that 2 trucks will be entering the site and 2 will be exiting the site during the morning and the afternoon peak hour.

3.1.2 Trip Distribution and Assignment

3.1.2.1 Employees

The 2011 TRANS O-D Survey was used to determine the trip distribution of car drivers (see **Appendix E**). It was determined that 50% of trips would be to/from east of Kanata, 10% would be to/from the rural west and 40% would be local, i.e. made within the Kanata-Stittsville area.

The vast majority of the auto trips to/from east of Kanata are expected to travel on Highway 417, while a small proportion would likely travel on Carling Avenue. Trips to/from the rural west will likely travel on Highway 417 as well, but some trips may be made on March Road north of the project site. The Kanata-Stittsville area is very large and includes various residential communities located north, south and west of the project site.

In consideration of the above, and of the road network configuration, the following car trip assignments were assumed:

- 10% via Carling Avenue east of Herzberg Road;
- 10% via Herzberg Road north of Carling Avenue;
- 10% via March Road north of Teron Road;



- 10% via Teron Road west of March Road; and
- 60% via March Road south of Teron Road.

Regarding non-auto modes, considering that the nearest residential area is located west of March Road, that all major bus routes are found on March Road and that no pedestrian facilities are provided on Teron Road and on Carling Avenue, it is anticipated that the totality of non-auto trips (11 trips during each peak hours) will be travelling via the intersection of March Road / Teron Road. Both pedestrian and transit users are expected to walk along the roadway between March Road and the project site.

Figure 8 presents the number of auto trips generated by the proposed development during the morning and the afternoon peak hours.



Figure 8: Auto Trip Generation, AM (PM) Peak Hour

3.1.2.2 Trucks

Truck trips are anticipated to be regional. For the purpose of this assessment, all trucks are assumed to be travelling via March Road south of Teron Road.



3.2 Background Network Travel Demand

3.2.1 Transportation Network Plans

As indicated in **Section 2.1.3**, no changes to the road capacity or to the active transportation network are planned near the project site within the 2031 planning horizon.

March Road is identified as a BRT corridor with a planned bus station at the intersection of March Road and Teron Road.

3.2.2 Background Growth

A review of the City's Strategic Long Range Model, comparing snapshots of the TRANS regional model for the 2011 AM base scenario and the 2031 AM affordable network (provided in **Appendix F**) was conducted. An annual growth rate within the 0% to 0.8% range is anticipated on Teron Road, March Road and Carling Avenue near the project site. Therefore, a 0.5% annual background growth rate has been applied.

Figure 9 presents the background traffic volumes for the 2025 horizon year within the study area.



Figure 9: 2025 Background Turning Movement Volumes, AM (PM) Peak Hour



3.2.3 Other Developments

As indicated in **Section 2.1.3**, no planned development, on its own, is expected to have a significant impact on traffic near the project site.

Nevertheless, as requested by the City of Ottawa, the planned developments at 329 March Road and at 1131/1151 Teron Road were included as part of the background travel demand which is presented in **Figure 10**.



Figure 10: Background Development Traffic, AM (PM) Peak Hour

3.3 Demand Rationalization

Figure 11 shows the total traffic volumes anticipated for the 2025 horizon year, based on the traffic background growth and trip generation rates discussed above.



Figure 11: 2025 Total Projected Turning Movement Volumes, AM (PM) Peak Hour

The anticipated auto trip generation by the proposed development is considered very low and unlikely to significantly affect existing traffic operations. The planned BRT on March Road will undoubtedly increase the public transportation's modal share. However, it may not be completed before 2025, and therefore no adjustment to the anticipated modal distribution has been made to reflect its addition to the transportation network.

As indicated in **Section 4.9.2** of this report, the road network is currently experiencing congestion. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to expect that many of the future employees will still opt to drive to work. While the City clearly aims to increase non-auto mode shares as stated in their 2031 Transportation Master Plan, the modal distribution presented in **Table 7** is considered reasonable.

BT ENGINEERING



4 Analysis

4.1 Development Design

4.1.1 Design for Sustainable Modes

A review of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist has been conducted. A copy of the checklist is included in **Appendix G**.

4.1.1.1 Pedestrians

The proposed development includes a sidewalk along the access to the parking lot and along the front of the building. Walking paths will surround the proposed parking lot for the benefit of drivers.

4.1.1.2 Bicycles

Bicycle spaces will be provided along the building for the occasional cyclist. Access is not expected to be an issue for cyclists as the operating speed on the parking lot access will be low.

4.1.1.3 Transit

The proposed development is located within 600 m of the nearest transit service. Frequent service is provided on March Road by Rapid bus Route 63 and local bus Route 64 during working hours and express service is provided by Connexion Route 266 during peak hours. Therefore, no mitigation measure is recommended with respect to public transportation.

4.1.1.4 Autos

All the parking stalls will be located along the west side of the building (the street side is facing north) and will be surrounded by clearly identified walkways, allowing drivers to safely travel between their cars and the building. Accessible parking stalls will be provided near the building entrances, complete with recessed curbs.

4.1.2 Circulation and Access

Based on the site plan, the loading bays are expected to be used by WB-19 tractor trailers. **Figures 12** and **13** present a swept path analysis using a WB-19 tractor trailer template as a design vehicle. As shown, access to and from the loading bays is not expected to be an issue, nor is access to and from Teron Road. However, a minimum corner radius of 12 m must be provided at Teron Road to ensure that the design vehicle does not overlap the edge of pavement.





Figure 12: Swept Path Analysis – WB-19 Trucks Accessing Loading Bays and Leaving the Site



Figure 13: Swept Path Analysis – WB-19 Trucks Entering the Site



4.1.3 New Street Networks

[Exempt.]

4.2 Parking

4.2.1 Parking Supply

The proposed parking lot will contain 90 parking stalls, which exceeds the Zoning By-law requirement (0.8 stall per 100 m² of gross floor area, or a total of 75 stalls) and the anticipated number of employees (up to 75).

Three (3) Type 'A' and 3 Type 'B' accessible parking spaces will be provided, consistent with the City's Accessibility Design Standards.

Ten (10) bicycle parking spaces will be provided, exceeding the Zoning By-law requirement (1 space per 2,000 m² of gross floor area, or a total of 5 stalls).

4.2.2 Spillover Parking

[Exempt.]

4.3 Boundary Street Design

The 2015 Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) Guidelines and its 2017 Addendum were used to evaluate the levels of service on Teron Road for each mode of transportation. Schedule B of the City's Official Plan identifies the project site as being within the Urban Employment Area. Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS Guidelines is used to determine the target LOS of each non-auto mode; these targets are presented in **Table 8**.

Pedestrian LOS	estrian LOS Bicycle LOS Transit LOS		Truck LOS
С	No Target	No Target	E

Because the proposed development is located on a local street that is not part of a bicycle route and is not served by transit, no target is provided for these two modes of transportation.

The operating speed of the boundary street is assumed as 10 km/h above the posted speed limit or, in this case, 60 km/h.

According to the 2017 Addendum, the "Average Daily Curb Lane Traffic Volume" (ADCLTV) is used as a traffic criterion for the pedestrian LOS analysis. The ADCLTV in this case is assumed as 10 times the average peak hour volume in the direction adjacent to the pedestrian facility. For this calculation, heavy vehicles are accounted for using a passenger car equivalent of 2.0. According to the 2025 total projected



turning movement volumes (**Figure 11**), the ADCLTV within the 2025 horizon on Teron Road in the northbound direction is expected to vary from 2,400 to 3,000 vehicles per day.

4.3.1 Pedestrian Level of Service (PLOS)

For the proposed development, the City of Ottawa requested that the existing gravel shoulder be upgraded to a paved shoulder along the site frontage. The results of the segment PLOS analysis are summarized in **Table 9**.

Parameter	Existing Propose		
Sidewalk width	No sidewalk, gravel shoulder	1.3 m paved shoulder	
Boulevard width	n/a	n/a	
Average Daily Curb Lane Traffic Volume (ADCLTV)	≤ 3,000 veh/d		
Presence of on-street parking	No		
Operating speed	60 km/h		
Pedestrian level of service	F	F	

Table 9: Pedestrian Level of Service on Teron Road

The absence of a pedestrian facility combined with a moderately high operating speed automatically yields a PLOS F.

The MMLOS Guidelines recognize that a paved shoulder may be an appropriate pedestrian facility in certain cases but recommend that the resulting PLOS be adjusted down one grade to acknowledge its lower safety and lesser convenience compared to a sidewalk.

It is noted that a paved shoulder would yield a PLOS F if less than 1.8 m wide, regardless of the other parameters. At 1.8 m or wider, a paved shoulder would yield a PLOS D if the operational speed is maintained at 60 km/h and PLOS C if the operational speed is reduced to 50 km/h (i.e. posted speed limit of 40 km/h).

A sidewalk of the same width would yield a PLOS C and a PLOS B respectively. However, the City has noted that a sidewalk along the site frontage would cause an issue with drainage, and therefore this solution has not been carried forward.

Although no bicycle LOS target is defined, a paved shoulder would improve cycling access to the site.



4.3.2 Truck Level of Service (TkLOS)

The results of the segment TkLOS analysis are summarized in **Table 10**.

Parameter	Value
Curb lane width	> 3.7 m
Number of travel lanes	1 per direction
Truck level of service	В

Table 10: Truck Level of Service on Teron Road

The target TkLOS is met in this case.

4.3.3 Road Safety

As noted in **Section 2.1.2.5**, no discernable collision pattern is evident that would indicate a deficiency on Teron Road. Therefore, no measures are required to address road safety.

4.4 Access Intersection Design

The access to the proposed development consists of a full movement, 3-way intersection on Teron Road. The proposed driveway is 9 m wide with a clear throat length of 19 m. However, the driveway width at the property line is 10 m, which exceeds the standard 9 m width. This is to accommodate the 12 m corner radii that are required to ensure that tractor-trailers can access the site, as discussed in **Section 4.1.2**.

The proposed driveway is located at approximately 40 m east of Brewer Hunt Way. There are 2 existing driveways east of the project site, one at 1260 Teron Road on the north side at a distance of 40 m, and one at 1283-1285 Teron Road on the south side at a distance of 60 m.

Based on MTO's left-turn lane warrant methodology, it was determined that a left-turn lane was clearly not warranted on Teron Road, as illustrated in **Figure 14**.





Figure 14: Left-Turn Lane Warrant Chart – Proposed Access on Teron Road, 2025 Total Traffic

A traffic capacity analysis has been performed using the analytical software tool Synchro. The results of the analysis for the 2025 horizon year with the access in place are presented in **Table 11**.

		Morning Peak Hour				Afternoon Peak Hour			
Intersection	Impeded Movement	V/C	Delay (s)	LOS	95th Queue (m)	V/C	Delay (s)	LOS	95th Queue (m)
Teron Road / site access	WBL/R	0.02	12	В	0	0.05	11	В	1
	SBL/T	0.00	1	А	0	0.00	0	А	0
	Overall		B	6			В	5	

Table 11: Auto Levels of Service at the Proposed Site Access

The traffic analysis of the proposed site access indicates that the new access will operate satisfactorily 5 years after build-out.

4.5 Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

The proposed development is located in a low-density industrial area which is appropriate for a warehouse but not typically conducive to a high modal share for active transportation, transit or carpooling. On the other hand, it is located near a residential community (Beaverbrook) and to a future rapid transit station. Additionally, occupants of the proposed development may also be encouraged to move to Kanata North to reduce their commuting distance.



As mentioned above, the road network is currently operating near or above capacity. While the proposed development is not expected to have a significant impact on traffic, it is important that the occupants be aware of the different available travel options, including cycling, public transit and carpooling, so to limit the impact on traffic delays.

Among the different TDM strategies suggested by the City of Ottawa, the following are recommended:

- Designate a TDM coordinator (role can be added to an existing position in parking, real estate, human resources or environmental management);
- Display local area maps with walking/cycling access routes and key destinations at the main entrances;
- Display relevant transit schedules and route maps at the main entrances;
- Provide online links to OC Transpo information;
- Provide a dedicated ride-matching portal at OttawaRideMatch.com; and
- Encourage flexible work hours.

A copy of the TDM checklist is provided in **Appendix G**.

4.6 Neighbourhood Traffic Management

[Exempt.]

4.7 Transit

Based on the trip generation estimates presented in **Section 3.1.1**, the proposed development is anticipated to generate 7 transit trips during both the morning and the afternoon peak hours. This transit review applies the trip distribution assumptions described in **Section 3.1.2**. The transit trips generated by the proposed development are therefore distributed as follows:

Morning peak hour:

- Stop #0858 (March/Teron northbound): 3 passengers alighting Route 63 or 64;
- Stop #1600 (March/Teron southbound): 2 passengers boarding and 1 alighting Route 63, 64 or 266; and
- Stop #7980 (Teron/Steacie northbound): 1 passenger boarding Route 166.

Afternoon peak hour:

- Stop #0858 (March/Teron northbound: 1 passenger boarding and 2 alighting Route 63, 64 or 266;
- Stop #1600 (March/Teron southbound): 3 passengers boarding Route 63 or 64; and
- Stop #0868 (Teron/Steacie southbound): 1 passenger boarding Route 166.

Based on the projected passenger volumes, no capacity problems are anticipated on the bus routes or at the bus stops listed above.



4.8 Review of Network Concept

[Exempt.]

4.9 Intersection Design

4.9.1 Intersection Control

All intersections within the study area are already signalized and provided with exclusive turning lanes, except the intersection at Carling Avenue / Teron Road.

4.9.1.1 Carling Avenue / Teron Road

Several issues are observed with the intersection at Carling Avenue / Teron Road:

- Observed queuing on Teron Road (Stop-controlled approach);
- No left-turn lane on Carling Avenue;
- Railway crossing on Teron Road adjacent to Carling Avenue; and
- Acute intersection skew angle (45°).

Based on MTO's left-turn lane warrant methodology, it has been determined that a left-turn lane is warranted on Carling Avenue, as illustrated in **Figure 15**. This warrant is met **without** the proposed development in place.



Figure 15: Left-Turn Lane Warrant Chart – Carling Avenue Westbound at Teron Road, 2025 Background Traffic

A traffic signal warrant analysis was performed based on the Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) Book 12's Justification 7 methodology. The analysis, provided in **Appendix H**, indicates that traffic signals are not warranted at this location within the 2025 horizon with or without the proposed development in place.



Some of the observed design issues at this intersection could be mitigated by the City in several ways without encouraging non-local traffic, including conversion to a right-in/right-out access, conversion to a cul-de-sac (i.e. road closure, at least for autos) or roadway realignment.

4.9.2 Intersection Design

The MMLOS Guidelines were used to evaluate the levels of service of all the intersections within the study area for each mode of transportation. Schedule B of the City's Official Plan identifies the study area as being within the Urban Employment Area. Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS Guidelines was used to determine the target LOS for each mode of transportation, based on the road class and relevant designations, as presented in **Table 12**. The target levels of service used for analysis are presented in **Table 13**.

Table 12: Existing or Planned Road Classes and Designations for each Transportation Mode

Roadway	Road	Bicycle	Transit	Truck
March Road	Arterial	Spine Route	Rapid Transit Corridor	Truck Route
Carling Avenue	Arterial	Spine Route	N/A	Truck Route
Herzberg Road	Collector	Spine Route	N/A	Truck Route

Table 13: Target LOS for each Transportation Mode

Roadway	Pedestrian LOS	Bicycle LOS	Transit LOS	Truck LOS	Auto LOS
March Road	С	С	В	В	D
Carling Avenue	С	С	No target	В	D
Herzberg Road	С	С	No target	В	D

4.9.2.1 Pedestrian Level of Service (PLOS)

The PLOS analysis is based on the PETSI scoring system as presented in Exhibit 5 of the MMLOS Guidelines. The results of the signalized intersection PLOS analysis are summarized in **Table 14**.



			East	West	North	South	
	Category	Parameter	Approach	Approach	Approach	Approach	
	Crossing	Total travel lanes crossed	6		3		
pad	Conditions	Median (> 2.4 m)	No		No		
erzberg Ro		Left turn conflict	Protected		Protected		
	Signal	Right turn conflict	No		Yield	NI / A	
	Features	Right turn on red	No		No		
He		Leading pedestrian interval	No	N/A	No	N/A	
/ pi	Corper Radiu	c	_		Smart		
Roa		5			channel		
ch	Crosswalk Tre	eatment	Standard		Standard		
Jan	Pedestrian Sc	core (LOS)	42 (E)		89 (B)		
2	Intersection	PLOS		I	Ξ		
	Crossing	Total travel lanes crossed	6	6	3	3	
ad	Conditions	Median (> 2.4 m)	No	No	No	No	
Ro		Left turn conflict	Protected	Protected	Prot/Perm	Prot/Perm	
ron	Signal Features	Right turn conflict	Yield	Yield	Yield	Yield	
Te		Right turn on red	No	No	No	No	
/ p		Leading pedestrian interval	No	No	No	No	
Roa	Corner Radiu	S	Channel with receiving lane				
ch	Crosswalk Tre	eatment	Standard				
Jan	Pedestrian Sc	core (LOS)	76 (B)	76 (B)	34 (E)	34 (E)	
2	Intersection	PLOS	E				
	Crossing	Total travel lanes crossed	4	2	7	7	
	Conditions	Median (> 2.4 m)	No	No	No	No	
bad		Left turn conflict	Permissive	Permissive	Protected	Protected	
ן אני	Signal	Right turn conflict	Yield	Yield	Permissive	Yield	
tion	Features	Right turn on red	No	No	Yes	No	
oad Sta		Leading pedestrian interval	No	No	No	No	
e /			Channel	Channel		Channel	
arch	Corpor Padiu	c	with	with	15 to	with	
¶ ∆ Ave		5	receiving	receiving	25 m	receiving	
' Bu			lane lane lane				
arlii	Crosswalk Tre	eatment		Stan	dard		
Ü	Pedestrian Sc	core (LOS)	59 (D)	91 (A)	10 (F)	22 (F)	
	Intersection	PLOS	F				

Table 14: Pedestrian Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections



			East	West	North	South
	Category	Parameter	Approach	Approach	Approach	Approach
	Crossing	Total travel lanes crossed	4	3	3	2
	Conditions	Median (> 2.4 m)	No	No	No	No
/enue / g Road	Signal Features	Left turn conflict	Prot/Perm	Permissive	Prot/Perm	Permissive
		Right turn conflict	Permissive	Permissive	Permissive	Permissive
		Right turn on red	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
g A		Leading pedestrian interval	No	No	No	No
ling erzk	Corner Radiu	S	15 to 25 m			
He Car	Crosswalk Treatment		Standard			
	Pedestrian Sc	Pedestrian Score (LOS)		68 (C)	68 (C)	86 (B)
	Intersection PLOS		D			

Table 14: Pedestrian Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections (continued)

The PLOS analysis indicates that none of the signalized intersections within the study area currently meet target PLOS C. This is mainly due to the high number of lanes that pedestrians need to cross to get to the other side of the roadway, especially on March Road where pedestrians need to cross up to 7 lanes.

This could be partially mitigated by converting existing channelization islands into smaller "smart channels" with yield control, which encourage drivers to slow down, instead of acceleration lanes, which encourage hasty departures. The implementation of fully-protected left-turn signals would also increase the PLOS as well as the overall intersection safety for drivers as it reduces the risks of angle collisions, although it is noted that this measure also tends to reduce the left-turn movement capacity.

4.9.2.2 Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS)

The results of the signalized intersection BLOS analysis are summarized in Table 15.



			East	West	North	South		
	Parameter		Approach	Approach	Approach	Approach		
	Type of bikeway	,	Bike lane	Bike lane	Cycle track	MUP		
Herzberg Road	Bike Through	Right-turn storage lane	_	_	_	_		
	vs Right Turn	Right-turn speed	_	—	—	_		
	Traffic	Type of right turn	_	_	_	_		
	Through BLOS		А	А	А	А		
	Dika Laft Turn	Two-stage area?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
/р	BIKE LEIL TUIN	Required lane changes	—	-	-	_		
ch Roa	Traffic	Through speed	-	-	-	_		
	TTAILIC	Dual left turn?	_	-	-	_		
lard	Left-Turn BLOS		А	А	А	А		
2	≥ Intersection BLOS			Α				
	Type of bikeway		Pocket lane	Pocket lane	Mixed	Mixed		
p	Bike Through	Right-turn storage lane	> 50 m	> 50 m	> 50 m	> 50 m		
Roa	vs Right Turn	Right-turn speed	≤ 30 km/h	≤ 30 km/h	≤ 25 km/h	≤ 25 km/h		
on	Traffic	Type of right turn	Single	Single	Single	Single		
Теі	Through BLOS		D	D	F	F		
/р		Two-stage area?	No	No	No	No		
Roa	BIKE LEIL TUITI	Required lane changes	2	2	1	1		
ch I	Traffic	Through speed	90 km/h	90 km/h	60 km/h	60 km/h		
Jar		Dual left turn?	No	No	No	No		
2	Left-Turn BLOS		F	F	F	F		
	Intersection BLC	DS	F					

Table 15: Bicycle Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections



			East	West	North	South	
	Parameter		Approach	Approach	Approach	Approach	
	Type of hikeway		Pocket	Mixed	Pocket	Pocket	
p	Type of bikeway		lane	IVIIAEd	lane	lane	
d / ation Road	Bike Through	Right-turn storage lane	> 50 m	≤ 50 m	≤ 50 m	> 50 m	
	vs Right Turn	Right-turn speed	≤ 30 km/h	≤ 25 km/h	≤ 25 km/h	≤ 30 km/h	
	Traffic	Type of right turn	Single	Single	Single	Single	
Roa / St	Through BLOS		D	D	В	D	
ch l ue	Piko Loft Turn	Two-stage area?	No	No	No	No	
Marc ling Avenu	vs Through	Required lane changes	0	0	2	2	
	Traffic	Through speed	60 km/h	60 km/h	90 km/h	90 km/h	
	Traffic	Dual left turn?	No	No	Yes	No	
Car	Left-Turn BLOS		С	D	F	F	
	Intersection BLOS		F				
ad	Type of bikeway		Pocket lane	Bike lane	Bike lane	Bike lane	
Ro	Bike Through	Right-turn storage lane	> 50 m	-	-	-	
erg	vs Right Turn	Right-turn speed	≤ 30 km/h	≤ 25 km/h	≤ 25 km/h	≤ 25 km/h	
rzb	Traffic	Type of right turn	Single	Shared	Shared	Shared	
Не	Through BLOS		D	А	А	А	
e /	Biko Loft Turp	Two-stage area?	No	No	No	No	
nua	Vs Through	Required lane changes	1	1	1	0	
Ave	Traffic	Through speed	70 km/h	70 km/h	60 km/h	60 km/h	
Вu	Traffic	Dual left turn?	No	No	No	No	
arli	Left-Turn BLOS		E	E	E	С	
0	Intersection BLOS		E				

The BLOS analysis indicates that March Road / Herzberg Road is the only the signalized intersection within the study area that satisfies the target BLOS. This intersection has been recently reconfigured as a "protected intersection", including fully segregated bicycle lanes. The benefits of such design are:

- No weaving between through cyclists and right-turning drivers cyclists remain to the right and cross the right-turn movement's path where right-turning drivers are moving slowly; and
- Dedicated areas where cyclists can safely wait for signals to perform a 2-stage left-turn instead of weaving through fast-moving traffic to use the left-turn lane.

The poor BLOS at the other locations are mainly attributed to pocket lanes, which result in cyclists riding between two fast-moving auto lanes over a certain distance, and to the lack of an adequate space to perform a 2-stage left turn.



4.9.2.3 Transit Level of Service (TLOS)

The results of the signalized intersection TLOS analysis are summarized in **Table 16**. The turning movements in the table are those performed by buses on the existing bus routes.

		Average Delay (s) ¹ Morning Afternoon			Intersection
Intersection	Turning Movement	Peak Hour	Peak Hour	TLOS	TLOS
March Road /	Eastbound left turn	88	86	F	Е
Herzberg Road	Southbound right turn	26	19	D	F
March Road /	Eastbound right turn	4	0	В	
	Westbound left turn	66	62	F	F
Teron Road	Northbound left turn	186	154	F	F
	Northbound right turn	1	1	В	
March Dood /	Westbound left turn	_	73	F	
Carling Avenue /	Northbound through	-	31	E	Е
Carling Avenue /	Northbound right turn	5	_	В	F
Station Rodu	Southbound through	16	_	С	

Table 16: Transit Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections

¹Based on **Table 18**.

The implementation of the planned BRT on March Road will significantly improve the efficiency of the bus service. It could also be an opportunity for the City to rebuild the intersections on March Road as protected intersections (leading to BLOS A) with island refuges for pedestrians (better PLOS).

4.9.2.4 Truck Level of Service (TkLOS)

The results of the signalized intersection TLOS analysis are summarized in **Table 17**.



Intersection	Approach	Turning Radius (m)	Number of Receiving Lanes	Approach TkLOS	Intersection TkLOS
March Road /	Westbound	> 15 m	1	C	C
Herzberg Road	Southbound	10 to 15 m	2	В	Ľ
	Eastbound	> 15 m	2	A	
March Road /	Westbound	> 15 m	2	А	•
Teron Road	Northbound	> 15 m	3	A	A
	Southbound	> 15 m	3	А	
	Eastbound	> 15 m	3	A	
March Road /	Westbound	> 15 m	3	A	6
Carling Avenue	Northbound	> 15 m	2	А	Ľ
	Southbound	> 15 m	1	C	
	Eastbound	> 15 m	1	C	
Carling Avenue /	Westbound	> 15 m	1	C	6
Herzberg Road	Northbound	> 15 m	1	С	Ľ
	Southbound	> 15 m	1	С	

Table 17: Truck Level	of Service at Signalize	d Intersections
-----------------------	-------------------------	-----------------

The intersection at March Road / Teron Road exceeds the target TkLOS B while the other signalized intersections do not. However, this is simply due to the TkLOS methodology which requires 2 receiving lanes in order to yield a TkLOS B or A. It is noted that at locations with a TkLOS C, the wide corner radii facilitate the movement of large trucks. It is assumed that all truck trips to and from the proposed development will travel along March Road and Highway 417. For these trips, March Road provides a TkLOS A.

4.9.2.5 Auto Level of Service

A traffic capacity analysis was performed using Synchro. The existing intersection configuration and signal settings were assumed and the timing at each location was optimized for capacity. Three measures of effectiveness are used for comparison: the volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C), the average delay in seconds and the 95th percentile queue length in metres.

Consistent with the MMLOS Guidelines, the auto LOS at signalized intersections is based on the V/C ratio. LOS A is attributed to a V/C ratio of 0.60 or less while LOS F is attributed to a V/C ratio of more than 1.00 (i.e. above capacity).

The auto LOS at unsignalized intersections is based on the average delay. LOS A is attributed to a delay of 10 seconds or less while LOS F is attributed to a delay of more than 50 seconds.

The results of the signalized intersection TLOS analysis are summarized in **Table 18** for signalized intersections and **Table 19** for the unsignalized intersection at Carling Avenue / Teron Road. By default,


the values presented in these tables represent 2025 traffic conditions with **and** without the proposed development. Where there is a difference, the values within brackets represent the 2025 traffic conditions with the proposed development.

		Ν	Aorning	Peak Hou	ır	Af	ternoon	Peak Ho	ur
Intersection	Turning Movement	v/c	LOS	Delay (s)	95th Queue (m)	v/c	LOS	Delay (s)	95th Queue (m)
	EBL	0.23	А	88 [91]	8	0.10	А	86 [85]	1
	ЕВТ	0.23	А	3 [2]	1	0.75 [0.76]	С	4 [5]	18 [23]
March Road /	WBT	1.06 [1.07]	F	54 [57]	#368 [#371]	0.68 [0.69]	В	23	144 [146]
Herzberg Road	WBR	0.77	С	10	117	0.25	А	4	16
	SBL	0.47	А	62	21	0.87	D	53	103
	SBR	0.08	А	26	5	0.04	А	19	6
	Overall	1.06 [1.07]	F	35 [37]	_	0.87	D	19	_

Table 18: Auto Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity; queue may be longer.



		1	Morning	Peak Hou	ır	Α	fternoon	Peak Ho	ur
Intersection	Turning Movement	v/c	LOS	Delay (s)	95th Queue (m)	v/c	LOS	Delay (s)	95th Queue (m)
	EBL	0.34 [0.36]	А	66	16	0.24 [0.25]	А	66 [67]	11
	ЕВТ	0.51 [0.54]	А	23 [25]	94	1.19	F	124	#296
	EBR	0.26 [0.27]	А	4	12	0.04	А	0	0
	WBL	0.44 [0.45]	А	66	11	0.54 [0.55]	А	62 [63]	#31
	WBT	1.13 [1.19]	F	77 [105]	#297	0.60 [0.62]	A [B]	22 [25]	152
March Road /	WBR	0.26 [0.29]	А	3 [4]	10 [11]	0.04 [0.05]	А	1	0
Teron Road	NBL	1.27 [1.17]	F	186 [144]	#90 [#83]	1.17	F	154 [153]	#82
	NBT	0.72 [0.71]	С	66 [65]	56 [57]	0.23	А	47	20 [21]
	NBR	0.14 [0.13]	А	1	0	0.09	А	1	0
	SBL	0.18 [0.19]	А	38 [35]	11	0.64 [0.69]	В	51 [54]	46 [51]
	SBT	0.19	А	54	14	0.75	С	67	60
	SBR	0.04	А	0	0	0.11	А	1	0
	Overall	1.27 [1.19]	F	65 [75]	-	1.19	F	84 [85]	-

Table 18: Auto Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections (continued)

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity; queue may be longer.



		1	Morning	Peak Hou	ır	Af	fternoon	Peak Ho	ur
Intersection	Turning Movement	V/C	LOS	Delay (s)	95th Queue (m)	V/C	LOS	Delay (s)	95th Queue (m)
	EBL/T	0.64	В	72	33	0.21	А	47	15
	EBR	0.04	А	0	0	0.09	А	1	0
	WBL/T	0.42	А	61	21	0.76	С	73	47
	WBR	0.13	А	0	0	0.24	А	0	0
	NBL	0.59	В	70	33	0.40	А	72	#19
March Road / Carling Avenue /	NBT	1.23	F	138 [139]	#326	0.84 [0.85]	D	31	#178 [#179]
Station Road	NBR	0.12	А	5	8	0.05	А	0	0
	SBL	0.59	А	54	49	0.76	С	66	#55
	SBT	0.51 [0.52]	А	16	92	0.99	Ε	41	#293
	SBR	0.15	А	6	14	0.06	А	1	3
	Overall	1.23	F	83	-	0.99	Е	37	-
	EBL	0.24	А	36	14	0.06 [0.07]	А	24	5 [6]
	EBT/R	0.84	D	54	#134	1.09	F	95 [97]	#242 [#244]
	WBL	0.14	А	34	7	0.87	D	129	#29
Carling Avenue /	WBT	0.70	В	45	102	0.63	В	34	102
Herzberg Road	WBR	1.00	Е	61	#157	0.46	А	4	15
	NBL/T/R	0.99	E	65	#217	1.00	Е	110	#94
	SBL	0.88	D	48	#58	1.10	F	98	#172
	SBT/R	0.20	А	13	26	0.79	С	37	152
	Overall	1.00	E	54	-	1.10	F	65 [66]	-

Table 18: Auto Levels of Service at Signalized Intersections (continued)

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity; queue may be longer.



			Morning P	eak Hou	ır	A	fternoon	Peak Ho	ur
Intersection	Impeded Movement	V/C	Delay (s)	LOS	95th Queue (m)	V/C	Delay (s)	LOS	95th Queue (m)
Carling Avenue / Teron Road	WBL/T	0.04	1	А	1	0.21 [0.22]	5	А	5
	NBL/R	1.78	>5 min	F	164	0.65 [0.67]	55 [57]	F	22 [24]
	Overall		F				F		

Table 19: Auto Levels of Service at a Stop-Controlled Intersection

The results above indicate that all the intersections operate near or above capacity during both peak hours with generally long average delays.

The traditional approach of increasing the auto capacity by adding more lanes will deteriorate the level of service of the active modes of transportation and is known to encourage traffic growth associated with induced demand and urban sprawl. Instead, the provision of a rapid bus service, as planned in the Transportation Master Plan will more efficiently increase the **people** capacity of the March Road corridor and provide commuters with a way to avoid car congestion.

The results also indicate that the proposed development will have a minor impact on the traffic operations, as delays and queues will increase slightly for certain turning movements, but will not, in itself, trigger any requirement for mitigation.



Conclusion

The proposed development consists of a 9,281 m² industrial building located at 1265 Teron Road in Kanata. The project site will be accessed by a single full-access driveway on Teron Road. The building is expected to serve as a warehouse with some office use. The estimated year of occupancy is 2020.

The project site is located in a General Industrial Zone, IG6 Subzone. At this location, Teron Road is classified as a local street but connects to March Road and to Carling Avenue, both classified as arterial roadways and truck routes, although the latter has a load restriction. March Road represents a direct route to Highway 417 to the south. The development is consistent with the industrial character of the neighbourhood and will reinforce the function of Teron Road as a "local street".

According to the developer, there will be an average of 2 truck deliveries per day and a maximum of 5 truck deliveries per day. The loading bays are designed to be used by WB-19 tractor-trailers. A swept path analysis shows that the design vehicle (WB-19 truck) will be capable of accessing all loading bays. The design vehicle will also be able to enter and exit the project site provided that the corner radii at the entrance are at least 12.0 m. As a consequence, the driveway width at the property line is 10.0 m, which is slightly larger than the standard 9.0 m.

The boundary street (Teron Road) meets the target level of service for trucks. A paved shoulder is required by the City of Ottawa along the frontage to improve pedestrian access to the site.

The parking lot included in the project site will provide more car and bicycle parking spaces than required by the Zoning By-law, i.e. 90 car spaces instead of 75 and 10 bicycle spaces instead of 5. The project site will also include 6 accessible parking spaces, consistent with the City's Accessibility Design Standards.

The developer has indicated that the proposed development will have up to 75 employees. For the purpose of this study, the origin-destination and the modal distribution of the trips generated by the development were assumed to be consistent with the current distribution in the Kanata-Stittsville area.

The multi-modal transportation analysis of the intersections in the study area indicates that the level of service is currently poor for all modes of transportation, with the exception of delivery trucks. The auto trips generated by the development will contribute to the capacity issues currently experienced at the signalized intersections within the study area, but will not trigger any requirement for traffic-related mitigation.

On the other hand, the development is located near a residential community (Beaverbrook) and bus stops with frequent bus services. Additionally, occupants of the proposed development may also be encouraged to move to Kanata North to reduce their commuting distance. Finally, the construction of the planned rapid bus service along March Road has the potential of encouraging potential drivers to commute by transit instead.



Recommendations

For the purpose of the proposed development, the following features are recommended:

- Pave the existing gravel shoulder along the frontage of the project site to improve pedestrian and cycling access; and
- Design the access on Teron Road with 12 m corner radii to facilitate the circulation of WB-19 tractor trailers.

Both recommended features are shown on the site plan in Appendix B.

Among the different transportation demand management strategies suggested by the City of Ottawa, the following are recommended:

- Designate a TDM coordinator (role can be added to an existing position in parking, real estate, human resources or environmental management);
- Display local area maps with walking/cycling access routes and key destinations at the main entrances;
- Display relevant transit schedules and route maps at the main entrances;
- Provide online links to OC Transpo information;
- Provide a dedicated ride-matching portal at OttawaRideMatch.com; and
- Encourage flexible work hours.

A copy of the TDM checklist is provided in **Appendix G**.



Appendix A TIA Certification



TIA Plan Reports

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

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

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

CERTIFICATION

- 1. I have reviewed and have a sound understanding of the objectives, needs and requirements of the City of Ottawa's Official Plan, Transportation Master Plan and the Transportation Impact Assessment (2017) Guidelines;
- 2. I have a sound knowledge of industry standard practice with respect to the preparation of transportation impact assessment reports, including multi modal level of service review;
- 3. I have substantial experience (more than 5 years) in undertaking and delivering transportation impact studies (analysis, reporting and geometric design) with strong background knowledge in transportation planning, engineering or traffic operations; and
- 4. I am either a licensed¹ or registered² professional in good standing, whose field of expertise [check $\sqrt{}$ appropriate field(s)] is either transportation engineering $\sqrt{}$ or transportation planning \Box .

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

City Of Ottawa Infrastructure Services and Community Sustainability Planning and Growth Management 110 Laurier Avenue West, 4th fl. Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1 Tel. : 613-580-2424 Fax: 613-560-6006 Ville d'Ottawa Services d'infrastructure et Viabilité des collectivités Urbanisme et Gestion de la croissance 110, avenue Laurier Ouest Ottawa (Ontario) K1P 1J1 Tél. : 613-580-2424 Télécopieur: 613-560-6006 Ottawa

Dated at	Ottawa	this _	<u>7th</u> day of	November	, 20 <u>19</u> .
	(City)				
Nomo			Daniel	Riendeau	
Name:			Damer	Menueau	
			(Pleas	e Print)	
Professional	Title:		Transporta	tion Engineer	
			al 2	(
	Signature of	⁻ Individua	Il certifier that s,	/he meets the above fo	our criteria

Office Contact Information (Please Print)
Address: 100 Craig Henry Drive, Suite 201
City / Postal Code: Ottawa, ON K2G 5W3
Telephone / Extension: 613-228-4813
E-Mail Address: daniel.riendeau@bteng.ca





Appendix B Site Plan



ICON	DESCRIPTION
14.45.4	Concrete
	Landscape Area
	Proposed Buildings
	Congrete Curb
	Depresent Curb
	Overhead Wires
	Property Lines
	- Existing Fence
	- Fence
	Signage
Å	BF Parking Space
	6m Wide Fire Route (12m centreline radius on all turns, TYP.)
	Principal Entrance Door
∇	Exterior Door ("O/H" indicates Overhead Door)
v	
	IN NOTES
	Note Text
SITE PLA	N NOTES Note Text Evision Fire Horizant
SITE PLA	NOTES Note Text Existing Fire Hydrant Existing Grand Schulder
V SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)GS (E)UP	N NOTES Note Text Existing Fine Hydrant Existing Ravel Shoulder Existing Rivith: Pole
V SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)GS (E)UP AS	IN NOTES Note Text Existing Fire Hydrant Existing Grave Shoulder Existing Utily Pole Paved Asphal Shoulder, Width of asphate I replace existing gareel shoulder, Width of asphate I
V SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)GS (E)UP AS	IN NOTES Note Text Existing for hydrant Existing Using Pole Pared Aphal Shoulder Existing Using Pole Pared Aphal Shoulder, flush with read surface, to replace setsing gravel shoulder. With of aphala to match width of existing gravel shoulder.
SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)GS (E)UP AS BR CC	NN NOTES Note Text Existing Fire Hydrant Existing Gravel Shoulder Existing Utility Pole Paved Asphal Shoulder, Rush with road surface, to replace assisting gravel shoulder Boycle Ruck Boycle Ruck
V SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)GS (E)UP AS BR CC CC CP	IN NOTES Note Text Existing for hydrant Existing Gravel Shoulder Existing Using Pole Pephoce existing gravel shoulder with of asphalt or existing gravel shoulder Brycke Rack Concrete Curb Concrete Grave
SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)UP AS BR CC CR CR	N NOTES Note Text Existing Fore Hydrant Existing Utility Pole Pawed Asphalt Shoulder. Rush with road surface, to replace existing gravel shoulder. Widh of asphalt to match widh of existing gravel shoulder. Bicycle Ruck Concrete Gurb Concrete Ramp
V SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)GS (E)UP AS BR CC CC CR CR CR CR CR CR	IN NOTES Note Text Existing For Hydrant Existing forwel Shoulder Existing Utility Pole Period Applied Shoulder Weth of axisting gravel shoulder Bigrafe Rack Concrete Curb Concrete Rump Concrete Retaining Wall
V SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)GSS (E)UP (E)UP (E)UP (E)UP (E)UP (E)UP (C)UP	IN NOTES Note Text Existing Fire Hydrant Existing Urity Pole Pawed Aphali Shoulder Existing Ulity Pole Pawed Aphali Shoulder, Wath of asphale to main with relating gravel shoulder Concrete Carb Concrete Ramp Concrete Staning Wall Concrete Sitewate: 2m wide as ner Carb Standard
V SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)GSS (E)UP AS BR CC CR CR CC CR CR CS CSW	IN NOTES Note Text Existing Fire Hydrant Existing forwel Shoulder Existing forwel Shoulder Existing Utility Pole Pased Asphals Shoulder, flush with road surface, to replace setsing gravel shoulder Bayde Rack Concrete Curb Concrete Ramp Concrete Ramp Concrete Ramp Concrete Raming Wall Concrete Raming C
V SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)GS (E)UP As BR CC CR CR CR CR CR CR CR CR CR CS W	IN NOTES Note Text Existing fore Hydrant Existing Officer Shoulder Existing Utility Pole Paved Asphalt Shoulder, flush with road surface, to raptice existing gravel shoulder Bicycle Ruck Concrete Existing gravel shoulder Concrete Barban Concrete Barba
V SITE PLA Note # EFH EGS EUP AS BR CC CR CR CR CR CR CS SSW CW CS CM CM CS CC CM CS CS CM CC CC CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS	IN NOTES Note Text Existing for the Hydrant Existing for the Hydrant Existing Gravel Shoulder Existing Utility Pole Paved Arghah Shoulder, flush with road surface, to replace setting gravel shoulder Beycela Rack Concrete Curb Concrete Rarp Concrete Rarp Concrete State Concrete Valveway
V SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)GS (E)UP AS BR CC CC CR CR CC CC CR CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS CS	IN NOTES Note Text Existing Fire Hydrant Existing Unity Pole Pawed Asphalt Shoulder Existing Utility Pole Pawed Asphalt Shoulder, flush with road surface, to replace existing gravel shoulder Bicycle Rack Concrete State Concrete State Concrete Statening Wall Concrete Walkway Database See Civil.
V SITE PLA (E)FH (E)FH (E)GS (E)UP AS BR CC CC CR CC CC CR CC CC CR CC CC CC CC	IN NOTES Note Text Existing Fire Hydrant Existing forwel Shoulder Existing USIP Pole Paved Agrhal Shoulder Existing USIP Pole Paved Agrhal Shoulder Brycle Rack Concrete State Concrete Rang Concrete Rang Concrete State Concrete C
V SITE PLA Note # (E)FH (E)GS (E)JP AS BR CC CR CR CR CR CR CR CR CR CR CR CR CR	IN NOTES Note Text Existing Fire Hydrant Existing for Hydrant Existing Oravel Shoulder Existing Utility Pole Paved Asphalt Shoulder, flush with road surface, to raptice existing gravel shoulder Bicycle Rack Concrete Rating Concrete Rating Wall Concrete Stating Concrete Conc

NOTES:

Contractor shall check and verify all dimensions on site and report any discrepancies to the Architect before proceeding.

GENERAL SITE PLAN NOTES:

- Exterior site lighting shall be directed onto the site away from adjacent properties. See Electrical Drawings.
 Read this drawing in conjunction with the Landscape Drawings. Civil Engineering Drawings and Electrical Drawings.

0	ISSUED FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL	16 JAN 2020
no.	revision	date



project projet

PROPOSED WAREHOUSE

1243 TERON RD. OTTAWA, ON.

designed by conçu par	KWC	approved by approuvé par	
drawn by dessiné par	AK/TC	project no. no. du projet	1943
^{dote} 16	JANUARY 2020	scole	as noted

drawing / dessir

revision révision

SITE PLAN, SITE PLAN DETAILS

sheet no. no. de fa feuille A010



Appendix C Traffic Count Reports



Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram HERZBERG RD @ MARCH RD





Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram HERZBERG RD @ MARCH RD





Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram MARCH RD @ RICHARDSON SIDE RD





Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram MARCH RD @ RICHARDSON SIDE RD





Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram CARLING AVE/STATION RD @ MARCH RD





Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram CARLING AVE/STATION RD @ MARCH RD





Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram CARLING AVE @ RICHARDSON SIDE RD





Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram CARLING AVE @ RICHARDSON SIDE RD





Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram HERZBERG RD @ CARLING AVE





Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram HERZBERG RD @ CARLING AVE





Vehicular Turning Movements – All Vehicles and Pedestrians

CARLING AVENUE and TERON ROAD in Ottawa, ON

Survey Date: Tuesday, 19 November 2019 Performed By: BTE



Note:

Volumes above include cars and heavy vehicles.

Cars include motorcycles, passenger cars, pick-up trucks (including "heavy-duty"), full-size vans (i.e. Econoline), and any of these with a trailer.

¶ N



Vehicular Turning Movements – Heavy Vehicles

CARLING AVENUE and TERON ROAD in Ottawa, ON

Survey Date: Tuesday, 19 November 2019 Performed By: BTE



Note:

Heavy vehicles include vehicles with more than 2 axles (with the exception of cars with trailers).

¶ N



CARLING AVENUE and TERON ROAD in Ottawa, ON

Survey Date: Tuesday, 19 November 2019 Performed By: BTE

	-	TERON	ROAD							C	ARLING	AVENU	E	C	ARLING	AVENU	E		
		Northb	ound			Southb	ound				Eastb	ound			Westb	ound			
				SUB				SUB	STR				SUB				SUB	STR	GRAND
Time Period	L	Т	R	TOT	L	Т	R	TOT	TOT	L	Т	R	TOT	L	Т	R	TOT	TOT	TOTAL
7:30 – 7:45	8	0	27	35	0	0	0	0	35	0	202	8	210	14	77	0	91	301	336
7:45 – 8:00	10	0	45	55	0	0	0	0	55	0	172	5	177	9	65	0	74	251	306
8:00 - 8:15	40	0	46	86	0	0	0	0	86	0	121	4	125	11	120	0	131	256	342
8:15 – 8:30	49	0	35	84	0	0	0	0	84	0	121	3	124	11	148	0	159	283	367
8:30 - 8:45	70	0	39	109	0	0	0	0	109	0	115	3	118	8	102	0	110	228	337
8:45 - 9:00	55	0	24	79	0	0	0	0	79	0	122	6	128	7	180	0	187	315	394
9:00 - 9:15	49	0	27	76	0	0	0	0	76	0	122	8	130	13	204	0	217	347	423
9:15 – 9:30	32	0	19	51	0	0	0	0	51	0	120	6	126	7	117	0	124	250	301
16:00 - 16:15	6	0	33	39	0	0	0	0	39	0	212	23	235	43	84	0	127	362	401
16:15 - 16:30	4	0	11	15	0	0	0	0	15	0	201	20	221	37	99	0	136	357	372
16:30 - 16:45	7	0	21	28	0	0	0	0	28	0	163	31	194	29	118	0	147	341	369
16:45 - 17:00	8	0	15	23	0	0	0	0	23	0	164	21	185	31	112	0	143	328	351
17:00 – 17:15	5	0	9	14	0	0	0	0	14	0	171	23	194	25	106	0	131	325	339
17:15 – 17:30	10	0	22	32	0	0	0	0	32	0	165	20	185	39	88	0	127	312	344
17:30 – 17:45	11	0	10	21	0	0	0	0	21	0	186	21	207	32	93	0	125	332	353
17:45 – 18:00	10	0	19	29	0	0	0	0	29	0	143	19	162	18	62	0	80	242	271
TOTAL	374	0	402	776	0	0	0	0	776	0	2500	221	2721	334	1775	0	2109	4830	5606

Grey = Peak Hour



Vehicular Turning Movements (15 Min. Volumes) – Heavy Vehicles

CARLING AVENUE and TERON ROAD in Ottawa, ON

Survey Date: Tuesday, 19 November 2019 Performed By: BTE

		TERON F	ROAD							CA	ARLING A	VENUE	E	CA	rling a	VENU	E		
		Northbo	ound		S	Southbo	ound				Eastbo	ound		,	Westbo	ound			
				SUB				SUB	STR				SUB				SUB	STR	GRAND
Time Period	L	Т	R	TOT	L	Т	R	TOT	TOT	L	Т	R	TOT	L	Т	R	TOT	TOT	TOTAL
7:30 – 7:45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7:45 – 8:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	2	0	2	6	6
8:00 - 8:15	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	0	5	6	7
8:15 – 8:30	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	3
8:30 - 8:45	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	3
8:45 - 9:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9:00 - 9:15	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
9:15 – 9:30	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	6	0	1	0	1	7	9
16:00 - 16:15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	4	0	4	6	6
16:15 - 16:30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
16:30 - 16:45	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	3
16:45 – 17:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
17:00 - 17:15	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
17:15 – 17:30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
17:30 - 17:45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	2	3	3
17:45 – 18:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	2	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	9	0	20	2	22	2	18	0	20	42	51



Vehicular Turning Movements (15 Min. Volumes) – Pedestrians

CARLING AVENUE and TERON ROAD in Ottawa, ON

Survey Date: Tuesday, 19 November 2019 Performed By: BTE

	TERON ROAD			CARLING AVENUE	CARLING AVENUE		
	Parallel Crossing	Parallel Crossing		Parallel Crossing	Parallel Crossing		
			STREET			STREET	GRAND
Time Period	East	West	TOTAL	South	North	TOTAL	TOTAL
7:30 – 7:45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7:45 - 8:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:00 - 8:15	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
8:15 - 8:30	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
8:30 - 8:45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:45 - 9:00	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
9:00 - 9:15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9:15 - 9:30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16:00 - 16:15	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
16:15 - 16:30	0	0	0	3	0	3	3
16:30 - 16:45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16:45 – 17:00	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
17:00 – 17:15	0	0	0	1	1	2	2
17:15 – 17:30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17:30 – 17:45	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
17:45 – 18:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	9	3	12	12



Appendix D Collision Details Report



City Operations - Transportation Services Collision Details Report - Public Version

From: January 1, 2014 To: December 31, 2018

Location: CARLING AVE @ RICHARDSON SIDE RD									
Traffic Control: Stop	o sign					Total Collisions: 5			
Date/Day/Time	Environment	Impact Type	Classification	Surface Cond'n	Veh. Dir	Vehicle Manoeuver	Vehicle type	First Event	No. Ped
2014-Aug-28, Thu,10:29	Clear	Rear end	Non-fatal injury	Dry	West	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					West	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
2015-Apr-21, Tue,07:48	Rain	Rear end	P.D. only	Wet	North	Turning right	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle	
					North	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
2016-Feb-13, Sat,02:00	Clear	SMV other	P.D. only	Loose snow	Unknown	Turning right	Unknown	Pole (sign, parking meter)	
2017-Jun-07, Wed,17:13	Clear	Turning movement	Non-fatal injury	Dry	West	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Cyclist	
					East	Going ahead	Bicycle	Other motor vehicle	
2017-Nov-15, Wed,16:00	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					West	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	

Location: MARCH RD @ RICHARDSON SIDE RD

 Traffic Control: Traffic signal
 Total Collisions: 32

 Date/Day/Time
 Environment
 Impact Type
 Classification
 Surface Cond'n
 Veh. Dir
 Vehicle Manoeuver Vehicle type
 First Event
 No. Ped

November 15, 2019

2014-Mar-04, Tue,16:05	Rain	Turning movement	Non-fatal injury	Wet	North	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2014-Oct-03, Fri,09:34	Clear	Rear end	Non-fatal injury	Dry	East	Turning left	Municipal transit bus	Other motor vehicle
					East	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2014-Sep-06, Sat,16:11	Rain	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Wet	North	Changing lanes	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					North	Turning left	Unknown	Other motor vehicle
2014-Nov-04, Tue, 18:03	Rain	Turning movement	Non-fatal injury	Wet	South	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					North	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2016-Feb-24, Wed,09:47	Snow	Angle	P.D. only	Loose snow	East	Slowing or stopping	g Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					North	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2016-Mar-09, Wed,17:30	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	North	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					North	Slowing or stopping	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2016-Oct-28, Fri,15:31	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Dry	South	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					North	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle

2015-Dec-11, Fri,18:42	Rain	SMV other	Non-fatal injury	Wet	South	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Pedestrian	1
2016-Feb-18, Thu,13:20	Clear	Angle	Non-fatal injury	Wet	East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					North	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
2016-Apr-14, Thu,16:10	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	South	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					South	Turning right	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle	
2016-Apr-07, Thu,12:56	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Dry	East	Turning left	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle	
					West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
2016-Apr-09, Sat,19:43	Clear	Angle	P.D. only	Dry	North	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
2016-Apr-15, Fri,09:08	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Dry	North	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					South	Turning left	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle	
2017-Aug-16, Wed,09:55	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	North	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					North	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
2017-Aug-21, Mon,09:00	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	South	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	

					South	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Jan-16, Mon,17:49	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Dry	South	Going ahead	Unknown	Other motor vehicle
					South	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2016-Dec-06, Tue,07:27	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Dry	East	Turning left	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
					West	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2017-Feb-06, Mon,08:30	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Ice	North	Slowing or stopping	g Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					North	Stopped	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2017-Mar-30, Thu,09:09	Clear	Turning movement	Non-fatal injury	Dry	South	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					North	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2017-Apr-28, Fri, 17:20	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Dry	North	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-May-29, Mon,20:00	Rain	Rear end	P.D. only	Wet	South	Going ahead	Unknown	Other motor vehicle
					South	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Jun-24, Sat,16:55	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Going ahead	Motor home	Other motor vehicle

					West	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Apr-11, Tue,12:00	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Dry	East	Changing lanes	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Jun-16, Fri,23:05	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	North	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					North	Stopped	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2017-Oct-12, Thu,08:54	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Dry	East	Going ahead	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
					East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Mar-12, Mon,09:00	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Dry	North	Changing lanes	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
					North	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Mar-07, Wed,06:30	Rain	Rear end	P.D. only	Slush	South	Slowing or stopping	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
					South	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Feb-27, Tue,14:40	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	South	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Apr-05, Thu,19:35	Clear	SMV other	Non-fatal injury	Dry	North	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Pole (utility, power)

2018-May-24, Thu,15:56	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	South	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Slowing or stopping	g Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Aug-10, Fri,12:20	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	South	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Aug-16, Thu,17:25	Clear	Rear end	Non-fatal injury	Dry	North	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					North	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle

Location: RICHARDSON SIDE RD btwn BREWER HUNT WAY & CARLING AVE

Traffic Control: No control					Total Collisions: 2				
Date/Day/Time	Environment	Impact Type	Classification	Surface Cond'n	Veh. Dir	Vehicle Manoeuve	er Vehicle type	First Event	No. Ped
2015-Nov-10, Tue, 12:06	Clear	SMV other	P.D. only	Dry	West	Turning right	Truck - dump	Other	
2016-Mar-03, Thu,17:37	Clear	Angle	Non-fatal injury	Dry	East	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					South	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	

Location: RICHARDSON SIDE RD btwn MARCH RD & BREWER HUNT WAY

Traffic Control: No control					Total Collisions: 1				
Date/Day/Time	Environment	Impact Type	Classification	Surface Cond'n	Veh. Dir	Vehicle Manoeuver	· Vehicle type	First Event	No. Ped
2015-Dec-05, Sat,16:00	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Dry	West	Making "U" turn	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle	
					East	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle	



Appendix E O-D Survey – Kanata-Stittsville



Demographic Characteristics

Population Employed Population Households	105,210 49,640 38,010	Actively Tray Number of V Area (km ²)	velled /ehicles	83,460 64,540 82.6
Occupation				
Status (age 5+)		Male	Female	Total
Full Time Employed		24,670	19,590	44,260
Part Time Employed		1,540	3,840	5,380
Student		13,630	13,410	27,040
Retiree		6,480	8,350	14,820
Unemployed		850	940	1,790
Homemaker		160	3,310	3,470
Other		350	1,010	1,360
Total:		47,690	50,440	98,120
Traveller Characteristics		Male	Female	Total
Transit Pass Holders		5,940	6,920	12,860
Licensed Drivers		36,280	36,790	73,070
Telecommuters		200	380	580
Trips made by residents		135,300	143,330	278,630



Household Size		
1 person	5,810	15%
2 persons	11,660	31%
3 persons	7,490	20%
4 persons	8,890	23%
5+ persons	4,160	11%
Total:	38,010	100%

Households by Vehicle Availability						
0 vehicles	1,050	3%				
1 vehicle	14,090	37%				
2 vehicles	19,110	50%				
3 vehicles	3,000	8%				
4+ vehicles	770	2%				
Total:	38,010	100%				

Households by Dwelling Type						
Single-detached	21,610	57%				
Semi-detached	3,890	10%				
Townhouse	10,550	28%				
Apartment/Condo	1,960	5%				
Total:	38,010	100%				

Selected Indicators	
Daily Trips per Person (age 5+)	2.84
Vehicles per Person	0.61
Number of Persons per Household	2.77
Daily Trips per Household	7.33
Vehicles per Household	1.70
Workers per Household	1.31
Population Density (Pop/km2)	1270



Employed Population



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


Travel Patterns

Top Five Destinations of Trips from Kanata - Stittsville

AM Peak Period



Summary of Trips to and from Kanata - Stittsville						
AM Peak Period (6:30 - 8:59)	Destinations of	Origins of				
	Trips From		Trips To			
Districts	District	% Total	District	% Total		
Ottawa Centre	4,560	8%	140	0%		
Ottawa Inner Area	3,350	6%	970	2%		
Ottawa East	660	1%	260	1%		
Beacon Hill	280	0%	170	0%		
Alta Vista	1,810	3%	660	1%		
Hunt Club	490	1%	420	1%		
Merivale	3,410	6%	1,200	3%		
Ottawa West	2,020	4%	840	2%		
Bayshore / Cedarview	5,010	9%	2,420	5%		
Orléans	290	1%	500	1%		
Rural East	100	0%	30	0%		
Rural Southeast	50	0%	260	1%		
South Gloucester / Leitrim	60	0%	140	0%		
South Nepean	690	1%	1,800	4%		
Rural Southwest	1,130	2%	1,850	4%		
Kanata / Stittsvile	30,360	54%	30,360	66%		
Rural West	1,050	2%	3,250	7%		
Île de Hull	670	1%	30	0%		
Hull Périphérie	160	0%	30	0%		
Plateau	100	0%	230	0%		
Aylmer	0	0%	190	0%		
Rural Northwest	20	0%	60	0%		
Pointe Gatineau	20	0%	80	0%		
Gatineau Est	0	0%	60	0%		
Rural Northeast	30	0%	50	0%		
Buckingham / Masson-Angers	30	0%	10	0%		
Ontario Sub-Total:	55,320	98%	45,270	98%		
Québec Sub-Total:	1,030	2%	740	2%		
Total:	56,350	100%	46,010	100%		

Trips by Trip Purpose

24 Hours	From District		To District	V	Vithin District	
Work or related	27,180	29%	17,020	18%	14,550	9%
School	7,070	7%	2,500	3%	15,110	9%
Shopping	6,070	6%	9,150	10%	22,480	14%
Leisure	8,450	9%	10,590	11%	17,090	11%
Medical	2,520	3%	1,170	1%	2,660	2%
Pick-up / drive passenger	6,570	7%	5,470	6%	15,190	9%
Return Home	33,610	35%	45,620	48%	65,770	41%
Other	3,560	4%	3,590	4%	8,440	5%
Total:	95,030	100%	95,110	100%	161,290	100%
AM Peak (06:30 - 08:59)	From District		To District	v	Vithin District	
Work or related	18,030	69%	11,020	70%	7,430	24%
School	4,890	19%	2,280	15%	11,740	39%
Shopping	170	1%	320	2%	760	3%
Leisure	340	1%	400	3%	780	3%
Medical	330	1%	230	1%	350	1%
Pick-up / drive passenger	1,260	5%	580	4%	4,760	16%
Return Home	290	1%	380	2%	1,980	7%
Other	670	3%	430	3%	2,560	8%
Total:	25,980	100%	15,640	100%	30,360	100%
PM Peak (15:30 - 17:59)	From District		To District	v	Vithin District	
Work or related	390	2%	350	1%	930	2%
School	370	2%	0	0%	90	0%
Shopping	1,030	5%	1,910	7%	5,100	14%
Leisure	2,140	11%	3,080	11%	4,130	11%
Medical	230	1%	180	1%	400	1%
Pick-up / drive passenger	1,980	10%	1,980	7%	3,410	9%
Return Home	12,130	64%	20,550	71%	21,560	58%
Other	680	4%	860	3%	1,850	5%
Total:	18,950	100%	28,910	100%	37,470	100%
Peak Period (%)	Total:		% of 24 Hours		Within Distric	ct (%)
24 Hours	351,430				46%	
AM Peak Period	71,980		20%		42%	
PM Peak Period	85,330		24%		44%	

Trips by Primary Travel Mode

24 Hours	From District		To District	Wi	ithin Distric	t
Auto Driver	63,470	67%	63,830	67%	92,190	57%
Auto Passenger	15,220	16%	14,920	16%	31,880	20%
Transit	12,200	13%	12,270	13%	4,050	3%
Bicycle	360	0%	410	0%	960	1%
Walk	40	0%	50	0%	21,080	13%
Other	3,730	4%	3,660	4%	11,130	7%
Total:	95,020	100%	95,140	100%	161,290	100%
AM Peak (06:30 - 08:59)	From District		To District	W	ithin Distric	t
Auto Driver	15,360	59%	11,530	74%	13,630	45%
Auto Passenger	2,450	9%	1,160	7%	5,050	17%
Transit	6,230	24%	1,290	8%	1,210	4%
Bicycle	30	0%	80	1%	220	1%
Walk	0	0%	40	0%	5,730	19%
Other	1,900	7%	1,560	10%	4,510	15%
Total:	25,970	100%	15,660	100%	30,350	100%
PM Peak (15:30 - 17:59)	From District		To District	W	ithin Distric	t
Auto Driver	13,850	73%	17,660	61%	21,240	57%
Auto Passenger	3,240	17%	4,270	15%	8,570	23%
Transit	1,270	7%	5,980	21%	670	2%
Bicycle	40	0%	100	0%	260	1%
Walk	40	0%	0	0%	4,570	12%
Other	520	3%	910	3%	2,160	6%
Total:	18,960	100%	28,920	100%	37,470	100%
Avg Vehicle Occupancy	From District		To District	W	ithin Distric	t
24 Hours	1.24		1.23		1.35	
AM Peak Period	1.16		1.10		1.37	
PM Peak Period	1.23		1.24		1.40	
Transit Modal Split	From District		To District	W	ithin Distric	t
24 Hours	13%		13%		3%	
AM Peak Period	26%		9%		6%	
PM Peak Period	7%		21%		2%	



Appendix F TRANS Regional Model











Appendix G TDM Checklists

TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist:

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

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

	TDM-s	supportive design & infrastructure measures: Non-residential developments	Check if completed & add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references
	1.	WALKING & CYCLING: ROUTES	
	1.1	Building location & access points	
BASIC	1.1.1	Locate building close to the street, and do not locate parking areas between the street and building entrances	\boxtimes
BASIC	1.1.2	Locate building entrances in order to minimize walking distances to sidewalks and transit stops/stations	\boxtimes
BASIC	1.1.3	Locate building doors and windows to ensure visibility of pedestrians from the building, for their security and comfort	
	1.2	Facilities for walking & cycling	
REQUIRED	1.2.1	Provide convenient, direct access to stations or major stops along rapid transit routes within 600 metres; minimize walking distances from buildings to rapid transit; provide pedestrian-friendly, weather-protected (where possible) environment between rapid transit accesses and building entrances; ensure quality linkages from sidewalks through building entrances to integrated stops/stations (see Official Plan policy 4.3.3)	
REQUIRED	1.2.2	Provide safe, direct and attractive pedestrian access from public sidewalks to building entrances through such measures as: reducing distances between public sidewalks and major building entrances; providing walkways from public streets to major building entrances; within a site, providing walkways along the front of adjoining buildings, between adjacent buildings, and connecting areas where people may congregate, such as courtyards and transit stops; and providing weather protection through canopies, colonnades, and other design elements wherever possible (see Official <i>Plan policy 4.3.12</i>)	

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

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

	TDM-s	supportive design & infrastructure measures: Non-residential developments	Check if completed & add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references
	3.	TRANSIT	
	3.1	Customer amenities	
BASIC	3.1.1	Provide shelters, lighting and benches at any on-site transit stops	
BASIC	3.1.2	Where the site abuts an off-site transit stop and insufficient space exists for a transit shelter in the public right-of-way, protect land for a shelter and/or install a shelter	
BETTER	3.1.3	Provide a secure and comfortable interior waiting area by integrating any on-site transit stops into the building	
	4.	RIDESHARING	
	4.1	Pick-up & drop-off facilities	
BASIC	4.1.1	Provide a designated area for carpool drivers (plus taxis and ride-hailing services) to drop off or pick up passengers without using fire lanes or other no-stopping zones	
	4.2	Carpool parking	
BASIC	4.2.1	Provide signed parking spaces for carpools in a priority location close to a major building entrance, sufficient in number to accommodate the mode share target for carpools	
BETTER	4.2.2	At large developments, provide spaces for carpools in a separate, access-controlled parking area to simplify enforcement	
	5.	CARSHARING & BIKESHARING	
	5.1	Carshare parking spaces	
BETTER	5.1.1	Provide carshare parking spaces in permitted non- residential zones, occupying either required or provided parking spaces (see Zoning By-law Section 94)	
	5.2	Bikeshare station location	
BETTER	5.2.1	Provide a designated bikeshare station area near a major building entrance, preferably lighted and sheltered with a direct walkway connection	

	TDM-s	supportive design & infrastructure measures: Non-residential developments	Check if completed & add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references
	6.	PARKING	
	6.1	Number of parking spaces	
REQUIRED	6.1.1	Do not provide more parking than permitted by zoning, nor less than required by zoning, unless a variance is being applied for	
BASIC	6.1.2	Provide parking for long-term and short-term users that is consistent with mode share targets, considering the potential for visitors to use off-site public parking	
BASIC	6.1.3	Where a site features more than one use, provide shared parking and reduce the cumulative number of parking spaces accordingly <i>(see Zoning By-law</i> <i>Section 104)</i>	
BETTER	6.1.4	Reduce the minimum number of parking spaces required by zoning by one space for each 13 square metres of gross floor area provided as shower rooms, change rooms, locker rooms and other facilities for cyclists in conjunction with bicycle parking <i>(see Zoning By-law Section 111)</i>	
	6.2	Separate long-term & short-term parking areas	
BETTER	6.2.1	Separate short-term and long-term parking areas using signage or physical barriers, to permit access controls and simplify enforcement (i.e. to discourage employees from parking in visitor spaces, and vice versa)	
	7.	OTHER	
	7.1	On-site amenities to minimize off-site trips	
BETTER	7.1.1	Provide on-site amenities to minimize mid-day or mid-commute errands	

TDM Measures Checklist:

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

Legend

The measure is generally feasible and effective, and in most cases would benefit the development and its users

BETTER The measure could maximize support for users of sustainable modes, and optimize development performance

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

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

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

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

TDM Measures Checklist Version 1.0 (30 June 2017)

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



Appendix H Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



1243 Teron Road Development

OTM Book 12 Signal Warrant Analysis (Justification 7)

Intersection: Carling Avenue / Teron Road

Scenario: 2025 Total Projection

Date of Traffic Count: Tuesday, 19 November 2019

Conditions

Main road oriented north-south? No	
Two lanes or more per approach on main road? No	
Intersection with only 3 approaches (T)? Yes	5
Urban setting (restricted flow)? Yes	3
Future intersection or roadway(s)? No	

Hourly Traffic Volumes (pc/h)

Book Hour	Eastbound (Main)			Northbound (Minor)			We	stbound (N	lain)	Sou	thbound (N	Peds Crossing	
Feak Houl	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	Left	Through	Right	Main Road
AM		494	16	221		150	44	567					
PM		762	98	26		88	147	426					
Average Hourly Volume (AHV)	0	314	29	62	0	60	48	248	0	0	0	0	0

Justification 7

		Justification	Threshold (pc/h)	Volume AM	e (pc/h) PM	Average Hourly Volume (pc/h)	Percentage of Threshold	Justification Met to 120%?
amu	1A	Total Traffic	720	1491	1547	759	105%	No
Volt	1B	Sidestreet Traffic	255	371	113	121	47%	- 110
lay	2A	Main Road Traffic	720	1120	1433	638	89%	No
De	2B	Crossing Traffic & Pedestrians	75	221	99	62	82%	

Result

Traffic signals are not warranted

Project 19-032 2019-12-15



Appendix I Synchro Traffic Analysis Reports

19-032 1243 Teror Lanes, Volumes, Ti	n Road mings						1: March Rd & Herzberg Re 2025 Background A
	≯	+	Ļ	×	1	4	
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	۲	***	**	1	ሻሻ	1	
Traffic Volume (voh)	19	840	2446	881	123	10	
Future Volume (vph)	10	840	2446	881	123	10	
Ideal Flow (upbal)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	
Lono Width (m)	1000	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	
Carle Width (m)	3.0	3.6	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
Grade (%)	== 0	0%	0%		0%		
Storage Length (m)	/5.0			0.0	0.0	30.0	
Storage Lanes	1			1	2	1	
Taper Length (m)	40.0				7.5		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.91	0.95	1.00	0.97	1.00	
Ped Bike Factor							
Frt				0.850		0.850	
Flt Protected	0.950				0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1676	4818	3353	1500	3252	1500	
Flt Permitted	0.950				0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1676	4818	3353	1500	3252	1500	
Right Turn on Red				Yes		Yes	
Satd. Flow (RTOR)				509		11	
ink Speed (k/h)		80	80		50		
ink Distance (m)		149.3	160.9		125.0		
Travel Time (s)		6.7	72		9.0		
Confl Peds (#/hr)		0.7	7.2		0.0		
Confl Bikes (#/hr)							
Book Hour Easter	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	
Crewth Fester	1000/	1000/	1000/	100%	1000/	100%	
arowin Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy venicies (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	
Bus Blockages (#/hr) Parking (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%	0%		0%		
Adi Elow (uph)	01	012	2650	050	124	- 1 - 1	
	21	913	2009	900	134		
Snared Lane Trattic (%)	0.1	040	0050	050	40.4		
Lane Group Flow (vph)	21	913	2659	958	134	11	
ium iype	Prot	NA	NA	Perm	Prot	Perm	
Protected Phases	5	2	6		4		
Permitted Phases				6		4	
Jetector Phase	5	2	6	6	4	4	
Switch Phase							
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	
Minimum Split (s)	12.0	27.0	27.0	27.0	35.0	35.0	
Total Split (s)	12.0	95.0	83.0	83.0	35.0	35.0	
Total Split (%)	9.2%	73.1%	63.8%	63.8%	26.9%	26.9%	
fellow Time (s)	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	3.3	3.3	
All-Red Time (s)	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	2.8	2.8	
ost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Fotal Lost Time (s)	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.1	6.1	
_ead/Lag	Lead		Lag	Lag			
Lead-Lag Optimize?			3	3			
	Maria	C Mov	C-Max	C-Max	None	None	
Recall Mode	INODE						

BTE

Synchro 9 Report Page 1

19-032 1243 Teror Lanes Volumes T	n Road						1: March Rd & Herzberg Rd
	<u>بار المراجع</u>	→	-	×.	1	∢	2020 Babiground An
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.06	0.82	0.75	0.75	0.09	0.09	
v/c Ratio	0.23	0.23	1.06	0.77	0.47	0.08	
Control Delay	88.3	3.1	54.0	10.0	61.7	25.9	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	88.3	3.1	54.0	10.0	61.7	25.9	
LOS	F	А	D	А	E	С	
Approach Delay		5.1	42.3		59.0		
Approach LOS		А	D		E		
Queue Length 50th (m)	3.5	0.4	~321.9	49.8	13.6	0.0	
Queue Length 95th (m)	m8.4	0.7	#367.6	116.5	21.3	4.7	
Internal Link Dist (m)		125.3	136.9		101.0		
Turn Bay Length (m)	75.0					30.0	
Base Capacity (vph)	93	3935	2513	1252	722	342	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.23	0.23	1.06	0.77	0.19	0.03	
Intersection Summary							
Area Type:	Other						
Cycle Length: 130							
Actuated Cycle Length: 130							
Offset: 12 (9%), Referenced	to phase a	2:EBT a	nd 6:WBT	, Start of	Green		
Natural Cycle: 150							
Control Type: Actuated-Coc	ordinated						
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.06							
Intersection Signal Delay: 3	5.4			Ir	tersectior	LOS: D	
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	tion 90.0%			IC	CU Level o	of Service E	
Analysis Period (min) 15							
 Volume exceeds capaci 	ty, queue i	s theore	tically infin	ite.			
Queue shown is maximu	m after two	o cycles.					
# 95th percentile volume e	exceeds ca	pacity, c	ueue may	/ be longe	er.		
Queue shown is maximu	m after two	cycles.					
m Volume for 95th percen	tile queue	is meter	ed by ups	tream sig	nal.		
Splits and Phases: 1: Ma	rch Rd & H	erzberg	Rd				



12-16-2019 BTE

<u>Lanes, Volumes, T</u>	imings									2025	5 Backgro	und AN
	۶	+	*	4	Ļ	*	•	1	*	1	ţ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Lane Configurations	ኘ	- † †	1	ሻ	- † †	1	ሻ	↑	*	ሻ	•	í
Traffic Volume (vph)	34	844	223	61	2017	218	342	183	43	30	33	
Future Volume (vph)	34	844	223	61	2017	218	342	183	43	30	33	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	180
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.
Grade (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Storage Length (m)	75.0		75.0	75.0		75.0	0.0		0.0	40.0		40.
Storage Lanes	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		
Taper Length (m)	50.0			50.0			7.5			40.0		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.0
Ped Bike Factor												
Frt			0.850			0.850			0.850			0.85
Flt Protected	0.950			0.950			0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1676	3353	1500	1676	3353	1500	1676	1765	1500	1676	1765	150
Flt Permitted	0.950			0.950			0.450			0.633		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1676	3353	1500	1676	3353	1500	794	1765	1500	1117	1765	150
Bight Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Ye
Satd Flow (BTOB)			242			135			133			13
ink Speed (k/h)		80			80	100		50	100		50	10
ink Distance (m)		220.0			806.6			79.5			112.5	
Fravel Time (s)		9.9			36.3			5.7			8.1	
Confl Peds (#/hr)		0.0			00.0			0.7			0.1	
Confl Bikes (#/hr)												
Poak Hour Factor	0 92	0 92	0.92	0.02	0 92	0.02	0 92	0.02	0 02	0.92	0.92	0.0
Fourth Easter	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	10.0%	100%	100%	10.02	100%	10.0
Jonus Vahiolog (%)	100%	20/	00%	00%	20/	20/	20/	00%	00%	20/	00%	1007
neavy venicies (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	27
Dus Diockages (#/III)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
arking (#/nr)		00/			00/			00/			00/	
VIID-DIOCK ITAIIIC (76)	07	0%	040	00	0%	007	070	100	47	22	0%	4
Adj. Flow (VpH)	3/	917	242	00	2192	237	3/2	199	47	33	30	1
Shared Lane Traffic (%)						0.07	070	100				
ane Group Flow (vph)	37	917	242	66	2192	237	372	199	47	33	36	1
iurn iype	Prot	NA	Perm	Prot	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perr
Protected Phases	5	2	~	1	6	~	3	8	~	/	4	
Permitted Phases	-	•	2			6	8	-	8	4		
Delector Phase	5	2	2	1	6	6	3	8	8	1	4	
Switch Phase		60.6			60.6	00.0		10.0	40.0		40.0	
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.
Minimum Split (s)	12.0	27.0	27.0	12.0	27.0	27.0	12.0	35.0	35.0	12.0	35.0	35.
otal Split (s)	12.0	61.0	61.0	12.0	61.0	61.0	22.0	35.0	35.0	22.0	35.0	35.
otal Split (%)	9.2%	46.9%	46.9%	9.2%	46.9%	46.9%	16.9%	26.9%	26.9%	16.9%	26.9%	26.9%
rellow Time (s)	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.
All-Hed Time (s)	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	2.8	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.
ost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.
otal Lost Time (s)	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.1	6.6	6.6	6.1	6.6	6.
ead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	La
-eao-Lag Optimize?		~ • • •			~ • •	~						
Recall Mode	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	None	None	None	None	Non
Act Effct Green (s)	8.4	69.7	69.7	11.6	75.3	75.3	29.9	20.5	20.5	17.7	13.7	13.

	≯	-	$\mathbf{\hat{v}}$	4	-	•	•	1	1	1	Ļ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.06	0.54	0.54	0.09	0.58	0.58	0.23	0.16	0.16	0.14	0.11	0.11
v/c Ratio	0.34	0.51	0.26	0.44	1.13	0.26	1.27	0.72	0.14	0.18	0.19	0.04
Control Delay	65.8	22.9	3.5	66.0	77.0	3.2	185.6	66.1	0.8	37.8	53.5	0.2
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	65.8	22.9	3.5	66.0	77.0	3.2	185.6	66.1	0.8	37.8	53.5	0.2
LOS	E	С	А	E	E	А	F	E	А	D	D	A
Approach Delay		20.3			69.7			133.1			40.2	
Approach LOS		С			E			F			D	
Queue Length 50th (m)	7.3	65.5	0.0	12.2	~288.1	7.0	~85.8	38.8	0.0	5.0	6.9	0.0
Queue Length 95th (m)	16.0	94.4	12.0	m11.31	m#296.7	m9.6	#89.9	56.0	0.0	10.6	14.2	0.0
Internal Link Dist (m)		196.0			782.6			55.5			88.5	
Turn Bay Length (m)	75.0		75.0	75.0		75.0				40.0		40.0
Base Capacity (vph)	108	1797	916	149	1941	925	292	385	431	290	385	431
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.34	0.51	0.26	0.44	1.13	0.26	1.27	0.52	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.02
Intersection Summary												
Area Type: C	Other											
Cycle Length: 130												
Actuated Cycle Length: 130												
Offset: 77 (59%), Referenced	d to phase	2:EBT ar	nd 6:WB	T, Start c	of Green							
Natural Cycle: 150												
Control Type: Actuated-Coor	dinated											
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.27												
Intersection Signal Delay: 64	.7			1	ntersectior	n LOS: E						
Intersection Capacity Utilizati	ion 103.09	%		l l	CU Level of	of Service	G					
Analysis Period (min) 15												
 Volume exceeds capacity 	, queue is	s theoretic	cally infin	nite.								
Queue shown is maximur	n after two	cycles.										
# 95th percentile volume ex	xceeds ca	pacity, qu	ieue may	/ be long	er.							
Queue shown is maximur	n after two	cycles.										
m Volume for 95th percent	ile queue i	is metere	d by ups	tream sig	gnal.							
Splits and Phases: 2: Tero	n Rd & M	arch Rd										
						1.			J.			
									$\mathbf{T} \models_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n}}$			

 Ø1
 Ø2 (R)
 Ø3
 Ø4

 12s
 61s
 22s
 35s

 Ø5
 Ø6 (R)
 Ø7
 Ø8

 12s
 61s
 22s
 35s

12-16-2019 BTE

	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	4	-	•	1	1	1	×	Ŧ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Lane Configurations		ę	1		ę	1	ľ	^	1	ኘ	^	1
Traffic Volume (vph)	66	27	. 9	39	13	182	91	2032	87	331	989	129
Future Volume (vph)	66	27	9	39	13	182	91	2032	87	331	989	129
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Grade (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Storage Length (m)	0.0		25.0	0.0		0.0	75.0		75.0	175.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	0		1	0		1	1		1	2		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			50.0			75.0		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	0.97	0.95	1.00
Ped Bike Factor		1.00	0.98		0.99	0.99	1.00		0.94	1.00		0.97
Frt			0.850			0.850			0.850			0.850
Flt Protected		0.966			0.964		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	1705	1500	0	1701	1500	1676	3353	1500	3252	3353	1500
Elt Permitted	-	0.753		-	0.636		0.950			0.950		
Satd, Flow (perm)	0	1323	1463	0	1113	1481	1671	3353	1415	3241	3353	1449
Right Turn on Red	-		Yes		-	Yes			Yes	-		Yes
Satd, Flow (RTOR)			103			198			80			80
Link Speed (k/h)		50			60			80			80	
Link Distance (m)		131.4			60.0			183.7			281.3	
Travel Time (s)		9.5			3.6			8.3			12.7	
Confl Peds (#/hr)	3	0.0	6	6	0.0	3	4	0.0	21	21		4
Confl Bikes (#/hr)	U			Ū		Ū	•					
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
Growth Eactor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Heavy Vehicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	2,0	2,0	2,0	0	0	0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2/
Parking (#/hr)	Ŭ	Ű	Ŭ	Ű		Ŭ	Ű	Ű	Ű	Ű	Ū	
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Adi Elow (vph)	72	29	10	42	14	198	99	2209	95	360	1075	140
Shared Lane Traffic (%)		20					00	2200	00	000		
Lane Group Flow (voh)	0	101	10	0	56	198	99	2209	95	360	1075	140
Turn Type	Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Free	Prot	NA	Perm	Prot	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8	1100	5	2	1 01111	1	6	1 0.11
Permitted Phases	4		4	8	Ū	Free	0	-	2		Ū	F
Detector Phase	4	4	4	8	8		5	2	2	1	6	F
Switch Phase				-			-	_	_			
Minimum Initial (s)	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0		5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	20.0	20.0
Minimum Solit (s)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0		13.0	28.0	28.0	13.0	28.0	28.0
Total Split (s)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0		22.0	76.0	76.0	19.0	73.0	73 (
Total Split (%)	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%		16.9%	58.5%	58.5%	14.6%	56.2%	56.2%
Yellow Time (s)	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3		4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4 6
All-Bed Time (s)	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8		2.8	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.3
Lost Time Adjust (s)		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)		5.1	5.1		5.1		7.4	79	79	7.4	79	7 0
l ead/Lag		0.1	0.1		0.1		Lead	lan	Lag	Lead	Lan	/
Lead-Lag Optimize?							Leau	Lay	Lay	Leau	Lay	Ldi
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None		None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max
Act Effet Green (s)	None	15.5	15.5	None	15.5	130.0	13.0	A PA	69.6	24.5	81 1	81.1

19-032 1243 Teron Road 3: March Rd & Station Rd/Carling Ave Lanes, Volumes, Timings 2025 Background AM ٠ 1 ٦ - \mathbf{i} 4 • ┛ -+ Lane Group EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR NBL NBT NBR SBI SBR Actuated g/C Ratio 0.12 0.12 0.12 1.00 0.10 0.54 0.54 0.19 0.62 0.62 v/c Ratio 0.64 0.04 0.42 0.13 0.59 1.23 0.12 0.59 0.51 0.15 Control Delay 72.0 0.2 61.4 0.2 69.8 138.4 4.7 53.5 15.8 6.1 Queue Delay 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Total Delay 72.0 0.2 61.4 0.2 69.8 138.4 4.7 53.5 15.8 6.1 LOS F Α F Α F F Α D В Α Approach Delay 65.5 13.7 130.3 23.6 Approach LOS Е В F С Queue Length 50th (m) 19.8 0.0 4.5 10.7 0.0 19.5 ~286.8 1.4 34.9 59.2 Queue Length 95th (m) 33.0 32.7 #326.3 49.4 91.5 0.0 20.6 0.0 8.0 13.8 Internal Link Dist (m) 107.4 36.0 159.7 257.3 Turn Bay Length (m) 25.0 75.0 75.0 175.0 25.0 198 1794 Base Capacity (vph) 304 415 794 612 2091 934 255 1481 Starvation Cap Reductn 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Spillback Cap Reductn 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Storage Cap Reductn 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Reduced v/c Ratio 0.33 0.02 0.22 0.13 0.50 1.23 0.12 0.59 0.51 0.15 Intersection Summary Area Type: Other Cycle Length: 130 Actuated Cycle Length: 130 Offset: 22 (17%), Referenced to phase 2:NBT and 6:SBT, Start of Green Natural Cycle: 150 Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.23 Intersection Signal Delay: 83.1 Intersection LOS: F Intersection Capacity Utilization 98.8% ICU Level of Service F Analysis Period (min) 15 ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. # 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. Splits and Phases: 3: March Rd & Station Rd/Carling Ave Ø1 Ø2 (R) 404

12-16-2019 BTE

19 s

Ø5

76 s

73 s

Ø6 (R)

Synchro 9 Report Page 6

35 s

35 s

₹ø8

19-032 1243 Terc Lanes, Volumes, T	on Road Fimings						4: Teron Rd & Carling Ave 2025 Background AM
	-	$\mathbf{\hat{v}}$	4	+	•	1	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations	↑	1		÷.	Y		
Traffic Volume (vph)	494	16	38	567	221	148	
Future Volume (vph)	494	16	38	567	221	148	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Grade (%)	0%			0%	0%		
Storage Length (m)		20.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
Storage Lanes		1	0		1	0	
Taper Length (m)			7.5		7.5		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Ped Bike Factor							
Frt		0.850			0.946		
Flt Protected				0.997	0.971		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1765	1500	0	1759	1621	0	
Flt Permitted				0.997	0.971		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1765	1500	0	1759	1621	0	
Link Speed (k/h)	60			60	50		
Link Distance (m)	194.0			213.2	38.0		
Travel Time (s)	11.6			12.8	2.7		
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)		3	3				
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)							
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy Vehicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	
Bus Blockages (#/hr) Parking (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mid-Block Traffic (%)	0%			0%	0%		
Adj. Flow (vph)	537	17	41	616	240	161	
Shared Lane Traffic (%)							
Lane Group Flow (vph)	537	17	0	657	401	0	
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop		
Intersection Summary							
Area Type:	Other						
Control Type: Unsignalized	ł						
Intersection Capacity Utiliz	ation 93.6%	,		IC	CU Level	of Service	e F
Analysis Period (min) 15							

HCM Unsignalized	n Road I Intersed	ction C	apacit	v Anal	vsis		4: Teron Rd & Carling Ave 2025 Background AM
	-	\mathbf{i}	1	-	1	1	
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations	↑	1		÷٩	Y		
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	494	16	38	567	221	148	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	494	16	38	567	221	148	
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop		
Grade	0%			0%	0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	537	17	41	616	240	161	
Pedestrians					3		
Lane Width (m)					3.6		
Walking Speed (m/s)					1.2		
Percent Blockage					0		
Right turn flare (veh)							
Median type	None			None			
Median storage veh)							
Upstream signal (m)				213			
pX, platoon unblocked					0.80		
vC, conflicting volume			557		1238	540	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol			557		1171	540	
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2	
tC, 2 stage (s)							
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3	
p0 queue free %			96		0	70	
cM capacity (veh/h)			1011		162	540	
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	537	17	657	401			
Volume Left	0	0	41	240			
Volume Right	0	17	0	161			
cSH	1700	1700	1011	226			
Volume to Capacity	0.32	0.01	0.04	1.78			
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.0	0.0	0.8	164.4			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.0	1.1	403.9			
Lane LOS			А	F			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0		1.1	403.9			
Approach LOS				F			
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			100.9				
Intersection Capacity Utilization	ation		93.6%	IC	U Level o	of Service	F
Analysis Period (min)			15				

12-16-2019 BTE

Synchro 9 Report Page 7 12-16-2019 BTE

	٦	-+	\mathbf{i}	1	-	×	•	Ť	~	×	ţ	~
Lane Group	FBI	FBT	FBB	WBI	WBT	WBB	NBI	NBT	NBB	SBI	SBT	SBE
Lane Configurations	8	1	2011	5	*	1		<u></u>		5.52	1	00.
Traffic Volume (unb)	37	/18	31	15	380	603	72	623	6	261	1/2	33
Future Volume (vph)	37	418	31	15	380	603	72	623	6	261	142	30
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Grade (%)	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0%	0.0
Storage Length (m)	0.0	0 /8	75.0	100.0	0 /8	100.0	0.0	0 /8	0.0	0.0	0 /8	0.0
Storage Lanes	1		1 1	100.0		100.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Taper Length (m)	75			75.0			75		0	75		
Lane Litil Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1 00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ped Bike Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ert		0 000				0.850		0 000			0 972	
Elt Protoctod	0.950	0.330		0.950		0.000		0.333		0.950	0.372	
Satd Flow (prot)	1676	1744	0	1676	1765	1500	0	1754	0	1676	1708	(
Elt Permitted	0.200	1744	0	0 100	1705	1300	0	0.940	0	0.258	1700	, c
Satd Flow (porm)	512	1744	0	351	1765	1/50	0	1657	0	455	1708	(
Bight Turn on Red	512	1744	Voc	331	1705	Voc	0	1037	Voc	400	1700	Vot
Satd Flow (RTOR)		3	163			256			163		15	163
Link Snood (k/b)		60			60	200		50			50	
Link Opeeu (k/II)		213.2			282.2			126.1			120.3	
Travel Time (c)		12.8			16.0			0.1			8.7	
Confl Pode (#/br)	2	12.0	1	1	10.5	2	1	5.1			0.7	1
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)	2					2						
Peak Hour Factor	0 02	0.92	0 92	0 92	0 92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0 02	0 02	0.02	0.95
Growth Easter	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	10.0%	100%	100%
	100%	100%	00%	20/	20/	20/	20/	20/	20/	00%	00%	100%
Bus Blockages (#/br)	2 /0	2 /0	2 /0	2 /0	2 /0	2 /0	2 /8	2 /0	2/0	2 /0	2 /0	2/0
Parking (#/br)	U	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C.
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Adi Elow (upb)	40	454	34	16	/13	655	78	677	7	284	154	36
Sharad Lana Traffia (%)	40	434	54	10	413	000	70	0//	1	204	134	50
Long Group Flow (uph)	40	100	0	16	412	CEE	0	760	0	204	100	(
Turn Turn	Porm	NIA	0	Porm	413	Porm	Porm	NA	0	pm pt	NA	, c
Protected Phases	reilli	2		Feilii	NA 6	Feilii	Feilii	NA 8		pin+pt 7	INA A	
Pormitted Phases	2	2		6	0	6	8	0		1	4	
Detector Phase	2	2		6	6	6	8	8		7	1	
Switch Phase	2	2		0	0	0	0	0		1	-	
Minimum Initial (c)	20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	10.0		5.0	10.0	
Minimum Split (s)	20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0	27.0	25.0	25.0		12.0	25.0	
Total Split (s)	27.0	27.0		27.0	27.0	27.0	23.0	23.0		12.0	20.0	
Total Split (%)	38.5%	38.5%		38.5%	38.5%	38.5%	51.5%	51.5%		10.0%	61.5%	
Vollow Time (s)	33	33		30.5%	30.3 %	30.3 %	31.578	31.378		10.0 %	33	
All-Red Time (s)	3.3	3.3		3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3		2.8	3.3	
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0		2.0	0.0	
Total Lost Time (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	
	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0		Load	0.0	
Lead Lag Optimize?							Lag	Lag		Lead		
Recall Mode	Max	Max		Max	Max	Max	None	None		None	None	
Act Effet Green (a)	Xbivi 42.4	12.4		17 A	10 A	IVIAX	NOTIE	60.4		72.0	70 /	

19-032 1243 Terc Lanes, Volumes, 1	n Road īmings							5: He	rzberg	Rd & 0	Carling Backgrou	Ave
	≯	+	*	4	+	*	•	Ť	1	1	Ŧ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.33	0.33		0.33	0.33	0.33		0.46		0.57	0.56	
v/c Ratio	0.24	0.84		0.14	0.70	1.00		0.99		0.88	0.20	
Control Delay	36.0	53.8		34.1	45.2	61.0		65.2		47.8	13.3	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	36.0	53.8		34.1	45.2	61.0		65.2		47.8	13.3	
LOS	D	D		С	D	E		E		D	В	
Approach Delay		52.4			54.6			65.2			34.0	
Approach LOS		D			D			Е			С	
Queue Length 50th (m)	5.8	90.5		2.3	72.4	92.7		149.5		28.6	16.5	
Queue Length 95th (m)	13.9	#133.7		7.1	101.8	#157.3		#216.8		#58.0	26.4	
Internal Link Dist (m)		189.2			258.2			102.1			96.3	
Turn Bay Length (m)				100.0		100.0						
Base Capacity (vph)	170	584		117	589	657		769		323	970	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.24	0.84		0.14	0.70	1.00		0.99		0.88	0.20	
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 130												
Actuated Cycle Length: 13	0											
Natural Cycle: 100												
Control Type: Semi Act-Ur	coord											
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.00												
Intersection Signal Delay:	53.6			In	tersectio	on LOS: D						
Intersection Capacity Utiliz	ation 112.0)%		IC	CU Level	of Service	e H					
Analysis Period (min) 15												
# 95th percentile volume	exceeds c	apacity, qu	leue may	be longe	er.							
Queue shown is maxim	um after tw	o cycles.										

Splits and Phases: 5: Herzberg Rd & Carling Ave

	₩ Ø4	
50 s	80 s	
	▶ø7 ▲ ø8	
50 s	13 s 67 s	

12-16-2019 BTE

19-032 1243 Tero Lanes, Volumes, T	n Road ïmings						6: Teron Rd & Project Site 2025 Background AM
	4	*	Ť	۴	1	Ŧ	
Lane Group	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Y		¢Î,			۴Î	
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	369	0	0	55	
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	369	0	0	55	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Grade (%)	0%		0%			0%	
Storage Length (m)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		
Storage Lanes	1	0		0	0		
Taper Length (m)	7.5				7.5		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Ped Bike Factor							
Frt							
Flt Protected							
Satd. Flow (prot)	1765	0	1765	0	0	1765	
Flt Permitted							
Satd. Flow (perm)	1765	0	1765	0	0	1765	
Link Speed (k/h)	50		50			50	
Link Distance (m)	78.8		108.3			300.6	
Travel Time (s)	5.7		7.8			21.6	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)							
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)							
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy Vehicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Parking (#/hr)							
Mid-Block Traffic (%)	0%		0%			0%	
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	0	401	0	0	60	
Shared Lane Traffic (%)							
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	401	0	0	60	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Intersection Summary							
Area Type:	Other						
Control Type: Unsignalized							
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation 23.8%	, ,		IC	CU Level	of Service	A
Analysis Period (min) 15							

19-032 1243 Tero HCM Unsignalized	n Road I Interse		6: Teron Rd & Project Site 2025 Background AM				
	4	•	†	~	``	Ļ	
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Ý		ĥ			ર્શ	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	0	0	369	0	0	55	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	0	0	369	0	0	55	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Grade	0%		0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	0	0	401	0	0	60	
Pedestrians							
Lane Width (m)							
Walking Speed (m/s)							
Percent Blockage							
Right turn flare (veh)							
Median type			None			None	
Median storage veh)							
Upstream signal (m)							
pX, platoon unblocked							
vC, conflicting volume	461	401			401		
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	461	401			401		
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1		
tC, 2 stage (s)							
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2		
p0 queue free %	100	100			100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	559	649			1158		
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1				
Volume Total	0	401	60				
Volume Left	0	0	0				
Volume Right	0	0	0				
cSH	1700	1700	1158				
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.24	0.00				
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Lane LOS	A						
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Approach LOS	A						
Intersection Summary	_						
Average Delay			0.0				
Intersection Capacity Utiliz	ation		23.8%	IC	U Level	of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)			15				

Synchro 9 Report Page 11 12-16-2019 BTE

19-032 1243 Tero Lanes, Volumes, T	n Road imings						1: March Rd & Herzberg I 2025 Background
i	۴	→	+	•	1	~	
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	5	***	**	1	ካካ	1	
Traffic Volume (voh)	6	1998	1222	224	816	17	
Future Volume (vph)	6	1998	1222	224	816	17	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Grade (%)	0.0	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	
Storage Length (m)	75.0	0 %	0 %	0.0	0%	20.0	
Storage Lanes	1			0.0	0.0	30.0	
Taper Length (m)	40.0				7.5		
Lane Litil Factor	40.0	0.01	0.95	1.00	0.97	1.00	
Ped Bike Factor	1.00	0.91	0.95	1.00	0.97	1.00	
				0.950		0.950	
Fit Drotosted	0.050			0.850	0.050	0.850	
Fit Protected	0.950	4005	0000	1010	0.950	1515	
Sato. Flow (prot)	1693	4865	3386	1515	3285	1515	
Fit Permitted	0.950	100-			0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1693	4865	3386	1515	3285	1515	
Right Lurn on Red				Yes		Yes	
Satd. Flow (RTOR)				202		10	
Link Speed (k/h)		80	80		50		
Link Distance (m)		149.3	160.9		125.0		
Travel Time (s)		6.7	7.2		9.0		
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)							
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)							
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy Vehicles (%)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Parking (#/hr)							
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%	0%		0%		
Adj. Flow (vph)	7	2172	1328	243	887	18	
Shared Lane Traffic (%)							
Lane Group Flow (vph)	7	2172	1328	243	887	18	
Turn Type	Prot	NA	NA	Perm	Prot	Perm	
Protected Phases	5	2	6		4		
Permitted Phases				6		4	
Detector Phase	5	2	6	6	4	4	
Switch Phase							
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	
Minimum Split (s)	12.0	27.0	27.0	27.0	35.0	35.0	
Total Split (s)	12.0	80.0	68.0	68.0	50.0	50.0	
Total Split (%)	9.2%	61.5%	52.3%	52.3%	38.5%	38.5%	
Yellow Time (s)	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	3.3	33	
All-Bed Time (s)	1.9	1.7	17	17	2.8	2.8	
Lost Timo Adjust (s)	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	
Total Lost Time (a)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Lood/Log	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0 . I	0.1	
Leau/Lay	Lead		Lag	Lag			
Leau-Lag Optimize /	Nex -	C Mari	C Mai	C Mari	Nen	Man	
necall Mode	None	G-Max	C-Max	C-Max	None	None	
Act Effct Green (s)	5.6	77.3	/4.9	/4.9	40.3	40.3	

Synchro 9 Report Page 1

19-032 1243 Teroi Lanes, Volumes, T	n Road imings						1: March Rd & Herzberg Rd 2025 Background PM
	۶	-	-	×	1	1	
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.04	0.59	0.58	0.58	0.31	0.31	
v/c Ratio	0.10	0.75	0.68	0.25	0.87	0.04	
Control Delay	85.7	4.4	22.9	4.4	52.5	18.9	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	85.7	4.4	22.9	4.4	52.5	18.9	
LOS	F	Α	С	Α	D	В	
Approach Delay		4.7	20.1		51.8		
Approach LOS		Α	С		D		
Queue Length 50th (m)	1.3	8.0	92.3	3.4	85.9	1.1	
Queue Length 95th (m)	m1.1	m18.3	143.5	15.9	103.4	5.5	
Internal Link Dist (m)		125.3	136.9		101.0		
Turn Bay Length (m)	75.0					30.0	
Base Capacity (vph)	73	2893	1951	958	1109	518	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.10	0.75	0.68	0.25	0.80	0.03	
Intersection Summary							
Area Type:	Other						
Cycle Length: 130							
Actuated Cycle Length: 130	1						
Offset: 12 (9%), Referenced	d to phase	2:EBT an	d 6:WBT,	Start of	Green		
Natural Cycle: 90							
Control Type: Actuated-Coc	ordinated						
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.87							
Intersection Signal Delay: 1	9.0			In	tersection	n LOS: B	
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation 75.7%	5		IC	CU Level of	of Service D	
Analysis Period (min) 15							
m Volume for 95th percen	ntile queue	is metere	d by upst	ream sigi	nal.		

Splits and Phases: 1: March Rd & Herzberg Rd

→ø2 (R)₩	< ↓ _{Ø4}	
80 s	50 s	
Ø5 Ø6 (R)		
12 s 68 s		

12-16-2019 BTE

una Piv	5 Backgro	2025									rinnings	Lanes, volumes, r
~	ţ	1	۲	Ť	•	×	+	4	\mathbf{r}	→	٦	
SBF	SBT	SBL	NBR	NBT	NBL	WBR	WBT	WBL	EBR	EBT	EBL	Lane Group
1	•	ሻ	1	•	ሻ	1		ኘ	*	* *	ሻ	Lane Configurations
35	200	179	29	58	245	32	1093	70	31	1848	18	Traffic Volume (vph)
35	200	179	29	58	245	32	1093	70	31	1848	18	Future Volume (vph)
1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	Ideal Flow (vphpl)
3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	Lane Width (m)
	0%			0%			0%			0%		Grade (%)
40.0		40.0	0.0		0.0	75.0		75.0	75.0		75.0	Storage Length (m)
1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1	Storage Lanes
		40.0			7.5			50.0			50.0	Taper Length (m)
1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	Lane Util. Factor
												Ped Bike Factor
0.850			0.850			0.850			0.850			Frt
		0.950			0.950			0.950			0.950	Flt Protected
1515	1782	1693	1515	1782	1693	1515	3386	1693	1515	3386	1693	Satd. Flow (prot)
		0.585			0.486			0.950			0.950	Elt Permitted
1519	1782	1043	1515	1782	866	1515	3386	1693	1515	3386	1693	Satd Flow (perm)
Yes		1010	Yes	1102	000	Yes	0000		Yes	0000	1000	Bight Turn on Bed
130			133			135			135			Satd Flow (BTOR)
	50			50		100	80			80		Link Speed (k/h)
	112.5			79.5			806.6			220.0		Link Distance (m)
	8.1			5.7			36.3			9.9		Travel Time (s)
	0.1			0.7			00.0			0.0		Confl Peds (#/hr)
												Confl Bikes (#/hr)
0.93	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	Peak Hour Factor
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Growth Eactor
100 /	100 /8	100 /8	100 /8	100 /8	100 /8	100 /8	100 /8	100 /8	100 /8	100 /8	100 /8	Heavy Vehicles (%)
17	1 %	1 %	1 %	1 %	1 %	1 %	1 %	1%	1%	1 %	1 76	Pue Pleekegee (#/br)
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Parking (#/hr)
	0%			0%			0%			0%		Mid-Block Traffic (%)
38	217	195	32	63	266	35	1188	76	34	2009	20	Adj. Flow (vph)
												Shared Lane Traffic (%)
38	217	195	32	63	266	35	1188	76	34	2009	20	Lane Group Flow (vph)
Pern	NA	pm+pt	Perm	NA	pm+pt	Perm	NA	Prot	Perm	NA	Prot	Turn Type
	4	7		8	3		6	1		2	5	Protected Phases
4		4	8		8	6			2			Permitted Phases
4	4	7	8	8	3	6	6	1	2	2	5	Detector Phase
												Switch Phase
10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	Minimum Initial (s)
35.0	35.0	12.0	35.0	35.0	12.0	27.0	27.0	12.0	27.0	27.0	12.0	Minimum Split (s)
35.0	35.0	14.0	35.0	35.0	14.0	69.0	69.0	12.0	69.0	69.0	12.0	Fotal Split (s)
26.9%	26.9%	10.8%	26.9%	26.9%	10.8%	53.1%	53.1%	9.2%	53.1%	53.1%	9.2%	Total Split (%)
3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	Yellow Time (s)
3.3	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.3	2.8	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.8	All-Red Time (s)
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	ost Time Adjust (s)
6.0	6.6	6.1	6.6	6.6	6.1	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.4	Fotal Lost Time (s)
La	Lao	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lao	Lag	Lead	_ead/Lag
_4	9	0	9	9	0	9	9	0	9	9		_ead-Lag Optimize?
Non	None	None	None	None	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	Recall Mode
							70.0	40.0		0.1.7		

	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	1	Ť	1	1	ţ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.05	0.50	0.50	0.08	0.59	0.59	0.21	0.16	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.16
v/c Ratio	0.24	1.19	0.04	0.54	0.60	0.04	1.17	0.23	0.09	0.64	0.75	0.11
Control Delay	66.4	123.6	0.1	62.1	22.4	0.5	154.2	47.3	0.5	50.6	67.3	0.6
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	66.4	123.6	0.1	62.1	22.4	0.5	154.2	47.3	0.5	50.6	67.3	0.6
LOS	E	F	А	E	С	А	F	D	А	D	E	A
Approach Delay		121.0			24.1			121.9			54.5	
Approach LOS		F			С			F			D	
Queue Length 50th (m)	3.9	~263.6	0.0	12.0	113.0	0.0	~50.9	11.2	0.0	32.4	42.3	0.0
Queue Length 95th (m)	10.8	#296.4	0.0	m#30.6	152.2	m0.0	#81.8	20.4	0.0	46.2	60.2	0.0
Internal Link Dist (m)		196.0			782.6			55.5			88.5	
Turn Bay Length (m)	75.0		75.0	75.0		75.0				40.0		40.0
Base Capacity (vph)	84	1685	822	140	1995	948	227	389	434	307	389	434
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.24	1.19	0.04	0.54	0.60	0.04	1.17	0.16	0.07	0.64	0.56	0.09
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 130												
Actuated Cycle Length: 130												
Offset: 83 (64%), Reference	ed to phas	e 2:EBT a	nd 6:WE	T, Start of	f Green							
Natural Cycle: 150												
Control Type: Actuated-Coo	rdinated											
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.19												
Intersection Signal Delay: 83	3.8			In	ntersection	n LOS: F						
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	tion 102.7	%		IC	CU Level	of Service	e G					
Analysis Period (min) 15												
 Volume exceeds capacit 	ty, queue	is theoretic	cally infi	nite.								
Queue shown is maximu	m after tw	o cycles.										
# 95th percentile volume e	exceeds c	apacity, qu	ieue ma	y be longe	er.							
Queue shown is maximu	m after tw	o cycles.										
m Volume for 95th percen	tile queue	is metere	d by ups	tream sig	nal.							
Splits and Phases: 2: Ter	on Rd & N	/arch Rd										
(a)							1	2	4			
12 - 60 - 60 - (R)				_			14 5	১	▼ 1 <u>0</u> 4			

Ø1	Ø2 (R)	▲ øз		
12 s	69 s	14 s	35 s	
م ∞	 Ø6 (R)	Ø7	- ¶ø8	
12 s	69 s	14 s	35 s	

	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	1	-	•	1	1	1	- \	Ŧ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		÷.	1		ę	۴	٦	- † †	1	ካካ	^	7
Traffic Volume (vph)	27	14	31	126	20	332	35	1426	37	304	1970	52
Future Volume (vph)	27	14	31	126	20	332	35	1426	37	304	1970	52
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Grade (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Storage Length (m)	0.0		25.0	0.0		0.0	75.0		75.0	175.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	0		1	0		1	1		1	2		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			50.0			75.0		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	0.97	0.95	1.00
Ped Bike Factor		1.00	0.98		0.99	0.99	1.00		0.94	0.99		0.97
Frt			0.850			0.850			0.850			0.850
Flt Protected		0.968			0.959		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	1725	1515	0	1709	1515	1693	3386	1515	3285	3386	1515
Flt Permitted		0.705			0.724		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	1253	1477	0	1277	1495	1692	3386	1429	3256	3386	1463
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)			165			358			142			80
Link Speed (k/h)		50			60			80			80	
Link Distance (m)		131.4			60.0			183.7			281.3	
Travel Time (s)		9.5			3.6			8.3			12.7	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)	3		6	6		3	4		21	21		4
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)												
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
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Heavy Vehicles (%)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parking (#/hr)												
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Adj. Flow (vph)	29	15	34	137	22	361	38	1550	40	330	2141	57
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	44	34	0	159	361	38	1550	40	330	2141	57
Turn Type	Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Free	Prot	NA	Perm	Prot	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8		5	2		1	6	
Permitted Phases	4		4	8		Free			2			6
Detector Phase	4	4	4	8	8		5	2	2	1	6	6
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0		5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	20.0	20.0
Minimum Split (s)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0		13.0	28.0	28.0	13.0	28.0	28.0
Total Split (s)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0		13.0	73.0	73.0	22.0	82.0	82.0
Total Split (%)	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%		10.0%	56.2%	56.2%	16.9%	63.1%	63.1%
Yellow Time (s)	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3		4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
All-Red Time (s)	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8		2.8	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.3
Lost Time Adjust (s)		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)		5.1	5.1		5.1		7.4	7.9	7.9	7.4	7.9	7.9
Lead/Lag							Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?												
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None		None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max
Act Effct Green (s)		21.5	21.5		21.5	130.0	7.3	71.0	71.0	17.2	83.4	83.4

ane Group Actuated g/C Ratio //c Ratio Control Delay Jueue Delay Total Delay _OS Approach Delay Approach Delay	EBL EBT 0.17 0.21 46.7 0.0 46.7	EBR 0.17 0.09 0.5	WBL	WBT 0.17	WBR	NBL	NBT	NDD			
Actuated g/C Ratio //c Ratio Control Delay Jueue Delay Fotal Delay _OS Approach Delay Approach Delay	0.17 0.21 46.7 0.0 46.7	0.17 0.09 0.5		0.17				NDN	SBL	SBT	SBF
//c Ratio Control Delay Jueue Delay Fotal Delay .OS Approach Delay Approach LOS	0.21 46.7 0.0 46.7	0.09 0.5			1.00	0.06	0.55	0.55	0.13	0.64	0.64
Control Delay Queue Delay Fotal Delay LOS Approach Delay Approach LOS	46.7 0.0 46.7	0.5		0.76	0.24	0.40	0.84	0.05	0.76	0.99	0.0
Queue Delay Fotal Delay LOS Approach Delay Approach LOS	0.0 46.7			72.8	0.4	71.7	31.2	0.1	66.4	40.9	1.3
Fotal Delay LOS Approach Delay Approach LOS	46.7	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LOS Approach Delay Approach LOS		0.5		72.8	0.4	71.7	31.2	0.1	66.4	40.9	1.3
Approach Delay Approach LOS	D	А		E	А	E	С	А	E	D	4
Approach LOS	26.6			22.5			31.3			43.4	
	С			С			С			D	
Queue Length 50th (m)	7.8	0.0		31.0	0.0	7.5	138.7	0.0	32.9	~244.2	0.0
Queue Length 95th (m)	15.4	0.0		46.7	0.0	#18.9	#178.2	0.0	#54.6	#292.5	2.5
nternal Link Dist (m)	107.4			36.0			159.7			257.3	
Furn Bay Length (m)		25.0				75.0		75.0	175.0		25.0
Base Capacity (vph)	288	466		293	1495	95	1848	844	433	2172	96
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.15	0.07		0.54	0.24	0.40	0.84	0.05	0.76	0.99	0.06
ntersection Summary											
Area Type: Othe	r										
Cycle Length: 130											
Actuated Cycle Length: 130											
Offset: 22 (17%), Referenced to	phase 2:NBT a	nd 6:SBT	, Start of	Green							
Natural Cycle: 140											
Control Type: Actuated-Coordina	ited										
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.99											
ntersection Signal Delay: 36.7			Ir	ntersection	1 LOS: D						
ntersection Capacity Utilization	93.8%		10	CU Level of	of Service	۶F					
Analysis Period (min) 15											
 Volume exceeds capacity, qu 	ueue is theoreti	cally infini	ite.								
Queue shown is maximum af	ter two cycles.										
# 95th percentile volume excee	eds capacity, qu	leue may	be longe	er.							
Queue shown is maximum af	er two cycles.										

12-16-2019 BTE

19-032 1243 Tero Lanes, Volumes, T						4: Teron Rd & Carling Ave 2025 Background PM	
	→	$\mathbf{\hat{v}}$	4	+	•	1	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations	↑	1		÷.	۰Y		
Traffic Volume (vph)	762	98	144	426	26	82	
Future Volume (vph)	762	98	144	426	26	82	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Grade (%)	0%			0%	0%		
Storage Length (m)		20.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
Storage Lanes		1	0		1	0	
Taper Length (m)			7.5		7.5		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Ped Bike Factor							
Frt		0.850			0.897		
Flt Protected				0.987	0.988		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1782	1515	0	1759	1579	0	
Flt Permitted				0.987	0.988		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1782	1515	0	1759	1579	0	
Link Speed (k/h)	60			60	50		
Link Distance (m)	194.0			213.2	38.0		
Travel Time (s)	11.6			12.8	2.7		
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)		3	3				
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)							
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy Vehicles (%)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	
Bus Blockages (#/hr) Parking (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mid-Block Traffic (%)	0%			0%	0%		
Adj. Flow (vph)	828	107	157	463	28	89	
Shared Lane Traffic (%)							
Lane Group Flow (vph)	828	107	0	620	117	0	
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop		
Intersection Summary							
Area Type:	Other						
Control Type: Unsignalized	ł						
Intersection Capacity Utiliz	ation 91.3%	,		IC	CU Level	of Service	e F
Analysis Period (min) 15							

HCM Unsignalized	Interse	ction C	Capaci	ty Anal	ysis		2025 Background PM
	-	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	-	1	1	
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations	↑	1		ę	Ý		
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	762	98	144	426	26	82	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	762	98	144	426	26	82	
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop		
Grade	0%			0%	0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	828	107	157	463	28	89	
Pedestrians					3		
Lane Width (m)					3.6		
Walking Speed (m/s)					1.2		
Percent Blockage					0		
Right turn flare (veh)							
Median type	None			None			
Median storage veh)							
Upstream signal (m)				213			
pX, platoon unblocked					0.79		
vC, conflicting volume			938		1608	831	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol			938		1637	831	
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2	
tC, 2 stage (s)							
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3	
p0 queue free %			79		59	76	
cM capacity (veh/h)			733		69	370	
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	828	107	620	117			
Volume Left	0	0	157	28			
Volume Right	0	107	0	89			
cSH	1700	1700	733	181			
Volume to Capacity	0.49	0.06	0.21	0.65			
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.0	0.0	4.9	22.4			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.0	5.3	55.4			
Lane LOS			A	F			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0		5.3	55.4			
Approach LOS				F			
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			5.8				
Intersection Capacity Litiliza	ation		91.3%	IC	ULevel	of Service	F
Analysis Period (min)			15		2 201010		•

Synchro 9 Report

Page 7

12-16-2019 BTE

19-032 1243 Teron Road

Synchro 9 Report Page 8

4: Teron Rd & Carling Ave

12-16-2019 BTE

	≯	_	~	1	t	×	*	ŧ	*	1	T	1
	FDI	FDT			WDT		NDI	NDT		001		0.00
Larie Group		<u>EDI</u>	EDR	VVDL		WDR	INDL	10D1	INDR	SDL .	5BT	301
Lane Configurations		*	54	1	T		00	(4)	40	-1	4	
Future Volume (vph)	10	000	51	44	431	301	32	100	10	562	570	4
Ideal Flow (uphpl)	1900	1900	1000	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	100
Lana Width (m)	1000	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	100
Grade (%)	3.0	0%	3.0	3.0	0%	5.0	3.0	0%	3.0	3.0	0%	3.
Storago Longth (m)	0.0	0%	75.0	100.0	0 %	100.0	0.0	0 %	0.0	0.0	0%	0.0
Storage Length (III)	0.0		1 1	100.0		100.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Topor Longth (m)	7.5			75.0			75		0	75		,
Lape Litil Easter	1.0	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ped Bike Eactor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
		0.000				0.97		0.002			0.000	
FIL Fit Protoctod	0.050	0.990		0.050		0.850		0.992		0.050	0.969	
Satd Flow (prot)	1602	1762	0	1602	1780	1515	0	1756	0	1602	1750	(
Elt Pormitted	0.212	1702	0	0.074	1/02	1010	0	0.921	0	0.095	1759	,
Satd Flow (perm)	558	1762	0	132	1782	1474	0	1451	0	508	1750	(
Bight Turn on Red	550	1702	Voc	152	1702	Voc	0	1431	Voc	500	1755	Vor
Satd Flow (RTOR)		4	163			302		2	163		1	103
Link Speed (k/h)		4 60			60	552		E0			- 50	
Link Speed (MII)		212.2			202.2			106.1			120.2	
Travel Time (s)		12.8			16.0			0.1			8.7	
Confl Pode (#/br)	2	12.0	1	1	10.9	2	1	9.1			0.7	1
Confl Bikes (#/hr)	2					2						
Poak Hour Factor	0.02	0 92	0 92	0 92	0 92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0 92	0.92	0 02	0.02
Growth Easter	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	10.0%	100%	100%
Heavy Vehicles (%)	100 %	100%	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100%	100 %	100%	100 %
Bus Blockages (#/br)	1 /0	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8	
Parking (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	,
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Adi Elow (vph)	14	7/8	55	/18	468	302	35	202	1/	611	620	50
Shared Lane Traffic (%)	14	740	00	40	400	002	00	202	14	011	020	00
Lane Group Flow (uph)	14	803	0	48	468	302	0	251	0	611	670	(
Turn Type	Porm	NA	0	Porm	400	Porm	Porm	NA	0	nmunt	NA	,
Protected Phases	i enn	2		renn	6	renn	reim	8		7	1	
Permitted Phases	2	2		6	0	6	8	0		1	4	
Detector Phases	2	2		6	6	6	8	8		7	1	
Switch Phase	2	2		0	0	0	0	0		,	-	
Minimum Initial (c)	20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	10.0		5.0	10.0	
Minimum Split (s)	20.0	20.0		27.0	20.0	27.0	25.0	25.0		12.0	25.0	
Total Split (s)	61.0	61.0		61.0	61.0	61.0	20.0	20.0		40.0	69.0	
Total Split (%)	46.9%	46.9%		46.9%	46.9%	46.9%	22.3%	22.3%		30.8%	53.1%	
Vollow Time (s)	40.378	40.378		40.378	40.378	40.378	22.0 /0	33		30.0 %	33.178	
All-Red Time (s)	3.3	3.3		3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3		2.8	3.3	
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		2.0	0.0	
Total Lost Time (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0		6.1	0.0	
	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	Lan	Lac		Load	0.0	
Lead-Lag							Lay	Lay		Lead		
Recall Mode	Max	Max		Max	Max	Max	None	None		None	None	
Act Effet Green (s)	FA A	54.4		54 4	54 4	54 4	None	22.4		62.0	60.4	

19-032 1243 Teron Road Lanes, Volumes, Timings 5: Herzberg Rd & Carling Averence 2025 Background PM 2025 Background PM Lane Group EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR NBL NBT NBR SBL SBT SBF Actuated g/C Ratio 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.17 0.48 0.48 0.48 Actuated g/C Ratio 0.06 1.09 0.87 0.63 0.46 1.00 1.10 0.79 Control Delay 23.6 95.4 129.0 34.4 4.2 110.1 97.9 36.6 Control Delay 23.6 95.4 129.0 34.4 4.2 110.1 97.9 36.6 Queue Delay 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 LOS C F F C A F F D 0.4 4.2 110.1 96.3 1.05 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0													
	۶	+	*	4	ł	×	1	1	1	1	Ŧ	4	
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.42	0.42		0.42	0.42	0.42		0.17		0.48	0.48		
v/c Ratio	0.06	1.09		0.87	0.63	0.46		1.00		1.10	0.79		
Control Delay	23.6	95.4		129.0	34.4	4.2		110.1		97.9	36.6		
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0		
Total Delay	23.6	95.4		129.0	34.4	4.2		110.1		97.9	36.6		
LOS	С	F		F	С	А		F		F	D		
Approach Delay		94.2			26.4			110.1			65.8		
Approach LOS		F			С			F			E		
Queue Length 50th (m)	1.7	~181.9		8.8	73.7	0.0		51.0		~116.0	110.5		
Queue Length 95th (m)	5.1	#241.7		#29.2	102.4	14.5		#94.1		#172.3	151.6		
Internal Link Dist (m)		189.2			258.2			102.1			96.3		
Turn Bay Length (m)				100.0		100.0							
Base Capacity (vph)	233	739		55	745	844		251		554	846		
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0		
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0		
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0		
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.06	1.09		0.87	0.63	0.46		1.00		1.10	0.79		
Intersection Summary													
Area Type: C	Other												
Cycle Length: 130													
Actuated Cycle Length: 130													
Natural Cycle: 130													
Control Type: Semi Act-Unco	oord												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.10													
Intersection Signal Delay: 65	5.4			lr	tersectio	n LOS: E							
Intersection Capacity Utilizat	ion 105.6	i%		IC	CU Level	of Service	G						
Analysis Period (min) 15													
 Volume exceeds capacity 	y, queue	is theoreti	cally infin	ite.									
Queue shown is maximur	n after tw	o cycles.											
# 95th percentile volume e	xceeds c	apacity, qu	leue may	be longe	er.								
Queue shown is maximur	m after tw	o cycles.											

Splits and Phases: 5: Herzberg Rd & Carling Ave

<u> </u>			
61 s	69 s		
₩ Ø6	Ø7	<∎ Ø8	
61s	40 s	29 s	

12-16-2019 BTE

19-032 1243 Tero Lanes, Volumes, T	n Road imings						6: Teron Rd & Project Site 2025 Background PM
	4	*	t	۴	1	ŧ	
Lane Group	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Ý		4Î			ę	
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	108	0	0	242	
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	108	0	0	242	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Grade (%)	0%		0%			0%	
Storage Length (m)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		
Storage Lanes	1	0		0	0		
Taper Length (m)	7.5				7.5		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Ped Bike Factor							
Frt							
Flt Protected							
Satd. Flow (prot)	1782	0	1782	0	0	1782	
Flt Permitted							
Satd. Flow (perm)	1782	0	1782	0	0	1782	
Link Speed (k/h)	50		50			50	
Link Distance (m)	78.8		108.3			300.6	
Travel Time (s)	5.7		7.8			21.6	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)							
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)							
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy Vehicles (%)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Parking (#/hr)							
Mid-Block Traffic (%)	0%		0%			0%	
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	0	117	0	0	263	
Shared Lane Traffic (%)							
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	117	0	0	263	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Intersection Summary							
Area Type:	Other						
Control Type: Unsignalized							
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation 16.8%	,		IC	CU Level	of Service	e A
Analysis Period (min) 15							

19-032 1243 Tero HCM Unsignalized	n Road I Interse		6: Teron Rd & Project Site 2025 Background PM				
	4	•	1	1	1	ţ	
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Y		f,			د ا	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	0	0	108	0	0	242	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	0	0	108	0	0	242	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Grade	0%		0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	0	0	117	0	0	263	
Pedestrians							
Lane Width (m)							
Walking Speed (m/s)							
Percent Blockage							
Right turn flare (veh)							
Median type			None			None	
Median storage veh)							
Upstream signal (m)							
pX, platoon unblocked	200	117			117		
vC, connicting volume	360	117			117		
vC1, stage 1 conti vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	380	117			117		
tC. single (s)	6.4	62			4 1		
tC, 2 stage (s)	0.4	0.2			4.1		
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2		
p0 queue free %	100	100			100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	624	938			1478		
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1				
Volume Total	0	117	263				
Volume Left	0	0	0				
Volume Right	0	0	0				
cSH	1700	1700	1478				
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.07	0.00				
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Lane LOS	A						
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Approach LOS	A						
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			0.0			(0)	•
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation		16.8%	IC	U Level	of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)			15				

Synchro 9 Report Page 11 12-16-2019 BTE

19-032 1243 Teror Lanes, Volumes, T	n Road imings						1: March Rd & Herzberg Rd 2025 Total AM
	۶	-	+	•	1	~	
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	۲	***	* *	1	ሻሻ	1	
Traffic Volume (vph)	19	848	2465	881	123	10	
Future Volume (vph)	19	848	2465	881	123	10	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Grade (%)		0%	0%		0%		
Storage Length (m)	75.0	070	0,0	0.0	0.0	30.0	
Storage Lanes	1			1	2	1	
Taper Length (m)	40.0				7.5		
Lane Litil Eactor	1 00	0.91	0.95	1 00	0.97	1 00	
Ped Bike Factor		5.01	5.00		5.07		
Frt				0.850		0.850	
Fit Protected	0.950			0.000	0.950	0.000	
Satd, Flow (prot)	1676	4818	3353	1500	3252	1500	
Flt Permitted	0.950	.0.0	0000		0.950		
Satd, Flow (perm)	1676	4818	3353	1500	3252	1500	
Bight Turn on Bed				Yes		Yes	
Satd, Flow (BTOR)				505		11	
Link Speed (k/h)		80	80	000	50		
Link Distance (m)		149.3	160.9		125.0		
Travel Time (s)		6.7	7.2		9.0		
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)		0.1			0.0		
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)							
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy Vehicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Parking (#/hr)							
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%	0%		0%		
Adi, Flow (vph)	21	922	2679	958	134	11	
Shared Lane Traffic (%)					-		
Lane Group Flow (vph)	21	922	2679	958	134	11	
Turn Type	Prot	NA	NA	Perm	Prot	Perm	
Protected Phases		2	6		4		
Permitted Phases				6		4	
Detector Phase	5	2	6	6	4	4	
Switch Phase	-						
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	
Minimum Split (s)	12.0	27.0	27.0	27.0	35.0	35.0	
Total Split (s)	12.0	95.0	83.0	83.0	35.0	35.0	
Total Split (%)	9.2%	73.1%	63.8%	63.8%	26.9%	26.9%	
Yellow Time (s)	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	3.3	3.3	
All-Red Time (s)	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	2.8	2.8	
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0,0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Lost Time (s)	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.1	6.1	
Lead/Lag	Lead	2.0	Lag	Lag			
Lead-Lag Optimize?			9	9			
Recall Mode	None	C-Max	C-Max	C-Max	None	None	
Act Effct Green (s)	7.2	106.2	97.5	97.5	11.4	11.4	
			21.0	21.0			

Synchro 9 Report Page 1

Lanes. Volumes. Ti	n Road iminas						1: March Rd & Herzberg Rd 2025 Total AM
, , ,	۶	-	+	×	1	∢	
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.06	0.82	0.75	0.75	0.09	0.09	
v/c Ratio	0.23	0.23	1.07	0.77	0.47	0.08	
Control Delay	91.2	1.8	57.0	10.0	61.7	25.9	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	91.2	1.8	57.0	10.0	61.7	25.9	
LOS	F	А	E	В	E	С	
Approach Delay		3.8	44.6		59.0		
Approach LOS		А	D		E		
Queue Length 50th (m)	3.5	0.4	~326.3	50.3	13.6	0.0	
Queue Length 95th (m)	m8.0	0.8	#371.8	117.5	21.3	4.7	
Internal Link Dist (m)		125.3	136.9		101.0		
Turn Bay Length (m)	75.0					30.0	
Base Capacity (vph)	93	3935	2513	1251	722	342	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.23	0.23	1.07	0.77	0.19	0.03	
Intersection Summary							
Area Type:	Other						
Cycle Length: 130							
Actuated Cycle Length: 130							
Offset: 12 (9%), Referenced	I to phase 2	:EBT ar	nd 6:WBT,	Start of	Green		
Natural Cycle: 150							
Control Type: Actuated-Coc	rdinated						
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.07							
Intersection Signal Delay: 3	6.9			In	tersection	n LOS: D	
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	tion 90.6%			IC	CU Level o	of Service E	
Analysis Period (min) 15							
 Volume exceeds capaci 	ty, queue is	theoret	ically infin	ite.			
Queue shown is maximu	m after two	cycles.					
# 95th percentile volume e	exceeds cap	bacity, q	ueue may	be longe	er.		
Queue shown is maximu	m after two	cycles.					
m Volume for 95th percen	tile queue i	s metere	ed by upst	ream sig	nal.		
Splits and Phases: 1: Ma	rch Rd & He	erzberg	Rd				

→ Ø2 (R) 95 s Ø5 → Ø6 (R) 12 s ■ 83 s

12-16-2019 BTE

Lanes, Volumes, Ti	imings										2025 T	otal AN
	٦	+	*	4	Ļ	•	•	Ť	*	1	ţ	4
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Lane Configurations	ኘ	^	1	٦	^	7	ኘ	↑	1	ኘ	↑	1
Traffic Volume (vph)	37	844	223	61	2017	236	342	186	43	38	34	1
Future Volume (vph)	37	844	223	61	2017	236	342	186	43	38	34	1
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	180
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.
Grade (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Storage Length (m)	75.0		75.0	75.0		75.0	0.0		0.0	40.0		40.
Storage Lanes	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		
Taper Length (m)	50.0			50.0			7.5			40.0		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.0
Ped Bike Factor												
Frt			0.850			0.850			0.850			0.85
Flt Protected	0.950			0.950			0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1676	3353	1500	1676	3353	1500	1676	1765	1500	1676	1765	150
Flt Permitted	0.950			0.950			0.489			0.631		
Satd, Flow (perm)	1676	3353	1500	1676	3353	1500	863	1765	1500	1114	1765	150
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Ye
Satd, Flow (RTOR)			242			144			133			13
ink Speed (k/h)		80			80			50			50	-
ink Distance (m)		220.0			806.6			79.5			112.5	
Travel Time (s)		9.9			36.3			5.7			8.1	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)												
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)												
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	0.9
Srowth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1000
Heavy Vehicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	20
Rus Blockages (#/hr)	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,
Parking (#/br)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Adi Elow (vph)	40	017	242	66	2102	257	372	202	47	/1	37	1
Sharad Lana Traffia (%)	40	317	242	00	2132	237	572	202	47	41	57	
snared Lane Trailic (%)	40	017	040	00	0100	057	070	000	47	41	07	4
Larie Group Flow (vpri)	40	917	242	Dret	2192	257	3/2	202	47	41	37	Dem
Turn Type	PIOL	INA 0	Perm	PIOL	INA	Perm	pm+pt	INA 0	Perm	pm+pt	INA 4	Pen
Protected Phases	5	2	0	1	0	0	3	0	0		4	
Permitted Phases	-	0	2		0	6	8	0	8	4		
Detector Phase	5	2	2	1	6	6	3	8	8	/	4	
Switch Phase	= 0								10.0			10
Vinimum Initial (s)	5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.
Minimum Split (s)	12.0	27.0	27.0	12.0	27.0	27.0	12.0	35.0	35.0	12.0	35.0	35.
otal Split (s)	12.0	61.0	61.0	12.0	61.0	61.0	22.0	35.0	35.0	22.0	35.0	35.
otal Split (%)	9.2%	46.9%	46.9%	9.2%	46.9%	46.9%	16.9%	26.9%	26.9%	16.9%	26.9%	26.9%
rellow Time (s)	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.
All-Hed Lime (s)	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	2.8	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.
ost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.
otal Lost Time (s)	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.1	6.6	6.6	6.1	6.6	6.
_ead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	La
ead-Lag Optimize?												
Recall Mode	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	None	None	None	None	Non
Act Effct Green (s)	8.7	66.5	66.5	11.4	71.6	71.6	33.2	21.0	21.0	20.7	14.2	14.

19-032 1243 Teror Lanes, Volumes, Ti	n Road mings							2	2: Tero	n Rd 8	2025 T	ch Ro otal AN
	۶	-	\mathbf{F}	4	+	•	•	Ť	*	1	ţ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.07	0.51	0.51	0.09	0.55	0.55	0.26	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.11	0.1
v/c Ratio	0.36	0.54	0.27	0.45	1.19	0.29	1.17	0.71	0.13	0.19	0.19	0.0
Control Delay	66.1	24.8	3.5	65.8	105.1	3.9	143.6	65.2	0.8	35.3	52.7	0.
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.
Total Delay	66.1	24.8	3.5	65.8	105.1	3.9	143.6	65.2	0.8	35.3	52.7	0.
LOS	E	С	А	E	F	А	F	E	А	D	D	
Approach Delay		21.9			93.7			107.3			38.2	
Approach LOS		C			F			F			D	
Queue Length 50th (m)	7.9	66.4	0.0	12.2	~291.1	8.3	~81.5	39.4	0.0	6.2	7.0	0.
Queue Length 95th (m)	17.0	94.4	12.0	m11.5r	n#297.3	m11.0	#83.0	56.7	0.0	12.0	14.4	0.
Internal Link Dist (m)		196.0			782.6			55.5			88.5	
Turn Bay Length (m)	75.0	100.0	75.0	75.0	702.0	75.0		00.0		40.0	00.0	40
Base Canacity (ynh)	112	1714	885	146	1845	890	319	385	431	312	385	43
Starvation Can Reductn	0	0	000	0	0	0.00	010	000		012	000	40
Spillback Can Beductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Can Beductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.36	0.54	0.27	0.45	1.19	0.29	1.17	0.52	0.11	0.13	0.10	0.0
Intersection Summary												
Area Type: (Other											
Cycle Length: 130												
Actuated Cycle Length: 130												
Offset: 77 (59%), Reference	d to phase	2:EBT a	nd 6:WB	T. Start o	f Green							
Natural Cycle: 150												
Control Type: Actuated-Coo	rdinated											
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.19												
Intersection Signal Delay: 75	5.0			li	ntersectio	n LOS: E						
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	tion 103.09	%		10	CU Level	of Service	e G					
Analysis Period (min) 15												
 Volume exceeds capacit 	v. aueue i	s theoretic	callv infir	nite.								
Queue shown is maximu	m after two	o cycles.										
# 95th percentile volume e	vceeds ca	inacity di	ielle may	/ he long	er							
Queue shown is maximu	m after two	cvcles.		,								
m Volume for 95th percent	tile queue	is metere	d by ups	tream sig	inal.							
) -p-									
Splits and Phases: 2: Ter	on Rd & M	arch Rd										
01 A 202 (P)						1	13	-	04			
12 s 61 s						22 s		33	5 s			
A						1						
						- I \~			<tb< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td></tb<>			

12-16-2019

BTE

Synchro 9 Report Page 4

19-032 1243 Teron Road Lanes, Volumes, Timings

3: March Rd & Station Rd/Carling Ave 2025 Total AM

	٦	-	\rightarrow	-	+	•	1	†	1	1	Ŧ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		ų	*		ę	1	۲	^	1	ኻኻ	† †	1
Traffic Volume (vph)	66	27	.9	39	13	182	91	2033	87	331	992	129
Future Volume (vph)	66	27	9	39	13	182	91	2033	87	331	992	129
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Grade (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Storage Length (m)	0.0		25.0	0.0		0.0	75.0		75.0	175.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	0		1	0		1	1		1	2		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			50.0			75.0		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	0.97	0.95	1.00
Ped Bike Factor		1.00	0.98		0.99	0.99	1.00		0.94	1.00		0.97
Frt			0.850			0.850			0.850			0.850
Fit Protected		0.966			0.964		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	1705	1500	0	1701	1500	1676	3353	1500	3252	3353	1500
Flt Permitted		0.753			0.636		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	1323	1463	0	1113	1481	1671	3353	1415	3241	3353	1449
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)			103			198			80			80
Link Speed (k/h)		50			60			80			80	
Link Distance (m)		131.4			60.0			183.7			281.3	
Travel Time (s)		9.5			3.6			8.3			12.7	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)	3		6	6		3	4		21	21		4
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)												
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
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Heavy Vehicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parking (#/hr)												
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Adj. Flow (vph)	72	29	10	42	14	198	99	2210	95	360	1078	140
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	101	10	0	56	198	99	2210	95	360	1078	140
Turn Type	Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Free	Prot	NA	Perm	Prot	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8		5	2		1	6	
Permitted Phases	4		4	8		Free			2			6
Detector Phase	4	4	4	8	8		5	2	2	1	6	6
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0		5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	20.0	20.0
Minimum Split (s)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0		13.0	28.0	28.0	13.0	28.0	28.0
Total Split (s)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0		22.0	76.0	76.0	19.0	73.0	73.0
Total Split (%)	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%		16.9%	58.5%	58.5%	14.6%	56.2%	56.2%
Yellow Time (s)	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3		4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
All-Red Time (s)	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8		2.8	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.3
Lost Time Adjust (s)		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)		5.1	5.1		5.1		7.4	7.9	7.9	7.4	7.9	7.9
Lead/Lag							Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?												
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None		None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max
Act Effct Green (s)		15.5	15.5		15.5	130.0	13.0	69.6	69.6	24.5	81.1	81.1
12-16-2019 BTE											Synchro	9 Report Page 5

	ا ال	\mathbf{i}	4	-	•	•	t	*	1	Ļ	1
l ane Group	FRI FRT	FRR	WRI	WRT	WRR	NBI	NBT	NBB	SBI	SBT	SBB
Actuated a/C Batio	0.12	0.12	TIDL	0.12	1.00	0.10	0.54	0.54	0.19	0.62	0.62
v/c Batio	0.12	0.12		0.12	0.13	0.10	1.23	0.12	0.13	0.52	0.02
Control Delay	72.0	0.04		61.4	0.10	69.8	138.6	4.7	53.5	15.9	6.1
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	72.0	0.2		61.4	0.2	69.8	138.6	4.7	53.5	15.9	6.1
	F	A.0		F	A.0	F		Δ	D	B	0.1 A
Approach Delay	65.5			13.7		_	130.5		5	23.6	~
Approach LOS	F			.с. <i>л</i> В			.00.0			C	
Queue Length 50th (m)	19.8	0.0		10.7	0.0	19.5	~287.1	1.4	34.9	59.5	4.5
Queue Length 95th (m)	33.0	0.0		20.6	0.0	32.7	#326.5	8.0	49.4	91.8	13.8
Internal Link Dist (m)	107.4			36.0			159.7			257.3	
Turn Bay Length (m)		25.0				75.0		75.0	175.0		25.0
Base Capacity (vph)	304	415		255	1481	198	1794	794	612	2091	934
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.33	0.02		0.22	0.13	0.50	1.23	0.12	0.59	0.52	0.15
Intersection Summary											
Area Type: C	other										
Cycle Length: 130											
Actuated Cycle Length: 130											
Offset: 22 (17%), Referenced	to phase 2:NBT a	nd 6:SBT	, Start of	Green							
Natural Cycle: 150											
Control Type: Actuated-Coor	dinated										
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.23											
Intersection Signal Delay: 83	.2		In	tersectior	LOS: F						
Intersection Capacity Utilizati	on 98.8%		IC	U Level o	of Service	F					
Analysis Period (min) 15											
 Volume exceeds capacity 	, queue is theoretic	ally infini	te.								
Queue shown is maximun	n after two cycles.										
# 95th percentile volume ex	ceeds capacity, qu	eue may	be longe	r.							
Queue shown is maximun	n after two cycles.										
Splits and Phases: 2: Mar	b Dd [®] Station Dd	Corling A									
	IT NU & SIALIUIT NU	Carning P	we								
Ø1 Ø2	(R)							€ 04			
19 s 76 s							3	5s			
·								<u> </u>			
▲ _{@5}	(76 (P)							608			

12-16-2019

Synchro 9 Report Page 6

BTE

19-032 1243 Tero	n Road						4: Teron Rd & Carling Ave
Lanes, Volumes, T	imings						2025 Total AM
	-	¥	4	+	•	1	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations	↑	1		با	۰Y		
Traffic Volume (vph)	494	16	44	567	221	150	
Future Volume (vph)	494	16	44	567	221	150	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Grade (%)	0%			0%	0%		
Storage Length (m)		20.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
Storage Lanes		1	0		1	0	
Taper Length (m)			7.5		7.5		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Ped Bike Factor							
Frt		0.850			0.945		
Flt Protected				0.996	0.971		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1765	1500	0	1758	1619	0	
Flt Permitted				0.996	0.971		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1765	1500	0	1758	1619	0	
Link Speed (k/h)	60			60	50		
Link Distance (m)	194.0			213.2	38.0		
Travel Time (s)	11.6			12.8	2.7		
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)		3	3				
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)							
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy Vehicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Parking (#/hr)							
Mid-Block Traffic (%)	0%			0%	0%		
Adj. Flow (vph)	537	17	48	616	240	163	
Shared Lane Traffic (%)							
Lane Group Flow (vph)	537	17	0	664	403	0	
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop		
Intersection Summary							
Area Type:	Other						
Control Type: Unsignalized							
Intersection Capacity Utilization	ation 94.1%			IC	CU Level	of Service	F
Analysis Period (min) 15							

HCM Unsignalized	Interse	ction C	apacit	y Anal	ysis		4. TEFOIT RU & Calling Ave 2025 Total AM
	-	\mathbf{i}	∢	←	1	1	
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations	↑	1		۴,	۰Y		
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	494	16	44	567	221	150	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	494	16	44	567	221	150	
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop		
Grade	0%			0%	0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	537	17	48	616	240	163	
Pedestrians					3		
Lane Width (m)					3.6		
Walking Speed (m/s)					1.2		
Percent Blockage					0		
Right turn flare (veh)							
Median type	None			None			
Median storage veh)							
Upstream signal (m)				213			
pX, platoon unblocked					0.80		
vC, conflicting volume			557		1252	540	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol			557		1188	540	
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2	
tC, 2 stage (s)							
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3	
p0 queue free %			95		0	70	
cM capacity (veh/h)			1011		157	540	
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	537	17	664	403			
Volume Left	0	0	48	240			
Volume Right	0	17	0	163			
cSH	1700	1700	1011	220			
Volume to Capacity	0.32	0.01	0.05	1.83			
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.0	0.0	0.9	169.2			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.0	1.2	427.8			
Lane LOS			А	F			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0		1.2	427.8			
Approach LOS				F			
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			106.9				
Intersection Capacity Utilization	ation		94.1%	IC	U Level o	of Service	F
Analysis Period (min)			15				

12-16-2019 BTE

Synchro 9 Report Page 7

12-16-2019 BTE

	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	•	Ť	1	- \	Ļ	4
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Lane Configurations	5	1.		5	*	1		<u>.</u>		5	Ť.	
Traffic Volume (voh)	38	419	31	15	382	603	72	623	6	261	142	36
Future Volume (vph)	38	419	31	15	382	603	72	623	6	261	142	36
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Grade (%)	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0.0
Storage Length (m)	0.0	070	75.0	100.0	070	100.0	0.0	070	0.0	0.0	070	0.0
Storage Lanes	1		1	1 1		1 1	0.0		0.0	1		(
Taper Length (m)	75			75.0			75		0	75		
Lane Litil Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1 00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ped Bike Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ert		0 000				0.850		0 000			0 970	
Elt Protoctod	0.950	0.330		0.950		0.000		0.333		0.950	0.370	
Satd Flow (prot)	1676	1744	0	1676	1765	1500	٥	1754	0	1676	1704	(
Elt Permitted	0.288	1744	0	0 108	1705	1300	0	0.940	0	0.258	1704	,
Satd Flow (perm)	508	1744	0	3/0	1765	1/50	0	1657	0	455	1704	(
Bight Turn on Red	500	1744	Voc	343	1705	Voc	0	1037	Voc	400	1704	Voi
Sate Flow (RTOR)		3	163			256			163		16	10.
Link Spood (k/b)		60			60	200		50			50	
Link Dietenee (m)		212.2			202.2			126.1			120.2	
Travel Time (a)		10.0			16.0			0.1			120.3	
Confl Rode (#/hr)	0	12.0	1	4	10.9	2	1	9.1			0.7	
Confl. Peus. (#/hr)	2			1		2						
Book Hour Easter	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01
Crewth Factor	100%	100%	1000/	100%	1000/	100%	1000/	100%	1000/	100%	100%	1000
Growin Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Pue Pleekagee (#/br)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Bus blockages (#/III)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	,
Mid Plock Troffic (%)		09/			0%			0%			09/	
Adi Elow (uph)	41	455	24	16	415	CEE	70	677	7	204	154	20
Auj. Flow (vpii)	41	400	34	10	415	000	70	0//	1	204	104	33
Shared Lane Trailic (%)	44	400	0	10	415	CEE	0	700	0	004	100	
Larie Group Flow (vpri)	41 Borm	409	0	Borm	415	Borm	Borm	/02	0	204	193	,
Turri Type	Perm	INA 0		Perm	INA	Perm	Perm	INA		pm+pt	INA	
Protected Phases	0	2		0	0	0	0	0		/	4	
Permitted Phases	2	2		6	6	6	0	0		4	4	
Switch Bhase	2	2		0	0	0	0	0		1	4	
Switch Phase	00.0	00.0		00.0	00.0	20.0	10.0	10.0		FO	10.0	
Minimum Initial (s)	20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	10.0		5.0	10.0	
Minimum Split (s)	27.0	27.0		27.0	27.0	27.0	25.0	25.0		12.0	25.0	
Total Split (S)	50.0	50.0		50.0	50.0	50.0	67.0	67.0		13.0	80.0	
Total Split (%)	38.5%	38.5%		38.5%	38.5%	38.5%	51.5%	51.5%		10.0%	61.5%	
All Ded Time (s)	3.3	3.3		3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3		3.3	3.3	
All-Red Time (s)	3.3	3.3		3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3		2.8	3.3	
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	
Total Lost Time (s)	6.6	6.6		6.6	6.6	6.6		6.6		6.1	6.6	
Lead/Lag							Lag	Lag		Lead		
Lead-Lag Optimize?												
Recall Mode	Max	Max		Max	Max	Max	None	None		None	None	

	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	1	+	•	1	1	1	1	Ŧ	1
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.33	0.33		0.33	0.33	0.33		0.46		0.57	0.56	
v/c Ratio	0.24	0.84		0.14	0.70	1.00		0.99		0.88	0.20	
Control Delay	36.3	53.9		34.2	45.4	61.0		65.2		47.8	13.3	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	36.3	53.9		34.2	45.4	61.0		65.2		47.8	13.3	
LOS	D	D		С	D	E		E		D	В	
Approach Delay		52.6			54.7			65.2			33.8	
Approach LOS		D			D			E			С	
Queue Length 50th (m)	6.0	90.7		2.3	72.9	92.7		149.5		28.6	16.7	
Queue Length 95th (m)	13.9	#134.2		7.1	102.4	#157.3		#216.8		#58.0	26.7	
Internal Link Dist (m)		189.2			258.2			102.1			96.3	
Turn Bay Length (m)				100.0		100.0						
Base Capacity (vph)	169	584		116	589	657		769		323	969	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.24	0.84		0.14	0.70	1.00		0.99		0.88	0.20	
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 130												
Actuated Cycle Length: 130												
Natural Cycle: 100												
Control Type: Semi Act-Unc	oord											
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.00												
Intersection Signal Delay: 53	3.6			In	itersectio	on LOS: D						
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	tion 112.0	%		IC	CU Level	of Service	н					
Analysis Period (min) 15												

Splits and Phases: 5: Herzberg Rd & Carling Ave

ø₂	Ø4
50 s	80 s
	Ø7 Ø8
50 s	13 s 67 s

12-16-2019 BTE

19-032 1243 Tero Lanes, Volumes, T	n Road ïmings						6: Teron Rd & Project Site 2025 Total AM
	4	*	1	۲	1	ŧ	
Lane Group	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Y		₽.			۹, t	
Traffic Volume (vph)	10	2	369	24	5	55	
Future Volume (vph)	10	2	369	24	5	55	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Grade (%)	0%		0%			0%	
Storage Length (m)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		
Storage Lanes	1	0		0	0		
Taper Length (m)	7.5				7.5		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Ped Bike Factor							
Frt	0.979		0.992				
Flt Protected	0.959					0.996	
Satd, Flow (prot)	1657	0	1751	0	0	1758	
Flt Permitted	0.959					0.996	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1657	0	1751	0	0	1758	
Link Speed (k/h)	50		50			50	
Link Distance (m)	78.8		108.3			300.6	
Travel Time (s)	5.7		7.8			21.6	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)							
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)							
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy Vehicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Parking (#/hr)							
Mid-Block Traffic (%)	0%		0%			0%	
Adi, Flow (vph)	11	2	401	26	5	60	
Shared Lane Traffic (%)		-		20	0	00	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	13	0	427	0	0	65	
Sign Control	Ston		Free	0	Ū	Free	
Intersection Summary							
Area Type:	Other						
Control Type: Unsignalized							
Intersection Canacity Litilize	ation 32.0%			10		of Service	Δ
Analysis Period (min) 15	2001 02.0 /0	,		ic.	JO LEVEI		

19-032 1243 Tero HCM Unsignalized	n Road Unterse	ction (anacit	v Anal	vsis		6: Teron Rd & Project Site
	A 100 - 100	A	†	<u>y / (nai</u>	yolo 🖌	ţ	
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Y		¢Î			ŧ	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	10	2	369	24	5	55	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	10	2	369	24	5	55	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Grade	0%		0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	11	2	401	26	5	60	
Pedestrians							
Lane Width (m)							
Walking Speed (m/s)							
Percent Blockage							
Right turn flare (veh)							
Median type			None			None	
Median storage veh)							
Upstream signal (m)							
pX, platoon unblocked							
vC, conflicting volume	484	414			427		
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	484	414			427		
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1		
tC, 2 stage (s)							
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2		
p0 queue free %	98	100			100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	539	638			1132		
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1				
Volume Total	13	427	65				
Volume Left	11	0	5				
Volume Right	2	26	0				
cSH	553	1700	1132				
Volume to Capacity	0.02	0.25	0.00				
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.4	0.0	0.1				
Control Delay (s)	11.7	0.0	0.7				
Lane LOS	В		Α				
Approach Delay (s)	11.7	0.0	0.7				
Approach LOS	В						
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			0.4				
Intersection Capacity Utilization	ation		32.0%	IC	U Level	of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)			15				

12-16-2019 BTE

Synchro 9 Report Page 12

12-16-2019 BTE

Synchro 9 Report

Page 11

19-032 1243 Teror Lanes, Volumes, Ti	n Road mings						1: March Rd & Herzberg Rd 2025 Total PM
	≯	+	Ļ	•	1	~	
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	٦	***	* *	1	ሻሻ	1	
Traffic Volume (vph)	6	2016	1233	224	816	17	
Future Volume (vph)	6	2016	1233	224	816	17	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	
ane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Grade (%)	0.0	0%	0%	0.0	0%	0.0	
Storage Length (m)	75.0	0 /8	0 /8	0.0	0,0	30.0	
Storage Lanes	10.0			0.0	0.0	1	
Storage Laries	40.0				7 5		
aper Length (m)	40.0	0.01	0.05	1 00	7.5	1.00	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.91	0.95	1.00	0.97	1.00	
-eu bike raciór				0.050		0.050	
-n	0.057			0.850	0.05-	0.850	
-it Protected	0.950				0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1693	4865	3386	1515	3285	1515	
Flt Permitted	0.950				0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1693	4865	3386	1515	3285	1515	
Right Turn on Red				Yes		Yes	
Satd. Flow (RTOR)				200		10	
_ink Speed (k/h)		80	80		50		
_ink Distance (m)		149.3	160.9		125.0		
Fravel Time (s)		6.7	7.2		9.0		
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)							
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)							
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy Vehicles (%)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	
Rus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	. /0	
Parking (#/br)	Ū	Ū	Ū	Ŭ	Ū	Ŭ	
Mid Plock Troffic (%)		0%	09/		0%		
VIU-DIUCK ITAIIIC (76)	7	0%	10.40	040	0%	10	
	/	2191	1340	243	007	10	
Shared Lane Traffic (%)	-	04.04	4040	0.40	007	40	
ane Group Flow (vph)	7	2191	1340	243	887	18	
ium lype	Prot	NÁ	NA	Perm	Prot	Perm	
Protected Phases	5	2	6		4		
Permitted Phases	_			6		4	
Detector Phase	5	2	6	6	4	4	
Switch Phase							
Vinimum Initial (s)	5.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	
Vinimum Split (s)	12.0	27.0	27.0	27.0	35.0	35.0	
Fotal Split (s)	12.0	80.0	68.0	68.0	50.0	50.0	
Fotal Split (%)	9.2%	61.5%	52.3%	52.3%	38.5%	38.5%	
fellow Time (s)	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	3.3	3.3	
All-Red Time (s)	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	2.8	2.8	
ost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
otal Lost Time (s)	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.1	6.1	
_ead/Lag	Lead		Lag	Lag			
ead-Lag Optimize?	2000			9			
	None	C-Max	C-Max	C-Max	None	None	
SPCALLWOOP	110110	Junar	Jinux	JINIUA	140116	1 tone	

BTE

Synchro 9 Report Page 1

Lanes, Volumes, Ti	mings						2025 Total PM
	۶	-	+	×	1	4	
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.04	0.59	0.58	0.58	0.31	0.31	
v/c Ratio	0.10	0.76	0.69	0.25	0.87	0.04	
Control Delay	84.8	4.9	23.1	4.4	52.5	18.9	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	84.8	4.9	23.1	4.4	52.5	18.9	
LOS	F	А	С	А	D	В	
Approach Delay		5.2	20.3		51.8		
Approach LOS		Α	С		D		
Queue Length 50th (m)	1.3	9.5	93.6	3.6	85.9	1.1	
Queue Length 95th (m)	m1.1	m22.8	145.6	16.2	103.4	5.5	
Internal Link Dist (m)		125.3	136.9		101.0		
Turn Bay Length (m)	75.0					30.0	
Base Capacity (vph)	73	2893	1951	957	1109	518	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.10	0.76	0.69	0.25	0.80	0.03	
Intersection Summary							
Area Type: 0	Other						
Cycle Length: 130							
Actuated Cycle Length: 130							
Offset: 12 (9%), Referenced	to phase	2:EBT an	d 6:WBT,	Start of	Green		
Natural Cycle: 90							
Control Type: Actuated-Coo	rdinated						
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.87							
Intersection Signal Delay: 19	9.3			In	tersectior	1 LOS: B	
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	tion 76.0%	, b		IC	U Level o	of Service	D
Analysis Period (min) 15							
m Volume for 95th percent	tilo quouo	is motoro	م میں بیم ام				

Splits and Phases: 1: March Rd & Herzberg Rd

→ø2 (R))	< ₩ _Ø4
80 s	50 s
≠ Ø5 Ø6 (R)	
12 s 68 s	

12-16-2019 BTE
Lane Group EBI EBI EBR WBL WBT WBR NBI NBT NBR SBL SBT Lane Configurations 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>													
Lane Group EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR NBL NBT NBR SBL SBT Lane Configurations 1 1 1 1033 43 245 60 29 197 202 Future Volume (vph) 19 1848 31 70 1033 43 245 60 29 197 202 ideal Flow (vphp) 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 100 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00		٠	-	\mathbf{r}	-	-	•	1	T.	1	-	Ŧ	-
Lane Configurations 1 ,	Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Traffic Volume (vph) 19 1848 31 70 1093 43 245 60 29 197 202 Future Volume (vph) 180 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 <td>Lane Configurations</td> <td>ሻ</td> <td>- ††</td> <td>1</td> <td>ሻ</td> <td>- ††</td> <td>*</td> <td>ሻ</td> <td>↑</td> <td>7</td> <td>ሻ</td> <td>↑</td> <td>1</td>	Lane Configurations	ሻ	- ††	1	ሻ	- † †	*	ሻ	↑	7	ሻ	↑	1
Fulure (vph) 19 1848 31 70 1033 43 245 60 29 197 202 deal Flow (vphp) 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1300 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 <	Traffic Volume (vph)	19	1848	31	70	1093	43	245	60	29	197	202	38
deal Flow (vphp) 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1800 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 <th1000< th=""> 1000 1000</th1000<>	Future Volume (vph)	19	1848	31	70	1093	43	245	60	29	197	202	3
ane Width (m) 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 <	deal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	180
Grade (%) 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Storage Length (m) 75.0 75.0 75.0 75.0 75.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <td>ane Width (m)</td> <td>3.6</td> <td>3.</td>	ane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.
Shorage Length (m) 75.0 75.0 75.0 75.0 75.0 75.0 75.0 0.0 40.0 Storage Lanes 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Grade (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Shorage Lanes 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <	Storage Length (m)	75.0		75.0	75.0		75.0	0.0		0.0	40.0		40.
Taper Length (m) 50.0 7.5 40.0 Lane Util. Factor 1.00 0.95 1.00 0.95 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	Storage Lanes	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		
ane Ulii. Factor 1.00 0.95 1.00 1.00 0.95 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 <th1.00< th=""> 1.00 1.00</th1.00<>	Taper Length (m)	50.0			50.0			7.5			40.0		
Pach Bike Factor 0.850 0.850 0.850 0.850 Pit Protected 0.950 0.950 0.950 0.833 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 1782 1515 1693 1782 1782 1515 1693 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782	ane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.0
rh0.8500.8500.8500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.9500.	ed Bike Factor												
11 Protected 0.950 0.950 0.950 Sald. Flow (prot) 1693 3386 1515 1693 3386 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 Sald. Flow (perm) 1693 3386 1515 1693 3386 1515 1693 1782 1515 1039 1782 Sald. Flow (perm) 1693 3386 1515 1693 3386 1515 861 1782 1515 1039 1782 Sald. Flow (perm) 1693 3386 1515 861 1782 1515 1039 1782 Sald. Flow (Perm) 1693 3386 806.6 79.5 50 50 50 Sink Speed (k/h) 80 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 10	Frt			0.850			0.850			0.850			0.85
Satd. Flow (prort) 1683 3386 1515 1693 3386 1515 1693 1782 1515 1693 1782 it Permitted 0.950 0.950 0.483 0.583 0.583 0.583 Stadt. Flow (perm) 1693 3386 1515 1693 3386 1515 1782 1515 1039 1782 Stadt. Flow (perm) 1693 3386 1515 1693 3386 1515 1782 1515 1039 1782 Stadt. Flow (perm) 1693 3386 1515 1693 3386 1515 1125 50 1135 1135 1135 1133 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 50 50 50 1125 50 1125 50 1125 50 1125 50 1125 50 1125 50 1125 50 1125 50 1125 50 1125 50 1125 50 50 50 50 <td< td=""><td>Fit Protected</td><td>0.950</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.950</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.950</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.950</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Fit Protected	0.950			0.950			0.950			0.950		
TH Permitted 0.950 0.483 0.483 0.583 Satd. Flow (perm) 169 3386 1515 1693 3386 1515 1613 1611 1782 1515 1039 1782 Satd. Flow (RTOR) 135 135 135 135 133 133 133 Link Speed (k/h) 80 80 50 50 50 Link Distance (m) 220.0 806.6 79.5 121.5 Confl. Peds. (#/hr) 220.0 36.3 5.7 8.1 Confl. Peds. (#/hr) 220.0 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.9	Satd. Flow (prot)	1693	3386	1515	1693	3386	1515	1693	1782	1515	1693	1782	151
Satd. Flow (perm) 1693 3386 1515 1693 3386 1515 1693 3386 1515 1693 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 1782 178 178 178	It Permitted	0.950			0.950			0.483			0.583		
Hight Turn on Red Yes Yes 135 135 135 Satd. Flow (RTOR) 135 135 135 50 ink Speed (kh) 80 806 79.5 112.5 fink Speed (kh) 9.9 36.3 5.7 8.1 Confl. Reds. (#hr) 50 9.9 36.3 5.7 8.1 Sonfl. Reds. (#hr) 50 9.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92	Satd. Flow (perm)	1693	3386	1515	1693	3386	1515	861	1782	1515	1039	1782	151
Satd. Flow (RTOR) 135 135 133 ink Deped (k/h) 80 80 50 50 ink Distance (m) 220.0 806.6 79.5 112.5 fink Distance (m) 220.0 806.6 79.5 81 Confl. Peds. (#/hr) 9.9 36.3 5.7 8.1 Somth 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 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 <t< td=""><td>Right Turn on Red</td><td></td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td></td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td></td><td></td><td>Yes</td><td></td><td></td><td>Ye</td></t<>	Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Ye
Jink Speed (k/h) 80 80 50 50 Link Distance (m) 220.0 806.6 79.5 112.5 Travel Time (s) 9.9 36.3 5.7 8.1 Confl. Peds. (#/hr) 50 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92	Satd. Flow (RTOR)			135			135			133			13
Ink Distance (m) 220.0 806.6 79.5 112.5 Fravel Time (s) 9.9 36.3 5.7 8.1 Jonfl. Peds, (#/hr) - - - 8.1 Sonfl. Peds, (#/hr) - - - - 8.1 Sonth Factor 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	ink Speed (k/h)		80			80			50			50	
Travel Time (s)9.936.35.78.1Confl. Bikes (#/hr)Donfl. Bikes (#/hr)Peak Hour Factor10920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.920.	ink Distance (m)		220.0			806.6			79.5			112.5	
Donfl. Peds. (#/hr) 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 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92	Fravel Time (s)		9.9			36.3			5.7			8.1	
Chardie Bikes (#/hr) 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 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0	Confl. Peds. (#/hr)												
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 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.93 0.94 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90 0.90	Confl. Bikes (#/hr)												
Growth Factor 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	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	0.9
Image of the set of t	Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Bus Blockages (#hr) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	leavy Vehicles (%)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	19
Parking (#/hr) O%	Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Parking (#/hr)												
Val. Protected Phase 2 2009 34 76 1188 47 266 65 32 214 220 Shared Lane Traffic (%) ane Group Flow (vph) 21 2009 34 76 1188 47 266 65 32 214 220 Shared Lane Traffic (%) ane Group Flow (vph) 21 2009 34 76 1188 47 266 65 32 214 220 Furn Type Prot NA Perm Prot NA Perm pm+pt NA Perm pm+pt NA Permitted Phases 5 2 1 6 6 3 8 7 4 Switch Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8.8 7 4 Switch Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 5.0 10.0 10.0 5.0 10.0 10.0 5.0	Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Shared Lane Traffic (%) .ane Group Flow (vph) 21 2009 34 76 1188 47 266 65 32 214 220 Lum Type Prot NA Perm Prot NA Perm pm+pt NA Perm pm+pt NA Protected Phases 5 2 1 6 3 8 7 4 Permited Phases 2 6 8 8 8 4 Detector Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 8 8 7 4 Switch Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8 7 4 Minimum Split (s) 12.0 27.0 27.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0	Adj. Flow (vph)	21	2009	34	76	1188	47	266	65	32	214	220	4
Lane Group Flow (vph) 21 2009 34 76 1188 47 266 65 32 214 220 furn Type Prot NA Perm Prot NA Perm pm+pt NA Perm pm+pt NA Perm pm+pt NA Protected Phases 5 2 1 6 6 8 8 4 Permitted Phases 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8 7 4 Vortected Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8 8 7 4 Vortected Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8 8 7 4 Vortected Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8.8 7 4 Vortected Phase 5 2 2 1 27.0 27.0 10.0 10	Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Yurn Type Prot NA Perm Prot NA Perm pm+pt Para Para Witch Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0	ane Group Flow (vph)	21	2009	34	76	1188	47	266	65	32	214	220	4
Protected Phases 5 2 1 6 3 8 7 4 Permitted Phases 2 6 8 8 4 Detector Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8 8 7 4 Switch Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8 8 7 4 Switch Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8 8 7 4 Minimum Split (s) 12.0 27.0 27.0 27.0 12.0 35.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 fotal Split (s) 12.0 68.0 12.0 68.0 68.0 10.80 10.8 26.9% 10.8 26.9% fotal Split (%) 9.2% 53.1% 9.2% 53.1% 53.1% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8 2.8 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 <td>Furn Type</td> <td>Prot</td> <td>NA</td> <td>Perm</td> <td>Prot</td> <td>NA</td> <td>Perm</td> <td>pm+pt</td> <td>NA</td> <td>Perm</td> <td>pm+pt</td> <td>NA</td> <td>Perr</td>	Furn Type	Prot	NA	Perm	Prot	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perr
Permitted Phases 2 6 8 8 4 Detector Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8 8 7 4 Winch Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8 8 7 4 Minimum Initial (s) 5.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 5.0 10.0 10.0 5.0 10.0 Jinimum Split (s) 12.0 27.0 12.0 27.0 27.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0	Protected Phases	5	2		1	6		3	8		7	4	
Detector Phase 5 2 2 1 6 6 3 8 8 7 4 Switch Phase	Permitted Phases	_	-	2		-	6	8	-	8	4		
Switch Phase Solution	Detector Phase	5	2	2	1	6	6	3	8	8	7	4	
Inimum Initial (s) 5.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 10.0 10.0 5.0 10.0 Jinimum Split (s) 12.0 27.0 27.0 27.0 27.0 27.0 12.0 35.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 Total Split (s) 12.0 80.0 12.0 80.0 12.0 83.0 12.0 35.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 Total Split (%) 9.2% 53.1% 9.2% 53.1% 53.1% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% Vil-Red Time (s) 4.6 4.6 4.6 4.6 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 <td>Switch Phase</td> <td></td>	Switch Phase												
Inimum Split (s) 12.0 27.0 27.0 12.0 27.0 12.0 27.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 35.0 12.0 27.0 12.0 83.0 12.0 35.0 13.0 14.0 35.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 14.0 35.0	Ainimum Initial (s)	5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.
otal Split (s) 12.0 69.0 69.0 69.0 69.0 69.0 35.0 35.0 14.0 35.0 Total Split (s) 9.2% 53.1% 9.2% 53.1% 10.8% 26.9% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3	Ainimum Split (s)	12.0	27.0	27.0	12.0	27.0	27.0	12.0	35.0	35.0	12.0	35.0	35.
otal Split (%) 9.2% 53.1% 53.1% 53.1% 53.1% 53.1% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8% 26.9% 10.8%	otal Split (s)	12.0	69.0	69.0	12.0	69.0	69.0	14.0	35.0	35.0	14.0	35.0	35.
Velow Imme (s) 4.b 4.b 4.b 4.b 4.b 4.b 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3	otal Split (%)	9.2%	53.1%	53.1%	9.2%	53.1%	53.1%	10.8%	26.9%	26.9%	10.8%	26.9%	26.9%
Wi-Hed Time (s) 1.8 1.7 1.7 1.8 1.7 1.7 2.8 3.3 3.3 2.8 3.3 Lost Time Adjust (s) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	(ellow Time (s)	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.
Lost lime Adjust (s) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	All-Red Time (s)	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	2.8	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.
otal Lost lime (s) 6.4 6.3 6.3 6.4 6.3 6.3 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1 6.6 6.1	ost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.
ead/Lag Lead Lag Lag Lead Lag Lag Lead Lag Lead Lag Lead Lag	otal Lost Time (s)	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.1	6.6	6.6	6.1	6.6	6.
ead-Lag ()ptimize?	ead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	La
	ead-Lag Optimize?												
tecali Mode None C-Max C-Max None C-Max C-Max None None None None None	Recall Mode	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	None	None	None	None	Non

	٦	→	\mathbf{i}	4	+	*	1	1	1	1	ţ	4
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.05	0.50	0.50	0.08	0.57	0.57	0.21	0.16	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.16
v/c Ratio	0.25	1.19	0.04	0.55	0.62	0.05	1.17	0.23	0.09	0.69	0.75	0.1
Control Delay	67.0	124.2	0.1	62.6	25.2	1.3	153.3	47.3	0.5	54.1	67.1	0.
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.
Total Delay	67.0	124.2	0.1	62.6	25.2	1.3	153.3	47.3	0.5	54.1	67.1	0.
LOS	E	F	А	E	С	А	F	D	А	D	E	
Approach Delay		121.6			26.5			120.9			55.5	
Approach LOS		F			С			F			E	
Queue Length 50th (m)	4.2	~263.6	0.0	12.1	134.6	0.0	~50.5	11.5	0.0	35.9	42.9	0.0
Queue Length 95th (m)	11.2	#296.4	0.0	m#30.8	152.2	m0.4	#81.6	20.9	0.0	50.7	60.5	0.0
Internal Link Dist (m)		196.0			782.6			55.5			88.5	
Turn Bay Length (m)	75.0		75.0	75.0		75.0				40.0		40.0
Base Capacity (vph)	84	1683	821	138	1920	917	228	389	434	308	389	434
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.25	1.19	0.04	0.55	0.62	0.05	1.17	0.17	0.07	0.69	0.57	0.09
Intersection Summary												
Area Type: 0	Other											
Cycle Length: 130												
Actuated Cycle Length: 130												
Offset: 83 (64%), Reference	d to phas	e 2:EBT ai	nd 6:WE	T, Start of	Green							
Natural Cycle: 150												
Control Type: Actuated-Coo	rdinated											
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.19												
Intersection Signal Delay: 84	4.5			In	itersection	n LOS: F						
Intersection Capacity Utilization	tion 102.8	1%		IC	U Level	of Service	e G					
Analysis Period (min) 15												
 Volume exceeds capacit 	ty, queue	is theoretic	cally infi	nite.								
Queue shown is maximu	m after tw	o cycles.										
# 95th percentile volume e	exceeds c	apacity, qu	ieue ma	y be longe	er.							
Queue shown is maximu	m after tw	o cycles.										
m Volume for 95th percent	tile queue	is metered	d by ups	stream sig	nal.							
Splits and Phases: 2: Ter	on Rd & M	larch Rd										
							•		4			
▼ Ø1 ♥ ▼Ø2 (R)				_	_		14 5	3	▼ "Ø4	_		
12.5 09.5							142	5	55			

05 06 (R) 12 s 69 s 14 s 35 s

12-16-2019 BTE

19-032 1243 Teron Road Lanes, Volumes, Timings

3: March Rd & Station Rd/Carling Ave 2025 Total PM

	≯	-	\rightarrow	-	+	•	•	†	1	1	Ŧ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		ų	1		ų	1	۲	^	1	ኻኻ	^	1
Traffic Volume (vph)	27	14	31	126	20	332	35	1429	37	304	1972	52
Future Volume (vph)	27	14	31	126	20	332	35	1429	37	304	1972	52
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Grade (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Storage Length (m)	0.0		25.0	0.0		0.0	75.0		75.0	175.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	0		1	0		1	1		1	2		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			50.0			75.0		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	0.97	0.95	1.00
Ped Bike Factor		1.00	0.98		0.99	0.99	1.00		0.94	0.99		0.97
Frt			0.850			0.850			0.850			0.850
Fit Protected		0.968			0.959		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	0	1725	1515	0	1709	1515	1693	3386	1515	3285	3386	1515
Flt Permitted		0.705			0.724		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	1253	1477	0	1277	1495	1692	3386	1429	3256	3386	1463
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)			165			358			142			80
Link Speed (k/h)		50			60			80			80	
Link Distance (m)		131.4			60.0			183.7			281.3	
Travel Time (s)		9.5			3.6			8.3			12.7	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)	3		6	6		3	4		21	21		4
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)												
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
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Heavy Vehicles (%)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parking (#/hr)												
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Adj. Flow (vph)	29	15	34	137	22	361	38	1553	40	330	2143	57
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	44	34	0	159	361	38	1553	40	330	2143	57
Turn Type	Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Free	Prot	NA	Perm	Prot	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8		5	2		1	6	
Permitted Phases	4		4	8	-	Free			2		-	6
Detector Phase	4	4	4	8	8		5	2	2	1	6	6
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0		5.0	20.0	20.0	5.0	20.0	20.0
Minimum Split (s)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0		13.0	28.0	28.0	13.0	28.0	28.0
Total Split (s)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0		13.0	73.0	73.0	22.0	82.0	82.0
Total Split (%)	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%	26.9%		10.0%	56.2%	56.2%	16.9%	63.1%	63.1%
Yellow Time (s)	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3		4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
All-Red Time (s)	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8		2.8	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.3
Lost Time Adjust (s)		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)		5.1	5.1		5.1		7.4	7.9	7.9	7.4	7.9	7.9
Lead/Lag							Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?								9	9		9	9
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None		None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max
Act Effct Green (s)		21.5	21.5		21.5	130.0	7.3	71.0	71.0	17.2	83.4	83.4
12-16-2019 BTE											Synchro	9 Report Page 5

	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	1	-	•	1	†	1	1	Ļ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.17	0.17		0.17	1.00	0.06	0.55	0.55	0.13	0.64	0.64
v/c Ratio		0.21	0.09		0.76	0.24	0.40	0.84	0.05	0.76	0.99	0.06
Control Delay		46.7	0.5		72.8	0.4	71.7	31.3	0.1	66.4	41.2	1.3
Queue Delay		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay		46.7	0.5		72.8	0.4	71.7	31.3	0.1	66.4	41.2	1.3
LOS		D	А		E	А	E	С	А	E	D	A
Approach Delay		26.6			22.5			31.4			43.6	
Approach LOS		С			С			С			D	
Queue Length 50th (m)		7.8	0.0		31.0	0.0	7.5	139.3	0.0	32.9	~244.6	0.0
Queue Length 95th (m)		15.4	0.0		46.7	0.0	#18.9	#179.4	0.0	#54.6	#293.0	2.5
Internal Link Dist (m)		107.4			36.0			159.7			257.3	
Turn Bay Length (m)			25.0				75.0		75.0	175.0		25.0
Base Capacity (vph)		288	466		293	1495	95	1848	844	433	2172	967
Starvation Cap Reductn		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
Spillback Cap Reductn		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
Storage Cap Reductn		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
Reduced v/c Ratio		0.15	0.07		0.54	0.24	0.40	0.84	0.05	0.76	0.99	0.06
Intersection Summary												
Area Type: O	ther											
Cycle Length: 130												
Actuated Cycle Length: 130												
Offset: 22 (17%), Referenced	to phase	2:NBT a	nd 6:SBT	, Start of	Green							
Natural Cycle: 140												
Control Type: Actuated-Coord	dinated											
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.99												
Intersection Signal Delay: 36.	8			In	itersection	1 LOS: D						
Intersection Capacity Utilization	on 93.8%			IC	CU Level of	of Service	θF					
Analysis Period (min) 15												
 Volume exceeds capacity 	, queue is	theoretic	cally infini	te.								
Queue shown is maximum	after two	cycles.										
# 95th percentile volume ex	ceeds ca	pacity, qu	ieue may	be longe	er.							
	<i>.</i> .	and a later										

 Ø1
 Ø2 (R)

 22s
 73s

 Ø5
 Ø6 (R)

 13s
 82s

12-16-2019 BTE

19-032 1243 Tero Lanes, Volumes, T	n Road ïmings						4: Teron Rd & Carling A 2025 Total
	→	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	•	1	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations		7		ę	Y		
Traffic Volume (vph)	762	98	147	426	26	88	
Future Volume (vph)	762	98	147	426	26	88	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Grade (%)	0%			0%	0%		
Storage Length (m)		20.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
Storage Lanes		1	0		1	0	
Taper Length (m)			7.5		7.5		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Ped Bike Factor							
Frt		0.850			0.895		
Flt Protected				0.987	0.989		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1782	1515	0	1759	1578	0	
Flt Permitted				0.987	0.989		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1782	1515	0	1759	1578	0	
Link Speed (k/h)	60			60	50		
Link Distance (m)	194.0			213.2	38.0		
Travel Time (s)	11.6			12.8	2.7		
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)		3	3				
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)							
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy Vehicles (%)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Parking (#/hr)							
Mid-Block Traffic (%)	0%			0%	0%		
Adj. Flow (vph)	828	107	160	463	28	96	
Shared Lane Traffic (%)							
Lane Group Flow (vph)	828	107	0	623	124	0	
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop		
Intersection Summany							

ICU Level of Service F

Area Type: Other Control Type: Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Utilization 91.8% Analysis Period (min) 15

4. Teron Rd & Carling Ave

I PM

	-	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	٠	۲
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations	*	1		ۍ ۲	¥	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	762	98	147	426	26	88
Future Volume (Veh/h)	762	98	147	426	26	88
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (yph)	828	107	160	463	28	96
Pedestrians	020	107	100	400	3	50
Lane Width (m)					36	
Walking Speed (m/s)					1.2	
Percent Blockage					0	
Right turn flare (yeh)					0	
Median type	None			None		
Median type	None			None		
Upstroom signal (m)				010		
opsirearn signar (m)				213	0.70	
vC. conflicting volume			020		1614	0.01
vC, connicting volume			930		1014	031
vC1, stage 1 conti voi						
vG2, stage 2 coni voi			020		1644	021
VCu, unbiocked voi			930		1644	031
tC, single (s)			4.1		0.4	0.2
IC, 2 stage (s)			0.0		0.5	2.2
IF (S)			2.2		3.5	3.3
pu queue free %			70		59	74
civi capacity (ven/n)			733		68	370
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	NB 1		
Volume Total	828	107	623	124		
Volume Left	0	0	160	28		
Volume Right	0	107	0	96		
cSH	1700	1700	733	184		
Volume to Capacity	0.49	0.06	0.22	0.67		
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.0	0.0	5.0	24.1		
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.0	5.4	57.3		
Lane LOS			А	F		
Approach Delay (s)	0.0		5.4	57.3		
Approach LOS				F		
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay			6.2			
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation		91.8%	IC	U Level	of Service
Associate Deviced (solar)			15			

19-032 1243 Teron Road

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

12-16-2019 BTE

Synchro 9 Report Page 8

F

4: Teron Rd & Carling Ave 2025 Total PM

12-16-2019 BTE

	٦	-+	\mathbf{i}	1	-	•	1	Ť	1	1	ţ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Lane Configurations	5	î.		5	*	1		đ.		٢	Ť.	
Traffic Volume (voh)	15	691	51	44	432	361	32	186	13	562	570	47
Future Volume (vph)	15	691	51	44	432	361	32	186	13	562	570	47
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Grade (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Storage Length (m)	0.0	070	75.0	100.0	0,0	100.0	0.0	0,0	0.0	0.0	070	0.0
Storage Lanes	1		1	1		1 1	0.0		0.0	1		0.0
Taper Length (m)	7.5			75.0			7.5		-	7.5		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Ped Bike Factor		1.00				0.97		1.00			1.00	
Frt		0.990				0.850		0.992			0.989	
Fit Protected	0.950	0.000		0.950		0.000		0.993		0.950	0.000	
Satd, Flow (prot)	1693	1762	0	1693	1782	1515	0	1756	0	1693	1759	0
Fit Permitted	0.311		Ū	0.074		1010	Ū	0.821	Ū	0.285		
Satd. Flow (perm)	554	1762	0	132	1782	1474	0	1451	0	508	1759	0
Bight Turn on Bed			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd, Flow (BTOR)		3				392		2			4	
Link Speed (k/h)		60			60			50			50	
Link Distance (m)		213.2			282.2			126.1			120.3	
Travel Time (s)		12.8			16.9			9.1			8.7	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)	2	12.0	1	1	10.0	2	1	0.1			0.7	1
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)	_					_						
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
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Heavy Vehicles (%)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parking (#/hr)												
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Adi, Flow (vph)	16	751	55	48	470	392	35	202	14	611	620	51
Shared Lane Traffic (%)					-					-		
Lane Group Flow (vph)	16	806	0	48	470	392	0	251	0	611	671	0
Turn Type	Perm	NA	-	Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	-	pm+pt	NA	
Protected Phases		2			6			8		7	4	
Permitted Phases	2			6	-	6	8	-		4		
Detector Phase	2	2		6	6	6	8	8		7	4	
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	10.0		5.0	10.0	
Minimum Split (s)	27.0	27.0		27.0	27.0	27.0	25.0	25.0		12.0	25.0	
Total Split (s)	61.0	61.0		61.0	61.0	61.0	29.0	29.0		40.0	69.0	
Total Split (%)	46.9%	46.9%		46.9%	46.9%	46.9%	22.3%	22.3%		30.8%	53.1%	
Yellow Time (s)	3.3	3.3		3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3		3.3	3.3	
All-Red Time (s)	3.3	3.3		3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3		2.8	3.3	
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	
Total Lost Time (s)	6.6	6.6		6.6	6.6	6.6		6.6		6.1	6.6	
Lead/Lag					2.5		Lag	Lao		Lead		
Lead-Lag Optimize?							- 3					
Recall Mode	Max	Max		Max	Max	Max	None	None		None	None	
Act Effct Green (s)	54.4	54.4		54.4	54.4	54.4		22.4		62.9	62.4	

19-032 1243 Tero Lanes, Volumes, T	n Road ïmings							5: Hei	rzberg	g Rd &	Carling 2025 T	j Ave otal PN
	٦	-	$\mathbf{\hat{v}}$	4	+	×.	1	1	1	6	Ŧ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.42	0.42		0.42	0.42	0.42		0.17		0.48	0.48	
v/c Ratio	0.07	1.09		0.87	0.63	0.46		1.00		1.10	0.79	
Control Delay	23.9	96.8		129.0	34.5	4.2		110.1		97.9	36.6	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	23.9	96.8		129.0	34.5	4.2		110.1		97.9	36.6	
LOS	С	F		F	С	А		F		F	D	
Approach Delay		95.4			26.5			110.1			65.9	
Approach LOS		F			С			F			E	
Queue Length 50th (m)	1.9	~183.5		8.8	74.1	0.0		51.0		~116.0	110.7	
Queue Length 95th (m)	5.8	#243.6		#29.2	103.0	14.5		#94.1		#172.3	152.0	
Internal Link Dist (m)		189.2			258.2			102.1			96.3	
Turn Bay Length (m)				100.0		100.0						
Base Capacity (vph)	231	739		55	745	844		251		554	846	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0		0	0	0		0		0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.07	1.09		0.87	0.63	0.46		1.00		1.10	0.79	
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 130												
Actuated Cycle Length: 130)											
Natural Cycle: 120												
Control Type: Semi Act-Une	coord											
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.10												
Intersection Signal Delay: 6	5.7			Ir	tersection	n LOS: E						
Intersection Capacity Utilization	ation 105.9	1%		IC	CU Level	of Service	G					
Analysis Period (min) 15												
~ Volume exceeds capac	ity, queue	is theoreti	cally infin	ite.								
Queue shown is maximu	um after tw	o cycles.										
# 95th percentile volume	exceeds c	apacity, qu	ieue may	be longe	er.							
Queue shown is maximu	um after tw	o cycles.										

Splits and Phases: 5: Herzberg Rd & Carling Ave

<u> </u>			
61 s	69 s		
₩ Ø6	Ø7	↑ø8	
61s	40 s	29 s	

12-16-2019 BTE

Synchro 9 Report Page 10

19-032 1243 Tero Lanes, Volumes, T	n Road imings						6: Teron Rd & Project Sit 2025 Total F
	4	•	Ť	۲	1	ŧ	
Lane Group	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Y		4Î			÷.	
Traffic Volume (vph)	23	5	108	14	3	242	
Future Volume (vph)	23	5	108	14	3	242	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	
Lane Width (m)	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Grade (%)	0%		0%			0%	
Storage Length (m)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		
Storage Lanes	1	0		0	0		
Taper Length (m)	7.5				7.5		
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Ped Bike Factor							
Frt	0.977		0.985				
Flt Protected	0.960					0.999	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1672	0	1755	0	0	1780	
Flt Permitted	0.960					0.999	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1672	0	1755	0	0	1780	
Link Speed (k/h)	50		50			50	
Link Distance (m)	78.8		108.3			300.6	
Travel Time (s)	5.7		7.8			21.6	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)							
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)							
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Growth Factor	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Heavy Vehicles (%)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	
Bus Blockages (#/hr)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Parking (#/hr)							
Mid-Block Traffic (%)	0%		0%			0%	
Adj. Flow (vph)	25	5	117	15	3	263	
Shared Lane Traffic (%)		-		-	-		
Lane Group Flow (vph)	30	0	132	0	0	266	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Intersection Summarv							
Area Type:	Other						
Control Type: Unsignalized							
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation 26.0%	,		10	CU Level	of Service	A
Analysis Period (min) 15							

19-032 1243 Tero HCM Unsignalized	on Road I Interse		6: Teron Rd & Project Site 2025 Total PM				
0	4	•	Ť	~	`	Ļ	
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Ý		ef 👘			÷f	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	23	5	108	14	3	242	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	23	5	108	14	3	242	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Grade	0%		0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	25	5	117	15	3	263	
Pedestrians							
Lane Width (m)							
Walking Speed (m/s)							
Percent Blockage							
Right turn flare (veh)							
Median type			None			None	
Median storage veh)							
Upstream signal (m)							
pX, platoon unblocked							
vC, conflicting volume	394	124			132		
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	394	124			132		
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1		
tC, 2 stage (s)							
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2		
p0 queue free %	96	99			100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	612	929			1459		
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1				
Volume Total	30	132	266				
Volume Left	25	0	3				
Volume Right	5	15	0				
cSH	649	1700	1459				
Volume to Capacity	0.05	0.08	0.00				
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.9	0.0	0.0				
Control Delay (s)	10.8	0.0	0.1				
Lane LOS	В		Α				
Approach Delay (s)	10.8	0.0	0.1				
Approach LOS	В						
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			0.8				
Intersection Capacity Utiliz	ation		26.0%	IC	U Level	of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)			15				

12-16-2019 BTE

Synchro 9 Report Page 11 12-16-2019 BTE