


Transportation Impact Assessment – Step 4: Analysis

# 115 Lusk Street

---



## **TIA Plan Reports - Certification**

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 associate 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 licensed<sup>1</sup> or registered<sup>1</sup> professional in good standing, whose field of expertise [check  appropriate field(s)] is either transportation engineering  or transportation planning .

<sup>1</sup> License or 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.

Dated at Ottawa this 9<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2020.  
(City)

Name: David Hook, P.Eng.


Professional Title: Project Engineer



Signature of Individual certifier that she/he meets the above four criteria

<b>Office Contact Information (Please Print)</b>
Address: 400-333 Preston Street
City / Postal Code: K1S 5N4
Telephone / Extension: 613-225-1311 ext. 64029
E-Mail Address: dhook@ibigroup.com

Stamp



# Document Control Page

---

<b>CLIENT:</b>	DCR Phoenix
<b>PROJECT NAME:</b>	115 Lusk Street
<b>REPORT TITLE:</b>	Transportation Impact Assessment
<b>IBI REFERENCE:</b>	122508
<b>VERSION:</b>	3.0
<b>DIGITAL MASTER:</b>	J:\122508_115LuskSt\6.0_Technical\6.4_Traffic\6.4.3_Tech-Reports\TTR_115LuskSt_TIA_analysis_2020-04-09.docx
<b>ORIGINATOR:</b>	Eric M <sup>c</sup> Laren/ Ben Pascolo-Neveu
<b>REVIEWER:</b>	David Hook
<b>AUTHORIZATION:</b>	Justin Date
<b>CIRCULATION LIST:</b>	Mike Giampa - City of Ottawa Transportation Project Manager
<b>HISTORY:</b>	1.0 - TIA Step 1 & 2 Submitted for City Review – October 29, 2019 2.0 - TIA Step 3 Submitted for City Review – December 31, 2019 3.0 - TIA Step 4 Submitted to Client – April 13, 2020

# Table of Contents

---

## Executive Summary

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>TIA Screening</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Project Scoping</b> .....	<b>2</b>
3.1	Description of Proposed Development .....	2
3.1.1	Site Location .....	2
3.1.2	Land Use Details.....	4
3.1.3	Development Phasing & Date of Occupancy.....	4
3.2	Existing Conditions .....	6
3.2.1	Existing Road Network.....	6
3.2.2	Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities.....	8
3.2.3	Existing Transit Facilities and Service .....	8
3.2.4	Collision History .....	9
3.3	Planned Conditions.....	9
3.3.1	Transportation Network.....	9
3.3.2	Future Adjacent Developments.....	11
3.3.3	Network Concept Screenline .....	14
3.4	Study Area .....	14
3.5	Time Periods.....	14
3.6	Study Horizon Year.....	14
3.7	Exemptions Review .....	15
<b>4</b>	<b>Forecasting</b> .....	<b>16</b>
4.1	Development Generated Traffic.....	16
4.1.1	Trip Generation Methodology .....	16
4.1.2	Trip Generation Results .....	16
4.1.3	Trip Distribution and Assignment.....	19
4.2	Background Network Traffic .....	21

# Table of Contents

---

4.2.1	Changes to the Background Transportation Network.....	21
4.2.2	General Background Growth Rates .....	21
4.2.3	Other Area Development .....	21
4.3	Demand Rationalization.....	22
4.3.1	Description of Capacity Issues.....	22
4.3.2	Adjustment to Development Generated Demands .....	23
4.3.3	Adjustment to Background Network Demands .....	23
4.4	Traffic Volume Summary .....	23
4.4.1	Future Background Traffic Volumes .....	23
4.4.2	Future Total Traffic Volumes.....	23
<b>5</b>	<b>Analysis .....</b>	<b>28</b>
5.1	Development Design.....	28
5.1.1	Design for Sustainable Modes .....	28
5.1.2	Circulation and Access .....	28
5.1.3	New Street Networks .....	28
5.2	Parking.....	28
5.2.1	Parking Supply .....	28
5.2.2	Spillover Parking .....	28
5.3	Boundary Streets .....	28
5.3.1	Mobility .....	29
5.3.2	Road Safety .....	29
5.4	Access Intersections .....	30
5.4.1	Location and Design of Access.....	30
5.4.2	Access Intersection Control .....	30
5.4.3	Intersection Design (MMLOS).....	31
5.5	Transportation Demand Management (TDM).....	31
5.5.1	Context for TDM.....	31
5.5.2	Need and Opportunity .....	31
5.5.3	TDM Program.....	31

# Table of Contents

---

5.6	Neighbourhood Traffic Management .....	31
5.6.1	Adjacent Neighbourhoods.....	31
5.7	Transit .....	32
5.7.1	Route Capacity.....	32
5.7.1	Transit Priority Measures .....	32
5.8	Review of Network Concept .....	32
5.9	Intersection Design .....	32
5.9.1	Intersection Control .....	32
5.9.2	Intersection Analysis Criteria (Automobile).....	33
5.9.3	Intersection Capacity Analysis .....	34
5.9.4	Intersection Design (MMLOS).....	37
5.10	Geometric Review.....	38
5.10.1	Sight Distance and Corner Clearances.....	39
5.10.2	Auxiliary Lane Analyses.....	39
5.11	Summary of Improvements Indicated and Modification Options .....	43
5.11.1	Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court/ Cobble Hill Drive .....	43
5.11.2	O’Keefe Court & Lusk Street.....	44
5.11.3	Fallowfield Road & Forager Street.....	44
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>45</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1 - Land Use Statistics .....	4
Table 2 - Reported Collisions within Vicinity of Proposed Development.....	9
Table 3 - Future Adjacent Developments .....	12
Table 4 - Exemptions Review .....	15
Table 5 - Base Vehicular Trip Generation Results .....	16
Table 6 - Person-Trip Generation .....	17

# Table of Contents

---

Table 7 - 2011 OD Survey Mode Shares and Proposed Mode Share Targets .....	18
Table 8 - Peak Hour Person Trips by Mode.....	19
Table 9 - Cumulative 4401 Fallowfield Road Trip Generation .....	19
Table 10 - Adjacent Development Vehicle Trip Generation.....	22
Table 11 - Segment MMLOS Results .....	29
Table 12 - Development Generated Transit Demand.....	32
Table 13 - LOS Criteria for Signalized Intersections.....	33
Table 14 - LOS Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections.....	34
Table 15 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: Existing (2019) Traffic .....	35
Table 16 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: 2023 Background Traffic .....	35
Table 17 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: 2028 Background Traffic .....	36
Table 18 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: 2023 Total Traffic.....	36
Table 19 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: 2028 Total Traffic.....	37
Table 20 - Intersection MMLOS - Future Conditions .....	37
Table 21 - Auxiliary Left-Turn Storage Analysis at Signalized Intersections .....	41
Table 22 – Auxiliary Right-Turn Lane Storage Analysis at Signalized Intersections .....	43



# Table of Contents

---

## List of Figures

Figure 1 - Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive intersection .....	7
Figure 2 - Fallowfield Road & Forager Street .....	7
Figure 3 - Existing (2019) Traffic.....	8
Figure 4 - Future Road Network Projects .....	10
Figure 5 - Ultimate Cycling Network .....	11

## List of Exhibits

Exhibit 1 - Site Location .....	3
Exhibit 2 - Proposed Development .....	5
Exhibit 3 - Adjacent Developments .....	13
Exhibit 4 - Site Generated AM & PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes .....	20
Exhibit 5 - Future (2023) Background Traffic .....	24
Exhibit 6 - Future (2028) Background Traffic .....	25
Exhibit 7 - Future (2023) Total Traffic .....	26
Exhibit 8 - Future (2028) Total Traffic .....	27

## List of Appendices

Appendix A – City Circulation Comments	
Appendix B – Screening Form	
Appendix C – Traffic Data	
Appendix D – OC Transpo Routes	
Appendix E – Collision Data	
Appendix F – Trip Generation Data	
Appendix G – TDM Checklist	
Appendix H – MMLOS Analysis	
Appendix I – Intersection Control Warrants	

# Table of Contents

---

Appendix J – Intersection Capacity Analyses

Appendix K – Auxiliary Lane Analyses

## Executive Summary

IBI Group (IBI) was retained by DCR Phoenix to undertake a Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) in support of a Site Plan Control application for an approximate 280 square metre proposed restaurant and 567 square metre medical office development to be located at 115 Lusk Street, Ottawa. The development represents a parcel of land in the original 4401 Fallowfield Road Plan of Subdivision.

The site is expected to be fully built out in a single phase and occupied by 2023. The horizon year of the study was therefore taken as 2028, representing 5 years beyond the expected full build-out of the site. The site will be accessed via two full-movement private approaches with direct connections to Forager Street and Lusk Street. Both of these are local streets within the 4401 Fallowfield Road subdivision and provide access to O’Keefe Court and Fallowfield Road, respectively. A total of 55 vehicle parking spaces and 8 bicycle parking spaces will be provided.

Based on the traffic analysis results, the proposed development is expected to generate up to 13 and 32 two-way vehicular trips during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively. These traffic volumes were distributed amongst two site access driveways, representing a marginal increase in traffic volumes with respect to the overall traffic projections expected within the 2028 study horizon year. The mode share targets were based on the South Nepean Traffic Assessment Zone (TAZ) and proportionally adjusted, in accordance with the Conditions of Approval for 4401 Fallowfield Road to yield an 85% auto/ 15% non-auto mode share split. It should also be noted that this study did not apply any pass-by reductions factors to the restaurant’s trip generation, as it was determined that the overall impact on the adjacent road network would be minimal.

The intersection of Fallowfield & O’Keefe/ Cobble Hill is presently operating as a two-way stop controlled intersection. The results of the analysis indicate that, by 2023, traffic signals will be operationally required under background traffic conditions, however signals are not warranted within the timeframe of this study. With traffic signals in place, the intersection would be expected to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS ‘B’) beyond the study horizon year. As site-generated traffic will not contribute significantly to any potential traffic operational issues at this intersection, it is recommended that the City continue monitoring this intersection on an annual basis to determine the appropriate timing for the introduction of traffic signals.

The results of the analysis indicate that the intersections of O’Keefe Court & Lusk Street and Fallowfield Road & Forager Street are expected to operate within acceptable standards (LOS ‘D’ or better) during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours. Both are T-intersections that are configured with stop control on the minor road and do not warrant auxiliary lanes or future modifications to intersection control within the timeframe of this study.

A multi-modal analysis identifies deficiencies in the existing road network and potential remediation measures have been suggested in which the City could consider to meet these prescribed targets. It should be noted that, although these measures would improve for a range of transportation modes, they are not required to safely accommodate the transportation demands of the proposed development.

A Roadway Modification Application (RMA-2019-TPD-041B) was recently approved to satisfy a conditional requirement for the 4401 Fallowfield Road Subdivision. The RMA includes the right-in/right-out intersection at Fallowfield Road & Forager Street, a multi-use pathway along the west side of Fallowfield Road and a southbound bus stop on Fallowfield Road near the O’Keefe Court intersection. As there is already an approved RMA intended to address the implementation of the above noted design elements and no off-site geometric improvements are required as a direct result of the proposed development, an RMA will not be included with the submission of this Transportation Impact Assessment.

All study area intersections were shown to operate well within the capacity constraints of the adjacent transportation network, with the appropriate modifications in place (i.e. signalization of Fallowfield & O’Keefe/ Cobble Hill by 2023). Further, the proposed development will contribute a negligible volume of

traffic to the adjacent road network. A post-development Monitoring Plan is, therefore, not a requirement of this study.

**Based on the findings of this study, it is the overall opinion of IBI Group that the proposed development will integrate well with and can be safely accommodated by the adjacent transportation network with the recommended actions and modifications in place.**

# 1 Introduction

IBI Group (IBI) was retained by DCR Phoenix to undertake a Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) in support of a Site Plan Control application for a proposed restaurant and medical office development to be located at 115 Lusk Street, Ottawa. The development represents a parcel of land in the original 4401 Fallowfield Road Plan of Subdivision.

In accordance with the City of Ottawa's Transportation Impact Assessment Guidelines, published in June 2017, the following report is divided into four major components:

- **Screening** – Prior to the commencement of a TIA, an initial assessment of the proposed development is undertaken to establish the need for a comprehensive review of the site based on three triggers: Trip Generation, Location and Safety.
- **Scoping** – This component of the TIA report describes both the existing and planned conditions in the vicinity of the development and defines study parameters such as the study area, analysis periods and analysis years of the development. It also provides an opportunity to identify any scope exemptions that would eliminate elements of scope described in the TIA Guidelines but not relevant to the development proposal, based on consultation with City staff.
- **Forecasting** – The Forecasting component of the TIA is intended to review both the development-generated travel demand and the background network travel demand. It also provides an opportunity to rationalize this demand to ensure projections are within the capacity constraints of the transportation network.
- **Analysis** – This component documents the results of any analyses undertaken to ensure that the transportation related features of the proposed development are in conformance with prescribed technical standards and that its impacts on the transportation network are both sustainable and effectively managed. It also identifies a development strategy to ensure that what is being proposed is aligned with the City of Ottawa's policies and city-building objectives.

Throughout the development of a TIA report, each of the four study components above are submitted in draft form to the City of Ottawa and undergo a review by a designated Transportation Project Manager. Any comments received are addressed to the satisfaction of the City's Transportation Project Manager before proceeding with subsequent components of the study. All technical comments and responses throughout this process are included in **Appendix A**.

A Roadway Modification Application (RMA-2019-TPD-041B) was recently approved to satisfy a conditional requirement for the Subdivision. The RMA includes a right-in/right-out intersection at Fallowfield Road & Forager Street, a multi-use pathway along the west side of Fallowfield Road and a southbound bus stop on Fallowfield Road near the O'Keefe Court intersection. As such, an RMA will not be required as part of this TIA. The submission may require a post-development Monitoring Plan to track performance of the planned TIA Strategy, however the need for a Monitoring Plan will be confirmed through the analysis undertaken in this report.

## 2 TIA Screening

An initial screening was completed to confirm the need for a Transportation Impact Assessment by reviewing the following three triggers:

- **Trip Generation:** Preliminary trip generation estimates were developed based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (10<sup>th</sup> Edition). A 1.28 person-trip conversion factor was applied to the base trip generation data to obtain person-trip generation. The 60 person-trip threshold prescribed by the TIA Guidelines is met during the weekday afternoon peak hour therefore the Trip Generation trigger is satisfied.
- **Location:** The proposed development will not be accessed from a boundary street that is designated as part of the City's Transit Priority, Rapid Transit network or Spine Bicycle Networks nor is the subject site within a Design Priority Area or Transit-Oriented Development zone, therefore, the Location trigger is not satisfied.
- **Safety:** Boundary street conditions were reviewed to determine if there is an elevated potential for safety concerns adjacent the site. Based on this review, there is no elevated potential for safety concerns adjacent to the site, therefore the Safety trigger is not satisfied.

As the proposed development meets the Trip Generation trigger, the need to undertake a Transportation Impact Assessment is confirmed.

A copy of the Screening Form is provided in **Appendix B**.


## 3 Project Scoping

### 3.1 Description of Proposed Development

#### 3.1.1 Site Location

The proposed development is located within the 4401 Fallowfield Road business park adjacent to Lusk Street, Forager Street and Fallowfield Road. The municipal address of the subject site is 115 Lusk Street. The approximately 0.4 hectare site is currently undeveloped and, based on GeoOttawa, is zoned IP[2265] H(16) – Business Park Industrial Zone.

The site location and its surrounding context is illustrated in **Exhibit 1**.



115 Lusk Street  
Transportation Impact Assessment

Exhibit 1:  
Site Location

PROJECT No. 122508  
DATE: April 2020  
SCALE: 0m 125m 250m



### 3.1.2 Land Use Details

**Table 1** summarizes the proposed land uses included in this development.

Table 1 - Land Use Statistics

LAND USE	SIZE
Quality Restaurant	280 m <sup>2</sup> (3,014 ft <sup>2</sup> )
Medical Office	567 m <sup>2</sup> (6,103 ft <sup>2</sup> )


The proposed development is illustrated in **Exhibit 2**.

The site will be accessed via two full-movement private approaches with direct connections to Forager Street and Lusk Street. Both of these are local streets within the 4401 Fallowfield Road subdivision and provide access to O’Keefe Court and Fallowfield Road, respectively. A total of 55 vehicle parking spaces and 8 bicycle parking spaces will be provided.

### 3.1.3 Development Phasing & Date of Occupancy

The proposed development will be constructed in a single phase. It is anticipated that the development will be constructed and fully occupied by 2023.





## 3.2 Existing Conditions

### 3.2.1 Existing Road Network

#### 3.2.1.1 Roadways

The proposed development is bound by the following street(s):

- **Fallowfield Road** is a two-lane undivided urban arterial roadway under the jurisdiction of the City of Ottawa with a right-of-way protection of 44.5m. From Highway 416 heading east, Fallowfield Road has a posted speed of 80km/h. At the intersection with Strandherd Drive, Fallowfield Road takes a 90-degree turn to the northeast and continues through to the study area with a reduced speed limit of 60 km/h.
- **Lusk Street** is a two-lane local road extending from O’Keefe Court and terminates in a cul-de-sac approximately 250m to the southwest and provides access to the 4401 Fallowfield Road business park. Lusk Street has a 20m right-of-way and an unposted speed limit of 50 km/h.
- **Forager Street** is a two-lane local road linking Lusk Street to Fallowfield Road and also provides access to the 4401 Fallowfield Road business park. Forager Street has a 20m right-of-way and an unposted speed limit of 50 km/h

Other streets within the vicinity of the proposed development are as follows:

- **Strandherd Drive** is a four-lane divided urban arterial road under the jurisdiction of the City of Ottawa with a posted speed limit of 80 km/h within the vicinity of the subject lands, and a right-of-way protection of 44.5m.
- **O’Keefe Court** is a two-lane road extending west from Fallowfield Road and terminating in a cul-de-sac approximately 800m west of the Fallowfield Road and O’Keefe Court intersection. The roadway has a rural cross-section with a posted speed limit of 50km/h. O’Keefe Court runs along the former Fallowfield Road alignment (prior to its realignment to Strandherd Drive). Its right-of-way (ROW) therefore varies and is generally 30m, however, additional ROW has been taken on a portion of the north side to accommodate a multi-use pathway (MUP).
- **Cedarview Road** is a City of Ottawa roadway that extends from Strandherd Drive in the south to Baseline Road in the north. Cedarview Road is a two-lane urban arterial road north of Fallowfield Road, with a 37.5m right-of-way protection. Between Fallowfield Road and Jockvale Road, it is a major collector with a 26m right-of-way. The posted speed limit on Cedarview Road is 60 km/h. South of Strandherd Drive and the VIA Rail corridor, Cedarview Road has been renamed Borrisokane Road and continues south to Barnsdale Road.
- **Foxtail Avenue** is a two-lane local road extending from O’Keefe Court that provides access for the Orchard Estates residential community. The posted speed limit is 40 km/h.

#### 3.2.1.2 Intersections

The following existing intersections have been identified as having the greatest potential to be impacted by the proposed development:


**Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive** presently exists as a four-legged unsignalized intersection with stop-control on the O’Keefe Court and Cobble Hill Drive approaches. Each leg of the intersection is configured with a single through lane and auxiliary left-turn lane. Auxiliary right-turn lanes are provided along Fallowfield Road, while the sidestreets are configured with shared through-right lanes. The City of Ottawa is currently monitoring this intersection for implementation of traffic signals, once warranted.

Figure 1 - Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive intersection



**Fallowfield Road & Forager Street** is a new three- legged intersection with an RMA which is intended to restrict access to right-in/right-out. A multi-use pathway (MUP) crossing is proposed on Forager Street to provide a connection for the future MUP to be located on the west side of Fallowfield Road. Each leg of the intersection is configured with a single through lane, with an auxiliary right-turn lane on the southbound approach only.

Figure 2 - Fallowfield Road & Forager Street



### 3.2.1.3 Traffic Management Measures

There are currently no traffic management or traffic calming measures on the boundary streets within the vicinity of the proposed development.

### 3.2.1.4 Nearby Driveways

There are currently no driveways within 200m of either proposed site access location. The adjacent Hampton Inn and Suites Hotel currently under construction and located immediately to the southwest of the 115 Lusk Street site will include private approaches, with the nearest being approximately 3 metres from the property line shared with the subject development.

### 3.2.1.5 Existing Traffic Volumes


Weekday morning and afternoon peak hour turning movement counts were obtained by IBI staff at the following intersection(s):

- Fallowfield Road and O’Keefe Court/ Cobble Hill Drive (IBI Group – January 30, 2018)

A growth rate was applied to the through volumes along Fallowfield Road to approximate existing (2019) traffic volumes. Justification of background traffic volumes is discussed further in the Forecasting section of this report.

Peak hour vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist traffic volumes representative of existing (2019) conditions are shown in **Figure 3**. Traffic count data is provided in **Appendix C**.

Figure 3 - Existing (2019) Traffic



### 3.2.2 Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

The section of Fallowfield Road within the context area is designated as a Spine cycling route, and presently provides paved shoulders on both sides of the road. A bike pocket exists along Fallowfield Road on the southbound approach to the Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive intersection. A multi-use pathway (MUP) presently exists along the north side of O'Keefe Court from Lytle Park in the west to Cedarview Road in the east. Uni-directional cycle tracks are provided on both sides of Strandherd Drive from Fallowfield Road to Maravista Drive with cross-rides, two-stage left-turn bike boxes and bicycle signals at key signalized intersections within the context area. There are no exclusive bicycle facilities crossing Strandherd Drive, however pedestrian crosswalks are provided at each signalized intersection.

No formal pedestrian facilities are provided within the vicinity of the proposed development with the exception of concrete sidewalks (corner refuge) at the intersection of Fallowfield Road and O'Keefe Court/ Cobble Hill Drive, as well as within the reconstructed section of Strandherd Drive through the context area.

### 3.2.3 Existing Transit Facilities and Service

OC Transpo operates the following transit routes within close proximity to the proposed development:

- **Route #179** provides weekday peak period service between the Citi-Gate development off of Strandherd Drive and the Fallowfield VIA Rail Station and operates on a 15-minute headway.

- **Route #272** provides weekday peak period service between the Cobble Hill residential development in Barrhaven South and Tunney’s Pasture Station and operates on a 10-minute headway.

The nearest bus stops to the proposed development are located at the corner of Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive, located approximately 270m walking distance from the proposed development.

Transit service maps for the above noted transit routes are provided in **Appendix D**.

### 3.2.4 Collision History

A review of historical collision data has been conducted for the road network surrounding the proposed development. The TIA Guidelines require a safety review if at least six collisions for any one movement or of a discernible pattern, over a five-year period have occurred. **Table 2** summarizes all reported collisions between January 1, 2014 and December 31, 2018.

Table 2 - Reported Collisions within Vicinity of Proposed Development

LOCATION	# OF REPORTED COLLISIONS
<b>INTERSECTIONS</b>	
Fallowfield Road & Strandherd Drive	35
Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive	1
<b>SEGMENTS</b>	
Fallowfield Road – Strandherd Drive to O’Keefe Court / Cobber Hill Drive	1
O’Keefe Court – Fallowfield Road to cul-de-sac	1

Based on the collision history summarized above, the Fallowfield Road & Strandherd Drive intersection may require further review in the Analysis section of the report.

Detailed collision records are provided in **Appendix E**.

## 3.3 Planned Conditions

### 3.3.1 Transportation Network

#### 3.3.1.1 Future Road Network Projects

The 2013 Transportation Master Plan (TMP) outlines future road network modifications in the 2031 ‘Affordable Network’. The following projects were noted that may have an impact on traffic patterns within the vicinity of the site:


- **Strandherd Drive** – Planned widening of Strandherd Drive from two to four lanes. The first phase included widening between Fallowfield Road and Maravista Drive (Phase 1: 2014-2019) and was completed in 2015. The second phase includes widening between Maravista Drive and Jockvale Road (Phase 2: 2020-2025).

The *2019 City-Wide Development Charges Background Study (March 15, 2019)* identifies the following revisions for the timing of the TMP road network modifications described above:

- **Strandherd Drive Phase 2** – The timing for the second phase of the planned widening has been revised to 2020-2024.

**Figure 4** illustrates the planned changes to the arterial road network projects in the broader area, as per the TMP Affordable Plan.

Figure 4 - Future Road Network Projects



Source: 2013 Transportation Master Plan – Map 11 ‘2031 Affordable Network’

Although not part of the ‘2031 Affordable Network’ the TMP indicates that Fallowfield Road may be widened between Strandherd Drive and Greenbank Road some time beyond the TMP’s 2031 horizon.

### 3.3.1.2 Future Transit Facilities and Services


The 2013 TMP outlines the future rapid transit and transit priority (RTTP) network. The TMP does not identify any planned RTTP projects within the vicinity of the proposed development as part of the ‘2031 Affordable Network’ or ‘2031 Network Concept’. The Roadway Modification Application (RMA) completed for the Fallowfield/ Forager intersection includes a new southbound bus stop on Fallowfield Road south of O’Keefe Court.

### 3.3.1.3 Future Cycling and Pedestrian Facilities

Although Fallowfield Road is identified as a Spine cycling route, the Ottawa Cycling Plan (2013) does not describe any planned improvements to bicycle infrastructure along this section of roadway within the study area.

A proposed north-south Major Pathway, identified as part of the Ultimate Cycling Network, will connect to the existing multi-use pathway north of O’Keefe Court, continue south through 4401 Fallowfield Road prior to following Highway 416 towards the Jock River. **Figure 5** shows the future cycling network in the vicinity of the proposed development. The RMA includes a portion of the multi-use pathway on the west side of Fallowfield Road along the 4401 Fallowfield subdivision frontage.

Figure 5 - Ultimate Cycling Network



No additional pedestrian network modifications are planned within the vicinity of the proposed development.

### 3.3.2 Future Adjacent Developments

The City of Ottawa Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) Guidelines specify that all significant developments proposed within the surrounding area which are likely to occur within the study's horizon year must be identified and taken into consideration in the development of future background traffic projections.

The subject site forms part of the 4401 Fallowfield Road Plan of Subdivision (previously referred to as the Highway 416 Lands development). It is located in the northwest quadrant of the Fallowfield Road and Strandherd Drive intersection that will eventually consist of two hotels and an office park.

All current development applications within the context area of the proposed development have been summarized below in **Table 3**.

Table 3 - Future Adjacent Developments


DEVELOPMENT	TIA	LAND USE AND SIZE	TARGETED BUILD-OUT <sup>1</sup>
Highway 416 Lands (4401 Fallowfield Road)	IBI Group (2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 Hotels</li> <li>• 496,168 ft<sup>2</sup> Business Park</li> </ul>	2017
Hampton Inn & Suites <sup>2</sup>	IBI Group (2018)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 102 Hotel Rooms</li> </ul>	2019
Gateway Industrial Centre (4497 O'Keefe Court)	Delcan (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 279,653 ft<sup>2</sup> General Light Industrial</li> </ul>	Unknown
4190, 4200, 4210, 4236 Fallowfield Road and 2740 Cedarview Road	Novatech (2018)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 194 Residential Units</li> </ul>	2023
CitiGate – 416 Employment Lands	Novatech (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 350,000 ft<sup>2</sup> Shopping Centre</li> <li>• 200 Hotel Rooms</li> <li>• Gas Station (8 fuel positions)</li> <li>• 16.56 ha Business Park</li> <li>• 67.65 ha Office Park</li> <li>• 10.5 ha New Car Sales</li> </ul>	2029
CitiGate Hotel (4433 Strandherd Drive) <sup>3</sup>	Novatech (2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 99 Hotel Rooms</li> </ul>	2020

Notes:

1. Target build-out date may be outdated for some developments
2. Located within the Highway 416 Lands development.
3. Located within the City Gate – 416 Employment Lands development.

The locations of the adjacent developments described above are shown in **Exhibit 3**.





### 3.3.3 Network Concept Screenline

Network screenline analysis is not expected to be necessary for this development, as it does not trigger the threshold prescribed in the TIA Guidelines of 200 person-trips or more during the peak hour. Detailed trip generation calculations will be provided in the Forecasting section of the report.

## 3.4 Study Area

The information presented thus far provides a base level of information for the development's context. Based on preliminary estimates of trip generation completed for the TIA Screening, the proposed development is expected to be a low traffic generator with roughly 60 person-trips expected during the weekday afternoon peak hour. Travel demand will be subsequently stratified by mode shares, divided amongst the two proposed site access intersections and further diluted by the variation in travel routes within the broader study area. As such, the proposed development is expected to contribute minimal downstream impacts to intersections on the periphery of the context area such as Cedarview Road and Fallowfield Road.

Strandherd Drive from Fallowfield Road to Maravista Drive was also exempt from the study area, as this segment of road was reconstructed in 2015 following the City's Complete Streets design philosophy to accommodate multi-modal travel demands beyond the TMP's ultimate planning horizon of 2031. Consideration was given to the proposed development travel demands as part of the Highway 416 Lands CTS.

With respect to the exemptions discussed above, this TIA will focus on site-specific impacts, integration with its boundary streets, including a functional review of the site access geometry and intersection control, on-site drive aisle requirements to accommodate proposed design vehicles and a review of the site's parking and loading requirements.

A condensed study area is proposed for this TIA, which will consist of the following intersections:

- Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive
- O'Keefe Court & Lusk Street
- Fallowfield Road & Forager Street

The study area is consistent with the recent TIA for the adjacent Hampton Inn and Suites.

Multi-modal level of service (MMLOS) analysis will be limited to Fallowfield Road between Forager Street and O'Keefe Court. Intersection MMLOS is only required for signalized intersections, and based on the low traffic generation projected for this development, it is unlikely that it will trigger the need for traffic signals at any of the three study area intersections. This will be verified through intersection capacity analysis in the Analysis component of the report.

## 3.5 Time Periods

Based on a preliminary review of trip generation rates associated with the proposed land uses, the peak weekly traffic generation is expected to occur on Saturdays. For the purposes of comparison, the weekday morning and afternoon peak periods represent 37% and 87% of this peak demand, respectively. It is important to note however that the Saturday peak likely does not coincide with the peak hour of adjacent street traffic, therefore the weekday morning and afternoon peak hour will constitute the critical analysis periods for this study.

## 3.6 Study Horizon Year

Traffic analyses associated with TIA's typically involve a review of existing conditions, as well as the anticipated future conditions, both with- and without the proposed development, at the year of

full-occupancy as well as five years beyond. Phased developments will often require interim analyses to provide a timeline for any necessary transportation infrastructure improvements.

It is expected that the proposed development will be constructed and fully occupied in a single phase in 2023. The horizon year for this study is therefore 2028.

### 3.7 Exemptions Review

The TIA Guidelines provide exemption considerations for elements of the Design Review and Network Impact components. **Table 4** summarizes the TIA modules that are not applicable to this study.

Table 4 - Exemptions Review

TIA MODULE	ELEMENT	EXEMPTION CONSIDERATIONS	REQUIRED
<b>DESIGN REVIEW COMPONENT</b>			
4.1 Development Design	4.1.2 Circulation and Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only required for site plans</li> </ul>	✓
	4.1.3 New Street Networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only required for plans of subdivision</li> </ul>	✗
4.2 Parking	4.2.1 Parking Supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only required for site plans</li> </ul>	✓
	4.2.2 Spillover Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only required for site plans where parking supply is 15% below unconstrained demand</li> </ul>	✗
<b>NETWORK IMPACT COMPONENT</b>			
4.5 Transportation Demand Management	All Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not required for site plans expected to have fewer than 60 employees and/or students on location at any given time</li> </ul>	✗
4.6 Neighbourhood Traffic Management	4.6.1 Adjacent Neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only required when the development relies on local or collector streets for access and total volumes exceed ATM capacity thresholds</li> </ul>	✓
4.8 Network Concept	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only required when proposed development generates more than 200 person-trips during the peak hour in excess of the equivalent volume permitted by established zoning</li> </ul>	✗

## 4 Forecasting

### 4.1 Development Generated Traffic

#### 4.1.1 Trip Generation Methodology

Peak hour site-generated traffic volumes were developed using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (10<sup>th</sup> Edition). The TIA Guidelines indicate that vehicle-trip generation rates from the ITE Trip Generation Manual should be converted to person-trips through the application of a 1.28 vehicle-to-person-trip conversion factor.

Following the application of the vehicle-to-person-trip conversion factor, the person-trips were then subdivided based on representative mode share percentages applicable to the study area to determine the number of vehicle, transit, pedestrian, cycling and other trip types.

Target mode shares were developed based on the local mode shares from the OD Survey and adjusted to account for Condition 6b of the Conditions of Approval of the Draft Plan of Subdivision of 4401 Fallowfield Road. Condition 6b indicates that all TIAs prepared for Site Plan Applications within the 4401 Fallowfield Road subdivision must assume a maximum non-auto mode share (transit, walking, cycling and other) of 15%. Furthermore, Condition 6a indicates that the cumulative vehicle-trip generation of all sites within the 4401 Fallowfield Road subdivision shall not exceed 739 vehicles per hour during the weekday morning and afternoon peak periods.

#### 4.1.2 Trip Generation Results

##### 4.1.2.1 Base Vehicle Trip Generation

Peak hour vehicular traffic volumes associated with the 115 Lusk Street development were determined using appropriate peak hour trip generation rates from the ITE Trip Generation Manual.

The vehicular trip generation results for the proposed development have been summarized in **Table 5**.

Table 5 - Base Vehicular Trip Generation Results

LAND USE	SIZE	PERIOD	GENERATED TRIPS (VPH)		
			IN	OUT	TOTAL
720 – Medical Offices	567 m <sup>2</sup>	AM	11	6	17
		PM	8	13	21
931 – Quality Restaurant	280 m <sup>2</sup>	AM	1	1	2
		PM	16	8	24

Notes: vph = Vehicles per Hour

##### 4.1.2.2 Person Trip Generation

The TIA Guidelines indicate that a 1.28 vehicle-to-person-trip conversion rate should be utilized to convert the base vehicular trip generation results into person trips.

The resulting number of person-trips the proposed development is expected to generate is summarized in **Table 6** below.

Table 6 - Person-Trip Generation

LAND USE	PERIOD	PERSON TRIPS (PPH)		
		IN	OUT	TOTAL
Medical Offices	AM	13	8	21
	PM	11	16	27
Quality Restaurant	AM	1	1	2
	PM	20	10	30

Notes: pph = persons per hour

#### 4.1.2.3 Mode Share Proportions

The 2011 TRANS Origin-Destination (O-D) Survey provides approximations of the existing modal share within the South Nepean Traffic Assessment Zone (TAZ). Relevant extracts from the 2011 O-D Survey are provided in **Appendix F**.

Of the available data, the average of the weekday AM and PM peak ‘Within District’ mode shares was determined to be the most appropriate existing mode share references, as the subject development is expected to primarily draw traffic from the local area.

Given the context of the proposed development, the mode shares specific to this development may deviate from the average mode share experienced in the South Nepean TAZ. As discussed below, adjustments were made to all the mode shares to better represent the mode shares for the proposed development.

The subject development is located on the opposite side of Fallowfield Road from the majority of the local residential developments, with only one signalized intersection in its vicinity providing a controlled crossing of Fallowfield Road. At present, limited active transportation facilities are provided in the study area, and although isolated measures are planned in the near term, there is a decreased likelihood of significant pedestrian or cycling demand being generated by the site. It is expected, however, that the intersection of Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive will eventually become signalized which will improve the accessibility of the site for pedestrians. This is expected to result in an increase in pedestrian demand which is reflected in the 2028 mode share targets.

Despite the planned inclusion of a southbound bus stop on Fallowfield Road south of O’Keefe Court as part of the approved RMA for the Fallowfield Road & Forager Street intersection, the transit mode share is expected to remain low, as transit service existing on the east side of Fallowfield Road will be partially inaccessible due to the lack of controlled pedestrian crossings on Fallowfield Road adjacent to the site.

Given the low probability of site-generated trips occurring by non-auto travel modes (transit, cycling, walking and other) within the horizon year of this study, the mode shares of all non-auto travel modes were proportionally adjusted to yield a total non-auto mode share of 15% in accordance with the Conditions of Approval for 4401 Fallowfield Road. The difference in mode share was reallocated to the auto driver and auto passenger mode shares.

**Table 7** below summarizes the 2011 OD Survey mode shares as well as the target mode shares.

Table 7 - 2011 OD Survey Mode Shares and Proposed Mode Share Targets

TRAVEL MODE	2011 OD SURVEY MODE SHARES	2023 MODE SHARE TARGETS	2028 MODE SHARE TARGETS
Auto Driver	40%	57%	57%
Auto Passenger	20%	28%	28%
<b>Total Auto Mode Share</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>85%</b>
Transit	4%	2%	2%
Cycling	2%	0%	0%
Walking	19%	7%	13%
Other	16%	6%	0%
<b>Total Non-Auto Mode Share</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>15%</b>

**4.1.2.4 Trip Reduction Factors**

Deduction of Existing Development Trips

Not Applicable: The proposed development lands are currently undeveloped, and do not generate any traffic volumes.

Pass-by Traffic

Based on survey data collected for the *ITE Trip Generation Handbook (3<sup>rd</sup> edition)*, the Quality Restaurant land use was shown to generate an average of 44% pass-by trips. This study conservatively did not apply any pass-by reduction factors, as the overall impact on the adjacent road network is expected to be minimal.

Synergy/ Internalization

Not Applicable: The proposed development will not generate internal person-trips between the proposed land uses. Non-auto trips are likely to occur to/from other sites within the 4401 Fallowfield Road subdivision, such as the adjacent Hampton Inn and Suites.

**4.1.2.5 Trip Generation by Mode**

The mode share targets from **Table 7** were applied to the number of development-generated person-trips to establish the expected number of trips per travel mode, as summarized in **Table 8** below.

Table 8 - Peak Hour Person Trips by Mode

MODE	2023				2028			
	AM		PM		AM		PM	
	IN	OUT	IN	OUT	IN	OUT	IN	OUT
Auto Driver	8	5	17	15	8	5	17	15
Auto Passenger	4	3	9	7	4	3	9	7
Transit	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Cycling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walking	1	1	2	2	2	2	4	4
Other	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>		<b>57</b>		<b>24</b>		<b>57</b>	

#### 4.1.2.6 Cumulative 4401 Fallowfield Road Trip Generation

Condition 6A of the Conditions of Approval of the Draft Plan of Subdivision of 4401 Fallowfield Road indicates that the total vehicle-trip generation of the subdivision shall not exceed 739 vehicle-trips per hour during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours. **Table 9** summarizes the total and cumulative number of vehicle-trips generated during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours by all sub-developments within 4401 Fallowfield Road subdivision which have been approved or are currently undergoing a Site Plan Control Application.

Table 9 - Cumulative 4401 Fallowfield Road Trip Generation

SUB-DEVELOPMENT	TOTAL AM (PM) VEHICLE TRIPS	CUMULATIVE AM (PM) VEHICLE TRIPS
Hampton Inn & Suites	56 (64)	56 (64)
115 Lusk Street	13 (32)	69 (96)
<b>Total from Current Development Applications</b>		<b>69 (96)</b>
<b>Total Allowable Vehicle-Trip Generation</b>		<b>739 (739)</b>
<b>Percentage of Maximum Trips Permitted</b>		<b>9% (13%)</b>

As indicated above, the proposed development will not exceed the maximum permissible vehicular generation of the 4401 Fallowfield Road subdivision.

#### 4.1.3 Trip Distribution and Assignment


As the proposed development is expected to primarily draw traffic from local residential areas, site-generated traffic has been distributed to the road network based on the concentrations of housing in the vicinity of the subject development:

- 40% to/from the southwest via Fallowfield Road
- 60% to/from the east via Fallowfield Road

Utilizing the estimated number of new auto trips and applying the above distribution, future site-generated traffic volumes are illustrated for each of the study area intersections in **Exhibit 4**.



NORTH



**LEGEND**



Permitted Movements



Weekday AM (PM) Peak Hour Vehicular Volume





## 4.2 Background Network Traffic

### 4.2.1 Changes to the Background Transportation Network

To properly assess future traffic conditions, planned modifications to the transportation network that may impact travel patterns or demand within the study area must be considered. The Scoping section of this TIA reviewed the anticipated changes to the study area transportation network based on the Transportation Master Plan (TMP), the Ottawa Cycling Plan, the Ottawa Pedestrian Plan and the *2019 City-Wide Development Charges Background Study* and determined that there are no major road, pedestrian or cycling network modifications planned within the study area prior to the 2028 horizon.

The intersection of Fallowfield Road/ O’Keefe/ Cobble Hill is being monitored by City staff for traffic signal warrants. As discussed previously, an RMA was recently approved for the right-in/ right-out intersection of Fallowfield Road & Forager Street which includes an isolated section of multi-use path (MUP) on the west side of Fallowfield Road and a southbound bus stop on Fallowfield Road along the 4401 Fallowfield Road, south of O’Keefe Court.

### 4.2.2 General Background Growth Rates

The background growth rate is intended to represent regional growth from outside the study area that will travel along the adjacent road network. Consistent with the adjacent Hampton Inn & Suites TIA, a 2% rate of linear growth per annum is proposed within the study area for the calculation of future background traffic.

The background growth rate was only been applied to the through movements on Fallowfield Road as traffic generation relating to all known future adjacent developments has been explicitly accounted for in the analysis.

### 4.2.3 Other Area Development

All current adjacent development applications within the study area were previously identified in **Table 3**. All of the developments identified have been accounted for in the future background volume projections. The developments represent specific areas of growth within the study area and are therefore considered in addition to the general background growth rate discussed previously. **Table 10** summarizes the vehicle trip generation of all current adjacent background development applications.

Table 10 - Adjacent Development Vehicle Trip Generation

DEVELOPMENT	TIA	VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION			
		AM		PM	
		IN	OUT	IN	OUT
Highway 416 Lands (4401 Fallowfield Road)	IBI Group (2015)	630	109	137	533
Hampton Inn & Suites	IBI Group (2018)	33	23	33	31
Gateway Industrial Centre (4497 O'Keefe Court)	Delcan (2008)	20	97	94	46
4190, 4200, 4210, 4236 Fallowfield Road and 2740 Cedarview Road	Novatech (2018)	108	33	131	76
CitiGate – 416 Employment Lands	Novatech (2012)	<b>Interim (2019)</b>			
		741	216	664	1015
		<b>Ultimate (2029)</b>			
		3494	635	1128	3316
CitiGate Hotel (4433 Strandherd Drive)	Novatech (2019)	29	20	27	26

It should be noted that some of the developments shown in **Table 10** above are not expected to be fully built out by the horizon year of the study or are sub-developments within a larger development. Background development traffic volumes have been adjusted appropriately to account for this.

The CitiGate – 416 Employment Lands is a large multi-phase development that has been partially built out and is expected to be fully built out by 2029. The projected traffic volumes generated by this development at the 2023 and 2028 analysis years were linearly interpolated and considered the development status at the time of the recorded traffic counts utilized in this study.

It was assumed that the Gateway Industrial Centre (4497 O'Keefe Court) development would be fully built out by the 2023 analysis year.

### 4.3 Demand Rationalization

The purpose of this section is to rationalize future travel demands within the study area to account for potential capacity limitations in the transportation network and its ability to effectively accommodate the additional demand generated by a new development.

#### 4.3.1 Description of Capacity Issues

The TIA recently completed for the adjacent Hampton Inn and Suites indicated study area intersections including Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/ Cobble Hill Drive as well as Lusk Street/ O'Keefe Court would operate below their theoretical capacities (i.e. LOS 'D' or better) beyond the build-out year of the proposed development.

#### **4.3.2 Adjustment to Development Generated Demands**

The proposed development is only expected to generate 32 two-way vehicle-trips during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours of adjacent street traffic and therefore unlikely to trigger any capacity issues.

#### **4.3.3 Adjustment to Background Network Demands**

As no further capacity issues have been identified, no adjustments to background network demands are necessary.

The TIA recently completed for Hampton Inn and Suites did not assign any traffic to the Fallowfield/Forager intersection. Now that the current study has assumed a reassignment of trips to this intersection.

### **4.4 Traffic Volume Summary**

#### **4.4.1 Future Background Traffic Volumes**

Future background traffic volumes projections have been established by combining the adjacent development traffic and background traffic derived through the application of a growth rate as discussed previously.

**Exhibit 5** and **Exhibit 6** present the future background traffic volumes anticipated for the 2023 build-out year, as well as the 2028 study horizon, respectively.


#### **4.4.2 Future Total Traffic Volumes**

Future total volumes have been derived by combining the site-generated traffic from **Exhibit 4** with the future background volumes from **Exhibit 5** and **Exhibit 6**.

**Exhibit 7** and **Exhibit 8** present the future total traffic volumes anticipated for 2023 and 2028 analysis years, respectively.



NORTH



**LEGEND**



Permitted Movements




Weekday AM (PM) Peak Hour Vehicular Volume





NORTH



**LEGEND**



Permitted Movements




Weekday AM (PM) Peak Hour Vehicular Volume





NORTH



**LEGEND**



Permitted Movements




Weekday AM (PM) Peak Hour Vehicular Volume





NORTH



**LEGEND**



Permitted Movements



Weekday AM (PM) Peak Hour Vehicular Volume



## 5 Analysis

### 5.1 Development Design

#### 5.1.1 Design for Sustainable Modes

The proposed development is located an approximate 600m walking distance from an existing bus stop at the corner of Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive, assuming that transit users cross Fallowfield Road at Strandherd Drive. The RMA for the Fallowfield Road & Forager Street intersection indicates that a new southbound bus stop will be constructed on Fallowfield Road south of O’Keefe Court, thereby reducing the walking distance to transit to approximately 200m.

The TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist as well as the TDM Measures Checklist were completed and are provided in **Appendix G**. These checklists identify anticipated measures that are being considered in association with the proposed development to offset the vehicular impact on the adjacent road network.

#### 5.1.2 Circulation and Access

A separate loading bay has been provided for each building on the site, as shown in **Exhibit 2**, which have been designed to accommodate a standard delivery vehicle.

Separate waste collection locations have also been provided for each building on the site, as shown in **Exhibit 2**. A loading bay near each garbage location will provide space for a standard waste collection vehicle to park while workers collect the waste.

#### 5.1.3 New Street Networks

Not Applicable: The New Street Networks element is exempt from this TIA, as defined in the study scope. This element is not required for Site Plan Control applications.

### 5.2 Parking

#### 5.2.1 Parking Supply

Based on the size of the proposed restaurant and medical office, a minimum of 45 vehicle parking spaces are required to meet the Zoning Bylaw requirements. The site plan indicates that 54 vehicle parking spaces will be provided, therefore the proposed parking supply is within the permissible range.

The Zoning Bylaw also requires a minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each land use within the subject development. A total of five bicycle parking spaces will be provided, exceeding the three spaces required.

#### 5.2.2 Spillover Parking

The minimum parking supply requirement specified in the Zoning Bylaw has been met, therefore, no further review of parking is necessary for the purposes of this study.

### 5.3 Boundary Streets

There are three existing boundary streets adjacent to the proposed development: Lusk Street, Forager Street and Fallowfield Road. As discussed in Section 3.4, segment-based MMLOS analysis will be limited to Fallowfield Road between Forager and O’Keefe/ Cobble Hill.



Both Lusk Street and Forager Street are classified as local roads, and were recently constructed in accordance with the latest City road design standards, therefore no Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) analysis is provided for either road segment. Given their classification as ‘local’ roads, both are in essence Complete Streets, as they provide sufficient facilities for active and motorized modes of travel. Concrete sidewalks 2.0 metres in width are proposed along one side of each local road. A sidewalk is provided along the proposed development’s frontage on Lusk Street, which will continue across the site access driveway, while the sidewalk on Forager Street will be constructed on the north side of the road, opposite the development. As such, the inclusion of site access driveways along Lusk Street and Forager Street are not anticipated to negatively impact the design of either local road.

### 5.3.1 Mobility

Segment-based Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) results for Fallowfield Road between Forager Street and O’Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive are provided in **Table 11** below.

Details of the MMLOS analysis are provided in **Appendix H**.

Table 11 - Segment MMLOS Results

LOCATION	LEVEL OF SERVICE BY MODE			
	PEDESTRIAN (PLOS)	BICYCLE (BLOS)	TRANSIT (TLOS)	TRUCK (TkLOS)
<b>SEGMENTS</b>				
Fallowfield Road – Forager Street to O’Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive	<b>F</b> (Target: C)	<b>F</b> (Target: C)	<b>D</b> (Target: D)	<b>C</b> (Target: E)

Based on the above, this segment of Fallowfield Road is not currently meeting its pedestrian and bicycle level of service targets. The following measures have been identified which could help achieve these targets:

- A reduction in operating speeds to 60 km/h or less;
- A 2.0m wide sidewalk separated from the road with a minimum 2.0m wide boulevard on either side of Fallowfield Road or the implementation of a multi-use path; and
- Bike lanes on both sides of Fallowfield Road or physically separated cycling facilities such as multi-use pathways.

As discussed previously, the approved RMA includes the planned implementation of a multi-use pathway along the west side of Fallowfield Road and a southbound bus stop on Fallowfield Road near the O’Keefe Court intersection, which should help to significantly improve both the PLOS and BLOS.

### 5.3.2 Road Safety

A summary of all reported collisions within the study period over the past 5 years was presented in the Scoping section of this TIA. The City requires a safety review if at least six collisions for any one movement or of a discernible pattern, over a five-year period have occurred. Based on the review of re-occurring events identified in the Scoping section of this report, none of the study area roadway segments or intersections require further analysis.

## 5.4 Access Intersections

### 5.4.1 Location and Design of Access

The proposed development will provide two new full-movement access intersections: one on Lusk Street and the other on Forager Street. The proposed site access driveways are in conformance with the City of Ottawa Private Approach By-law 2003-447, with particular confirmation of the following items:

- Width: A private approach should have a minimum width of 2.4m and a maximum width of 9.0m.
  - Both site access driveways will be 6.7m wide. ✓
- Distance from Intersecting Road: For a commercial development on or within 46m of an arterial or major collector with between 50 and 99 parking spaces, the proposed private approach must be at least 30 metres from the nearest intersecting street line.
  - The proposed access on Forager Street is approximately 45m from the nearest intersecting street line at Fallowfield Road and is therefore in compliance with the by-law.
- Quantity and Spacing of Private Approaches: For sites with frontage between 46 and 150 metres, one (1) two-way and two (2) one-way, or two (2) two-way private approaches are permitted. Any two private approaches must be separated by at least 9.0m and can be reduced to 2.0m in the case of two one-way driveways. On lots that abut more than one roadway, these provisions apply to each frontage separately.
  - The frontage on Lusk Street is 46m and therefore the single proposed two-way private approach is compliant with the by-law. ✓
  - The frontage on Forager Street is 73m and therefore the single proposed two-way private approach is compliant with the by-law. ✓
- Distance from Property Line: Private approaches must be at least 3.0m from the abutting property line, however this requirement can be reduced to 0.3m provided that the access is a safe distance from the access serving the adjacent property, sight lines are adequate and that it does not create a traffic hazard.
  - Both proposed private approaches exceed the minimum distance required. ✓
- Grade of Private Approach: The grade of a private approach serving a parking area of more than 50 spaces must not exceed 2% within the private property for a distance of 9m from the highway/curb line.
  - The grade of both private approaches will not exceed 2% within 9m of the curb line. ✓

The Transportation Association of Canada's (TAC) Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads (June 2017) does not suggest a minimum clear throat length for site access driveways proposed on local roads. The clear throat length is provided to ensure that any queues that form due to on-site circulation blockages do not spillback onto collector and arterial roads. Given the low traffic volumes typically expected on local roads such as Lusk and Forager, occasional queue spillback is not likely to result in traffic operational issues.

### 5.4.2 Access Intersection Control

The proposed site access driveways on Lusk Street and Forager Street will both be stop-controlled, which is expected to be sufficient given the low site-generated traffic volumes presented in the Forecasting section of this report.

### **5.4.3 Intersection Design (MMLOS)**

Not Applicable – Both proposed site access driveways will be unsignalized, therefore Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) analysis is not required.

## **5.5 Transportation Demand Management (TDM)**

Not Applicable – The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) element is exempt from this TIA, as defined in the study scope. This element is not required for non-residential site plans that are projected to have fewer than 60 employees and/or students on location at any given time.

Based on the employee densities indicated in the *ITE Parking Generation Manual (4<sup>th</sup> Edition)* for the restaurant and medical office land uses, it is anticipated that there will only be up to 36 employees on site at any given time. As such, the TDM element is not required.

### **5.5.1 Context for TDM**

Not Applicable.

### **5.5.2 Need and Opportunity**

Not Applicable.

### **5.5.3 TDM Program**

Not Applicable.

## **5.6 Neighbourhood Traffic Management**

### **5.6.1 Adjacent Neighbourhoods**

The proposed development relies on the following collector or lower-classification roads for access to the arterial road network: O’Keefe Court, Lusk Street and Forager Street. With the development of the 4401 Fallowfield Road Subdivision lands, O’Keefe Court is expected to function as a collector road, while Lusk Street and Forager Street will operate as local roads. To determine if neighbourhood traffic management measures are required, traffic volumes projected in the study horizon year are compared against the appropriate liveability thresholds, as prescribed in the TIA Guidelines.

The livability threshold for a local road is 120 vehicles per hour. Based on Future (2028) Total Traffic volumes, Lusk Street and Forager Street will be required to accommodate up to 56 and 40 vehicles per hour, respectively, during the weekday afternoon peak hour. As such, both local roads are anticipated to operate well below the 120 vehicle per hour threshold within the timeframe of this study.

Total traffic volume projections along O’Keefe Court indicate that it may slightly exceed its threshold of 300 vehicles per hour during the weekday afternoon peak hour, with up to 315 vehicles approaching Fallowfield Road. It should be noted, however, that it is not uncommon for a collector road to exceed this threshold approaching an arterial road, and that two-way volumes on O’Keefe Court through the remainder of the study area are expected operate within this threshold. As such, a neighbourhood traffic management plan will not be required for this TIA.

## 5.7 Transit

### 5.7.1 Route Capacity

The estimated future site-generated transit passenger demand was provided in the Forecasting component of this study. The results have been summarized in **Table 12** below.

Table 12 - Development Generated Transit Demand

PERIOD	PEAK PERIOD DEMAND	
	IN	OUT
AM	0	0
PM	1	0

As indicated in **Table 12** above, the subject development is expected to contribute a negligible increase in transit ridership to the existing transit network, therefore no additional transit capacity will be required to accommodate the proposed development.

### 5.7.1 Transit Priority Measures

Transit priority measures are not required at any of the signalized study area intersections to support the projected travel demands within the timeframe of this study.

## 5.8 Review of Network Concept

Not Applicable – The Network Concept element is exempt from this TIA, as defined in the study scope. This element is not required for proposed developments expected to generate less than 200 person-trips during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours.

## 5.9 Intersection Design

The following sections summarize the methodology and results of the multi-modal intersection capacity analysis conducted within the study area.

### 5.9.1 Intersection Control

#### 5.9.1.1 Traffic Signal Warrants

Traffic signal warrants were completed for the intersection of Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive. Based on the results of the analysis, traffic signals are not warranted at this intersection under Future (2028) Total Traffic conditions.

The results of the traffic signal warrant analysis are provided in **Appendix I**.

#### 5.9.1.2 Roundabout Analysis

The feasibility of implementing a roundabout was evaluated at the intersection of Fallowfield & O’Keefe/ Cobble Hill. It was determined that this form of traffic control would not be feasible, given that only one of the suitability factors had been met.

The results of the Roundabout Feasibility Screening Tool are provided in **Appendix I**.

## 5.9.2 Intersection Analysis Criteria (Automobile)

The following section outlines the City of Ottawa’s methodology for determining motor vehicle Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections.

### 5.9.2.1 Signalized Intersections

In qualitative terms, the Level of Service (LOS) defines operational conditions within a traffic stream and their perception by motorists. A LOS definition generally describes these conditions in terms of such factors as delay, speed and travel time, freedom to manoeuvre, traffic interruptions, safety, comfort and convenience. LOS can also be related to the ratio of the volume to capacity (v/c) which is simply the relationship of the traffic volume (either measured or forecast) to the capability of the intersection or road section to accommodate a given traffic volume. This capability varies depending on the factors described above. LOS are given letter designations from ‘A’ to ‘F’. LOS ‘A’ represents the best operating conditions and LOS ‘E’ represents the level at which the intersection or an approach to the intersection is carrying the maximum traffic volume that can, practicably, be accommodated. LOS ‘F’ indicates that the intersection is operating beyond its theoretical capacity.

The City of Ottawa has developed criteria as part of the Transportation Impact Assessment Guidelines, which directly relate the volume to capacity (v/c) ratio of a signalized intersection to a LOS designation. These criteria are as follows:

Table 13 - LOS Criteria for Signalized Intersections

LOS	VOLUME TO CAPACITY RATIO (v/c)
A	0 to 0.60
B	0.61 to 0.70
C	0.71 to 0.80
D	0.81 to 0.90
E	0.91 to 1.00
F	> 1.00

The intersection capacity analysis technique provides an indication of the LOS for each movement at the intersection under consideration and for the intersection as a whole. The overall v/c ratio for an intersection is defined as the sum of equivalent volumes for all critical movements at the intersection divided by the sum of capacities for all critical movements.

The Level of Service calculation is based on locally-specific parameters as described in the TIA Guidelines and incorporates existing signal timing plans obtained from the City of Ottawa. The analysis existing conditions utilized a Peak Hour Factor (PHF) of 0.90, while future conditions considers optimized signal timing plans and use of a Peak Hour Factor (PHF) of 1.0 to recognize peak spreading beyond a 15-minute period in congested conditions.

### 5.9.2.2 Unsignalized Intersections

The capacity of an unsignalized intersection can also be expressed in terms of the LOS it provides. For an unsignalized intersection, the Level of Service is defined in terms of the average movement delays at the intersection. This is defined as the total elapsed time from when a vehicle stops at the end of the queue until the vehicle departs from the stop line; this includes the time required for

a vehicle to travel from the last-in-queue position to the first-in-queue position. The average delay for any particular minor movement at the un-signalized intersection is a function of the capacity of the approach and the degree of saturation.

The Highway Capacity Manual 2010 (HCM), prepared by the Transportation Research Board, includes the following Levels of Service criteria for un-signalized intersections, related to average movement delays at the intersection, as indicated in **Table 14**.

Table 14 - LOS Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections

LOS	DELAY (seconds)
A	<10
B	>10 and <15
C	>15 and <25
D	>25 and <35
E	>35 and <50
F	>50

The unsignalized intersection capacity analysis technique included in the HCM and used in the current study provides an indication of the Level of Service for each movement of the intersection under consideration. By this technique, the performance of the unsignalized intersection can be compared under varying traffic scenarios, using the Level of Service concept in a qualitative sense. One unsignalized intersection can be compared with another unsignalized intersection using this concept. Level of Service 'E' represents the capacity of the movement under consideration and generally, in large urban areas, Level of Service 'D' is considered to represent an acceptable operating condition. Level of Service 'E' is considered an acceptable operating condition for planning purposes for intersections located within Ottawa's Urban Core the downtown and its vicinity). Level of Service 'F' indicates that the movement is operating beyond its design capacity.

### 5.9.3 Intersection Capacity Analysis

Following the established intersection capacity analysis criteria described above, the existing and future conditions are analyzed during the weekday peak hour traffic volumes derived in this study.

The following section presents the results of the intersection capacity analysis. All tables summarize study area intersection LOS results during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hour periods.

The Synchro output files have been provided in **Appendix J**.

#### 5.9.3.1 Existing (2019) Traffic

An intersection capacity analysis has been undertaken using the Existing (2019) Traffic volumes presented in **Figure 3**, yielding the following results:

Table 15 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: Existing (2019) Traffic

INTERSECTION	TRAFFIC CONTROL	AM PEAK HOUR		PM PEAK HOUR	
		OVERALL LOS (V/C OR DELAY)	CRITICAL MOVEMENTS (V/C OR DELAY)	OVERALL LOS (V/C OR DELAY)	CRITICAL MOVEMENTS (V/C OR DELAY)
Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive	Unsignalized	D (28.2s)	EBL (28.2s)	D (26.5s)	EBL (26.5s)

Based on the above, the intersection of Fallowfield & O’Keefe/ Cobble Hill is operating at an acceptable level of service (LOS ‘D’ or better) under Existing Traffic conditions.

**5.9.3.2 Future (2023) Background Traffic**

An intersection capacity analysis has been undertaken using the Future (2023) Background Traffic volumes presented in **Exhibit 5**, yielding the following results:

Table 16 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: 2023 Background Traffic

INTERSECTION	TRAFFIC CONTROL	AM PEAK HOUR		PM PEAK HOUR	
		OVERALL LOS (V/C OR DELAY)	CRITICAL MOVEMENTS (V/C OR DELAY)	OVERALL LOS (V/C OR DELAY)	CRITICAL MOVEMENTS (V/C OR DELAY)
Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive	Unsignalized	<b>F (83.6s)</b>	<b>WBTRL (83.6s)</b>	<b>F (104.6s)</b>	<b>EBL (104.6s)</b>
	Signalized	A (0.51)	WBTRL (0.56)	A (0.54)	EBL (0.60)
Lusk Street & O’Keefe Court	Unsignalized	A (8.5s)	NBRL (8.5s)	A (9.2s)	NBRL (9.2s)
Fallowfield Road & Forager Street	Unsignalized	B (13.8s)	EBR (13.8s)	B (14.7s)	EBR (14.7s)

By 2023, it is expected that the Fallowfield & O’Keefe/ Cobble Hill intersection will operate over its theoretical capacity as a stop-controlled intersection under background traffic conditions. Analysis indicates that signalization of the intersection will be required to achieve an acceptable level of service (LOS ‘D’ or better) during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours.

The intersections of Lusk Street & O’Keefe Court and Fallowfield Road & Forager Street were shown to operate at Level of Service ‘C’ or better as two-way stop-controlled intersections, which is well within acceptable standards.

**5.9.3.3 Future (2028) Background Traffic**

An intersection capacity analysis has been undertaken using the Future (2028) Background Traffic volumes presented in **Exhibit 6**, yielding the following results:

Table 17 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: 2028 Background Traffic

INTERSECTION	TRAFFIC CONTROL	AM PEAK HOUR		PM PEAK HOUR	
		OVERALL LOS (V/C OR DELAY)	CRITICAL MOVEMENTS (V/C OR DELAY)	OVERALL LOS (V/C OR DELAY)	CRITICAL MOVEMENTS (V/C OR DELAY)
Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive	Signalized	A (0.59)	SBT (0.60)	A (0.59)	EBL (0.60)
Lusk Street & O'Keefe Court	Unsignalized	A (8.5s)	NBRL (8.5s)	A (9.2s)	NBRL (9.2s)
Fallowfield Road & Forager Street	Unsignalized	C (16.8s)	EBR (16.8s)	C (15.8s)	EBR (15.8s)

All study area intersections are expected to operate acceptably (LOS 'D' or better) under Future (2028) Background Traffic conditions, with the Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive intersection signalized.

**5.9.3.4 Future (2023) Total Traffic**

An intersection capacity analysis has been undertaken using the Future (2023) Total Traffic volumes presented in **Exhibit 7**, yielding the following results:

Table 18 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: 2023 Total Traffic

INTERSECTION	TRAFFIC CONTROL	AM PEAK HOUR		PM PEAK HOUR	
		OVERALL LOS (V/C OR DELAY)	CRITICAL MOVEMENTS (V/C OR DELAY)	OVERALL LOS (V/C OR DELAY)	CRITICAL MOVEMENTS (V/C OR DELAY)
Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive	Signalized	A (0.51)	WBTRL (0.56)	A (0.56)	EBL (0.62)
Lusk Street & O'Keefe Court	Unsignalized	A (8.5s)	NBRL (8.5s)	A (9.3s)	NBRL (9.3s)
Fallowfield Road & Forager Street	Unsignalized	B (13.8s)	EBR (13.8s)	B (14.8s)	EBR (14.8s)

Based on the above results, all study area intersections are expected to operate at Level of Service 'B' or better with the addition of site-generated traffic, provided that the intersection of Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive is signalized.

**5.9.3.5 Future (2028) Total Traffic**

An intersection capacity analysis has been undertaken using the Future (2028) Total Traffic volumes presented in **Exhibit 8**, yielding the following results:



Table 19 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: 2028 Total Traffic

INTERSECTION	TRAFFIC CONTROL	AM PEAK HOUR		PM PEAK HOUR	
		OVERALL LOS (V/C OR DELAY)	CRITICAL MOVEMENTS (V/C OR DELAY)	OVERALL LOS (V/C OR DELAY)	CRITICAL MOVEMENTS (V/C OR DELAY)
Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive	Signalized	A (0.59)	SBT (0.60)	B (0.62)	SBT (0.65)
Lusk Street & O'Keefe Court	Unsignalized	A (8.5s)	NBRL (8.5s)	A (9.3s)	NBRL (9.3s)
Fallowfield Road & Forager Street	Unsignalized	C (16.8s)	EBR (16.8s)	C (16.0s)	EBR (16.0s)

All study area intersections are expected to operate at a Level of Service of 'C' or better under Future (2028) Total Traffic conditions without any additional intersection modifications beyond what was required to accommodate background traffic volumes.

#### 5.9.4 Intersection Design (MMLOS)

Analysis of conditions for each mode has been conducted based on the methodology prescribed in the City of Ottawa Multi-Modal Level of Service Guidelines. The Level of Service for each mode has been calculated for each intersection where signals exist or are anticipated.

The Future (2028) Total Traffic intersection MMLOS results have been summarized in **Table 20**. Detailed analysis results for existing and future conditions are provided **Appendix H**.

Table 20 - Intersection MMLOS - Future Conditions

LOCATION	LEVEL OF SERVICE BY MODE			
	PEDESTRIAN (PLOS)	BICYCLE (BLOS)	TRANSIT (TLOS)	TRUCK (TkLOS)
<b>INTERSECTIONS</b>				
Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive	<b>E</b> (Target: C)	<b>F</b> (Target: C)	<b>B</b> (Target: D)	<b>F</b> (Target: E)

##### 5.9.4.1 Summary of Potential Improvements

Based on the MMLOS results outlined in **Table 20** above, the following measures have been identified that could improve conditions for each travel mode:

###### Pedestrians

The PLOS at intersections is based on several factors including the number of traffic lanes that pedestrians must cross, corner radii, and whether the crossing allows for permissive or protective right or left turns, among others. The City of Ottawa minimum target for PLOS is 'C'.

The results of the analysis indicate that the intersection of Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive is expected to experience a PLOS of 'E' primarily due to the level of traffic exposure pedestrians crossing the north/south approaches will experience in combination with the

pedestrian delays. Providing enhanced pedestrian features such as a median, pedestrian leading interval, zebra stripe high-visibility crosswalk markings on the north and south approaches would reduce the level of pedestrian exposure on those crossings. The above features in combination with a reduced cycle length from the standard length of 120s to 70s would achieve a PLOS of 'C'. It should be noted, however, that a reduction in the cycle length may result in negative impacts to the vehicle level of service. Alternatively, design of the intersection as a 'protected intersection' will help attain the PLOS target.

### Cyclists

The BLOS at intersections is dependent on several factors: the number of lanes that the cyclist is required to cross to make a left-turn; the presence of a dedicated right-turn lane on the approach; and the operating speed of each approach. The City target for BLOS is 'C'.

The results of the analysis indicate that cycling facilities at the Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive intersection are not sufficient to achieve the BLOS target. Given the high operating speeds at this location, only the provision of physically separated cycling facilities with two-stage, left-turn bike boxes on all approaches will be sufficient to achieve the BLOS target. Alternatively, design of the intersection as a 'protected intersection' will help attain the BLOS target.

### Transit

Intersection TLOS is based on the average signal delay experienced by transit vehicles at each intersection. The City Target TLOS is 'D'.

The results of the analysis indicate that the eastbound and westbound approaches are expected to experience average delays between 20 and 45 seconds during the weekday peak hours, however as there are no transit routes that utilize either approach, neither is factored into the TLOS calculation. Both the northbound and southbound approaches do currently serve as transit routes and are expected to experience minimal average delays of 10s or less, therefore the overall intersection TLOS is 'B' and well within the City's target.

### Trucks

The Truck LOS (TkLOS) is based on the right-turn radii, as well as the number of receiving lanes for vehicles making a right-turn from the traffic lane being analyzed. The City of Ottawa target for TKLOS is 'E'.

Overall, the intersection TkLOS target is not attainable as a result of the tight right-turn radii to/from Cobble Hill Drive. Turning movement count data indicates that trucks infrequently utilize Cobble Hill, which is consistent with its classification as a local road and non-truck route. Given that its primary function is to provide access to adjacent residential subdivisions, the substandard right-turn radii is considered acceptable in this context. It should be noted that the right-turn radii to/from O'Keefe Court meets the TkLOS target, which is appropriate given that the Highway 416 Lands development is classified is expected to generate regular truck traffic.

The recommended measures listed above are intended only as suggestions to the City on how the MMLOS within the study area could be improved and do not identify measures to be implemented as a direct consequence of this development. The remediation measures described above would improve mobility and comfort for cyclists but are not required to accommodate the proposed development.

## 5.10 Geometric Review

The following section provides a review of all geometric requirements for the study area intersections.

### 5.10.1 Sight Distance and Corner Clearances

The Lusk Street site access driveway is located on the outside of a horizontal curve which should afford this access favorable sightlines upstream and downstream of the intersection, while the Forager Street site access driveway is located on a short, straight segment with no significant horizontal or vertical curves. Despite its curvilinear alignment, the Lusk Street access allows for visibility in excess of the 85-metre distance required by TAC for road with a 60km/h design speed. Given that Forager Street is approximately 80m in length, vehicular are not expected to reach high operating speeds (i.e. 60 km/h) within such a short distance. Provided that vegetation is kept clear of the intersection sightlines, sight distances and corner clearances are not expected to be a concern for either of the proposed development's site access driveways.

### 5.10.2 Auxiliary Lane Analyses

Auxiliary turning lane requirements for all study area intersections are described as follows:

#### 5.10.2.1 Auxiliary Left-Turn Lane Requirements (Unsignalized)

The intersection of O'Keefe Court & Lusk Street does not warrant a left-turn lane based on the advancing and opposing volumes projected at this intersection under Future (2028) Total Traffic conditions.

The future intersection configuration per the approved RMA will restrict the Fallowfield & Forager intersection to right-in/ right-out movements, therefore it was not necessary to assess left-turn lane requirements at this intersection.

The results of the left-turn lane warrant analysis are provided in **Appendix K**.

#### 5.10.2.2 Auxiliary Left-Turn Lane Requirements (Signalized)

A review of auxiliary left-turn lane storage requirements was completed at all signalized intersections within the study area under Future (2028) Total Traffic conditions. The review compared the projected 95th percentile queue lengths from Synchro operational results, and the standard queue length calculation based on the following equation:

$$\text{Storage Length} = \frac{NL}{C} \times 1.5$$

Where:

$N$  = number of vehicles per hour

$L$  = Length occupied by a vehicle in the queue = 7 m

$C$  = number of traffic signal cycles per hour

The results of the auxiliary left-turn lane analysis are summarized below in **Table 21** below.

Table 21 - Auxiliary Left-Turn Storage Analysis at Signalized Intersections

INTERSECTION	APPROACH	95TH %ILE QUEUE LENGTH (M)	CALCULATED QUEUE LENGTH (M)	EXISTING PARALLEL LENGTH (M)	STORAGE DEFICIENCY (M)
Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive	NB	5	10	140	Existing Storage Adequate
	SB	5	0	60	Existing Storage Adequate
	EB	25	10	50	Existing Storage Adequate
	WB	30 <sup>1</sup>	5	-	Existing Storage Adequate <sup>2</sup>

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Synchro queues were determined based on existing shared lane configuration  
<sup>2</sup> Through volumes are nominal during weekday peak hours (i.e. less than 10 veh/h)

As per the results of the queue length analyses presented

**Table 21** above, the existing parallel lanes have sufficient storage to accommodate the projected Future (2028) Total Traffic demand. No modifications to the existing auxiliary lanes are required within the timeframe of this study.

Synchro results indicate that with the existing shared through-left configuration, queue lengths during the weekday peak hours would be at most 16 and 27 metres on the eastbound and westbound approaches, respectively, under Future (2028) Total Traffic conditions. Queue lengths of this magnitude can be considered within an acceptable range for spillback on a through lane given the nominal through volumes of less than 10 vehicles per hour expected on these movements during the weekday peak hours.

#### ***5.10.2.3 Auxiliary Right-Turn Lane Requirements (Unsignalized)***

The Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) suggests that auxiliary right-turn lanes be considered “when the volume of decelerating or accelerating vehicles compared with through vehicles causes undue hazard.” Consideration for auxiliary right-turn lanes is typically given when the right-turning traffic exceeds 10% of the through volume and is at least 60 vehicles per hour.

The RMA for the Fallowfield/ Forager intersection has been designed with a parallel lane that includes sufficient deceleration length. No storage is required on this lane.

#### ***5.10.2.4 Auxiliary Right-Turn Lane Requirements (Signalized)***

Similarly for signalized intersections, Section 9.14 of TAC suggests that auxiliary right-turn lanes shall be considered when more than 10% of vehicles on an approach are turning right and when the peak hour demand exceeds 60 vehicles. The purpose of this guideline is to mitigate operational impacts to through-traffic, particularly on high-speed arterial roadways such as Fallowfield Road, and may not be applicable in all circumstances.

The results of the auxiliary right-turn lane analysis are summarized in **Table 22** below:

Table 22 – Auxiliary Right-Turn Lane Storage Analysis at Signalized Intersections

INTERSECTION	APPROACH	RIGHT TURN VOLUME	APPROACH VEHICLES TURNING RIGHT (%)	95TH %ILE QUEUE LENGTH (M)	EXISTING PARALLEL LENGTH (M)	STORAGE DEFICIENCY (M)
Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court/ Cobble Hill Drive	NB	23	3%	<10	115	Existing Storage Adequate
	SB	88	9%	<10	25	Existing Storage Adequate
	EB	114	51%	20 <sup>1</sup>	-	Existing Storage Adequate <sup>2</sup>
	WB	42	48%	30 <sup>1</sup>	-	Existing Storage Adequate <sup>2</sup>

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Synchro queues were determined based on existing shared lane configuration  
<sup>2</sup> Through volumes are nominal during weekday peak hours (i.e. less than 10 veh/h)

Although the eastbound and westbound approaches technically meet the criteria for a right-turn lane, the through volumes on these approaches were observed to be nominal (i.e. 10 vehicles or less) during the weekday peak hours. Synchro results indicate that with the existing shared through-right configuration, queue lengths during the weekday peak hours would be at most 16 and 27 metres on the eastbound and westbound approaches, respectively, under Future (2028) Total Traffic conditions. Queue lengths of this magnitude can be considered within an acceptable range for spillback on a through lane given the nominal through volumes expected. Further, the right-turn criteria is typically more applicable along high-speed arterial roads and is not considered appropriate in this context.

Based on the traffic volumes projections developed for this TIA, no additional right-turn facilities are required as a result of projected background or site-generated volumes at signalized study area intersections.

## 5.11 Summary of Improvements Indicated and Modification Options

As per the intersection capacity, Multi-Modal Level of Service and auxiliary lane analyses results presented above, off-site improvements to the adjacent road network have been recommended in order to accommodate the transportation demands of both background and site-generated traffic. The MMLOS results indicate existing deficiencies with respect user comfort and safety that could be considered for implementation by the City but are not required to safely accommodate the proposed development.

### 5.11.1 Fallowfield Road & O’Keefe Court/ Cobble Hill Drive

The intersection of Fallowfield & O’Keefe/ Cobble Hill is presently operating as a two-way stop-controlled intersection. The results of the analysis indicates that, by 2023, traffic signals will be operationally required under background traffic conditions, however traffic signals are not warranted within the timeframe of this study. As indicated in **Exhibit 4**, the proposed development

is only expected to contribute nominal volumes at this intersection. With traffic signals in place, the intersection would be expected to operate at an acceptable level of service (i.e. LOS 'B') under Future (2028) Total Traffic conditions. It is recommended that the City monitor this intersection on an annual basis to determine the appropriate timing for its signalization.

An analysis of auxiliary lane requirements found that auxiliary lane storage at this intersection is sufficient and can accommodate future travel demands within the context of this study.

Based on the MMLOS analysis, in order to meet the Pedestrian Level of Service and Bicycle Level of Service targets, various measures would need to be implemented. To attain the PLOS target, zebra stripe high-visibility crosswalk markings, a pedestrian leading interval and a median on the northbound/ southbound approaches are required in conjunction with a reduce cycle length to satisfy the Pedestrian Delay Evaluation. The implementation of bike lanes or higher-order cycling facilities on all approaches, along with two-stage, left-turn bike boxes are required to meet the BLOS targets. Alternatively, design of the intersection as a 'protected intersection' with fully-integrated pedestrian and cycling facilities will help attain the PLOS and BLOS targets. These features should be considered by the City upon signalization of this intersection but are not required to accommodate the proposed development.

### **5.11.2 O'Keefe Court & Lusk Street**

O'Keefe Court & Lusk Street is a new three-legged intersection that is expected to operate at a high level of service (i.e. LOS 'A') beyond the horizon year of this study with stop control on Lusk Street and free-flow along O'Keefe Court.

Analysis indicated that left- or right-turn auxiliary lanes are not required on any of the intersection approaches within the timeframe of this study.

### **5.11.3 Fallowfield Road & Forager Street**

Fallowfield Road & Forager Street is a new three-legged intersection with an approved RMA intended to restrict movements to right-in/right-out. With these turning restrictions in place, the intersection is anticipated to operate at LOS 'C' or better within the timeframe of this study.

## 6 Conclusion

The proposed restaurant and medical office development at 115 Lusk Street is expected to generate up to 13 and 32 two-way vehicular trips during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively. These traffic volumes were distributed amongst two site access driveways, representing a marginal increase in traffic volumes with respect to the overall traffic projections expected within the 2028 study horizon year. The mode share targets were based on the South Nepean Traffic Assessment Zone (TAZ) and proportionally adjusted, in accordance with the Conditions of Approval for 4401 Fallowfield Road to yield an 85% auto/ 15% non-auto mode share split. It should also be noted that this study did not apply any pass-by reductions factors to the restaurant's trip generation, as it was determined that the overall impact on the adjacent road network would be minimal.

The intersection of Fallowfield & O'Keefe/ Cobble Hill is presently operating as a two-way stop controlled intersection. The results of the analysis indicate that, by 2023, traffic signals will be operationally required under background traffic conditions, however signals are not warranted within the timeframe of this study. With traffic signals in place, the intersection would be expected to operate at LOS 'B' beyond the study horizon year. As site-generated traffic will not contribute significantly to any potential traffic operational issues at this intersection, it is recommended that the City continue monitoring this intersection on an annual basis to determine the appropriate timing for the introduction of traffic signals.

The results of the analysis indicate that the intersections of O'Keefe Court & Lusk Street and Fallowfield Road & Forager Street are expected to operate within acceptable standards (LOS 'D' or better) during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours. Both are T-intersections that are configured with stop control on the minor road and do not warrant auxiliary lanes or future modifications to intersection control within the timeframe of this study.

A multi-modal analysis identifies deficiencies in the existing road network and potential remediation measures have been suggested in which the City could consider to meet these prescribed targets. It should be noted that, although these measures would improve for a range of transportation modes, they are not required to safely accommodate the transportation demands of the proposed development.

A Roadway Modification Application (RMA-2019-TPD-041B) was recently approved to satisfy a conditional requirement for the 4401 Fallowfield Road Subdivision. The RMA includes the right-in/right-out intersection at Fallowfield Road & Forager Street, a multi-use pathway along the west side of Fallowfield Road and a southbound bus stop on Fallowfield Road near the O'Keefe Court intersection. As there is already an approved RMA intended to address the implementation of the above noted design elements and no off-site geometric improvements are required as a direct result of the proposed development, an RMA will not be included with the submission of this Transportation Impact Assessment.

All study area intersections were shown to operate well within the capacity constraints of the adjacent transportation network, with the appropriate modifications in place (i.e. signalization of Fallowfield & O'Keefe/ Cobble Hill by 2023). Further, the proposed development will contribute a negligible volume of traffic to the adjacent road network. A post-development Monitoring Plan is, therefore, not a requirement of this study.

**Based on the findings of this study, it is the overall opinion of IBI Group that the proposed development will integrate well with and can be safely accommodated by the adjacent transportation network with the recommended actions and modifications in place.**



## Appendix A – City Circulation Comments

---

## Step 1 & 2 Submission (Screening & Scoping) – Circulation Comments & Response

Report Submitted: October 29, 2019

Comments Received: November 1, 2019

Transportation Project Manager: Josiane Gervais

### Module 2.3 - Exceptions Review

Table 4: Possible Exemptions

Module	Element	Exemption Considerations
4.5 Transportation Demand Management	All elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not required for non-residential site plans expected to have fewer than 60 employees and/or students on location at any given time – <b>Please confirm how many employees are envisioned for the site.</b></li> </ul>

- The exact number of employees envisioned for the site is not available yet. However, the ITE Parking Generation Manual (4<sup>th</sup> Edition) provides average employee densities for a variety of land uses. The average employee densities relevant to this site are as follows:
  - Office (ITE Land Use 701): 3.4 employees / 1000 ft<sup>2</sup>
  - Quality Restaurant (ITE Land Use 931): 4.2 employees / 1000 ft<sup>2</sup>
 The medical office and restaurant will be 600 m<sup>2</sup> (6458 ft<sup>2</sup>) and 300 m<sup>2</sup> (3229 ft<sup>2</sup>), respectively, which, when multiplied by their respective employee densities, results in a total of 36 employees for both land uses combined. The Transportation Demand Management module is therefore exempt from the study.

### Step 3 Submission (Forecasting) – Circulation Comments & Response

Report Submitted: December 31, 2019

Comments Received: January 17, 2020

Transportation Project Manager: Josiane Gervais

#### Transportation Engineering Services

- Consider increasing the walking mode share at ultimate build-out (while staying below the 15% non-auto mode outlined within the subdivision conditions). Once O'Keefe/Fallowfield is signalized, there may be a few more walking trips to the development.
  - **IBI Response: The mode share targets for 2023 and 2028 have been separated, with the 2028 analysis year adjusted to reflect a higher pedestrian mode share anticipated by this time. The 15% non-auto mode share target in 2028 will be stratified as follows: 2% transit, 0% cycling, 13% walking and 0% other mode share target. The mode share targets for 2023 have not been modified.**
- Provide the number of trips from the other developments in a table.
  - **IBI Response: A table has been added in Section 4.2.3 summarizing the number of trips generated by each adjacent development.**

#### Traffic Signal Operations

- No comments.

#### Development Review Transportation


- No comments.

## Appendix B – Screening Form

---


City of Ottawa 2017 TIA Guidelines Screening Form

1. Description of Proposed Development

Municipal Address	115 Lusk Street
Description of Location	<p>South Nepean – North of Strandherd Drive, West of Fallowfield Road and east of Highway 416</p> 
Land Use Classification	Quality Restaurant and Medical Office
Development Size (units)	N/A
Development Size (m <sup>2</sup> )	<p>Quality Restaurant – 300 m<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Medical Office – 600 m<sup>2</sup></p>
Number of Accesses and Locations	<p>One (1) access off of Lusk Street</p> <p>One (1) access off of Forager Street</p>
Phase of Development	Single Phase
Buildout Year	2023 (Assumed)

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

Proposed Development:



## 2. Trip Generation Trigger

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

Land Use Type	Minimum Development Size
Single-family homes	40 units
Townhomes or apartments	90 units
Office	3,500 m <sup>2</sup>
Industrial	5,000 m <sup>2</sup>
Fast-food restaurant or coffee shop	100 m <sup>2</sup>
Destination retail	1,000 m <sup>2</sup>
Gas station or convenience market	75 m <sup>2</sup>

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

Preliminary trip generation estimates were calculated based on average trip generation characteristics derived from the applicable land indicated in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation (10<sup>th</sup> Edition), the Quality Restaurant land use (931) and Medical-Dental Office Building land use (720). The 1.28 person-trip conversion factor recommended in the TIA Guidelines was applied to the base trip generation results to obtain the equivalent person-trip generation.

As indicated below, trip generation may slightly exceed the 60 person-trip threshold during the weekday afternoon peak hour, therefore the trip generation trigger is satisfied.

Baseline Vehicle Trips				AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
ITE Land Use	Units	Size		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
720: Medical-Dental Office Bldg	ft2	6458.35	Equation: $T=2.78 \cdot X$				$T=3.46 \cdot X$		
			% Distribution:	62%	38%	100%	39%	61%	100%
			Baseline Vehicle Trips:	11	7	18	9	14	22
931: Quality Restaurant	ft2	3229.17	Equation: $T=0.73 \cdot X$				$T=7.80 \cdot X$		
			% Distribution:	50%	50%	100%	67%	33%	100%
			Baseline Vehicle Trips:	1	1	2	17	8	25
			Subtotal:	12	8	20	26	22	48
Note: Directional distribution is not provided for the Quality Restaurant for the weekday AM Peak Hour, therefore a 50/50 split has been assumed.									
Person Trips				AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
ITE Land Use				In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
720: Medical-Dental Office Bldg		Conversion Factor		1.28			1.28		
				14	9	23	11	17	29
931: Quality Restaurant		Conversion Factor		1.28			1.28		
				2	2	3	22	11	32
			Subtotal:	16	10	26	33	28	61

➤ Based on the results above, the Trip Generation Trigger is satisfied.

### 3. Location Triggers

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

\*DPA and TOD are identified in the City of Ottawa Official Plan (DPA in Section 2.5.1 and Schedules A and B; TOD in Annex 6). See Chapter 4 for a list of City of Ottawa Planning and Engineering documents that support the completion of TIA).

➤ **Based on the results above, the Location Trigger is NOT satisfied.**

### 4. Safety Triggers

	Yes	No
Are posted speed limits on a boundary street are 80 km/hr or greater?		✓
Are there any horizontal/vertical curvatures on a boundary street limits sight lines at a proposed driveway?		✓
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)?		✓
Is the proposed driveway within auxiliary lanes of an intersection?		✓
Does the proposed driveway make use of an existing median break that serves an existing site?		✓
Is there is a documented history of traffic operations or safety concerns on the boundary streets within 500 m of the development?		✓
Does the development include a drive-thru facility?		✓

➤ **Based on the results above, the Safety Trigger is NOT satisfied.**



5. Summary

	Yes	No
Does the development satisfy the Trip Generation Trigger?	✓	
Does the development satisfy the Location Trigger?		✓
Does the development satisfy the Safety Trigger?		✓

**CONCLUSION:** The Trip Generation Trigger is satisfied, therefore a TIA is required.

## Appendix C – Traffic Data

---

Survey Date: Tuesday January 30 2018  
 Weather: Sunny

## TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT SUMMARY - ALL MODES



AM Peak Hour: 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM  
 MD Peak Hour: 12:15 PM to 1:15 PM  
 PM Peak Hour: 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM

AADT FACTOR: 1.1

Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report (Vehicles)																							
Time Period	Fallowfield Road					Fallowfield Road					N/S STREET TOTAL	O'Keefe Court					O'Keefe Court					E/W STREET TOTAL	Grand TOTAL
	Northbound					Southbound						Eastbound					Westbound						
	LT	ST	RT	U-Turns	NB TOTAL	LT	ST	RT	U-Turns	SB TOTAL		LT	ST	RT	U-Turns	EB TOTAL	LT	ST	RT	U-Turns	WB TOTAL		
7:00 8:00	3	488	12	0	503	9	288	3	1	301	804	4	5	8	0	17	33	7	38	0	78	95	899
8:00 9:00	9	923	12	0	944	14	896	11	0	921	1865	6	12	22	0	40	78	12	82	0	172	212	2077
9:00 10:00	7	196	9	0	212	7	243	4	0	254	466	3	3	11	0	17	16	8	20	0	44	61	527
<b>AVG AM Pk HR</b>	6	536	11	0	553	10	476	6	0	492	1045	4	7	14	0	25	42	9	47	0	98	123	1168
11:30 12:30	4	486	9	0	499	5	205	2	0	212	711	2	4	12	0	18	17	4	17	0	38	56	767
12:30 13:30	3	923	14	0	940	10	388	14	0	412	1352	8	5	12	0	25	15	14	29	0	58	83	1435
<b>AVG MD Pk HR</b>	4	705	12	0	720	8	297	8	0	312	1032	5	5	12	0	22	16	9	23	0	48	70	1101
15:00 16:00	8	869	14	0	891	87	461	9	0	557	1448	3	3	9	0	15	13	2	23	0	38	53	1501
16:00 17:00	8	814	16	0	838	16	564	6	0	586	1424	6	2	12	1	21	10	2	21	0	33	54	1478
17:00 18:00	25	239	7	0	271	48	1073	11	0	1132	1403	11	5	26	1	43	19	1	40	0	60	103	1506
<b>AVG PM Pk HR</b>	14	641	12	0	667	50	699	9	0	758	1425	7	3	16	1	26	14	2	28	0	44	70	1495
<b>TOTAL</b>	77	6,178	116	0	6,371	214	4,890	74	1	5,179	11,550	52	50	138	2	242	259	68	340	0	667	909	12,459

<b>EQ 12Hr</b>	107	8588	161	0	8855	297	6797	103	2	7199	16054	73	70	191	3	337	360	95	472	0	927	1264	17318
<b>Note:</b> These volumes are calculated by multiplying the totals by the appropriate expansion factor.											1.39												
<b>AVG 12Hr</b>	117	9446	177	0	9740	326	7477	113	2	7919	17659	80	77	210	3	370	397	104	519	0	1020	1390	19049
<b>Note:</b> These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Equivalent 12 hr. totals by the AADT factor.											1.1												
<b>AVG 24Hr</b>	154	12375	231	0	12760	428	9795	148	3	10373	23134	105	100	276	4	485	519	136	680	0	1336	1821	24955
<b>Note:</b> These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Average Daily 12hr. totals by the 12 to 24 expansion factor.											1.31												

Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report (Pedestrians)																							
Time Period	Fallowfield Road					Fallowfield Road					N/S STREET TOTAL	O'Keefe Court					O'Keefe Court					E/W STREET TOTAL	Grand TOTAL
	NB Approach (East or West Crossing)					SB Approach (East or West Crossing)						EB Approach (North or South Crossing)					WB Approach (North or South Crossing)						
7:00 8:00	0					0					0	0					1					1	1
8:00 9:00	0					0					0	0					0					0	0
9:00 10:00	1					0					1	1					16					17	18
11:30 12:30	0					0					0	0					0					0	0
12:30 13:30	0					1					1	0					0					0	1
15:00 16:00	0					2					2	0					0					0	2
16:00 17:00	0					15					15	0					0					0	15
17:00 18:00	0					0					0	0					0					0	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	1					18					19	1					17					18	37

Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report (Cyclists)																							
Time Period	Fallowfield Road					Fallowfield Road					N/S STREET	O'Keefe Court					O'Keefe Court					E/W STREET	Grand

TIME PERIOD	Northbound	Southbound	STREET TOTAL	Eastbound	Westbound	STREET TOTAL	TOTAL
7:00 8:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8:00 9:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9:00 10:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11:30 12:30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12:30 13:30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15:00 16:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16:00 17:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17:00 18:00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report (Heavy Vehicles)																							
Time Period	Fallowfield Road					Fallowfield Road					N/S STREET TOTAL	O'Keefe Court					O'Keefe Court					E/W STREET TOTAL	Grand TOTAL
	Northbound					Southbound						Eastbound					Westbound						
	LT	ST	RT	U-Turns	NB TOTAL	LT	ST	RT	U-Turns	SB TOTAL		LT	ST	RT	U-Turns	EB TOTAL	LT	ST	RT	U-Turns	WB TOTAL		
7:00 8:00	1	18	0	0	19	0	20	0	0	20	39	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	41
8:00 9:00	0	23	5	0	28	1	18	0	0	19	47	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	3	50
9:00 10:00	0	12	1	0	13	0	36	0	0	36	49	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	3	4	53
11:30 12:30	0	7	2	0	9	0	21	0	0	21	30	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	3	33
12:30 13:30	0	10	0	0	10	0	8	0	0	8	18	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	3	21
15:00 16:00	0	22	1	0	23	0	19	0	0	19	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	6	6	48	
16:00 17:00	0	10	1	0	11	1	22	0	0	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
17:00 18:00	0	6	0	0	6	0	13	0	0	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	21
<b>TOTAL:</b>	1	108	10	0	119	2	157	0	0	159	278	1	2	3	0	6	4	4	9	0	17	23	301

## Appendix D – OC Transpo Routes

---




# 179

## FALLOWFIELD CITIGATE

### Local

**Monday to Friday / Lundi au vendredi**  
Peak periods only  
Périodes de pointe seulement

**FALLOWFIELD**



**CITIGATE**



Transitway & Station



Some trips / Quelques trajets



Park & Ride / Parc-o-bus



Timepoint / Heures de passage

2019.06



**Schedule / Horaire.....613-560-1000**

**Text / Texto .....560560**

*plus your four digit bus stop number / plus votre numéro d'arrêt à quatre chiffres*

Customer Service

Service à la clientèle ..... **613-842-3600**

Lost and Found / Objets perdus..... **613-563-4011**

Security / Sécurité ..... **613-741-2478**

**Effective June 25, 2017**

**En vigueur 25 juin 2017**



**INFO 613-741-4390**  
**octranspo.com**



# 272


## COBBLE HILL TUNNEY'S PASTURE

### Connexion

**Monday to Friday / Lundi au vendredi**

Peak periods only

Périodes de pointe seulement



- Transitway & Station
- Limited stops: Off only in AM / No stop in PM  
Arrêts limités : Débarquement en AM seul. / Aucun arrêt en PM
- AM: Off only - PM: Full Service  
AM: Débarquement seul. - PM: Service complet
- Park & Ride / Parc-o-bus

2019.07



**Future route after O-Train Line 1 is open  
Trajet du circuit après l'ouverture  
de la Ligne 1 de l'O-Train**

Lost and Found / Objets perdus..... **613-563-4011**

Security / Sécurité..... **613-741-2478**



INFO 613-741-4390  
octranspo.com

## Appendix E – Collision Data

---





# City Operations - Transportation Services

## Collision Details Report - Public Version

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

**Location:** CEDARVIEW RD @ FALLOWFIELD RD

**Traffic Control:** Traffic signal

**Total Collisions:** 29

Date/Day/Time	Environment	Impact Type	Classification	Surface Cond'n	Veh. Dir	Vehicle Manoeuvre	Vehicle type	First Event	No. Ped
2018-Aug-16, Thu,08:29	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					West	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
2018-Jul-30, Mon,13:56	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Dry	South	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					North	Going ahead	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle	
2018-Jul-09, Mon,11:21	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-Jun-22, Fri,08:35	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Dry	West	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					East	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
2018-Jun-14, Thu,08:35	Rain	Rear end	P.D. only	Wet	East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					East	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
2018-May-22, Tue,08:18	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
2018-Jan-22, Mon,18:13	Snow	Turning movement	P.D. only	Loose snow	East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					East	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Dec-18, Mon,22:05	Snow	Sideswipe	Non-fatal injury	Loose snow	South	Changing lanes	Unknown	Other motor vehicle
					South	Going ahead	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
2017-Nov-04, Sat,11:29	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Dry	North	Turning left	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
					South	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Nov-02, Thu,16:27	Rain	Rear end	P.D. only	Wet	West	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Skidding/sliding
					West	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Mar-21, Tue,17:18	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Wet	South	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Stopped	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2017-Feb-15, Wed,18:11	Snow	Angle	P.D. only	Loose snow	South	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Going ahead	Snow plow	Other motor vehicle

2017-Jan-27, Fri,16:46	Snow	Turning movement	Non-fatal injury	Wet	East	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2016-Jun-27, Mon,14:50	Clear	Angle	P.D. only	Dry	East	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Unknown	Unknown	Other motor vehicle
2016-Feb-25, Thu,18:49	Snow	Rear end	Non-fatal injury	Slush	North	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					North	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2016-Feb-22, Mon,13:47	Clear	Sideswipe	Non-fatal injury	Dry	North	Changing lanes	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
					North	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2016-Jan-11, Mon,17:30	Clear	Other	P.D. only	Wet	North	Reversing	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2016-Jan-06, Wed,07:26	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Dry	South	Turning left	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
					North	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2015-Oct-31, Sat,01:40	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Dry	South	Turning left	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
					North	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle

2015-Jul-01, Wed,07:35	Rain	Angle	P.D. only	Wet	North	Turning left	Truck and trailer	Other motor vehicle
					East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2015-Jun-23, Tue,08:00	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Turning right	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2015-Apr-12, Sun,13:48	Clear	Sideswipe	Non-fatal injury	Dry	South	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Cyclist
					South	Turning left	Bicycle	Other motor vehicle
2014-Oct-22, Wed,14:00	Clear	Angle	P.D. only	Dry	East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2014-Oct-11, Sat,22:48	Clear	Turning movement	P.D. only	Wet	North	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2014-Oct-05, Sun,17:28	Clear	Angle	P.D. only	Dry	South	Going ahead	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
					East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2014-Aug-04, Mon,11:48	Clear	Angle	Non-fatal injury	Dry	West	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
					North	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle

2014-Aug-02, Sat,13:04	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle

2014-Apr-04, Fri,07:39	Clear	Angle	Non-fatal injury	Dry	West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Going ahead	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle

2014-Feb-11, Tue,17:00	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Dry	West	Overtaking	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle

**Location:** FALLOWFIELD RD @ O'KEEFE CRT

**Traffic Control:** Stop sign

**Total Collisions:** 1

Date/Day/Time	Environment	Impact Type	Classification	Surface Cond'n	Veh. Dir	Vehicle Manoeuver	Vehicle type	First Event	No. Ped
2015-Sep-28, Mon,07:47	Clear	Angle	P.D. only	Dry	South	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					East	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle	

**Location:** FALLOWFIELD RD @ STRANDHERD DR

**Traffic Control:** Traffic signal

**Total Collisions:** 35

Date/Day/Time	Environment	Impact Type	Classification	Surface Cond'n	Veh. Dir	Vehicle Manoeuver	Vehicle type	First Event	No. Ped
2018-Dec-22, Sat,08:04	Snow	Turning movement	P.D. only	Loose snow	West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					East	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	

2018-Oct-24, Wed,08:45	Clear	Rear end	Non-fatal injury	Dry	West	Changing lanes	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
------------------------	-------	----------	------------------	-----	------	----------------	---------------------------	---------------------

					West	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Sep-17, Mon,14:10	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	South	Turning right	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
					South	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Sep-10, Mon,07:45	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Dry	West	Unknown	Unknown	Other motor vehicle
					West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Aug-16, Thu,12:28	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Jun-24, Sun,14:01	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	South	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Jun-19, Tue,21:05	Clear	Angle	Non-fatal injury	Dry	South	Going ahead	Motorcycle	Other motor vehicle
					East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Apr-26, Thu,16:11	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	South	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Turning right	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
2018-Mar-09, Fri,10:55	Snow	Angle	Non-fatal injury	Wet	West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle

					South	Turning left	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2018-Feb-16, Fri,15:35	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	East	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					East	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Feb-09, Fri,17:45	Clear	Rear end	Non-fatal injury	Wet	West	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Skidding/sliding
					West	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2018-Feb-08, Thu,15:46	Clear	Angle	P.D. only	Dry	East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2018-Jan-08, Mon,12:55	Snow	Rear end	Non-fatal injury	Slush	East	Slowing or stopping	Pick-up truck	Skidding/sliding
					East	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Nov-17, Fri,12:02	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
					West	Stopped	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
2017-Oct-17, Tue,17:28	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Sep-20, Wed,20:10	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle

					West	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Aug-15, Tue,14:45	Clear	Angle	Non-fatal injury	Dry	East	Going ahead	Passenger van	Other motor vehicle
					North	Turning left	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2017-Aug-12, Sat,18:56	Rain	Rear end	Non-fatal injury	Wet	West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Jul-26, Wed,07:34	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Dry	West	Changing lanes	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Jul-14, Fri,18:11	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	South	Turning right	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
					South	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Merging	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Jun-05, Mon,14:45	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	South	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					South	Turning right	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2017-Apr-20, Thu,08:40	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	East	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					East	Turning left	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle



2017-Feb-26, Sun,14:09	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Dry	West	Changing lanes	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Changing lanes	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2017-Jan-12, Thu,06:25	Rain	Approaching	P.D. only	Wet	West	Unknown	Unknown	Other motor vehicle
					East	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2016-Jun-18, Sat,13:50	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2016-Feb-20, Sat,03:57	Rain	Rear end	P.D. only	Slush	West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2016-Jan-19, Tue,06:27	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Ice	West	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					West	Stopped	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
2016-Jan-13, Wed,15:11	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Wet	West	Changing lanes	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
					West	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
2015-Aug-14, Fri,16:39	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Dry	East	Changing lanes	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle
					East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle

2015-Jul-22, Wed,20:20	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	East	Turning left	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle	
					East	Turning left	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
2015-Feb-24, Tue,12:48	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
2014-Oct-20, Mon,08:45	Clear	SMV other	Non-fatal injury	Dry	East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Pedestrian	1
2014-Aug-29, Fri,08:56	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	
2014-Jun-08, Sun,04:47	Clear	SMV other	P.D. only	Dry	West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Curb	
2014-Mar-26, Wed,17:53	Clear	Rear end	Non-fatal injury	Dry	East	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle	
					East	Stopped	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle	
					East	Stopped	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle	

**Location:** FALLOWFIELD RD btwn O'KEEFE CRT & CEDARVIEW RD

**Traffic Control:** No control

**Total Collisions:** 4

Date/Day/Time	Environment	Impact Type	Classification	Surface Cond'n	Veh. Dir	Vehicle Manoeuver	Vehicle type	First Event	No. Ped
2016-Sep-01, Thu,11:31	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Dry	East	Overtaking	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle	
					East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	

2016-Jul-24, Sun,00:39	Clear	Approaching	P.D. only	Dry	East	Going ahead	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
					West	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle

2015-Jan-29, Thu,17:52	Snow	SMV other	P.D. only	Loose snow	East	Going ahead	Automobile, station wagon	Ditch
------------------------	------	-----------	-----------	------------	------	-------------	---------------------------	-------

2014-Nov-05, Wed,07:20	Clear	Sideswipe	P.D. only	Dry	East	Changing lanes	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle
					East	Going ahead	Truck - dump	Other motor vehicle

**Location:** FALLOWFIELD RD btwn STRANDHERD DR & O'KEEFE CRT

**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
2016-Apr-22, Fri,15:13	Rain	Rear end	P.D. only	Wet	South	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	
					South	Slowing or stopping	Automobile, station wagon	Other motor vehicle	

**Location:** O'KEEFE CRT btwn FOXTAIL AVE & FALLOWFIELD RD

**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-Aug-26, Wed,16:49	Clear	Rear end	P.D. only	Dry	West	Unknown	Unknown	Other motor vehicle	
					West	Stopped	Pick-up truck	Other motor vehicle	

## Appendix F – Trip Generation Data

---


# Medical-Dental Office Building (720)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA  
 On a: Weekday,  
 Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,  
 One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.  
 Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban  
 Number of Studies: 44  
 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 32  
 Directional Distribution: 78% entering, 22% exiting

## Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
2.78	0.85 - 14.30	1.28

## Data Plot and Equation



# Medical-Dental Office Building (720)


Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA  
 On a: Weekday,  
 Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,  
 One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban  
 Number of Studies: 65  
 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 28  
 Directional Distribution: 28% entering, 72% exiting

## Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
3.46	0.25 - 8.86	1.58

## Data Plot and Equation



# Quality Restaurant (931)


**Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Seats**  
**On a: Weekday,**  
**Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,**  
**One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.**  
**Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban**  
 Number of Studies: 5  
 Avg. Num. of Seats: 355  
 Directional Distribution: Not Available

## Vehicle Trip Generation per Seat

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
0.02	0.01 - 0.04	0.01

## Data Plot and Equation

*Caution – Small Sample Size*




# Quality Restaurant (931)

**Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Seats**  
**On a: Weekday,**  
**Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,**  
**One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.**  
**Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban**  
 Number of Studies: 11  
 Avg. Num. of Seats: 344  
 Directional Distribution: 67% entering, 33% exiting

## Vehicle Trip Generation per Seat

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
0.28	0.14 - 0.50	0.11

## Data Plot and Equation





# South Nepean


## Demographic Characteristics

Population	72,750	Actively Travelled	57,830
Employed Population	35,540	Number of Vehicles	44,130
Households	26,260	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	54.8

Occupation Status (age 5+)	Male	Female	Total
Full Time Employed	17,630	14,730	32,350
Part Time Employed	620	2,570	3,190
Student	9,910	9,420	19,340
Retiree	3,420	4,200	7,620
Unemployed	720	500	1,220
Homemaker	180	2,390	2,570
Other	270	540	810
<b>Total:</b>	<b>32,750</b>	<b>34,350</b>	<b>67,100</b>

Traveller Characteristics	Male	Female	Total
Transit Pass Holders	5,590	6,100	11,700
Licensed Drivers	24,480	25,260	49,740
Telecommuters	60	310	370
Trips made by residents	88,180	97,380	185,550



Selected Indicators	
Daily Trips per Person (age 5+)	2.77
Vehicles per Person	0.61
Number of Persons per Household	2.77
Daily Trips per Household	7.07
Vehicles per Household	1.68
Workers per Household	1.35
Population Density (Pop/km <sup>2</sup> )	1330



Household Size		
1 person	3,560	14%
2 persons	7,300	28%
3 persons	5,500	21%
4 persons	6,320	24%
5+ persons	3,590	14%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>26,260</b>	<b>100%</b>

Households by Vehicle Availability		
0 vehicles	810	3%
1 vehicle	9,500	36%
2 vehicles	13,800	53%
3 vehicles	1,730	7%
4+ vehicles	410	2%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>26,260</b>	<b>100%</b>

Households by Dwelling Type		
Single-detached	14,530	55%
Semi-detached	3,090	12%
Townhouse	7,770	30%
Apartment/Condo	870	3%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>26,260</b>	<b>100%</b>




\* 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 South Nepean

#### AM Peak Period



### Summary of Trips to and from South Nepean

#### AM Peak Period (6:30 - 8:59)

Districts	Destinations of Trips From		Origins of Trips To	
	District	% Total	District	% Total
Ottawa Centre	3,820	9%	30	0%
Ottawa Inner Area	2,270	5%	340	1%
Ottawa East	630	2%	50	0%
Beacon Hill	370	1%	50	0%
Alta Vista	2,360	6%	460	2%
Hunt Club	920	2%	440	2%
Merivale	4,310	10%	790	3%
Ottawa West	1,830	4%	160	1%
Bayshore / Cedarview	3,230	8%	700	3%
Orléans	330	1%	200	1%
Rural East	20	0%	60	0%
Rural Southeast	250	1%	580	2%
South Gloucester / Leitrim	100	0%	310	1%
South Nepean	17,260	42%	17,260	74%
Rural Southwest	580	1%	970	4%
Kanata / Stittsville	1,800	4%	690	3%
Rural West	80	0%	30	0%
Île de Hull	840	2%	50	0%
Hull Périphérie	260	1%	40	0%
Plateau	0	0%	40	0%
Aylmer	60	0%	40	0%
Rural Northwest	40	0%	40	0%
Pointe Gatineau	0	0%	0	0%
Gatineau Est	0	0%	20	0%
Rural Northeast	10	0%	20	0%
Buckingham / Masson-Angers	20	0%	0	0%
<b>Ontario Sub-Total:</b>	<b>40,160</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>23,120</b>	<b>99%</b>
<b>Québec Sub-Total:</b>	<b>1,230</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>41,390</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23,370</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Trips by Trip Purpose

24 Hours	From District		To District		Within District	
Work or related	25,640	41%	5,290	8%	4,680	6%
School	5,310	8%	1,430	2%	10,610	13%
Shopping	4,940	8%	4,220	7%	12,840	16%
Leisure	6,960	11%	4,020	6%	5,760	7%
Medical	1,720	3%	900	1%	840	1%
Pick-up / drive passenger	4,040	6%	3,920	6%	7,530	9%
Return Home	11,460	18%	40,960	65%	34,630	43%
Other	2,640	4%	2,090	3%	3,020	4%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>62,710</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>62,830</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>79,910</b>	<b>100%</b>

AM Peak (06:30 - 08:59)	From District		To District		Within District	
Work or related	18,160	75%	2,890	47%	2,120	12%
School	3,280	14%	1,170	19%	9,180	53%
Shopping	180	1%	70	1%	720	4%
Leisure	350	1%	230	4%	220	1%
Medical	400	2%	60	1%	100	1%
Pick-up / drive passenger	1,060	4%	770	13%	2,860	17%
Return Home	210	1%	640	10%	1,070	6%
Other	520	2%	290	5%	990	6%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>24,160</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6,120</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17,260</b>	<b>100%</b>

PM Peak (15:30 - 17:59)	From District		To District		Within District	
Work or related	410	5%	290	1%	410	2%
School	250	3%	0	0%	50	0%
Shopping	900	11%	1,090	5%	2,090	11%
Leisure	1,420	17%	790	3%	1,840	10%
Medical	190	2%	230	1%	90	0%
Pick-up / drive passenger	820	10%	1,700	7%	1,610	9%
Return Home	3,800	47%	18,990	81%	11,810	64%
Other	360	4%	490	2%	540	3%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>8,150</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23,580</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18,440</b>	<b>100%</b>

Peak Period (%)	Total:	% of 24 Hours	Within District (%)
24 Hours	205,450		39%
AM Peak Period	47,540	23%	36%
PM Peak Period	50,170	24%	37%

### Trips by Primary Travel Mode

24 Hours	From District		To District		Within District	
Auto Driver	41,340	66%	41,280	66%	39,110	49%
Auto Passenger	9,400	15%	10,030	16%	15,320	19%
Transit	9,990	16%	9,520	15%	2,260	3%
Bicycle	310	0%	320	1%	960	1%
Walk	80	0%	170	0%	13,060	16%
Other	1,600	3%	1,520	2%	9,210	12%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>62,720</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>62,840</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>79,920</b>	<b>100%</b>

AM Peak (06:30 - 08:59)	From District		To District		Within District	
Auto Driver	14,570	60%	4,360	71%	5,800	34%
Auto Passenger	1,930	8%	780	13%	3,210	19%
Transit	6,610	27%	330	5%	730	4%
Bicycle	80	0%	50	1%	320	2%
Walk	20	0%	10	0%	3,000	17%
Other	930	4%	590	10%	4,200	24%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>24,140</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6,120</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17,260</b>	<b>100%</b>

PM Peak (15:30 - 17:59)	From District		To District		Within District	
Auto Driver	5,840	72%	14,640	62%	8,420	46%
Auto Passenger	1,730	21%	2,680	11%	3,930	21%
Transit	350	4%	5,770	24%	650	4%
Bicycle	80	1%	110	0%	150	1%
Walk	30	0%	0	0%	3,680	20%
Other	100	1%	380	2%	1,590	9%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>8,130</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23,580</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18,420</b>	<b>100%</b>

Avg Vehicle Occupancy	From District	To District	Within District
24 Hours	1.23	1.24	1.39
AM Peak Period	1.13	1.18	1.55
PM Peak Period	1.30	1.18	1.47

Transit Modal Split	From District	To District	Within District
24 Hours	16%	16%	4%
AM Peak Period	29%	6%	7%
PM Peak Period	4%	25%	5%

## Appendix G – TDM Checklist

---

## TDM-Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist: Non-Residential Developments (office, institutional, retail or industrial)

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

TDM-supportive design & infrastructure measures: <i>Non-residential developments</i>		Check if completed & add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references
<b>1. WALKING &amp; CYCLING: ROUTES</b>		
<b>1.1 Building location &amp; access points</b>		
BASIC	1.1.1 Locate building close to the street, and do not locate parking areas between the street and building entrances	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BASIC	1.1.2 Locate building entrances in order to minimize walking distances to sidewalks and transit stops/stations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BASIC	1.1.3 Locate building doors and windows to ensure visibility of pedestrians from the building, for their security and comfort	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>1.2 Facilities for walking &amp; cycling</b>		
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 ( <i>see Official Plan policy 4.3.3</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>  N/A - no rapid transit service exists within the vicinity of the proposed development
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 ( <i>see Official Plan policy 4.3.12</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>  A network of sidewalks is proposed within the development

<b>TDM-supportive design &amp; infrastructure measures: Non-residential developments</b>		<b>Check if completed &amp; add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references</b>
<b>REQUIRED</b>	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 ( <i>see Official Plan policy 4.3.10</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>  All sidewalks will be constructed per City standards
<b>REQUIRED</b>	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 ( <i>see Official Plan policy 4.3.10</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>  Proposed pedestrian facilities will conform to AODA standards
<b>REQUIRED</b>	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> )	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>BASIC</b>	1.2.6 Provide safe, direct and attractive walking routes from building entrances to nearby transit stops	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>BASIC</b>	1.2.7 Ensure that walking routes to transit stops are secure, visible, lighted, shaded and wind-protected wherever possible	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>BASIC</b>	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	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1.3 Amenities for walking &amp; cycling</b>		
<b>BASIC</b>	1.3.1 Provide lighting, landscaping and benches along walking and cycling routes between building entrances and streets, sidewalks and trails	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>BASIC</b>	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)	<input type="checkbox"/>

TDM-supportive design & infrastructure measures: <i>Non-residential developments</i>		Check if completed & add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references
<b>2. WALKING &amp; CYCLING: END-OF-TRIP FACILITIES</b>		
<b>2.1 Bicycle parking</b>		
REQUIRED	2.1.1 Provide bicycle parking in highly visible and lighted areas, sheltered from the weather wherever possible (see <i>Official Plan policy 4.3.6</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>
REQUIRED	2.1.2 Provide the number of bicycle parking spaces specified for various land uses in different parts of Ottawa; provide convenient access to main entrances or well-used areas (see <i>Zoning By-law Section 111</i> )	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Number of bicycle parking spaces exceeds Zoning Bylaw requirements and are located within close proximity to building entrances
REQUIRED	2.1.3 Ensure that bicycle parking spaces and access aisles meet minimum dimensions; that no more than 50% of spaces are vertical spaces; and that parking racks are securely anchored (see <i>Zoning By-law Section 111</i> )	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  All 5 bicycle parking spaces are horizontal
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2.2 Secure bicycle parking</b>		
REQUIRED	2.2.1 Where more than 50 bicycle parking spaces are provided for a single office building, locate at least 25% of spaces within a building/structure, a secure area (e.g. supervised parking lot or enclosure) or bicycle lockers (see <i>Zoning By-law Section 111</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>  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)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2.3 Shower &amp; change facilities</b>		
BASIC	2.3.1 Provide shower and change facilities for the use of active commuters	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2.4 Bicycle repair station</b>		
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)	<input type="checkbox"/>

TDM-supportive design & infrastructure measures: <i>Non-residential developments</i>		Check if completed & add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references
<b>3. TRANSIT</b>		
<b>3.1 Customer amenities</b>		
BASIC	3.1.1 Provide shelters, lighting and benches at any on-site transit stops	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
BETTER	3.1.3 Provide a secure and comfortable interior waiting area by integrating any on-site transit stops into the building	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4. RIDESHARING</b>		
<b>4.1 Pick-up &amp; drop-off facilities</b>		
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4.2 Carpool parking</b>		
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
BETTER	4.2.2 At large developments, provide spaces for carpools in a separate, access-controlled parking area to simplify enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>5. CARSHARING &amp; BIKESHARING</b>		
<b>5.1 Carshare parking spaces</b>		
BETTER	5.1.1 Provide carshare parking spaces in permitted non-residential zones, occupying either required or provided parking spaces ( <i>see Zoning By-law Section 94</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>5.2 Bikeshare station location</b>		
BETTER	5.2.1 Provide a designated bikeshare station area near a major building entrance, preferably lighted and sheltered with a direct walkway connection	<input type="checkbox"/>

TDM-supportive design & infrastructure measures: <i>Non-residential developments</i>		Check if completed & add descriptions, explanations or plan/drawing references
<b>6. PARKING</b>		
<b>6.1 Number of parking spaces</b>		
<b>REQUIRED</b>	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	<input type="checkbox"/> Parking supply is within the permissible range specified in the Zoning Bylaw
<b>BASIC</b>	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	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>BASIC</b>	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 Section 104</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>BETTER</b>	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> )	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>6.2 Separate long-term &amp; short-term parking areas</b>		
<b>BETTER</b>	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)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>7. OTHER</b>		
<b>7.1 On-site amenities to minimize off-site trips</b>		
<b>BETTER</b>	7.1.1 Provide on-site amenities to minimize mid-day or mid-commute errands	<input type="checkbox"/>



## Appendix H – MMLOS Analysis

---

**Multi-Modal Level of Service**

115 Lusk Street TIA

Scenario: Future Conditions

INTERSECTIONS		Fallowfield & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive			
		NORTH leg	SOUTH leg	EAST leg	WEST leg
Pedestrian	Lanes (do NOT include lanes protected by bulb-outs)	4	4	2	3
	Median	No Median	No Median	No Median	No Median
	Island Refuge				
	Conflicting Left Turns (from street to right)	Permissive	Permissive	Permissive	Permissive
	Conflicting Right Turns (from street to left)	Permissive or yield control	Permissive or yield control	Permissive or yield control	Permissive or yield control
	RTOR? (from street to left)	RTOR allowed	RTOR allowed	RTOR allowed	RTOR allowed
	Ped Leading Interval? (on cross street)	No	No	No	No
	Corner Radius	> 10m to 15m	> 5m to 10m	> 5m to 10m	> 10m to 15m
	Right Turn Channel	No right turn channel	No right turn channel	No right turn channel	No right turn channel
	Crosswalk Type	Standard	Standard	Standard	Standard
LOS (PETS I)		D	D	B	C
Cycle Length (sec)		120	120	120	120
Pedestrian Walk Time (solid white symbol) (sec)		7	7	7	7
LOS (Delay,seconds)		54.3	54.3	54.3	54.3
Overall Level of Service		E			
Cyclist	Type of Bikeway	Bike Pocket at Intersection	Mixed Traffic	Mixed Traffic	Mixed Traffic
	Turning Speed (based on corner radius & angle)	Slow	Slow		
	Right Turn Storage Length	≤ 50m	> 50m		
	Dual Right Turn?	No	No		
	Shared Through-Right?	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Bike Box?	No	No	No	No
	Number of Lanes Crossed for Left Turns	1 Lane Crossed	1 Lane Crossed	No Lanes Crossed	1 Lane Crossed
	Operating Speed on Approach	≥ 60km/h	≥ 60km/h	≥ 60km/h	≥ 60km/h
Level of Service		E	F	D	F
Overall Level of Service		F			
Transit	Average Signal Delay	≤10 sec	≤10 sec		
	Level of Service	B	B		
Overall Level of Service		B			
Truck	Turning Radius (Right Turn)	10 to 15m	< 10m	< 10m	10 to 15m
	Number of Receiving Lanes	1	1	1	1
Level of Service		E	F	F	E
Overall Level of Service		F			
Auto	Level of Service	B (AM) / B (PM)			

SEGMENTS		Fallowfield – Forager Street to O'Keefe Court		
		1	2	3
Pedestrian	Sidewalk Width		No Sidewalk	
	Boulevard Width		N/A	
	AADT		N/A	
	On-Street Parking		N/A	
Operating Speed		61 km/h or more		
Level of Service		F		
Cyclist	Type of Bikeway	Mixed Traffic		
	Number of Travel Lanes (per direction)	1 Travel Lane Per Direction		
	Raised Median?			
	Bike Lane Width			
	Operating Speed	≥ 70 km/h		
	Bike Lane Blockages (Commercial Areas)			
	Median Refuge			
Level of Service		F		
Transit	Facility Type	Mixed Traffic		
	Friction	Limited parking/driveway friction		
Level of Service		D		
Truck	Curb Lane Width	≤3.5		
	Number of Travel Lanes	2		
Level of Service		C		

## Appendix I – Intersection Control Warrants

# Input Data Sheet

Analysis Sheet

Results Sheet

Proposed Collision

GO TO Justification:

What are the intersecting roadways?

Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive

What is the direction of the Main Road street?

North-South

When was the data collected?

Future (2028) Total Traffic

## Justification 1 - 4: Volume Warrants

a.- Number of lanes on the Main Road?

1

b.- Number of lanes on the Minor Road?

1

c.- How many approaches?

4

d.- What is the operating environment?

Urban

Population >= 10,000

AND

Speed < 70 km/hr

e.- What is the eight hour vehicle volume at the intersection? (Please fill in table below)

Hour Ending	Main Northbound Approach			Minor Eastbound Approach			Main Southbound Approach			Minor Westbound Approach			Pedestrians Crossing Main Road
	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	
7:00	119	646	9	30	6	32	8	881	88	39	7	42	
8:00	60	323	5	15	3	16	4	441	44	20	4	21	
9:00	60	323	5	15	3	16	4	441	44	20	4	21	
10:00	60	323	5	15	3	16	4	441	44	20	4	21	
15:00	52	661	23	107	3	114	17	767	38	9	1	20	
16:00	26	331	12	54	2	57	9	384	19	5	1	10	
17:00	26	331	12	54	2	57	9	384	19	5	1	10	
18:00	26	331	12	54	2	57	9	384	19	5	1	10	
<b>Total</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>3,268</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>4,120</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>0</b>

## Justification 5: Collision Experience

Preceding Months	Number of Collisions*
1-12	
13-24	
25-36	

\* Include only collisions that are susceptible to correction through the installation of traffic signal control

## Justification 6: Pedestrian Volume

a.- Please fill in table below summarizing total pedestrians crossing major roadway at the intersection or in proximity to the intersection (zones). Please reference Section 4.8 of the Manual for further explanation and graphical representation.

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3 (if needed)		Zone 4 (if needed)		Total
	Assisted	Unassisted	Assisted	Unassisted	Assisted	Unassisted	Assisted	Unassisted	
<b>Total 8 hour pedestrian volume</b>									
<b>Factored 8 hour pedestrian volume</b>	0		0		0		0		
<b>% Assigned to crossing rate</b>									
<b>Net 8 Hour Pedestrian Volume at Crossing</b>									0
<b>Net 8 Hour Vehicular Volume on Street Being Crossed</b>									6,411

b.- Please fill in table below summarizing delay to pedestrians crossing major roadway at the intersection or in proximity to the intersection (zones). Please reference Section 4.8 of the Manual for further explanation and graphical representation.

	Zone 1		Zone 2		Zone 3 (if needed)		Zone 4 (if needed)		Total
	Assisted	Unassisted	Assisted	Unassisted	Assisted	Unassisted	Assisted	Unassisted	
<b>Total 8 hour pedestrian volume</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Total 8 hour pedestrians delayed greater than 10 seconds</b>									
<b>Factored volume of total pedestrians</b>	0		0		0		0		
<b>Factored volume of delayed pedestrians</b>	0		0		0		0		
<b>% Assigned to Crossing Rate</b>	0%		0%		0%		0%		
<b>Net 8 Hour Volume of Total Pedestrians</b>									0
<b>Net 8 Hour Volume of Delayed Pedestrians</b>									0

# Results Sheet

[Input Sheet](#)

[Analysis Sheet](#)

[Proposed Collision](#)

[GO TO Justification:](#)

Intersection: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive Count Date: Future (2028) Total Traffic

## Summary Results

	Justification	Compliance	Signal Justified?	
			YES	NO
1. Minimum Vehicular Volume	A Total Volume	100 %	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	B Crossing Volume	69 %	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Delay to Cross Traffic	A Main Road	100 %	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	B Crossing Road	74 %	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Combination	A Justificaton 1	69 %	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	B Justification 2	74 %	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. 4-Hr Volume		67 %	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

5. Collision Experience		0 %	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------	--	-----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

6. Pedestrians	A Volume	Justification not met	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	B Delay	Justification not met	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## City of Ottawa Roundabout Initial Feasibility Screening Tool

The intent of this screening tool is to provide a relatively quick assessment of the feasibility of a roundabout at a particular intersection in comparison to other appropriate forms of traffic control or road modifications including all-way stop control, traffic signals, auxiliary lanes, etc. The intended outcome of this tool is to provide enough information to assist staff in deciding whether or not to proceed with an Intersection Control Study to investigate the feasibility of a roundabout in more detail.

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Project Name:  | 115 Lusk Street - Transportation Impact Assessment   |
| 2 | Intersection:  | Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court / Cobble Hill Drive   |
| 3 | Location and Description of Intersection:<br>Lane Configuration, total or approach AADT, distance to nearby intersection(s), etc. Attach or sketch a diagram and include existing and/or horizon-year turning movements. If an existing intersection then indicate type of control | The intersection is currently configured as a two-way stop-controlled intersection with free-flow on Fallowfield Road. |
| 4 | What traditional modifications are proposed?<br>All-way stop control, traffic signals, auxiliary lanes, etc. Attach or sketch a diagram if necessary.  | Traffic signals.   |
| 5 | What size of roundabout is being considered?<br>Describe, and attach a Roundabout Traffic Flow Worksheet   | Multi-lane roundabout.   |
| 6 | Why is a roundabout being considered?  | As an alternative to traffic signals.  |

- 7 Are there contra-indications for a roundabout? If "Yes" is indicated for one or more of the contra-indications then a roundabout may be problematic at the subject intersection. That is not to say that a

No.	Contra-Indication	Outcome
1	Is there insufficient property at the intersection (i.e. less than 44 metres diameter if considering a single-lane roundabout, and less than 60 metres if considering a two-lane roundabout) or property constraints that would require demolition of adjacent structures?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	Are there any instances where stopping sight distance (SSD) of a roundabout yield line may not be attainable (i.e. the intersection is on a crest vertical curve)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	Is there an existing uncontrolled approach with a grade in excess of 4 percent?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4	Is the intersection located within a coordinated signal system?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5	Is there a closely-spaced traffic signal or railway crossing that could not be controlled with a nearby roundabout?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6	Are significant differences in directional flows or any situations of sudden high demand expected?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7	Are there known visually-impaired pedestrians that cross this intersection?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- 8 Are there suitability factors for a roundabout? If "Yes" is indicated for two or more of the suitability factors then a roundabout should be technically feasible at the subject intersection.

No.	Suitability Factor	Outcome
1	Does the intersection currently experience an average collision frequency of more than 1.5 injury crashes per year, or a collision rate in excess of 1 injury crash per 1 million vehicles entering (MVE)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	Has there been a fatal crash at the intersection in the last 10 years?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	Are capacity problems currently being experienced, or expected in the future?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
4	Are traffic signals warranted, or expected to be warranted in the future?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5	Does the intersection have more than 4 legs, or unusual geometry?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6	Will Planned modifications to the intersection require that nearby structures be widened (i.e. to accommodate left-turn lanes)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7	Is the intersection located at a transition between rural and urban environments (i.e. an urban boundary) such that a roundabout could act as a means of speed transition?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- 9 Conclusions/recommendation whether to proceed with an Intersection Control Study:

The results of the Roundabout Screening Tool indicate that the a roundabout is not feasible or recommended at the intersection of Fallowfield & O'Keefe/ Cobble Hill, given that only one of the suitability factors is met.

DRAFT





## Appendix J – Intersection Capacity Analyses

---

Existing Traffic

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Existing Traffic  
AM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 2.8

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	↖	↗			↕		↖	↗	↖	↗	↖	↗
Traffic Vol, veh/h	7	6	19	39	7	42	5	496	9	8	454	5
Future Vol, veh/h	7	6	19	39	7	42	5	496	9	8	454	5
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None
Storage Length	500	-	-	-	-	-	1400	-	0	600	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	3	14	0	0	5	56	12	4	0
Mvmt Flow	8	7	21	43	8	47	6	551	10	9	504	6

Major/Minor	Minor2		Minor1		Major1		Major2					
Conflicting Flow All	1119	1097	506	1104	1093	552	511	0	0	562	0	0
Stage 1	523	523	-	564	564	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	596	574	-	540	529	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.25	7.13	6.64	6.2	4.1	-	-	4.22	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.13	5.64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.13	5.64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.345	3.527	4.126	3.3	2.2	-	-	2.308	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	186	215	560	188	204	537	1065	-	-	961	-	-
Stage 1	541	534	-	509	490	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	494	506	-	524	508	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	163	211	559	174	201	536	1064	-	-	960	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	163	211	-	174	201	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	537	529	-	505	487	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	441	502	-	493	503	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	17.7	26.8	0.1	0.2
HCM LOS	C	D		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	EBLn2	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	1064	-	-	163	400	261	960	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.005	-	-	0.048	0.069	0.375	0.009	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.4	-	-	28.2	14.7	26.8	8.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	D	B	D	A	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	0.1	0.2	1.7	0	-	-

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Existing Traffic  
PM Peak Hour

Intersection												
Int Delay, s/veh	1.2											
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	↖	↗			↕		↖	↗	↖	↗	↖	↗
Traffic Vol, veh/h	7	3	20	9	1	20	14	337	23	17	578	20
Future Vol, veh/h	7	3	20	9	1	20	14	337	23	17	578	20
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None
Storage Length	500	-	-	-	-	-	1400	-	0	600	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	6	4	0
Mvmt Flow	8	3	22	10	1	22	16	374	26	19	642	22

Major/Minor	Minor2		Minor1		Major1		Major2					
Conflicting Flow All	1113	1112	642	1110	1108	376	664	0	0	400	0	0
Stage 1	680	680	-	406	406	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	433	432	-	704	702	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	4.1	-	-	4.16	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.3	3.5	4	3.3	2.2	-	-	2.254	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	187	211	478	188	212	675	935	-	-	1137	-	-
Stage 1	444	454	-	626	601	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	605	586	-	431	443	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	175	204	478	173	205	674	935	-	-	1137	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	175	204	-	173	205	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	436	446	-	615	591	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	573	576	-	401	435	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB		WB		NB		SB	
HCM Control Delay, s	17.2		16.5		0.3		0.2	
HCM LOS	C		C					

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	EBLn2	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	935	-	-	175	407	347	1137	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.017	-	-	0.044	0.063	0.096	0.017	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.9	-	-	26.5	14.4	16.5	8.2	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	D	B	C	A	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	-	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1	-	-

Future (2023) Background Traffic

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Background Traffic

AM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 7

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	27	6	32	39	7	42	116	573	9	8	670	88
Future Vol, veh/h	27	6	32	39	7	42	116	573	9	8	670	88
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None
Storage Length	500	-	-	-	-	-	1400	-	0	600	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	5	3	14	0	0	5	56	12	4	0
Mvmt Flow	27	6	32	39	7	42	116	573	9	8	670	88

Major/Minor	Minor2		Minor1		Major1		Major2					
Conflicting Flow All	1521	1502	672	1556	1581	574	759	0	0	583	0	0
Stage 1	687	687	-	806	806	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	834	815	-	750	775	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.25	7.13	6.64	6.2	4.1	-	-	4.22	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.13	5.64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.13	5.64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.345	3.527	4.126	3.3	2.2	-	-	2.308	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	98	123	451	91	102	522	862	-	-	944	-	-
Stage 1	440	450	-	374	378	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	365	394	-	402	391	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	75	105	450	72	87	521	861	-	-	943	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	75	105	-	72	87	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	380	446	-	323	327	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	284	340	-	365	387	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB		WB		NB		SB	
HCM Control Delay, s	43.4		83.6		1.6		0.1	
HCM LOS	E		F					

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	EBLn2	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	861	-	-	75	296	125	943	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.135	-	-	0.36	0.128	0.704	0.008	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	9.8	-	-	77.9	18.9	83.6	8.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	F	C	F	A	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.5	-	-	1.4	0.4	3.9	0	-	-

1: Fallowfield & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Background Traffic - Mods

AM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (vph)	27	6	32	39	7	42	116	573	9	8	670	88
Future Volume (vph)	27	6	32	39	7	42	116	573	9	8	670	88
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Storage Length (m)	50.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	140.0		0.0	60.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	1		0	0		0	1		1	1		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			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		0.98			1.00		1.00		0.98	1.00		0.98
Fr <sub>t</sub>		0.874			0.936				0.850			0.850
Fl <sub>t</sub> Protected	0.950				0.978		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1729	1498	0	0	1626	0	1729	1733	992	1544	1750	1547
Fl <sub>t</sub> Permitted	0.680				0.839		0.382			0.430		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1238	1498	0	0	1394	0	695	1733	969	698	1750	1512
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		32			36				23			51
Link Speed (k/h)		50			50			60				60
Link Distance (m)		201.1			305.1			207.2				300.4
Travel Time (s)		14.5			22.0			12.4				18.0
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)			1	1			1		1	1		1
Peak Hour Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	5%	3%	14%	0%	0%	5%	56%	12%	4%	0%
Adj. Flow (vph)	27	6	32	39	7	42	116	573	9	8	670	88
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	27	38	0	0	88	0	116	573	9	8	670	88
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2				6
Permitted Phases	4			8			2		2	6		6
Detector Phase	4	4		8	8		2	2	2	6	6	6
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Minimum Split (s)	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5		27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4
Total Split (s)	34.0	34.0		34.0	34.0		86.0	86.0	86.0	86.0	86.0	86.0
Total Split (%)	28.3%	28.3%		28.3%	28.3%		71.7%	71.7%	71.7%	71.7%	71.7%	71.7%
Maximum Green (s)	28.5	28.5		28.5	28.5		80.6	80.6	80.6	80.6	80.6	80.6
Yellow Time (s)	3.6	3.6		3.6	3.6		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
All-Red Time (s)	1.9	1.9		1.9	1.9		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
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)	5.5	5.5			5.5		5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Lead/Lag												
Lead-Lag Optimize?												
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Recall Mode	None	None		None	None		Max	Max	Max	Max	Max	Max
Walk Time (s)	7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Flash Dont Walk (s)	21.0	21.0		21.0	21.0		15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
Act Effct Green (s)	9.4	9.4			9.4		87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.09	0.09			0.09		0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84
v/c Ratio	0.24	0.23			0.56		0.20	0.39	0.01	0.01	0.46	0.07



1: Fallowfield & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Background Traffic - Mods

AM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Control Delay	47.9	20.5			41.5		3.7	4.0	0.4	2.8	4.5	1.5
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	47.9	20.5			41.5		3.7	4.0	0.4	2.8	4.5	1.5
LOS	D	C			D		A	A	A	A	A	A
Approach Delay		31.9			41.5			3.9			4.1	
Approach LOS		C			D			A			A	
Queue Length 50th (m)	5.1	1.1			10.0		4.1	25.3	0.0	0.3	32.2	1.1
Queue Length 95th (m)	13.2	10.3			24.7		11.1	49.7	0.5	1.4	62.9	4.7
Internal Link Dist (m)		177.1			281.1			183.2			276.4	
Turn Bay Length (m)	50.0						140.0			60.0		25.0
Base Capacity (vph)	337	432			406		582	1451	815	584	1466	1275
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	0.08	0.09			0.22		0.20	0.39	0.01	0.01	0.46	0.07

Intersection Summary

Area Type:	Other
Cycle Length:	120
Actuated Cycle Length:	104.5
Natural Cycle:	70
Control Type:	Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio:	0.56
Intersection Signal Delay:	7.2
Intersection LOS:	A
Intersection Capacity Utilization	69.6%
ICU Level of Service	C
Analysis Period (min)	15

Splits and Phases: 1: Fallowfield & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill



2: Lusk Street & O'Keefe Court  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Background Traffic

AM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 1.5

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	31	0	25	173	0	23
Future Vol, veh/h	31	0	25	173	0	23
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	3	0	0	6	0	0
Mvmt Flow	31	0	25	173	0	23

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor1	Minor2	Minor3
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	31	0	254
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	31
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	223
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.1	-	6.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.4
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.2	-	3.5
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1595	-	739
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	997
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	819
Platoon blocked, %	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1595	-	726
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	726
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	997
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	805

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	0.9	8.5
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	1049	-	-	1595	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.022	-	-	0.016	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.5	-	-	7.3	0
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	A	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	-	0	-

3: Fallowfield Road & Forager Street  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Background Traffic

AM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 0.1

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↗		↑↑	↑	↘
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	13	0	699	737	8
Future Vol, veh/h	0	13	0	699	737	8
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	0	-	-	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	6	4	0
Mvmt Flow	0	13	0	699	737	8

Major/Minor	Minor2	Major1	Major2
Conflicting Flow All	-	737	0
Stage 1	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	6.2	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	3.3	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0	422	0
Stage 1	0	-	0
Stage 2	0	-	0
Platoon blocked, %			-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	422	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	13.8	0	0
HCM LOS	B		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	- 422	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	- 0.031	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	- 13.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	- B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	- 0.1	-	-

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Background Traffic

PM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 8.7

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Vol, veh/h	98	3	114	9	1	20	45	504	23	17	679	38
Future Vol, veh/h	98	3	114	9	1	20	45	504	23	17	679	38
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None	-	-	None
Storage Length	500	-	-	-	-	-	1400	-	0	600	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	6	4	0
Mvmt Flow	98	3	114	9	1	20	45	504	23	17	679	38

Major/Minor	Minor2		Minor1		Major1		Major2					
Conflicting Flow All	1331	1330	679	1385	1345	506	717	0	0	527	0	0
Stage 1	713	713	-	594	594	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	618	617	-	791	751	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	4.1	-	-	4.16	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	6.1	5.5	-	6.1	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	4	3.3	3.5	4	3.3	2.2	-	-	2.254	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	133	156	455	122	153	570	893	-	-	1020	-	-
Stage 1	426	438	-	495	496	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	480	484	-	386	421	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platoon blocked, %								-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	121	146	455	85	143	569	893	-	-	1020	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	121	146	-	85	143	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	405	431	-	470	471	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	438	460	-	282	414	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB		WB		NB		SB	
HCM Control Delay, s	56.6		25.8		0.7		0.2	
HCM LOS	F		D					

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBL	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	EBLn2	WBLn1	SBL	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	893	-	-	121	432	203	1020	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.05	-	-	0.81	0.271	0.148	0.017	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	9.2	-	-	104.6	16.4	25.8	8.6	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	F	C	D	A	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.2	-	-	4.8	1.1	0.5	0.1	-	-

1: Fallowfield & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Background Traffic - Signalized

PM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (vph)	98	3	114	9	1	20	45	504	23	17	679	38
Future Volume (vph)	98	3	114	9	1	20	45	504	23	17	679	38
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Storage Length (m)	50.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	140.0		0.0	60.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	1		0	0		0	1		1	1		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			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				0.98							
Fr <sub>t</sub>		0.854			0.910				0.850			0.850
Fl <sub>t</sub> Protected	0.950				0.985		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1729	1554	0	0	1605	0	1729	1750	1547	1631	1750	1547
Fl <sub>t</sub> Permitted	0.738				0.895		0.362			0.456		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1338	1554	0	0	1458	0	659	1750	1547	783	1750	1547
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		114			20				23			23
Link Speed (k/h)		50			50			60			60	
Link Distance (m)		201.1			305.1			207.2			300.4	
Travel Time (s)		14.5			22.0			12.4			18.0	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)	2					2						
Peak Hour Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	6%	4%	0%
Adj. Flow (vph)	98	3	114	9	1	20	45	504	23	17	679	38
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	98	117	0	0	30	0	45	504	23	17	679	38
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases	4			8			2		2	6		6
Detector Phase	4	4		8	8		2	2	2	6	6	6
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Minimum Split (s)	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5		27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4
Total Split (s)	35.0	35.0		35.0	35.0		85.0	85.0	85.0	85.0	85.0	85.0
Total Split (%)	29.2%	29.2%		29.2%	29.2%		70.8%	70.8%	70.8%	70.8%	70.8%	70.8%
Maximum Green (s)	29.5	29.5		29.5	29.5		79.6	79.6	79.6	79.6	79.6	79.6
Yellow Time (s)	3.6	3.6		3.6	3.6		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
All-Red Time (s)	1.9	1.9		1.9	1.9		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5		5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Lead/Lag												
Lead-Lag Optimize?												
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Recall Mode	None	None		None	None		Max	Max	Max	Max	Max	Max
Walk Time (s)	7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Flash Dont Walk (s)	21.0	21.0		21.0	21.0		15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
Act Effct Green (s)	13.0	13.0		13.0	13.0		82.6	82.6	82.6	82.6	82.6	82.6
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.12	0.12		0.12	0.12		0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77
v/c Ratio	0.60	0.40		0.15	0.15		0.09	0.37	0.02	0.03	0.50	0.03

1: Fallowfield & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Background Traffic - Signalized

PM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Control Delay	58.5	12.4			23.0		4.1	5.1	1.5	3.7	6.4	2.1
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	58.5	12.4			23.0		4.1	5.1	1.5	3.7	6.4	2.1
LOS	E	B			C		A	A	A	A	A	A
Approach Delay		33.4			23.0			4.9			6.2	
Approach LOS		C			C			A			A	
Queue Length 50th (m)	18.9	0.6			1.8		1.8	26.5	0.0	0.7	41.5	0.6
Queue Length 95th (m)	35.2	15.7			10.0		5.7	51.1	2.0	2.7	79.6	3.3
Internal Link Dist (m)		177.1			281.1			183.2			276.4	
Turn Bay Length (m)	50.0						140.0			60.0		25.0
Base Capacity (vph)	370	512			418		510	1356	1204	607	1356	1204
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	0.26	0.23			0.07		0.09	0.37	0.02	0.03	0.50	0.03

Intersection Summary

Area Type:	Other
Cycle Length:	120
Actuated Cycle Length:	106.6
Natural Cycle:	70
Control Type:	Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio:	0.60
Intersection Signal Delay:	9.8
Intersection LOS:	A
Intersection Capacity Utilization:	61.0%
ICU Level of Service:	B
Analysis Period (min):	15

Splits and Phases: 1: Fallowfield & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill



2: Lusk Street & O'Keefe Court  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Background Traffic

PM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 1.3

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	178	0	26	32	0	14
Future Vol, veh/h	178	0	26	32	0	14
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mvmt Flow	178	0	26	32	0	14

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor1	Minor2		
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	178	0	262	178
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	178	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	84	-
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.1	-	6.4	6.2
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.4	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.4	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.2	-	3.5	3.3
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1410	-	731	870
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	858	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	944	-
Platoon blocked, %	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1410	-	717	870
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	717	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	858	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	926	-

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	3.4	9.2
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	870	-	-	1410	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.016	-	-	0.018	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	9.2	-	-	7.6	0
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	A	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	0.1	-

3: Fallowfield Road & Forager Street  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Background Traffic

PM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 0.2

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↗		↑↑	↑	↘
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	17	0	575	798	7
Future Vol, veh/h	0	17	0	575	798	7
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	0	-	-	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	3	4	0
Mvmt Flow	0	17	0	575	798	7

Major/Minor	Minor2	Major1	Major2
Conflicting Flow All	-	798	0
Stage 1	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	6.2	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	3.3	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0	389	0
Stage 1	0	-	0
Stage 2	0	-	0
Platoon blocked, %			-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	389	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	14.7	0	0
HCM LOS	B		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	-	389	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.044	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	14.7	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	0.1	-	-



## Future (2028) Background Traffic

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Background Traffic

AM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (vph)	27	6	32	39	7	42	116	646	9	8	876	88
Future Volume (vph)	27	6	32	39	7	42	116	646	9	8	876	88
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Storage Length (m)	50.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	140.0		0.0	60.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	1		0	0		0	1		1	1		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			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		0.98			1.00				0.98	1.00		0.98
Frt		0.874			0.936				0.850			0.850
Flt Protected	0.950				0.978		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1729	1498	0	0	1626	0	1729	1733	992	1544	1750	1547
Flt Permitted	0.678				0.839		0.289			0.394		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1234	1498	0	0	1394	0	526	1733	969	640	1750	1512
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		32			36				23			40
Link Speed (k/h)		50			50			60				60
Link Distance (m)		201.1			305.1			207.2				300.4
Travel Time (s)		14.5			22.0			12.4				18.0
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)			1	1			1		1	1		1
Peak Hour Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	5%	3%	14%	0%	0%	5%	56%	12%	4%	0%
Adj. Flow (vph)	27	6	32	39	7	42	116	646	9	8	876	88
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	27	38	0	0	88	0	116	646	9	8	876	88
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2				6
Permitted Phases	4			8			2		2	6		6
Detector Phase	4	4		8	8		2	2	2	6	6	6
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Minimum Split (s)	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5		27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4
Total Split (s)	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5		86.5	86.5	86.5	86.5	86.5	86.5
Total Split (%)	27.9%	27.9%		27.9%	27.9%		72.1%	72.1%	72.1%	72.1%	72.1%	72.1%
Maximum Green (s)	28.0	28.0		28.0	28.0		81.1	81.1	81.1	81.1	81.1	81.1
Yellow Time (s)	3.6	3.6		3.6	3.6		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
All-Red Time (s)	1.9	1.9		1.9	1.9		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5		5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Lead/Lag												
Lead-Lag Optimize?												
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Recall Mode	None	None		None	None		Max	Max	Max	Max	Max	Max
Walk Time (s)	7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Flash Dont Walk (s)	21.0	21.0		21.0	21.0		15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
Act Effct Green (s)	9.5	9.5		9.5	9.5		88.1	88.1	88.1	88.1	88.1	88.1
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.09	0.09		0.09	0.09		0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84
v/c Ratio	0.25	0.23		0.56	0.56		0.26	0.44	0.01	0.01	0.60	0.07

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Background Traffic

AM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Control Delay	48.3	20.6			41.6		4.6	4.4	0.4	2.8	6.2	1.7
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	48.3	20.6			41.6		4.6	4.4	0.4	2.8	6.2	1.7
LOS	D	C			D		A	A	A	A	A	A
Approach Delay		32.1			41.6			4.4			5.8	
Approach LOS		C			D			A			A	
Queue Length 50th (m)	5.1	1.1			10.0		4.4	30.8	0.0	0.3	52.4	1.5
Queue Length 95th (m)	13.3	10.4			24.9		12.7	59.8	0.5	1.4	104.1	5.2
Internal Link Dist (m)		177.1			281.1			183.2			276.4	
Turn Bay Length (m)	50.0						140.0			60.0		25.0
Base Capacity (vph)	329	423			398		441	1452	816	536	1467	1274
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	0.08	0.09			0.22		0.26	0.44	0.01	0.01	0.60	0.07

Intersection Summary

Area Type:	Other
Cycle Length:	120
Actuated Cycle Length:	105.1
Natural Cycle:	90
Control Type:	Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio:	0.60
Intersection Signal Delay:	7.8
Intersection LOS:	A
Intersection Capacity Utilization:	81.1%
ICU Level of Service:	D
Analysis Period (min):	15

Splits and Phases: 1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive



2: Lusk Street & O'Keefe Court  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Background Traffic

AM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 1.5

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	31	0	25	173	0	23
Future Vol, veh/h	31	0	25	173	0	23
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	3	0	0	6	0	0
Mvmt Flow	31	0	25	173	0	23

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor1	Minor2	Minor3
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	31	0	254
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	31
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	223
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.1	-	6.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.4
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.2	-	3.5
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1595	-	739
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	997
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	819
Platoon blocked, %	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1595	-	726
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	726
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	997
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	805

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	0.9	8.5
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	1049	-	-	1595	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.022	-	-	0.016	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.5	-	-	7.3	0
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	A	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	-	0	-

3: Fallowfield Road & Forager Street  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Background Traffic

AM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 0.1

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↗		↑↑	↑	↘
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	13	0	773	949	8
Future Vol, veh/h	0	13	0	773	949	8
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	0	-	-	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	6	4	0
Mvmt Flow	0	13	0	773	949	8

Major/Minor	Minor2	Major1	Major2
Conflicting Flow All	- 949	- 0	- 0
Stage 1	- -	- -	- -
Stage 2	- -	- -	- -
Critical Hdwy	- 6.2	- -	- -
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	- -	- -	- -
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	- -	- -	- -
Follow-up Hdwy	- 3.3	- -	- -
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0 319	0 -	- -
Stage 1	0 -	0 -	- -
Stage 2	0 -	0 -	- -
Platoon blocked, %			- -
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	- 319	- -	- -
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	- -	- -	- -
Stage 1	- -	- -	- -
Stage 2	- -	- -	- -

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	16.8	0	0
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	- 319	- -	- -
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	- 0.041	- -	- -
HCM Control Delay (s)	- 16.8	- -	- -
HCM Lane LOS	- C	- -	- -
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	- 0.1	- -	- -

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Background Traffic

PM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (vph)	98	3	114	9	1	20	45	661	23	17	757	38
Future Volume (vph)	98	3	114	9	1	20	45	661	23	17	757	38
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Storage Length (m)	50.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	140.0		0.0	60.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	1		0	0		0	1		1	1		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			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				0.98							
Frt		0.854			0.910				0.850			0.850
Flt Protected	0.950				0.985		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1729	1554	0	0	1605	0	1729	1750	1547	1631	1750	1547
Flt Permitted	0.738				0.895		0.324			0.372		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1338	1554	0	0	1458	0	590	1750	1547	639	1750	1547
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		114			20				23			23
Link Speed (k/h)		50			50			60				60
Link Distance (m)		201.1			305.1			207.2				300.4
Travel Time (s)		14.5			22.0			12.4				18.0
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)	2					2						
Peak Hour Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	6%	4%	0%
Adj. Flow (vph)	98	3	114	9	1	20	45	661	23	17	757	38
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	98	117	0	0	30	0	45	661	23	17	757	38
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2				6
Permitted Phases	4			8			2		2	6		6
Detector Phase	4	4		8	8		2	2	2	6	6	6
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Minimum Split (s)	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5		27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4
Total Split (s)	34.0	34.0		34.0	34.0		86.0	86.0	86.0	86.0	86.0	86.0
Total Split (%)	28.3%	28.3%		28.3%	28.3%		71.7%	71.7%	71.7%	71.7%	71.7%	71.7%
Maximum Green (s)	28.5	28.5		28.5	28.5		80.6	80.6	80.6	80.6	80.6	80.6
Yellow Time (s)	3.6	3.6		3.6	3.6		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
All-Red Time (s)	1.9	1.9		1.9	1.9		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5		5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Lead/Lag												
Lead-Lag Optimize?												
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Recall Mode	None	None		None	None		Max	Max	Max	Max	Max	Max
Walk Time (s)	7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Flash Dont Walk (s)	21.0	21.0		21.0	21.0		15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
Act Effct Green (s)	13.1	13.1		13.1	13.1		83.7	83.7	83.7	83.7	83.7	83.7
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.12	0.12		0.12	0.12		0.78	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.78
v/c Ratio	0.60	0.40		0.15	0.15		0.10	0.49	0.02	0.03	0.56	0.03

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Background Traffic

PM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Control Delay	59.2	12.5			23.2		4.2	6.3	1.5	3.8	7.2	2.1
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	59.2	12.5			23.2		4.2	6.3	1.5	3.8	7.2	2.1
LOS	E	B			C		A	A	A	A	A	A
Approach Delay		33.8			23.2			6.0			6.9	
Approach LOS		C			C			A			A	
Queue Length 50th (m)	19.1	0.6			1.8		1.8	40.0	0.0	0.7	50.3	0.6
Queue Length 95th (m)	35.6	15.8			9.9		5.8	76.5	2.0	2.7	96.4	3.3
Internal Link Dist (m)		177.1			281.1			183.2			276.4	
Turn Bay Length (m)	50.0						140.0			60.0		25.0
Base Capacity (vph)	354	495			401		458	1359	1206	496	1359	1206
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	0.28	0.24			0.07		0.10	0.49	0.02	0.03	0.56	0.03

Intersection Summary

Area Type:	Other
Cycle Length:	120
Actuated Cycle Length:	107.7
Natural Cycle:	75
Control Type:	Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio:	0.60
Intersection Signal Delay:	10.0
Intersection LOS:	B
Intersection Capacity Utilization:	63.5%
ICU Level of Service:	B
Analysis Period (min):	15

Splits and Phases: 1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive



2: Lusk Street & O'Keefe Court  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Background Traffic  
PM Peak Hour

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	1.3					
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	178	0	26	32	0	14
Future Vol, veh/h	178	0	26	32	0	14
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mvmt Flow	178	0	26	32	0	14

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor1	Minor2	Minor3
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	178	0	262
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	178
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	84
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.1	-	6.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.4
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.2	-	3.5
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1410	-	731
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	858
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	944
Platoon blocked, %	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1410	-	717
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	717
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	858
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	926

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	3.4	9.2
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	870	-	-	1410	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.016	-	-	0.018	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	9.2	-	-	7.6	0
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	A	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	0.1	-



3: Fallowfield Road & Forager Street  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Background Traffic

PM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 0.2

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↗		↑↑	↑	↘
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	17	0	736	878	7
Future Vol, veh/h	0	17	0	736	878	7
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	0	-	-	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	3	4	0
Mvmt Flow	0	17	0	736	878	7

Major/Minor	Minor2	Major1	Major2
Conflicting Flow All	-	878	-
Stage 1	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	6.2	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	3.3	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0	350	0
Stage 1	0	-	0
Stage 2	0	-	0
Platoon blocked, %			-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	350	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	15.8	0	0
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	-	350	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.049	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	15.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	C	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	0.2	-	-

Future (2023) Total Traffic

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Total Traffic

AM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (vph)	30	6	32	39	7	42	119	573	9	8	675	88
Future Volume (vph)	30	6	32	39	7	42	119	573	9	8	675	88
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Storage Length (m)	50.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	140.0		0.0	60.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	1		0	0		0	1		1	1		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			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		0.98			1.00		1.00		0.98	1.00		0.98
Fr <sub>t</sub>		0.874			0.936				0.850			0.850
Fl <sub>t</sub> Protected	0.950				0.978		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1729	1498	0	0	1626	0	1729	1733	992	1544	1750	1547
Fl <sub>t</sub> Permitted	0.680				0.839		0.379			0.430		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1238	1498	0	0	1394	0	689	1733	969	698	1750	1512
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		32			36				23			51
Link Speed (k/h)		50			50			60				60
Link Distance (m)		201.1			305.1			207.2				300.4
Travel Time (s)		14.5			22.0			12.4				18.0
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)			1	1			1		1	1		1
Peak Hour Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	5%	3%	14%	0%	0%	5%	56%	12%	4%	0%
Adj. Flow (vph)	30	6	32	39	7	42	119	573	9	8	675	88
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	30	38	0	0	88	0	119	573	9	8	675	88
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2				6
Permitted Phases	4			8			2		2	6		6
Detector Phase	4	4		8	8		2	2	2	6	6	6
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Minimum Split (s)	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5		27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4
Total Split (s)	34.0	34.0		34.0	34.0		86.0	86.0	86.0	86.0	86.0	86.0
Total Split (%)	28.3%	28.3%		28.3%	28.3%		71.7%	71.7%	71.7%	71.7%	71.7%	71.7%
Maximum Green (s)	28.5	28.5		28.5	28.5		80.6	80.6	80.6	80.6	80.6	80.6
Yellow Time (s)	3.6	3.6		3.6	3.6		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
All-Red Time (s)	1.9	1.9		1.9	1.9		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
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)	5.5	5.5			5.5		5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Lead/Lag												
Lead-Lag Optimize?												
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Recall Mode	None	None		None	None		Max	Max	Max	Max	Max	Max
Walk Time (s)	7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Flash Dont Walk (s)	21.0	21.0		21.0	21.0		15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
Act Effct Green (s)	9.4	9.4			9.4		87.4	87.4	87.4	87.4	87.4	87.4
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.09	0.09			0.09		0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84
v/c Ratio	0.27	0.23			0.56		0.21	0.39	0.01	0.01	0.46	0.07

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Total Traffic  
AM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Control Delay	48.8	20.5			41.4		3.7	4.0	0.4	2.8	4.5	1.5
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	48.8	20.5			41.4		3.7	4.0	0.4	2.8	4.5	1.5
LOS	D	C			D		A	A	A	A	A	A
Approach Delay		33.0			41.4			3.9			4.2	
Approach LOS		C			D			A			A	
Queue Length 50th (m)	5.7	1.1			9.9		4.3	25.3	0.0	0.3	32.6	1.1
Queue Length 95th (m)	14.4	10.3			24.7		11.5	49.7	0.5	1.4	63.9	4.7
Internal Link Dist (m)		177.1			281.1			183.2			276.4	
Turn Bay Length (m)	50.0						140.0			60.0		25.0
Base Capacity (vph)	338	432			407		577	1451	815	584	1465	1274
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	0.09	0.09			0.22		0.21	0.39	0.01	0.01	0.46	0.07

Intersection Summary

Area Type:	Other
Cycle Length:	120
Actuated Cycle Length:	104.4
Natural Cycle:	70
Control Type:	Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio:	0.56
Intersection Signal Delay:	7.3
Intersection LOS:	A
Intersection Capacity Utilization:	70.1%
ICU Level of Service:	C
Analysis Period (min):	15

Splits and Phases: 1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive



2: Lusk Street & O'Keefe Court  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Total Traffic  
AM Peak Hour

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	1.6					
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	31	0	28	173	0	26
Future Vol, veh/h	31	0	28	173	0	26
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	3	0	0	6	0	0
Mvmt Flow	31	0	28	173	0	26

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor1		
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	31	0	260 31
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	31 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	229 -
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.1	-	6.4 6.2
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.4 -
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.4 -
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.2	-	3.5 3.3
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1595	-	733 1049
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	997 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	814 -
Platoon blocked, %	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1595	-	719 1049
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	719 -
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	997 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	799 -

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	1	8.5
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	1049	-	-	1595	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.025	-	-	0.018	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.5	-	-	7.3	0
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	A	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	-	0.1	-

3: Fallowfield Road & Forager Street  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Total Traffic  
AM Peak Hour

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	0.1					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↗		↑↑	↑	↘
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	15	0	702	737	13
Future Vol, veh/h	0	15	0	702	737	13
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	0	-	-	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	6	4	0
Mvmt Flow	0	15	0	702	737	13

Major/Minor	Minor2	Major1	Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	-	737	-	0	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	6.2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	3.3	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0	422	0	-	-
Stage 1	0	-	0	-	-
Stage 2	0	-	0	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	422	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	13.8	0	0
HCM LOS	B		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	-	422	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.036	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	13.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	0.1	-	-

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Total Traffic

PM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (vph)	107	3	114	9	1	20	52	504	23	17	689	38
Future Volume (vph)	107	3	114	9	1	20	52	504	23	17	689	38
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Storage Length (m)	50.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	140.0		0.0	60.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	1		0	0		0	1		1	1		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			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				0.98							
Fr <sub>t</sub>		0.854			0.910				0.850			0.850
Fl <sub>t</sub> Protected	0.950				0.985		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1729	1554	0	0	1605	0	1729	1750	1547	1631	1750	1547
Fl <sub>t</sub> Permitted	0.738				0.898		0.355			0.454		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1338	1554	0	0	1463	0	646	1750	1547	780	1750	1547
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		114			20				23			23
Link Speed (k/h)		50			50			60				60
Link Distance (m)		201.1			305.1			207.2				300.4
Travel Time (s)		14.5			22.0			12.4				18.0
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)	2					2						
Peak Hour Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	6%	4%	0%
Adj. Flow (vph)	107	3	114	9	1	20	52	504	23	17	689	38
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	107	117	0	0	30	0	52	504	23	17	689	38
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases	4			8			2		2	6		6
Detector Phase	4	4		8	8		2	2	2	6	6	6
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Minimum Split (s)	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5		27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4
Total Split (s)	35.0	35.0		35.0	35.0		85.0	85.0	85.0	85.0	85.0	85.0
Total Split (%)	29.2%	29.2%		29.2%	29.2%		70.8%	70.8%	70.8%	70.8%	70.8%	70.8%
Maximum Green (s)	29.5	29.5		29.5	29.5		79.6	79.6	79.6	79.6	79.6	79.6
Yellow Time (s)	3.6	3.6		3.6	3.6		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
All-Red Time (s)	1.9	1.9		1.9	1.9		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5		5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Lead/Lag												
Lead-Lag Optimize?												
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Recall Mode	None	None		None	None		Max	Max	Max	Max	Max	Max
Walk Time (s)	7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Flash Dont Walk (s)	21.0	21.0		21.0	21.0		15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
Act Effct Green (s)	13.8	13.8		13.8	13.8		82.6	82.6	82.6	82.6	82.6	82.6
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.13	0.13		0.13	0.13		0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77
v/c Ratio	0.62	0.39		0.15	0.15		0.10	0.37	0.02	0.03	0.51	0.03

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Total Traffic  
PM Peak Hour




Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Control Delay	59.1	12.0			22.6		4.5	5.4	1.7	3.9	6.9	2.2
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	59.1	12.0			22.6		4.5	5.4	1.7	3.9	6.9	2.2
LOS	E	B			C		A	A	A	A	A	A
Approach Delay		34.5			22.6			5.2			6.6	
Approach LOS		C			C			A			A	
Queue Length 50th (m)	20.7	0.6			1.8		2.2	27.5	0.0	0.7	44.2	0.6
Queue Length 95th (m)	38.1	15.7			9.8		6.8	53.4	2.1	2.8	85.1	3.4
Internal Link Dist (m)		177.1			281.1			183.2			276.4	
Turn Bay Length (m)	50.0						140.0			60.0		25.0
Base Capacity (vph)	368	510			417		497	1346	1195	600	1346	1195
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	0.29	0.23			0.07		0.10	0.37	0.02	0.03	0.51	0.03

Intersection Summary

Area Type:	Other
Cycle Length:	120
Actuated Cycle Length:	107.3
Natural Cycle:	70
Control Type:	Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio:	0.62
Intersection Signal Delay:	10.3
Intersection LOS:	B
Intersection Capacity Utilization:	67.6%
ICU Level of Service:	C
Analysis Period (min):	15




Splits and Phases: 1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive





2: Lusk Street & O'Keefe Court  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Total Traffic  
PM Peak Hour

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	1.8					
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	178	0	33	32	0	23
Future Vol, veh/h	178	0	33	32	0	23
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mvmt Flow	178	0	33	32	0	23

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor1		
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	178	0	276
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	178
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	98
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.1	-	6.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.4
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.2	-	3.5
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1410	-	718
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	858
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	931
Platoon blocked, %	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1410	-	701
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	701
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	858
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	909

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	3.9	9.3
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	870	-	-	1410	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.026	-	-	0.023	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	9.3	-	-	7.6	0
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	A	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	-	0.1	-

3: Fallowfield Road & Forager Street  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2023) Total Traffic  
PM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 0.2

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↗		↑↑	↑	↘
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	23	0	582	798	17
Future Vol, veh/h	0	23	0	582	798	17
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	0	-	-	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	3	4	0
Mvmt Flow	0	23	0	582	798	17

Major/Minor	Minor2	Major1	Major2
Conflicting Flow All	-	798	0
Stage 1	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	6.2	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	3.3	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0	389	0
Stage 1	0	-	0
Stage 2	0	-	0
Platoon blocked, %			-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	389	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	14.8	0	0
HCM LOS	B		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	-	389	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.059	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	14.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	B	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	0.2	-	-

Future (2028) Total Traffic

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Total Traffic

AM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (vph)	30	6	32	39	7	42	119	646	9	8	881	88
Future Volume (vph)	30	6	32	39	7	42	119	646	9	8	881	88
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Storage Length (m)	50.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	140.0		0.0	60.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	1		0	0		0	1		1	1		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			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		0.98			1.00				0.98	1.00		0.98
Frt		0.874			0.936				0.850			0.850
Flt Protected	0.950				0.978		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1729	1498	0	0	1626	0	1729	1733	992	1544	1750	1547
Flt Permitted	0.679				0.839		0.286			0.394		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1236	1498	0	0	1394	0	521	1733	969	640	1750	1512
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		32			36				23			40
Link Speed (k/h)		50			50			60				60
Link Distance (m)		201.1			305.1			207.2				300.4
Travel Time (s)		14.5			22.0			12.4				18.0
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)			1	1			1		1	1		1
Peak Hour Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	5%	3%	14%	0%	0%	5%	56%	12%	4%	0%
Adj. Flow (vph)	30	6	32	39	7	42	119	646	9	8	881	88
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	30	38	0	0	88	0	119	646	9	8	881	88
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2				6
Permitted Phases	4			8			2		2	6		6
Detector Phase	4	4		8	8		2	2	2	6	6	6
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Minimum Split (s)	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5		27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4
Total Split (s)	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5		86.5	86.5	86.5	86.5	86.5	86.5
Total Split (%)	27.9%	27.9%		27.9%	27.9%		72.1%	72.1%	72.1%	72.1%	72.1%	72.1%
Maximum Green (s)	28.0	28.0		28.0	28.0		81.1	81.1	81.1	81.1	81.1	81.1
Yellow Time (s)	3.6	3.6		3.6	3.6		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
All-Red Time (s)	1.9	1.9		1.9	1.9		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
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)	5.5	5.5			5.5		5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Lead/Lag												
Lead-Lag Optimize?												
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Recall Mode	None	None		None	None		Max	Max	Max	Max	Max	Max
Walk Time (s)	7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Flash Dont Walk (s)	21.0	21.0		21.0	21.0		15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
Act Effct Green (s)	9.4	9.4			9.4		87.9	87.9	87.9	87.9	87.9	87.9
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.09	0.09			0.09		0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84
v/c Ratio	0.27	0.23			0.56		0.27	0.44	0.01	0.01	0.60	0.07

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Total Traffic  
AM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Control Delay	49.2	20.6			41.6		4.8	4.4	0.4	2.8	6.3	1.7
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	49.2	20.6			41.6		4.8	4.4	0.4	2.8	6.3	1.7
LOS	D	C			D		A	A	A	A	A	A
Approach Delay		33.2			41.6			4.4			5.8	
Approach LOS		C			D			A			A	
Queue Length 50th (m)	5.7	1.1			10.0		4.6	30.5	0.0	0.3	52.6	1.5
Queue Length 95th (m)	14.3	10.4			24.9		13.3	59.8	0.5	1.4	105.3	5.2
Internal Link Dist (m)		177.1			281.1			183.2			276.4	
Turn Bay Length (m)	50.0						140.0			60.0		25.0
Base Capacity (vph)	330	423			398		436	1452	816	536	1466	1274
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	0.09	0.09			0.22		0.27	0.44	0.01	0.01	0.60	0.07

Intersection Summary

Area Type:	Other
Cycle Length:	120
Actuated Cycle Length:	104.9
Natural Cycle:	90
Control Type:	Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio:	0.60
Intersection Signal Delay:	7.9
Intersection LOS:	A
Intersection Capacity Utilization	81.5%
ICU Level of Service	D
Analysis Period (min)	15

Splits and Phases: 1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive



2: Lusk Street & O'Keefe Court  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Total Traffic  
AM Peak Hour

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	1.6					
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	31	0	28	173	0	26
Future Vol, veh/h	31	0	28	173	0	26
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	3	0	0	6	0	0
Mvmt Flow	31	0	28	173	0	26

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor1	Minor2	Minor3
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	31	0	260
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	31
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	229
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.1	-	6.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.4
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.2	-	3.5
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1595	-	733
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	997
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	814
Platoon blocked, %	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1595	-	719
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	719
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	997
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	799

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	1	8.5
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	1049	-	-	1595	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.025	-	-	0.018	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	8.5	-	-	7.3	0
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	A	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	-	0.1	-

3: Fallowfield Road & Forager Street  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Total Traffic  
AM Peak Hour

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	0.1					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↗		↑↑	↑	↘
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	15	0	776	949	13
Future Vol, veh/h	0	15	0	776	949	13
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	0	-	-	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	6	4	0
Mvmt Flow	0	15	0	776	949	13

Major/Minor	Minor2	Major1	Major2		
Conflicting Flow All	-	949	-	0	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	6.2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	3.3	-	-	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0	319	0	-	-
Stage 1	0	-	0	-	-
Stage 2	0	-	0	-	-
Platoon blocked, %				-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	319	-	-	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	16.8	0	0
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	-	319	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.047	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	16.8	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	C	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	0.1	-	-

1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Total Traffic  
PM Peak Hour



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (vph)	107	3	114	9	1	20	52	661	23	17	767	38
Future Volume (vph)	107	3	114	9	1	20	52	661	23	17	767	38
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800	1800
Storage Length (m)	50.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	140.0		0.0	60.0		25.0
Storage Lanes	1		0	0		0	1		1	1		1
Taper Length (m)	7.5			7.5			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				0.99							
Frt		0.854			0.910				0.850			0.850
Flt Protected	0.950				0.985		0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (prot)	1729	1554	0	0	1607	0	1729	1750	1547	1631	1750	1547
Flt Permitted	0.738				0.873		0.280			0.346		
Satd. Flow (perm)	1340	1554	0	0	1424	0	510	1750	1547	594	1750	1547
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		111			20				39			39
Link Speed (k/h)		50			50			60				60
Link Distance (m)		201.1			305.1			207.2				300.4
Travel Time (s)		14.5			22.0			12.4				18.0
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)	2					2						
Peak Hour Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	6%	4%	0%
Adj. Flow (vph)	107	3	114	9	1	20	52	661	23	17	767	38
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Lane Group Flow (vph)	107	117	0	0	30	0	52	661	23	17	767	38
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	Perm	Perm	NA	Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2				6
Permitted Phases	4			8			2		2	6		6
Detector Phase	4	4		8	8		2	2	2	6	6	6
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Minimum Split (s)	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5		27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4	27.4
Total Split (s)	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5		36.5	36.5	36.5	36.5	36.5	36.5
Total Split (%)	47.9%	47.9%		47.9%	47.9%		52.1%	52.1%	52.1%	52.1%	52.1%	52.1%
Maximum Green (s)	28.0	28.0		28.0	28.0		31.1	31.1	31.1	31.1	31.1	31.1
Yellow Time (s)	3.6	3.6		3.6	3.6		4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
All-Red Time (s)	1.9	1.9		1.9	1.9		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.5	5.5		5.5	5.5		5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Lead/Lag												
Lead-Lag Optimize?												
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Recall Mode	None	None		None	None		Max	Max	Max	Max	Max	Max
Walk Time (s)	7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Flash Dont Walk (s)	21.0	21.0		21.0	21.0		15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
Act Effct Green (s)	9.4	9.4		9.4	9.4		35.8	35.8	35.8	35.8	35.8	35.8
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.18	0.18		0.18	0.18		0.68	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.68
v/c Ratio	0.45	0.32		0.11	0.11		0.15	0.56	0.02	0.04	0.65	0.04



1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Total Traffic  
PM Peak Hour




Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Control Delay	24.9	7.5			11.4		6.7	9.0	1.5	5.5	11.4	2.2
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0			0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	24.9	7.5			11.4		6.7	9.0	1.5	5.5	11.4	2.2
LOS	C	A			B		A	A	A	A	B	A
Approach Delay		15.8			11.4			8.6			10.8	
Approach LOS		B			B			A			B	
Queue Length 50th (m)	8.8	0.5			0.8		1.7	31.9	0.0	0.5	41.0	0.0
Queue Length 95th (m)	20.0	10.3			5.9		6.9	71.7	1.5	2.8	#103.7	2.8
Internal Link Dist (m)		177.1			281.1			183.2			276.4	
Turn Bay Length (m)	50.0						140.0			60.0		25.0
Base Capacity (vph)	713	878			767		346	1188	1063	403	1188	1063
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	0.13			0.04		0.15	0.56	0.02	0.04	0.65	0.04

Intersection Summary

Area Type:	Other
Cycle Length:	70
Actuated Cycle Length:	52.7
Natural Cycle:	75
Control Type:	Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio:	0.65
Intersection Signal Delay:	10.6
Intersection LOS:	B
Intersection Capacity Utilization:	67.6%
ICU Level of Service:	C
Analysis Period (min):	15
# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.	
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.	

Splits and Phases: 1: Fallowfield Road & O'Keefe Court/Cobble Hill Drive



2: Lusk Street & O'Keefe Court  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Total Traffic  
PM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 1.8

Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	178	0	33	32	0	23
Future Vol, veh/h	178	0	33	32	0	23
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mvmt Flow	178	0	33	32	0	23

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor1	Minor2	Minor3
Conflicting Flow All	0	0	178	0	276
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	178
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	98
Critical Hdwy	-	-	4.1	-	6.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.4
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.4
Follow-up Hdwy	-	-	2.2	-	3.5
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1410	-	718
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	858
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	931
Platoon blocked, %	-	-	-	-	-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	-	1410	-	701
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	701
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	858
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	909

Approach	EB	WB	NB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	3.9	9.3
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBLn1	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT
Capacity (veh/h)	870	-	-	1410	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.026	-	-	0.023	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	9.3	-	-	7.6	0
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	A	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	-	0.1	-

3: Fallowfield Road & Forager Street  
115 Lusk Street

Future (2028) Total Traffic  
PM Peak Hour

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh 0.2

Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		↗		↑↑	↑	↘
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	23	0	743	878	17
Future Vol, veh/h	0	23	0	743	878	17
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	-	0	-	-	-	250
Veh in Median Storage, #	0	-	-	0	0	-
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	100	100	100	100	100	100
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	0	3	4	0
Mvmt Flow	0	23	0	743	878	17


Major/Minor	Minor2	Major1	Major2
Conflicting Flow All	-	878	0
Stage 1	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy	-	6.2	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-
Follow-up Hdwy	-	3.3	-
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	0	350	0
Stage 1	0	-	0
Stage 2	0	-	0
Platoon blocked, %			-
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	-	350	-
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-
Stage 1	-	-	-
Stage 2	-	-	-

Approach	EB	NB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	16	0	0
HCM LOS	C		

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	NBT	EBLn1	SBT	SBR
Capacity (veh/h)	-	350	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	0.066	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	-	16	-	-
HCM Lane LOS	-	C	-	-
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	0.2	-	-


## Appendix K – Auxiliary Lane Analyses

O'Keefe Court & Lusk Street - Future (2028) Total Traffic - AM Peak Hour  
Westbound Left-turn Lane



- TRAFFIC SIGNALS MAY BE WARRANTED IN RURAL AREAS OR URBAN AREAS WITH RESTRICTED FLOW
- TRAFFIC SIGNALS MAY BE WARRANTED IN "FREE FLOW" URBAN AREAS
- Opposing Volume
- Advancing Volume

O'Keefe Court & Lusk Street - Future (2028) Total Traffic - PM Peak Hour  
Westbound Left-Turn Lane



- TRAFFIC SIGNALS MAY BE WARRANTED IN RURAL AREAS OR URBAN AREAS WITH RESTRICTED FLOW
- TRAFFIC SIGNALS MAY BE WARRANTED IN "FREE FLOW" URBAN AREAS
- Opposing Volume
- Advancing Volume