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## 1 INTRODUCTION

LEA Consulting Ltd. (LEA) was retained by Stanford Homes to undertake a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) for the proposed mixed-use development located at 1437-1455 Queen Street West in the City of Toronto (hereinafter referred to as the "subject site"). The following TIS has been prepared in support of the Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) and Site Plan Control (SPA) applications for the proposed development. The subject site is currently occupied by 1-2 storey commercial shops and surface parking lot and is located near the southwest corner of Queen Street West and Jameson Avenue. The subject site location is illustrated in Figure 1-1.

Figure 1-1: Subject Site Location


Source: Google Maps, accessed February 2023
The purpose of this assessment is to review the existing transportation infrastructure in the surrounding area, including the road network, transit network and active transportation network and assess the traffic impact of the proposed development on the network. In addition, the proposed parking and loading provisions will be reviewed, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures will be recommended to encourage the use of other modes of transportation which aligns with the City of Toronto Official Plan objectives.
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### 1.1 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The development proposal includes a 12-storey mixed-use building. A total of 249 units and approximately $789 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of ground floor retail GFA are proposed. A breakdown of the proposed land uses is outlined in Table 1-1.

Table 1-1: Site Statistics

| Land Use | Unit/GFA |
| :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 249 Units |
| Studio | 9 |
| 1 Bedroom | 130 |
| 2 Bedroom | 84 |
| 3 Bedroom | 26 |
| Retail | $789 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |

Access to the development is proposed via an unsignalized, all-moves site access via a laneway onto Queen Street West. The proposed site plan is illustrated in Figure 1-2.

Figure 1-2: Proposed Site Plan


Source: RAW Design., April 2023

## 2 EXISTING TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS

This section identifies the existing transportation conditions present in the study area, including the road, transit, cyclist and pedestrian networks. The study area was determined by assessing the size of the proposed development and its anticipated transportation impact. The terms of reference and correspondence with the City is included in Appendix A. The study area includes the following intersections:

- Lansdowne Avenue and Queen Street West (Signalized);
- MacDonell Avenue/Existing Site Access (Unsignalized);
- Jameson Avenue and Queen Street West (Signalized); and
- Sorauren Avenue and Queen Street West (Signalized).


### 2.1 EXISTING ROAD NETWORK

This section will describe the road network with the above-mentioned study area. The existing intersection controls and lane configuration are illustrated in Figure 2-1. All roadways within the study area are under the jurisdiction of the City of Toronto.

Figure 2-1: Existing Lane Configuration


Queen Street is an east-west major arterial roadway with a four-lane cross-section (two (2) lanes per direction) in the vicinity of the subject site. Under the City of Toronto's jurisdiction, the roadway extends from the intersection with King Street/Roncesvalles Avenue (where the road becomes The Queensway) in the west and Fallingbrook Road in the east. The roadway operates with a posted speed limit of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ within the study area.

Jameson Avenue is a north-south minor arterial roadway with a two-lane cross-section (one lane per direction) within the study area. The roadway operates between Queen Street West in the north and Lakeshore Boulevard in the south. Jameson Avenue operates with a posted speed limit of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ within the study area.

MacDonell Avenue is a north-south local roadway with a two-lane cross-section (one lane per direction) south of the intersection with Seaforth Avenue and a one-lane cross-section (one lane southbound direction) north of the intersection. The roadway operates between Queen Street West in the south and Wabash Avenue in the north. MacDonell Avenue operates with a speed limit of $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ within the study area.

Lansdowne Avenue is a north-south minor arterial roadway with a two-lane cross-section (one lane per direction) within the study area. The roadway operates between Queen Street West in the south and St. Clair Avenue West in the north. Lansdowne Avenue operates with a posted speed limit of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ within the study area.

Sorauren Avenue is a north-south collector roadway with a two-lane cross-section (one lane per direction) within the study area. The roadway operates between Queen Street West in the south and Dundas Street West in the north. Sorauren Avenue operates with a posted speed limit of $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ within the study area.

### 2.2 TRANSIT NETWORK

The subject site is located in an area well-serviced by the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) transit network. The subject site is within walkable distance of bus stops along Queen Street West. Transit routes servicing the area are illustrated in Figure 2-2.

As a testament to the subject site's transit accessibility, the site receives a Transit Score of 82/100, indicating an excellent transit score when entered into the WalkScore application, indicating that public transit is a convenient mode of travel for most trips.

Figure 2-2: Existing Transit Network


Source: Toronto Transit Commission, January 2023
TTC Bus Route 47 - Lansdowne is a bus route that generally operates in a north-south direction between the area of Lansdowne Avenue and Queen Street West in the south and the area of Lansdowne Avenue and St. Clair Avenue West in the north. The route also provides service to Yorkdale TTC Stations on Line 1, YongeUniversity. Accessible service is provided on the route. Three services are operated along the route and include the 47A short-turn and 47B branches which operates every day, all day. The route also includes the 47C branch which operates during weekday peak periods only. The route is part of the 10-Minute Network and as such operates with service headways of 10 minutes or better throughout the day.

Access Location: Route 47 is accessible at the intersection of Queen Street West and Lansdowne Avenue, which is located 110 m from the subject site (equivalent to a two-minute walk) from the subject site.

TTC Streetcar Route 501 - Queen is a streetcar route that generally operates in an east-west direction between the Long Branch Loop in the west and the Neville Park Loop in the east. During the day and early evening times, all seven (7) days a week, the route operates two (2) services, the Humber-Neville Park and Long Branch-Humber routes. During the late evenings, the singular Long Branch-Neville Park route is operated. The route also provides service to Osgoode and Queen TTC Stations on Line 1 Yonge-University. The route is part of the 10 -Minute Network and as such operates with service headways of 10 minutes or better throughout the day.

Access Location: Route 501 is accessible near the intersection of Queen Street West and Jameson Avenue, which is located adjacent to the subject site.

### 2.3 CYCLING NETWORK

The subject site is located in a neighbourhood with access to some nearby existing cycling infrastructure. Onstreet shared cycling connections are located just to the west of the subject site along Queen Street West for east-west travel and connect to further on-street cycling connections along Sorauren Avenue.

As a testament to how bikeable the subject site is, the site receives a Bike Score of $85 / 100$, or "Very Bikeable", when entered into the WalkScore application. This indicates that cycling is convenient for most trips. The cycling network is illustrated in Figure 2-3.

Figure 2-3: Existing Cycling Network


Source: City of Toronto, 2023

### 2.4 PEDESTRIAN NETWORK

In the area immediately surrounding the subject site, the existing pedestrian network and environment is excellent. Continuous sidewalks are available on both sides of all streets in the study area. Furthermore, pedestrian crosswalks are available on most approaches with protected pedestrian phases at the signalized intersection nearby. The existing pedestrian network provides excellent connections between the residential and commercial uses in the area as well as nearby TTC transit stops.

As a testament to the subject site's walkability, the site receives a Walk Score of 91/100, or "Walker's Paradise", when entered into the WalkScore application. This indicates that the day's errands are able to be accomplished without a vehicle. As shown in Figure 2-4 below, a 15 -minute walk from the subject site could permit an individual to reach Roncesvalles Avenue, Dufferin Street West, Dundas Street and King Street West along with many other amenities along Queen Street West.


Figure 2-4: 15-Minute Walking Distance from Subject Site


Source: walkscore.com, 2023


### 2.5 TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

Turning movement counts (TMCs) were used as the source of traffic data in the intersection capacity analysis. A summary of the TMC data collected is outlined in Table 2-1 with details of the TMC data collected found within Appendix B. Counts were conducted by LEA for all study area intersections on February 7, 2023. The traffic data collected is considered to be an appropriate representation of current traffic patterns and an appropriate baseline to forecast future traffic patterns as COVID-19 restrictions have been removed and modified work commuting habits are expected to remain permanent. because of various workplaces implementing a hybrid in-person/work from home structure. The collected traffic data provides an appropriate representation of current traffic patterns as well as possible future traffic patterns caused by the pandemic. As such, no COVID-19 related adjustments to traffic patterns were applied.

Table 2-1: Data Collection Summary

| Intersection | TMC Date | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lansdowne Avenue \& Queen Street West |  |  |
| Jameson Avenue \& Queen Street West | February 7, 2023 | LEA Consulting Ltd. |
| Existing Site Access/MacDonell Avenue \& Queen Street West |  |  |
| Sorauren Avenue \& Queen Street West |  |  |

### 2.6 EXISTING CONDITIONS SYNCHRO MODEL INPUTS

Existing traffic operations were assessed to provide a baseline for future traffic operations. The existing analysis incorporates the most recent signal timing plans for the study intersections and were obtained from the City of Toronto. Furthermore, peak hour factors (PHF) were obtained from the TMCs collected.

Existing model calibration was conducted based on existing conditions for the northbound right (NBR) movement at the Queen Street West and Jameson Avenue intersection during the PM peak hour. For this movement with the default model parameters, a Volume-to-Capacity (V/C) ratio greater than 1.00 was indicated. As this is not theoretically possible, the movement under the PM peak hour incorporated the following parameters:

- Lost Time Adjustment (LTA): LTA for the movement was decreased to -2 with assumption that more vehicles will use the amber and all-red time to complete the movement under congested conditions.
- Ideal Saturated Flow Rate: Ideal Saturated Flow rate was increased to 2100 vphpl, while maintaining the City of Toronto's Guidelines for Using Synchro 11 (Including SimTraffic 11) (2021) recommended saturated flow rate (protected) below threshold of 2005 vphpl for through lane groups.

The V/C ratio that resulted from the two adjustments described above for the NBR at Queen St W and Jameson Ave was checked against an estimation of capacity for this movement based on a review of video footage from the time of data collection. Details can be found in Appendix B.

Existing model calibration was also conducted based on the streetcar operations in mixed traffic conditions along Queen Street West. As such, the existing analysis incorporated the following parameters:

- Lane Utilization Factor (LUF): LUF adjusted for eastbound and westbound lane groups along Queen Street West during both weekday peak hours to reflect mixing of streetcar and general traffic within the centre-lane. The base LUF was 0.95 for both directions in both peak hours. LUF adjustment was calculated based on review of survey video footage for the peak 15 minutes for both peak hours, with detailed calculations provided in Appendix B. The LUF was adjusted to 0.88 and 0.94 in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively for the eastbound direction. The LUF was adjusted to 0.93 and 0.99 in the AM and PM peak hours respectively for the westbound direction.


### 2.6.1 Queue Survey - Queen Street West \& Jameson Avenue

A queue survey was conducted for eastbound movements at the intersection of Queen Street West \& Jameson Avenue to assess queuing constraints on Queen Street West, west of the intersection travelling in the eastbound direction. The purpose of conducting this survey was to assist in assessing the limits to the synchro modelling in capturing queuing conditions during the traffic survey. The results of this survey are discussed in Section 6 and details on the queue survey results are included in Appendix C.

### 2.7 EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

The existing traffic volumes in the study area during the weekday AM and PM peak hours are illustrated in Figure 2-5. No corridor traffic volume balancing was conducted for the existing traffic volumes.

Figure 2-5: Existing Traffic Volumes


## 3 FUTURE BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

For the analysis of future background traffic conditions, this study considers a five-year horizon to the year 2028. The following sections discuss the anticipated and planned changes to the transportation network as well as the background developments and corridor growth assumptions.

### 3.1 CORRIDOR GROWTH

Based on a review of TMC data for the intersections of Queen Street West and Lansdowne Avenue/Jameson Avenue from 2008, 2013 and 2019, and Queen Street West and Sorauren Avenue from 2015 and 2018, minimal or negative growth along Queen Street West was identified with the exception of the eastbound direction in the PM peak period, where some growth was indicated. As such a $3 \%$ compound annual growth rate for the eastbound PM peak hour was applied. Of note, the surrounding background development reports mostly assumed no growth for the study corridors, which aligns with the findings of historical counts historical counts. The corridor growth applied for the future scenarios is illustrated below in Figure 3-1 and corridor growth calculations are included in Appendix D.
Figure 3-1: Corridor Growth


### 3.2 BACKGROUND DEVELOPMENTS

Four (4) background developments located within or near the study area were considered under future background conditions. The site statistics of the background developments are summarized below in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1: Background Developments

| $\#$ | Location | Proposed Development | Source of Traffic Volumes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1521 Queen St W | 95 residential units; <br> $293 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ non-residential GFA | TIS dated Nov 2019 <br> Table 15 (1) <br> BA Group |
| 2 | 1375 Queen St W | 50 residential units; <br> $264 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ non-residential / <br> commercial GFA | TIS dated March 2020 (Figure H-3) <br> BA Group |
| 3 | 150 Dunn Ave | 192 long-term care beds | TIS dated February 2019 (Figure 5-1 and 5-2) <br> LEA |
| 4 | $8-14$ Brock Ave \& 1354-1360 <br> Queen St W | 172 residential units; <br> $386 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ retail GFA | TIS dated September 2020 (Figure 13) <br> BA Group |

(1) The latest submission with site trip generation was from November 2019. Table 15 of this submission indicated that no auto driver trip generation is forecasted for this development given the provision of zero parking.
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The site-generated traffic volumes and their assignment on the study area road network for the background developments were extracted from their respective traffic reports prepared in support of their development applications. Relevant excerpts from the traffic studies for each background development are included in Appendix E. The location of each background development relative to the location of the subject site is illustrated below in Figure 3-2 and the background development traffic volumes considered in the analysis are illustrated below in Figure 3-3.

Figure 3-2: Background Development Locations


Source: Google Maps, 2023
Figure 3-3: Background Development Traffic Volumes
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### 3.3 FUTURE BACKGROUND SYNCRHO MODEL INPUTS

Input parameters from the existing conditions scenario, inclusive of existing modal calibrations, were maintained with corresponding future background volumes. No signal optimization was conducted for the future scenarios.

### 3.4 FUTURE BACKGROUND TRAFFIC VOLUMES

The future background traffic volumes for the weekday AM and PM peak hours under the 2028 future background scenario are illustrated in Figure 3-4.

Figure 3-4: Future Background Traffic Volumes


## 4 SITE-GENERATED TRAFFIC

The proposed development consists of a 12 -storey mixed-use building. A total of 249 units and approximately $789 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of ground floor retail GFA are proposed. The following section details the trip generation from the subject site.

### 4.1 MODE SPLIT

Data from the 2016 Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) was extracted to identify the modal split of the neighborhood trips based on home-based work trips for filtered for apartments from the Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs): 89, 109, 110, and 113. This modal split was used to identify the transit and pedestrian mode shares to determine the breakdown of transit and pedestrian trips from the trip generation. Upon determining the breakdown of transit and pedestrian trips based on the TTS modal split data, the modal split for the sitegenerated trips was ultimately based on the ratio of two-way peak hour trips for each mode to the total site trip generation (discussed further in the next section). The TTS modal split is identified in Table 4-1 below, with detailed TTS data is provided in Appendix F.

Table 4-1: Modal Split

| Mode | $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Auto Driver + Passenger | $33 \%$ |
| Transit | $45 \%$ |
| Walk | $14 \%$ |
| Cycle | $8 \%$ |
| 2 Total | $100 \%$ |

### 4.2 TRIP GENERATION

### 4.2.1 Residential Trip Generation

Trip generation was estimated for the residential portion of the subject site through the utilization of proxy surveys at comparable developments. The proxy sites chosen are 15 Stafford Street and 25 Stafford Street. These proxy sites were chosen as they display comparable land use characteristics to the subject site and have a similar transportation context. Furthermore, the proxy sites are located within reasonable proximity to the subject site ( $\sim 2.5 \mathrm{~km}$ from the subject site). The trip generation surveys were conducted at the proxy sites between 7:30 AM - 9:30 AM and 4:30 PM and 6:30 PM on Tuesday, February 7, 2023. Trip generation rates from these sites were determined based on the average of both proxy sites for auto driver/passenger trips, pedestrian trips, and cyclist trips, to determine the multimodal trip generation for the subject site.

LEA Consulting has also surveyed these proxy sites in 2015 for trip generation and as such compared the 2015 rates with the rates from the 2023 surveys, determining they were comparable and in some cases, more conservative than the 2015 rates. The 2015 surveys were carried out from Friday June $5^{\text {th }}$ to Friday June $12^{\text {th }}$ 2015. Thus, this determined the 2023 surveyed rates are appropriate to use for the analysis. Of note however, there were no cyclist trips from the 2023 surveys and as such, the cyclist trip generation rates from the 2015 surveys were used to determine cyclist trips generated from the subject site.

The location of the proxy sites relative to the subject site is shown in Figure 4-1 and detailed survey data is included in Appendix G.

Figure 4-1: Proxy Site Location


Source Google Maps, 2023

### 4.2.2 Retail Trip Generation - New Retail Use and Existing Retail Uses to Remove

Regarding the proposed retail component of the subject site, given the scale of retail use on-site, zero retail parking spaces provided on site, as well as local travel characteristics, it is assumed that the proposed retail use will attract local trips already in the area but is not expected to generate new vehicle trips solely for this use. As such, no new trip generation will be included for the retail use. For the existing retail uses, trip generation was based on the TMC data. Trips were removed at the existing site access but have not been removed from the remainder of the network. This methodology accounts for the fact that, while the existing retail use will not exist, these trips may still exist in the area in the form of previous pass-by trips to the existing retail use on the subject lands.

Table 4-2 below illustrates the trip generation for the new residential trips based on the average proxy site trip generation rates per mode.

Table 4-2: Subject Site Trip Generation (New Residential Trips)

| New Residential Trips - 255 units | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Auto (Driver + Passenger) Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Rate | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.13 |
| Auto (Driver + Passenger) Trips | 4 | 25 | 29 | 24 | 8 | 32 |
| Transit + Walking Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Rate | 0.09 | 0.17 | 0.26 | 0.17 | 0.10 | 0.28 |
| Trips (Transit + Walking) ${ }^{(1)}$ | 22 | 43 | 65 | 44 | 27 | 71 |
| Transit Trips | 17 | 33 | 50 | 33 | 21 | 54 |
| Walking Only Trips | 5 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 6 | 17 |
| Cycling Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Rate | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| Cycling Trips | 0 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Total New Person Trips | 26 | 75 | 101 | 70 | 36 | 106 |

[^0]CANADA| INDIA | AFRICA| ASIA | MIDDLE EAST
Page | 14

As noted in the above table, based on the average trip rates from the proxy sites, the subject site is anticipated to generate 29 two-way auto driver and auto passenger trips during the AM peak hour (4 inbound and 25 outbound) ad 32 two-way auto driver and auto passenger trips during the PM peak hour ( 24 inbound and 8 outbound). Furthermore, for transit trips, the subject site is anticipated to generate 49 two-way trips in the AM peak hour (17 inbound and 33 outbound) and 54 two-way trips in the PM peak hour ( 33 inbound and 21 outbound). For walking trips, 16 two-way AM peak hour trips ( 5 inbound and 10 outbound) and 17 two-way PM peak hour trips ( 11 inbound and 6 outbound) are anticipated to be generated. For cycling trips, 7 two-way AM peak hour trips ( 7 outbound only) and 3 two-way PM peak hour trips ( 2 inbound and 1 outbound) are anticipated to be generated.

### 4.2.3 Multi-Modal Trip Generation

The multi-modal site trip generation is summarized in Table 4-3 below with the mode split for the subject site trips calculated.

Table 4-3: Subject Site Multi-Modal Trip Generation (New Residential)

| Land Use | Description | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mode Split | In | Out | Total | Mode Split | In | Out | Total |
| New Residential | External Person Trips | - | 26 | 75 | 101 | - | 70 | 36 | 106 |
|  | Auto Driver + Passenger Trips | 29\% | 4 | 25 | 29 | 30\% | 24 | 8 | 32 |
|  | Transit Trips | 49\% | 17 | 33 | 49 | 51\% | 33 | 21 | 54 |
|  | Walking trips | 15\% | 5 | 10 | 16 | 16\% | 11 | 6 | 17 |
|  | Cycling Trips | 7\% | 0 | 7 | 7 | 3\% | 2 | 1 | 3 |

### 4.3 TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

Trip distribution for the site traffic was derived using Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) 2016 data for the TAZs 98, 109, 110, and 113. The distribution was based on the peak directional distribution. Trip assignment was based on local road network, turn restrictions, changes in the future network (assumed none for the analysis), logical routing, and the type of access. The trip distribution for the residential uses is outlined in Table 4-4. Detailed TTS data is provided in Appendix F.

Table 4-4: Proposed Auto Trip Distribution (New Residential)

| Direction From/To | Expected Route | Weekday AM/PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out |
| North | Lansdowne Ave | $7 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| South | Jameson Ave | $36 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| East | Queen St W | $39 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| West | Queen St W | $18 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |

Of note, for the existing retail site traffic for removal, existing retail trips were removed at the existing site access but it was assumed that no net change at the remaining study area intersections as new retail trips may still be driving in and out of the area and parking nearby.

The new residential trips for the subject site are illustrated in Figure 4-2, the existing retail trips to remove are illustrated in Figure 4-3 and the net site auto trips are illustrated in Figure 4-4.

Figure 4-2: New Residential Site Trips


Figure 4-3: Existing Retail Trips to Remove


Figure 4-4: Net Site Auto Trips


## 5 FUTURE TOTAL TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS

Future total traffic conditions include the addition of site trips to the 2028 future background volumes. Changes noted under future background conditions were maintained in the future total analysis. The future road network configuration is illustrated below in Figure 5-1.

Figure 5-1: Future Road Network


### 5.1 FUTURE TOTAL TRAFFIC VOLUMES

The future total traffic volumes for the weekday AM and PM peak hours are illustrated in Figure 5-2.
Figure 5-2: Future Total Traffic Volumes


## 6 INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS

The intersection capacity analysis was undertaken using Synchro 11.0, which is based on the Highway Capacity Manual (2000) methodology and adheres to the City of Toronto Guidelines for the Preparation of Transportation Impact Studies (2013). As per the City of Toronto Guidelines, key movements of interest are those with Level-of-Service (LOS) E or worse or a Volume-to-Capacity (V/C) ratio greater than 0.85 for through and right movements and a V/C greater than 0.9 for dedicated left turn-movements.

The intersection capacity analysis was conducted for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. As was noted prior, the Peak Hour Factors (PHF) under existing conditions for all intersections were calculated based on surveyed traffic counts. As noted in Section 3.3, input parameters under existing conditions, inclusive of existing model calibrations, were maintained under future background/total conditions. No signal optimization was conducted for the future scenarios.

The following sections outline a comparison of the capacity analysis results under existing, future background and future total conditions. The analysis outlines the intersection capacity analysis for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

Detailed intersection capacity analysis is provided in the following appendices:

- Appendix H: Existing Intersection Capacity Analysis;
- Appendix I: 2028 Future Background Intersection Capacity Analysis; and
- Appendix J: 2028 Future Total Intersection Capacity Analysis.


### 6.1 SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

The intersection capacity analysis results for the signalized intersections for the AM and PM peak hour are summarized in Table 6-1 to Table 6-6 below.

Table 6-1: Queen Street West and Lansdowne Avenue Intersection Capacity Analysis

| AM PK HR | Existing |  |  |  | Future Background (2028) |  |  |  | Future Total (2028) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mvmt | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| OVERALL | - | 0.63 | 25 | C | - | 0.64 | 25 | C | - | 0.64 | 25 | C |
| EBLT | 558 | 0.57 | 6 | A | 568 | 0.58 | 6 | A | 581 | 0.59 | 6 | A |
| WBTR | 340 | 0.59 | 36 | D | 351 | 0.61 | 37 | D | 353 | 0.61 | 37 | D |
| SBL | 111 | 0.58 | 47 | D | 111 | 0.58 | 47 | D | 111 | 0.58 | 47 | D |
| SBR | 140 | 0.67 | 52 | D | 140 | 0.67 | 52 | D | 140 | 0.67 | 52 | D |
| PM PK HR | Existing |  |  |  | Future Background (2028) |  |  |  | Future Total (2028) |  |  |  |
| Mvmt | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| OVERALL | - | 0.65 | 27 | C | - | 0.67 | 26 | C | - | 0.68 | 26 | C |
| EBLT | 529 | 0.51 | 7 | A | 599 | 0.56 | 7 | A | 603 | 0.57 | 7 | A |
| WBTR | 447 | 0.66 | 38 | D | 458 | 0.68 | 38 | D | 467 | 0.69 | 39 | D |
| SBL | 87 | 0.43 | 41 | D | 87 | 0.43 | 41 | D | 87 | 0.43 | 41 | D |
| SBR | 159 | 0.71 | 54 | D | 159 | 0.71 | 54 | D | 161 | 0.72 | 55 | D |

Table 6-2: Queen Street West and Lansdowne Avenue Queues

| AM PEAK | Available Storage (m) ${ }^{(1)}$ | Existing <br> Queue (m) |  | Future Background 2028 Queue (m) |  | Future Total 2028 Queue (m) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mvmt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th |
| EBLT | 23 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 14 |
| WBTR | 40 | 31 | 48 | 33 | 50 | 33 | 50 |
| SBL | 221 | 22 | 42 | 22 | 42 | 22 | 42 |
| SBR | 45 | 28 | 57 | 28 | 57 | 28 | 57 |
| PM PEAK | Available Storage (m) ${ }^{(1)}$ | Existing |  | Future Background 2028 |  | Future Total 2028 |  |
| Mvmt |  | Queue (m) |  | Queue (m) |  | Queue (m) |  |
|  |  | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th |
| EBLT | 23 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 9 |
| WBTR | 40 | 40 | 58 | 42 | 60 | 43 | 61 |
| SBL | 221 | 16 | 32 | 16 | 32 | 16 | 32 |
| SBR | 45 | 31 | 62 | 31 | 62 | 32 | 64 |

(1) For through or shared through/right movements without dedicated turn lanes, the distance to the closest intersection or main accesses upstream that could potentially be impacted by queues has been included under available storage.

Table 6-3: Queen Street West and Jameson Avenue Intersection Capacity Analysis

| AM PK HR | Existing |  |  |  | Future Background (2028) |  |  |  | Future Total (2028) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mvmt | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| OVERALL | - | 0.65 | 27 | C | - | 0.66 | 27 | C | - | 0.68 | 28 | C |
| EBTR | 401 | 0.65 | 32 | C | 411 | 0.67 | 32 | C | 434 | 0.71 | 34 | C |
| WBLT | 395 | 0.44 | 4 | A | 406 | 0.45 | 5 | A | 408 | 0.46 | 5 | A |
| NBL | 55 | 0.26 | 36 | D | 55 | 0.26 | 36 | D | 56 | 0.27 | 36 | D |
| NBR | 181 | 0.81 | 62 | E | 181 | 0.81 | 62 | E | 181 | 0.81 | 62 | E |
| PM PK HR | Existing |  |  |  | Future Background (2028) |  |  |  | Future Total (2028) |  |  |  |
| Mvmt | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| OVERALL | - | 0.66 | 29 | C | - | 0.68 | 29 | C | - | 0.69 | 29 | C |
| EBTR | 303 | 0.45 | 27 | C | 373 | 0.55 | 29 | C | 380 | 0.56 | 29 | C |
| WBLT | 527 | 0.49 | 5 | A | 538 | 0.50 | 6 | A | 549 | 0.51 | 6 | A |
| NBL | 79 | 0.40 | 40 | D | 79 | 0.40 | 40 | D | 88 | 0.44 | 41 | D |
| NBR | 256 | 0.93 | 76 | E | 256 | 0.93 | 76 | E | 256 | 0.93 | 76 | E |

Table 6-4: Queen Street West and Jameson Avenue Queues

| AM PEAK | Available Storage (m) ${ }^{(1)}$ | Existing |  | Future Background 2028 |  | Future Total 2028 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Queue (m) |  | Queue (m) |  | Queue (m) |  |
|  |  | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th |
| EBTR | 28 | 36 | 52 | 37 | 53 | 41 | 58 |
| WBLT | 23 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| NBL | 15 | 10 | 23 | 10 | 23 | 11 | 23 |
| NBR | 84 | 39 | 77 | 39 | 77 | 39 | 77 |
| PM PEAK | Available Storage (m) ${ }^{(1)}$ | Existing |  | Future Background 2028 |  | Future Total 2028 |  |
| Mvmt |  | Queue (m) |  | Queue (m) |  | Queue (m) |  |
|  |  | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th |
| EBTR | 28 | 19 | 32 | 27 | 40 | 27 | 41 |
| WBLT | 23 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 8 |
| NBL | 15 | 15 | 31 | 15 | 31 | 17 | 34 |
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| NBR | 84 | 56 | 106 | 56 | 106 | 56 | 106 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) For through or shared through/right movements without dedicated turn lanes, the distance to the closest intersection or main |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | accesses upstream that could potentially be impacted by queues has been included under available storage.

Table 6-5: Queen Street West and Sorauren Avenue Intersection Capacity Analysis

| AM PK HR | Existing |  |  |  | Future Background (2028) |  |  |  | Future Total (2028) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mvmt | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| OVERALL | - | 0.47 | 9 | A | - | 0.47 | 9 | A | - | 0.47 | 10 | A |
| EBLT | 607 | 0.50 | 7 | A | 617 | 0.51 | 7 | A | 618 | 0.51 | 7 | A |
| WBTR | 269 | 0.17 | 7 | A | 279 | 0.17 | 7 | A | 281 | 0.18 | 7 | A |
| SBL | 53 | 0.28 | 37 | D | 53 | 0.28 | 37 | D | 53 | 0.28 | 37 | D |
| SBR | 20 | 0.02 | 35 | C | 20 | 0.02 | 35 | C | 20 | 0.02 | 35 | C |
| PM PK HR | Existing |  |  |  | Future Background (2028) |  |  |  | Future Total (2028) |  |  |  |
| Mvmt | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| OVERALL | - | 0.37 | 9 | A | - | 0.41 | 9 | A | - | 0.41 | 9 | A |
| EBLT | 511 | 0.40 | 6 | A | 581 | 0.44 | 7 | A | 585 | 0.45 | 7 | A |
| WBTR | 478 | 0.26 | 7 | A | 488 | 0.27 | 8 | A | 489 | 0.27 | 8 | A |
| SBL | 46 | 0.23 | 37 | D | 46 | 0.23 | 37 | D | 46 | 0.23 | 37 | D |
| SBR | 26 | 0.02 | 35 | C | 26 | 0.02 | 35 | C | 26 | 0.02 | 35 | C |

Table 6-6: Queen Street West and Sorauren Avenue Queues

| AM PEAK | Available Storage (m) ${ }^{(1)}$ | Existing Queue (m) |  | Future B | und 2028 | Futu | 2028 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mvmt |  |  |  | Queue (m) |  | Queue (m) |  |
|  |  | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th |
| EBLT | 20 | 35 | 50 | 36 | 51 | 36 | 52 |
| WBTR | 135 | 9 | 18 | 12 | 19 | 12 | 19 |
| SBL | 119 | 10 | 22 | 10 | 22 | 10 | 22 |
| SBR | 35 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| PM PEAK | Available Storage (m) ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ | Existing |  | Future Background 2028 |  | Future Total 2028 |  |
| Mvmt |  | Queue (m) |  | Queue (m) |  | Queue (m) |  |
|  |  | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th | 50th | 95th |
| EBLT | 20 | 23 | 33 | 28 | 40 | 28 | 40 |
| WBTR | 135 | 18 | 26 | 20 | 26 | 20 | 26 |
| SBL | 119 | 8 | 19 | 8 | 19 | 8 | 19 |
| SBR | 35 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 |

### 6.2 UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

The intersection capacity analysis results for the unsignalized intersections for the AM and PM peak hour are summarized in Table 6-7 to Table 6-10 below.

CANADA| INDIA | AFRICA| ASIA | MIDDLE EAST
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Table 6-7: Queen Street West and Existing Site Access/MacDonell Avenue Intersection Capacity Analysis

| AM PK HR | Existing |  |  |  | Future Background (2028) |  |  |  | Future Total (2028) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mvmt | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| NBLTR | 4 | 0.01 | 17 | C | 4 | 0.02 | 17 | C | - | - | - | - |
| EBL | 63 | 0.08 | 10 | A | 63 | 0.08 | 10 | A | 63 | 0.07 | 9 | A |
| EBT | 394 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 404 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 427 | 0.00 | 0 | A |
| EBR | 2 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 2 | 0.00 | 0 | A | - | - | - | - |
| WBL | 2 | 0.00 | 9 | A | 2 | 0.00 | 9 | A | - | - | - | - |
| WBT | 233 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 243 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 246 | 0.00 | 0 | A |
| WBR | 24 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 24 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 24 | 0.00 | 0 | A |
| SBLTR | 86 | 0.27 | 19 | C | 86 | 0.27 | 19 | C | - | - | - | - |
| SBLR | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 86 | 0.25 | 18 | C |
| PM PK HR | Existing |  |  |  | Future Background (2028) |  |  |  | Future Total (2028) |  |  |  |
| Mvmt | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| NBLTR | 14 | 0.14 | 42 | E | 14 | 0.15 | 48 | E | - | - | - | - |
| EBL | 74 | 0.13 | 12 | B | 74 | 0.13 | 12 | B | 74 | 0.12 | 11 | B |
| EBT | 288 | 0.00 | 1 | A | 358 | 0.00 | 1 | A | 365 | 0.00 | 1 | A |
| EBR | 5 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 5 | 0.00 | 0 | A | - | - | - | - |
| WBL | 6 | 0.01 | 9 | A | 6 | 0.01 | 10 | A | - | - | - | - |
| WBT | 404 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 414 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 434 | 0.00 | 0 | A |
| WBR | 31 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 31 | 0.00 | 0 | A | 31 | 0.00 | 0 | A |
| SBLTR | 105 | 0.43 | 28 | D | 105 | 0.44 | 29 | D | - | - | - | - |
| SBLR | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 105 | 0.38 | 24 | C |

Table 6-8: Queen Street West and Existing Site Access/MacDonell Avenue Queues

| AM PEAK | Available Storage (m) ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ | Existing | Future Background 2028 | Future Total 2028 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mvmt |  | Queue (m) | Queue (m) | Queue (m) |
|  |  | 95th | 95th | 95th |
| NBLTR | 7 | 0 | 0 | - |
| EBL | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EBT | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EBR | 76 | 0 | 0 | - |
| WBL | 27 | 0 | 0 | - |
| WBT | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WBR | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBLTR | 35 | 7 | 7 | - |
| SBLR | 35 | - | - | 7 |
| PM PEAK | Available Storage (m) ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ | Existing | Future Background 2028 | Future Total 2028 |
| Mvmt |  | Queue (m) | Queue (m) | Queue (m) |
|  |  | 95th | 95th | 95th |
| NBLTR | 7 | 7 | 7 | - |
| EBL | 76 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| EBT | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EBR | 76 | 0 | 0 | - |
| WBL | 27 | 0 | 0 | - |
| WBT | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| WBR | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SBLTR | 35 | 13 | 13 | - |
| SBLR | 35 | - | - | 13 |

(1) For through or shared through/right movements without dedicated turn lanes, the distance to the closest intersection or main accesses upstream that could potentially be impacted by queues has been included under available storage.

Table 6-9: Queen Street West and Proposed Site Access Intersection Capacity Analysis

| AM PK HR | Existing |  |  |  | Future Background (2028) |  |  |  | Future Total (2028) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mvmt | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| NBLR | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 25 | 0.05 | 12 | B |
| EBT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 469 | 0.00 | 0 | A |
| EBR | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0.00 | 0 | A |
| WBL | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 0.00 | 9 | A |
| WBT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 301 | 0.00 | 0 | A |
| PM PK HR | Existing |  |  |  | Future Background (2028) |  |  |  | Future Total (2028) |  |  |  |
| Mvmt | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | Vol | V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| NBLR | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 0.02 | 14 | B |
| EBT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 437 | 0.00 | 0 | A |
| EBR | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 0.00 | 0 | A |
| WBL | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20 | 0.03 | 10 | A |
| WBT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 514 | 0.00 | 0 | A |

Table 6-10: Queen Street West and Proposed Site Access Queues

| AM PEAK | Available Storage (m) ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ | Existing | Future Background 2028 | Future Total 2028 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mvmt |  | Queue (m) | Queue (m) | Queue (m) |
|  |  | 95th | 95th | 95th |
| NBLR | 7 | - | - | 0 |
| EBT | 35 | - | - | 0 |
| EBR | 35 | - | - | 0 |
| WBL | 42 | - | - | 0 |
| WBT | 42 | - | - | 0 |
| PM PEAK | Available Storage (m) ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ | Existing | Future Background 2028 | Future Total 2028 |
| Mvmt |  | Queue (m) | Queue (m) | Queue (m) |
|  |  | 95th | 95th | 95th |
| NBLR | 7 | - | - | 0 |
| EBT | 35 | - | - | 0 |
| EBR | 35 | - | - | 0 |
| WBL | 42 | - | - | 0 |
| WBT | 42 | - | - | 0 |

(1) For through or shared through/right movements without dedicated turn lanes, the distance to the closest intersection or main accesses upstream that could potentially be impacted by queues has been included under available storage.

## Existing Conditions

Under existing weekday AM and PM peak hour conditions, the signalized study intersections are indicated to be operating within capacity with V/C ratios less than 1.00 and at an acceptable overall LOS C or better. The northbound right turn at the Jameson Avenue intersection was indicated to be a movement of interest with a $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratio of 0.81 and LOS E with 62 seconds of delay in the AM peak hour and a $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratio of 0.93 and LOS E with 76 seconds of delay in the PM peak hour.

Furthermore, the unsignalized intersection indicates all movements operating within capacity with $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ratios below 1.00, acceptable LOS of D or better, and minimal queuing (i.e. no more than 2 vehicles) with the exception of the northbound movement out of the site access during the PM peak hour. This movement of interest indicates a LOS E ( 42 seconds of delay) during the PM peak hour. This delay can likely be attributed to the heavy traffic flow along Queen Street East, which would limit opportunities for drivers to make left turns from the minor approaches. This is not uncommon for an unsignalized approach to an arterial road in the City of Toronto during the busiest peak of the day.

Field observations indicated that there are currently queueing constraints along Queen Street West. A queue survey of the eastbound approach at the Jameson Avenue intersection (as noted in Section 2.6.1) indicated queue lengths on average extended beyond the existing site access during both peak hours. The longest queue lengths recorded at the onset of green during both peak hours extended to the Sorauren Avenue intersection (i.e. 300 m just after 9:00 AM and 294 m just after 5:00 PM). These queueing conditions may not be captured in the synchro modelling as the flow may be metered (i.e. intersections may indicate low volumes because volumes cannot get through due to downstream queueing). Therefore, it is recognized that although the synchro analysis may indicate movements are operating within capacity and generally with acceptable delay, the model is limited in capturing the queuing conditions along Queen Street West observed in the field.

## Future Background/Total Conditions

Under future background weekday AM and PM peak hour conditions, the study intersections are expected to continue operating with minimal changes to operations compared to existing.

Under future total weekday AM and PM peak hour conditions, the study intersections are expected to continue operating similar to future background. The $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios, delay, and queue lengths for all movements during both peak hours indicate minimal changes with the added site traffic compared to future background conditions. No new constraints were identified as a result of the added site traffic. It is recognized that drivers making a left in or out of the proposed site access may have to rely on courtesy gaps in order to complete their movement, given the existing queuing constraints fronting the site access along Queen Street West.

## 7 MULTI-MODAL ANALYSIS

### 7.1 EXISTING MULTI-MODAL LEVEL OF SERVICE

The City of Ottawa's Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) Guidelines were adopted to generate levels of service (LOS) to describe the convenience and comfort level of existing and proposed active transportation infrastructure within the subject area. The results are presented on a scale of $A$ to $F$, where $A$ represents preferred conditions and F represents the least preferred conditions, depending on the criteria of each mode. It should be noted that LOS is not always the desired target for all modes, as each mode is considered independently, and the minimum LOS targets depend on the context of the street and surrounding area.

The transit level of service (TLOS) was conducted for the major signalized study intersections along Queen Street West, including at Lansdowne Avenue and at Jameson Avenue based on the "worst intersection" approach. It should be noted that the evaluation is only confined to surface bus and streetcar routes operating within mixed general traffic and does not consider rapid transit options in the area (i.e. TTC subway service, Metrolinx GO service), which would provide grade-separated rapid transit access unencumbered by general vehicle traffic.

The pedestrian level of service (PLOS) and cycling level of service (BLOS) evaluations were conducted for the "worst section" of the segment of Queen Street West between Macdonell Avenue and Lansdowne Avenue near the subject site.

A breakdown of the calculations and lookup tables from the MMLOS Guidelines are provided in Appendix K. Table 7-1 and Table 7-2 summarize the results for transit and pedestrians/cyclists, respectively.

Table 7-1: Surface Transit Level of Service Evaluation

| Intersection Evaluation | Criteria | Queen St W \& Lansdowne Ave | Queen St W \& Jameson Ave |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TLOS | delay | F | E |

Table 7-2: Pedestrian and Bicycling Level of Service Evaluation

| Segment <br> Evaluation | Criteria | Queen St W - <br> Macdonell Avenue and Lansdowne Avenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PLOS | - sidewalk width <br> - boulevard width <br> - motor vehicle volume (AADT/lane) <br> - presence of on-street parking <br> - vehicle operating speed | C |
| BLOS | - type of cycling facility <br> - street width <br> - vehicle operating speed <br> - width of bike lane (if present) <br> - bike lane blockage (if present) | D |

The two signalized intersections along Queen Street West closest to the subject site indicate a TLOS score of F (at Lansdowne Avenue) and a TLOS score of E (at Jameson Avenue). Transit vehicles mix with general traffic without dedicated space to operate, which leads to transit delays at the signalized intersections. The results therefore indicate that surface transit is generally not prioritized at study area intersections and has no dedicated infrastructure.

Pedestrian conditions on the analyzed segment is indicated to be PLOS C on both the north side and the south side of Queen Street West. There are sidewalks with boulevard space provided along the corridor, which also has low vehicle operating speeds. Conditions are somewhat impacted by the road width and vehicle volumes along Queen Street West. The results therefore indicate that the study area pedestrian environment is characterized by appropriate infrastructure and a largely comfortable experience for users.

The segment indicates a BLOS of D due to the lack of cycling facilities available and the road width, providing a less comfortable experience for cyclists (particularly new cyclists) compared to dedicated cycling facilities. The evaluation results demonstrate that on-street cycling is currently used given the low vehicle volumes, but conditions may be impacted by high vehicle volumes and limited infrastructure and connectivity to other existing cycling infrastructure.

### 7.2 FUTURE BACKGROUND MULTI-MODAL LEVEL OF SERVICE ASSESSMENT

No improvements in transit, pedestrian or cycling infrastructure along the studied areas were assumed; therefore, no change in results are expected to the TLOS, PLOS and BLOS compared to existing conditions.

### 7.3 SITE MULTI-MODAL LEVEL OF SERVICE ASSESSMENT

As indicated prior in Table 4-3, the new two-way site trips estimated for transit, walking, and cycling modes for each weekday peak hour are as follows:

- Transit: 50 to 55;
- Walking: 15 to 20; and
- Cycling: 5 to 10.

As discussed below, these new trips are expected to be supported by the multi-modal transportation network surrounding the subject site. In addition, the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan for the subject site (see Section 11) include strategies to support and encourage users to travel by alternative modes to driving.

### 7.3.1 Transit Trips

The proposed development is projected to generate 50 to 55 two-way transit trips per weekday peak hour.
The routes expected to be taken by the transit trips were estimated using 2016 TTS transit data for the same traffic zones as used for mode split and vehicle trip distribution, filtered for outbound home-based trips during the weekday AM peak period. A breakdown of the routes is outlined in Table 7-3 below. Detailed TTS results are indicated in Appendix $\mathbf{X}$.

Table 7-3: Breakdown of Expected Routes for Local Transit Trips

| Transit | $\%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| TTC | $99 \%$ |
| Bus | $23 \%$ |
| Streetcar | $75 \%$ |
| Subway | $1 \%$ |
| GO | $1 \%$ |
| Train | $1 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ |

Based on the TTS data, approximately $75 \%$ of transit trips leaving the subject site are expected to use the nearby streetcar routes, particularly the 504 King Streetcar (closest stop is located at the King Street West and Jameson Avenue intersection, about 400 m south of the subject site, equivalent to a 5 minute walk) and the 501 Queen Streetcar (closest stop is located at the Jameson Avenue intersection just east of the subject site). Both streetcars are part of the 10-minute network and operate 10 minutes or better, all day, every day. The proposed development is anticipated to add up to 7 riders for a streetcar per peak hour, which is considered minimal.

### 7.3.2 Walking Trips

The proposed development is projected to generate 15 to 20 two-way walking trips per weekday peak hour. This is in addition to the walking trips that represent the first/last connection for transit trips from/to the subject site. These pedestrian trips are expected to be supported by the continuous pedestrian facilities in the study area. However, many of the additional walk-only commute trips may be converted from transit trips, so the impact to the pedestrian infrastructure surrounding the site would remain relatively unchanged.

### 7.3.3 Cycling Trips

The proposed development is projected to generate 5 to 10 two-way cycling trips per weekday peak hour. These forecasted cycling trips are minimal and are anticipated to have minimal impact on the surrounding network.

## 8 PARKING ASSESSMENT

This section reviews the vehicular parking standards based on the zoning by-law requirements applicable to the subject site.

### 8.1 ZONING BY-LAW REQUIREMENTS - BICYCLE PARKING

The bicycle parking provision of the proposed development has been assessed according to the standards set by the City of Toronto Zoning By-Law 569-2013 and the Toronto Green Standard Tier 1 Guidelines. The subject site is located in Bicycle Zone 1, and the required bicycle parking rates and bicycle parking provisions are summarized in Table 8-1.

Table 8-1: Zoning By-Law Bicycle Parking Requirements

| Land Use | Units/GFA | ZBL 569-2013 Bike Zone 1 | Min. Requirement | Proposed Supply |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 249 Units | Short Term: 0.2 spaces/unit | 50 | 50 |
|  |  | Long Term: 0.9 spaces/unit | 225 | 225 |
| Retail | $789 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | Short Term: None Required (GFA < $2000 \mathrm{m2}$ ) | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Long Term: None Required (GFA < $2000 \mathrm{m2}$ ) | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{2 7 5}$ | 275 |  |

According to the City of Toronto Zoning By-law 569-2013 and TGS, the subject site requires a total of 275 bicycle parking spaces, consisting of 50 short-term and 225 long-term residential spaces, resulting in a total of 275 bicycle parking spaces. Regarding bicycle parking requirements for the retail land use, Section 230.5.10.1 (3) in the City of Toronto Zoning By-law 569-2013, "if a bicycle parking space is required for uses on a lot, other than a dwelling unit, and the total interior floor area of all such uses on the lot is 2000 square metres or less, then no bicycle parking space is required". As such, no retail bicycle parking spaces are required. The proposed supply therefore meets the bicycle parking requirements of the zoning by-law.

### 8.2 ZONING BY-LAW REQUIREMENTS - VEHICLE PARKING

The parking requirements for vehicle parking are governed by the parking standards set out in By-law 892022. The City of Toronto undertook a review of its parking requirements for new developments under a study titled Review of Parking Requirements for New Development, which commenced in January 2021 and concluded in November 2021.

On November 25, 2021, City staff recommended the adoption of Zoning By-law Amendments to the city-wide Zoning By-law 569-2013 to modify the current standards for automobile parking as a result of this review. In recognition that the demand for parking is shifting from societal changes, decreases in automobile ownership, increases in the popularity of sustainable alternatives, and significant investments in transit infrastructure, the Zoning By-law Amendment removes the minimum residential parking requirements for multi-unit residential buildings and introduces updated maximum parking requirements for developments throughout the City.

The Zoning By-law Amendment was approved by City Council on December $15^{\text {th }}$, 2021, enacted in February 2022 as By-law 89-2022 and is now fully in force.

In addition to the removal of most parking minimums, the Zoning By-law Amendment has separated parking requirements from the existing Policy Areas, which will be relevant to the updated parking standards. Two (2) Parking Zones (PZ) are proposed. As illustrated in Figure 8-1, the subject site falls within Parking Zone B.

Therefore, the requirements based on the Zoning By-law Amendment Parking rates for Parking Zone B are summarized below in Table 8-2.

Figure 8-1: Proposed Parking Zones


Source: City of Toronto, February 2022


Table 8-2: Zoning By-law 89-2022 Vehicular Parking Standards - Parking Zone B

| Unit Type | Units/GFA | ZBL 89-2022 Parking Zone B |  |  |  | Proposed Supply |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Min. Parking Rate (spaces/unit) | Max. Parking Rate (spaces/unit) | Min. Required Spaces |  |  |
| Studio | 9 Units | - | 0.7 | 0 | 6 | 59 |
| 1 Bedroom | 130 Units | - | 0.8 | 0 | 104 |  |
| 2 Bedroom | 84 Units | - | 0.9 | 0 | 75 |  |
| 3 Bedroom | 26 Units | - | 1.1 | 0 | 28 |  |
| Residential Sub-Total |  |  |  | 0 | 213 | 59 |
| Visitor | 249 Units | $2+0.05 /$ unit | 1/unit for the first 5 units and 0.1/unit for the 6th and subsequent unit | 14 | 29 | 14 |
| Retail | 789 m² | - | 4.0 spaces/100m2 | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| Non-Residential Sub-Total |  |  |  | 14 | 60 | 14 |
| Total |  |  |  | 14 | 273 | 73 |

According to Zoning By-law 89-2022, the proposed development is subject to a minimum parking requirement of 14 visitor spaces and an overall maximum of 273 residential, visitor and retail spaces. As such, the parking supply proposed for the subject site consisting of 59 residential and 14 visitor parking spaces will satisfy the requirements from the zoning by-law requirement.

All residential and visitor parking spaces will be equipped with Electric Vehicle (EV) outlets to which meets TGS V4's EV infrastructure requirements for residential parking spaces and exceeds the requirement for visitor parking spaces, which will be further discussed in Section 10.1.2.

### 8.3 ACCESSIBLE VEHICLE PARKING REQUIREMENTS

The City of Toronto Zoning By-law 569-2013, through by-law 89-2022, provides updated parking requirements to determine effective parking requirements to calculate the required accessible parking supply for the subject site. The by-law requirements and proposed supply are illustrated below in Table 8-3.

Table 8-3: Accessible Parking Requirements

| Unit Type | Units/GFA | Rate (Parking Zone B) | Effective <br> Parking Spaces | Required Accessible Spaces | Provided Accessible Spaces |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Studio | 9 Units | 0.7 spaces/unit | 6 | 8 | 9 |
| 1 Bedroom | 130 Units | 0.8 spaces/unit | 104 |  |  |
| 2 Bedroom | 84 Units | 0.9 spaces/unit | 75 |  |  |
| 3 Bedroom | 26 Units | 1.1 spaces/unit | 28 |  |  |
|  |  | Residential Sub-total | 215 |  |  |
| Visitor Parking | 249 Units | 0.1 spaces/unit | 24 |  |  |
| Residential and Residential Visitor Total |  |  | 242 | 8 |  |
| Retail | 789 m ${ }^{2}$ | 1.0 space/100 m2 GFA | 7 | 1 |  |
| Min. Number of Accessible Spaces |  |  |  | 9 | 9 |

The proposed development is required to provide a minimum of 9 accessible parking spaces as outlined in the zoning by-law requirements. The proposed development will satisfy the requirements by providing 9 accessible parking spaces. Based on the calculation provided above, 1 accessible retail parking space is
required to be provided on-site. However, as no retail spaces are provided on-site, no designated accessible retail parking spaces are provided. Of note, the site is located adjacent to the streetcar stop for the 501 Queen Streetcar at Jameson and Queen Street West. This stop is designated as an accessibility stop and as such will provide transportation access to the retail component of the subject site without requiring the provision of a parking space on-site or requiring an onerous walk to the subject site.

## 9 LOADING ASSESSMENT

The City of Toronto By-Law 569-2013 was reviewed to determine the loading requirements for the proposed development. Table 9-1 summarizes the loading requirements according to the City's by-law and the proposed supply.

Table 9-1: Zoning By-Law Loading Requirements

| Land Use | Unit <br> Count/GFA | ZBL 569-2013 |  | Proposed Supply |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Loading Space Required |  |  |
| Residential | 249 Units | 31 to 399 dwelling units | 1 Type "G" | 1 Type "G/B" |
| Retail | $789 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 500 to $1,999 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 1 Type "B" |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

The subject site is required to provide one (1) Type "G" and one (1) Type "B" loading space which meets the loading requirements of the zoning by-law. One shared Type "G/B" loading space is provided on-site to accommodate the loading requirements. Given the sharing of the loading space, it is anticipated that future deliveries for the retail component will be conducted in a manner that does not conflict with City garbage collection.

A review of the functionality and accessibility of the proposed loading space indicates that the proposed loading space can be safely accessed and egressed by a garbage truck. Swept paths were conducted which confirmed that garbage trucks will be able to enter the loading zone and reverse back out of the space to egress the site. Swept path diagrams are provided in Appendix L.

## 10 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

The subject site is required to meet the Tier 1 Performance Measures listed under the Toronto Green Standards Version 4 (TGS V4) for Mid- to High -Rise Residential and Non-Residential developments. This section will review the TGS V4 development features based on the applicable requirements for the study area. Overall, the proposed development is compliant with all the Tier 1 Performance Measures where applicable with respect to transportation-related measures.

### 10.1 LOW EMMISSIONS TRANSPORTATION

### 10.1.1 Single-Occupant vehicle Trips

Section AQ 1.1 of TGS V4 requires that the proposed development reduce single-occupancy-vehicle trips by 25\%. This will be achieved through the inclusion of a variety of multimodal infrastructure strategies and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures. The subject site meets this requirement as the proposed development includes a TDM plan. This plan will be discussed in greater detail in Section 10.

### 10.1.2 Electric Vehicle Infrastructure

Section AQ 1.2 of the TGS V4 requires that parking spaces in the proposed development be equipped with an Energized Outlet in accordance with Zoning By-Law 569-2013. According to the Zoning By-Law, all residential parking spaces provided for dwelling units and $25 \%$ of non-residential parking spaces located in a mixed-use building must include an energized outlet to ensure electric vehicles can be accommodated. Table 10-1 summarizes the required Electric Vehicle (EV) parking supply.

Table 10-1: Zoning By-Law 569-2013 Electric Vehicle Parking Standards

| Use | Proposed Spaces | Minimum Rate | Required EV Spaces | Proposed EV Spaces |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 59 | $100 \%$ of parking spaces | 59 | 59 |
| Visitor | 14 | $25 \%$ of parking spaces | 4 | 14 |
| Retail | 0 | $25 \%$ of parking spaces | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 73 | - | 63 | 73 |

All proposed residential and visitor parking spaces on-site will provide an electrical rough-in to ensure EVs can be accommodated on-site, thus supporting sustainable travel options for the subject development. This meets the requirement for residential parking spaces and exceeds the requirement for the visitor parking spaces. The new EV infrastructure will help enable a wider range of individuals to have access to parking spaces that support low emission transportation modes.

### 10.2 CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE

### 10.2.1 Bicycle Parking Rates

Section AQ 2.1 of TGS V4 requires developments to provide bicycle parking spaces in accordance with Zoning By-Law 569-2013. These rates will inform the bicycle parking supply to be provided on-site to accommodate travel by bicycle to and from the subject site. As discussed in Section 8.1, the proposed development will provide bicycle parking facilities that meet the requirements for long-term and short-term bicycle parking for the residential uses. This will support and encourage active transportation and travel by bicycle in place of a personal vehicle for residents and visitors.

### 10.2.2 Long-Term Bicycle Parking Location

Section AQ 2.2 of TGS V4 requires developments to provide long-term bicycle parking in a secure controlledaccess bicycle parking facility or purpose-built bicycle locker on the first or second storey of the building or on levels below ground commencing with the first level below ground. Long-term bicycle parking can be provided on levels below ground when at least 50 percent of the area of the level is occupied by bicycle parking spaces until all required spaces have been provided. However, required spaces such as elevator shafts and mechanical rooms are omitted when calculating for the net area of a level.
The subject development proposes to place long-term residential bicycle parking spaces on the P1 parking level in a secure bicycle storage room.

### 10.2.3 Short-Term Bicycle Parking Location

Section AQ 2.3 of TGS V4 requires developments to provide short-term bicycle parking in a highly visible and publicly accessible location at-grade or on the first parking level of the building below grade.

The site plan for the subject site proposes to provide short-term residential bicycle parking at-grade at the rear of the subject site near the southwest corner of the property. This provides easy access for visitors to first park their bikes. The subject site therefore meets this requirement through appropriate provisions in the site plan.

### 10.2.4 Electric Bicycle Infrastructure

Section AQ 2.4 of TGS V4 requires developments to provide bicycle parking spaces equipped with an energized outlet for at least 15 percent of the required long-term bicycle parking spaces.

As such, $15 \%$ of long-term residential bicycle parking spaces are equipped with an energized outlet.

### 10.2.5 Shower and Change Facilities

Section AQ 2.5 of TGS V4 requires developments to provide shower and change facilities consistent with the rate identified in Zoning By-Law 569-2013. Since the proposed development includes residential uses and does not require bicycle parking spaces for the retail component, on-site shower and change facilities are not required.

### 10.3 PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE

Section 3.1 of the TGS V4 requires developments to provide safe, direct, universally accessible pedestrian routes that connect the buildings on-site to the off-site pedestrian network and priority destinations. The subject site meets this requirement as the plan for the development includes several elements to maintain and improve pedestrian access and permeability through the subject site. Building entrances connect to the adjacent sidewalks along Queen Street West and allow ease of access to the nearby transit stop for the 501 Queen Streetcar which is adjacent to the subject site.

Section AQ 3.2 requires developments to provide a context-sensitive pedestrian clearway that is a minimum of 2.1 m wide, to safely and comfortably accommodate pedestrian flow. At least a 2.1 m sidewalk is currently existing along Queen Street West with a sidewalk of at least 2.1 m being provided along the street fronting the subject site according to the site plan.

Section 3.3 of the TGS V4 requires developments to provide covered outdoor waiting areas for pedestrian comfort and protection from inclement weather. Covered outdoor waiting areas are proposed via canopies at the building entrances.

Section 3.4 of the TGS V4 requires developments to provide pedestrian-scale lighting that is evenly spaced, continuous and directly onto sidewalks pathways, entrances, outdoor waiting areas and public spaces. The subject site will meet this requirement by providing appropriate pedestrian scale lighting throughout the site plan. These measures will foster a safer experience for pedestrians regardless of the time of day and promote walking, biking, and riding public transit as a viable option to travel to and from the subject site.

## 11 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PLAN

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is a set of strategies that strive towards a more efficient transportation network by influencing travel behaviour. Effective TDM measures can reduce vehicle usage and encourage residents to engage in more sustainable methods of travel. There are various opportunities to incorporate TDM measures that support alternative modes of transportation. The recommendations should enhance non-single occupant auto vehicle trips for future residents of the subject development.

These TDM strategies are critical in achieving a balanced multi-modal transportation system in the City of Toronto and supporting goals towards sustainable development as identified by the Toronto Green Standards (TGS) and TransformTO Net Zero Strategy to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2040.

A specific requirement of the TGS is to reduce single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips generated by a proposed development by $25 \%$. The following multimodal infrastructure strategies and TDM measures are recommended for consideration to support the subject site's parking strategy and role in transforming the surrounding neighbourhood. As the development moves through the development process, the TDM plan will undergo further refinement.

### 11.1.1 Cycling-based Strategies

On-site bicycle parking facilities.

- The proposed development will provide bicycle parking facilities to support and encourage active transportation. A supply of 225 and 50 long-term and short-term residential bicycle parking spaces, respectively, will be accommodated on-site. This supply is provided to satisfy the required rate of 0.9 spaces per unit for residents and 0.2 spaces per unit for residential visitors.

Additionally, the provision of electric bicycle infrastructure in line with Toronto Green Standard version 4 requirements, will enable a wider range of residents to have access to a bicycle parking space on-site that meets their needs.

- The proposed development will provide bicycle parking facilities both at-grade and in the underground parking level, in secure locations. This provision will accommodate bike parking in a manner that is safe, secure and convenient.


## Provision of Bicycle Repair Stations.

- One (1) bicycle repair station is provided on-site. The provision of the bicycle repair stations will support the use of cycling as an alternative mode of transportation to further reduce SOV trips from the site and reduce barriers to cycling. A bicycle repair station is provided near the long-term bicycle parking storage areas on-site.


## Promote and increase cycling awareness and multi-modal transport.

- It is recommended that information packages be provided to residents of the proposed development to help encourage active transportation and increase awareness of different travel alternatives. The package should include information regarding the environmental and health benefits of cycling, rules of the road, as well as maps of active transportation available in the surrounding area.

Provision of Bike Share memberships for residents.

- The subject site is located within walking distance to Bike Share docking stations. This will provide residents with a convenient option to travel for short trips and discourage single-occupancy vehicle usage. As such, it is recommended that Bike Share memberships are provided for each unit of the subject site and are subsidized for one (1) year.

Estimated Impact: Based on the trip generation conducted for the subject site from the proxy trip generation rates, about $7 \%$ and $3 \%$ of trips undertaken to and from the site are cycling trips in the AM and PM peak hours (Table 4-3), respectively, indicating a prevalence of cycling usage as a mode of transportation. The combination of these robust measures, notably on-site bicycle parking facilities, bicycle repair stations, promotional/information packages and provision of Bike Share membership for all units, have the ability to further encourage the use of transit with an estimated impact of approximately $10 \%$.

### 11.1.2 Pedestrian-Based Recommended Strategies

Building entrances are to be oriented close to the street with direct connections to the pedestrian pathways.

- The proposed pedestrian entrance for the residential and retail components are oriented to a sidewalk at greater than 2.1 m in width along Queen Street West to provide convenient linkages for pedestrians, transit users and cyclists to access the residential units and ground-floor retail, respectively. The development should also maintain enhanced landscaping and facades throughout the site to encourage walking and ensure minimal barriers to provide a safe and accessible pedestrian realm.


## Mixed land uses to facilitate walking trips.

- The inclusion of ground-floor retail in the same building as residential units provides a great opportunity for residents to walk to retail destinations that they may otherwise drive to. This retail space within the proposed development will also provide opportunities for nearby local residents to walk to the destinations via the Queen Street West and Jameson Avenue sidewalk network, or from nearby transit stops, which will ultimately further discourage automobile travel in the area.

Estimated Impact: Based on the trip generation conducted for the subject site from the proxy trip generation rates, and as determined through the utilization of TTS modal split data (Table 4-1), about 15-16\% of trips undertaken to and from the site are walking trips in the AM and PM peak hours (Table 4-3), indicating a prevalence of walking trips. The combination of these robust pedestrian-based measures, inclusive of the location of the building entrances close to the street providing connections to pedestrian pathways and the provision of mixed-land use to reduce SOV trips, will have the ability to further encourage walking with an estimated impact of at least 1-2\% considering how very walkable the local area is as noted from the walkscore (91/100 - "Walkers Paradise") provided in Section 2.4.

### 11.1.3 Transit-Based Strategies

## Transit incentive program.

- As PRESTO has become a dominant form of payment for transit throughout the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA), it is recommended that pre-loaded PRESTO cards be offered to units in their welcome packages. This incentive, coupled with the site's proximity to transit from the 501 Queen Streetcar and the 47 Lansdowne bus, provides an opportunity for residents to experience the benefits of using adjacent transit facilities.


## Communication strategy and information packages.

- In order for residents to take advantage of the transit services surrounding the subject site, it is recommended that the owners provide information packages and communications to increase transit awareness and multimodal transport by encouraging active transportation and different travel demand management programs. The information packages should contain public transit information such as route maps and schedule timetables.

Estimated Impact: Based on the trip generation conducted for the subject site from the proxy trip generation rates, and as determined through the utilization of TTS modal split data (Table 4-1), about 49-51\% of trips undertaken to and from the site are transit trips in the AM and PM peak hours (Table 4-3), indicating a prevalence of transit usage. The combination of these robust measures, notably the provision of pre-loaded PRESTO cards to all units on-site, given that the Queen Streetcar stop is located adjacent to the northeast corner of the subject site, will have the ability to further encourage the use of transit with an estimated impact of at least $20 \%$.

### 11.2 IMPACT OF TDM MEASURES

The proposed TDM measures are expected to further support the site's proposed parking strategy by increasing the convenience and attractiveness of taking transit, walking, or cycling to/from the subject site. The proposed TDM measures will help further reduce vehicle activity associated with the subject site and encourage a lifestyle that largely relies upon transit and active transportation. Table 11-1 summarizes the proposed strategies and the expected auto trip reductions.

Table 11-1: Summary of TDM Strategies and Estimated Impacts

| Recommended TDM Measures | Cycling-Based Strategies | Impact ${ }^{\text {(1) }}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| On-site bicycle parking facilities | + Supports and encourages cycling as <br> primary mode of travel <br> + Provides secure bicycle parking and <br> bicycle repair station on-site |  |
| Provision of bicycle repair stations | + Support cycling as an alternative to SOV <br> trips <br> + Reduce barriers to cycling |  |
| Promote and increase cycling <br> awareness and multi-modal transport | + Encourages active transportation and <br> increase awareness of active travel <br> alternatives <br> + Spreads awareness of benefits of cycling | $\sim$ |

Note: (1) - Consultant Estimate
The combination of these TDM strategies listed above is expected to significantly reduce the auto-dependency of residents and visitors in the subject development and encourage more sustainable travel habits. This thereby enables the requirements of TGS V4 to be met and contributes to a $25 \%$ SOV reduction for the subject development.

### 11.3 TDM MONITORING

It is recommended that ongoing monitoring and evaluation be undertaken to collect data and information regarding TDM performance measures. The key goal of TDM monitoring is to provide useful information on identifying successful program activities, improvements to existing programming as well as the potential development of future programs. The owner should perform periodic evaluation to assess how well the TDM Program is achieving the goal in reducing the number of single-occupant vehicle trips generated by the site. A baseline survey and annual monitoring five (5) years onward is recommended to ensure effective monitoring.

## 12 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- The development proposal consists of a 12 -storey mixed-use building. A total of 249 residential units and approximately $789 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of ground floor retail GFA are proposed. Access to the development is proposed via an unsignalized, all-moves site access via a laneway onto Queen Street West.
- The subject site is located in an area that is well-serviced by the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) transit networks. The subject site is within walkable distance of bus stops and a streetcar stop for the 501 Queen Streetcar. The subject site is located in a neighbourhood with some nearby cycling infrastructure and an excellent pedestrian network and environment.
- The proposed development is anticipated to generate 29 two-way auto driver and auto passenger trips during the AM peak hour ( 4 inbound and 25 outbound) ad 32 two-way auto driver and auto passenger trips during the PM peak hour ( 24 inbound and 8 outbound). Furthermore, for transit trips, the subject site is anticipated to generate 49 two-way trips in the AM peak hour ( 17 inbound and 33 outbound) and 54 two-way trips in the PM peak hour ( 33 inbound and 21 outbound). For walking trips, 16 two-way AM peak hour trips ( 5 inbound and 10 outbound) and 17 two-way PM peak hour trips ( 11 inbound and 6 outbound) are anticipated to be generated. For cycling trips, 7 two-way AM peak hour trips (7 outbound only) and 3 two-way PM peak hour trips ( 2 inbound and 1 outbound) are anticipated to be generated.
- Under existing conditions the signalized and unsignalized intersections all operate within capacity with only two movements of interest noted. It should also be noted that queuing constraints were identified from field observations that may not be captured through Synchro as the flows may be metered. As such the model is limited in capturing queueing conditions that may exist in the field. Under future background conditions, minimal change in operations are seen, as well as minimal change in operations with the addition of site traffic in future total conditions and no new constrains are added.
- The development is providing 73 vehicle parking spaces consisting of 59 residential spaces and 14 visitor parking spaces. The proposed parking supply will be acceptable and will satisfy the minimum requirements of the zoning by-law.
- The proposed bicycle parking supply of 275 residential spaces, consisting of 50 short-term and 225 long-term spaces meeting the requirements under the City of Toronto Zoning Bylaw 569-2013. The proposed bicycle parking supply satisfies the minimum requirements of the zoning by-law.
- The provision of one (1) shared Type " $\mathrm{G} / \mathrm{B}$ " loading space satisfies the By-law requirements.
- The proposed development will meet all of the Tier 1 Performance Measures in the Toronto Green Standards Version 4 (TGS V4) where applicable by including the required design features in the site plan.

- A set of transportation demand management (TDM) measures have been recommended to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips the required $25 \%$ according to the TGS Version 4 requirement and encourage multi-modal travel alternatives. A TDM plan containing these measures and a monitoring strategy has been included.

APPENDIX A
Terms of Reference

Daniel Reynolds
City of Toronto
55 John St,
Toronto ON M5V 3C6

Dear Daniel Reynolds,

## RE: Terms of Reference <br> Transportation Impact Study for Proposed Mixed-Use Development 1437-1455 Queen Street West, City of Toronto

We wish to confirm the following work plan for a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) in support of the Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) application for the proposed mixed-use residential development located at 14371455 Queen Street West in the City of Toronto. Figure 1 below illustrates the subject site.

Figure 1: Subject Site and Proposed Study Area (Source: Google Earth, retrieved January 2023)


The TIS will be conducted following the City of Toronto's Guidelines for the Preparation of Transportation Impact Studies (2013). The following outlines the proposed Terms of Reference for the TIS for your review and approval.

Proposed Redevelopment

The subject site is currently occupied by several low-rise retail buildings and a surface parking lot. The proposed development will involve replacing the existing land uses with an 11-storey residential tower containing 244 residential units, $853 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of ground floor retail GFA, and one level of underground parking. Vehicular and loading access to the site is proposed via a laneway connection to Queen Street West on the west side of the subject site. The latest available conceptual plan is illustrated below in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Conceptual Plan (Source: Raw Design Inc., Oct 2022)


## Study Area \& Traffic Data

LEA will review the existing conditions of the proposed study area, including the existing road, active transportation, and transit networks. As illustrated in Figure 1, the proposed study area includes the following intersections:

- Lansdowne Avenue and Queen Street West (Signalized);
- Jameson Avenue and Queen Street West (Signalized); and
- Sorauren Avenue and Queen Street West (Signalized).

LEA proposes to survey the intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak periods.


Peak hour factors, heavy vehicle percentages, and conflicting pedestrian/cyclist volumes will be adopted based on the existing turning movement count (TMC) data. The latest signal timing plans will be obtained from City staff.

## Study Horizons and Traffic Assessment

The TIS will assess traffic operations during the weekday AM peak hour and the weekday PM peak hour for the study area intersections. A five (5) year horizon period to the year 2028 will be assessed as part of the study.

Synchro 11.0 software will be used to perform intersection capacity analysis, utilizing the methodology of the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual and input parameter values consistent with the City of Toronto's Guidelines for Using Synchro 11 (Including SimTraffic 11), dated January 15, 2021.

## Background Traffic

General Corridor Growth Rate - LEA will obtain historical TMC data in the study area to determine appropriate growth rates to apply for the major study corridors for the 2028 study horizon.

Road Network Improvements - LEA will investigate and account for any anticipated road improvements in the study area.

Background Development Traffic - LEA is requesting that the City confirm the list of background developments provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Background Developments (Source: City of Toronto Development Applications)

| File Number | Location | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22138059 STE 04 SA | 1521 Queen St W | 95 residential units; $293 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ retail GFA |
| 21251366 STE 04 SA | 1375 Queen St W | 50 residential units; $264 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ commercial GFA |
| 19112609 STE 04 OZ | 150 Dunn Ave | Expansion to long-term care facility with a 60-storey wing <br> containing 192 beds with new parking |
| 20200379 STE 04 OZ | 8-14 Brock Ave \& 1354- <br> 1360 Queen St W | 172 residential units; $386.1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ commercial GFA |

Trip Generation, Distribution and Assignment
The trip generation methodology for the proposed development is as follows:

- Proposed residential use: LEA is proposing to collect trip generation survey data at a proxy site (15 \& 25 Stafford Street) with comparable land use characteristics and transportation context as the subject site. This data will be compared to the trip generation survey data collected at the same proxy site prior to the pandemic (which was used for two approved developments nearby at 1182 King Street W and 1221 King Street West) to determine appropriate residential trip generation rates to apply.

- Proposed retail use: Given the scale of the retail use and the local travel characteristics, it is assumed that the proposed retail use will attract local trips already in the area but is not expected to generate new vehicle trips solely for this use. As such, no new vehicle trip generation will be included.
- Existing commercial use: Existing commercial trips will be removed based on the observed TMC data.

The local mode split will be estimated using the 2016 Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS). Trip distribution and assignment will be based on a review of 2016 TTS data as well as observations of traffic patterns and existing turn permissions/prohibitions.

## Multi-Modal Transportation Assessment

A multi-modal level of service (MMLOS) evaluation of the surrounding transit, pedestrian, and cycling environments will be conducted adopting the City of Ottawa's Multi-Modal Level of Service Guidelines. This evaluation will assess the level of convenience and comfort of transit and active transportation infrastructure users given existing conditions, planned background network changes, and the impact of site generated trips.

## Site Specific Transportation Improvements

Based on the results of the TIS, LEA will identify whether transportation related improvements or mitigation measures are required to accommodate traffic generated by the proposed development.

Parking \& Loading
The site is currently subject to City of Toronto Zoning By-Law 569-2013, which will be reviewed for parking and loading requirements.

## Transportation Demand Management

A TDM plan will be completed and provide recommendations to promote alternate modes of travel. The TDM will justify the appropriate parking requirement and reduce the auto dependency of the subject site.

## Site Plan Review

A site plan review will be undertaken to ensure vehicular movements can be accommodated at the proposed loading bay, drive aisle, garage ramp, etc. and loading and servicing vehicles can effectively access, circulate, and/or perform loading activities on-site.


Should you have any questions or concerns regarding these terms of reference, please do not hesitate to contact me at pperera@lea.ca.

Yours truly,
LEA CONSULTING LTD.


Pavani Perera, EIT, B.A.Sc.
Transportation Analyst

## Pavani Perera

## From:

## Sent:

To:
Cc:
Subject:

Daniel Reynolds [Daniel.Reynolds@toronto.ca](mailto:Daniel.Reynolds@toronto.ca)
February 6, 2023 12:03 PM
Pavani Perera
Zara Georgis; Joia Mendez
RE: Terms of Reference_1437-1455 Queen Street West, Toronto

External Sender

Hey Pavani,
Thanks for this submission. My comments are as follows:

- The traffic assessment methodology is acceptable, including existing/future assumptions, study scope, etc.;
- No major infrastructure works are anticipated along this segment of Queen Street West, as far as I can determine at this time;
- For parking, application of By-law No. 89-2022 (which amends 569-2013) is acceptable;
- The loading will be subject to By-law 569-2013 requirements (any deviation from the minimums will require appropriate justification);
- A full TDM plan, including provisions to be provided for the site and secured via the Site Plan Agreement (e.g. memberships to car/bike-share) is to be provided;
- The proposed access must be appropriately offset from the existing driveway to the west. This will likely require some site re-design and additional details. It is noted that the existing driveway to the west does not appear to be heavily used, however we would like to limit the width of the consolidated curb cut at this location on Queen West; and
- There is no right-of-way widening along Queen Street West for this site, though we would like a 2.5 metre wide pedestrian clearway (with a furnishing/planting zone to be provided adjacent to the curb). This may require a pedestrian clearway easement to secure the appropriate space on private land (to be determined).

Let me know if you have any other questions or concerns.

Thanks.

Daniel Reynolds
Senior Project Manager, Development Planning \& Review Area 1
Transportation Services
Metro Hall, 17th Floor
416-392-1124
daniel.reynolds@toronto.ca

From: Pavani Perera [mailto:PPerera@lea.ca]
Sent: February 2, 2023 3:09 PM
To: Daniel Reynolds [Daniel.Reynolds@toronto.ca](mailto:Daniel.Reynolds@toronto.ca)
Cc: Zara Georgis [ZGeorgis@lea.ca](mailto:ZGeorgis@lea.ca); Joia Mendez [JMendez@lea.ca](mailto:JMendez@lea.ca)
Subject: Terms of Reference_1437-1455 Queen Street West, Toronto
Hi Daniel

We wish to confirm the attached Terms of Reference for a Transportation Impact Study for a proposed mixed-use residential development located at 1437-1455 Queen Street West in the City of Toronto.

Please let me know if you have any comments or concerns with our assumptions.

Thank you,

## Pavani Perera, EIT, B.A.Sc.

Transportation Analyst

## LEA Consulting Ltd.

40 University Avenue, Suite 503 | Toronto, ON | M5J 1T1
T: 9054700015 E: pperera@lea.ca W: www.LEA.ca
We've Moved!
Our Downtown office has moved, please make note of our new address above.

This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee(s) listed above
Please notify the sender and delete all copies of this message together with any attached files if you have obtained this message in error.
LEA is not responsible for edited or reproduced versions of this digital data.


APPENDIX B
Traffic Data and Signal Timing Plans

## Signal Timing Plans





| Notes: | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Turning Restrictions: "No SB Right-Turn on Red", "No NB Right-Turn on Red", "No EB Right-Turn on Red". } \\ \\ \text { Offset Intersection, Farside EW vehicle heads with limited vision visors. }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |



## Turning Movement Counts

## LEA

LEA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9 Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9
$905-470-0015 \times 240$ idinsmore@lea.ca

Turning Movement Data


LEA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9 905-470-0015 x240 idinsmore@lea.ca


Turning Movement Data Plot

## EA

LEA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9 905-470-0015 x240 idinsmore@lea.ca

Count Name: 23322_Jameson Ave \& Queen St W-AM
Site Code: 23322
Start Date: 02/07/2023
Page No: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:30 AM)


LEA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9 905-470-0015 x240 idinsmore@lea.ca


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (8:30 AM)

## LEA

LEA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9 Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9
$905-470-0015 \times 240$ idinsmore@lea.ca

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Queen Street West Westbound |  |  |  |  | Jameson Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | Queen Street West Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | Peds | App. Total |  |
| 4:30 PM | 107 | 40 | 0 | 1 | 147 | 54 | 14 | 0 | 74 | 68 | 14 | 66 | 1 | 92 | 81 | 296 |
| 4:45 PM | 96 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 57 | 19 | 0 | 69 | 76 | 8 | 68 | 0 | 66 | 76 | 275 |
| Hourly Total | 203 | 67 | 0 | 1 | 270 | 111 | 33 | 0 | 143 | 144 | 22 | 134 | 1 | 158 | 157 | 571 |
| 5:00 PM | 70 | 32 | 0 | 8 | 102 | 54 | 17 | 0 | 76 | 71 | 9 | 49 | 0 | 57 | 58 | 231 |
| 5:15 PM | 94 | 32 | 0 | 2 | 126 | 69 | 20 | 0 | 71 | 89 | 6 | 61 | 0 | 67 | 67 | 282 |
| 5:30 PM | 94 | 35 | 0 | 4 | 129 | 71 | 21 | 0 | 82 | 92 | 9 | 63 | 0 | 87 | 72 | 293 |
| 5:45 PM | 113 | 50 | 0 | 2 | 163 | 57 | 18 | 0 | 73 | 75 | 7 | 77 | 0 | 89 | 84 | 322 |
| Hourly Total | 371 | 149 | 0 | 16 | 520 | 251 | 76 | 0 | 302 | 327 | 31 | 250 | 0 | 300 | 281 | 1128 |
| 6:00 PM | 87 | 46 | 0 | 1 | 133 | 64 | 20 | 0 | 72 | 84 | 9 | 86 | 0 | 65 | 95 | 312 |
| 6:15 PM | 90 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 36 | 14 | 0 | 61 | 50 | 12 | 66 | 0 | 58 | 78 | 255 |
| 6:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 751 | 299 | 0 | 18 | 1050 | 462 | 143 | 0 | 578 | 605 | 74 | 536 | 1 | 581 | 611 | 2266 |
| Approach \% | 71.5 | 28.5 | 0.0 | - | - | 76.4 | 23.6 | 0.0 | - | - | 12.1 | 87.7 | 0.2 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 33.1 | 13.2 | 0.0 | - | 46.3 | 20.4 | 6.3 | 0.0 | - | 26.7 | 3.3 | 23.7 | 0.0 | - | 27.0 | - |
| Lights | 636 | 295 | 0 | - | 931 | 451 | 140 | 0 | - | 591 | 71 | 471 | 1 | - | 543 | 2065 |
| \% Lights | 84.7 | 98.7 | - | - | 88.7 | 97.6 | 97.9 | - | - | 97.7 | 95.9 | 87.9 | 100.0 | - | 88.9 | 91.1 |
| Buses | 57 | 1 | 0 | - | 58 | 1 | 1 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 35 | 0 | - | 35 | 95 |
| \% Buses | 7.6 | 0.3 | - | - | 5.5 | 0.2 | 0.7 | - | - | 0.3 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.0 | - | 5.7 | 4.2 |
| Trucks | 18 | 1 | 0 | - | 19 | 5 | 2 | 0 | - | 7 | 1 | 5 | 0 | - | 6 | 32 |
| \% Trucks | 2.4 | 0.3 | - | - | 1.8 | 1.1 | 1.4 | - | - | 1.2 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 | - | 1.0 | 1.4 |
| Bicycles on Road | 40 | 2 | 0 | - | 42 | 5 | 0 | 0 | - | 5 | 2 | 25 | 0 | - | 27 | 74 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 5.3 | 0.7 | - | - | 4.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.8 | 2.7 | 4.7 | 0.0 | - | 4.4 | 3.3 |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | 12 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 1.7 | - | - | - | - | 2.1 | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | 18 | - | - | - | - | 568 | - | - | - | - | 569 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | 98.3 | - | - | - | - | 97.9 | - | - |

LEA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9 905-470-0015 x240 idinsmore@lea.ca


Turning Movement Data Plot

## EA

EA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9 905-470-0015 x240 idinsmore@lea.ca

Count Name: 23322_Jameson Ave \& Queen S W-PM
Site Code: 23322
Start Date: 02/07/2023
Page No: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:15 PM)

| Start Time | Queen Street West Westbound |  |  |  |  | Jameson Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | Queen Street West Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | U-Turn |  |  |  |
| 5:15 PM | 94 | 32 | 0 | 2 | 126 | 69 | 20 | 0 | 71 | 89 | 6 | 61 | 0 | 67 | 67 | 282 |
| 5:30 PM | 94 | 35 | 0 | 4 | 129 | 71 | 21 | 0 | 82 | 92 | 9 | 63 | 0 | 87 | 72 | 293 |
| 5:45 PM | 113 | 50 | 0 | 2 | 163 | 57 | 18 | 0 | 73 | 75 | 7 | 77 | 0 | 89 | 84 | 322 |
| 6:00 PM | 87 | 46 | 0 | 1 | 133 | 64 | 20 | 0 | 72 | 84 | 9 | 86 | 0 | 65 | 95 | 312 |
| Total | 388 | 163 | 0 | 9 | 551 | 261 | 79 | 0 | 298 | 340 | 31 | 287 | 0 | 308 | 318 | 1209 |
| Approach \% | 70.4 | 29.6 | 0.0 | - | - | 76.8 | 23.2 | 0.0 | - | - | 9.7 | 90.3 | 0.0 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 32.1 | 13.5 | 0.0 | - | 45.6 | 21.6 | 6.5 | 0.0 | - | 28.1 | 2.6 | 23.7 | 0.0 | - | 26.3 | - |
| PHF | 0.858 | 0.815 | 0.000 | - | 0.845 | 0.919 | 0.940 | 0.000 | - | 0.924 | 0.861 | 0.834 | 0.000 | - | 0.837 | 0.939 |
| Lights | 331 | 162 | 0 | - | 493 | 254 | 77 | 0 | - | 331 | 30 | 255 | 0 | - | 285 | 1109 |
| \% Lights | 85.3 | 99.4 | - | - | 89.5 | 97.3 | 97.5 | - | - | 97.4 | 96.8 | 88.9 | - | - | 89.6 | 91.7 |
| Buses | 26 | 1 | 0 | - | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | - | 16 | 43 |
| \% Buses | 6.7 | 0.6 | - | - | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | - | - | 5.0 | 3.6 |
| Trucks | 7 | 0 | 0 | - | 7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | - | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | - | 2 | 13 |
| \% Trucks | 1.8 | 0.0 | - | - | 1.3 | 0.8 | 2.5 | - | - | 1.2 | 3.2 | 0.3 |  | - | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| Bicycles on Road | 24 | 0 | 0 | - | 24 | 5 | 0 | 0 | - | 5 | 0 | 15 | 0 | - | 15 | 44 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 6.2 | 0.0 | - | - | 4.4 | 1.9 | 0.0 | - | - | 1.5 | 0.0 | 5.2 | - | - | 4.7 | 3.6 |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 8 | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 2.7 | - | - | - | - | 2.3 | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | 9 | - | - | - | - | 290 | - | - | - | - | 301 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | 97.3 | - | - | - | - | 97.7 | - | - |

LEA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9 905-470-0015 x240 idinsmore@lea.ca


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (5:15 PM)

# LEA Consulting Ltd. 

625 Cochrane Drive, $9^{\text {th }}$ Floor
M arkham, ON L3R 9R9

Project No.: 23322
Intersection: Lansdowne Ave \& Queen St W
Weather: Clear
Surveyor(s): ID

File Name : Lansdowne Ave \& Queen St W - AM
Site Code : 00023322
Start Date : 2023-02-07
Page No : 1

|  | Lansdowne Avenue Southbound |  |  |  | Queen Street West Westbound |  |  |  | Queen Street West Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | Peds | App. Total | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Peds | App. Total | Exclu. Total | Inclu. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:30 | 17 | 44 | [24] | 61 | 57 | 10 | [8] | 67 | 36 | 85 | [0] | 121 | 32 | 249 | 281 |
| 07:45 | 16 | 32 | [24] | 48 | 62 | 13 | [9] | 75 | 47 | 77 | [1] | 124 | 34 | 247 | 281 |
| Total | 33 | 76 | [48] | 109 | 119 | 23 | [17] | 142 | 83 | 162 | [1] | 245 | 66 | 496 | 562 |
| 08:00 | 17 | 35 | [42] | 52 | 67 | 17 | [19] | 84 | 33 | 74 | [0] | 107 | 61 | 243 | 304 |
| 08:15 | 20 | 35 | [31] | 55 | 69 | 28 | [20] | 97 | 33 | 87 | [1] | 120 | 52 | 272 | 324 |
| 08:30 | 24 | 34 | [59] | 58 | 56 | 20 | [51] | 76 | 42 | 114 | [0] | 156 | 110 | 290 | 400 |
| 08:45 | 31 | 41 | [60] | 72 | 66 | 16 | [63] | 82 | 37 | 93 | [1] | 130 | 124 | 284 | 408 |
| Total | 92 | 145 | [192] | 237 | 258 | 81 | [153] | 339 | 145 | 368 | [2] | 513 | 347 | 1089 | 1436 |
| 09:00 | 36 | 30 | [47] | 66 | 71 | 14 | [46] | 85 | 34 | 118 | [2] | 152 | 95 | 303 | 398 |
| 09:15 | 25 | 30 | [52] | 55 | 47 | 17 | [36] | 64 | 42 | 99 | [0] | 141 | 88 | 260 | 348 |
| Grand Total | 186 | 281 | [339] | 467 | 495 | 135 | [252] | 630 | 304 | 747 | [5] | 1051 | 596 | 2148 | 2744 |
| Apprch \% | 39.8 | 60.2 |  |  | 78.6 | 21.4 |  |  | 28.9 | 71.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \% | 8.7 | 13.1 |  | 21.7 | 23 | 6.3 |  | 29.3 | 14.2 | 34.8 |  | 48.9 | 21.7 | 78.3 |  |
| Cars/lights | 168 | 244 |  | 751 | 427 | 123 |  | 799 | 282 | 672 |  | 959 | 0 | 0 | 2509 |
| \% Cars/lights | 90.3 | 86.8 | 100 | 93.2 | 86.3 | 91.1 | 98.8 | 90.6 | 92.8 | 90 | 100 | 90.8 | 0 | 0 | 91.4 |
| Trucks | 17 | 13 |  | 30 | 21 | 12 |  | 36 | 22 | 20 |  | 42 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| \% Trucks | 9.1 | 4.6 | 0 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 8.9 | 1.2 | 4.1 | 7.2 | 2.7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Buses | 1 | 24 |  | 25 | 47 | 0 |  | 47 | 0 | 55 |  | 55 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| \% Buses | 0.5 | 8.5 | 0 | 3.1 | 9.5 | 0 | 0 | 5.3 | 0 | 7.4 | 0 | 5.2 | 0 | 0 | 4.6 |

## LEA Consulting Ltd.

625 Cochrane Drive, $9^{\text {th }}$ Floor
M arkham, ON L3R 9R9

File Name : Lansdowne Ave \& Queen St W - AM
Site Code : 00023322
Start Date : 2023-02-07
Page No : 2


# LEA Consulting Ltd. 

## 625 Cochrane Drive, $9^{\text {th }}$ Floor <br> M arkham, ON L3R 9R9

File Name : Lansdowne Ave \& Queen St W - AM
Site Code : 00023322
Start Date : 2023-02-07
Page No : 3

|  | Lansdowne Avenue Southbound |  |  | Queen Street West Westbound |  |  | Queen Street West Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:30 to 09:15-Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Int | on Beg | t 08:15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08:15 | 20 | 35 | 55 | 69 | 28 | 97 | 33 | 87 | 120 | 272 |
| 08:30 | 24 | 34 | 58 | 56 | 20 | 76 | 42 | 114 | 156 | 290 |
| 08:45 | 31 | 41 | 72 | 66 | 16 | 82 | 37 | 93 | 130 | 284 |
| 09:00 | 36 | 30 | 66 | 71 | 14 | 85 | 34 | 118 | 152 | 303 |
| Total Volume | 111 | 140 | 251 | 262 | 78 | 340 | 146 | 412 | 558 | 1149 |
| \% App. Total | 44.2 | 55.8 |  | 77.1 | 22.9 |  | 26.2 | 73.8 |  |  |
| PHF | . 771 | . 854 | . 872 | . 923 | . 696 | . 876 | . 869 | . 873 | . 894 | . 948 |
| Cars/lights | 103 | 122 | 225 | 226 | 72 | 298 | 136 | 375 | 511 | 1034 |
| \% Cars/lights | 92.8 | 87.1 | 89.6 | 86.3 | 92.3 | 87.6 | 93.2 | 91.0 | 91.6 | 90.0 |
| Trucks | 8 | 7 | 15 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 52 |
| \% Trucks | 7.2 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 4.2 | 7.7 | 5.0 | 6.8 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 4.5 |
| Buses | 0 | 11 | 11 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 27 | 27 | 63 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 7.9 | 4.4 | 9.5 | 0 | 7.4 | 0 | 6.6 | 4.8 | 5.5 |



## LEA Consulting Ltd.

625 Cochrane Drive, $9^{\text {th }}$ Floor M arkham, ON L3R 9R9

# LEA Consulting Ltd. 

625 Cochrane Drive, $9^{\text {th }}$ Floor
M arkham, ON L3R 9R9

Project No.: 23322
Intersection: Lansdowne Ave \& Queen St
Weather: Clear
Surveyor(s): ID

File Name : Lansdowne Ave \& Queen St W - PM
Site Code : 00023322
Start Date : 2023-02-07
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Cars/lights - Trucks - Buses

|  | Lansdowne Avenue Southbound |  |  |  | Queen Street West Westbound |  |  |  | Queen Street West Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | Peds | App. Total | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Peds | App. Total | Exclu. Total | Inclu. Total | Int. Total |
| 16:30 | 24 | 47 | [83] | 71 | 97 | 17 | [45] | 114 | 57 | 64 | [1] | 121 | 129 | 306 | 435 |
| 16:45 | 27 | 26 | [76] | 53 | 94 | 19 | [40] | 113 | 48 | 71 | [2] | 119 | 118 | 285 | 403 |
| Total | 51 | 73 | [159] | 124 | 191 | 36 | [85] | 227 | 105 | 135 | [3] | 240 | 247 | 591 | 838 |
| 17:00 | 26 | 36 | [108] | 62 | 64 | 16 | [46] | 80 | 52 | 47 | [2] | 99 | 156 | 241 | 397 |
| 17:15 | 23 | 33 | [80] | 56 | 91 | 23 | [42] | 114 | 57 | 71 | [1] | 128 | 123 | 298 | 421 |
| 17:30 | 25 | 43 | [107] | 68 | 83 | 19 | [51] | 102 | 48 | 82 | [3] | 130 | 161 | 300 | 461 |
| 17:45 | 14 | 41 | [88] | 55 | 113 | 16 | [46] | 129 | 43 | 84 | [2] | 127 | 136 | 311 | 447 |
| Total | 88 | 153 | [383] | 241 | 351 | 74 | [185] | 425 | 200 | 284 | [8] | 484 | 576 | 1150 | 1726 |
| 18:00 | 25 | 42 | [65] | 67 | 82 | 20 | [51] | 102 | 48 | 96 | [4] | 144 | 120 | 313 | 433 |
| 18:15 | 29 | 39 | [71] | 68 | 80 | 9 | [46] | 89 | 53 | 47 | [1] | 100 | 118 | 257 | 375 |
| Grand Total | 193 | 307 | [678] | 500 | 704 | 139 | [367] | 843 | 406 | 562 | [16] | 968 | 1061 | 2311 | 3372 |
| Apprch \% | 38.6 | 61.4 |  |  | 83.5 | 16.5 |  |  | 41.9 | 58.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \% | 8.4 | 13.3 |  | 21.6 | 30.5 | 6 |  | 36.5 | 17.6 | 24.3 |  | 41.9 | 31.5 | 68.5 |  |
| Cars/lights | 188 | 278 |  | 1138 | 653 | 134 |  | 1120 | 395 | 527 |  | 935 | 0 | 0 | 3193 |
| \% Cars/lights | 97.4 | 90.6 | 99.1 | 96.6 | 92.8 | 96.4 | 90.7 | 92.6 | 97.3 | 93.8 | 81.2 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 94.7 |
| Trucks | 5 | 9 |  | 20 | 14 | 5 |  | 53 | 11 | 0 |  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 87 |
| \% Trucks | 2.6 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 2 | 3.6 | 9.3 | 4.4 | 2.7 | 0 | 18.8 | 1.4 | 0 | 0 | 2.6 |
| Buses | 0 | 20 |  | 20 | 37 | 0 |  | 37 | 0 | 35 |  | 35 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 6.5 | 0 | 1.7 | 5.3 | 0 | 0 | 3.1 | 0 | 6.2 | 0 | 3.6 | 0 | 0 | 2.7 |

## LEA Consulting Ltd.

625 Cochrane Drive, $9^{\text {th }}$ Floor
M arkham, ON L3R 9R9

File Name : Lansdowne Ave \& Queen St W - PM
Site Code : 00023322
Start Date : 2023-02-07
Page No : 2


# LEA Consulting Ltd. 

## 625 Cochrane Drive, $9^{\text {th }}$ Floor <br> M arkham, ON L3R 9R9

File Name : Lansdowne Ave \& Queen St W - PM
Site Code : 00023322
Start Date : 2023-02-07
Page No : 3

|  | Lansdowne Avenue Southbound |  |  | Queen Street West Westbound |  |  | Queen Street West Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Right | App. Total | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 16:30 to 18:15-Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 17:15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17:15 | 23 | 33 | 56 | 91 | 23 | 114 | 57 | 71 | 128 | 298 |
| 17:30 | 25 | 43 | 68 | 83 | 19 | 102 | 48 | 82 | 130 | 300 |
| 17:45 | 14 | 41 | 55 | 113 | 16 | 129 | 43 | 84 | 127 | 311 |
| 18:00 | 25 | 42 | 67 | 82 | 20 | 102 | 48 | 96 | 144 | 313 |
| Total Volume | 87 | 159 | 246 | 369 | 78 | 447 | 196 | 333 | 529 | 1222 |
| \% App. Total | 35.4 | 64.6 |  | 82.6 | 17.4 |  | 37.1 | 62.9 |  |  |
| PHF | . 870 | . 924 | . 904 | . 816 | . 848 | . 866 | . 860 | . 867 | . 918 | . 976 |
| Cars/lights | 85 | 146 | 231 | 347 | 77 | 424 | 192 | 317 | 509 | 1164 |
| \% Cars/lights | 97.7 | 91.8 | 93.9 | 94.0 | 98.7 | 94.9 | 98.0 | 95.2 | 96.2 | 95.3 |
| Trucks | 2 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| \% Trucks | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.8 | 1.3 |
| Buses | 0 | 9 | 9 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 42 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 4.6 | 0 | 3.8 | 0 | 4.8 | 3.0 | 3.4 |
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Groups Printed- Cars/lights - Trucks - Buses

|  | Macdonnell Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | Queen Street West Westbound |  |  |  |  | 1441 Queen Street West Northbound |  |  |  |  | Queen Street West Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Exclu.Total | Inclu. Toal | Int. Toal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Toal |  |  |  |
| 07:30 | 7 | 0 | 11 | $[23$ $]$ | 18 | 0 | 50 | 7 | [4] | 57 | 0 | 0 | 1 | [10 ] | 1 | 7 | 93 | 0 | [2] | 100 | 39 | 176 | 215 |
| 07:45 | 7 | 1 | 6 | $\begin{array}{r} {[21} \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 14 | 1 | 50 | 6 | [1] | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $[15$ | 0 | 14 | 73 | 0 | [2] | 87 | 39 | 158 | 197 |
| Total | 14 | 1 | 17 | $[44$ $]$ | 32 | 1 | 100 | 13 | [5] | 114 | 0 | 0 | 1 | $[25$ $]$ | 1 | 21 | 166 | 0 | [4] | 187 | 78 | 334 | 412 |
| 08:00 | 10 | 0 | 8 | $[19$ $]$ | 18 | 0 | 58 | 3 | [1] | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $[13$ $]$ | 0 | 13 | 73 | 0 | [4] | 86 | 37 | 165 | 202 |
| 08:15 | 5 | 1 | 8 | $[24$ $]$ | 14 | 0 | 61 | 4 | [0] | 65 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $[14$ $]$ | 3 | 7 | 76 | 3 | [3] | 86 | 41 | 168 | 209 |
| 08:30 | 6 | 0 | 16 | $[57$ $]$ | 22 | 0 | 47 | 9 | [1] | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $[27$ $]$ | 0 | 23 | 107 | 1 | [2] | 131 | 87 | 209 | 296 |
| 08:45 | 7 | 0 | 12 | $[49$ | 19 | 0 | 65 | 5 | [5] | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r}{[16} \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 0 | 14 | 83 | 1 | [3] | 98 | 73 | 187 | 260 |
| Total | 28 | 1 | 44 | $\begin{gathered} {[\{\backslash f} \\ \text { s1 } \\ 5 \\ 14 \\ 9\}] \end{gathered}$ | 73 | 0 | 231 | 21 | [7] | 252 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $[70$ $]$ | 3 | 57 | 339 | 5 | $[12$ $]$ | 401 | 238 | 729 | 967 |
| 09:00 | 7 | 0 | 9 | $[44$ $]$ | 16 | 1 | 66 | 7 | [2] | 74 | 0 | 1 | 1 | $[27$ $]$ | 2 | 15 | 110 | 0 | [6] | 125 | 79 | 217 | 296 |
| 09:15 | 8 | 0 |  |  | 29 | 1 | 55 | 3 | [3] | 59 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 2 | 11 | 94 | 0 | [2] | 105 | 57 | 195 | 252 |
| Grand Total | 57 | 2 | 91 | $\begin{gathered} {[\{\backslash f} \\ \text { s1 } \\ 5 \\ 26 \\ 1\}] \end{gathered}$ | 150 | 3 | 452 | 44 | $[17$ $]$ | 499 | 1 | 2 | 5 | $\begin{gathered} {[\{\backslash f} \\ \text { s1 } \\ 5 \\ 15 \\ 0\}] \end{gathered}$ | 8 | 104 | 709 | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} {[24} \\ ] \end{array}$ | 818 | 452 | 1475 | 1927 |
| Apprch \% | 38 | 1.3 | 60.7 |  |  | 0.6 | 90.6 | 8.8 |  |  | 12.5 | 25 | 62.5 |  |  | 12.7 | 86.7 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \% | 3.9 | 0.1 | 6.2 |  | 10.2 | 0.2 | 30.6 | 3 |  | 33.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 |  | 0.5 | 7.1 | 48.1 | 0.3 |  | 55.5 | 23.5 | 76.5 |  |
| Cars/lights | 56 | 2 | 86 |  | 405 | 3 | 398 | 19 |  | 430 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  | 157 | 100 | 630 | 5 |  | 752 | 0 |  | 1744 |
| \% Cars/lights | 98.2 | 100 | 94.5 | 100 | 98.5 | 100 | 88.1 | 43.2 | 58.8 | 83.3 | 100 | 100 | 80 | 100 | 99.4 | 96.2 | 88.9 | 100 | 70.8 | 89.3 | 0 | 0 | 90.5 |
| Trucks | 1 | 0 | 5 |  | 6 | 0 | 14 | 1 |  | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 4 | 34 | 0 |  | 45 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| \% Trucks | 1.8 | 0 | 5.5 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 41.2 | 4.3 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0.6 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 0 | 29.2 | 5.3 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 40 | 24 |  | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 |  | 45 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.8 | 54.5 | 0 | 12.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.3 | 0 | 0 | 5.3 | 0 | 0 | 5.7 |
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|  | Macdonnell Avenue Southbound |  |  |  | Queen Street West Westbound |  |  |  | 1441 Queen Street West Northbound |  |  |  | Queen Street West Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |

Peak Hour Analysis From 07:30 to 09:15 - Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 08:30

| 08:30 | 6 | 0 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 47 | 9 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 107 | 1 | 131 | 209 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08:45 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 19 | 0 | 65 | 5 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 83 | 1 | 98 | 187 |
| 09:00 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 1 | 66 | 7 | 74 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 110 | 0 | 125 | 217 |
| 09:15 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 29 | 1 | 55 | 3 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 94 | 0 | 105 | 195 |
| Total Volume | 28 | 0 | 58 | 86 | 2 | 233 | 24 | 259 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 63 | 394 | 2 | 459 | 808 |
| \% App. Total | 32.6 | 0 | 67.4 |  | 0.8 | 90 | 9.3 |  | 0 | 25 | 75 |  | 13.7 | 85.8 | 0.4 |  |  |
| PHF | . 875 | . 000 | . 690 | . 741 | . 500 | . 883 | . 667 | . 875 | . 000 | 250 | . 375 | . 500 | . 685 | . 895 | . 500 | . 876 | . 931 |
| Cars/lights | 28 | 0 | 56 | 84 | 2 | 204 | 13 | 219 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 59 | 347 | 2 | 408 | 714 |
| \% Cars/lights | 100 | 0 | 96.6 | 97.7 | 100 | 87.6 | 54.2 | 84.6 | 0 | 100 | 66.7 | 75.0 | 93.7 | 88.1 | 100 | 88.9 | 88.4 |
| Trucks | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 22 | 0 | 26 | 39 |
| \% Trucks | 0 | 0 | 3.4 | 2.3 | 0 | 4.3 | 0 | 3.9 | 0 | 0 | 33.3 | 25.0 | 6.3 | 5.6 | 0 | 5.7 | 4.8 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 11 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 55 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.2 | 45.8 | 11.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.3 | 0 | 5.4 | 6.8 |
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File Name : RAW_Macdonnel Ave \& Queen St W - PM
Site Code : 00023322
Start Date : 2023-02-07
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Groups Printed- Cars/lights - Trucks - Buses

|  | Macdonnell Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | Queen Street West Westbound |  |  |  |  | 1441 Queen Street West Northbound |  |  |  |  | Queen Street West Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Toal | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Toal | Exclu Toald | Inclu. Tooal | Int. Toal |
| 16:30 | 5 | 0 | 16 |  | 21 | 2 | 111 | 6 | [0] | 119 | 0 | 0 | 2 | $[37$ $]$ | 2 | 10 | 73 | 0 | [5] | 83 | 99 | 225 | 324 |
| 16:45 | 7 | 0 | 17 | [62 | 24 | 2 | 101 | 8 | [4] | 111 | 0 | 1 | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} {[29} \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 6 | 8 | 58 | 0 | [14 | 66 | 109 | 207 | 316 |
| Total | 12 | 0 | 33 | $\begin{gathered} {[\{\backslash f} \\ \text { s1 } \\ 5 \\ 11 \\ 9\}] \end{gathered}$ | $45$ | 4 | 212 | 14 | [4] | 230 | 0 | 1 | 7 | $[66$ $]$ | 8 | 18 | 131 | 0 | $[19$ $]$ | 149 | 208 | 432 | 640 |
| 17:00 | 4 | 0 | 21 | $[60$ $]$ | 25 | 1 | 77 | 6 | [4] | 84 | 1 | 0 | 0 | $[45$ $]$ | 1 | 11 | 51 | 0 | $[10$ $]$ | 62 | 119 | 172 | 291 |
| 17:15 | 2 | 0 | 22 | $[81$ $]$ | 24 | 1 | 102 | 8 | [3] | 111 | 2 | 2 | 1 | $[46$ $]$ | 5 | 22 | 61 | 2 | [6] | 85 | 136 | 225 | 361 |
| 17:30 | 4 | 0 | 28 | $[67$ $]$ | 32 | 2 | 101 | 7 | [5] | 110 | 0 | 0 | 4 | $\begin{array}{r} {[43} \\ ] \end{array}$ | 4 | 11 | 63 | 2 | [9] | 76 | 124 | 222 | 346 |
| 17:45 | 4 | 0 | 28 | [69 | 32 | 2 | 113 | 7 | [5] | 122 | 2 | 2 | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} {[59} \\ ] \end{array}$ | 4 | 19 | 74 | 0 | [3] | 93 | 136 | 251 | 387 |
| Total | 14 | 0 | 99 | $\begin{array}{r} {[\{\backslash} \\ \text { s1 } \\ 5 \\ 27 \\ 7\}] \end{array}$ | 113 | 6 | 393 | 28 | $[17$ $]$ | 427 | 5 | 4 | 5 | $[\{1$ s1 5 19 $3\}]$ | 14 | 63 | 249 | 4 | $[28$ $]$ | 316 | 515 | 870 | 1385 |


| 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 17 | $[49$ $]$ | 17 | 1 | 88 | 9 | [2] | 98 | 1 | 0 | 0 | $[50$ $]$ | 1 | 22 | 90 | 1 | [12 | 113 | 113 | 229 | 342 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18:15 | 6 | 0 | 21 | $[61$ $]$ | 27 | 1 | 87 | 8 | $[11$ $]$ | 96 | 0 | 0 |  | $[56$ $]$ | 4 | 16 | 65 | 1 | $[12$ $]$ | 82 | 140 | 209 | 349 |
| Grand Total | 32 | 0 | 170 | $\begin{gathered} \text { [\{\f } \\ \text { s1 } \\ 5 \\ 50 \\ 6\}] \end{gathered}$ | 202 | 12 | 780 | 59 | [34 <br> ] | 851 | 6 | 5 | 16 | $\begin{gathered} {[\{\backslash f} \\ \text { s1 } \\ 5 \\ 36 \\ 5\}] \end{gathered}$ | 27 | 119 | 535 | 6 | [71 | 660 | 976 | 1740 | 2716 |
| Apprch \% | 15.8 | 0 | 84.2 |  |  | 1.4 | 91.7 | 6.9 |  |  | 22.2 | 18.5 | 59.3 |  |  | 18 | 81.1 | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \% | 1.8 | 0 | 9.8 |  | 11.6 | 0.7 | 44.8 | 3.4 |  | 48.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.9 |  | 1.6 | 6.8 | 30.7 | 0.3 |  | 37.9 | 35.9 | 64.1 |  |
| Cars/lights | 31 | 0 | 166 |  | 703 | 12 | 725 | 39 |  | 785 | 6 | 5 | 16 |  | 392 | 118 | 495 | 6 |  | 674 | 0 | 0 | 2554 |
| \% Cars/lights | 96.9 | 0 | 97.6 | 100 | 99.3 | 100 | 92.9 | 66.1 | 26.5 | 88.7 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99.2 | 92.5 | 100 | 77.5 | 92.2 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| Trucks | 1 | 0 | 4 |  | 5 | 0 | 18 | 0 |  | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |  | 22 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| \% Trucks | 3.1 | 0 | 2.4 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 2.3 | 0 | 73.5 | 4.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0 | 22.5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2.6 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 37 | 20 |  | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 |  | 35 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.7 | 33.9 | 0 | 6.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.5 | 0 | 0 | 4.8 | 0 | 0 | 3.4 |
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|  | Macdonnell Avenue Southbound |  |  |  | Queen Street West Westbound |  |  |  | 1441 Queen Street West Northbound |  |  |  | Queen Street West Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |

Peak Hour Analysis From 16:30 to 18:15-Peak 1 of 1
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 17:15

| ou | , | ection | Beg | 17: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17:15 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 24 | 1 | 102 | 8 | 111 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 22 | 61 | 2 | 85 | 225 |
| 17:30 | 4 | 0 | 28 | 32 | 2 | 101 | 7 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 63 | 2 | 76 | 222 |
| 17:45 | 4 | 0 | 28 | 32 | 2 | 113 | 7 | 122 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 74 | 0 | 93 | 251 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 1 | 88 | 9 | 98 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 90 | 1 | 113 | 229 |
| Total Volume | 10 | 0 | 95 | 105 | 6 | 404 | 31 | 441 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 74 | 288 | 5 | 367 | 927 |
| \% App. Total | 9.5 | 0 | 90.5 |  | 1.4 | 91.6 | 7 |  | 35.7 | 28.6 | 35.7 |  | 20.2 | 78.5 | 1.4 |  |  |
| PHF | . 625 | . 000 | . 848 | . 820 | . 750 | . 894 | . 861 | . 904 | . 625 | . 500 | . 313 | . 700 | . 841 | . 800 | . 625 | . 812 | . 923 |
| Cars/lights | 9 | 0 | 92 | 101 | 6 | 380 | 22 | 408 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 74 | 271 | 5 | 350 | 873 |
| \% Cars/lights | 90.0 | 0 | 96.8 | 96.2 | 100 | 94.1 | 71.0 | 92.5 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 94.1 | 100 | 95.4 | 94.2 |
| Trucks | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| \% Trucks | 10.0 | 0 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 0 | 1.7 | 0 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.3 | 1.3 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 9 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 42 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 | 29.0 | 5.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.6 | 0 | 4.4 | 4.5 |
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EA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive
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Turning Movement Data
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Turning Movement Data Plot

## EA

EA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9 Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9 ar9
$905-470-0015 \times 240$ idinsmore@lea.ca

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:30 AM)

| Start Time | Sorauren Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ho | a | AMI) | Queen Street West Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Queen Street West Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | Peds | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | App. Total |  |
| 8:30 AM | 3 | 9 | 0 | 22 | 12 | 7 | 52 | 1 | 21 | 60 | 117 | 26 | 0 | 10 | 143 | 215 |
| 8:45 AM | 4 | 14 | 0 | 12 | 18 | 21 | 55 | 0 | 8 | 76 | 128 | 34 | 0 | 12 | 162 | 256 |
| 9:00 AM | 9 | 22 | 0 | 12 | 31 | 24 | 43 | 0 | 12 | 67 | 144 | 26 | 0 | 10 | 170 | 268 |
| 9:15 AM | 4 | 11 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 22 | 50 | 0 | 7 | 72 | 113 | 30 | 0 | 2 | 143 | 230 |
| Total | 20 | 56 | 0 | 55 | 76 | 74 | 200 | 1 | 48 | 275 | 502 | 116 | 0 | 34 | 618 | 969 |
| Approach \% | 26.3 | 73.7 | 0.0 | - | - | 26.9 | 72.7 | 0.4 | - | - | 81.2 | 18.8 | 0.0 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 2.1 | 5.8 | 0.0 | - | 7.8 | 7.6 | 20.6 | 0.1 | - | 28.4 | 51.8 | 12.0 | 0.0 | - | 63.8 | - |
| PHF | 0.556 | 0.636 | 0.000 | - | 0.613 | 0.771 | 0.909 | 0.250 | - | 0.905 | 0.872 | 0.853 | 0.000 | - | 0.909 | 0.904 |
| Lights | 20 | 51 | 0 | - | 71 | 66 | 174 | 1 | - | 241 | 443 | 110 | 0 | - | 553 | 865 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 91.1 | - | - | 93.4 | 89.2 | 87.0 | 100.0 | - | 87.6 | 88.2 | 94.8 | - | - | 89.5 | 89.3 |
| Buses | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 18 | 0 | - | 18 | 25 | 2 | 0 | - | 27 | 46 |
| \% Buses | 0.0 | 1.8 | - | - | 1.3 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 | - | 6.5 | 5.0 | 1.7 | - | - | 4.4 | 4.7 |
| Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 6 | 5 | 0 | - | 11 | 25 | 2 | 0 | - | 27 | 39 |
| \% Trucks | 0.0 | 1.8 | - | - | 1.3 | 8.1 | 2.5 | 0.0 | - | 4.0 | 5.0 | 1.7 | - | - | 4.4 | 4.0 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 3 | 0 | - | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | - | 5 | 9 | 2 | 0 | - | 11 | 19 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 5.4 | - | - | 3.9 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 0.0 | - | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.7 | - | - | 1.8 | 2.0 |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 2.1 | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | 55 | - | - | - | - | 47 | - | - | - | - | 32 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | 97.9 | - | - | - | - | 94.1 | - | - |

LEA Consulting Ltd


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (8:30 AM)

## LEA

LEA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9
Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9
$905-470-0015 \times 240$ idinsmore@lea.ca

Turning Movement Data


LEA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9 905-470-0015 x240 idinsmore@lea.ca


Turning Movement Data Plot

## EA

EA Consulting Ltd 625 Cochrane Drive

Markam, Ontario, Canada L3R 9R9 905-470-0015 x240 idinsmore@lea.ca

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:15 PM)


LEA Consulting Ltd


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (5:15 PM)

## Lane Utilization Factor with Streetcar Operations

```
M Intersecion:
                Muen stw & lameson Ave
```



```
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```





Queen Street West \& Jameson Avenue Northbound Right Calibration Check

NBR at Queen St W and Jameson Ave indicates v/c ratio over 1.00 for PM with default synchro model parameters. The following
work of reviewing video footage for the PM peak 15 -minute period was done to get an idea of appropriate model calibration.

| Intersection: | Queen St W \& Jameson Ave |
| :--- | :--- |
| Movement of focus: | NBR |
| Weekday PM Peak Hour: | 5:15-6:15 PM |
| PM Peak 15-min: | 5:45-6:00 PM |

From video footage for PM peak 15-min:

| Cycle | NBR Volume | Note: queue at onset of red? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 9 | N |
| 2 | 7 | Y |
| 3 | 6 | Y |
| 4 | 9 | Y |
| 5 | 5 | Y |
| 6 | 6 | Y |
| 7 | 8 | Y |
| 8 | 7 | Y |
| 9 | 8 | Y |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{6 5}$ |  |

For NBR capacity per cycle, assumed 8 vehicles rather than 9 vehicles to be conservative.

APPENDIX C

## Queue Survey

22332
Queen St \& Macdonell Ave EBL
2023-02-07
JC
AM Peak

| Queue | Time Start | Time End | Duration | \# of Cars in LT Queue | Courtesy | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 7:31:09 | 7:31:12 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |  |
| 2 | 7:36:06 | 7:36:16 | 0:00:10 | 0 |  |  |
| 3 | 7:37:40 | 7:38:11 | 0:00:31 | 0 |  |  |
| 4 | 7:41:08 | 7:41:12 | 0:00:04 | 1 |  |  |
| 5 | 7:41:11 | 7:41:14 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |  |
| 6 | 7:43:12 | 7:43:20 | 0:00:08 | 0 |  |  |
| 7 | 7:44:36 | 7:44:48 | 0:00:12 | 0 |  |  |
| 8 | 7:45:26 | 7:45:29 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |  |
| 9 | 7:46:01 | 7:46:03 | 0:00:02 | 0 |  |  |
| 10 | 7:46:47 | 7:46:51 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |  |
| 11 | 7:49:34 | 7:49:50 | 0:00:16 | 1 |  |  |
| 12 | 7:49:45 | 7:50:05 | 0:00:20 | 1 |  |  |
| 13 | 7:49:56 | 7:50:08 | 0:00:12 | 0 |  |  |
| 14 | 7:50:47 | 7:51:01 | 0:00:14 | 0 |  |  |
| 15 | 7:53:01 | 7:53:04 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |  |
| 16 | 7:53:08 | 7:53:14 | 0:00:06 | 0 |  |  |
| 17 | 7:54:38 | 7:54:42 | 0:00:04 | 3 |  |  |
| 18 | 7:54:44 | 7:54:50 | 0:00:06 | 2 |  |  |
| 19 | 7:54:54 | 7:54:58 | 0:00:04 | 1 |  |  |
| 20 | 7:55:00 | 7:55:06 | 0:00:06 | 0 |  |  |
| 21 | 7:56:59 | 7:57:39 | 0:00:40 | 0 |  |  |
| 22 | 7:59:57 | 8:00:03 | 0:00:06 | 0 |  |  |
| 23 | 8:01:09 | 8:01:13 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |  |
| 24 | 8:02:35 | 8:02:48 | 0:00:13 | 0 |  |  |
| 25 | 8:04:55 | 8:04:58 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |  |
| 26 | 8:05:20 | 8:05:24 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |  |
| 27 | 8:06:59 | 8:07:03 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |  |
| 28 | 8:07:18 | 8:07:20 | 0:00:02 | 0 |  |  |
| 29 | 8:08:19 | 8:08:37 | 0:00:18 | 1 |  |  |
| 30 | 8:08:39 | 8:08:44 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |  |
| 31 | 8:08:55 | 8:09:04 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |  |
| 32 | 8:09:03 | 8:09:11 | 0:00:08 | 0 |  |  |
| 33 | 8:10:23 | 8:10:27 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |  |
| 34 | 8:11:26 | 8:11:33 | 0:00:07 | 0 |  |  |
| 35 | 8:11:43 | 8:11:48 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |  |
| 36 | 8:17:10 | 8:17:13 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |  |
| 37 | 8:18:16 | 8:18:20 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |  |
| 38 | 8:19:14 | 8:19:19 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |  |
| 39 | 8:20:33 | 8:20:38 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |  |
| 40 | 8:20:55 | 8:21:07 | 0:00:12 | 0 |  |  |
| 41 | 8:22:01 | 8:22:16 | 0:00:15 | 1 |  |  |


| 42 | 8:22:10 | 8:22:19 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 43 | 8:23:17 | 8:23:21 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 44 | 8:30:33 | 8:30:44 | 0:00:11 | 1 |  |
| 45 | 8:30:56 | 8:30:59 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |
| 46 | 8:31:04 | 8:31:13 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |
| 47 | 8:33:57 | 8:34:01 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 48 | 8:35:36 | 8:35:40 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 49 | 8:37:08 | 8:37:17 | 0:00:09 | 1 |  |
| 50 | 8:37:15 | 8:37:20 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 51 | 8:37:37 | 8:37:46 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |
| 52 | 8:39:00 | 8:39:07 | 0:00:07 | 1 |  |
| 53 | 8:39:07 | 8:39:11 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 54 | 8:39:15 | 8:39:21 | 0:00:06 | 1 |  |
| 55 | 8:39:16 | 8:39:23 | 0:00:07 | 0 |  |
| 56 | 8:39:34 | 8:39:38 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 57 | 8:39:45 | 8:39:48 | 0:00:03 | 1 |  |
| 58 | 8:39:48 | 8:39:51 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |
| 59 | 8:40:44 | 8:40:53 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |
| 60 | 8:40:59 | 8:41:02 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |
| 61 | 8:42:01 | 8:42:04 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |
| 62 | 8:42:09 | 8:42:27 | 0:00:18 | 1 |  |
| 63 | 8:42:17 | 8:42:30 | 0:00:13 | 0 |  |
| 64 | 8:43:04 | 8:43:13 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |
| 65 | 8:43:56 | 8:44:07 | 0:00:11 | 1 |  |
| 66 | 8:44:01 | 8:44:10 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |
| 67 | 8:45:40 | 8:45:42 | 0:00:02 | 0 |  |
| 68 | 8:46:00 | 8:46:07 | 0:00:07 | 0 |  |
| 69 | 8:46:25 | 8:46:33 | 0:00:08 | 0 |  |
| 70 | 8:51:02 | 8:51:07 | 0:00:05 | 1 |  |
| 71 | 8:51:05 | 8:51:09 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 72 | 8:51:51 | 8:51:58 | 0:00:07 | 0 |  |
| 73 | 8:52:31 | 8:52:35 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 74 | 8:54:10 | 8:54:28 | 0:00:18 | 1 |  |
| 75 | 8:54:34 | 8:54:37 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |
| 76 | 8:54:44 | 8:54:55 | 0:00:11 | 1 |  |
| 77 | 8:54:45 | 8:54:57 | 0:00:12 | 0 |  |
| 78 | 8:55:54 | 8:56:03 | 0:00:09 | 2 |  |
| 79 | 8:55:59 | 8:56:21 | 0:00:22 | 1 |  |
| 80 | 8:56:00 | 8:56:25 | 0:00:25 | 0 |  |
| 81 | 9:01:30 | 9:01:38 | 0:00:08 | 0 |  |
| 82 | 9:01:45 | 9:01:49 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 83 | 9:02:44 | 9:03:06 | 0:00:22 | 3 |  |
| 84 | 9:03:02 | 9:03:09 | 0:00:07 | 2 |  |
| 85 | 9:03:09 | 9:03:12 | 0:00:03 | 1 |  |
| 86 | 9:03:09 | 9:03:13 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 87 | 9:04:27 | 9:04:32 | 0:00:05 | 1 |  |
| 88 | 9:04:32 | 9:04:36 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |


| 89 | $9: 06: 15$ | $9: 06: 22$ | $0: 00: 07$ | 0 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 90 | $9: 06: 27$ | $9: 06: 37$ | $0: 00: 10$ | 0 |  |
| 91 | $9: 07: 54$ | $9: 07: 57$ | $0: 00: 03$ | 1 |  |
| 92 | $9: 07: 58$ | $9: 08: 00$ | $0: 00: 02$ | 0 |  |
| 93 | $9: 08: 13$ | $9: 08: 16$ | $0: 00: 03$ | 0 |  |
| 94 | $9: 09: 35$ | $9: 09: 39$ | $0: 00: 04$ | 1 |  |
| 95 | $9: 09: 41$ | $9: 09: 45$ | $0: 00: 04$ | 0 |  |
| 96 | $9: 14: 39$ | $9: 14: 43$ | $0: 00: 04$ | 0 |  |
| 97 | $9: 16: 23$ | $9: 16: 31$ | $0: 00: 08$ | 0 |  |
| 98 | $9: 18: 06$ | $9: 18: 15$ | $0: 00: 09$ | 2 |  |
| 99 | $9: 18: 13$ | $9: 18: 25$ | $0: 00: 12$ | 1 |  |
| 100 | $9: 18: 25$ | $9: 18: 29$ | $0: 00: 04$ | 0 |  |
| 101 | $9: 21: 21$ | $9: 21: 25$ | $0: 00: 04$ | 0 |  |
| 102 | $9: 21: 38$ | $9: 21: 42$ | $0: 00: 04$ | 0 |  |
| 103 | $9: 21: 45$ | $9: 21: 50$ | $0: 00: 05$ | 0 |  |
| 104 | $9: 26: 28$ | $9: 26: 31$ | $0: 00: 03$ | 1 |  |
| 105 | $9: 26: 30$ | $9: 26: 35$ | $0: 00: 05$ | 0 |  |
| 106 | $9: 26: 38$ | $9: 26: 41$ | $0: 00: 03$ | 0 |  |
| 107 | $9: 29: 58$ | $9: 30: 02$ | $0: 00: 04$ | 0 |  |

PM Peak

| Queue | Time Start | Time End | Duration | \# of Cars in LT Queue | SB Courtesy |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | $4: 30: 48$ | $4: 31: 04$ | $0: 00: 16$ | 0 |  |
| 2 | $4: 32: 23$ | $4: 32: 42$ | $0: 00: 19$ | 0 |  |
| 3 | $4: 37: 39$ | $4: 37: 43$ | $0: 00: 04$ | 4 |  |
| 4 | $4: 37: 43$ | $4: 37: 55$ | $0: 00: 12$ | 3 |  |
| 5 | $4: 37: 53$ | $4: 37: 58$ | $0: 00: 05$ | 2 |  |
| 6 | $4: 37: 59$ | $4: 38: 04$ | $0: 00: 05$ | 1 |  |
| 7 | $4: 38: 02$ | $4: 38: 05$ | $0: 00: 03$ | 0 |  |
| 8 | $4: 44: 38$ | $4: 44: 43$ | $0: 00: 05$ | 1 |  |
| 9 | $4: 44: 43$ | $4: 44: 47$ | $0: 00: 04$ | 0 |  |
| 10 | $4: 45: 00$ | $4: 45: 03$ | $0: 00: 03$ | 0 |  |
| 11 | $4: 46: 11$ | $4: 46: 19$ | $0: 00: 08$ | 0 |  |
| 12 | $4: 46: 41$ | $4: 46: 55$ | $0: 00: 14$ | 0 |  |
| 13 | $4: 49: 33$ | $4: 49: 37$ | $0: 00: 04$ | 0 |  |
| 14 | $4: 51: 13$ | $4: 51: 36$ | $0: 00: 23$ | 2 |  |
| 15 | $4: 51: 14$ | $4: 51: 38$ | $0: 00: 24$ | 1 |  |
| 16 | $4: 51: 42$ | $4: 51: 58$ | $0: 00: 16$ | 0 |  |
| 17 | $4: 53: 00$ | $4: 53: 07$ | $0: 00: 07$ | 0 |  |
| 18 | $4: 54: 36$ | $4: 55: 07$ | $0: 00: 31$ | 0 |  |
| 19 | $4: 56: 38$ | $4: 56: 41$ | $0: 00: 03$ | 0 |  |
| 20 | $5: 01: 26$ | $5: 01: 31$ | $0: 00: 05$ | 0 |  |
| 21 | $5: 01: 51$ | $5: 01: 54$ | $0: 00: 03$ | 0 |  |
| 22 | $5: 03: 21$ | $5: 03: 49$ | $0: 00: 28$ | 0 |  |
| 23 | $5: 06: 12$ | $5: 06: 19$ | $0: 00: 07$ | 0 |  |
| 24 | $5: 08: 15$ | $5: 08: 24$ | $0: 00: 09$ | 0 |  |
|  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |


| 25 | 5:08:29 | 5:08:34 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 | 5:12:01 | 5:12:08 | 0:00:07 | 0 |  |
| 27 | 5:13:22 | 5:13:35 | 0:00:13 | 2 |  |
| 28 | 5:13:35 | 5:13:40 | 0:00:05 | 1 |  |
| 29 | 5:13:45 | 5:13:50 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 30 | 5:14:50 | 5:14:54 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 31 | 5:17:02 | 5:17:06 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 32 | 5:17:21 | 5:17:26 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 33 | 5:17:28 | 5:17:31 | 0:00:03 | 1 |  |
| 34 | 5:17:29 | 5:17:36 | 0:00:07 | 0 |  |
| 35 | 5:18:05 | 5:18:10 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 36 | 5:18:28 | 5:18:33 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 37 | 5:18:59 | 5:19:04 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 38 | 5:20:12 | 5:20:19 | 0:00:07 | 1 |  |
| 39 | 5:20:17 | 5:20:28 | 0:00:11 | 0 |  |
| 40 | 5:22:28 | 5:22:34 | 0:00:06 | 0 |  |
| 41 | 5:23:34 | 5:23:40 | 0:00:06 | 3 |  |
| 42 | 5:23:39 | 5:23:47 | 0:00:08 | 2 |  |
| 43 | 5:23:50 | 5:24:01 | 0:00:11 | 1 |  |
| 44 | 5:24:01 | 5:24:05 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 45 | 5:24:10 | 5:24:20 | 0:00:10 | 0 |  |
| 46 | 5:26:56 | 5:27:18 | 0:00:22 | 4 |  |
| 47 | 5:26:57 | 5:27:24 | 0:00:27 | 3 |  |
| 48 | 5:26:58 | 5:27:27 | 0:00:29 | 2 |  |
| 49 | 5:27:27 | 5:27:47 | 0:00:20 | 1 |  |
| 50 | 5:27:40 | 5:27:52 | 0:00:12 | 0 |  |
| 51 | 5:28:04 | 5:28:13 | 0:00:09 | 1 |  |
| 52 | 5:28:07 | 5:28:26 | 0:00:19 | 0 |  |
| 53 | 5:29:26 | 5:29:43 | 0:00:17 | 0 |  |
| 54 | 5:30:11 | 5:30:36 | 0:00:25 | 2 |  |
| 55 | 5:30:12 | 5:30:39 | 0:00:27 | 1 |  |
| 56 | 5:30:35 | 5:30:42 | 0:00:07 | 0 |  |
| 57 | 5:34:05 | 5:34:16 | 0:00:11 | 1 |  |
| 58 | 5:34:19 | 5:34:23 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 59 | 5:34:50 | 5:34:58 | 0:00:08 | 1 |  |
| 60 | 5:34:52 | 5:35:01 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |
| 61 | 5:37:15 | 5:37:24 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |
| 62 | 5:39:12 | 5:39:17 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 63 | 5:40:55 | 5:41:04 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |
| 64 | 5:42:15 | 5:42:33 | 0:00:18 | 0 |  |
| 65 | 5:46:47 | 5:46:54 | 0:00:07 | 1 |  |
| 66 | 5:46:55 | 5:47:04 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |
| 67 | 5:47:25 | 5:47:42 | 0:00:17 | 0 |  |
| 68 | 5:48:09 | 5:48:40 | 0:00:31 | 0 |  |
| 69 | 5:50:31 | 5:50:34 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |
| 70 | 5:51:06 | 5:51:10 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 71 | 5:51:14 | 5:51:17 | 0:00:03 | 1 |  |


| 72 | 5:51:17 | 5:51:24 | 0:00:07 | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 73 | 5:52:26 | 5:52:34 | 0:00:08 | 2 |  |
| 74 | 5:52:35 | 5:52:39 | 0:00:04 | 1 |  |
| 75 | 5:52:38 | 5:52:42 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 76 | 5:54:10 | 5:54:38 | 0:00:28 | 0 |  |
| 77 | 5:55:48 | 5:56:05 | 0:00:17 | 0 |  |
| 78 | 5:56:19 | 5:56:22 | 0:00:03 | 1 |  |
| 79 | 5:56:22 | 5:56:26 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 80 | 5:56:38 | 5:56:43 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 81 | 5:57:29 | 5:57:32 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |
| 82 | 5:58:05 | 5:58:09 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 83 | 5:58:37 | 5:58:47 | 0:00:10 | 1 |  |
| 84 | 5:58:44 | 5:58:55 | 0:00:11 | 0 |  |
| 85 | 5:59:42 | 5:59:50 | 0:00:08 | 0 |  |
| 86 | 6:01:17 | 6:01:21 | 0:00:04 | 1 |  |
| 87 | 6:01:23 | 6:01:27 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 88 | 6:02:40 | 6:02:57 | 0:00:17 | 4 |  |
| 89 | 6:02:41 | 6:03:00 | 0:00:19 | 3 |  |
| 90 | 6:02:59 | 6:03:03 | 0:00:04 | 2 |  |
| 91 | 6:03:00 | 6:03:08 | 0:00:08 | 1 |  |
| 92 | 6:03:03 | 6:03:10 | 0:00:07 | 0 |  |
| 93 | 6:03:20 | 6:03:25 | 0:00:05 | 2 |  |
| 94 | 6:03:21 | 6:03:27 | 0:00:06 | 1 |  |
| 95 | 6:03:26 | 6:03:31 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 96 | 6:04:00 | 6:04:03 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |
| 97 | 6:04:37 | 6:04:44 | 0:00:07 | 0 |  |
| 98 | 6:04:46 | 6:04:49 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |
| 99 | 6:05:06 | 6:05:11 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 100 | 6:06:07 | 6:06:21 | 0:00:14 | 2 |  |
| 101 | 6:06:08 | 6:06:25 | 0:00:17 | 1 |  |
| 102 | 6:06:18 | 6:06:31 | 0:00:13 | 0 |  |
| 103 | 6:07:38 | 6:07:54 | 0:00:16 | 0 |  |
| 104 | 6:08:07 | 6:08:12 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 105 | 6:08:35 | 6:08:40 | 0:00:05 | 0 |  |
| 106 | 6:11:57 | 6:12:06 | 0:00:09 | 1 |  |
| 107 | 6:11:58 | 6:12:08 | 0:00:10 | 0 |  |
| 108 | 6:14:22 | 6:14:26 | 0:00:04 | 0 |  |
| 109 | 6:15:36 | 6:15:47 | 0:00:11 | 0 |  |
| 110 | 6:16:24 | 6:16:32 | 0:00:08 | 1 |  |
| 111 | 6:16:31 | 6:16:37 | 0:00:06 | 0 |  |
| 112 | 6:17:00 | 6:17:10 | 0:00:10 | 0 |  |
| 113 | 6:19:52 | 6:19:59 | 0:00:07 | 0 |  |
| 114 | 6:20:07 | 6:20:15 | 0:00:08 | 0 |  |
| 115 | 6:21:01 | 6:21:04 | 0:00:03 | 0 |  |
| 116 | 6:22:57 | 6:23:10 | 0:00:13 | 0 |  |
| 117 | 6:25:06 | 6:25:15 | 0:00:09 | 0 |  |
| 118 | 6:25:56 | 6:26:04 | 0:00:08 | 0 |  |


| 119 | $6: 27: 51$ | $6: 27: 55$ | $0: 00: 04$ | 0 |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 120 | $6: 28: 08$ | $6: 28: 34$ | $0: 00: 26$ | 0 |  |
| 121 | $6: 29: 31$ | $6: 29: 37$ | $0: 00: 06$ | 1 |  |
| 122 | $6: 29: 45$ | $6: 29: 53$ | $0: 00: 08$ | 0 |  |
| 123 |  |  | $0: 00: 00$ | 0 |  |
| 124 |  |  | $0: 00: 00$ | 0 |  |
| 125 |  |  | $0: 00: 00$ | 0 |  |

DATE OF SURVEY:
QUEUE ANALYSIS:

Tuesday, Feb 07, 2023
Eastbound - Queen St \& Jameson Ave

ONSET GREEN










## APPENDIX D

Corridor Growth Calculations
ssumptions and Reasonings:
Ony EBPM shows notable gownh consistenty a t both locations. Remanining show ether neariby zero or negative growth.






APPENDIX E
Background Developments

### 9.0 TRAVEL DEMAND FORECAST

### 9.1 MULTI-MODAL TRIP GENERATION

BA Group had forecast multi-modal travel demand based on a "first principles" approach that derives travel demand from the expected occupancy of the development from a person trip making perspective. The 2016 TTS was used to establish the expected number of people to live in the proposed development after buildout and to derive a peak hour factor for trip making by these new residents over the peak period, assuming all residents will make at least one trip. Directional and mode split are then applied to the resultant peak hour person trips to forecast travel demand for each mode.

Multi-modal trip generation for the proposed development is summarized in Table 15. TTS queries for trip generation assumptions and the detailed calculations are provided in Appendix B and G, respectively.

Table 15 Trip Generation by First Principles

|  | Weekday Peak Hour Travel Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposed Residential Units | 78 units ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building Occupancy (Person) | Assume $100 \%$ of units occupied at any given time @ Unit occupancy of 1.72 people / unit ${ }^{2}$ <br> 134 people |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Travel Demand | Assume all residents make a trip sometime throughout the day: $34 \%$ of residents to travel during the AM peak hour ${ }^{3}$ 46 person trips during the AM peak hour $25 \%$ of residents to travel during the PM peak hour ${ }^{3}$ 33 person trips during the PM peak hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inbound / Outbound | Assume inbound / outbound person-based trip distribution is consistent with inbound / outbound vehicle trip distribution |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution ${ }^{4}$ | Weekday Morning <br> 26\% inbound / 74\% outbound |  |  | Weekday Afternoon 61\% inbound / 39\% outbound |  |  |
| Person Trips | 12 | 34 | 46 | 20 | 13 | 33 |
| Effective Person Trip Rates | 0.15 | 0.44 | 0.59 | 0.26 | 0.17 | 0.42 |
| Multi-Modal Trips ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transit Driver Passenger Walk Cycle | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 4 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 13 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 17 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 5 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 12 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |

## Notes:

1. Based on site statistics provided by Core Architects Inc., dated November 6, 2019
2. Based on average household occupancy for mid/high rise in the Sorauren Avenue / Queen Street West area from 2016 TTS
3. Based on peak hour travel patterns of home-based trips by residents in the Sorauren Avenue / Queen Street West area from 2016 TTS, assuming all residents make at least one trips throughout the day
4. Based on directional splits for vehicle trips provided in the ITE Trip Generation Manual 10 Edition LUC 221.
5. Based on application of mode splits presented in Table 6.

Based on the foregoing, the proposed development will generate in the order of 45 and 35 two-way person trips during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively. Vehicle based trips are negligible as expected from the provision of zero parking.

Trip making will be made primary via transit and walking. The proposed development will generate in the order of 23 and 17 two-way transit trips in addition to 17 and 12 two-way walking trips during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively. This level of traffic activity is low, particularly for the walking and cycling modes, and will not noticeably change the operating conditions of the area active transportation network with respect to existing conditions.




FIGURE 5-1 NEW SITE TRAFFIC

LEA Consulting Ltd.
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APPENDIX F

## Detailed TTS Calculations

TAZ Used: 89, 109, 110, 113
Thu Mar 022023 16:04:28 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time) - Run Time: 2604ms

Cross Tabulation Query Form - Trip - 2016 v1.1
Row: Type of dwelling unit - dwell type
Column: Primary travel mode of trip -mode_prime

Filters:
(2006 GTA zone of household - gta06_hhld In 89, 109, 110, 113
and
Trip purpose - trip_purp In 1, )

Trip 2016
Table:

|  | Transit excluding GO rail | Cycle | Auto driver | GO rail only | Joint GO rail and local transit | Motorcycle | Other | Auto passenger | Taxi passenger | Paid rideshare | Walk | Sum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| House | 1522 | 987 | 1695 | 9 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 180 | 59 | 0 | 580 | 5056 |
| Apartment | 12549 | 2409 | 7779 | 226 | 28 | 94 | 93 | 725 | 181 | 602 | 4083 | 28676 |
| Townhouse | 482 | 76 | 599 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 1246 |


| Mode Split - Residential Trips |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mode | Residential |  |  |
| Auto Driver | $27 \%$ |  |  |
| Auto Passenger | $5 \%$ |  |  |
| Transit | $45 \%$ |  |  |
| Walk | $14 \%$ |  |  |
| Cycle | $8 \%$ |  |  |
| Total |  |  | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |



Filters:
(2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06_orig $\ln 89,109,110,113$
and
antart tim
f trip-start time In 730-930
and
Trip pu
Trip purpose of origin - purp orig $\ln \mathrm{H}$
and
Primary travel mode of trip - mode_prime In $\mathrm{D}, \mathrm{M}$

| Destination | Origin |  |  |  | Total to Destination | Trip Distribution |  | Trip Assignment |  |  |  |  | Res Out Detailed Summary |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 89 | 109 | 110 | 113 |  | \% | Direction To | To North | To South | To East | To West | Predicted Route | Direction To | Predicted Route | \% |
| PD 1 of Toronto | 492 | 43 | 185 | 68 | 788 | 23\% | E |  |  | 23\% |  | Queen St W EB |  | Lansdowne Ave NB | 1\% |
| 89 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 3\% | E |  |  | 3\% |  | Queen St W Eb | N | Queen St W EB | 9\% |
| 91 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0\% | E |  |  | 0\% |  | Queen St W EB |  | Queen St W WB | 3\% |
| 91 95 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 15 | 0\% | NE | 0\% |  |  |  | Lansdowne Ave NB |  | Jameson Ave SB | 3\% |
| 95 97 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0\% | NE | 0\% |  |  |  | Lansdowne Ave NB |  | Lansdowne Ave NB | 1\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ne |  |  | 0\% |  | Queen St W Eb | NE | Queen St W EB | 9\% |
|  | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0\% | E |  |  | 0\% |  | Queen St W Eb |  | Jameson Ave SB | 6\% |
| 98 101 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 66 | 2\% | NE | 2\% |  |  |  | Queen St W EB |  | King st W WB | 1\% |
| 101 105 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 2\% | N | 2\% |  |  |  | Queen St W EB | NW | Queen St W EB | 2\% |
|  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0\% | N | 0\% |  |  |  | Lansdowne Ave NB |  | Queen St W WB | 2\% |
| 107 108 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 1\% | N | 1\% |  |  |  | Lansdowne Ave NB |  | Jameson Ave SB | 5\% |
| 109 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 0\% | NE | 0\% |  |  |  | Lansdowne Ave NB | 5 | Jameson Ave SB | 8\% |
| 109 | 0 | 8 | 249 | 0 | 257 | 8\% | s |  | 8\% |  |  | Jameson Ave SB | E | Queen St W EB | 28\% |
| 110 113 | 0 | 10 | 27 | 7 | 44 | 1\% | w |  |  |  | 1\% | Queen St W WB |  | Jameson Ave SB | 3\% |
| 113 114 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 31 | 43 | 1\% | N | 1\% |  |  |  | Queen St W WB |  | Queen St W EB | 3\% |
| 114115 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 39 | 1\% | NW | 0\% |  |  |  | Queen St w wb | w | Queen St W WB | 2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | nw |  |  |  | 1\% | King St W WB |  | Jameson Ave SB | 16\% |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 0\% | N | 0\% |  |  |  | Queen St W WB | Total |  | 100\% |
| 116 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 0\% | w |  |  |  | 0\% | Queen St w WB |  |  |  |
| 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0\% | NW | 0\% |  |  |  | Queen St W WB |  |  |  |
| 125 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 44 | 60 | 2\% | NW | 2\% |  |  |  | Queen St W WB |  | Out Summary |  |
| PD 3 of Toronto | 27 | 0 | 44 | 25 | 96 | 3\% | N | 3\% |  |  |  | Queen St W Eb | Direction To | \% |  |
| PD 4 of Toronto | 38 | 106 | 12 | 17 | 173 | 5\% | NE | 5\% |  |  |  | Queen St W EB | N | 15\% |  |
| PD 5 of Toronto | 27 | 22 | 44 | 21 | 114 | 3\% | NE |  |  | 3\% |  | Jameson Ave SB | NE | 15\% |  |
| PD 6 of Toronto | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 2\% | E |  |  | 2\% |  | Jameson Ave SB | NW | 10\% |  |
| PD 7 of Toronto | 0 | 22 | 0 | 6 | 28 | 1\% | w |  |  |  | 1\% | Jameson Ave SB | 5 | 8\% |  |
| PD 8 of Toronto | 95 | 0 | 57 | 33 | 185 | 6\% | w |  |  |  | 3\% | Jameson Ave SB | E | 31\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | w | 3\% |  |  |  | Queen St W EB | w | 21\% |  |
| PD 9 of Toronto | 27 | 17 | 74 | 0 | 118 | 4\% | NW | 2\% |  |  |  | Queen St W EB | SUM | 100\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | NW |  |  |  | 2\% | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| PD 10 of Toronto | 41 | 7 | 37 | 0 | 85 | 3\% | N | 3\% |  |  |  | Queen St W EB | Predicte | d Route Summary |  |
| PD 11 of Toronto | 28 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 54 | 2\% | N | 2\% |  |  |  | Queen St W EB | Lansdowne Ave NB | 2\% |  |
| PD 12 of Toronto | 17 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 101 | 3\% | NE | 2\% |  |  |  | Queen St W EB | Jameson Ave SB | 40\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ne |  |  | 2\% |  | Jameson Ave SB | Queen St W EB | 50\% |  |
| PD 13 of Toronto | 18 | 33 | 35 | 0 | 86 | 3\% | E | 1\% |  |  |  | Queen St W EB | Queen St W WB | 8\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |  | 1\% |  | Jameson Ave SB | Total | 100\% |  |
| PD 16 of Toronto | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 1\% | NE |  |  | 1\% |  | $J$ Jmeson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Ajax | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 1\% | E |  |  | 1\% |  | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Georgina | 0 |  | 21 | 0 | 21 | 1\% | N |  |  | 1\% |  | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Richmond Hill | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 0\% | N |  |  | 0\% |  | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Markham | 41 | 0 | 6 |  | 47 | 1\% | N |  |  | 1\% |  | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Vaughan | 27 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 41 | 1\% | N | 1\% |  |  |  | Queen St w wb |  |  |  |
| Brampton | 41 | 0 | 49 | 15 | 105 | 3\% | NW |  |  |  | 3\% | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Mississauga | 187 | 6 | 70 | 16 | 279 | 8\% | w |  |  |  | 8\% | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Milton | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0\% | w |  |  |  | 0\% | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Oakville | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 1\% | w |  |  |  | 1\% | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Burlington | 24 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 28 | 1\% | w |  |  |  | 1\% | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Hamilton | 20 |  | 0 | 0 | 20 | 1\% | w |  |  |  | 1\% | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Niagara Falls | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 1\% | w |  |  |  | 1\% | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Waterloo | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0\% | w |  |  |  | 0\% | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| Kitchener | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 1\% | w |  |  |  | 1\% | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
| External | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0\% | N | 0\% |  |  |  | Jameson Ave SB |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | c | 3360 | 100\% |  | 31\% | 8\% | 38\% | 24\% |  |  |  |  |

PD 2:
Thu Feb 02 2023 09:35:32 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time) - Run Time: 3134ms
Cross Tabulation Query Form - Trip - 2016 v1.1
Row: 2006 GTA zone of destination - gta06_des
Column: 2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06_orig
Filters
(2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06_orig In 89, 109, 110, 11
Start time of trip - start_time In 730-930
Trip purpose of origin - purp_orig In $\vdash$
and
Primary travel mode of trip - mode_prime $\operatorname{In} \mathrm{D}, \mathrm{M}$
and
Planning district of destination - pd_dest In 2)
Trip 2016
Table:

|  | 89 | 109 | 110 | 113 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 89 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 91 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 95 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 |
| 97 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 98 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| 101 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 |
| 105 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 107 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 108 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| 110 | 0 | 8 | 249 | 0 |
| 113 | 0 | 10 | 27 | 7 |
| 114 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 31 |
| 115 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 125 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 44 |

## APPENDIX G

Residential Trip Generation Proxy Surveys

625 Cochrane Drive, $5^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Markham, ON, L3R 9R9 Canada
T | 9054700015 F | 9054700030
WWW.LEA.CA

## 2015 Residential Proxy Site Trip Generation

| Proxy Site | No. of Units | Trip Rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weekday AM |  |  | Weekday PM |  |  |
|  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Auto Trip Generation Rates (per Unit) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 Stafford Street | 142 Units | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.18 |
| 25 Stafford Street | 104 Units | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.08 |
| Pedestrian Trip Generation Rates (per Unit) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 Stafford Street | 142 Units | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.21 |
| 25 Stafford Street | 104 Units | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| Cyclist Trip Generation Rates (per Unit) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 Stafford Street | 142 Units | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| 25 Stafford Street | 104 Units | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |

## 2023 Residential Proxy Site Trip Generation

| Proxy Site | No. of Units | Trip Rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weekday AM |  |  | Weekday PM |  |  |
|  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Auto Trip Generation Rates (per Unit) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 Stafford Street | 142 Units | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.15 |
| 25 Stafford Street | 104 Units | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.10 |
| Pedestrian Trip Generation Rates (per Unit) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 Stafford Street | 142 Units | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.21 |
| 25 Stafford Street | 104 Units | 0.12 | 0.24 | 0.36 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.35 |
| Cyclist Trip Generation Rates (per Unit) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 Stafford Street | 142 Units | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 25 Stafford Street | 104 Units | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 |

Average Residential Proxy Site Trip Generation Applied Rates

| Proxy Site | Average Trip Rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Weekday AM |  |  | Weekday PM |  |  |
|  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Average Auto Trip Generation Rates (per Unit) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 \& 25 Stafford Street (2023) | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.13 |
| 15 \& 25 Stafford Street (2015) | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.13 |
| Average Pedestrian Trip Generation Rates (per Unit) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 \& 25 Stafford Street (2023) | 0.09 | 0.17 | 0.26 | 0.17 | 0.10 | 0.28 |
| 15 \& 25 Stafford Street (2015) | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.16 |
| Average Cyclist Trip Generation Rates (per Unit) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 \& 25 Stafford Street (2023) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| 15 \& 25 Stafford Street (2015) | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |

Of note, some rounding errors may occur for the total rates provided

| 15 Stafford Street Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Hour (8:00-9:00a) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date | Inbound |  |  |  |  | Outbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share | Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share |
| June 5th | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| June 6th | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| June 7th | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| June 8th | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| June 9th | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| June 10th | 11 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| June 11th | 4 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| June 12th | 7 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | PM P | k Hour (5:00 | -6:00p) |  |  |  |  |
| Date | Inbound |  |  |  |  | Outbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share | Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share |
| June 5th | 19 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| June 6th | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| June 7th | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| June 8th | 11 | 25 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| June 9th | 32 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| June 10th | 34 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| June 11th | 7 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| June 12th | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Average Trip Gen (weekday)

| AM Peak Hour (8:00-9:00a) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inbound |  |  |  |  | Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share | Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share |
| 6.6 | 7.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0 | 21.4 | 16.2 | 4 | 0.2 | 0 |
| PM Peak Hour (5:00-6:00p) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inbound |  |  |  |  | Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share | Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share |
| 19.8 | 16.4 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0 | 9.8 | 8.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0 |

Trip Gen Rate (per unit)
142

| AM Peak Hour (8:00-9:00a) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inbound |  |  |  |  | Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share | Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share |
| 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| PM Peak Hour (5:00-6:00p) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inbound |  |  |  |  | Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share | Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Trip Gen Rate (per unit) $\qquad$ 104

| AM Peak Hour (8:00-9:00a) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inbound |  |  |  |  | Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share | Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share |
| 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| PM Peak Hour (5:00-6:00p) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inbound |  |  |  |  | Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share | Peds | Auto | Bicycle | Taxi | Car Share |
| 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABULAR SUMMARY OF TRIP GENERATION COUNT

| countoter |
| :---: |
| prolecti: | $\qquad$ Weather:

Locatoo: $\frac{\text { Clear }}{{ }_{1} \text { Stafford St, Toronto }}$

| TIME | UNDOERGR |  | Ofineway |  | тота। |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Left | Right | Left | Right |  |  |  |  |
| 7730 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 8 | ${ }_{8}$ |  |
| 7:45 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |
| $8: 00$ | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 4 | 4 |  |
| ${ }_{8} 815$ | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 5 | 6 | 19 |
| 8:30 | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 4 | 15 |
| 8:45 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 3 | 17 |
| 9:00 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9.15 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{7}$ |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 20 | 5 | ${ }^{21}$ | , |  |
| АM PEAK |  |  |  | 10 | 5 | 10 | 15 |  |




Peak Hour Trip Gen


## TABULAR SUMMARY OF TRIP GENERATION COUNT



| tIME | UNDERGROUND DRNEWAY |  |  |  | total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | InBound |  | outbound |  | 18 | ов | All | HoURIV |
|  | Left | Right | Left | Right |  |  |  |  |
| 7:30 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 7:45 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | 2 |  |
| 8:30 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | ${ }_{3}$ | ${ }_{8}$ |
| 8:45 | 1 | , | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10 |
| 9:00 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 9:15 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| TOTAL | 2 |  | 10 |  | 2 | 12 | 14 |  |
| AM PEAK | 1 |  | 7 |  | 1 | 7 | 8 |  |



Peak Hour Trip Gen


Trip Gen Rate (per unit) $\qquad$ ${ }_{\text {AM Peakithour }}^{104}$




APPENDIX H

## Existing Conditions Intersection Capacity Analysis

AM Peak Hour


Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 99 (97\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
$m$ Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

Splits and Phases: 1: Queen St W \& Lansdowne Ave




Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 99 ( $97 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 2: Jameson Ave \& Queen St W


|  | $\rightarrow$ | \％ | 7 |  | 4 | \％ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | 性 |  |  | ＊个 | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 377 | 24 | 186 | 209 | 55 | 181 |  |
| Future Volume（vph） | 377 | 24 | 186 | 209 | 55 | 181 |  |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total Lost time（s） | 10.0 |  |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | ＊0．88 |  |  | ＊0．93 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes | 0.98 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 |  |  | 0.95 | 0.69 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 2377 |  |  | 2451 | 1044 | 1126 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 1.00 |  |  | 0.63 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 2377 |  |  | 1584 | 1044 | 1126 |  |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |  |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 405 | 26 | 200 | 225 | 59 | 195 |  |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 427 | 0 | 0 | 425 | 59 | 195 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  | 160 | 160 |  | 246 | 8 |  |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  | 11 |  |  |  | 8 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 10\％ | 0\％ | 4\％ | 19\％ | 0\％ | 5\％ |  |
| Bus Blockages（\＃／hr） | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 |  | 8 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 |  | 7 | 7 |  |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 27.0 |  |  | 48.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Effective Green，g（s） | 28.0 |  |  | 50.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.27 |  |  | 0.49 | 0.22 | 0.22 |  |
| Clearance Time（s） | 11.0 |  |  | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 652 |  |  | 963 | 225 | 242 |  |
| v／s Ratio Prot | c0．18 |  |  | c0．10 |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  |  | 0.12 | 0.06 | c0．17 |  |
| v／c Ratio | 0.65 |  |  | 0.44 | 0.26 | 0.81 |  |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 32.7 |  |  | 16.9 | 33.3 | 38.0 |  |
| Progression Factor | 0.82 |  |  | 0.19 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 4.7 |  |  | 1.1 | 2.8 | 24.2 |  |
| Delay（s） | 31.5 |  |  | 4.4 | 36.1 | 62.1 |  |
| Level of Service | C |  |  | A | D | E |  |
| Approach Delay（s） | 31.5 |  |  | 4.4 | 56.1 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A | E |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  |  | 26.7 |  | HCM 2000 | evel of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.65 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 102.0 |  | Sum of los | ime（s） | 32.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 80．8\％ |  | CU Level | Service | D |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | +1\% |  |  | * |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 63 | 394 | 2 | 2 | 233 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 28 | 0 | 58 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 63 | 394 | 2 | 2 | 233 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 28 | 0 | 58 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 174 | 0 | 98 | 98 | 0 | 174 | 13 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 13 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 68 | 424 | 2 | 2 | 251 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 30 | 0 | 62 |



|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\Perp$ | $\pm$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * $\uparrow$ | 中\% | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 114 | 493 | 197 | 53 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 114 | 493 | 197 | 53 | 20 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 675 | 299 | 59 | 22 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | NA | Perm | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 | 6 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 8 | 8 |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 29.7 | 29.7 | 29.7 | 27.1 | 27.1 |
| Total Split (s) | 74.0 | 74.0 | 74.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 72.5\% | 72.5\% | 72.5\% | 27.5\% | 27.5\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.7 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max | None | None |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.49 | 0.17 | 0.22 | 0.08 |
| Control Delay |  | 8.4 | 6.0 | 35.7 | 13.7 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 8.4 | 6.0 | 35.7 | 13.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) |  | 34.8 | 8.6 | 10.2 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) |  | 50.1 | 17.8 | 22.1 | 6.6 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 195.6 | 227.3 | 112.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  |  | 35.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1379 | 1721 | 273 | 302 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.49 | 0.17 | 0.22 | 0.07 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 70 (69\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 4: Queen St W \& Sorauren Ave


| 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\Perp$ |  | $t$ | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ $\uparrow$ | 恨 |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) 114 | 493 | 197 | 72 | 53 | 20 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) 114 | 493 | 197 | 72 | 53 | 20 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 5.1 | 5.1 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | *0.88 | *0.93 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.94 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 2264 | 2266 |  | 1220 | 1270 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.80 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1837 | 2266 |  | 1220 | 1270 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) 127 | 548 | 219 | 80 | 59 | 22 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) 0 | 675 | 277 | 0 | 59 | 4 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) 55 |  |  | 55 | 48 | 34 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  | 5 |  | 3 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) 4\% | 10\% | 12\% | 8\% | 4\% | 0\% |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) 0 | 27 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Turn Type Perm | NA | NA |  | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases 2 |  |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 73.4 | 73.4 |  | 16.8 | 16.8 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 74.4 | 74.4 |  | 17.8 | 17.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 5.7 | 5.7 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 1339 | 1652 |  | 212 | 221 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.12 |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | c0.37 |  |  | c0.05 | 0.00 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.50 | 0.17 |  | 0.28 | 0.02 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 5.9 | 4.3 |  | 36.5 | 34.9 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.51 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 1.4 | 0.2 |  | 0.7 | 0.0 |  |
| Delay (s) | 7.3 | 6.6 |  | 37.2 | 34.9 |  |
| Level of Service | A | A |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 7.3 | 6.6 |  | 36.6 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A |  | D |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  | 9.3 | HCM 2000 Level of Service |  |  | A |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  | 102.0 | Sum of lost time (s) |  |  | 10.8 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  | 69.6\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | C |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

## PM Peak Hour

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\bullet-$ | \% | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | +4 | 性 | ${ }^{*}$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 196 | 333 | 369 | 87 | 159 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 196 | 333 | 369 | 87 | 159 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 540 | 457 | 89 | 162 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA | NA | Perm | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 2 | 6 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 8 | 8 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 32.0 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 32.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 31.4\% | 37.3\% | 37.3\% | 31.4\% | 31.4\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.50 | 0.67 | 0.43 | 0.71 |
| Control Delay |  | 5.7 | 36.6 | 42.0 | 55.8 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 6.2 | 36.6 | 42.0 | 55.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) |  | 6.2 | 40.3 | 16.1 | 31.4 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) |  | m9.3 | 57.9 | 32.3 | \#62.3 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 27.5 | 139.5 | 205.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  |  | 45.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1089 | 682 | 208 | 228 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 228 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.63 | 0.67 | 0.43 | 0.71 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 47 (46\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
$m$ Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.
Splits and Phases: 1: Queen St W \& Lansdowne Ave




Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 47 (46\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 2: Jameson Ave \& Queen St W


|  | $\rightarrow$ | \% | 7 |  | 4 | \% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | 1\% |  |  | ¢个 | * | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 272 | 31 | 163 | 364 | 79 | 256 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 272 | 31 | 163 | 364 | 79 | 256 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 2100 |  |
| Lane Width | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total Lost time (s) | 10.0 |  |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | *0.94 |  |  | *0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 0.94 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 |  |  | 0.92 | 0.67 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.98 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 2553 |  |  | 2698 | 987 | 1296 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 1.00 |  |  | 0.74 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 2553 |  |  | 2030 | 987 | 1296 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 289 | 33 | 173 | 387 | 84 | 272 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 313 | 0 | 0 | 560 | 84 | 272 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  | 298 | 298 |  | 308 | 9 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  | 15 |  |  |  | 5 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 6\% | 3\% | 1\% | 9\% | 3\% | 1\% |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 |  | 8 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 |  | 7 | 7 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 27.0 |  |  | 48.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 28.0 |  |  | 50.0 | 22.0 | 23.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.27 |  |  | 0.49 | 0.22 | 0.23 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 11.0 |  |  | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 700 |  |  | 1139 | 212 | 292 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.12 |  |  | c0.11 |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  | c0.13 | 0.09 | c0.21 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.45 |  |  | 0.49 | 0.40 | 0.93 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 30.6 |  |  | 17.5 | 34.3 | 38.7 |  |
| Progression Factor | 0.82 |  |  | 0.22 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 2.0 |  |  | 1.1 | 5.5 | 37.7 |  |
| Delay (s) | 27.0 |  |  | 4.9 | 39.8 | 76.4 |  |
| Level of Service | C |  |  | A | D | E |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 27.0 |  |  | 4.9 | 67.8 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A | E |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  |  | 28.7 |  | HCM 2000 | evel of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.66 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 102.0 |  | Sum of los | ime (s) | 32.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 80.8\% |  | CU Level | Service | D |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * ${ }^{1 \%}$ |  |  | * ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |  |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 74 | 288 | 5 | 6 | 404 | 31 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 95 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 74 | 288 | 5 | 6 | 404 | 31 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 95 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 266 | 0 | 198 | 198 | 0 | 266 | 30 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 30 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 80 | 313 | 5 | 7 | 439 | 34 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 103 |




Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 19 (19\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 4: Queen St W \& Sorauren Ave


| 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 4 |  | $\pm$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | * $\uparrow$ | 中F |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) 133 | 378 | 351 | 127 | 46 | 26 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) 133 | 378 | 351 | 127 | 46 | 26 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
|  | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 5.1 | 5.1 |  |
| Total Lost time (s) | *0.94 | *0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.90 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.89 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 2580 | 2492 |  | 1217 | 1220 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.71 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1855 | 2492 |  | 1217 | 1220 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) 140 | 398 | 369 | 134 | 48 | 27 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 22 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) 0 | 538 | 470 | 0 | 48 | 5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) 65 |  |  | 65 | 74 | 59 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  | 21 |  | 4 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) 0\% | 5\% | 8\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) 0 | 16 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Turn Type Perm | NA | NA |  | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases 2 |  |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 73.4 | 73.4 |  | 16.8 | 16.8 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 74.4 | 74.4 |  | 17.8 | 17.8 |  |
|  | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio <br> Clearance Time (s) | 5.7 | 5.7 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 1353 | 1817 |  | 212 | 212 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot 0.19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | c0.29 |  |  | c0.04 | 0.00 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.40 | 0.26 |  | 0.23 | 0.02 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 5.3 | 4.6 |  | 36.2 | 34.9 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.54 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.9 | 0.3 |  | 0.5 | 0.0 |  |
| Delay (s) | 6.1 | 7.4 |  | 36.7 | 34.9 |  |
| Level of Service | A | A |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 6.1 | 7.4 |  | 36.1 |  |  |
| Approach LOS A A D |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  | 8.7 |  | HCM 2000 | Level of Service | A |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  | 0.37 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  | 102.0 |  | Sum of lost | time (s) | 10.8 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  | 69.6\% |  | ICU Level of | Service | C |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

APPENDIX I
2028 Future Background Intersection Capacity Analysis

## AM Peak Hour

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\Perp$ | $\pm$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * $\uparrow$ | 性 | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 146 | 422 | 273 | 111 | 140 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 146 | 422 | 273 | 111 | 140 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 598 | 369 | 117 | 147 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA | NA | Perm | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 2 | 6 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 8 | 8 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 32.0 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 32.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 31.4\% | 37.3\% | 37.3\% | 31.4\% | 31.4\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.57 | 0.62 | 0.58 | 0.67 |
| Control Delay |  | 5.0 | 34.7 | 48.7 | 53.7 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 5.9 | 34.7 | 48.7 | 53.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) |  | 6.3 | 32.7 | 22.0 | 28.3 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) |  | m12.0 | 49.7 | 42.1 | \#56.5 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 27.5 | 140.2 | 205.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  |  | 45.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1046 | 592 | 202 | 218 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 199 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.71 | 0.62 | 0.58 | 0.67 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 99 (97\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
$m$ Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

Splits and Phases: 1: Queen St W \& Lansdowne Ave




Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 99 ( $97 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 2: Jameson Ave \& Queen St W


|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | \％ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | 中F |  |  | ＊个 | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 387 | 24 | 187 | 219 | 55 | 181 |  |
| Future Volume（vph） | 387 | 24 | 187 | 219 | 55 | 181 |  |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total Lost time（s） | 10.0 |  |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | ＊0．88 |  |  | ＊0．93 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes | 0.98 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 |  |  | 0.95 | 0.69 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 2379 |  |  | 2455 | 1044 | 1126 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 1.00 |  |  | 0.63 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 2379 |  |  | 1577 | 1044 | 1126 |  |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |  |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 416 | 26 | 201 | 235 | 59 | 195 |  |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 438 | 0 | 0 | 436 | 59 | 195 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  | 160 | 160 |  | 246 | 8 |  |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  | 11 |  |  |  | 8 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 10\％ | 0\％ | 4\％ | 19\％ | 0\％ | 5\％ |  |
| Bus Blockages（\＃／hr） | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 |  | 8 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 |  | 7 | 7 |  |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 27.0 |  |  | 48.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Effective Green，g（s） | 28.0 |  |  | 50.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.27 |  |  | 0.49 | 0.22 | 0.22 |  |
| Clearance Time（s） | 11.0 |  |  | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 653 |  |  | 962 | 225 | 242 |  |
| v／s Ratio Prot | c0．18 |  |  | c0．10 |  |  |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  |  | 0.12 | 0.06 | c0．17 |  |
| v／c Ratio | 0.67 |  |  | 0.45 | 0.26 | 0.81 |  |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 32.9 |  |  | 17.0 | 33.3 | 38.0 |  |
| Progression Factor | 0.82 |  |  | 0.21 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 5.0 |  |  | 1.2 | 2.8 | 24.2 |  |
| Delay（s） | 31.8 |  |  | 4.8 | 36.1 | 62.1 |  |
| Level of Service | C |  |  | A | D | E |  |
| Approach Delay（s） | 31.8 |  |  | 4.8 | 56.1 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A | E |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  |  | 26.8 |  | CM 2000 | evel of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.66 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 102.0 |  | um of los | ime（s） | 32.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 80．8\％ |  | U Level | Service | D |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |  |  | * ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 63 | 404 | 2 | 2 | 243 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 28 | 0 | 58 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 63 | 404 | 2 | 2 | 243 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 28 | 0 | 58 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 174 | 0 | 98 | 98 | 0 | 174 | 13 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 13 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 68 | 434 | 2 | 2 | 261 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 30 | 0 | 62 |



|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 4 | ( | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * $\uparrow$ | 个\% | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 114 | 503 | 207 | 53 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 114 | 503 | 207 | 53 | 20 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 686 | 310 | 59 | 22 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | NA | Perm | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 | 6 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 8 | 8 |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 29.7 | 29.7 | 29.7 | 27.1 | 27.1 |
| Total Split (s) | 74.0 | 74.0 | 74.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 72.5\% | 72.5\% | 72.5\% | 27.5\% | 27.5\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.7 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max | None | None |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.50 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 0.08 |
| Control Delay |  | 8.6 | 6.3 | 35.7 | 13.7 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 8.6 | 6.3 | 35.7 | 13.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) |  | 35.7 | 11.9 | 10.2 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) |  | 51.4 | 18.9 | 22.1 | 6.6 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 201.5 | 227.3 | 112.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  |  | 35.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1375 | 1724 | 273 | 302 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.50 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 0.07 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 70 (69\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 4: Queen St W \& Sorauren Ave


| 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\square$ |  | $\pm$ | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | * $\uparrow$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) 114 | 503 | 207 | 72 | 53 | 20 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) 114 | 503 | 207 | 72 | 53 | 20 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 5.1 | 5.1 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | *0.88 | *0.93 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.94 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 2265 | 2272 |  | 1220 | 1270 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.80 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1834 | 2272 |  | 1220 | 1270 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) 127 | 559 | 230 | 80 | 59 | 22 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) 0 | 686 | 288 | 0 | 59 | 4 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) 55 |  |  | 55 | 48 | 34 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  | 5 |  | 3 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) 4\% | 10\% | 12\% | 8\% | 4\% | 0\% |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) 0 | 27 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Turn Type Perm | NA | NA |  | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases 2 |  |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 73.4 | 73.4 |  | 16.8 | 16.8 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 74.4 | 74.4 |  | 17.8 | 17.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 5.7 | 5.7 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 1337 | 1657 |  | 212 | 221 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | c0.37 |  |  | c0.05 | 0.00 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.51 | 0.17 |  | 0.28 | 0.02 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 6.0 | 4.3 |  | 36.5 | 34.9 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.57 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 1.4 | 0.2 |  | 0.7 | 0.0 |  |
| Delay (s) | 7.4 | 6.9 |  | 37.2 | 34.9 |  |
| Level of Service | A | A |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 7.4 | 6.9 |  | 36.6 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A |  | D |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  | 9.4 | HCM 2000 Level of Service |  |  | A |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  | 102.0 | Sum of lost time (s) |  |  | 10.8 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  | 69.6\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | C |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

# PM Peak Hour 

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * 4 | 性 | ${ }^{7}$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 196 | 403 | 380 | 87 | 159 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 196 | 403 | 380 | 87 | 159 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 611 | 468 | 89 | 162 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA | NA | Perm | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 2 | 6 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 8 | 8 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 32.0 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 32.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 31.4\% | 37.3\% | 37.3\% | 31.4\% | 31.4\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.55 | 0.69 | 0.43 | 0.71 |
| Control Delay |  | 5.8 | 37.2 | 42.0 | 55.8 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 6.7 | 37.2 | 42.0 | 55.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) |  | 6.1 | 41.7 | 16.1 | 31.4 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) |  | m9.2 | 59.5 | 32.3 | \#62.3 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 27.5 | 147.3 | 205.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  |  | 45.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1102 | 683 | 208 | 228 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 230 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.70 | 0.69 | 0.43 | 0.71 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 47 (46\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
$m$ Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

Splits and Phases: 1: Queen St W \& Lansdowne Ave




Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 47 (46\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 2: Jameson Ave \& Queen St W


|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | \% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | 㻢 |  |  | ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ ¢ | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 342 | 31 | 164 | 374 | 79 | 256 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 342 | 31 | 164 | 374 | 79 | 256 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 2100 |  |
| Lane Width | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total Lost time (s) | 10.0 |  |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | *0.94 |  |  | *0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 0.95 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 |  |  | 0.93 | 0.67 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 2588 |  |  | 2729 | 987 | 1296 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 1.00 |  |  | 0.72 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 2588 |  |  | 1991 | 987 | 1296 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 364 | 33 | 174 | 398 | 84 | 272 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 390 | 0 | 0 | 572 | 84 | 272 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  | 298 | 298 |  | 308 | 9 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  | 15 |  |  |  | 5 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 6\% | 3\% | 1\% | 9\% | 3\% | 1\% |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 |  | 8 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 |  | 7 | 7 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 27.0 |  |  | 48.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 28.0 |  |  | 50.0 | 22.0 | 23.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.27 |  |  | 0.49 | 0.22 | 0.23 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 11.0 |  |  | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 710 |  |  | 1135 | 212 | 292 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.15 |  |  | c0.11 |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  | 0.14 | 0.09 | c0.21 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.55 |  |  | 0.50 | 0.40 | 0.93 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 31.6 |  |  | 17.6 | 34.3 | 38.7 |  |
| Progression Factor | 0.81 |  |  | 0.25 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 2.9 |  |  | 1.2 | 5.5 | 37.7 |  |
| Delay (s) | 28.6 |  |  | 5.7 | 39.8 | 76.4 |  |
| Level of Service | C |  |  | A | D | E |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 28.6 |  |  | 5.7 | 67.8 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A | E |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  |  | 29.2 |  | CM 2000 | evel of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.68 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 102.0 |  | um of los | ime (s) | 32.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 80.8\% |  | U Level | Service | D |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |







Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 19 (19\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 4: Queen St W \& Sorauren Ave


c Critical Lane Group

APPENDIX J

## 2028 Future Total Intersection Capacity Analysis

## AM Peak Hour



Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 99 (97\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
$m$ Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.

Splits and Phases: 1: Queen St W \& Lansdowne Ave




Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 99 ( $97 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 2: Jameson Ave \& Queen St W


|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | \% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | 1F |  |  | ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ ¢ | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 400 | 34 | 187 | 221 | 56 | 181 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 400 | 34 | 187 | 221 | 56 | 181 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total Lost time (s) | 10.0 |  |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | *0.88 |  |  | *0.93 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 0.97 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 |  |  | 0.95 | 0.69 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 2357 |  |  | 2465 | 1044 | 1126 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 1.00 |  |  | 0.62 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 2357 |  |  | 1552 | 1044 | 1126 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 430 | 37 | 201 | 238 | 60 | 195 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 461 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 60 | 195 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  | 160 | 160 |  | 246 | 8 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  | 11 |  |  |  | 8 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 10\% | 0\% | 4\% | 19\% | 0\% | 5\% |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 |  | 8 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 |  | 7 | 7 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 27.0 |  |  | 48.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 28.0 |  |  | 50.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.27 |  |  | 0.49 | 0.22 | 0.22 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 11.0 |  |  | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 647 |  |  | 957 | 225 | 242 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.20 |  |  | c0.10 |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  | 0.13 | 0.06 | c0.17 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.71 |  |  | 0.46 | 0.27 | 0.81 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 33.4 |  |  | 17.1 | 33.3 | 38.0 |  |
| Progression Factor | 0.82 |  |  | 0.23 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 6.1 |  |  | 1.2 | 2.9 | 24.2 |  |
| Delay (s) | 33.6 |  |  | 5.2 | 36.2 | 62.1 |  |
| Level of Service | C |  |  | A | D | E |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 33.6 |  |  | 5.2 | 56.0 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A | E |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  |  | 27.8 |  | CM 2000 | evel of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.68 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 102.0 |  | um of los | ime (s) | 32.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 80.8\% |  | U Level | Service | D |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢T | 个 |  |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 63 | 427 | 246 | 24 | 28 | 58 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 63 | 427 | 246 | 24 | 28 | 58 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 174 | 0 | 0 | 174 | 11 | 13 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 6 | 11 | 12 | 46 | 0 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 68 | 459 | 265 | 26 | 30 | 62 |



|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\Perp$ | $\pm$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * 4 | 恨 | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 114 | 504 | 209 | 53 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 114 | 504 | 209 | 53 | 20 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 687 | 312 | 59 | 22 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | NA | Perm | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 | 6 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 8 | 8 |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 29.7 | 29.7 | 29.7 | 27.1 | 27.1 |
| Total Split (s) | 74.0 | 74.0 | 74.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 72.5\% | 72.5\% | 72.5\% | 27.5\% | 27.5\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 4.7 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.1 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max | None | None |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.50 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 0.08 |
| Control Delay |  | 8.6 | 6.3 | 35.7 | 13.7 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 8.6 | 6.3 | 35.7 | 13.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) |  | 35.8 | 12.2 | 10.2 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) |  | 51.5 | 18.6 | 22.1 | 6.6 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 195.5 | 184.4 | 112.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  |  | 35.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1375 | 1726 | 273 | 302 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.50 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 0.07 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 70 (69\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 4: Queen St W \& Sorauren Ave


| 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\Perp$ |  | $\pm$ | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | * $\uparrow$ | 个\% |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) 114 | 504 | 209 | 72 | 53 | 20 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) 114 | 504 | 209 | 72 | 53 | 20 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 5.1 | 5.1 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | *0.88 | *0.93 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.94 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 2265 | 2273 |  | 1220 | 1270 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.80 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1833 | 2273 |  | 1220 | 1270 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) 127 | 560 | 232 | 80 | 59 | 22 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) 0 | 687 | 290 | 0 | 59 | 4 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) 55 |  |  | 55 | 48 | 34 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  | 5 |  | 3 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) 4\% | 10\% | 12\% | 8\% | 4\% | 0\% |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) 0 | 27 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Turn Type Perm | NA | NA |  | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases 2 |  |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 73.4 | 73.4 |  | 16.8 | 16.8 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 74.4 | 74.4 |  | 17.8 | 17.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 5.7 | 5.7 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 1337 | 1657 |  | 212 | 221 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | c0.37 |  |  | c0.05 | 0.00 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.51 | 0.18 |  | 0.28 | 0.02 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 6.0 | 4.3 |  | 36.5 | 34.9 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.57 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 1.4 | 0.2 |  | 0.7 | 0.0 |  |
| Delay (s) | 7.4 | 7.0 |  | 37.2 | 34.9 |  |
| Level of Service | A | A |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 7.4 | 7.0 |  | 36.6 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A |  | D |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  | 9.5 | HCM 2000 Level of Service |  |  | A |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  | 102.0 | Sum of lost time (s) |  |  | 10.8 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  | 69.6\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | C |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\Perp$ |  | $\pm$ | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | * $\uparrow$ | 个\% |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) 114 | 504 | 209 | 72 | 53 | 20 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) 114 | 504 | 209 | 72 | 53 | 20 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 5.1 | 5.1 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | *0.88 | *0.93 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.94 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 2265 | 2273 |  | 1220 | 1270 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.80 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1833 | 2273 |  | 1220 | 1270 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) 127 | 560 | 232 | 80 | 59 | 22 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) 0 | 687 | 290 | 0 | 59 | 4 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) 55 |  |  | 55 | 48 | 34 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  | 5 |  | 3 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) 4\% | 10\% | 12\% | 8\% | 4\% | 0\% |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) 0 | 27 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Turn Type Perm | NA | NA |  | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases 2 |  |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 73.4 | 73.4 |  | 16.8 | 16.8 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 74.4 | 74.4 |  | 17.8 | 17.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 5.7 | 5.7 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 1337 | 1657 |  | 212 | 221 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | c0.37 |  |  | c0.05 | 0.00 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.51 | 0.18 |  | 0.28 | 0.02 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 6.0 | 4.3 |  | 36.5 | 34.9 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.57 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 1.4 | 0.2 |  | 0.7 | 0.0 |  |
| Delay (s) | 7.4 | 7.0 |  | 37.2 | 34.9 |  |
| Level of Service | A | A |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 7.4 | 7.0 |  | 36.6 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A |  | D |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  | 9.5 | HCM 2000 Level of Service |  |  | A |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  | 102.0 | Sum of lost time (s) |  |  | 10.8 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  | 69.6\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | C |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group


| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 609 | 0 | 779 | 354 |
| Stage 1 | - |  | - | - | 609 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 170 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.14 | - | 6.84 | 6.94 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.84 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.84 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 2.22 | - | 3.52 | 3.32 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 966 | - | 333 | 642 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 505 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 843 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 899 | - | 309 | 598 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 309 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 470 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 840 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0.1 |  | 11.8 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 556 | - | - | 899 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.049 | - | - | 0.004 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 11.8 | - | - | 9 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | B | - | - | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.2 | - | - | 0 | - |

## PM Peak Hour



Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 47 (46\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
$m$ Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal.
Splits and Phases: 1: Queen St W \& Lansdowne Ave




Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 47 (46\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 100
Control Type: Pretimed
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 2: Jameson Ave \& Queen St W


|  | $\rightarrow$ | \% | 7 |  | 4 | \% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | 性 |  |  | ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ ¢ | * | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 346 | 34 | 164 | 385 | 88 | 256 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 346 | 34 | 164 | 385 | 88 | 256 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 2100 |  |
| Lane Width | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total Lost time (s) | 10.0 |  |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | *0.94 |  |  | *0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 0.95 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 |  |  | 0.94 | 0.67 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 2577 |  |  | 2735 | 987 | 1296 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 1.00 |  |  | 0.72 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 2577 |  |  | 1995 | 987 | 1296 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 368 | 36 | 174 | 410 | 94 | 272 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 397 | 0 | 0 | 584 | 94 | 272 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  | 298 | 298 |  | 308 | 9 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  | 15 |  |  |  | 5 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 6\% | 3\% | 1\% | 9\% | 3\% | 1\% |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 |  | 8 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 |  | 7 | 7 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 27.0 |  |  | 48.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 28.0 |  |  | 50.0 | 22.0 | 23.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.27 |  |  | 0.49 | 0.22 | 0.23 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 11.0 |  |  | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 707 |  |  | 1137 | 212 | 292 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.15 |  |  | c0.11 |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  | 0.14 | 0.10 | c0.21 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.56 |  |  | 0.51 | 0.44 | 0.93 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 31.7 |  |  | 17.7 | 34.7 | 38.7 |  |
| Progression Factor | 0.81 |  |  | 0.27 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 3.0 |  |  | 1.2 | 6.6 | 37.7 |  |
| Delay (s) | 28.8 |  |  | 5.9 | 41.3 | 76.4 |  |
| Level of Service | C |  |  | A | D | E |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 28.8 |  |  | 5.9 | 67.4 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A | E |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  |  | 29.4 |  | HCM 2000 | evel of Service | C |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.69 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 102.0 |  | Sum of los | ime (s) | 32.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 80.8\% |  | CU Level | Service | D |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 1\% |  | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 74 | 365 | 434 | 31 | 10 | 95 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 74 | 365 | 434 | 31 | 10 | 95 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 266 | 0 | 0 | 266 | 15 | 30 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 6 | 6 | 29 | 10 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 80 | 397 | 472 | 34 | 11 | 103 |


| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 772 | 0 |  | 0 | 1129 | 549 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 755 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 374 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.1 | - | - | - | 7 | 6.96 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - - | - | 6 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - - | - | 6 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.2 | - | - - | - | 3.6 | 3.33 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 852 | - | - - | - | 186 | 477 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 405 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 643 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 692 | - | - - | - | 105 | 379 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - - | - | 105 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 280 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 522 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 2.3 |  | 0 |  | 23.8 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | C |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 692 | 析 | - | - | 304 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.116 | - | - | - | 0.375 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 10.9 | 0.6 | - | - | 23.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | B | - A | - | - | C |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.4 | , | - | - | 1.7 |



Cycle Length: 102
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Offset: 19 (19\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 4: Queen St W \& Sorauren Ave


| 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\Perp$ |  | $\pm$ | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | * $\uparrow$ | 个\% |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) 133 | 452 | 362 | 127 | 46 | 26 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) 133 | 452 | 362 | 127 | 46 | 26 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 5.1 | 5.1 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | *0.94 | *0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.90 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.89 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 2586 | 2496 |  | 1217 | 1220 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.72 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1891 | 2496 |  | 1217 | 1220 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) 140 | 476 | 381 | 134 | 48 | 27 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 22 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) 0 | 616 | 483 | 0 | 48 | 5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) 65 |  |  | 65 | 74 | 59 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  | 21 |  | 4 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) 0\% | 5\% | 8\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) 0 | 16 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Turn Type Perm | NA | NA |  | Perm | Perm |  |
| Protected Phases | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases 2 |  |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 73.4 | 73.4 |  | 16.8 | 16.8 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 74.4 | 74.4 |  | 17.8 | 17.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 5.7 | 5.7 |  | 6.1 | 6.1 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 1379 | 1820 |  | 212 | 212 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.19 |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | c0.33 |  |  | c0.04 | 0.00 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.45 | 0.27 |  | 0.23 | 0.02 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 5.5 | 4.6 |  | 36.2 | 34.9 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.58 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 1.0 | 0.3 |  | 0.5 | 0.0 |  |
| Delay (s) | 6.6 | 7.6 |  | 36.7 | 34.9 |  |
| Level of Service | A | A |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 6.6 | 7.6 |  | 36.1 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A |  | D |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  | 8.9 | HCM 2000 Level of Service |  |  | A |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  | 0.41 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  | 102.0 | Sum of lost time (s) |  |  | 10.8 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  | 69.6\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | C |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 16 |  |  | $\mathbf{4 \uparrow}$ | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 437 | 4 | 20 | 514 | 1 | 7 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 437 | 4 | 20 | 514 | 1 | 7 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 198 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 475 | 4 | 22 | 559 | 1 | 8 |


| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 677 | 0 | 999 | 438 |
| Stage 1 | - |  | - | - | 675 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 324 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.14 | - | 6.84 | 6.94 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.84 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.84 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 2.22 | - | 3.52 | 3.32 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 911 | - | 240 | 567 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 467 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 705 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 784 | - | 198 | 488 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 198 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 402 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 676 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0.6 |  | 13.9 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 412 | - | - | 784 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.021 | - | - | 0.028 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 13.9 | - | - | 9.7 | 0.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | B | - | - | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.1 | - | - | 0.1 | - |

APPENDIX K
MMLOS Guidelines

Exhibit 16 - TLOS Signalized Intersection Evaluation Table

| Delay | Typical Location | LOS |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 0 | Grade Separation | A |
| $\leq 10 \mathrm{sec}$ | High Level TSP | B |
| $\leq 20 \mathrm{sec}$ |  | C |
| $\leq 30 \mathrm{sec}$ |  | D |
| $\leq 40 \mathrm{sec}$ | TSP \& long cycle length | E |
| $>40 \mathrm{sec}$ | No TSP \& long cycle length | F |

Note: Delay includes travel time from end of queue to entering the intersection

## 5 Truck Level of Service (TkLOS)

### 5.1 Intent

Motor vehicle LOS accounts for trucks by considering the percent of trucks and buses in the traffic volume. However, some elements of roadway segments and intersections clearly affect the ability of trucks to operate with ease. The intent of the truck level of service (TkLOS) is to complement motor vehicle LOS by considering the physical space available for trucks to negotiate corners quickly and easily, and to operate safely within travelled lanes.

The objective of evaluating TkLOS is to facilitate goods movement within the City of Ottawa however, unlike other modes, the TkLOS need only be applied along truck routes, arterial roads and key delivery access routes, since trucks are not intended to operate on every street. An exception would be within employment or enterprise areas where targets are set for trucks on all streets in these areas, as laid out in Section 7.

Care should be taken when considering the trade-offs between truck level of service and pedestrian/bicycle level of service with respect to the corner radii and turning speed. There is potential for trucks to encroach on pedestrian and cycling facilities if trucks are not accommodated appropriately, which can put vulnerable users at risk. As mentioned in Section 1.2, the MMLOS guidelines do not replace safety or geometric guidance.

### 5.2 Data Requirements

A summary of the data required to evaluate the truck level of service is provided in Exhibit 17.
Exhibit 17 - Data Requirements for Truck Level of Service

## SEGMENTS

## SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

| " | Street width (number of through lanes per <br> direction) |
| :--- | :--- |
| » | Curb lane width $(\mathrm{m})$ |

» Effective radius
» Number of receiving lanes on departing leg

Note that effective radius is the same as corner radius where trucks must turn from the curbside lane into a departing curbside lane, however where parking lanes or on-street parking lanes are provided adjacent to the travel / turn lanes the effective radius can be determined by placing a simple or compound radius between the edge of the travel lane on the approach and departing legs - refer to Exhibit 18 below.

|  |  | Existing |  |  |  | FUTURE BACKGROUND |  |  |  | FUTURE TOTAL |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signalized Intersection | Side of Intersection | AM Delay (sec) | PM Delay (sec) | Worst Delay (sec) | tlos | AM Delay (sec) | PM Delay (sec) | Worst Delay (sec) | tos | AM Delay (sec) | PM Delay (sec) | Worst Delay (sec) | tos |
| Lansdowne Ave \& Queen St W | North | 52 | 54 | 54 | F | 52 | 54 | 54 | F | 52 | 55 | 55 | F |
|  | South | . | . |  | . | . | . | . |  | - |  |  | - |
|  | East | 36 | 38 | 38 | E | 37 | 38 | 38 | E | 37 | 39 | 39 | E |
|  | West | - | - | - | - | $-$ | - | - | . | - | $\cdots$ | - | - |
| Jameson Ave \& Queen St W | North | . | . | - | - | . | . | - | . | - | - | - | - |
|  | South | - | - | - | . | - | . | . | - | - | - | . | . |
|  | East | . | . |  | - | . | . | - | . | - | . | - | - |
|  | West | 32 | 27 | 32 | E | 32 | 29 | 32 | E | 34 | 29 | 34 | E |

Exhibit 4 - PLOS Segment Evaluation Table

| Sidewalk Width (m) | Boulevard Width (m) | Motor Vehicle Traffic Volume (AADT) | Presence of Onstreet Parking | Segment PLOS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Operating Speed (km/h) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\leq 30$ | >30 or 50 | >50 or 60 | $>60{ }^{1}$ |
| 2.0 or more | $>2$ | $\leq 3000$ | N/A | A | A | A | B |
|  |  | > 3000 | Yes | A | B | B | N/A |
|  |  |  | No | A | B | C | D |
|  | 0.5 to 2 | $\leq 3000$ | N/A | A | A | A | B |
|  |  | > 3000 | Yes | A | B | C | N/A |
|  |  |  | No | A | C | D | E |
|  | 0 | $\leq 3000$ | NA | A | B | C | D |
|  |  | > 3000 | Yes | B | B | D | N/A |
|  |  |  | No | B | C | E | F |
| 1.8 | $>2$ | $\leq 3000$ | N/A | A | A | A | B |
|  |  | > 3000 | Yes | A | B | C | N/A |
|  |  |  | No | A | C | D | E |
|  | 0.5 to 2 | $\leq 3000$ | N/A | A | B | B | D |
|  |  | > 3000 | Yes | A | C | C | N/A |
|  |  |  | No | B | C | E | E |
|  | 0 | $\leq 3000$ | N/A | A | B | C | D |
|  |  | > 3000 | Yes | B | C | D | N/A |
|  |  |  | No | C | D | F | F |
| 1.5 | $>2$ | $\leq 3000$ | N/A | C | C | C | C |
|  |  | > 3000 | Yes | C | C | D | N/A |
|  |  |  | No | C | D | E | E |
|  | 0.5 to 2 | $\leq 3000$ | N/A | C | C | C | D |
|  |  | > 3000 | Yes | C | C | D | N/A |
|  |  |  | No | D | E | E | E |
|  | 0 | N/A |  | D | E | $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ | $F^{2}$ |
| <1.5 | N/A |  |  | $\mathrm{F}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{F}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{F}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{F}^{3}$ |
| No sidewalk | N/A |  |  | $C^{4}$ | $\mathrm{F}^{3}$ | $F^{3}$ | $F^{3}$ |

Notes:

1. On-street parking not provided on roadways with posted speed of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ or more
2. Sidewalk must be 1.8 m wide if no separation is provided (curb-face sidewalk) where speeds are high
3. Sidewalk must be 1.5 m wide to meet Provincial accessiblity standards
4. Ottawa Pedestrian Plan, 2014: "all new and reconstructed urban local roads where pedestrian facilities are required in accordance with these policies but no dedicated pedestrian facility is provided, require that roads be designed for a speed of $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ or lower (pending development of a new $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ roadway design standard)." Where a roadway is specifically designed as 'shared space', with appropriate design controls and features, it can achieve LOS A.
5. Where a multi-use path is provided in lieu of sidewalks, the MUP can be evaluated using the same methodology.


Exhibit 11 - BLOS Segment Evaluation Table

| Type of Bikeway |  | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Physically Separated Bikeway (cycle tracks, protected bike lanes and multi-use paths). Physical separation refers to, but is not limited to, curbs, raised medians, bollards and parking lanes (adjacent to the bike lane along the travelled way i.e. not curbside). |  | A |
| Bike Lanes Not Adjacent Parking Lane - Select Worst Scoring Criteria |  |  |
| No. of Travel Lanes | 1 travel lane in each direction | A |
|  | 2 travel lanes in each direction separated by a raised median | B |
|  | 2 travel lanes in each direction without a separating median | C |
|  | More than 2 travel lanes in each direction | D |
| Bike Lane Width | $\geq 1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ wide bike lane (includes marked buffer and paved gutter width) | A |
|  | $\geq 1.5 \mathrm{~m}$ to $<1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ wide bike lane (includes marked buffer and paved gutter width) | B |
|  | $\geq 1.2 \mathrm{~m}$ to $<1.5 \mathrm{~m}$ wide bike lane (includes marked buffer and paved gutter width) | C |
| Operating Speed | $\leq 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ operating speed | A |
|  | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ operating speed | C |
|  | $\geq 70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ operating speed | E |
| Bike lane blockage (commercial areas) | Rare | A |
|  | Frequent | C |
| Bike Lanes Adjacent to curbside Parking Lane - Select Worst Scoring Criteria |  |  |
| No. of Travel Lanes | 1 travel lane in each direction | A |
|  | 2 or more travel lanes in each direction | C |
| Bike Lane and Parking Lane Width | 4.5 m wide bike lane plus parking lane (includes marked buffer and paved gutter width) | A |
|  | 4.25 m wide bike lane plus parking lane (includes marked buffer and paved gutter width) | B |
|  | $\leq 4.0 \mathrm{~m}$ wide bike lane plus parking lane (includes marked buffer and paved gutter width) | C |
| Operating Speed | $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ operating speed | A |
|  | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ operating speed | B |
|  | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ operating speed | D |
|  | $\geq 70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ operating speed | F |
| Bike lane blockage (commercial areas) | Rare | A |
|  | Frequent | C |
| Mixed Traffic |  |  |
| No. of Travel Lanes and Operating Speed | 2 travel lanes; $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$; no marked centerline or classified as residential | A |
|  | 2 to 3 travel lanes; $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |
|  | 2 travel lanes; $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$; no marked centerline or classified as residential | B |
|  | 2 to 3 travel lanes; $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | D |
|  | 44 to 5 travel lanes; $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | D |
|  | 4 to 5 travel lanes; $\geq 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | E |
|  | 6 or more travel lanes; $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | E |
|  | $\geq 60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |
| Unsignalized Crossing along Route: no median refuge |  |  |
| No. of Travel Lanes on Side Street and Operating Speed | 3 or less lanes being crossed; $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | A |
|  | 4 to 5 lanes being crossed; $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |
|  | 3 or less lanes being crossed; $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |
|  | 4 to 5 lanes being crossed; $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | C |
|  | 3 or less lanes being crossed; $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | C |
|  | 4 to 5 lanes being crossed; $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | D |
|  | 6 or more lanes being crossed; $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | E |
|  | 3 or less lanes being crossed; $\geq 65 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | E |
|  | 6 or more lanes being crossed; $\geq 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |
|  | 4 to 5 lanes being crossed; $\geq 65 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |
| Unsignalized Crossing along Route: with median refuge ( $\geq 1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ wide) |  |  |
| No. of Travel Lanes on Side Street and Operating Speed | 5 or less lanes being crossed; $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | A |
|  | 3 or less lanes being crossed; $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | A |
|  | 6 or more lanes being crossed; $\leq 40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |
|  | 4 to 5 lanes being crossed; $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |
|  | 3 or less lanes being crossed; $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |
|  | 6 or more lanes being crossed; $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | C |
|  | 4 to 5 lanes being crossed; $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | C |
|  | 3 or less lanes being crossed; $\geq 65 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | D |
|  | 6 or more lanes being crossed; $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | E |
|  | 4 to 5 lanes being crossed; $\geq 65 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | E |
|  | 6 or more lanes being crossed; $\geq 65 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |


| Segment | From | To | Side | Type | No. of Lanes | Operating Speed | No Centreline/Residential? | Segment BLOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Queen St W | Macdonell Ave | Lansdowne Ave | North | Mixed Traffic | 4 | Less than or equal to $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | N/A | D |
|  |  |  | South | Mixed Traffic | 4 | Less than or equal to $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | N/A | D |

Future (per City's Cycling Network Plan):
-None planned along Queen St W

Mon Mar 272023 22:08:15 GMT-0400 (Eastern Daylight Time) - Run Time: 984 ms
Cross Tabulation Query Form - Transit - 2016 v1.1
Row: Planning district of transit egress pt. - pd_egrs

Filters
2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06 orig In 89, 109, 110, 113
and
Trip pu
and
Start time of trip - start_time In 600-1000)
Tran 20

PD 1 of Toronto
PD 2 of Toronto
PD 3 of Toronto
PD 4 of Toronto
PD 5 of Toronto
PD 6 of Toronto
PD 7 of Toronto
PD8 of Toronto
PD 9 of Toronto
PD 10 of Toronto
PD 11 of Toronto
PD 11 of Toronto
PD 12 of Toronto
PD 15 of Toronto
Richmond Hill
Markham
Markham
Mississauga
Milton

Oakville |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oakville |  | 14 | 0 |
|  | SUM | 163 | 123 |



| Summary by Route |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transit Route | Trips | \% |
| TTC Bus |  |  |
| 29 Dufferin | 632 | 7\% |
| 47 Caledonia | 548 | 6\% |
| 63 Oakwood | 842 | 9\% |
| 80 Parkside | 96 | 1\% |
| TC Wheel Trans | 6 | 0\% |
| 509 Harbourfront Bus | 105 | 1\% |
| TTC Streetcar |  |  |
| 501 Queen Streetcar | 803 | 8\% |
| 504 King Streetcar | 6002 | 63\% |
| 505 Dundas Streetcar | 141 | 1\% |
| 506 College / Carloton Streetcar | 57 | 1\% |
| 511 Bathurst Streetcar | 27 | 0\% |
| Cherry Streetcar | 173 | 2\% |
| TTC Subway |  |  |
| Yonge-University West | 20 | 0\% |
| Bloor Danforth | 110 | 1\% |
| GO |  |  |
| GO-Lakeshore West | 123 | 1\% |
| 60-Kitchener | 13 | 0\% |
| total | 9525 | 100\% |

APPENDIX L
Functional Design Review









[^0]:    (1) Total pedestrian trips from the proxy survey rates includes both transit trips and walk only trips. Local mode split data from the 2016 TTS indicated that transit trips make up $76 \%$ of the total transit + walk only trips. This was used to separate out the pedestrian trips into transit trips and walk only trips.

