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## 1 INTRODUCTION

Background
Plans are being prepared for a residential development of up to 1,250 apartment units in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, see Figure 1. The proposed development is planned to include 10 midrise apartment buildings, as shown in Figure 2. Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) has requested that a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) be completed to review the impacts to the adjacent road network. WSP Canada Inc. has been retained to complete a Traffic Impact Study for the proposed Research Drive Development.


Figure 1 - Study Area and Study Intersections

A Traffic Impact Study Usually Considers Four Questions

Study Objectives

A TIS usually consists of determining answers for the following questions:

1. What is the existing transportation situation adjacent to the study site? How have volumes changed historically?
2. What transportation changes are expected at key Study Area locations? How many vehicle and active mode trips are expected to be generated by the proposed development during weekday peak hours? What routes are the trips expected to use to travel within and through the Study Area?
3. What transportation impacts will occur on Study Area roads, sidewalks, and intersections?
4. What transportation improvements are required to mitigate project impacts on Study Area travel? Are there transportation modifications that should be made to improve the travel experience for all users?

The objectives of the Traffic Impact Study are to:

1. Develop projected 2042 background weekday AM and PM peak hourly volumes for Study Intersections.
2. Estimate the number of weekday AM and PM peak hour trips that will be generated by the proposed development.
3. Distribute and assign site generated trips to Study Intersections to project 2042 peak hourly volumes that include site generated trips.
4. Evaluate impacts of site generated traffic on the performance of Study Intersections.
5. Complete warrant analyses, as necessary, for Study Intersections and recommend improvements that may be needed at Study Intersections to mitigate the impacts of site development.


Figure 2 - Site Plan

## 2 STUDY AREA DESCRIPTIONS

Description of Existing Development

## Description of Proposed Development

## Existing

Study Road
Descriptions

Existing
Study
Intersection
Descriptions

There is currently an office building located on the proposed site and is approximately $80 \%$ occupied. The office building of approximately $65,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ will be demolished and the proposed 10 mid-rise apartment buildings will be constructed in phases. The access to the existing office building is via Research Drive.

The proposed residential development is planned to include 10 mid-rise apartment buildings with up to 1,250 units. It is anticipated that the development will be completed by 2037. The horizon year of 2042 (build-out + five years) was analysed.

Prince Arthur Avenue is a two-lane minor collector roadway (one lane in each direction). The posted speed limit within the study area is $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. There is an asphalt sidewalk on the west side and a concrete sidewalk on the east side of Prince Arthur Avenue. There are no transit services on Prince Arthur Avenue.

Fenwick Street is a local road that has two lanes with one lane in each direction and a posted speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. There is sidewalk on both sides of Fenwick Street to Clement Street and then sidewalk on the south side to Research Drive. There are no transit services on Fenwick Street.

Research Drive is a local road that has two lanes with one lane in each direction and a posted speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. There are no sidewalk facilities or transit services on Research Drive.

Neptune Crescent is a local road that has two lanes with one lane in each direction and a posted speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. There are no sidewalk facilities or transit services on Neptune Crescent.

Mount Hope Avenue is a minor collector road that has two lanes with one lane in each direction and a posted speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. There is a sidewalk on the north side and an asphalt multiuse pathway on the south side of Mount Hope Avenue. Transit Route \#67 provides service along Mount Hope Avenue.

Intersection \#1 - Portland Street at Prince Arthur Avenue is a 3-leg signalized intersection with a shared through/right-turn lane in the eastbound direction and a dedicated left-turn lane with a through lane in the westbound direction on Portland Street. The northbound approach has a leftturn and right-turn lane on Prince Arthur Avenue. There are marked pedestrian crossings on all approaches.

Intersection \#2 - Prince Arthur Avenue at Fenwick Street is a 3-leg intersection with stop control on the Fenwick Street approach (westbound approach). All approaches have a shared movement and there are two marked pedestrian crossings, one on the east side of the intersection crossing Fenwick Street and a second that is further removed from the intersection on the west leg of Prince Arthur Avenue.

Intersection \#3 - Neptune Crescent at Ragus Road is a 4-leg intersection with stop control on Ragus Road. All approaches are shared movements and there are no marked pedestrian crossings at this intersection.

Intersection \#4 - Mount Hope Avenue at Neptune Crescent is a 3-leg intersection with stop control on Neptune Crescent. All approaches are shared movements and there are no marked pedestrian crossings at this intersection.

Intersection \#5 - Mount Hope Avenue at Leonamarie Drive is a 3-leg signalized intersection. The eastbound approach has a left turn lane and a through lane, the westbound approach has a through lane and a right turn channelized lane, while the southbound approach has a left turn lane
and a right turn lane. There are marked crosswalks on all three approaches and a multi-use path on the west side of Leonamarie Drive.

## 3 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC

Turning Movement Counts

Future Nearby
Development

Traffic Growth Rate

Active Transportation \& Transit

Turning movement counts were collected by WSP on Thursday, November $23^{\text {rd }}, 2023$ at Study Intersection 1 during the morning (7:00-9:00AM), midday (11:30AM-1:30PM), and afternoon (4:00-6:00PM) peak periods and at Study Intersection 2 to 4 on Tuesday, March 22, 2022 during the morning (7:00-9:00AM), midday (11:30AM-1:30PM) and afternoon (4:00-6:00PM) peak periods. Intersection counts have been tabulated in 15 -minute intervals with peak hours indicated by shaded areas. Turning movement volumes are provided in Tables A-1 to A-4, Appendix A.

There is a nearby development located on Mount Hope Avenue that includes a large residential development of approximately 875 units. The initial phase of that development is under construction and it is anticipated to be completed by 2029. WSP completed the Traffic Impact Study for this other Mount Hope Avenue Development and has included the full build-out of the $20 \%$ non-vehicle reduction analysis scenario in the background road network. That new development includes a new signalized intersection along Mount Hope Avenue and this newly signalized intersection has been included in the study area.

There is limited historical data for the Southdale area and the Mount Hope Avenue Interchange with Highway 111. Therefore, an annual growth rate of $0.5 \%$ has been applied to project the 2042 background volumes for this Traffic Impact Study for other nearby developments, in addition to the Mount Hope Avenue Development noted above.

Within the study area there is sidewalk provided on Prince Arthur Avenue and Fenwick Street. On Research Drive and Neptune Crescent there are currently no active transportation facilities. Within the proposed development, there are plans to include sidewalk facilities throughout and an active transportation connection to Lynn Drive from Fenwick Street. On Research Drive, that is outside the proposed development area and on Neptune Crescent, it is recommended that HRM complete a review to extend the active transportation facilities to Mount Hope Avenue to connect into the existing sidewalk and multi-use pathway.

There are currently transit routes on Portland Street (Routes \# 5, 158, 161, 165, 168, 159), and Mount Hope Avenue (Route \#67), however there are no transit routes that travel along the frontage of the proposed development. HRM is currently undertaking a corridor study along Portland Street that reviews opportunities to improve transit and active transportation connections.

## 4 TRIP GENERATION, DISTRIBUTION, AND ASSIGNMENT

## Prepared Trip

## Generation

 Estimates
## Estimation of

 Trips Generated by Background Development Existing \& Proposed Development
## Anticipated Land

Use for the
Existing \&
Proposed
Development

## Person Trips

 Generated by the Existing \& Proposed DevelopmentWhen using the published trip generation rates in the Trip Generation Manual (Institute of Transportation Engineers), the transportation engineer's objective should be to provide a realistic estimate of the number of trips that will be generated by the proposed development.
The background development, Mount Hope Avenue (Clayton), is expected to include 875 residential units. Trips generated by that development have been assigned to the study area for this TIS.

The existing development has an office building of approximately $65,00 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ that was $80 \%$ occupied during the traffic data collection. The proposed development is expected to include 875 mid-rise apartment units.

Trips generated by the existing Office Building (Land Use 710) are estimated for the AM and PM peak hours by square footage and Multi-family Housing Mid-Rise (Land Use 221) are estimated for the AM and PM peak hours of traffic by unit count. Trip generation estimates for the proposed development were prepared using published rates from Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, 2021).

Based on the proposed development's proximity to numerous amenities and that the site lies within an area of HRM with trail connectivity and frequent transit nearby, many of the trips generated by the proposed development are anticipated to be non-auto trips. Using the methodology provided in Trip Generation Handbook, $3^{r d}$ Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, 2017), estimates of the total person trips generated by the development were prepared (See Table 1).

Trip generation estimates for the existing and proposed developments are summarized in Table 1. It is estimated that the development will generate:

- 540 two-way person trips ( 63 entering and 477 exiting) during the AM peak hour; and,
- 485 two-way person trips ( 335 entering and 150 exiting) during the PM peak hour.

Table 1 - Trip Generation Estimates for the Existing \& Proposed Developments

| Land Use ${ }^{1}$ | Units ${ }^{2}$ | Trip Generation Rates ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  | Trip Generation Estimates ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out |
| Existing Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Office Building (Land Use 710) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 52.0 \\ \text { KGLA } \end{gathered}$ | 1.34 | 0.18 | 0.24 | 1.20 | 70 | 9 | 13 | 62 |
| Proposed Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multi-family Housing (Mid-Rise) <br> (Land Use 221) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1250 \\ & \text { Units } \end{aligned}$ | Equations from Pages 275 and 276 |  |  |  | 124 | 415 | 298 | 190 |
| Net Trip Generation Estimates for Proposed Development |  |  |  |  |  | 54 | 406 | 285 | 128 |
| Net Estimated Person Trips for the Proposed Development |  |  |  |  |  | 63 | 477 | 335 | 150 |

NOTES: 1. Land Use Codes are from Trip Generation, 11th Edition, (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, 2021).
2. 'Residential Units' for Multi-family Housing and 'Gross Leasable Area $\times 1000$ SF' for all other land uses.
3. Rates are 'vehicles per hour per unit'; trips generated are 'vehicles per hour for peak hours'.

Estimated Modal Shares of Development Trips

Trip Distribution and Assignment

The Halifax Regional Municipality Integrated Mobility Plan includes targets for non-auto modal shares within the Municipality: at least $30 \%$ of trips will be made by sustainable modes of travel (walking / rolling, bicycling or transit) by 2031. Since the proposed development is located in a more industrial area, a more conservative modal share been applied. Table 2 shows the estimated site generated trips by modal share.

Table 2 - Site Generated Trips by Modal Share

| Travel Mode | Modal Share | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | In | Out |  |  |  |  |  |
| Person Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{6 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ |
| Auto Driver | $\mathbf{7 5 \%}$ | 48 | 357 | 252 | 112 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Auto Passenger | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | 6 | 48 | 33 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transit | $\mathbf{1 0} \%$ | 6 | 48 | 33 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Active Modes | $\mathbf{5} \%$ | 3 | 24 | 17 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |

It is estimated that the development will generate:

- 405 new two-way vehicle trips (48 entering and 357 exiting) during the AM peak hour; and,
- 364 new two-way vehicle trips (252 entering and 112 exiting) during the PM peak hour.

The proposed development generated trips were distributed to the Study Intersections based on counted volumes and local knowledge of the area considering major trip origins and destinations in the region. The estimated directional distributions are provided below.

| Direction <br> North \& West on <br> Portland | Distribution <br> $25 \%$ | Description <br> (Dartmouth, Macdonald Bridge and surrounding <br> areas) |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| North \& East on Portland | $20 \%$ | (Cole Harbour, Hwy 111 and surrounding areas) <br> South |
| West to Pleasant | $20 \%$ | (Eastern Passage and surrounding areas) <br> (Acadia Street, Dartmouth General Hospital, |
| East to Hwy 111 | $25 \%$ | Woodside, Macdonald Bridge and surrounding <br> areas) <br> (MacKay Bridge, Sackville and surrounding areas) |

Peak hourly estimated site generated vehicle volumes were distributed and assigned to external streets and intersections in the study area using the above assumptions. Assigned AM and PM peak hourly site generated volumes are illustrated diagrammatically on Figure A-2, Appendix A. Assigned site development trips were added to background volumes (Figure A-1, Appendix A) to provide estimates of the AM and PM peak hour volumes at study area intersections for development build-out which are illustrated diagrammatically on Figure A-3, Appendix A.

## 5 INTERSECTION OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS

Intersection Capacity Analysis was completed to estimate how intersections may be expected to operate into the future without and with site generated trips. This section of the report addresses how left-turn lane warrants and traffic signal warrants were conducted and how each intersection was evaluated. The following subsections identify each study intersection and summarize the results of the operational analysis.
Left-Turn Left-turn movements on a two-lane street may cause both operational and safety problems.

Lane
Warrant
Analysis

Traffic
Signal Warrant
Analysis Capacity
Analysis
Results

Intersection Synchro 11 software have been used for performance evaluation of the Study Intersections.
A signal warrant analysis is completed to determine if the installation of traffic signals at an intersection will provide a positive impact on total intersection operation. That is, the benefits in time saved and improved safety that will accrue to vehicles entering from a side street will exceed the impact that signals will have in time lost and potential additional collisions for vehicles approaching the intersection on the main street.

The Canadian Traffic Signal Warrant Matrix Analysis (Transportation Association of Canada (TAC), 2005) considers 100 warrant points as an indication that traffic signals will provide a positive impact. Signal warrant analysis uses vehicular and pedestrian volumes, and intersection, roadway and study area characteristics to calculate a warrant point value.

Evaluation of traffic signal warrants were completed for appropriate intersections using 2042 traffic volumes with the proposed development and traffic signals are not warranted at any of the unsignalized study intersections. Summaries of the results are provided in the following sub-sections and detailed results of the analyses are included in Appendix C.

### 5.1 ANALYSIS SCENARIOS

Scenario 1 - Future 2042 without Site: Represents future 2042 traffic volumes on the existing road network, including the traffic control and lane configurations that may be warranted without site generated trips.

Scenario 2 - Future 2042 with Site: Represents future 2042 traffic volumes on the existing road network, including the traffic control and lane configurations that may be warranted with site generated trips. The traffic signals at the intersection of Portland Street and Prince Arthur Avenue have been optimized in both the AM and PM peak periods.

Scenario 3 - Future 2042 with Site \& intersection modifications: Represents future 2042 traffic volumes with the proposed development, including modified lane configurations and/or traffic control.

### 5.2 INT \#1: PORTLAND STREET AT PRINCE ARTHUR AVENUE

Operational performance results for this intersection are provided in Table 3 for both the AM and PM peak hours.
The intersection is expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits during the AM and PM peak hours with the exception of the eastbound through/right-turn movement that is over the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ threshold ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio over 0.85 ) without and with the proposed development in the PM peak period. The westbound left-turn lane in the PM peak hour may spill over into the through lane periodically without and with site development as the existing storage length is approximately 55 m ; however, the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length is 45 m with site development and is expected to be contained within the left-turn lane.

HRM is completing a corridor study of Portland Street and modifications at this intersection should be deferred until that plan is finalized.

Table 3 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: Portland Street at Prince Arthur Avenue

| LOS <br> Criteria | Control Delay (sec/veh), v/c Ratio, and $95^{\text {th }}$ \%ile Queue (m) by Intersection Movement |  |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Portland Street |  |  | Prince Arthur Avenue |  |  |  |
|  | EB-TR | WB-L | WB-T | NB-L | NB-R | Delay | Control |
| Future 2042 without Site AM Peak Hour (Page C-1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 21.1 | 6.4 | 11.9 | 20.3 | 7.3 | 13.3 |  |
| v/c | 0.68 | 0.39 | 0.69 | 0.11 | 0.37 |  |  |
| Queue | 58.3 | 14.3 | 72.1 | 10.9 | 13.9 |  |  |
| Future 2042 with Site AM Peak Hour (Page C-11) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 22.2 | 7.0 | 12.2 | 24.6 | 7.2 | 14.2 |  |
| v/c | 0.69 | 0.41 | 0.69 | 0.38 | 0.47 |  |  |
| Queue | 69.0 | 18.5 | 85.8 | 31.2 | 17.0 |  |  |
| Future 2042 without Site PM Peak Hour (Page C-6) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 30.2 | 32.2 | 5.9 | 34.8 | 10.7 | 21.3 |  |
| v/c | 0.90 | 0.76 | 0.42 | 0.22 | 0.59 |  |  |
| Queue | 212.2 | 61.7 | 51.9 | 19.0 | 20.8 |  |  |

Future 2042 with Site PM Peak Hour (Page C-16)

| Delay | 36.0 | 45.6 | 5.0 | 53.1 | 13.4 |  | 27.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v/c | $\mathbf{0 . 9 2}$ | 0.82 | 0.39 | 0.41 | 0.66 |  |  |
| Queue | $\mathbf{2 9 7 . 0}$ | 98.4 | 53.7 | 35.6 | 26.2 |  |  |

### 5.3 INT \#2: PRINCE ARTHUR AVENUE AT FENWICK STREET

Operational performance results for this intersection are provided in Table 4 for both the AM and PM peak hours. A traffic signal warrant was completed for the 2042 Future with Site scenario, and it was determined that:

- 2042 Future with Site: Traffic signals are not warranted (17 Warrant Points, Table B-1, Appendix B)

The intersection is expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits during the AM and PM peak hours. Negligible changes in the operational performance of this intersection are expected with the addition of the proposed development. With an increase of trips expected on Fenwick Street in both the AM and PM peak periods, it is recommended that HRM complete a review to determine if traffic calming features may be required.

| LOS Criteria | Control Delay (sec/veh), v/c Ratio, and $95^{\text {th }} \%$ ile Queue ( m ) by Intersection Movement |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Prince Arthur Avenue |  | Fenwick Street |  |  |
|  | EB-TR | WB-LT | NB-LR | Delay | Control |
| Future 2042 without Site AM Peak Hour (Page C-2) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 0.0 | 2.0 | 10.0 | 1.6 |  |
| v/c | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.04 |  |  |
| Queue | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Future 2042 with Site AM Peak Hour (Page C-12) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 0.0 | 2.6 | 10.7 | 4.2 | $\square$ |
| v/c | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.24 |  |  |
| Queue | 0.0 | 1.6 | 7.5 |  |  |
| Future 2042 without Site PM Peak Hour (Page C-7) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 0.0 | 1.0 | 11.1 | 2.2 |  |
| v/c | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.16 |  |  |
| Queue | 0.0 | 0.5 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Future 2042 with Site PM Peak Hour (Page C-17) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 0.0 | 3.9 | 12.1 | 4.1 | $\square$ |
| v/c | 0.18 | 0.31 | 0.25 |  |  |
| Queue | 0.0 | 3.2 | 7.9 |  |  |

### 5.4 INT \#3: NEPTUNE CRESCENT AT RAGUS ROAD

Operational performance results for this intersection are provided in Table 5 for both the AM and PM peak hours.
A left-turn lane warrant was completed for the intersection, and it was determined that a left-turn lane is not warranted, see Figure B-1 \& B-2 in Appendix B. Based on the existing traffic control and lane configurations, traffic signal warrants were completed for the study scenarios, and it was determined that:

- 2042 Future with Site: Traffic signals are not warranted (11 Warrant Points, Table B-2, Appendix B)

The intersection is expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits during the AM and PM peak hours. Negligible changes in the operational performance of this intersection are expected with the addition of the proposed development.

Table 5 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: Neptune Crescent at Ragus Road

| LOS <br> Criteria | Control Delay (sec/veh), v/c Ratio, and $95^{\text {th }} \%$ ile Queue (m) by Intersection Movement |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ragus Drive |  | Neptune Crescent |  |  |  |
|  | EB-LTR | WB-LTR | NB-LTR | SB-LTR | Delay | Control |
| Future 2042 without Site AM Peak Hour (Page C-3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 9.7 | 10.5 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 3.0 |  |
| v/c | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.03 |  |  |
| Queue | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Future 2042 with Site AM Peak Hour (Page C-13) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 11.9 | 12.9 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 1.9 |  |
| v/c | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0.18 |  |  |
| Queue | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.0 |  |  |

Future 2042 without Site PM Peak Hour (Page C-8)

| Delay | 9.7 | 10.9 | 1.4 | 0.0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v/c | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 2.6 |
| Queue | 1.9 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 |  |

Future 2042 with Site PM Peak Hour (Page C-18)

| Delay | 12.5 | 14.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v/c | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.15 |
| Queue | 4.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 |

### 5.5 INT \#4: NEPTUNE CRESCENT AT MOUNT HOPE AVENUE

Operational performance results for this intersection are provided in Table 6 for both the AM and PM peak hours.
A left-turn lane warrant was completed for the intersection, and it was determined that a left-turn lane is warranted on Mount Hope Avenue in the eastbound direction, see Figure B-1 in Appendix B. A concept plan for that left turn lane is included in Appendix D. Based on the existing traffic control and lane configurations, traffic signal warrants were completed for the study scenarios, and it was determined that:

- 2042 Future with Site: Traffic signals are not warranted ( 76 Warrant Points, Table B-3, Appendix B)

The intersection is expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits during the AM and PM peak hours with the exception of the southbound left-turn lane in the PM peak period is expected to perform with 95 seconds of delay, however the v/c ratio is within HRM Guidelines.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LOS } \\ & \text { Criteria } \end{aligned}$ | Control Delay (sec/veh), v/c Ratio, and $95^{\text {th }}$ \%ile Queue ( m ) by Intersection Movement |  |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mount Hope Avenue |  |  | Neptune Crescent |  |  |  |
|  | EB-L | EB-T | WB-TR | SB-L | SB-R | Delay | Control |
| Scenario 1 - Future 2042 without Site AM Peak Hour - LT Lane as Warranted (Page C-4) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 9.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.9 | 13.3 | 1.1 |  |
| v/c | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.44 | 0.11 | 0.05 |  |  |
| Queue | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Scenario 2 - Future 2042 with Site AM Peak Hour - LT Lane as Warranted (Page C-14) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.5 | 16.5 | 4.8 |  |
| v/c | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.26 |  |  |
| Queue | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.6 | 8.2 |  |  |
| Scenario 1 - Future 2042 without Site PM Peak Hour- LT Lane as Warranted (Page C-9) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.7 | 10.2 | 3.8 |  |
| v/c | 0.02 | 0.36 | 0.22 | 0.49 | 0.03 |  |  |
| Queue | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.8 |  |  |
| Scenario 2 - Future 2042 with Site PM Peak Hour - LT Lane as Warranted (Page C-19) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 94.9 | 11.0 | 11.5 |  |
| v/c | 0.08 | 0.39 | 0.28 | 0.90 | 0.08 |  |  |
| Queue | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 53.6 | 1.9 |  |  |

While the analysis summarized in Table 6 has been completed as a stand-alone intersection, the proposed traffic signals on Mount Hope Avenue with the nearby development may provide additional gaps on Mount Hope Avenue and assist the left-turn movement from Neptune Crescent. The network performance during the PM peak hour was output using SimTraffic software and is summarized in Table 7.

Table 7-SimTraffic PM Delays - Mount Hope Avenue at Neptune Crescent

| Sim Traffic | Control Delay (sec/veh) by Intersection Movement |  |  |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mount Hope Avenue |  |  |  | Neptune Crescent |  |  |  |
|  | EB-L | EB-T | WB-T | WB-R | SB-L | SB-R | Delay | Control |
| Delay | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.9 | 6.3 | 3.0 |  |

### 5.6 INT \#5: MOUNT HOPE AVENUE AT LEONAMARIE DRIVE

Operational performance results for this intersection are provided in Table 8 for both the AM and PM peak hours.
The intersection is expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits during the AM and PM peak hours with the exception of the westbound through movement during the AM peak hour and the eastbound through movement during the PM peak hour. Both are at or over the v/c threshold (v/c ratio over 0.85 ) without and with the proposed development.

The traffic generated by the proposed development is expected to have little impact on the performance of this intersection.

Table 8 - Intersection Capacity Analysis: Mount Hope Avenue at Leonamarie Drive

| LOS Criteria | Control Delay (sec/veh), v/c Ratio, and $95^{\text {th }}$ \%ile Queue (m) by Intersection Movement |  |  |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mount Hope Avenue |  |  |  | Leonamarie Drive |  |  |  |
|  | EB-L | EB-T | WB-T | WB-R | SB-L | SB-R | Delay | Control |
| Future 2042 without Site AM Peak Hour (Page C-5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 8.6 | 6.5 | 19.2 | 2.9 | 34.4 | 9.4 | 17.5 |  |
| v/c | 0.17 | 0.25 | 0.85 | 0.08 | 0.58 | 0.18 |  |  |
| Queue | 5.1 | 28.2 | 161.0 | 6.0 | 56.2 | 10.7 |  |  |
| Future 2042 with Site AM Peak Hour (Page C-15) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 10.0 | 7.1 | 21.3 | 2.7 | 37.3 | 9.6 | 18.5 |  |
| v/c | 0.20 | 0.34 | 0.88 | 0.08 | 0.60 | 0.19 |  |  |
| Queue | 5.6 | 41.3 | 189.3 | 5.8 | 56.2 | 10.7 |  |  |

Future 2042 without Site PM Peak Hour (Page C-10)

| Delay | 5.2 | 17.7 | 6.5 | 1.3 | 30.7 | 11.1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ | 0.11 | $\mathbf{0 . 8 5}$ | 0.36 | 0.18 | 0.42 | 0.14 |  |
| Queue | 7.5 | $\mathbf{1 5 0 . 0}$ | 38.3 | 5.9 | 37.3 | 8.8 |  |


| Future 2042 with Site PM Peak Hour (Page C-20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Delay | 5.2 | 19.5 | 6.9 | 1.2 | 33.8 | 11.4 | 14.8 |  |
| v/c | 0.12 | 0.88 | 0.42 | 0.17 | 0.44 | 0.15 |  |  |
| Queue | 7.7 | 183.4 | 50.9 | 5.9 | 37.3 | 8.8 |  |  |

6 SUMMARY \& CONCLUSIONS

### 6.1 SUMMARY

| Background | 1. Plans are being prepared by Portucana Construction and AJ LeGrow Holdings for a residential development of up to 1,250 apartment units in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia. The proposed development is planned to include 10 mid-rise apartment buildings. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Description of Existing Development | 2. There is currently an office building located on the proposed site and is approximately $80 \%$ occupied. The office building of approximately $65,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ will be demolished and the proposed 10 mid-rise apartment buildings will be constructed in phases. The access to the existing office building is via Research Drive. |
| Future <br> Nearby <br> Development | 3. There is a known nearby future development located on Mount Hope Avenue that includes a large residential development of approximately 875 units. It is anticipated to be completed by 2029. |
| Description of Proposed Development | 4. The proposed development is planned to include up to 1,250 mid-rise apartment units and it is anticipated that the development will be completed by 2037. |
| Proposed Site Access | 5. The access to the proposed development will be via multiple driveways on Research Drive. |
| Study Area Roads | 6. The study considers Portland Street, Prince Arthur Avenue, Fenwick Street, Neptune Crescent, Mount Hope Avenue, and Leonamarie Drive. |
| Turning Movement Counts | 7. Turning movement volumes were collected by WSP on Tuesday, March $22^{\text {nd }}, 2022$. |
| Background Traffic Volumes | 8. Projected 2042 peak hour future background volumes include an annual growth of $0.5 \%$ between 2022 and 2042. |
| Estimation of Trips Generated by Background Development | 9. The background development, Mount Hope Avenue (Clayton), is expected to include 875 residential units. Trips generated by that development have been assigned to the study area for this TIS. |
| Estimation of Existing \& Proposed Development Trips | 10. Trip generation estimates for the proposed development were prepared using rates published in Trip Generation, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, 2021). <br> 11. It is estimated that the development will generate: <br> - 405 two-way primary vehicle trips (48 entering and 357 exiting) during the AM peak hour; and, <br> - 364 two-way pass-by vehicle trips (252 entering and 112 exiting) during the PM peak hour. |


| Trip |
| :--- |
| Distribution |
| and |
| Assignment |

12. Proposed development generated trips were distributed to the Study Intersections based on counted volumes and local knowledge of the area considering major trip origins and destinations in the region. Trips were distributed to the north and west on Portland Street $(25 \%)$, north and east on Portland Street (20\%), west (20\%), east ( $25 \%$ ) and south ( $10 \%$ ).

Analysis Scenarios Considered
13. Scenario 1 - Future 2042 without Site: Represents future 2042 traffic volumes on the existing road network, including the traffic control and lane configurations that may be warranted without site generated trips.
14. Scenario 2 - Future 2042 with Site: Represents future 2042 traffic volumes on the existing road network, including the traffic control and lane configurations that may be warranted with site generated trips. The traffic signals at the intersection of Portland Street and Prince Arthur Avenue have been optimized in both the AM and PM peak periods.
15. Scenario 3 - Future 2042 with Site \& intersection modifications: Represents future 2042 traffic volumes with the proposed development, including modified lane configurations and/or traffic control.

Warrant Analysis Summary
16. Warrant reviews were completed for left-turn lanes and traffic signals with the projected traffic volumes.
17. It was determined that left-turn lanes are warranted at the following study intersection:

- Neptune Crescent @ Mount Hope Avenue (without and with site development)

18. It was determined that traffic signals are not warranted at the unsignalized study intersections.

Summary Intersection Capacity Analysis
19. Intersection performance analysis was completed using Synchro 11 at the Study Intersections.
20. The Portland Street at Prince Arthur Avenue intersection is expected to work well during the study analysis scenarios during both the AM and PM peak periods without and with the proposed development. During the PM peak period the eastbound through/right-turn is expected to operate over the HRM acceptable limits (v/c ratio over 0.85 ) without and with the proposed development. The westbound left-turn lane in the PM peak hour may spill over into the through lane periodically as the existing storage length is approximately 55 m ; however, the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length is 45 m and is expected to be contained within the left-turn lane.
21. The Prince Arthur Avenue at Fenwick Street intersection is expected to operate well during both the AM and PM peak periods and within HRM Guidelines.
22. The Neptune Crescent at Ragus Road intersection is expected to operate well during both the AM and PM peak periods and within HRM Guidelines.
23. The Neptune Crescent at Mount Hope Avenue intersection is expected to operate well during both the AM and PM peak periods with the inclusion of the eastbound left-turn lane on Mount Hope Avenue and within HRM Guidelines with the exception of the southbound leftturn lane in the PM peak period is expected to perform with 95 seconds of delay. With traffic signals being proposed on Mount Hope Avenue with the nearby development, this may provide gaps in the network to allow for vehicles to travel left onto Mount Hope Avenue and improve this operation, as demonstrated by the SimTraffic analysis.
24. The Mount Hope Avenue at Leonamarie Drive intersection is expected to operate well during both the AM and PM peak periods with the exception of the westbound through movement in the AM peak hour and the eastbound through movement during the PM peak hour (v/c ratio over 0.85 ) without and with site generated trips. The trips generated by the proposed development are expected to have little impact on the performance of the intersection.

### 6.2 CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions 25. Trips generated by the Research Drive Development are expected to have a minimal or negligible impact on the operational performance of any of the Study Intersections and the adjacent street network.
26. HRM should monitor the Neptune Drive at Mount Hope Avenue intersection and install a left-turn lane at this intersection.

## APPENDIX



TRAFFIC VOLUME DATA

| Table A-1 <br> Portland Street <br> @ ince Arthur Avenue <br> Dartmouth, NS <br> Thursday, November 23, 2023 |  |  |  | Portland Street |  |  | Portland Street |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Ped 1 <br> rthur A |  |  |
| AM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Prince Arthur Avenue Northbound Approach |  | Portland Street Westbound Approach |  | Portland StreetEastbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | C | D | E | K | L |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 107 | 42 | 2 | 179 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 6 | 29 | 14 | 152 | 66 | 4 | 271 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 5 | 32 | 19 | 154 | 62 | 4 | 276 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 4 | 39 | 41 | 154 | 76 | 8 | 322 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 5 | 25 | 31 | 165 | 76 | 7 | 309 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 4 | 37 | 40 | 138 | 72 | 14 | 305 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 11 | 34 | 47 | 172 | 76 | 6 | 346 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 12 | 40 | 63 | 132 | 76 | 8 | 331 |
| AM Peak Hour |  | 32 | 136 | 181 | 607 | 300 | 35 | 1291 |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 19 | 109 | 89 | 567 | 246 | 18 | 1048 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 32 | 136 | 181 | 607 | 300 | 35 | 1291 |
|  |  | Ped 1 |  | Ped 2 |  | Ped 4 |  | Total Peds |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 5 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 5 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 6 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  | 8 |
| Midday Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Prince Arthur Avenue Northbound Approach |  | Portland Street Westbound Approach |  | Portland Street Eastbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | C | D | E | K | L |  |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 6 | 37 | 28 | 106 | 87 | 4 | 268 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 6 | 29 | 25 | 95 | 114 | 5 | 274 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 14 | 49 | 26 | 92 | 110 | 7 | 298 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 9 | 46 | 39 | 122 | 105 | 10 | 331 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 7 | 40 | 38 | 106 | 107 | 8 | 306 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 9 | 47 | 39 | 92 | 108 | 5 | 300 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 7 | 37 | 40 | 97 | 102 | 10 | 293 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 5 | 39 | 26 | 112 | 99 | 10 | 291 |
| Midday Peak Hour |  | 39 | 182 | 142 | 412 | 430 | 30 | 1235 |
| 11:30 | 12:30 | 35 | 161 | 118 | 415 | 416 | 26 | 1171 |
| 12:30 | 13:30 | 28 | 163 | 143 | 407 | 416 | 33 | 1190 |
|  |  | Ped 1 |  | Ped 2 |  | Ped 4 |  | Total Peds |
| 11:30 | 12:30 | 12 |  | 0 |  | 5 |  | 17 |
| 12:30 | 13:30 | 5 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 7 |
| PM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Prince Arthur Avenue Northbound Approach |  | Portland Street Westbound Approach |  | Portland Street Eastbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | C | D | E | K | L |  |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 15 | 49 | 48 | 103 | 160 | 6 | 381 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 8 | 64 | 48 | 128 | 187 | 10 | 445 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 12 | 64 | 53 | 114 | 168 | 6 | 417 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 9 | 47 | 58 | 99 | 177 | 14 | 404 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 18 | 42 | 50 | 120 | 167 | 6 | 403 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 7 | 42 | 45 | 139 | 143 | 8 | 384 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 11 | 52 | 45 | 135 | 171 | 4 | 418 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 9 | 41 | 50 | 119 | 102 | 6 | 327 |
| PM Peak Hour |  | 47 | 217 | 209 | 461 | 699 | 36 | 1669 |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 44 | 224 | 207 | 444 | 692 | 36 | 1647 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 | 45 | 177 | 190 | 513 | 583 | 24 | 1532 |
|  |  | Ped 1 |  | Ped 2 |  | Ped 4 |  | Total Peds |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 15 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 16 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 | 8 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 9 |



| Table A-3 <br> Neptune Crescent <br> @ <br> Ragus Drive <br> Dartmouth, NS <br> Tuesday, March 22, 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{K} \\ \hline \text { Ragus } \end{array}$ | $\mathrm{Ne}$ | rescent <br> B C <br> escent | gus |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Neptune Crescent Northbound Approach |  |  | Ragus DriveWestbound Approach |  |  | Neptune Crescent Southbound Approach |  |  | Ragus DriveEastbound Approach |  |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K | L |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 26 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 12 | 25 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 49 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 12 | 24 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 60 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 8 | 26 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 48 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 14 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 8 | 24 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 57 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 6 | 27 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 57 |
| AM Peak Hour |  | 42 | 94 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 7 | 14 | 0 | 8 | 214 |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 29 | 64 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 158 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 36 | 97 | 4 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 9 | 211 |
|  |  | Ped 1 |  |  | Ped 2 |  |  | Ped 3 |  |  | Ped 4 |  |  | Total Peds |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 4 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 4 |
| Midday Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Neptune Crescent Northbound Approach |  |  | Ragus DriveWestbound Approach |  |  | Neptune Crescent Southbound Approach |  |  | Ragus DriveEastbound Approach |  |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | , | J | K | L |  |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 13 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 45 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 14 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 55 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 46 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 9 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 41 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 36 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 10 | 14 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 46 |
| 13:00 | 13:15 | 6 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 46 |
| 13:15 | 13:30 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 31 |
| Midday Peak Hour |  | 41 | 33 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 54 | 8 | 11 | 3 | 20 | 187 |
| 11:30 | 12:30 | 41 | 33 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 54 | 8 | 11 | 3 | 20 | 187 |
| 12:30 | 13:30 | 30 | 43 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 35 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 22 | 159 |
|  |  | Ped 1 |  |  | Ped 2 |  |  | Ped 3 |  |  | Ped 4 |  |  | Total Peds |
| 11:30 | 12:30 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| 12:30 | 13:30 | 0 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 4 |
| PM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Neptune Crescent Northbound Approach |  |  | Ragus DriveWestbound Approach |  |  | Neptune Crescent Southbound Approach |  |  | Ragus DriveEastbound Approach |  |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K | L |  |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 4 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 49 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 9 | 14 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 53 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 10 | 23 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 11 | 93 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 8 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 56 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 2 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 57 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 7 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 62 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 78 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 11 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 73 |
| PM Peak Hour |  | 25 | 80 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 34 | 270 |
| 15:30 | 16:30 | 31 | 67 | 11 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 8 | 11 | 2 | 25 | 251 |
| 16:30 | 17:30 | 25 | 80 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 34 | 270 |
|  |  | Ped 1 |  |  | Ped 2 |  |  | Ped 3 |  |  | Ped 4 |  |  | Total Peds |
| 15:30 | 16:30 | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 4 |
| 16:30 |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | $0$ |  |  | 2 |











## APPENDIX



WARRANT ANALYSIS


$\square$



## 2005 Canadian Traffic Signal Warrant Matrix Analysis

Table: B-1 - Prince Arthur Avenue at Fenwick Street 2042 Future w Site

| Main Street (name) | Prince Arthur Avenue | Direction (EW or NS) <br> Direction (EW or NS) | NS | Date: <br> City: | February 2024 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Side Street (name) | Fenwick Street |  | EW |  | Dartmouth, NS |


| Lane Configuration |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & \frac{5}{y} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \leftrightarrows \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*} \\ & \underset{F}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\star}{\alpha} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*} \\ & \stackrel{F}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\stackrel{\hbar}{c}}{\bar{x}}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prince Arthur Avenue | SB |  |  | 1 |  |  | 185 | 0 |  |  |
| Prince Arthur Avenue | WB |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fenwick Street | EB |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Other input |  | Speed <br> $(\mathrm{Km} / \mathrm{h})$ | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Bus Rt <br> $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | Median <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prince Arthur Avenue | NS | 50 | $2.0 \%$ | n | 0.0 |
| Fenwick Street | EW | 50 | $2.0 \%$ | n |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ped1 | Ped2 | Ped3 | Ped4 |
|  | NS | NS | EW | EW |
|  | W Side | E Side | N Side | S side |
| $7: 00-8: 00$ | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |
| $8: 00-9: 00$ | 69 | 15 | 0 |  |
| $11: 30-12: 30$ | 10 | 6 | 1 |  |
| $12: 30-13: 30$ | 125 | 3 | 2 |  |
| $15: 30-16: 30$ | 6 | 0 | 2 |  |
| 16:30-17:30 | 13 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Total (6-hour peak) | $\mathbf{2 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Average (6-hour peak) | $\mathbf{3 8}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |


| Demographics |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary School | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | y |
| Senior's Complex | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Pathway to School | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | y |
| Metro Area Population | $(\mathrm{\#})$ | 400,000 |
| Central Business District | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |


| Traffic Input | $\mathrm{NB}$ |  |  | SB |  |  | $\overline{\mathbf{W B}}$ |  |  | $\overline{\mathbf{E B}}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT |
| 7:00-8:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 10 | 180 | 90 | 5 | 0 |
| 8:00-9:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 5 | 160 | 170 | 10 | 0 |
| 11:30-12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $45$ | 0 | 105 | 0 | 5 | 70 | 115 | 5 | 0 |
| 12:30-13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 130 | 5 | 0 |
| 15:30-16:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $115$ | 0 | 140 | 0 | 10 | 90 | 180 | 10 | 0 |
| 16:30-17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 10 | 115 | 160 | 15 | 0 |
| Total (6-hour peak) | 0 | 0 | 0 | $470$ | 0 | 765 | 0 | 40 | 685 | 845 | 50 | 0 |
| Average (6-hour peak) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 128 | 0 | 7 | 114 | 141 | 8 | 0 |



## 2005 Canadian Traffic Signal Warrant Matrix Analysis

Table: B-2 - Neptune Crescent at Ragus Drive 2042 Future w Site

| Main Street (name) | Neptune Crescent | Direction (EW or NS) <br> Direction (EW or NS) | NS | Date: City: | February 2024 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Side Street (name) | Ragus Drive |  | EW |  | Dartmouth, NS |


| Lane Configuration |  | Э 畄 | $\begin{aligned} & \leftrightarrows \\ & \underset{\sim}{*} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \approx \\ & \approx \\ & \neq \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{z}}{\bar{x}}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neptune Crescent | NB |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1,300 | 1 |  |  |
| Neptune Crescent | SB |  |  | 1 |  |  | 850 | 1 |  |  |
| Ragus Drive | WB |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ragus Drive | EB |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Other input | Speed <br> $(\mathrm{Km} / \mathrm{h})$ | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Bus Rt <br> $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | Median <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neptune Crescent | NS | 50 | $2.0 \%$ | n | 0.0 |
| Ragus Drive | EW | 50 | $2.0 \%$ | n |  |


|  | Ped1 | Ped2 | Ped3 | Ped4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NS | NS | EW | EW |
|  | W Side | E Side | N Side | S side |
| $7: 00-8: 00$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| $8: 00-9: 00$ | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| $11: 30-12: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $12: 30-13: 30$ | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| $15: 30-16: 30$ | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 16:30-17:30 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Total (6-hour peak) | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| Average (6-hour peak) | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |


| Demographics |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary School | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Senior's Complex | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Pathway to School | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Metro Area Population | $(\mathrm{H})$ | 400,000 |
| Central Business District | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |


| Traffic Input | $\mathrm{NB}$ |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | $\overline{\mathrm{EB}}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | $\overline{\text { LT }}$ | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT |
| 7:00-8:00 | 30 | 90 | 5 | 0 | 200 | 35 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| 8:00-9:00 | 40 | 125 | 5 | 0 | 185 | 30 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 10 |
| 11:30-12:30 | $45$ | $70$ | 10 | 0 | $115$ | $20$ | $5$ | 5 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 20 |
| 12:30-13:30 | 35 | 85 | 5 | 0 | 95 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 25 |
| 15:30-16:30 | $35$ | $180$ | $10$ | $0$ | $135$ | $15$ | $20$ | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 30 |
| 16:30-17:30 | 30 | 205 | 5 | 0 | 155 | 25 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 35 |
| Total (6-hour peak) | $215$ | $755$ | $40$ | 0 | $885$ | $140$ | $65$ | 10 | 0 | 130 | 5 | 130 |
| Average (6-hour peak) | 36 | 126 | 7 | 0 | 148 | 23 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 1 | 22 |



## 2005 Canadian Traffic Signal Warrant Matrix Analysis

Table: B-3 - Mount Hope Avenue at Neptune Crescent 2042 Future w Site

| Main Street (name) <br> Side Street (name) | Mount Hope Avenue |  |  | Direction (EW or NS) |  |  | EW | Date: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Neptune Crescent |  |  | Direction (EW or NS) |  |  | NS |  | City: |
| Lane Configuration |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\vec{x}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \leftrightarrows \\ & \underset{F}{*} \\ & \stackrel{y}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { th } \\ & \text { out } \\ & \text { obt } \\ & \text { Hy } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{E}{*} \\ & \underset{F}{*} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\stackrel{\Sigma}{c}}{\stackrel{x}{c}}$ |  |  |  |
| Mount Hope Avenue | EB |  | 1 |  |  |  | 850 | 1 |  |
| Mount Hope Avenue | WB |  |  |  | 1 |  | 10,000 | 1 |  |
| Neptune Crescent | NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neptune Crescent | SB |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Other input |  | Speed <br> $(\mathrm{Km} / \mathrm{h})$ | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Bus Rt <br> $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | Median <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mount Hope Avenue | EW | 50 | $2.0 \%$ | n | 0.0 |
| Neptune Crescent | NS | 50 | $2.0 \%$ | n |  |


|  | Ped1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ped2 | Ped3 | Ped4 |  |  |
|  | NS | NS | EW | EW |
|  | W Side | E Side | N Side | S side |
| $7: 00-8: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| $8: 00-9: 00$ | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |
| $11: 30-12: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| $12: 30-13: 30$ | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |
| $15: 30-16: 30$ | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 16:30-17:30 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Total (6-hour peak) | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Average (6-hour peak) | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |


| Demographics |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary School | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Senior's Complex | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Pathway to School | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Metro Area Population | $(\mathrm{\#})$ | 400,000 |
| Central Business District | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |


| Traffic Input | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT |
| 7:00-8:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 580 | 115 | 30 | 175 | 0 |
| 8:00-9:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 525 | 140 | 30 | 175 | 0 |
| 11:30-12:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 335 | 75 | 55 | 370 | 0 |
| 12:30-13:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 350 | 85 | 40 | 305 | 0 |
| 15:30-16:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 295 | 160 | 70 | 590 | 0 |
| 16:30-17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 250 | 120 | 90 | 450 | 0 |
| Total (6-hour peak) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 695 | 0 | 390 | 0 | 2,335 | 695 | 315 | 2,065 | 0 |
| Average (6-hour peak) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 389 | 116 | 53 | 344 | 0 |



$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{W} & =\left[\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bt}}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{v}-\mathrm{v}}\right) / \mathrm{K}_{1}+\left(\mathbf{F}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{v}-\mathrm{p}}\right) \mathrm{L}\right) / \mathrm{K}_{2}\right] \times \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{i}} \\
& \begin{array}{llc}
\mathrm{W}= & 75 & 1 \\
\text { NOT Warranted }
\end{array} \\
\text { Veh } & \text { Ped }
\end{aligned}
$$

## APPENDIX

INTERSECTION PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

| Lane Group | $\rightarrow$ EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | F |  | \% | 4 | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 330 | 40 | 200 | 670 | 35 | 150 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 330 | 40 | 200 | 670 | 35 | 150 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1837 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | 0.326 |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1837 | 0 | 607 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | 7 |  |  |  |  | 163 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 402 | 0 | 217 | 728 | 38 | 163 |
| Turn Type | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 2 |  | 1 | 6 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |
| Total Split (s) | 58.0 |  | 22.0 | 80.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.2 |  | 4.0 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 16.5 |  | 31.2 | 28.9 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.32 |  | 0.61 | 0.56 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.68 |  | 0.39 | 0.69 | 0.11 | 0.37 |
| Control Delay | 21.1 |  | 6.4 | 11.9 | 20.3 | 7.3 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 21.1 |  | 6.4 | 11.9 | 20.3 | 7.3 |
| LOS | C |  | A | B | C | A |
| Approach Delay | 21.1 |  |  | 10.7 | 9.8 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | B | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 31.8 |  | 7.7 | 43.1 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 58.3 |  | 14.3 | 72.1 | 10.9 | 13.9 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 286.7 |  |  | 138.5 | 181.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 30.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1772 |  | 780 | 1863 | 836 | 833 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.23 |  | 0.28 | 0.39 | 0.05 | 0.20 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 51.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.69
Intersection Signal Delay: $13.3 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 53.8\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 1: Prince Arthur Avenue \& Portland Street


WSP Canada $\quad$ Synchro 11 Report

WSP Canada Inc.

| Movement | EBL E | $\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow \\ & \text { EBT } \end{aligned}$ | EBR | WBL | - WBT | 4 WBR | 4 | 4 NBT | NBR | $\downarrow$ SBL | ¢ SBT | $\stackrel{ }{\text { ¢ }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 15 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 105 | 5 | 0 | 35 | 10 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 15 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 105 | 5 | 0 | 35 | 10 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 16 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 114 | 5 | 0 | 38 | 11 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 258 | 260 | 44 | 269 | 264 | 116 | 49 |  |  | 119 |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 258 | 260 | 44 | 269 | 264 | 116 | 49 |  |  | 119 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 98 | 100 | 99 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 97 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 678 | 624 | 1027 | 660 | 622 | 936 | 1558 |  |  | 1469 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 27 | 11 | 168 | 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 16 | 11 | 49 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 11 | 0 | 5 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 787 | 660 | 1558 | 1469 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.7 | 10.5 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.7 | 10.5 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection Summary

| Average Delay | 3.0 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $25.0 \%$ | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |


| WSP Canada Inc. | Synchro 11 Report <br> February 2024 |
| :--- | ---: |

WSP Canada Inc.

| Movement | ¢ EBL | $\xrightarrow[\text { EBT }]{\rightarrow}$ | $\leftarrow$ WBT | 4 WBR | \$ | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | 个 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 20 | 145 | 545 | 145 | 30 | 20 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 20 | 145 | 545 | 145 | 30 | 20 |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 22 | 158 | 592 | 158 | 33 | 22 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None | None |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 750 |  |  |  | 873 | 671 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 750 |  |  |  | 873 | 671 |  |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 97 |  |  |  | 89 | 95 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 859 |  |  |  | 312 | 456 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 22 | 158 | 750 | 33 | 22 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 22 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 22 |  |  |
| cSH | 859 | 1700 | 1700 | 312 | 456 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.44 | 0.11 | 0.05 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 1.2 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.9 | 13.3 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  | C | B |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 1.1 |  | 0.0 | 16.0 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 47.5\% |  | Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

WSP Canada $\quad$ Synchro 11 Report

WSP Canada Inc.

|  | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ | 4 |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | F' |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 23 | 260 | 880 | 70 | 186 | 62 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 23 | 260 | 880 | 70 | 186 | 62 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1863 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.135 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 251 | 1863 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 45 |  | 67 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 25 | 283 | 957 | 76 | 202 | 67 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | NA | Perm | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 8 |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 6 |
| Total Split (s) | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 39.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 12.8 | 12.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.17 | 0.25 | 0.85 | 0.08 | 0.58 | 0.18 |
| Control Delay | 8.6 | 6.5 | 19.2 | 2.9 | 34.4 | 9.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 8.6 | 6.5 | 19.2 | 2.9 | 34.4 | 9.4 |
| LOS | A | A | B | A | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 6.7 | 18.0 |  | 28.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A | B |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 1.2 | 13.9 | 82.0 | 1.3 | 22.6 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 5.1 | 28.2 | 161.0 | 6.0 | 56.2 | 10.7 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 59.1 | 93.5 |  | 127.5 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 50.0 |  |  | 30.0 | 50.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 219 | 1629 | 1629 | 1390 | 532 | 523 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.11 | 0.17 | 0.59 | 0.05 | 0.38 | 0.13 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 64.9
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.85
Intersection Signal Delay: 17.5
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 66.6\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 16: Mount Hope Avenue \& Leonamarie Drive


| Lane Group | - EBT | EBR | WBL | - WBT | 4 | NBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | \% | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 770 | 40 | 230 | 505 | 50 | 240 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 770 | 40 | 230 | 505 | 50 | 240 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1850 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | 0.093 |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1850 | 0 | 173 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | 4 |  |  |  |  | 261 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 880 | 0 | 250 | 549 | 54 | 261 |
| Turn Type | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 2 |  | 1 | 6 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |
| Total Split (s) | 53.0 |  | 14.0 | 67.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.2 |  | 4.0 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 41.7 |  | 57.8 | 55.6 | 10.8 | 10.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.53 |  | 0.73 | 0.71 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.90 |  | 0.76 | 0.42 | 0.22 | 0.59 |
| Control Delay | 30.2 |  | 32.2 | 5.9 | 34.8 | 10.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 30.2 |  | 32.2 | 5.9 | 34.8 | 10.7 |
| LOS | C |  | C | A | C | B |
| Approach Delay | 30.2 |  |  | 14.1 | 14.8 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | B | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 112.0 |  | 19.6 | 28.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#212.2 |  | \#61.7 | 51.9 | 19.0 | 20.8 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 286.7 |  |  | 138.5 | 181.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 30.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1112 |  | 331 | 1453 | 386 | 549 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.79 |  | 0.76 | 0.38 | 0.14 | 0.48 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 78.7
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.90
Intersection Signal Delay: $21.3 \quad$ Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 77.5\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: Prince Arthur Avenue \& Portland Street


| Movement | $\underset{\text { EBT }}{\rightarrow}$ | EBR | WBL |  | 4 NBL | ${ }_{\text {NBR }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 265 | 15 | 25 | 220 | 10 | 95 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 265 | 15 | 25 | 220 | 10 | 95 |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 288 | 16 | 27 | 239 | 11 | 103 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  | 205 |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume |  |  | 304 |  | 589 | 296 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol |  |  | 304 |  | 589 | 296 |  |
| tC , single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 98 |  | 98 | 86 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1257 |  | 461 | 743 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 304 | 266 | 114 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 27 | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 16 | 0 | 103 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1257 | 702 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.18 | 0.02 | 0.16 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th ( m ) | 0.0 | 0.5 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 1.0 | 11.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 1.0 | 11.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 44.2\% |  | Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

WSP Canala

WSP Canada Inc.

| Movement | - | $\xrightarrow[\text { EBT }]{\rightarrow}$ | EBR | WBL | - WBT | 4 WBR | 4 | 4 NBT | NBR | SBL | ¢ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { ¢ }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 20 | 0 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 90 | 5 | 0 | 100 | 15 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 20 | 0 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 90 | 5 | 0 | 100 | 15 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 22 | 0 | 38 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 98 | 5 | 0 | 109 | 16 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 262 | 264 | 117 | 300 | 270 | 100 | 125 |  |  | 103 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 262 | 264 | 117 | 300 | 270 | 100 | 125 |  |  | 103 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 97 | 100 | 96 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 98 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 683 | 632 | 935 | 619 | 627 | 955 | 1462 |  |  | 1489 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 60 | 5 | 125 | 125 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 22 | 5 | 22 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 38 | 0 | 5 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 824 | 619 | 1462 | 1489 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.9 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.7 | 10.9 | 1.4 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.7 | 10.9 | 1.4 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection Summary

| Average Delay | 2.6 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $22.8 \%$ | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |


| Movement | ¢ EBL | $\xrightarrow[\text { EBT }]{\rightarrow}$ | $\leftarrow$ WBT | 4 WBR | \$ | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | 个 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 25 | 560 | 255 | 95 | 120 | 20 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 25 | 560 | 255 | 95 | 120 | 20 |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 27 | 609 | 277 | 103 | 130 | 22 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None | None |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 380 |  |  |  | 992 | 328 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 380 |  |  |  | 992 | 328 |  |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 98 |  |  |  | 51 | 97 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1178 |  |  |  | 266 | 713 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 27 | 609 | 380 | 130 | 22 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 27 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 22 |  |  |
| cSH | 1178 | 1700 | 1700 | 266 | 713 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.02 | 0.36 | 0.22 | 0.49 | 0.03 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.8 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.7 | 10.2 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  | D | B |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.3 |  | 0.0 | 27.8 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 42.8\% |  | Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

WSP Canala

WSP Canada Inc.

|  | 4 |  | 4 |  |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 4 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 58 | 885 | 370 | 172 | 118 | 40 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 58 | 885 | 370 | 172 | 118 | 40 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1863 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.519 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 967 | 1863 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 187 |  | 43 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 63 | 962 | 402 | 187 | 128 | 43 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | NA | Perm | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 8 |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 6 |
| Total Split (s) | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 36.4 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 10.4 | 10.4 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.11 | 0.85 | 0.36 | 0.18 | 0.42 | 0.14 |
| Control Delay | 5.2 | 17.7 | 6.5 | 1.3 | 30.7 | 11.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 5.2 | 17.7 | 6.5 | 1.3 | 30.7 | 11.1 |
| LOS | A | B | A | A | C | B |
| Approach Delay |  | 16.9 | 4.9 |  | 25.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B | A |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 2.4 | 70.4 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 12.6 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 7.5 | 150.0 | 38.3 | 5.9 | 37.3 | 8.8 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 59.1 | 93.5 |  | 127.5 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 50.0 |  |  | 30.0 | 50.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 878 | 1692 | 1692 | 1455 | 579 | 546 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.07 | 0.57 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.22 | 0.08 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 59.9
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.85
Intersection Signal Delay: 13.8
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 63.1\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 16: Mount Hope Avenue \& Leonamarie Drive


| Lane Group | $\rightarrow$ EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | 4 NBL | NBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 330 | 52 | 210 | 670 | 124 | 221 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 330 | 52 | 210 | 670 | 124 | 221 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1829 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | 0.313 |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1829 | 0 | 583 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | 11 |  |  |  |  | 240 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 416 | 0 | 228 | 728 | 135 | 240 |
| Turn Type | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 2 |  | 1 | 6 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |
| Total Split (s) | 64.0 |  | 16.0 | 80.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.2 |  | 4.0 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 17.9 |  | 33.3 | 31.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.33 |  | 0.61 | 0.57 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.69 |  | 0.41 | 0.69 | 0.38 | 0.47 |
| Control Delay | 22.2 |  | 7.0 | 12.2 | 24.6 | 7.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 22.2 |  | 7.0 | 12.2 | 24.6 | 7.2 |
| LOS | C |  | A | B | C | A |
| Approach Delay | 22.2 |  |  | 11.0 | 13.5 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | B | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 33.7 |  | 8.1 | 43.1 | 11.9 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 69.0 |  | 18.5 | 85.8 | 31.2 | 17.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 286.7 |  |  | 138.5 | 181.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 30.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1764 |  | 622 | 1863 | 795 | 843 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.24 |  | 0.37 | 0.39 | 0.17 | 0.28 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 54.7
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.69
Intersection Signal Delay: 14.2
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 54.0\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 1: Prince Arthur Avenue \& Portland Street


WSP Canada $\quad$ Synchro 11 Report

WSP Canada Inc.

| Movement | $\stackrel{4}{\text { EBL }}$ | $\rightarrow \underset{\text { EBT }}{\rightarrow}$ |  | WBL | - |  | 4 | ¢ NBT | NBR | SBL | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\dagger}$ | $\stackrel{ }{\text { ¢ }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 19 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 127 | 5 | 0 | 204 | 38 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 19 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 127 | 5 | 0 | 204 | 38 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 21 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 138 | 5 | 0 | 222 | 41 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conflicting volume | 481 | 484 | 242 | 492 | 502 | 140 | 263 |  |  | 143 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 481 | 484 | 242 | 492 | 502 | 140 | 263 |  |  | 143 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 96 | 100 | 99 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 96 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 481 | 465 | 796 | 467 | 454 | 907 | 1301 |  |  | 1440 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 32 | 11 | 192 | 263 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 21 | 11 | 49 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 11 | 0 | 5 | 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 557 | 467 | 1301 | 1440 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 11.9 | 12.9 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 11.9 | 12.9 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection Summary

| Average Delay | 1.9 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $35.9 \%$ | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |


| WSP Canada Inc. | Synchro 11 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| February 2024 |  |


| Movement | EBL | - EBT | WBT | 4 WBR | $\begin{gathered} \\ \text { SBL } \end{gathered}$ | d SBR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 30 | 164 | 595 | 157 | 119 | 100 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 30 | 164 | 595 | 157 | 119 | 100 |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 33 | 178 | 647 | 171 | 129 | 109 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None | None |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 818 |  |  |  | 976 | 732 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 818 |  |  |  | 976 | 732 |  |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  |  |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 96 |  |  |  | 52 | 74 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 810 |  |  |  | 267 | 421 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 33 | 178 | 818 | 129 | 109 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 33 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 109 |  |  |
| cSH | 810 | 1700 | 1700 | 267 | 421 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.26 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.6 | 8.2 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.5 | 16.5 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  | D | C |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 1.5 |  | 0.0 | 24.1 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Util |  |  | 54.1\% |  | Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

WSP Canada $\quad$ Synchro 11 Report

WSP Canada Inc.

|  | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ | 4 |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | F' |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 23 | 368 | 942 | 70 | 186 | 62 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 23 | 368 | 942 | 70 | 186 | 62 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1863 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.110 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 205 | 1863 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 48 |  | 67 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 25 | 400 | 1024 | 76 | 202 | 67 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | NA | Perm | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 8 |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 6 |
| Total Split (s) | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 43.7 | 43.7 | 43.7 | 43.7 | 13.3 | 13.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.34 | 0.88 | 0.08 | 0.60 | 0.19 |
| Control Delay | 10.0 | 7.1 | 21.3 | 2.7 | 37.3 | 9.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 10.0 | 7.1 | 21.3 | 2.7 | 37.3 | 9.6 |
| LOS | A | A | C | A | D | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 7.2 | 20.0 |  | 30.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A | B |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 1.3 | 22.1 | 98.9 | 1.3 | 25.6 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 5.6 | 41.3 | 189.3 | 5.8 | 56.2 | 10.7 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 59.1 | 93.5 |  | 127.5 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 50.0 |  |  | 35.0 | 50.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 172 | 1564 | 1564 | 1337 | 490 | 487 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.65 | 0.06 | 0.41 | 0.14 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 70
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.88
Intersection Signal Delay: $18.5 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 69.9\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 16: Mount Hope Avenue \& Leonamarie Drive



Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 103.1
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.92
Intersection Signal Delay: $27.2 \quad$ Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 84.1\% ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: Prince Arthur Avenue \& Portland Street


Synchro 11 Report
WSP Canada Inc.

WSP Canala

WSP Canada Inc.

| Movement | ¢ EBL | $\rightarrow$ |  | WBL | $\leftarrow$ WBT | 4 <br> WBR | 4 | 4 NBT | NBR | ¢ | ¢ SBT | $\stackrel{ }{\text { ¢ }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 40 | 0 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 290 | 5 | 0 | 153 | 24 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 40 | 0 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 290 | 5 | 0 | 153 | 24 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 43 | 0 | 38 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 315 | 5 | 0 | 166 | 26 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 562 | 565 | 179 | 600 | 576 | 318 | 192 |  |  | 320 |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 562 | 565 | 179 | 600 | 576 | 318 | 192 |  |  | 320 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 90 | 100 | 96 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 98 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 429 | 424 | 864 | 387 | 418 | 723 | 1381 |  |  | 1240 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 81 | 5 | 353 | 192 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 43 | 5 | 33 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 38 | 0 | 5 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 562 | 387 | 1381 | 1240 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 4.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 12.5 | 14.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 12.5 | 14.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz |  |  | 40.6\% |  | Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


WSP Canala

WSP Canada Inc.
February 2024

|  | 4 |  | 4 | 4 |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | F' |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 58 | 959 | 465 | 172 | 118 | 40 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 58 | 959 | 465 | 172 | 118 | 40 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1863 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.445 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 829 | 1863 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 187 |  | 43 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 63 | 1042 | 505 | 187 | 128 | 43 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | NA | Perm | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 8 |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 6 |
| Total Split (s) | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 41.8 | 41.8 | 41.8 | 41.8 | 10.8 | 10.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.12 | 0.88 | 0.42 | 0.17 | 0.44 | 0.15 |
| Control Delay | 5.2 | 19.5 | 6.9 | 1.2 | 33.8 | 11.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 5.2 | 19.5 | 6.9 | 1.2 | 33.8 | 11.4 |
| LOS | A | B | A | A | C | B |
| Approach Delay |  | 18.7 | 5.4 |  | 28.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B | A |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 2.5 | 87.0 | 25.4 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 7.7 | 183.4 | 50.9 | 5.9 | 37.3 | 8.8 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 59.1 | 93.5 |  | 127.5 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 50.0 |  |  | 35.0 | 50.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 723 | 1625 | 1625 | 1404 | 523 | 498 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.09 | 0.64 | 0.31 | 0.13 | 0.24 | 0.09 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 65.5
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.88
Intersection Signal Delay: 14.8
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 67.0\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 16: Mount Hope Avenue \& Leonamarie Drive


Summary of All Intervals

| Run Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Start Time | $4: 20$ | $4: 20$ | $4: 20$ | $4: 20$ | $4: 20$ | $4: 20$ | $4: 20$ |
| End Time | $5: 30$ | $5: 30$ | $5: 30$ | $5: 30$ | $5: 30$ | $5: 30$ | $5: 30$ |
| Total Time (min) | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Time Recorded (min) | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| \# of Intervals | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| \# of Recorded Intervals | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Vehs Entered | 4107 | 4216 | 4380 | 4080 | 4174 | 4096 | 4175 |
| Vehs Exited | 4114 | 4229 | 4368 | 4107 | 4151 | 4113 | 4174 |
| Starting Vehs | 67 | 71 | 76 | 94 | 64 | 73 | 75 |
| Ending Vehs | 60 | 58 | 88 | 67 | 87 | 56 | 76 |
| Travel Distance (km) | 2188 | 2281 | 2356 | 2205 | 2238 | 2185 | 2238 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 71.6 | 78.6 | 82.5 | 78.6 | 74.2 | 72.4 | 79.7 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 24.8 | 29.9 | 32.0 | 31.2 | 26.3 | 25.6 | 31.7 |
| Total Stops | 2491 | 2651 | 2833 | 2776 | 2588 | 2518 | 2705 |
| Fuel Used (l) | 204.5 | 215.0 | 224.0 | 213.7 | 209.6 | 205.7 | 214.5 |

Summary of All Intervals

| Run Number |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Start Time | 8 | 9 | 10 | Avg |
| End Time | $4: 20$ | $4: 20$ | $4: 20$ | $4: 20$ |
| Total Time (min) | $5: 30$ | $5: 30$ | $5: 30$ | $5: 30$ |
| Time Recorded (min) | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| \# of Intervals | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| \# of Recorded Intervals | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Vehs Entered | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Vehs Exited | 4151 | 4242 | 4152 | 4177 |
| Starting Vehs | 4167 | 4269 | 4119 | 4182 |
| Ending Vehs | 90 | 88 | 61 | 75 |
| Travel Distance (km) | 74 | 61 | 94 | 69 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 2221 | 2271 | 2234 | 2241 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 79.6 | 79.6 | 72.6 | 76.9 |
| Total Stops | 32.1 | 31.0 | 24.9 | 29.0 |
| Fuel Used (l) | 2726 | 2756 | 2502 | 2655 |
|  | 214.0 | 218.4 | 209.7 | 212.9 |
| Interval \#O Information Seeding |  |  |  |  |


| Start Time | $4: 20$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| End Time | $4: 30$ |
| Total Time (min) | 10 |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors. |  |
| No data recorded this interval. |  |


| WSP Canada Inc. | SimTraffic Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| February 2024 |  |

## Interval \#1 Information

| Start Time | $4: 30$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| End Time | $4: 45$ |
| Total Time (min) | 15 |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors, Anti PHF. |  |


| Run Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehs Entered | 1003 | 1066 | 1019 | 938 | 1012 | 978 | 1046 |
| Vehs Exited | 1015 | 1049 | 1018 | 968 | 1018 | 981 | 1042 |
| Starting Vehs | 67 | 71 | 76 | 94 | 64 | 73 | 75 |
| Ending Vehs | 55 | 88 | 77 | 64 | 58 | 70 | 79 |
| Travel Distance (km) | 545 | 574 | 543 | 512 | 553 | 515 | 567 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 17.9 | 19.1 | 19.3 | 18.1 | 17.9 | 17.9 | 19.1 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 6.1 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 6.1 | 6.8 | 7.0 |
| Total Stops | 623 | 631 | 675 | 681 | 615 | 652 | 668 |
| Fuel Used (I) | 51.3 | 53.5 | 52.3 | 49.8 | 51.5 | 49.7 | 52.8 |

## Interval \#1 Information

| Start Time | $4: 30$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| End Time | $4: 45$ |  |  |  |
| Total Time (min) | 15 |  |  |  |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors, Anti PHF. |  |  |  |  |
| Run Number | 8 | 9 | 10 | Avg |
| Vehs Entered | 1020 | 1033 | 1021 | 1012 |
| Vehs Exited | 1031 | 1051 | 1012 | 1018 |
| Starting Vehs | 90 | 88 | 61 | 75 |
| Ending Vehs | 79 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Travel Distance (km) | 552 | 556 | 548 | 546 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 23.3 | 19.4 | 17.4 | 18.9 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 11.5 | 7.5 | 5.7 | 7.2 |
| Total Stops | 795 | 674 | 568 | 660 |
| Fuel Used (I) | 57.1 | 53.5 | 50.7 | 52.2 |

Interval \#2 Information

| Start Time | $4: 45$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| End Time | $5: 00$ |
| Total Time (min) | 15 |

Volumes adjusted by PHF, Growth Factors.

| Run Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehs Entered | 1111 | 1173 | 1185 | 1158 | 1109 | 1118 | 1151 |
| Vehs Exited | 1081 | 1167 | 1177 | 1121 | 1080 | 1123 | 1110 |
| Starting Vehs | 55 | 88 | 77 | 64 | 58 | 70 | 79 |
| Ending Vehs | 85 | 94 | 85 | 101 | 87 | 65 | 120 |
| Travel Distance (km) | 583 | 627 | 637 | 610 | 581 | 598 | 601 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 19.2 | 24.6 | 22.4 | 25.4 | 19.1 | 21.2 | 23.6 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 6.7 | 11.2 | 8.7 | 12.2 | 6.7 | 8.5 | 10.6 |
| Total Stops | 666 | 841 | 753 | 911 | 648 | 723 | 818 |
| Fuel Used (l) | 54.2 | 61.3 | 60.4 | 62.4 | 54.4 | 58.0 | 59.8 |

## Interval \#2 Information

| Start Time | $4: 45$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| End Time | $5: 00$ |
| Total Time (min) | 15 |
| Volumes adjusted by PHF, Growth Factors. |  |


| Run Number | 8 | 9 | 10 | Avg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehs Entered | 1131 | 1170 | 1091 | 1140 |
| Vehs Exited | 1130 | 1147 | 1076 | 1122 |
| Starting Vehs | 79 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Ending Vehs | 80 | 93 | 85 | 86 |
| Travel Distance (km) | 601 | 612 | 581 | 603 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 22.0 | 22.3 | 20.2 | 22.0 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 9.1 | 9.2 | 7.8 | 9.1 |
| Total Stops | 739 | 769 | 708 | 756 |
| Fuel Used (I) | 58.2 | 59.5 | 56.2 | 58.4 |

## Interval \#3 Information

| Start Time | $5: 00$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| End Time | $5: 15$ |
| Total Time (min) | 15 |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors, Anti PHF. |  |


| Run Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehs Entered | 1036 | 1015 | 1076 | 992 | 1068 | 998 | 983 |
| Vehs Exited | 1032 | 1038 | 1080 | 1027 | 1089 | 1004 | 1029 |
| Starting Vehs | 85 | 94 | 85 | 101 | 87 | 65 | 120 |
| Ending Vehs | 89 | 71 | 81 | 66 | 66 | 59 | 74 |
| Travel Distance (km) | 547 | 555 | 580 | 553 | 580 | 534 | 534 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 17.6 | 18.6 | 18.8 | 18.6 | 20.3 | 16.2 | 20.7 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 5.9 | 6.7 | 6.4 | 6.8 | 7.9 | 4.7 | 9.3 |
| Total Stops | 634 | 622 | 650 | 625 | 710 | 545 | 657 |
| Fuel Used (I) | 50.5 | 51.8 | 54.0 | 52.5 | 55.3 | 48.5 | 52.9 |

## Interval \#3 Information

| Start Time | $5: 00$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| End Time | $5: 15$ |  |  |  |
| Total Time (min) | 15 |  |  |  |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors, Anti PHF. |  |  |  |  |
| Run Number | 8 | 9 | 10 | Avg |
| Vehs Entered | 1032 | 1002 | 1003 | 1020 |
| Vehs Exited | 1042 | 1031 | 1016 | 1039 |
| Starting Vehs | 80 | 93 | 85 | 86 |
| Ending Vehs | 70 | 64 | 72 | 71 |
| Travel Distance (km) | 554 | 542 | 551 | 553 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 18.1 | 19.6 | 17.5 | 18.6 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 6.3 | 8.0 | 5.7 | 6.8 |
| Total Stops |  | 640 | 667 | 609 |
| Fuel Used (I) | 51.7 | 52.9 | 51.7 | 633 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Interval \#4 Information Recording

| Start Time | $5: 15$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| End Time | $5: 30$ |
| Total Time (min) | 15 |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors, Anti PHF. |  |


| Run Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehs Entered | 957 | 962 | 1100 | 992 | 985 | 1002 | 995 |
| Vehs Exited | 986 | 975 | 1093 | 991 | 964 | 1005 | 993 |
| Starting Vehs | 89 | 71 | 81 | 66 | 66 | 59 | 74 |
| Ending Vehs | 60 | 58 | 88 | 67 | 87 | 56 | 76 |
| Travel Distance (km) | 512 | 524 | 596 | 530 | 523 | 538 | 536 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 16.9 | 16.3 | 22.0 | 16.5 | 16.8 | 17.1 | 16.3 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 6.0 | 5.1 | 9.2 | 5.1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 4.9 |
| Total Stops | 568 | 557 | 755 | 559 | 615 | 598 | 562 |
| Fuel Used (l) | 48.5 | 48.4 | 57.3 | 48.9 | 48.5 | 49.5 | 48.9 |

## Interval \#4 Information Recording

| Start Time | $5: 15$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| End Time | $5: 30$ |  |  |  |
| Total Time (min) | 15 |  |  |  |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors, Anti PHF. |  |  |  |  |
| Run Number | 8 | 9 | 10 | Avg |
| Vehs Entered | 968 | 1037 | 1037 | 1002 |
| Vehs Exited | 964 | 1040 | 1015 | 1002 |
| Starting Vehs | 70 | 64 | 72 | 71 |
| Ending Vehs | 74 | 61 | 94 | 69 |
| Travel Distance (km) | 514 | 561 | 554 | 539 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 16.3 | 18.3 | 17.5 | 17.4 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 5.2 | 6.2 | 5.7 | 5.9 |
| Total Stops | 552 | 646 | 617 | 601 |
| Fuel Used (l) | 47.1 | 52.5 | 51.1 | 50.1 |


| WSP Canada Inc. | SimTraffic Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| February 2024 |  |

4: Mount Hope Avenue \& Neptune Crescent Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Stop Del/Veh (s) | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.9 | 6.3 | 3.0 |

## APPENDIX



LEFT TURN LANE CONCEPT
PLAN


