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## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Study Purpose

This report documents the traffic study conducted for the needs and justification component of the Class Environmental Assessment for Peel Regional Road 7 (Airport Road) between a point one kilometre north of Mayfield Road and a point 600 metres north of King Street. The traffic study was conducted by the Region of Peel's Traffic Operations group with input from the Region’s Traffic Signals and Systems group, Traffic Development group and Transportation Planning group, and the safety performance review was conducted by the Region's Traffic Safety group. Exhibit 1 provides a map of the study area.

### 1.2 Background

To determine the traffic needs of the study area a number of previous studies and resources have been consulted including:

- Peel Long Range Transportation Plan, 2012 Update ;
- Caledon Transportation Needs Study Update (CATS) (2009); and
- Region of Peel Transportation Demand Forecasting Model with 2021 and 2031 AM peak hour forecasts.

Automatic traffic recorder (ATR) classification counts were also analyzed for the following intersections:

- Airport Road at 2.1 KM north of Mayfield Road
- Airport Road at 0.21 KM north of Old School Road
- Airport Road at 2.8 KM north of King Street
- King Street at 0.5 KM west of Airport Road

According to the Caledon Transportation Needs Study Update (CATS), Airport Road from north of Mayfield Road to north of King Street is to be widened from two lanes to five lanes by 2019. Exhibit 2 provides a map of the screenlines with the arrows representing the 2031 capacity deficiency for traffic crossing each screenline. According to Exhibit 2, the capacity deficiency is 900 Vph for screenline 4B covering Airport Road within the study area.

Exhibit 1: Study Area


Exhibit 2: Traffic Analysis Screenlines and Capacity Deficiency for 2031 (Source: CATS)


### 1.3 Traffic Analysis Approach

As a part of conducting this needs assessment, Regional staff took into account existing and forecasted traffic in the study area for the years 2011, 2021, and 2031. Traffic capacity analysis was undertaken for all intersections and road sections in the study area for future road network scenarios. The traffic forecasts were derived by using previous studies and growth factors within the study area.

### 1.4 Regional and Study Area Context

A significant amount of growth is projected to occur in the Town of Caledon and the Region of Peel, as shown in Table 1 and Table 2. The values provided in Table 1 indicate the 2011 to 2031 population forecasts. Table 2 shows the employment forecasts compared to our current 2011 values. The Town of Caledon population and employment
growth on a town-wide level has been projected at $29 \%$ and $36 \%$ respectively from 2011 to 2021 and at 65\% and 74\% respectively from 2011 to 2031.

Table 1 - Projected Population Growth

| Municipality | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ | 10 Year Growth | 20 Year Growth |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region of Peel | $1,340,125$ | $1,522,158$ | $1,682,864$ | $14 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
| Town of Caledon | 68,362 | 87,993 | 113,001 | $29 \%$ | $65 \%$ |

Table 2 - Projected Employment Growth

| Municipality | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ | 10 Year Growth | 20 Year Growth |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region of Peel | 685,607 | 811,792 | 887,723 | $18 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Town of Caledon | 28,009 | 38,213 | 48,756 | $36 \%$ | $74 \%$ |

NOTE - Population and Employment forecasts based on existing approved data from 2009.
The Airport Road corridor is planned to support growth on adjacent lands along the corridor. The corridor right of way is designated as 45 metres in the Regional Official Plan (ROP) which is sufficient to support a four lane cross-section.

Immediately south of the study area is the Tullamore South Industrial Park, which calls for a full build out of 431,000 square metres of industrial and retail lands by 2018. Traffic impact, specifically site trips, documented in the Tullamore Secondary Plan Transportation Impact Study prepared by IBI Group in February 2009 have been incorporated in this Needs Assessment and Safety Performance Report.

The Town of Caledon is also finalizing an Official Plan Review for the Sandhill Commercial/Industrial Centre (Sandhill Land Use Study), located at the northerly limits of the study area. A series of development applications have been received by the Town and Region pertaining to highway commercial and trucking uses, all of which will ultimately impact the capacity and operation of Airport Road in the future.

## 2. Existing Conditions Analysis

A traffic analysis of the Airport Road corridor from a point one kilometre north of Mayfield Road to 600 m north of King Street was based on a number of traffic data and forecasts. The tasks associated with the traffic analysis included:

- A review of existing traffic conditions throughout the corridor;
- Analysis of intersections and midblock road sections;
- A review of existing transportation deficiencies;
- A review of the safety performance for the Airport Road corridor;
- An assessment of future travel demands and deficiencies; and
- Identification of improvements for intersections and road sections to handle future travel demands.


### 2.1 Existing Road Network

The existing road network for the Airport Road corridor is shown in Exhibit 3 and a detailed description is provided below:

Airport Road - Regional Road 7 (within the study area) is a two lane north-south major arterial road under the jurisdiction of the Region of Peel. It has a posted speed limit of 80 kilometres per hour except within the settlement community of Sandhill at the northerly limits of the study area where it has a posted speed limit of 60 kilometres per hour. To the south, Airport Road extends to Highway 427 (the boundary between the City of Mississauga and City of Toronto) where it continues as Dixon Road. Northerly, Airport Road extends to Highway 9 (the boundary between the Town of Caledon and Town of Mono) where it continues as Simcoe County Road 18.

King Street - Regional Road 9 is a two lane east-west major arterial road under the jurisdiction of the Region of Peel. The posted speed limit on King Street at Airport Road is 70 kilometres per hour, and is posted at 80 kilometres per hour beyond each side of the intersection. To the west, King Street extends to Halton Hills Side Road 27 (the boundary between the Town of Caledon and Town of Halton Hills) where it transitions southward to become Winston Churchill Boulevard (Regional Road 19). Easterly, King Street extends to Albion-Vaughan Road/Caledon-King Townline South (the boundary between the Town of Caledon and King Township) where it continues as King Road (York Regional Road 11).

Old School Road is a two lane minor arterial road under the jurisdiction of the Town of Caledon and has a posted speed limit of 80 kilometres per hour. Old School Road terminates at Airport Road as an offset intersection with 30 metres of separation from Healey Road, and extends westerly to Winston Churchill Boulevard (the boundary between the Town of Caledon and Town of Halton Hills) where it continues as Halton Hills Side Road 22. Old School Road is currently truck prohibited.

Exhibit 3 - Existing Road Network


Healey Road is a two lane minor arterial road under the jurisdiction of the Town of Caledon and has a posted speed limit of 80 kilometres per hour. Healey Road terminates at Airport Road as an offset intersection with 30 metres of separation from Old School Road, and extends easterly to Queen Street South (Regional Road 50) in Bolton. Healey Road is currently truck prohibited.
"Street A" currently serves as a private access road immediately south of the study area limits. It intersects with Airport Road as a signalized three-legged intersection, and is being incorporated in this study merely as a checkpoint for north-south volumes on Airport Road since no other municipal streets cross Airport Road south of Healey Road, and since it is the closest signalized intersection to the southerly limits of the study area.

### 2.2 Transit and Active Transportation

Currently, there is no transit service or active transportation facilities within the study area. The nearest transit stop to the study area is located approximately 0.5 kilometres south of the study area at the intersection of Airport Road and Davis Lane/Purdue Court, and is served by six bus trips per day as part of a three-year trial extension of Brampton Transit Route 30 Airport Road into Caledon for employees at the AMB Distribution Centre (Exhibit 4).

The Region's Active Transportation Plan recommends providing a paved shoulder cycling route facility on Airport Road (paved shoulder as per typical requirements for rural roads based on design speed and AADT volumes with bicycle route signs as part of the overall signage strategy). Adding paved shoulders is a way to accommodate cyclists in rural areas. Cyclists will benefit from space outside the general purpose lane. Paved shoulders offer other advantages such as extending the life cycle of the vehicle lanes through improving the lateral support for the roadway structure, reducing maintenance costs associated with the grading of gravel shoulders, and can reduce run-off-the road collisions.

Exhibit 4 - Existing Transit Service Near Study Area


### 2.3 Sightline Analysis

The criteria used to determine sightline requirements are shown in Table 3 is based on the TAC (Transportation Association of Canada) Geometric Design Guide "Stopping Sight Distance for Automobiles and Trucks with Antilock Braking Systems" Table 1.2.5.3

Table 3 - "Stopping Sight Distance for Automobiles and Trucks with Antilock Braking Systems" Table 1.2.5.3 TAC Geometric Design Guide

| Design Speed (km/h) | Minimum stopping sight distance (m) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 70 | $95-110$ |
| 80 | $115-140$ |
| 90 | $130-170$ |

Five locations, as identified in Table 4, were found to have deficient/minimum sightlines along Airport.

Table 4 - Addresses of locations with sightline deficiencies along Airport Road

| Location (Address \#) | Looking North (m) | Looking South (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12404 | Flat (clear sightlines) | 140 m |
| 12484 | 373 m | 145 m |
| 12541 | 118 m | Hill (clear sightlines) |
| 12577 | 140 m | Hill (clear sightlines) |
| 12618 | Flat (clear sightlines) | 95 m |

All five locations are within the posted $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ zone (assumed $90 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ design speed). It should be noted that all the locations where sightline concerns were noted are in the same general area and are as a result in a change to the vertical curvature of the road.

### 2.4 Weekday Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Turning movement counts (TMCs) were conducted by Ontario Traffic Inc. (OTI) and MG8 ENG and were used to create a representation of the existing traffic volumes in the Study Area. Table 5 summarizes the locations, sources and dates of the TMCs used in the traffic analysis.

Table 5 - Location, Date and Source of TMCs

| Location | Source | Date |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Airport Road at King Street | OTI | Tuesday, May 3, 2011 |
| Airport Road at Old School Road/ Healey Road | OTI | Wednesday, November 30, 2011 |
| *Airport Road at "Street A" | MG8 ENG | Tuesday, September 28, 2010 |

The existing peak hour TMCs on Airport Road are shown in Exhibit 5. The TMCs indicate that the peak direction during the AM and PM peak hours is southbound and northbound, respectively. Southbound through traffic volumes in the AM peak hour range from 435 (at King Street) to 676 (at "Street A") vehicles per hour. During the PM peak hour, northbound traffic volumes range from 479 (at "Street A") to 403 (at King Street) vehicles per hour.

Exhibit 5-2011 Peak Hour TMCs


Individual peak hour factors (PHFs) were calculated and applied to each turning movement using the 15 minute counts from the TMCs to account for fluctuation of traffic within the peak hour. Adjusting the PHF yields a more conservative value for traffic volume by placing more weight on the highest peak 15 minute volume. The lower the PHF, the higher the volume adjusts. For Airport Road, values ranged from 0.25 to 0.97, suggesting that traffic is not equally distributed throughout the respective peak hours.

### 2.5 AADT Traffic Volumes

Historical and existing Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes on Airport Road were collected by LEA Consulting Ltd. on Tuesday, May 11, 2011. Table 6 shows the current (2011) AADT volumes on Airport Road within the study limits.

Table 6 - Existing AADT on Airport Road

| Location | Northbound <br> AADT | Southbound <br> AADT | Two-way <br> AADT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.3 kilometres north of Mayfield Road | 3,875 | 4,488 | 8,363 |
| 100 metres north of Old School Road | 3,598 | 4,057 | 7,655 |

### 2.6 Historical Growth

The AADT volumes over the period from 2002 to 2011 on Airport Road within the study area were reviewed in order to determine a historical growth rate. The analysis of the AADT volumes suggests that volumes within the study area are declining by an average of 1-2 percent per annum (see Exhibit 6), despite an outlier spike in volumes in 2009.

Exhibit 6 - Historical AADT Trends


### 2.7 Truck Percentages

Peak hour truck percentages for each approach were obtained using the AM and PM peak TMCs. The intersection truck percentages and volumes (provided in brackets) for the intersections of Airport Road at King Street and Airport Road at Old School Road / Healey Road can be found in Table 7.

Table 7 - Truck Percentages and Volumes - (truck volumes shown in brackets)

| Intersection | Peak <br> Period | North <br> Approach <br> Truck \% | South <br> Approach <br> Truck \% | East <br> Approach <br> Truck \% | West <br> Approach <br> Truck \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM | $5 \%(36)$ | $17 \%(24)$ | $1 \%(1)$ | $1 \%(1)$ |
|  | PM | $12 \%(22)$ | $5 \%(22)$ | $1 \%(2)$ | $1 \%(1)$ |
| Airport Road and Old School <br> Road - Healey Road | AM | $8 \%(45)$ | $22 \%(26)$ | $3 \%(15)$ | $7 \%(19)$ |
|  | PM | $12 \%(24)$ | $3 \%(13)$ | $5 \%(21)$ | $2 \%(8)$ |

### 2.8 Traffic Analysis

### 2.8.1 Link / Mid-block Analysis

A theoretical link capacity of 900 vehicles per hour per lane (the equivalent of LOS D) was applied to the existing volumes to assess a V/C ratio for each link of Airport Road. Based on the link analysis, Airport Road has an existing maximum link V/C ratio of 0.82 in the AM peak hour, which occurs south of Healey Road. The existing PM peak hour has a maximum link V/C ratio of 0.64 occurring north of Old School Road.

### 2.8.2 Existing Intersection Capacity Analysis

The capacity analysis of each intersection within the study area was based upon the existing intersection lane configurations as shown in Exhibit 3 and the existing TMCs as shown in Exhibit 5 and associated PHFs. Analysis was conducted in Synchro 7.0, a traffic software containing an analysis module based upon the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000 methodology for signalized and unsignalized intersections. The three measures of effectiveness that were chosen to evaluate the operation of intersections are as follows:

- the maximum volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio for the intersection;
- the level of service (LOS) for signalized intersections based on the average delay per vehicle; and
- the average delay of the intersection measured in seconds.

LOS are given letter designations from ' A ' to ' F ' where LOS A represents the best operating conditions and LOS F represents the worst. Typically the Region plans and designs facilities for improvements when LOS reaches D , which is representative of a V/C ratio of 0.90 or better.

Table 8 summarizes the existing V/C ratios and LOS for the study intersections. Detailed Synchro HCM reports are found in Appendix A.

Table 8 - Existing Conditions Intersection Capacity Analysis

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / King Street | AM | 0.70 (WBTR) | 17.4 | B |
|  | PM | 0.88 (WBTR) | 22.1 | C |
| Airport Road / Old School Road | AM | 0.58 (EB) | 5.4 | - |
|  | PM | $0.24(\mathrm{~EB})$ | 4.7 | - |
| Airport Road / Healey Road | AM | $0.36(\mathrm{WB})$ | 4.8 | - |
|  | PM | $0.86(\mathrm{WB})$ | 15.4 | - |
|  | AM | $0.28(\mathrm{SBT})$ | 5.2 | A |
|  | PM | $0.33(\mathrm{WBL})$ | 4.4 | A |

Although the intersection of Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey Road is considered to be a single intersection that is offset, the analysis assumed this intersection as two unsignalized three-legged intersections given that an east-west through movement would be required to complete two separate turn movements each subject to its own gap
acceptance as opposed to a single protected movement. Overall, the intersections within the study area operate at acceptable levels of service.

### 2.8.3 Traffic Control Warrant

The intersections of Airport Road at Old School Road and Airport Road at Healey Road are the only unsignalized intersections within the study area. As such, a preliminary traffic control signals warrant based on the Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) Book 12 procedures was undertaken. The preliminary signal warrant analysis treated these intersections as a single offset intersection as opposed to two separate intersections. The detailed traffic control signals warrant is found in Appendix B. The results of the study are shown in Table 9.

Table 9 - Traffic Control Signals Warrant for Airport Road at Old School Road/Healey Road

| Warrant | Percent Compliance |
| :--- | :---: |
| Minimum Vehicular Volume Warrant | 86 |
| Delay to Cross Traffic Warrant | 90 |
| Collision Hazard Warrant | 0 |

OTM Book 12 states that traffic signals must be considered if one of the above warrants is $100 \%$ met or two are $80 \%$ met. Due to the complexities and unique challenges offset intersections create, a more comprehensive analysis will be conducted, independent of this report to determine if the intersections should be signalized, and if so, if they should be treated as a single or as separate intersections.

### 2.8.4 Airport and Old School Road / Healey Road Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

Capacity analysis was conducted to determine the effects of signalizing the offset intersection of Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey Road. Given that the study area intersections are not within a coordinated network, the lowest recommended value for the cycle length was assumed for each respective peak period as per the optimization feature in Synchro, as lower cycle lengths typically reduce queue lengths. Split phasing for the east-west movements would be required in order to prevent conflict between through movements and turning movements. Eastbound and westbound right turns on red (RTOR) were assumed to be prohibited, as permitting these manoeuvres would effectively permit through movements in the respective directions, resulting in conflict with north-south traffic. Table 10 summarizes the V/C ratios and LOS for the subject intersection with these improvements. Detailed Synchro HCM reports are found in Appendix C.

Table 10 - Signalization of Offset Airport Road / Old School Road - Healey Road

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay <br> (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road | AM | $0.99(\mathrm{SBTL})$ | 46.3 | D |
|  | PM | $0.91 / 0.91(\mathrm{WB} / \mathrm{NB})$ | 42.8 | D |

The capacity analysis suggests that traffic control signalization increases delay at the intersection and worsens level of service, particularly in the southbound direction during the AM peak hour. This is caused primarily by the introduction of traffic control to
north-south traffic and the inefficient distribution of green time caused by the east-west movements operating separately due to split phasing.

### 2.8.5 Queuing Analysis

The left and right turn storage needs were calculated using the following methodology as per Regional practice:

Formula $m=(V e x C) /(n \times 3600)$
Where: m : average number of vehicles arriving at an intersection approach in one cycle
Ve: equivalent hourly volume
C: cycle length in seconds
n : number of lanes used by the equivalent volume
3,600: number of seconds in one hour

The average arrival rate is then multiplied by 7 m for cars and a factor of ( $2.4 \times 7 \mathrm{~m}$ ) for heavy vehicles. The value obtained is applied to a LOS table to determine the appropriate storage for LOS C. In addition to the method used by the Region, $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues were obtained using synchro.

Priority on which storage lengths are required are based on the larger storage requirement obtained by either method. Regardless of the calculated queues, the Region of Peel uses a minimum storage of 30 m for all left turn lanes.

The worst case storage needs between the AM and PM peak periods based on 2011 volumes are indicated in Table 11.

Table 11 - Existing Conditions Storage Requirements
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|}\hline \text { Intersection } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Existing Storage } \\ (\mathbf{m})\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Required } \\ \text { Storage } \\ \text { Region } \\ \text { Method } \\ (\mathbf{m})\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Required } \\ \text { Storage } \\ \text { Synchro } \\ \text { 95 }\end{array} \\ \text { percentile } \\ (\mathbf{m})\end{array}\right]$

Based on existing volumes, the queue analysis indicates that all existing storage lengths exceed requirements.

### 2.8.6 Existing Volumes Roundabout Feasibility and Analysis

Regional practice is to assess all intersections, which are warranted for signals, for the implementation of roundabouts during the EA process. While the initial costs and property needs for roundabouts can be higher, roundabouts can provide a number of benefits over signalized intersections such as a reduction in severe injury collisions,
speed reduction/management, lower maintenance costs and access management via splitter islands, and easily allow u-turning movements through the roundabout.

The intersections of Airport Road and King Street, and Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey Road were evaluated using the Region of Peel’s Roundabout Feasibility Screening Tool as well as using ARCADY to further evaluate roundabout capacity and entry lane needs. The roundabout Feasibility Screening Tool is a high level tool used to determine if a subject intersection warrants more detailed analysis for the installation of a roundabout. It takes into consideration the existing traffic volumes, operational concerns, existing traffic control proximity to adjacent signals, vertical geometry and property constraints. Each item is identified as roundabout supportive, non-supportive or neutral.

The Roundabout assessment was Peer Reviewed by Ourston Roundabout Engineering on November $12^{\text {th }}, 2012$ as found in Appendix D. Based on the recommendations in the peer review, adjustments were made to the initial analysis. The revised analysis, which is discussed in this report is in line with the recommendations in the peer review.

ARCADY 8 is a software package for predicting capacities, queues and delays at roundabouts.

The ARCADY assessment was conducted using the geometric parameters as shown in Table 12. It should be noted that roundabouts were assessed by modifying the entry lanes based on three geometric layouts. The flared two lane entry consists of a single approach lane flaring into two entry lanes into the roundabout. The two lane approach and entry indicates that a full two lanes are required upstream of the roundabout as well as two entry lanes.

Table 12 - ARCADY Geometric Parameters

| Single-lane Entry |  | Flared two-lane entry |  | Two-lane approach and entry |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R | 25 | R | 25 | R | 25 |
| Phi | 20 | Phi | 20 | Phi | 20 |
| V | 4.25 | V | 4.25 | V | 4 |
| E | 4.25 | E | 8 | E | 8 |
| $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | 0 | $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | 20 | $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | 10 |
| D | 55 | D | 49 | D | 49 |

R- Entry Radius
Phi- Conflict Angle
Inscribed Ciricle Diameter
Entry Width
Approach Half Width
Flare length
In addition to the above noted parameters a y-intercept value of $90 \%$ of the capacity prediction was used to account for driver unfamiliarity at roundabouts in North America as compared to the United Kingdom.

The following summarizes the feasibility assessment and ARCADY analysis:

- Airport Road / King Street - Roundabout Screening Tool- The screening tool identified that Airport Road and King Street can be considered a candidate for the implementation of a roundabout. Detailed property requirements will need to be scoped based on a preliminary roundabout design. In order to accommodate heavy vehicles and farm equipment, a truck apron would be required in order to due to the larger vehicles’ turning swept paths.
- Airport Road / King Street - ARCADY Analysis- ARCADY analysis based on 2011 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes indicate a single lane roundabout would operate at a LOS B and LOS A during the AM and PM peak periods respectively, although the northbound approach would likely start experiencing moderate queuing and delays shortly after construction as it would operate at a LOS C as shown in Table 13.
- Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road Roundabout Screening ToolThe screening tool identified that Airport Road and Old School Road - Healey Road can be considered a candidate for a roundabout. A realignment of Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey Road is recommended and would provide an opportunity to construct a roundabout to correct the current offset at the intersection. Detailed property requirements will need to be scoped based on a preliminary roundabout design. In order to accommodate heavy vehicles and farm equipment, a truck apron would be required in order to due to the larger vehicles' turning swept paths.
- Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road ARCADY Analysis- ARCADY analysis based on 2011 traffic volumes indicate the roundabout would operate at a LOS A during the AM and PM periods utilizing single lane entries on all approaches as shown in Table 13.

Detailed ARCADY reports and the screening tool results can be found in Appendix E.

Table 13 - ARCADY Roundabout Analysis 2011 Traffic Volumes

| Airport Road and King Street |  |  |  | Airport Road and Old School Road - Healey Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Entry Lanes | $\begin{gathered} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | Approach | Entry <br> Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| King Street East | Single | A | A | Healey Road | Single | A | A |
| Airport Road North | Single | C | A | Airport Road North | Single | B | A |
| King Street West | Single | A | A | Old School Road | Single | A | A |
| Airport Road South | Single | A | A | Airport Road South | Single | A | A |
| Overall | Single | B | A | Overall | Single | B | A |

### 2.8.7 Existing Conditions Summary of Recommended Improvements

Based on the analysis in the previous subsections, the following geometric and traffic signal timing modifications are recommended:

- Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road - A preliminary assessment identified that traffic control signals should be considered. Further analysis is to be conducted independent of this report; and
- Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road - A realignment of the intersection to not be offset should take place as soon as practicable. However, it is recognized that jog elimination may be most cost effectively co-ordinated with other scheduled improvements.
- Airport Road - Sight distance issues were identified at the following addresses along Airport Road: 12404, 12484, 12541, 12577, and 12618. These are as a result of the vertical alignment of the road and should be rectified.


## 3. Future Conditions Analysis

### 3.1 Traffic Volume Forecasts

To determine the future need for improvements and lane requirements, travel demand forecasts were created for this review for the 2021 and 2031 horizon years (showing 10and 20-year growth). Truck percentages were estimated to match existing conditions.

### 3.1.1 Development in the Study Area

Airport Road is one of the major arterial roads connecting communities in Caledon to Brampton, Toronto and the rest of the Greater Toronto Area. Despite the declining growth rates discussed in Section 3.1.2, substantial growth is projected to continue for the City of Brampton and Town of Caledon in the next 10 to 20 years. The Region's Long Range Transportation Plan, 2012 Update has identified the needs for widening Airport Road from 2 to 4 lanes prior to the 2021 horizon.

As mentioned in Section 2, the Airport Road study area is adjacent to the Tullamore Secondary Plan area, which has an anticipated full build out of 431,000 square metres of industrial and retail lands by 2018. Traffic volumes generated from this area were extracted from the Tullamore Secondary Plan Transportation Impact Study prepared by IBI Group in February 2009, and assigned separately to the 2021 traffic network accordingly, as the site trips exceeded future background traffic generated by the growth rates in Table 15. Due to truck restrictions and no documented plans for road improvements along Old School Road or Healey Road, none of the Tullamore Secondary Plan traffic was distributed to these roads. Site trip distribution at the intersection of Airport Road and King Street were distributed based on forecasted trip distribution, as depicted in Table 14.

Table 14 - Trip Distribution at Airport Road and King Street to/from South

| Peak Period | Direction | West | North | East |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM | Southbound | $6 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
|  | Northbound | $5 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| PM | Southbound | $6 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
|  | Northbound | $6 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $11 \%$ |

Also acknowledged in Section 2 is the Town of Caledon's recently launched Official Plan Review for the Sandhill Settlement Area, located at the northerly limits of the study area. Based on a review of traffic impact studies associated with the development applications submitted to date, additional traffic anticipated from future developments in this area have been assumed to be accounted for in the background growth rates in Section 3.1.2.

All new developments abutting Regional roads are subject to access management conditions as per the Region’s Controlled Access By-Law 59-77, as amended. The bylaw requires a minimum spacing from intersections of 300 metres for full movements accesses and 100-130 metres for right-in/right-out accesses (depending on whether the access is on the far side or nearside of the intersection, respectively). The by-law also
speaks to one private residential access and one farming access per property in rural areas, and no access where alternative access is available (e.g. from a local road).

A two way left turn lane was assessed and is recommended throughout the study area as the average number of accesses per kilometre is 12 . The density of accesses in the Sandhill area is double the average rate of the study area with approximately 25 accesses. The implementation of a two way left turn lane will reduce friction and the potential for collisions between through vehicles and left turning vehicles which is particularly important along higher speed rural roads.

### 3.1.2 Growth Rates

Growth rates and rational were provided by the Region’s Transportation Planning Group, and are as follows. The Growth Rates for Airport Road and all cross-streets within the study area were determined based on a review of traffic counts in the past 10 years, general travel patterns from the Regional travel demand forecasting model (Emme 3), and population and employment growth in the surrounding study area. The final results are shown in Table 15.

Airport Road has 3\% annual growth for the next 10 years. The rate is relatively high due to the fact that Airport Road is a major north-south arterial road which crosses into Toronto and major 400 -series highways such as 407,409 and 427 and also connects a few northern communities such as Mono and Collingwood to the south. The growth will decrease to $2 \%$ after 10 years because of road capacity restraints and limited growth rate in the long term.

On the other hand, King Street has only a $1 \%$ growth rate annually for the next 10 years given that there won't be any major development or new communities along the road in the future. However, the rate will increase to $2 \%$ after 10 years since more drivers will use the road as an alternative east-west route as Mayfield Road, located south of King Street, will have longer travel times caused by the commuters from new developments along the road.

Old School Road / Healey Road is the closest east-west road to Mayfield Road for southbound traffic. Therefore, some drivers will use this road instead of Mayfield Road. Even though the growth rate is relatively high, it is not significant in terms of the number of vehicles. The road capacity restraint will also cause in a $1 \%$ reduction in annual growth after 10 years.

Table 15 - Annual Growth Rates

| Corridor | 2011-2021 Growth Rate (\%) | 2021-2031 Growth Rate (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road | 3 | 2 |
| King Street | 1 | 2 |
| Old School Road- Healey Road | 3 | 2 |

### 3.2 2021 Traffic

### 3.2.1 Link / Mid-block Analysis

Link volumes were calculated based on the Regional travel demand forecasting model which is based on AM peak hour conditions and the existing traffic count. Table 16 summarizes the AM peak hour link volumes on sections of Airport Road between intersections. PM link volumes were obtained by applying the growth rates to existing traffic count data as summarized in Table 17. Using the theoretical link capacity of 900 vehicles per hour per lane, the analysis of 2021 and 2031 forecasted volumes on the existing two lane cross-section of Airport Road suggests that traffic volumes exceed a V/C ratio of 1.0 in 2021 and beyond. However, since intersections with traffic control tend to present greater capacity restraints than free-flow road links, intersection analysis was undertaken.

Table 16 - AM Peak Hour Link Volume Forecasts on Airport Road

| Road Segment | 2021 |  | 2031 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southbound | Northbound | Southbound | Northbound |
| King to Old School/Healey | 834 | 210 | 998 | 253 |
| Old School/Healey to "Street A: | 1083 | 228 | 1302 | 271 |

Table 17 - PM Peak Hour Link Volume Forecasts on Airport Road

| Road Segment | 2021 |  | 2031 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southbound | Northbound | Southbound | Northbound |
| King to Old School/Healey | 309 | 1048 | 353 | 1218 |
| Old School/Healey to "Street A: | 400 | 948 | 463 | 1089 |

### 3.2.2 Weekday Peak Hour Traffic Volume

TMC projections for 2021 are shown in Exhibit 7. In addition, traffic forecasts from the Regional travel demand forecasting model were compared against the projected volumes presented in the 2009 Caledon Needs Study Update report on a screenline level for validation.

Exhibit 7-2021 Peak Hour TMCs


### 3.2.3 2021 LOS - Do Nothing

Table 18 summarizes the 2021 horizon year V/C ratios and LOS for the study intersections assuming current geometric configurations with no new construction. Since signal timing optimization is relatively simple to implement, optimized signal timings were assumed at the intersection of Airport Road and King Street. Using the intersection optimization features in Synchro, it was determined that allocating additional green time to the north-south phase within the same cycle length (4 seconds greater than the current split of 40 seconds) at the expense of east-west green time would improve operation at the intersection. No changes to the AM peak signal timings were recommended. Detailed Synchro HCM reports are found in Appendix F.

Airport Road (1KM north of Mayfield Road to 0.6KM North of King Street) Needs Assessment and Safety Performance Preliminary Draft Report
Table 18 - 2021 Intersection Operations - Do Nothing

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / King Street | AM | $0.80($ SBTR | 19.8 | B |
|  | PM | $0.87 / 0.86(\mathrm{WBTR} / \mathrm{NBTR})$ | 25.6 | C |
| Airport Road/Old School Road | AM | $0.76(\mathrm{~EB})$ | 7.4 | - |
|  | PM | $0.36(\mathrm{~EB})$ | 5.4 | - |
| Airport Road/Healey Road | AM | $0.51(\mathrm{WB})$ | 6.0 | - |
|  | PM | $1.56(\mathrm{WB})$ | 71.9 | - |
| Airport Road / "Street A" | AM | $0.67(\mathrm{WBL})$ | 13.4 | B |
|  | PM | $0.85(\mathrm{WBL})$ | 26.7 | C |

Overall, the intersections within the study area continue to operate at acceptable levels of service with the exception of the intersection of Airport Road and Healey Road during the PM peak period. In particular, the westbound movement operates over one-and-ahalf times greater than the capacity of the approach, and delays at the intersection are in excess of one minute.

### 3.2.4 2021 Intersection Capacity Analysis - Intersection improvements

Table 19 summarizes the 2021 horizon year V/C ratios and LOS at an offset signalized intersection of Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey Road. Detailed Synchro HCM reports are found in Appendix G.

Table 19-2021 Intersection Operations at Offset Old School Road/Healey Road

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road | AM | $1.07($ SBTL | 65.0 | E |
|  | PM | $1.0(\mathrm{WB}) / 1.01(\mathrm{NB})$ | 64.8 | E |

The analysis shows that maintaining the offset configuration yields LOS E for both the AM and PM peak periods, operating at or above capacity on the respective critical movements.

Based on the capacity and safety impacts an offset, signalized intersection presents, further analysis was conducted assuming a realigned intersection. Regional practice is to include exclusive left turn lanes at signalized intersections. TAC guidelines specify that an auxiliary right turn lane should be considered when right turning volumes are 10 to 20 percent of the total approach volumes. The eastbound and westbound right turning volumes for the AM and PM peak periods, as well as northbound right turn during the AM period fall within these guidelines. Therefore, auxiliary right turn lanes are recommended on these approaches. Although southbound right turning volumes are low, a southbound right turn taper is recommended in order to reduce interference with through traffic. The addition of auxiliary left and right turning lanes at Airport Road and Old School / Healey Road is summarized in Table 20. Detailed Synchro HCM reports are found in Appendix H.

Table 20 - 2021 Intersection Operations at Realigned Old School Road - Healey Road with Auxiliary Lanes

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / | AM | $0.85($ SBT) | 18.1 | B |
| Old School Road-Healey Road | PM | $0.82(\mathrm{NBT})$ | 17.2 | B |

The addition of right turn lanes on all approaches at Airport and King Street were analyzed in order to reduce friction and conflicts between through and right turning movements. This summary can be found in Table 21 and detailed Synchro HCM reports are found in Appendix I.

Table 21-2021 Intersection Operations at Airport Road and King Street with Auxiliary Lanes

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / King Street | AM | 0.74 (SBT) | 17.6 | B |
|  | PM | 0.77 (NBT) | 18.1 | B |

The analysis indicates that all subject intersections in the study area operate at acceptable levels of service with the signalization and realignment of Airport and Old School Road / Healey Road and the addition of auxiliary turning lanes at both intersections.

### 3.2.5 2021 Roundabout Analysis

Airport Road / King Street - ARCADY Analysis - Analysis based on 2021 traffic volumes indicate a single lane roundabout will operate at an unacceptable LOS F during both the AM and PM peak periods as shown in Table 22. Both the north and south approaches operate at a LOS F during the AM and PM peak periods respectively.

Two-lane flared entries were assessed on the northbound and southbound approaches with the analysis indicating they will operate at acceptable levels as shown in Table 23. The addition of the two lane entries on the north and south approaches on Airport Road result in the east approach on King Street operating at a LOS F, and, as such, the east leg was also assessed with a flared two-lane entry. This additional flared entry allows the east approach and overall intersection to operate at a LOS A as shown in Table 24.
Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road ARCADY Analysis - Analysis based on 2021 traffic volumes indicate that a single lane roundabout will operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the AM peak period and LOS D during the PM peak period as shown in Table 22. Both the north and south approaches operate at a LOS F during the AM and PM peak periods respectively.

Two-lane flared entries were assessed on the north and south approaches. The additional capacity provided by the two-lane entries allow the roundabout to operate at a LOS A in both the AM and PM periods as shown in Table 23.

Detailed ARCADY reports based on 2021 forecast volumes can be found in Appendix J.
Table 22 - ARCADY Roundabout Analysis 2021 Traffic Volumes (Single Lane)

| Airport Road and King Street |  |  |  | Airport Road and Healey Road - Old School Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Entry Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { AM } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | Approach | Entry Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| King Street East | Single | A | C | Healey Road | Single | A | C |
| Airport Road North | Single | F | A | Airport Road North | Single | F | A |
| King Street West | Single | B | A | Old School Road | Single | B | A |
| Airport Road South | Single | A | F | Airport Road South | Single | A | F |
| Overall | Single | F | F | Overall | Single | F | D |

Table 23- ARCADY Roundabout Analysis 2021 Traffic Volumes (Multi Lane Approaches)

| Airport Road and King Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Entry <br> Lanes | AM <br> LOS | PM <br> LOS | Approach | Entry <br> Lanes | AM <br> LOS | PM <br> LOS |
| King Street East | Single | A | F | Healey Road | Single | A | C |
| Airport Road North | Dual | A | A | Airport Road North | Dual | A | A |
| King Street West | Single | C | A | Old School Road | Single | B | A |
| Airport Road South | Dual | A | A | Airport Road South | Dual | A | A |
| Overall | Multi | A | C | Overall | Multi | A | A |

Table 24 - ARCADY Roundabout Analysis 2021 Traffic Volumes Airport Road and King Street

| Airport Road and King Street |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Entry Lanes | AM <br> LOS | PM <br> LOS |
| King Street East | Dual | A | A |
| Airport Road North | Dual | A | A |
| King Street West | Single | C | A |
| Airport Road South | Dual | A | B |
| Overall | Multi | A | A |

### 3.2.6 2021 LOS - Widen to Four Lanes

Table 25 summarizes the 2021 horizon year V/C ratios and LOS for the study intersections assuming a four-lane cross-section as well as left and right turning lanes on all approaches at the intersections of Airport and Old School / Healey Road and Airport and King Street Detailed Synchro HCM reports are found in Appendix K.

Table 25-2021 Intersection Operations - Widen to Four Lanes

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / King Street | AM | $0.57(\mathrm{WBT})$ | 13.8 | B |
|  | PM | $0.57(\mathrm{EBT})$ | 13.9 | B |
| Airport Road/Old School Road-Healey Road | AM | $0.48(\mathrm{SBT})$ | 11.5 | B |
|  | PM | $0.49(\mathrm{WBT} / \mathrm{NBT})$ | 12.4 | B |

The analysis shows that a widening Airport Road and the addition of right and left turn lanes improves LOS at all subject intersections.

### 3.2.7 2021 Queuing Analysis

Left and right turning storage needs were calculated for the 2021 horizon year using both the Region standards and the synchro $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues. The analysis includes the addition of left and right turn auxiliary lanes based on the 2021 recommended lane configuration. Regardless of the calculated queues lengths the Region of Peel uses a minimum storage of 30 m for all left turn lanes.

Table 26-2021 Storage Requirements - recommended lane configuration

| Intersection | Existing Storage <br> (m) | Required <br> Storage <br> Region <br> Method <br> (m) | Required <br> Storage <br> Synchro 95 <br> percentile <br> (m) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 40 | 14 | 11 |
| Airport Road and King Street | - | 21 | 9 |
| Northbound Left | 35 | 28 | 26 |
| Northbound Right | - | 7 | 6 |
| Southbound Left | 60 | 14 | 11 |
| Southbound Right | - | 14 | 5 |
| Eastbound Left | 35 | 28 | 20 |
| Eastbound Right | - | 28 | 13 |
| Westbound Left | - | 7 |  |
| Westbound Right | - | 7 | 4 |
| Airport Road and Old School Healey | - | 14 | 5 |
| Northbound Left | 45 | 7 | 2 |
| Northbound Right | - | 7 | 2 |
| Southbound Left | - | 7 | 5 |
| Southbound Right | - | 14 | 6 |
| Eastbound Left | - | 28 | 12 |
| Eastbound Right |  |  | 15 |
| Westbound Left |  |  |  |
| Westbound Right |  |  | 7 |

The existing storage lengths exceed the calculated required storage lengths based on 2021 traffic volumes. There are several new auxiliary lanes that will need to be designed based on the minimum storage of 30 m for left turn lanes and the storage requirements outlined in Table 26.

### 3.2.8 2021 Summary of Recommended Improvements

A widening of Airport Road to four lanes is recommended by 2021 based on a link capacity of 900 vehicles. In absence of a road widening, sufficient capacity on Airport Road is expected to be available in 2021 with a two-lane cross-section based on the improvements identified in the existing conditions analysis as well as the recommendations below:

- Airport Road - Based on the number of developments and full-moves accesses currently in place (especially in the Sandhill area) a two-way left turn lane is recommended to be constructed to reduce friction and conflicts between through movements and left turning vehicles throughout the study area.
- Airport Road / King Street - A multilane roundabout with flared two-lane entries on the north, south and east approaches would be required based on 2021 traffic volumes.
- Airport Road / King Street - In the absence of a roundabout, the addition of auxiliary right turning lanes on all approaches to separate turning volumes from through movement volumes, increasing intersection safety and capacity.
- Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road - A multilane roundabout with flared two-lane entries on the north and south approaches would be required based on 2021 traffic volumes.
- Airport Road / Old School Road - Healey Road - In the absence of a roundabout, a realignment of the intersection, signalization and the installation of right and left turning auxiliary lanes on all approaches is recommended.


### 3.3 2031 Traffic

### 3.3.1 Development in the Study Area

No additional developments within the study area have been identified beyond the 2021 horizon. As such, Tullamore Secondary Plan Transportation site trips used in the 2021 analysis remained constant for the 2031 analysis.

### 3.3.2 2031 Link / Mid-block Analysis

A theoretical link capacity of 900 vehicles per hour per lane was applied to the existing volumes to assess a V/C ratio for each link of Airport Road. Based on the 2021 link volumes, under the existing 2 lane cross section, Airport Road has a maximum link V/C ratio of 1.44 in the AM peak hour, which occurs south of Healey Road. The existing PM peak hour has a maximum link V/C ratio of 1.35 occurring north of Old School Road.

### 3.3.3 Weekday Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

TMC projections for 2031 are shown in Exhibit 8. Regional traffic forecasts were once again cross-referenced against those in the 2009 Caledon Needs Study Update report.

Exhibit 8-2031 Peak Hour TMCs


### 3.3.4 2031 Level of Service - Do Nothing

Table 27 summarizes the 2031 horizon year V/C ratios and LOS for the study intersections assuming current geometric configurations with no new construction. As in the 2021 "do nothing" analysis, optimized signal timings were assumed at the intersection of Airport Road and King Street. Using intersection optimization features in Synchro, it was determined that increasing the cycle length to 80 seconds during the AM peak period and to 75 seconds during the PM peak period would improve operation at the intersection. Detailed Synchro HCM reports are found in Appendix L.

Table 27-2031 Intersection Operations - Do Nothing

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / King Street | AM | $0.92(\mathrm{SBTR})$ | 29.1 | C |
|  | PM | $1.02 / 1.0(\mathrm{WBTR} / \mathrm{NBTR})$ | 47.8 | D |
| Airport Road / Old School Road | AM | $1.26(\mathrm{~EB})$ | 27.2 | - |
|  | PM | $0.65(\mathrm{~EB})$ | 9.5 | - |
| Airport Road / Healey Road | AM | $0.99(\mathrm{WB})$ | 15.7 | - |
|  | PM | $2.45(\mathrm{WB})$ | 171.8 | - |
| Airport Road / "Street A" | AM | $0.67(\mathrm{WBL})$ | 13.4 | B |
|  | PM | $0.87(\mathrm{WBL})$ | 28.0 | C |

Overall, the intersections within the study area operate near or above capacity with poor levels of service, with the exception of the intersection of Airport Road and King Street during the AM peak, and the western leg of the intersection of Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey Road in the PM peak. Of particular note is the westbound movement at the intersection of Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey Road during the PM peak period, which operates at nearly two-and-a-half times greater than the capacity of the approach, and delays at the intersection are just under three minutes.

### 3.3.5 2031 Intersection Capacity Analysis - Old School Road/Healey Road

Table 28 summarizes the 2031 horizon year V/C ratios and LOS at an offset signalized intersection of Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey Road using the existing lane configurations. Detailed Synchro HCM reports are found in Appendix M.

Table 28 - 2031 Intersection Operations at Offset Old School Road / Healey Road Existing Configuration

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road | AM | $1.18 / 1.14(\mathrm{~EB} / \mathrm{SBTR})$ | 99.9 | F |
|  | PM | $1.18 / 1.14(\mathrm{NB} / \mathrm{WB})$ | 110.8 | F |

The analysis shows that maintaining the offset configuration yields LOS F for the AM and PM peak periods, with the critical movements operating above capacity.

Using intersection optimization features in Synchro, it was determined that realigning the intersection to not be offset and installing auxiliary left and right turn lanes as per the 2021 recommended scenario would significantly improve operations at the intersection as shown in Table 29. Although a realignment of the intersection provides a large improvement, the southbound through movement and northbound through movements are both approaching capacity in the AM and PM peak periods respectively, indicating a widening would be of benefit. Detailed Synchro reports are found in Appendix $\mathbf{N}$

Table 29 - 2031 Intersection Operations at Realigned Old School Road / Healey Road with Auxiliary Lanes

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road | AM | 0.97 (SBT) | 29.8 | C |
|  | PM | 0.88 (NBT) | 22.1 | C |

The addition of right turn lanes on all approaches at Airport Road and King Street as per the recommendations in the 2021 scenario were analyzed. While the addition of the auxiliary lanes provides a little relief in the form of extra capacity, the critical movements are still approaching capacity indicating a widening would be of benefit. This summary can be found in Table 30 and Detailed Synchro reports are found in Appendix N.

Table 30-2031 Intersection Operations at Airport Road and King Street with Auxiliary Lanes

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / King Street | AM | 0.87 (SBT) | 23.0 | C |
|  | PM | 0.90 (NBT) | 25.9 | C |

### 3.3.6 2031 LOS - Widen to four lanes

Table 31 summarizes the 2031 horizon year V/C ratios and LOS for the study intersections assuming a four-lane cross-section including the auxiliary lane improvements identified in the 2021 analysis. Detailed Synchro HCM reports are found in Appendix 0.
Table 31-2031 Intersection Operations - Widen to Four Lanes

| Intersection | Peak Hour | Max. V/C | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road / King Street | AM | 0.65 (WBT) | 15.5 | B |
|  | PM | $0.62($ NBT $)$ | 13.9 | B |
| Airport Road/Old School Road-Healey Road | AM | 0.57 (SBT) | 12.8 | B |
|  | PM | 0.54 (WBT) | 12.8 | B |

The analysis shows that a four-lane widening in addition to left and right turning auxiliary lanes allow the subject intersections to operate at acceptable LOS. The proposed lane configuration based on a signalized scenario is shown in Exhibit 9.

Exhibit 9-2031 Signalized configuration


### 3.3.7 2031 Queuing Analysis

Left and right turning storage needs were calculated for the 2031 horizon year and include the addition of left and right turn auxiliary lanes based on the 2031 recommended lane configuration. Regardless of the calculated queues, the Region of Peel uses a minimum storage of 30 m for all left turn lanes.

Table 32-2031 Storage Requirements - Recommended lane configuration

| Intersection | Existing Storage <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | Required <br> Storage <br> Region Method <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | Required <br> Storage <br> Synchro 95 <br> percentile |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 40 | 14 | 10 |
| Airport Road and King Street | - | 21 | 7 |
| Northbound Left | 35 | 35 | 32 |
| Northbound Right | - | 14 | 6 |
| Southbound Left | 60 | 14 | 11 |
| Southbound Right | - | 14 | 6 |
| Eastbound Left | 35 | 28 | 25 |
| Eastbound Right | - | 35 | 17 |
| Westbound Left |  |  |  |
| Westbound Right | - | 7 | 4 |
| Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey | - | 7 | 5 |
| Road | - | 14 | 9 |
| Northbound Left | 45 | 7 | 2 |
| Northbound Right | - | 7 | 5 |
| Southbound Left | - | 7 | 7 |
| Southbound Right | - | 14 | 13 |
| Eastbound Left | - | 28 | 19 |
| Eastbound Right |  |  |  |
| Westbound Left |  |  |  |
| Westbound Right |  |  |  |

The storage lengths for the existing lanes meet or exceed the calculated required storage lengths based on 2031 traffic volumes. There are several new auxiliary lanes that would need to be designed based on the minimum 30m storage for left turn lanes and the storage requirements outlined in Table 26.

### 3.3.8 2031 Roundabout Analysis

Airport Road / King Street ARCADY Analysis - Analysis based on 2031 traffic volumes, using the 2021 approach geometrics (two-lane flared entries on the north, south and east approaches) indicate that the west and north approaches will operate at a LOS F and LOS D respectively during the AM peak period, and the south approach will operate at a LOS F during the PM peak period as shown in Table 33.

Based on these results, a two-lane entry was added to the west approach and the model was updated to reflect a widening to 4 lanes on Airport Road. The additional west approach lanes in combination with a the 2 approach lanes (due to the widening) and 2 entry lanes into the roundabout on the north and south approaches allow the roundabout to operate at a LOS A in both the AM and PM peak periods as shown in Table 34.

Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road ARCADY Analysis - Analysis based on 2031 traffic volumes and using the 2021 approach geometrics (two-lane entries on the north and south approaches) indicate that a roundabout would operate at an unacceptable LOS E during the PM peak, with the Healey Road (east approach) operating at a LOS F ( $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues in excess of 63 vehicles and delays over two minutes) as shown in Table 33. It should be noted that although the Old School Road (west approach) operates at a LOS D queues in the model are acceptable at a $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue of 8 vehicles and a half of a minute delay.

Both a right turn bypass and two-lane entries were assessed for Healey Road using both a 2 lane cross section (Table 36) and 4 lane cross section (Table 35) on Airport Road. Based on the analysis using either a right turn bypass or a two-lane entry on Healey Road would allow the approach to operate at acceptable levels of service.

In the 2 lane cross section scenario, the north approach on Airport Road operates at a LOS C with $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues of 20 vehicles and a delay of approximately 15 seconds. A full widening to a 4 lane cross section was modelled as to determine the effects of a four-lane widening on Airport Road in the study area. The widening allows the north approach and overall roundabout to operate at a LOS A during the AM and PM peak periods.

Detailed ARCADY reports are found in Appendix P.

Table 33-2031 ARCADY Roundabout Analysis- (lane configuration as per 2021 analysis)

| Airport Road and King Street |  |  |  | Airport Road and Healey / Old School Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Entry <br> Lanes | AM <br> LOS | PM <br> LOS | Approach | Entry <br> Lanes | AM <br> LOS | PM <br> LOS |
| King Street East | Dual | A | B | Healey Road | Single | A | F |
| Airport Road <br> North | Dual | D | A | Airport Road North | Dual | C | A |
| King Street West | Single | F | B | Old School Road | Single | D | A |
| Airport Road <br> South | Dual | A | F | Airport Road South | Dual | A | A |
| Overall | Multi | D | D | Overall | Multi | B | E |

Table 34-2031 ARCADY Roundabout Analysis Airport Road and King Street 4 lane widening
Airport Road and King Street - With

| Widening |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Entry <br> Lanes | AM <br> LOS | PM <br> LOS |
| King Street East | Dual | A | B |
| Airport Road <br> North | Dual | A | A |
| King Street West | Dual | A | A |
| Airport Road <br> South | Dual | A | B |
| Overall | 2-lane | A | A |

Airport Road (1KM north of Mayfield Road to 0.6KM North of King Street) Needs Assessment and Safety Performance Preliminary Draft Report
Table 35-2031 ARCADY Roundabout Analysis Airport Road and Healey Road - Old School Road Healey Road RT Bypass vs. Two-Lane Entry 2-Lane cross section

| Airport Road and Healey / Old School Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Airport Road and Healey / Old School Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Entry <br> Lanes | AM <br> LOS | PM <br> LOS | Entry <br> Approach | AM <br> LOS | PM <br> LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | Single + RT <br> Bypass | A | C | Healey Road | Dual | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Airport Road North | Dual | C | A | Airport Road North | Dual | C | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | Single | D | A | Old School Road | Single | D | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | Dual | A | A | Airport Road South | Dual | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall | Multi | B | B | Overall | Multi | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 36-2031 ARCADY Roundabout Analysis Airport Road and Healey Road - Old School Road Healey Road RT Bypass vs Two-Lane Entry 4-Lane cross section

| Airport Road and Healey / Old School Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Airport Road and Healey / Old School Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | Entry <br> Lanes | AM <br> LOS | PM <br> LOS | Approach | Entry <br> Lanes | AM <br> LOS | PM <br> LOS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | Single + RT <br> Bypass | A | C | Healey Road | Dual | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Airport Road North | Dual | A | A | Airport Road North | Dual | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | Single | D | A | Old School Road | Single | D | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | Dual | A | A | Airport Road South | Dual | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall | Multi | A | A | Overall | Multi | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |

Based on the roundabout assessment, a full two-lane roundabout is recommended at Airport Road and King Street with a four lane widening (two-lane approaches) required northbound and southbound on Airport Road. King Street operates well with flared two lane entries (1 approach lane in advance of the roundabout). At Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey Road a multi-lane roundabout is recommended with a four lane widening (two-lane approaches) recommended northbound and southbound on Airport Road. Healey Road will require either a right turn bypass or a two lane entry. The two lane flared entry provides more capacity than the right turn bypass and is the recommended option. It is recommended that Old School Road operate with a single entry lane.

The proposed roundabout configuration is shown in Exhibit 10.
The roundabout(s) could be constructed in stages such that the 2021 recommended configuration be constructed as an interim stage, expanding the roundabouts to the ultimate 2031 configuration when required.

Exhibit 10-2031 Roundabout configuration


### 3.3.9 Summary of Recommended Improvements for 2031

Based on the analysis in the previous subsections, the following improvements will be required by 2031:

- Airport Road - A four lane widening through the study area is required.
- Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road - A partial two-lane roundabout is recommended with two-lane entries and approaches on the north and south approaches and either a right turn bypass or a flared two lane entry on Healey Road (east approach).
- Airport Road / King Street - A full two-lane roundabout is recommended with flared two-lane entries on the east and west approaches, with a two lane approaches and entries northbound and southbound on Airport Road.
- Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road - In the absence of the implementation of a roundabout at this intersection, the addition of auxiliary left and right turning lanes on all approaches to separate turning volumes from through movement volumes, increasing intersection safety and capacity are recommended.
- Airport Road / King Street - In the absence of the implementation of a roundabout at this intersection, the addition of auxiliary left and right turning lanes on all approaches to separate turning volumes from through movement volumes, increasing intersection safety and capacity are recommended.


## 4. Summary of Traffic Needs Assessment

Regional staff assessed the short term and long term needs for improvement on Airport Road and determined the ultimate lane requirements based on the 2021 and 2031 planning horizons.

The following is a summary of the traffic needs assessment findings:

- A preliminary traffic control signal assessment indicates that currently traffic signals must be considered at the intersection of Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey Road based on the OTM Book 12 warrant. Further signal analysis will be conducted independent of this report;
- A realignment of the intersection of Airport Road and Old School Road / Healey Road is recommended to occur as soon as is feasible.
- By 2031, a road widening to five lanes (four through lanes and a centre two way left turn) on Airport Road within the study will be required based on link level volumes and signal/roundabout analysis.
- Sight distance deficiencies were identified at the following addresses along Airport Road: 12404, 12484, 12541, 12577, and 12618 as a result of the vertical alignment of the road and should be rectified.
- Based on the number of developments and full-moves accesses currently in place, specifically in the Sandhill area, a two-way left turn lane is recommended to be constructed to reduce friction and conflicts between through movements and left turning vehicles.
- Airport Road / King Street - A full two-lane roundabout is recommended by 2031 with flared two-lane entries on the east and west approaches, with two- lane approaches and entries on the northbound and southbound on Airport Road.
- Airport Road / Old School Road-Healey Road - A partial two-lane roundabout is recommended by 2031 with two-lane entries and approaches on the north and south approaches and either a right turn bypass or a flared two lane entry on Healey Road (east approach).
- It is recommended that the roundabout(s) be designed and constructed in a staged approach such that the 2021 roundabout(s) are designed as an interim stage in an effort to minimize future throw away costs and property impacts, once capacity dictates that the roundabouts need to be expanded to the 2031 lane requirements.


## Appendix A

## Existing Conditions Intersection Capacity Analysis

|  |  | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group | 40 | 4 | 199 | 20 | 4 | 777 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0.25 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.26 |
| v/c Ratio | 50.2 | 29.3 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Control Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Delay | 50.2 | 29.3 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Total Delay | 8.6 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 23.1 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 12.1 | 2.6 | 6.7 | 1.8 | 0.3 | 31.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 124.0 |  | 413.6 |  |  | 265.7 |
| Internal Link Dist ( m ) |  |  |  | 145.0 | 70.0 |  |
| Turn Bay Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | 375 | 224 | 2404 | 1133 | 1008 | 3005 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.26 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]



|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | , |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 32 | 323 | 116 | 418 | 16 | 148 | 136 | 525 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.18 | 0.56 | 0.41 | 0.71 | 0.09 | 0.20 | 0.24 | 0.64 |
| Control Delay | 20.2 | 22.3 | 23.5 | 27.4 | 11.7 | 9.0 | 12.0 | 17.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 20.2 | 22.3 | 23.5 | 27.4 | 11.7 | 9.0 | 12.0 | 17.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 2.9 | 32.1 | 11.5 | 46.0 | 1.1 | 8.0 | 9.8 | 47.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 6.1 | 52.3 | 25.1 | 74.8 | 1.6 | 14.3 | 18.2 | 75.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 1346.7 |  | 1342.5 |  | 2950.1 |  | 3069.4 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 60.0 |  | 35.0 |  | 40.0 |  | 35.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 203 | 674 | 335 | 690 | 197 | 868 | 650 | 961 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.16 | 0.48 | 0.35 | 0.61 | 0.08 | 0.17 | 0.21 | 0.55 |

[^1]

|  |  | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group | 28 | 6 | 551 | 38 | 4 | 302 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0.18 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.10 |
| v/c Ratio | 49.7 | 27.7 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 2.6 |
| Control Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Delay | 49.7 | 27.7 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 2.6 |
| Total Delay | 6.0 | 0.0 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 7.6 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 8.5 | 1.8 | 19.8 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 11.3 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 124.0 |  | 413.6 |  |  | 265.7 |
| Internal Link Dist ( m ) |  |  |  | 145.0 | 70.0 |  |
| Turn Bay Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | 389 | 337 | 2935 | 828 | 481 | 2963 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.19 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.10 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^2]|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |




|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 76 | 410 | 44 | 560 | 44 | 514 | 76 | 155 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.59 | 0.63 | 0.21 | 0.88 | 0.08 | 0.62 | 0.28 | 0.21 |
| Control Delay | 42.9 | 24.4 | 20.4 | 38.8 | 10.4 | 16.7 | 14.2 | 9.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 42.9 | 24.4 | 20.4 | 38.8 | 10.4 | 16.7 | 14.2 | 9.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 8.3 | 45.1 | 4.1 | 64.9 | 2.9 | 43.8 | 5.5 | 8.9 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 15.3 | 67.4 | 8.1 | \#80.0 | 5.9 | 70.6 | 10.5 | 18.5 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) |  | 1346.7 |  | 1342.5 |  | 2950.1 |  | 3069.4 |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 60.0 |  | 35.0 |  | 40.0 |  | 35.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 134 | 671 | 213 | 654 | 613 | 969 | 317 | 872 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.57 | 0.61 | 0.21 | 0.86 | 0.07 | 0.53 | 0.24 | 0.18 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Appendix B

## Traffic Control Signals Warrant for Airport Road at Old School Road/Healey Road







## Ontario Traffic Inc.

| Count Date: |
| :--- |
| Intersection: |
| 30-Nov-11 |
| Major Road: Road \& Old School Road/Heale |
| Operating Speed of Major Road: $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
|  |
| Warrant \#1: Minimum Vehicular Volumes. |

A. All Approaches. 80\% Satisfied

B. Minor Street Both Approaches.


## Ontario Traffic Inc.

| Count Date: $\quad 30-$ Nov-11 |
| :--- |
| Intersection: Airport Road \& Old School Road |
| Major Road: Airport Road |
| Operating Speed of Major Road: $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
| Warrant \#2: Delay to Cross Traffic. |

A. Major Street Both Approaches.

Municipality: Peel
Major Road Runs: N/S one lane each way Operating under free flow conditions

B. Traffic Crossing Major Street.


## Ontario Traffic Inc.

| Count Date: 30-Nov <br> Intersection: Airport <br> Major Road: Airport <br> Operating Speed of | Old School Road/Heale <br> 80 km/hr | Municipality: Peel <br> Major Road Runs: N/S one lane each way Operating under free flow conditions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Not Satisfied |  |  |  |
| A. Renortable accidents within a twelve month period averaged over 36 consequtive months susceptible to correction by a traffic signal. |  |  |  |
| Minimum Requirements | Actual Number of Accidents | Average Number of Accidents | Fulfilled |
| 5 | 0 in 3 years | 0 per year | 0\% |
| B. Adequate trial of less restrictive remedies has failed to reduce accident frequency. |  |  | Yes |
| C. Either Warrant 1 (Minimum Vehicular Volume) or Warrant 2 (Delay to Cross Traffic) satisfied $80 \%$ or more. |  |  | Yes |

Warrant \#4: Combination Warrant.
(Used if no warrant satisfied 100\%)
Satisfied

| Minimum Requirements | Warrant Satisfied 80\% or More | Fulfilled |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Two Warrants | Warrant 1 (Minimum Vehicular Volume) | Yes |
| Satisfied 80\% | Warrant 2 (Delay to Cross Traffic) | Yes |
|  | Warrant 3 (Accident Experience) | No |

Conclusion: Traffic signal warranted.

## Ontario Traffic Inc.

Count Date: 30-Nov-11 Site \#: 0000720589

| Interval Time | Passenger Cars - North Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Trucks - North Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Cyclists - North Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians <br> North Cross |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  |  |  |
|  | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr |
| 7:00:00 | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 3 3 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 00 |  | 00 |  | 00 |  |
| 7:15:00 | $3 \quad 3$ |  | $132 \quad 129$ |  | , |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $5 \quad 5$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 7:30:00 | $14 \quad 11$ |  | 312180 |  | 3 |  | 11 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}10 & 5 \\ 19 & 9\end{array}$ |  | 00 |  | 00 |  | 0 |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 7:45:00 | $25 \quad 11$ |  | $481 \quad 169$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 8:00:00 | 36 |  | 635154 |  | 4 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0\end{array}$ |  | $30 \quad 11$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 8:15:00 | $42 \quad 6$ |  | $790 \quad 155$ |  | 5 |  | 10 |  | $39 \quad 9$ |  | 11 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 8:30:00 | $52 \quad 10$ |  | $901 \quad 111$ |  | 7 |  | 10 |  | 47 |  | 2 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  |
| 8:45:00 | $57 \quad 5$ |  | 1014113 |  | 70 |  | 10 |  | $52 \quad 5$ |  | $2 \begin{array}{ll}2 & 0\end{array}$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 9:00:00 | 62 |  | 1101 87 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | $66 \quad 14$ |  | 20 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 9:00:15 | 620 |  | 1101 0 |  | $10 \quad 0$ |  | 10 |  | $66 \quad 0$ |  | 20 |  | 00 |  | 0 |  | 00 |  | 00 |  |
| 11:00:00 | 62 |  | 1101 0 |  | $10 \quad 0$ |  | 10 |  | $66 \quad 0$ |  | 20 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 11:15:00 | 64 |  | $1139 \quad 38$ |  | $10 \quad 0$ |  | 10 |  | 73 |  | 3 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 11:30:00 | 65 |  | 120768 |  | 11 |  | 10 |  | 77 |  | 30 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 11:45:00 | 67 |  | 1250 43 |  | 12 |  | 2 |  | 82 |  | 3 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | 00 |  | 00 |  |
| 12:00:00 | 67 |  | $1283 \quad 33$ |  | 14 2 |  | 20 |  | $84-2$ |  | 30 |  | 00 |  | 0 |  | 0 0 |  | 0 0 |  |
| 12:15:00 | $69 \quad 2$ |  | 1330 47 |  | 15 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 88 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30:00 | 73 | 4 | 1376 | 46 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 94 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45:00 | 76 | 3 | 1420 | 44 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 98 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00:00 | 76 | 0 | 1457 | 37 | 19 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 107 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:15:00 | 76 | 0 | 1478 | 21 | 20 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 116 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:30:00 | 78 | 2 | 1518 | 40 | 21 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 121 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:45:00 | 79 | 1 | 1553 | 35 | 22 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 127 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00:00 | 81 | 2 | 1590 | 37 | 24 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 144 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00:36 | 81 | 0 | 1591 | 1 | 24 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00:00 | 81 | 0 | 1592 | 1 | 24 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15:00 | 82 | 1 | 1622 | 30 | 27 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 149 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30:00 | 84 | 2 | 1661 | 39 | 27 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 153 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45:00 | 86 | 2 | 1689 | 28 | 31 | 4 | 2 |  | 158 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 16:00:00 | 92 | 6 | 1735 | 46 | 34 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 165 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15:00 | 94 | 2 | 1776 | 41 | 36 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 172 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30:00 | 95 | 1 | 1817 | 41 | 38 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 180 | 8 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45:00 | 101 | 6 | 1852 | 35 | 41 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 185 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00:00 | 102 | 1 | 1887 | 35 | 41 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 191 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15:00 | 105 | 3 | 1926 | 39 | 43 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 195 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30:00 | 106 | 1 | 1963 | 37 | 45 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 199 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45:00 | 110 | 4 | 1989 | 26 | 47 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 204 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00:00 | 113 | 3 | 2020 | 31 | 49 |  | 5 |  | 205 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00:15 | 113 | 0 | 2020 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 205 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Ontario Traffic Inc.

Count Date: 30-Nov-11 Site \#: 0000720589

| Interval Time | Passenger Cars - East Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Trucks - East Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Cyclists - East Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians <br> East Cross |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  |  |  |
|  | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr |
| 7:00:00 | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 0 |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 7:15:00 | 7 |  | $12 \quad 12$ |  | 3 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 7:30:00 | 10 |  | $31 \quad 19$ |  | 6 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 7:45:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 8:00:00 | $\begin{array}{ll}16 & 6 \\ 24 & 8\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{rrr}38 & 7 \\ 52 & 14\end{array}$ |  | 916 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0\end{array}$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 8:15:00 |  |  | $62 \quad 10$ |  | 23 |  | 1 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  |
| 8:30:00 | $\begin{array}{lr}32 & 8 \\ 43 & 11\end{array}$ |  | $72 \quad 10$ |  | 26 |  | 10 |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  |
| 8:45:00 | 50 |  | 81 |  | 29 |  | 21 |  | $1 \begin{array}{ll}0 & 1\end{array}$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9:00:00 | 55 |  | 88 |  | $45 \quad 16$ |  | 3 |  | $1 \begin{array}{ll}1 & 0\end{array}$ |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9:00:15 | 55 |  | $88 \quad 0$ |  | 450 |  | 30 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | 00 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 00 |  |
| 11:00:00 | 55 0 |  | 88 0 |  | 450 |  | 30 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  |
| 11:15:00 | 56 |  | $92 \quad 4$ |  | $50 \quad 5$ |  | 30 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | 00 |  | 1 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 11:30:00 | 58 |  | 94 |  | 54 |  | 30 |  | 10 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 11:45:00 | 65 |  | 97 |  | 59 |  | 30 |  | 10 |  | 2 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | 00 |  | 00 |  |
| 12:00:00 | $67 \quad 2$ |  | 101 4 |  | $61 \quad 2$ |  | 30 |  | 10 |  | 20 |  | 00 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 12:15:00 | $69 \quad 2$ |  | 104 3 |  | 65 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30:00 | 73 | 4 | 106 | 2 | 67 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45:00 | 77 | 4 | 111 | 5 | 69 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00:00 | 79 | 2 | 114 | 3 | 71 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:15:00 | 83 | 4 | 119 | 5 | 76 | 5 | 4 |  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:30:00 | 87 | 4 | 123 | 4 | 83 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:45:00 | 93 | 6 | 128 | 5 | 87 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00:00 | 98 | 5 | 140 | 12 | 88 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00:36 | 98 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00:00 | 98 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15:00 | 106 | 8 | 150 | 10 | 94 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30:00 | 113 | 7 | 169 | 19 | 101 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45:00 | 121 | 8 | 181 | 12 | 109 | 8 | 6 |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00:00 | 127 | 6 | 204 | 23 | 121 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15:00 | 134 | 7 | 225 | 21 | 136 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30:00 | 143 | 9 | 262 | 37 | 148 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45:00 | 151 | 8 | 285 | 23 | 167 | 19 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00:00 | 160 | 9 | 354 | 69 | 195 | 28 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15:00 | 172 | 12 | 378 | 24 | 217 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30:00 | 184 | 12 | 430 | 52 | 250 | 33 | 6 |  | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45:00 | 188 | 4 | 459 | 29 | 263 | 13 | 6 |  | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00:00 | 195 | 7 | 475 | 16 | 284 | 21 | 6 |  | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00:15 | 195 | 0 | 475 | 0 | 284 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Ontario Traffic Inc.

Count Date: 30-Nov-11 Site \#: 0000720589

| Interval Time | Passenger Cars - South Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Trucks - South Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Cyclists - South Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians <br> South Cross |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  |  |  |
|  | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr |
| 7:00:00 | 0 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | 00 |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $1 \quad 1$ |  |
| 7:15:00 | 11 |  | $20 \quad 20$ |  | 3 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $3 \quad 3$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $2 \begin{array}{ll}1 & 1\end{array}$ |  |
| 7:30:00 | 10 |  | $44 \quad 24$ |  | 6 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 10 |  | 1 |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 2 |  |
| 7:45:00 |  |  | $75 \quad 31$ |  | 12 |  | 1 |  | 14 |  | 21 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 20 |  |
| 8:00:00 | $\begin{array}{ll}1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1\end{array}$ |  | $95 \quad 20$ |  | 19 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{array}$ |  | 16 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}2 & 1 \\ 2 & 0\end{array}$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 20 |  |
| 8:15:00 | 20 |  | 118 23 |  | 20 |  | 10 |  | 24 |  | 2 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |  |  |
| 8:30:00 | 2 |  | $144 \quad 26$ |  | 26 |  | 10 |  | $30 \quad 6$ |  | 20 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 2 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 \end{array}$ |  |
| 8:45:00 | 42 |  | 177 33 |  | 32 |  | 10 |  | $38 \quad 8$ |  | 3 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | 22 |  |
| 9:00:00 | 51 |  | $212 \quad 35$ |  | 38 |  | 10 |  | $48 \quad 10$ |  | 30 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 20 |  |
| 9:00:15 | 50 |  | 2120 |  | $38 \quad 0$ |  | 10 |  | $48 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 20 |  |
| 11:00:00 | 50 |  | 212 0 |  | $38 \quad 0$ |  | 10 |  | $48 \quad 0$ |  | 30 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 20 |  |
| 11:15:00 | 5 |  | $250 \quad 38$ |  | 40 |  | 10 |  | $54-6$ |  | 30 |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 20 |  |
| 11:30:00 | 5 |  | 272 22 |  | 42 |  | 10 |  | $63 \quad 9$ |  | 4 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 20 |  |
| 11:45:00 | 5 |  | 299 27 |  | 44 |  | 0 |  | 68 |  | 4 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | 00 |  | 2 |  |
| 12:00:00 | 5 |  | $325 \quad 26$ |  | 47 |  | 10 |  | 73 5 |  | 0 |  | 00 |  | 0 |  | 0 0 |  | 20 |  |
| 12:15:00 | 50 |  | $351 \quad 26$ |  | 48 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 81 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 12:30:00 | 6 | 1 | 375 | 24 | 51 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 88 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| 12:45:00 | 6 | 0 | 401 | 26 | 53 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 96 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 13:00:00 | 7 | 1 | 428 | 27 | 57 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 103 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| 13:15:00 | 7 | 0 | 469 | 41 | 59 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 116 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 13:30:00 | 7 | 0 | 503 | 34 | 63 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 120 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| 13:45:00 | 7 | 0 | 526 | 23 | 64 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 125 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 14:00:00 | 7 | 0 | 563 | 37 | 70 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 129 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| 14:00:36 | 7 | 0 | 563 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 15:00:00 | 7 | 0 | 563 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 15:15:00 | 9 | 2 | 629 | 66 | 75 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 135 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 15:30:00 | 13 | 4 | 693 | 64 | 79 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 142 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 |
| 15:45:00 | 14 | 1 | 766 | 73 | 86 | 7 | 2 |  | 148 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 16:00:00 | 14 | 0 | 848 | 82 | 92 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 151 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 16:15:00 | 18 | 4 | 928 | 80 | 98 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 154 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 |
| 16:30:00 | 23 | 5 | 1025 | 97 | 100 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 158 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 16:45:00 | 24 | 1 | 1142 | 117 | 106 | 6 | 5 |  | 164 | 6 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 17:00:00 | 25 | 1 | 1261 | 119 | 110 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 170 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 2 |
| 17:15:00 | 30 | 5 | 1368 | 107 | 111 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 175 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 2 |
| 17:30:00 | 31 | 1 | 1470 | 102 | 119 | 8 | 8 |  | 175 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| 17:45:00 | 34 | 3 | 1570 | 100 | 120 | 1 | 8 |  | 181 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| 18:00:00 | 38 | 4 | 1660 | 90 | 121 |  | 8 |  | 184 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| 18:00:15 | 38 | 0 | 1660 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 184 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Ontario Traffic Inc.

Count Date: 30-Nov-11 Site \#: 0000720589

| Interval Time | Passenger Cars - West Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Trucks - West Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Cyclists - West Approach |  |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians <br> West Cross |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  | Left |  | Thru |  | Right |  |  |  |
|  | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr | Cum | Incr |
| 7:00:00 | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 0 |  | 0 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 00 |  | 0 0 |  | 0 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 7:15:00 | 0 |  | $23 \quad 23$ |  | 3 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 7:30:00 | 0 |  | $40 \quad 17$ |  | 8 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 7:45:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |  |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 8:00:00 | 0 |  | $\begin{array}{rr}84 & 44 \\ 127 & 43\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{ll}13 & 5 \\ 20 & 7\end{array}$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 8:15:00 | 40 |  | $144 \quad 17$ |  | $26 \quad 6$ |  | 0 |  | 11 |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 8:30:00 | $6 \quad 2$ |  | $165 \quad 21$ |  | $33 \quad 7$ |  | $1 \begin{array}{ll}0 & 1\end{array}$ |  | 10 |  | 11 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $\begin{array}{ll}0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0\end{array}$ |  |
| 8:45:00 | $10 \quad 4$ |  | 18318 |  | $39 \quad 6$ |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  |
| 9:00:00 | $13 \quad 3$ |  | 19310 |  | 43 |  | 2 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  |
| 9:00:15 | 130 |  | 193 0 |  | 43 |  | 2 |  | 0 |  | 10 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 11:00:00 | 130 |  | 193 0 |  | 430 |  | 20 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 11:15:00 | 130 |  | 195 |  | 45 |  | 20 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 00 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 11:30:00 | $15 \quad 2$ |  | 199 |  | 48 |  | 31 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 11:45:00 | $17 \quad 2$ |  | 202 |  | 49 |  | 3 |  | $1 \begin{array}{ll}1 & 0\end{array}$ |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 |  |
| 12:00:00 | $17 \quad 0$ |  | 203 |  | 490 |  | 30 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 00 |  |
| 12:15:00 | 18 1 |  | 207 |  | 52 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30:00 | 19 | 1 | 211 | 4 | 57 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45:00 | 19 | 0 | 214 | 3 | 58 | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00:00 | 22 | 3 | 219 | 5 | 59 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:15:00 | 22 | 0 | 223 | 4 | 60 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:30:00 | 24 | 2 | 229 | 6 | 61 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:45:00 | 24 | 0 | 233 | 4 | 62 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00:00 | 24 | 0 | 239 | 6 | 64 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00:36 | 24 | 0 | 239 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00:00 | 24 | 0 | 239 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15:00 | 27 | 3 | 251 | 12 | 64 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30:00 | 30 | 3 | 268 | 17 | 66 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45:00 | 31 |  | 281 | 13 | 68 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00:00 | 33 | 2 | 298 | 17 | 69 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15:00 | 34 | 1 | 319 | 21 | 74 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30:00 | 34 | 0 | 334 | 15 | 76 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45:00 | 36 | 2 | 349 | 15 | 78 | 2 | 4 |  | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00:00 | 39 | 3 | 363 | 14 | 81 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15:00 | 44 | 5 | 377 | 14 | 82 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30:00 | 45 | 1 | 391 | 14 | 85 | 3 | 4 |  | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45:00 | 46 |  | 406 | 15 | 86 | 1 | 4 |  | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00:00 | 49 |  | 410 | 4 | 87 |  | 4 |  | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00:15 | 49 | 0 | 410 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix C

## Signalization of Offset Airport Road / Old School Road - Healey Road

|  | - |  | $\dagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 221 | 139 | 172 | 784 | 8 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.73 | 0.52 | 0.29 | 1.00 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 51.0 | 42.0 | 16.5 | 58.3 | 11.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 51.0 | 42.0 | 16.5 | 58.3 | 11.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 36.1 | 22.0 | 16.7 | $\sim 135.2$ | 0.3 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 44.0 | 27.9 | 29.3 | \#213.0 | 1.4 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) | 3361.2 | 290.8 | 1946.4 | 2950.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  |  | 45.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 313 | 307 | 603 | 786 | 569 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.71 | 0.45 | 0.29 | 1.00 | 0.01 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\longleftarrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 96 | 457 | 566 | 196 | 12 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.38 | 0.90 | 0.89 | 0.36 | 0.02 |
| Control Delay | 38.7 | 53.1 | 46.4 | 24.2 | 10.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 38.7 | 53.1 | 46.4 | 24.2 | 10.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 14.8 | 74.1 | 89.8 | 24.4 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 28.8 | 68.3 | \#161.7 | 44.4 | 1.9 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) | 3361.2 | 290.8 | 1946.4 | 2950.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) |  |  |  |  | 45.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 324 | 519 | 633 | 544 | 583 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.30 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 0.36 | 0.02 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Appendix D

## Roundabout Peer Review

## MEMORANDUM

## To: $\quad$ The Regional Municipality of Peel

## From: Ourston Roundabout Engineering

## Date: November 2, 2012

Subject: Airport Road Roundabout Capacity Analysis Review

This memo details our review of the capacity analysis of roundabouts at two potential locations: Airport Road at King Street, and Airport Road at Old School Road/Healey Road. The initial capacity analysis was performed by the Region of Peel using the ARCADY 8 software package.

## Airport Road at King Street

Turning movement forecasts were entered correctly as per the forecasts provided. Several geometric parameters were slightly unrealistic (e.g. using 4.50 metres instead of the effective maximum 4.25 metres for single-lane entry widths), and the analysis was not run using a y-intercept adjustment. ${ }^{1}$

Using typical default parameters, a full two-lane roundabout would be required by 2031. Adding right-turn channelizations on any leg would not avoid the need for a twolane entry. Northbound and southbound approaches and entries would need to be two lanes, and eastbound and westbound entries could flare from one-lane approaches to two lanes.

The interim 2021 scenario could be staged such that the eastbound entry need only be one lane. The 2011 counts indicate that the roundabout could open in a single-lane configuration, although the southbound entry would likely start experiencing moderate queues and delays shortly after construction (estimated to be 2013 or 2014).

## Airport Road at Old School Road/Healey Road

Turning movement forecasts were entered incorrectly for the 2011 a.m. peak hour, and (although insignificant to the results) the 2021 p.m. peak hour eastbound right-turn movement should be 13 vehicles instead of 19 vehicles as per the forecasts provided. Several geometric parameters were slightly unrealistic, and the analysis was not run using a y-intercept adjustment.

[^3]Using typical default parameters, a partial two-lane roundabout would be required by 2031. Flared two-lane entries would be needed northbound and southbound along Airport Road, a single-lane entry is sufficient eastbound on Old School Road, and either a flared two-lane entry or a single-lane entry with a right-turn bypass would be needed for the westbound approach on Healey Road.

The interim 2021 scenario would be of similar configuration except that the eastbound entry could remain one lane without a right-turn channelization. The 2011 traffic counts indicate that a single-lane configuration would operate well.

## Recommendations

At Airport Road and King Street, should a roundabout proceed as the preferred alternative we recommend construction of a partial two-lane design: two-lane entries northbound and southbound, and single-lane entries eastbound and westbound. When queues and delays are observed to be consistently high, the roundabout would require expansion to two-lane entries on all legs, assuming two-lane approaches north-south and one-lane approaches east-west.

At Airport Road and Old School Road and Healey Road, should a roundabout proceed as the preferred alternative we recommend construction of a single-lane design at the outset, with future expansion to flared two-lane entries northbound and southbound on Airport Road when queues and delays are observed to be consistently high.

A further staging consideration is the expansion of Airport Road to a four-lane crosssection, as is indicated by the Approach Road Half-Width parameters used in the analysis. The timing of the widening may affect capacity at the roundabouts and viceversa.

We hope the foregoing is helpful. Please advise if you have any questions or require further information.

Yours truly,

## OURSTON ROUNDABOUT ENGINEERING (CANADA)

(A Member of The Sernas Group Inc.)


Clayton Rudy, EIT
Project Coordinator


Philip Weber, P.Eng.
Senior Project Manager

## Appendix E

## ARCADY Roundabout Analysis 2011 Traffic Volumes <br> and Roundabout Screening Tool Results

## Airport Road at Old School / Healey Road 2011

## Single Lane Roundabout 2 Lane Cross Section

## Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | V-Approach <br> road hal-width <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | E-Entry <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | '- Effective <br> flare (ength <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | R-Entry <br> radius $(\mathbf{m})$ | D- Inscribed <br> circle diameter <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | PHI- Conflict <br> $($ entry) angle <br> (deg) | Exit <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Healey <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> North | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Old School <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> South | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95\% } \\ & \text { Queue } \\ & \text { (Veh) } \end{aligned}$ | Delay (s) | V/C Ratio | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | single lane -2 lane cross section - 2011 (Existing) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 0.10 | ? | 3.61 | 0.09 | A | 10.21 | B | $22 \%$ <br> [Airport Road North] |
| Airport <br> Road North | 2.84 | 7.00 | 12.93 | 0.75 | B |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 0.29 | ? | 6.37 | 0.23 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport <br> Road South | 0.21 | ? | 4.87 | 0.17 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/C Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | single lane -2 lane cross section- 2011 (Existing) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 0.62 | 1.00 | 6.52 | 0.38 | A | 6.10 | A | $71 \%$ <br> [Healey Road] |
| Airport Road North | 0.29 | ? | 5.04 | 0.22 | A |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 0.09 | ? | 3.75 | 0.08 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport <br> Road South | 1.00 | ? | 6.64 | 0.50 | A |  |  |  |

## Airport Road at King Street 2011

Single Lane Roundabout 2 Lane Cross Section

## Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V- Approach } \\ & \text { road half-width } \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { E. Entry } \\ \text { width }(m)}}{ }$ width (m) | I' - Effective flare length (m) | R-Entry radius (m) | D - Inscribed circle diameter (m) | PHI - Conflict (entry) angle (deg) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exit } \\ & \text { Only } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| King Street East | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport Road North | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| King Street West | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport Road <br> South | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Queue } \\ & \text { (Veh) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95\% } \\ & \text { Queue } \\ & \text { (Veh) } \end{aligned}$ | Delay (s) | $\underset{\text { Vatio }}{\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}}$ | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | DC Single lane- 2 lane cross section - 2011 (Existing) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| King Street East | 0.97 | ? | 6.63 | 0.50 | A | 11.99 | B | $\begin{gathered} 10 \% \\ \substack{\text { [Airport Road } \\ \text { North] }} \end{gathered}$ |
| Airport Road North | 3.29 | 10.00 | 19.10 | 0.78 | c |  |  |  |
| King Street West | 0.78 | 1.00 | 8.92 | 0.44 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 0.21 | ? | 5.83 | 0.17 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Queue } \\ & \text { (Veh) } \end{aligned}$ | 95\% Queue (Veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ (\mathrm{s}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { V/ C } \\ \text { Ratio } \end{gathered}$ | Los | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Intersection } \\ \text { Delay (s) } \end{array}$ | Intersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | DC Single lane-2 lane cross section - 2011 (Existing) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { King Street } \\ \text { East } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1.18 | ? | 9.24 | 0.54 | A | 8.05 | A | $34 \%$ <br> [Airport Road South] |
| Airport Road North | 0.33 | ? | 5.57 | 0.25 | A |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { King Street } \\ \text { West } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0.72 | 1.00 | 5.99 | 0.42 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 1.44 | 1.00 | 9.76 | 0.59 | A |  |  |  |

## Region of Peel <br> Roundabout Feasibility Screening Tool

|  |  | Roundabout Supportive? Supportive? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1) | Project name, File \#, Intersection Location (B/C/M, Street name, distance from major intersections, etc.): <br> Airport Road and Old School Road/Healey Road, approximately 3km south of King Street and approximately 3km north of Mayfield Road |  |
| 2) | Brief description of Intersection (No. of legs, Lanes on each leg, Total AADT, ADDT on each road). Attach or sketch a diagram of existing and horizon year TMCs: <br> 4-leg offset intersection: EB and WB legs each will have one travel lanes per direction, NB and SB legs will have 1-2 travel lane(s) per direction <br> Existing AADT on Airport Road 8,400 <br> Existing AADT on Old School Road 1,000 <br> Existing AADT on Healey Road 1,500 <br> See attached for existing AM / PM TMCs | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
| 3) | What operational problems are being experienced at this location? <br> Delays on Old School Road and Healey Road currently at LOS D/LOS E $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \boxtimes \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \square \end{array}$ |
| 4) | Is it a new intersection or a retrofit of an existing intersection? If existing, what is the existing type of traffic control? <br> Retrofit of existing offset two-way stop controlled intersection. $\qquad$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \boxtimes \\ \text { NO } \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \square \end{array}$ |


| 5) | Is the intersection near a major intersection or a railroad crossing? If so, how close and what type of traffic control exists at the adjacent intersection(s)? Will queues be a problem? Describe the corridor (eg.: average intersection spacing). <br> Closest major intersection is signalized and about 2 km to the south (Street A). Queues are not expected to be a problem. Average intersection spacing along this portion of Airport Road is $2-3 \mathrm{~km}$. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6) | Would the intersection be located within a coordinated signal network? | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
|  | The signal network along this segment of Airport Road is not suitable for coordination due to the average intersection spacing of $2-3 \mathrm{~km}$ and rural conditions. |  |
| 7) | Would the intersection be located on a preferred roundabout corridor? If yes why? | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \boxtimes \\ \text { NOO } \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \end{array}$ |
|  | The Airport Road corridor is a preferred roundabout corridor because it would maintain existing free-flow operation on Airport Road. Converting the signalized intersection of Airport Road and King Street would establish a 6 km -long free-flow corridor. |  |
| 8) | What is the collision history of the intersection over the past five years? Is there a collision problem that needs to be addressed? | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \end{array}$ |
|  | There were two property damage only collisions at this intersection between 2006-2010, which are too few to establish a trend that can be rectified by improvements. |  |
| 9) | Is the intersection scheduled for improvements or is it located within a corridor that is scheduled for improvements in the next 10 years? What is the ultimate cross-section of the approaching legs? <br> Airport Road is scheduled to be widened from two to five lanes by 2019. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |


| 10) | Are there expected to be special users at this intersection in the near future (ie. a person with disability, pedestrians, cyclists, large agricultural machinery, horses, etc.)? If yes, what special considerations would be required? <br> There is a moderate volume of through truck traffic on Airport Road (5-7\% heavy vehicles). Farm vehicles use this corridor. Few pedestrians have been observed within this segment of Airport Road. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11) | What traditional improvements are proposed for this intersection (traffic signals, all-way stop, auxiliary lanes, off-set re-alignment, etc)? | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
|  | Single left turn lanes on the northbound and southbound approaches, traffic control (signals or roundabout) and offset realignment are proposed. |  |
| 12) | If traffic signals are considered, does it meet the warrant for the horizon year? | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \mathrm{NO} \\ \text { NOL } \end{array}$ |
|  | Traffic signals are currently warranted. |  |
| 13) | What size of roundabout is being considered for this intersection (ie. single, two, three lane entry)? Please attach a Traffic Flow Worksheet, a lane configuration diagram and a sketch of how a roundabout would fit into the ROW. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \end{array}$ |
|  | A roundabout with one-lane entries on all legs would result in an Inscribed Circle Diameter (ICD) of 40m, though such a roundabout would be near capacity by 2031. Traffic assessment indicates that a single-lane roundabout would function poorer than a two-lane roundabout. A roundabout with two-lane entries on the Airport Road legs would result in an ICD of at least 55 m . |  |
| 14) | Are there property constraints at/near the intersection or is it restricted by a watercourse/parks/cemeteries/etc? If yes, what are they? <br> A house exists at the northeast corner very close to the road right-of-way. Private driveways are located opposite each offset east-west leg. |  |
|  |  |  |


| 15) | Terrain - Is the area on a grade/flat/rolling? <br> The surrounding area is flat. |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { yES } \begin{array}{r} \text { NO } \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \end{array} . \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16) | 20 Year Life Cycle Cost Estimate <br> Injury Collision Cost (ICC): $\qquad$ <br> Discount Rate (i): $\qquad$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \square \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | LIFE- CYCLE COST | ARISON |  |
|  | Cost Item | Other Traffic Control | Roundabout |  |
|  | Implementation Cost | \$ | \$ |  |
|  | Injury Collision Cost (Present Value) | \$ | \$ |  |
|  | Total Life Cycle Cost | \$ | \$ |  |
|  | Notes: <br> Implementation Cost <br> = sum of costs for construction, property, utility relocation, illumination, engineering (20\%), contingency (20\%) and maintenance (5\%) <br> Present Value of 20 Year Injury Collision Cost $=$ expected annual collision frequency x ICC $\left((1+i)^{20}-1\right) / i(1+i)^{20}$ <br> Monte Carlo Analysis may be required. If so, a range for the implementation cost (i.e. $10 \%, 50 \%, 90 \%$ probability) is required |  |  |  |



## Region of Peel <br> Roundabout Feasibility Screening Tool

|  |  | Roundabout Supportive? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1) | Project name, File \#, Intersection Location (B/C/M, Street name, distance from major intersections, etc.): <br> Airport Road and King Street $\qquad$ |  |
| 2) | Brief description of Intersection (No. of legs, Lanes on each leg, Total AADT, ADDT on each road). Attach or sketch a diagram of existing and horizon year TMCs: <br> 4-leg offset intersection: EB and WB legs each have one travel lanes per direction, NB and SB legs will have 1-2 travel lane(s) per direction Existing AADT on Airport Road 4,100 <br> Existing AADT on Old School Road 3,600 <br> See attached for existing AM / PM TMCs | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
| 3) | What operational problems are being experienced at this location? <br> Minor delays on King Street with LOS D $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
| 4) | Is it a new intersection or a retrofit of an existing intersection? If existing, what is the existing type of traffic control? <br> Existing signalized intersection with fully actuated control and no pedestrian push buttons $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \boxtimes \\ \text { NO } \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \square \end{array}$ |


| 5) | Is the intersection near a major intersection or a railroad crossing? If so, how close and what type of traffic control exists at the adjacent intersection(s)? Will queues be a problem? Describe the corridor (eg.: average intersection spacing). <br> Subject intersection is a major intersection, with minor queuing. Nearest signalized intersection approximately $4-5 \mathrm{~km}$ in all directions. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6) | Would the intersection be located within a coordinated signal network? <br> The signal network along this segment of Airport Road is not suitable for coordination due to the average intersection spacing of $2-3 \mathrm{~km}$ and rural conditions. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
| 7) | Would the intersection be located on a preferred roundabout corridor? If yes why? <br> The Airport Road corridor is a preferred roundabout corridor because it would increase free-flow operation on Airport Road northerly to Olde Base Line Road. Converting the signalized intersection of Airport Road and King Street would establish a 6km-long free-flow corridor along Airport Road and an 8km-long free-flow corridor along King Street. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \\ \text { NO } \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \square \end{array}$ |
| 8) | What is the collision history of the intersection over the past five years? Is there a collision problem that needs to be addressed? | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
| 9) | Is the intersection scheduled for improvements or is it located within a corridor that is scheduled for improvements in the next 10 years? What is the ultimate cross-section of the approaching legs? <br> Airport Road is scheduled to be widened from two to five lanes by 2019. $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |


| 10) | Are there expected to be special users at this intersection in the near future (ie. a person with disability, pedestrians, cyclists, large agricultural machinery, horses, etc.)? If yes, what special considerations would be required? <br> There is a moderate volume of through truck traffic on Airport Road (5-7\% heavy vehicles) and King Street (2-5\%). Farm vehicles use the two corridors. Few pedestrians have been observed at this intersection. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11) | What traditional improvements are proposed for this intersection (traffic signals, all-way stop, auxiliary lanes, off-set re-alignment, etc)? <br> Northbound and westbound right turn lane in 2031 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
| 12) | If traffic signals are considered, does it meet the warrant for the horizon year? <br> Exist | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |
| 13) | What size of roundabout is being considered for this intersection (ie. single, two, three lane entry)? Please attach a Traffic Flow Worksheet, a lane configuration diagram and a sketch of how a roundabout would fit into the ROW. <br> A roundabout with one-lane entries on all legs would result in an Inscribed Circle Diameter (ICD) of 40m, though such a roundabout would be near capacity by 2031. Traffic assessment indicates that a single-lane roundabout would function poorer than a two-lane roundabout. A roundabout with two-lane entries on the Airport Road legs would result in an ICD of at least 55 m . | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \boxtimes \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |
| 14) | Are there property constraints at/near the intersection or is it restricted by a watercourse/parks/cemeteries/etc? If yes, what are they? <br> Two structures exist on the north side of the intersection and are spaced approximately 30 metres apart, requiring a new roundabout to be constructed south of the intersection. Approved developments on the southeast corner further inhibit the ability to construct a roundabout. |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \boxtimes \end{gathered}$ <br> NEUTRAL |


| 15) | Terrain - Is the area on a grade/flat/rolling? <br> The surrounding area is flat. |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { yES } \begin{array}{r} \text { NO } \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \end{array} . \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16) | 20 Year Life Cycle Cost Estimate <br> Injury Collision Cost (ICC): $\qquad$ <br> Discount Rate (i): $\qquad$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { YES } \square \\ \text { NO } \square \\ \text { NEUTRAL } \square \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | LIFE- CYCLE COST | ARISON |  |
|  | Cost Item | Other Traffic Control | Roundabout |  |
|  | Implementation Cost | \$ | \$ |  |
|  | Injury Collision Cost (Present Value) | \$ | \$ |  |
|  | Total Life Cycle Cost | \$ | \$ |  |
|  | Notes: <br> Implementation Cost <br> = sum of costs for construction, property, utility relocation, illumination, engineering (20\%), contingency (20\%) and maintenance (5\%) <br> Present Value of 20 Year Injury Collision Cost $=$ expected annual collision frequency x ICC $\left((1+i)^{20}-1\right) / i(1+i)^{20}$ <br> Monte Carlo Analysis may be required. If so, a range for the implementation cost (i.e. $10 \%, 50 \%, 90 \%$ probability) is required |  |  |  |



## Appendix F

## 2021 Intersection Operations - Do <br> Nothing

|  | $\dagger$ | $4$ | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 230 | 15 | 213 | 522 | 28 | 995 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.67 | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.49 | 0.04 | 0.43 |
| Control Delay | 48.8 | 14.7 | 7.5 | 2.5 | 7.9 | 9.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 48.8 | 14.7 | 7.5 | 2.5 | 7.9 | 9.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 43.4 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 46.1 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 67.9 | 5.2 | 14.7 | 12.5 | 5.9 | 72.5 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 124.0 |  | 413.6 |  |  | 265.7 |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) |  |  |  | 145.0 | 70.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 589 | 537 | 1981 | 1061 | 719 | 2328 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.39 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.49 | 0.04 | 0.43 |

[^4]



|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | , |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 22 | 302 | 132 | 416 | 9 | 154 | 153 | 700 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.14 | 0.54 | 0.46 | 0.72 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0.27 | 0.81 |
| Control Delay | 19.1 | 22.2 | 24.8 | 28.4 | 12.1 | 9.1 | 12.1 | 24.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 19.1 | 22.2 | 24.8 | 28.4 | 12.1 | 9.1 | 12.1 | 24.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 2.0 | 29.7 | 13.3 | 45.8 | 0.6 | 8.7 | 11.2 | 73.1 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 6.9 | 51.0 | 28.2 | 74.4 | 3.1 | 18.2 | 22.3 | \#134.8 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) |  | 1346.7 |  | 1342.5 |  | 2950.1 |  | 3069.4 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 60.0 |  | 35.0 |  | 40.0 |  | 35.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 183 | 635 | 325 | 653 | 117 | 822 | 606 | 910 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.12 | 0.48 | 0.41 | 0.64 | 0.08 | 0.19 | 0.25 | 0.77 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | 7 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 635 | 30 | 918 | 220 | 9 | 484 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.85 | 0.04 | 0.62 | 0.28 | 0.06 | 0.33 |
| Control Delay | 37.9 | 5.2 | 27.7 | 4.4 | 24.4 | 22.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 37.9 | 5.2 | 27.7 | 4.4 | 24.4 | 22.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 111.1 | 0.0 | 74.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 33.7 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 156.2 | 4.7 | 121.1 | 15.8 | 5.2 | 58.5 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 124.0 |  | 413.6 |  |  | 265.7 |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) |  |  |  | 145.0 | 70.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1031 | 934 | 1480 | 775 | 154 | 1466 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.62 | 0.03 | 0.62 | 0.28 | 0.06 | 0.33 |

[^5]


Future 2021 PM- Do Nothing


|  | 4 |  | $t$ |  | 4 | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 56 | 387 | 50 | 433 | 59 | 866 | 74 | 273 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.45 | 0.77 | 0.35 | 0.87 | 0.10 | 0.86 | 0.59 | 0.29 |
| Control Delay | 34.4 | 35.7 | 28.7 | 43.4 | 8.5 | 25.0 | 36.0 | 9.3 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 34.4 | 35.7 | 28.7 | 43.4 | 8.5 | 25.0 | 36.0 | 9.3 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 6.1 | 46.0 | 5.3 | 49.8 | 3.5 | 88.8 | 6.1 | 16.9 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#17.7 | \#84.3 | 14.7 | \#97.2 | 8.6 | \#165.1 | \#26.8 | 29.8 |
| Internal Link Dist ( m ) |  | 1346.7 |  | 1342.5 |  | 2950.1 |  | 3069.4 |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 60.0 |  | 35.0 |  | 40.0 |  | 35.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 128 | 513 | 146 | 506 | 569 | 1004 | 125 | 929 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.44 | 0.75 | 0.34 | 0.86 | 0.10 | 0.86 | 0.59 | 0.29 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

## Appendix G

## 2021 Intersection Operations at Offset Old School Road/Healey Road

|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ | - | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 200 | 129 | 207 | 54 | 1022 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.60 | 0.50 | 0.20 | 0.07 | 0.86 |
| Control Delay | 39.6 | 36.1 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 21.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 39.6 | 36.1 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 21.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 29.8 | 17.7 | 11.4 | 3.0 | 120.9 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 50.9 | 34.5 | 21.0 | 7.2 | \#230.9 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) | 3361.2 | 290.8 | 1946.4 |  | 2950.1 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  | 40.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 389 | 304 | 1081 | 777 | 1237 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.51 | 0.42 | 0.19 | 0.07 | 0.83 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^6]|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | 1 | $4$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | \% |  | 1 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | \& |  |  | \$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | F |  |
| Volume (vph) | 5 | 164 | 31 | 35 | 67 | 27 | 3 | 178 | 26 | 54 | 1017 | 5 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.3 |  | 7.3 | 7.3 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.97 |  |  | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 1822 |  |  | 1782 |  |  | 1605 |  | 1733 | 1827 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.99 |  |  | 0.77 |  |  | 0.99 |  | 0.63 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1808 |  |  | 1387 |  |  | 1588 |  | 1146 | 1827 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 5 | 164 | 31 | 35 | 67 | 27 | 3 | 178 | 26 | 54 | 1017 | 5 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 54 | 1022 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 18\% | 11\% | 3\% | 5\% | 25\% |
| Turn Type | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 15.3 |  |  | 15.3 |  |  | 56.0 |  | 56.0 | 56.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 15.3 |  |  | 15.3 |  |  | 56.0 |  | 56.0 | 56.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.18 |  |  | 0.18 |  |  | 0.65 |  | 0.65 | 0.65 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.3 |  | 7.3 | 7.3 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 323 |  |  | 248 |  |  | 1039 |  | 750 | 1195 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | c0.56 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  | c0.11 |  |  | 0.09 |  |  | 0.13 |  | 0.05 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.60 |  |  | 0.48 |  |  | 0.19 |  | 0.07 | 0.85 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 32.3 |  |  | 31.6 |  |  | 5.9 |  | 5.4 | 11.6 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 4.4 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 0.2 |  | 0.1 | 6.8 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 36.7 |  |  | 34.6 |  |  | 6.1 |  | 5.5 | 18.4 |  |
| Level of Service |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | A |  | A | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 36.7 |  |  | 34.6 |  |  | 6.1 |  |  | 17.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 19.9 |  | HCM Level | of Service |  |  | B |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 85.6 |  | Sum of lost | ime (s) |  |  | 14.3 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 89.5\% |  | CU Level of | Service |  |  | E |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^7]|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 105 | 420 | 938 | 19 | 341 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.23 | 0.89 | 0.91 | 0.08 | 0.35 |
| Control Delay | 24.8 | 52.3 | 31.8 | 10.2 | 11.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 24.8 | 52.3 | 31.8 | 10.2 | 11.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 12.9 | 65.0 | 136.1 | 1.4 | 29.8 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 25.7 | \#116.4 | \#225.6 | 4.7 | 46.7 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 3361.2 | 290.8 | 1946.4 |  | 2950.1 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  | 40.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 464 | 488 | 1034 | 236 | 976 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.23 | 0.86 | 0.91 | 0.08 | 0.35 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

[^8]
## Appendix H

## 2021 Intersection Operations at Realigned <br> Old School Road - Healey Road with Auxiliary Lanes

|  | $\stackrel{*}{ }$ |  | 7 | 7 | - | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 5 | 164 | 31 | 35 | 67 | 27 | 3 | 178 | 26 | 54 | 1017 | 5 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.02 | 0.53 | 0.11 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.85 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 27.0 | 36.5 | 16.3 | 30.0 | 29.6 | 11.9 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 2.3 | 5.8 | 20.4 | 5.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 27.0 | 36.5 | 16.3 | 30.0 | 29.6 | 11.9 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 2.3 | 5.8 | 20.4 | 5.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 0.6 | 20.6 | 1.2 | 4.1 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 0.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.2 | 37.0 | 7.4 | 11.2 | 17.5 | 5.8 | 1.0 | 16.1 | 2.3 | 6.2 | \#192.9 | 1.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 3361.2 |  |  | 290.8 |  |  | 1946.4 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 252 | 350 | 318 | 222 | 353 | 322 | 110 | 1083 | 950 | 770 | 1197 | 837 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.02 | 0.47 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.85 | 0.01 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  | 4 |  | $\dagger$ | \% |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 22 | 253 | 49 | 132 | 392 | 24 | 9 | 119 | 35 | 153 | 653 | 47 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.13 | 0.46 | 0.10 | 0.42 | 0.70 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.25 | 0.74 | 0.06 |
| Control Delay | 19.6 | 22.4 | 6.8 | 23.8 | 28.3 | 7.9 | 10.8 | 10.1 | 3.5 | 11.4 | 19.9 | 5.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 19.6 | 22.4 | 6.8 | 23.8 | 28.3 | 7.9 | 10.8 | 10.1 | 3.5 | 11.4 | 19.9 | 5.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 1.9 | 24.0 | 0.3 | 12.3 | 40.5 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 58.6 | 1.3 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 6.4 | 41.4 | 6.2 | 25.5 | 65.6 | 4.2 | 2.7 | 14.7 | 3.4 | 19.6 | 94.5 | 5.4 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 1346.7 |  |  | 1342.5 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  | 3069.4 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 28.0 | 30.0 |  | 21.0 | 35.0 |  | 14.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 195 | 630 | 576 | 366 | 648 | 519 | 150 | 872 | 814 | 664 | 968 | 854 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.11 | 0.40 | 0.09 | 0.36 | 0.60 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.23 | 0.67 | 0.06 |

[^9]

|  | 4 |  | $\rangle$ | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 1 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 15 | 77 | 13 | 55 | 227 | 138 | 16 | 895 | 27 | 19 | 332 | 9 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.07 | 0.20 | 0.04 | 0.21 | 0.61 | 0.32 | 0.03 | 0.82 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.32 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 23.0 | 24.3 | 12.3 | 25.0 | 32.6 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 19.9 | 5.3 | 9.2 | 8.4 | 4.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 23.0 | 24.3 | 12.3 | 25.0 | 32.6 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 19.9 | 5.3 | 9.2 | 8.4 | 4.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 1.4 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 24.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 78.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 18.6 | 0.1 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 5.5 | 17.0 | 3.6 | 13.5 | 43.3 | 11.4 | 2.8 | \#150.6 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 31.0 | 1.5 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 3361.2 |  |  | 290.8 |  |  | 1946.4 |  | 2950.1 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 238 | 414 | 320 | 290 | 409 | 455 | 472 | 1102 | 892 | 152 | 1051 | 956 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.06 | 0.19 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.56 | 0.30 | 0.03 | 0.81 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.32 | 0.01 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


Future 2021 PM (Airport/Healey Realigned) Auxiliary Lanes

|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  | 4 | , | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 56 | 370 | 17 | 50 | 292 | 141 | 59 | 764 | 102 | 74 | 242 | 31 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.22 | 0.72 | 0.04 | 0.30 | 0.58 | 0.26 | 0.10 | 0.78 | 0.12 | 0.41 | 0.27 | 0.04 |
| Control Delay | 21.9 | 31.3 | 12.5 | 25.4 | 26.5 | 5.2 | 9.0 | 20.0 | 4.4 | 18.7 | 10.0 | 3.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 21.9 | 31.3 | 12.5 | 25.4 | 26.5 | 5.2 | 9.0 | 20.0 | 4.4 | 18.7 | 10.0 | 3.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 5.1 | 39.4 | 0.6 | 4.7 | 29.7 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 68.6 | 2.2 | 5.0 | 14.9 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 13.0 | 64.3 | 4.2 | 12.8 | 50.1 | 10.1 | 8.2 | \#109.8 | 7.8 | 15.6 | 26.1 | 3.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 1346.7 |  |  | 1342.5 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  | 3069.4 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 28.0 | 30.0 |  | 21.0 | 35.0 |  | 14.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 274 | 565 | 505 | 182 | 555 | 586 | 596 | 1030 | 923 | 189 | 948 | 885 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.65 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.53 | 0.24 | 0.10 | 0.74 | 0.11 | 0.39 | 0.26 | 0.04 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


## Appendix I

## 2021 Intersection Operations at Airport Road and King Street with Auxiliary Lanes

|  | $\stackrel{*}{ }$ |  | 7 | 7 | - | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 5 | 164 | 31 | 35 | 67 | 27 | 3 | 178 | 26 | 54 | 1017 | 5 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.02 | 0.53 | 0.11 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.85 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 27.0 | 36.5 | 16.3 | 30.0 | 29.6 | 11.9 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 2.3 | 5.8 | 20.4 | 5.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 27.0 | 36.5 | 16.3 | 30.0 | 29.6 | 11.9 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 2.3 | 5.8 | 20.4 | 5.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 0.6 | 20.6 | 1.2 | 4.1 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 0.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.2 | 37.0 | 7.4 | 11.2 | 17.5 | 5.8 | 1.0 | 16.1 | 2.3 | 6.2 | \#192.9 | 1.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 3361.2 |  |  | 290.8 |  |  | 1946.4 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 252 | 350 | 318 | 222 | 353 | 322 | 110 | 1083 | 950 | 770 | 1197 | 837 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.02 | 0.47 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.85 | 0.01 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  | 4 |  | $\dagger$ | \% |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 22 | 253 | 49 | 132 | 392 | 24 | 9 | 119 | 35 | 153 | 653 | 47 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.13 | 0.46 | 0.10 | 0.42 | 0.70 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.25 | 0.74 | 0.06 |
| Control Delay | 19.6 | 22.4 | 6.8 | 23.8 | 28.3 | 7.9 | 10.8 | 10.1 | 3.5 | 11.4 | 19.9 | 5.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 19.6 | 22.4 | 6.8 | 23.8 | 28.3 | 7.9 | 10.8 | 10.1 | 3.5 | 11.4 | 19.9 | 5.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 1.9 | 24.0 | 0.3 | 12.3 | 40.5 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 58.6 | 1.3 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 6.4 | 41.4 | 6.2 | 25.5 | 65.6 | 4.2 | 2.7 | 14.7 | 3.4 | 19.6 | 94.5 | 5.4 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 1346.7 |  |  | 1342.5 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  | 3069.4 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 28.0 | 30.0 |  | 21.0 | 35.0 |  | 14.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 195 | 630 | 576 | 366 | 648 | 519 | 150 | 872 | 814 | 664 | 968 | 854 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.11 | 0.40 | 0.09 | 0.36 | 0.60 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.23 | 0.67 | 0.06 |

[^10]

|  | 4 |  | $\rangle$ | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 1 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 15 | 77 | 13 | 55 | 227 | 138 | 16 | 895 | 27 | 19 | 332 | 9 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.07 | 0.20 | 0.04 | 0.21 | 0.61 | 0.32 | 0.03 | 0.82 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.32 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 23.0 | 24.3 | 12.3 | 25.0 | 32.6 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 19.9 | 5.3 | 9.2 | 8.4 | 4.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 23.0 | 24.3 | 12.3 | 25.0 | 32.6 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 19.9 | 5.3 | 9.2 | 8.4 | 4.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 1.4 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 24.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 78.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 18.6 | 0.1 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 5.5 | 17.0 | 3.6 | 13.5 | 43.3 | 11.4 | 2.8 | \#150.6 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 31.0 | 1.5 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 3361.2 |  |  | 290.8 |  |  | 1946.4 |  | 2950.1 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 238 | 414 | 320 | 290 | 409 | 455 | 472 | 1102 | 892 | 152 | 1051 | 956 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.06 | 0.19 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.56 | 0.30 | 0.03 | 0.81 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.32 | 0.01 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


Future 2021 PM (Airport/Healey Realigned) Auxiliary Lanes

|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  | 4 | , | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 56 | 370 | 17 | 50 | 292 | 141 | 59 | 764 | 102 | 74 | 242 | 31 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.22 | 0.72 | 0.04 | 0.30 | 0.58 | 0.26 | 0.10 | 0.78 | 0.12 | 0.41 | 0.27 | 0.04 |
| Control Delay | 21.9 | 31.3 | 12.5 | 25.4 | 26.5 | 5.2 | 9.0 | 20.0 | 4.4 | 18.7 | 10.0 | 3.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 21.9 | 31.3 | 12.5 | 25.4 | 26.5 | 5.2 | 9.0 | 20.0 | 4.4 | 18.7 | 10.0 | 3.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 5.1 | 39.4 | 0.6 | 4.7 | 29.7 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 68.6 | 2.2 | 5.0 | 14.9 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 13.0 | 64.3 | 4.2 | 12.8 | 50.1 | 10.1 | 8.2 | \#109.8 | 7.8 | 15.6 | 26.1 | 3.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 1346.7 |  |  | 1342.5 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  | 3069.4 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 28.0 | 30.0 |  | 21.0 | 35.0 |  | 14.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 274 | 565 | 505 | 182 | 555 | 586 | 596 | 1030 | 923 | 189 | 948 | 885 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.65 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.53 | 0.24 | 0.10 | 0.74 | 0.11 | 0.39 | 0.26 | 0.04 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


## Appendix J

## ARCADY Roundabout Analysis 2021 Traffic Volumes

## Airport Road at King Street 2021

Single Lane Roundabout 2 Lane Cross Section

| Roundabout Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leg | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V- Approach } \\ & \text { road half-width } \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { E. Entry } \\ \text { width }(m)}}{ }$ width (m) | I' - Effective flare length $(\mathrm{m})$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { R-Entry } \\ & \text { radius (m) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { D - Inscribed } \\ \text { circle diameter } \\ (\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ | PHI - Conflict (entry) angle (deg) | Exit Only <br> Only |
| King Street East | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport Road North | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| King Street West | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport Road South | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue <br> (Veh) | 95\% Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | Single lane all approaches -2 lane cross section - 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| King Street East | 1.29 | 1.00 | 7.79 | 0.57 | A | 134.63 | F | $-19 \%$ |
| Airport Road North | 76.21 | 126.00 | 281.86 | 1.17 | F |  |  |  |
| King Street West | 1.29 | 2.00 | 13.28 | 0.57 | B |  |  | [Airport Road North] |
| Airport Road South | 0.26 | ? | 5.26 | 0.21 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | Single lane all approaches -2 lane cross section - 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| King Street East | 3.12 | 10.00 | 21.92 | 0.77 | C | 260.81 | F | $-26 \%$ <br> [Airport Road South] |
| Airport Road North | 0.82 | 1.00 | 7.79 | 0.45 | A |  |  |  |
| King Street West | 1.09 | ? | 8.10 | 0.52 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 134.84 | 200.00 | 577.78 | 1.30 | F |  |  |  |

## Airport Road at King Street 2021

Multilane Roundabout N,S approaches 2 Lane Cross Section

Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | V-Approach <br> road hal-width <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | E-Entry <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | I' - Effective <br> flare length $(\boldsymbol{m})$ | R-Entry <br> radius $(\mathbf{m})$ | D- Inscribed <br> circle diameter <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | PHI- Conflict <br> (entry) angle <br> (deg) | Exit <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| King <br> Street East | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> North | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 48.00 | 20.00 |  |
| King <br> Street <br> West | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> South | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 48.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/C <br> Ratio | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | Dual lane North South approaches - 2 lane - 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| King Street East | 1.29 | 1.00 | 7.79 | 0.57 | A | 9.92 | A | 11\% <br> [King Street West] |
| Airport Road North | 2.45 | 4.00 | 9.56 | 0.71 | A |  |  |  |
| King Street West | 1.72 | 4.00 | 17.82 | 0.64 | C |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 0.15 | ? | 3.01 | 0.13 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue <br> (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | Dual lane North South approaches - 2 lane - 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| King Street East | 8.75 | 35.00 | 63.43 | 0.93 | F | 21.65 | C | $-5 \%$[King Street East] |
| Airport Road North | 0.39 | ? | 3.71 | 0.28 | A |  |  |  |
| King Street West | 1.09 | ? | 8.09 | 0.52 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport <br> Road South | 3.84 | 11.00 | 13.91 | 0.80 | B |  |  |  |

## Airport Road at King Street 2021

Multilane Roundabout N,S,E approach 2 Lane Cross Section

Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | V-Approach <br> road hal-width <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | E-Entry <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | I' - Effective <br> flare length $(\boldsymbol{m})$ | R-Entry <br> radius $(\mathbf{m})$ | D- Inscribed <br> circle diameter <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | PHI- Conflict <br> (entry) angle <br> (deg) | Exit <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| King <br> Street East | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 48.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> North | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 48.00 | 20.00 |  |
| King <br> Street <br> West | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> South | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 48.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/C <br> Ratio | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | Dual lane East, North, South approaches - 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| King Street East | 0.56 | 1.00 | 3.36 | 0.36 | A | 8.68 | A | 11\% <br> [King Street West] |
| Airport Road North | 2.45 | 4.00 | 9.57 | 0.71 | A |  |  |  |
| King Street West | 1.72 | 4.00 | 17.82 | 0.64 | C |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 0.15 | ? | 3.01 | 0.13 | A |  |  |  |


|  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Queue } \\ \text { (Veh) }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { 95\% } \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (Veh) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Delay } \\ \text { (s) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { V/ C } \\ \text { Ratio }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | LOS \(\left.\begin{array}{c}I ntersection <br>

Delay (s)\end{array} \quad $$
\begin{array}{c}\text { I ntersection } \\
\text { LOS }\end{array}
$$ \quad $$
\begin{array}{c}\text { Network } \\
\text { Residual } \\
\text { Capacity }\end{array}
$$\right]\)

## Airport Road at Old School / Healey Road 2021

## Single Lane Roundabout 2 Lane Cross Section

Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | V-Approach <br> road hal-width <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | E-Entry <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | '- Effective <br> flare (ength <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | R-Entry <br> radius $(\mathbf{m})$ | D- Inscribed <br> circle diameter <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | PH1- Conflict <br> $($ entry) angle <br> (deg) | Exit <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Healey <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> North | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Old School <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> South | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | single lane 2 lane cross section - 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 0.15 | ? | 3.92 | 0.13 | A | 127.16 | F | $-17 \%$ <br> [Airport Road North] |
| Airport Road North | 67.69 | 125.00 | 188.50 | 1.11 | F |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 0.61 | 1.00 | 10.07 | 0.38 | B |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 0.35 | ? | 5.49 | 0.26 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/C <br> Ratio | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | single lane 2 lane cross section- 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 2.57 | 7.00 | 20.82 | 0.73 | C | 33.68 | D | $-5 \%$ <br> [Airport Road South] |
| Airport Road North | 0.77 | 1.00 | 7.00 | 0.44 | A |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 0.14 | ? | 4.43 | 0.12 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 14.45 | 58.00 | 53.20 | 0.96 | F |  |  |  |

## Airport Road at Old School / Healey Road 2021

Multi Lane Roundabout N,S Approaches 2 Lane Cross Section

## Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | V-Aproach <br> road half-width <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | E-Entry <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | P- Effective <br> flare length $(\mathbf{m})$ | R-Entry <br> radius $(\mathbf{m})$ | D- Inscribed <br> circle diameter <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | PHI- Conflict <br> (entry) angle <br> (deg) | Exit <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Healey <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> North | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Old School <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> South | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/C <br> Ratio | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | N/ S Dual Entry 2 lane cross section - 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 0.15 | ? | 3.92 | 0.13 | A | 7.02 | A | $21 \%$[Old School Road] |
| Airport Road North | 2.37 | 3.00 | 7.31 | 0.71 | A |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 0.74 | 2.00 | 12.30 | 0.43 | B |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 0.20 | ? | 3.09 | 0.16 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue <br> (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | N/ S Dual Entry 2 lane cross section - 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 2.69 | 8.00 | 21.69 | 0.74 | C | 8.58 | A | 6\% <br> [Healey Road] |
| Airport Road North | 0.38 | ? | 3.42 | 0.27 | A |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 0.14 | ? | 4.43 | 0.12 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 1.58 | 2.00 | 5.55 | 0.61 | A |  |  |  |

## Appendix K

## 2021 Intersection Operations - Widen to Four Lanes

|  | 4 |  | 7 | 7 | - | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 5 | 164 | 31 | 35 | 67 | 27 | 3 | 178 | 26 | 54 | 1017 | 5 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.02 | 0.46 | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.48 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 22.6 | 29.7 | 9.5 | 25.1 | 24.9 | 9.9 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 3.2 | 7.3 | 9.4 | 6.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 22.6 | 29.7 | 9.5 | 25.1 | 24.9 | 9.9 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 3.2 | 7.3 | 9.4 | 6.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 0.5 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 32.0 | 0.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 2.8 | 32.8 | 5.6 | 10.0 | 15.5 | 5.2 | 1.2 | 9.4 | 2.8 | 7.5 | 55.5 | 1.4 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 3361.2 |  |  |  | 629.9 |  | 1946.4 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 408 | 567 | 508 | 359 | 572 | 505 | 192 | 1914 | 886 | 710 | 2114 | 778 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | O | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.29 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.48 | 0.01 |

Intersection Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  | 7 | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | p |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 22 | 253 | 49 | 132 | 392 | 24 | 9 | 119 | 35 | 153 | 653 | 47 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.09 | 0.38 | 0.08 | 0.34 | 0.57 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.31 | 0.47 | 0.07 |
| Control Delay | 13.0 | 15.7 | 4.1 | 16.2 | 18.8 | 5.1 | 14.7 | 12.9 | 5.5 | 16.1 | 15.4 | 5.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 13.0 | 15.7 | 4.1 | 16.2 | 18.8 | 5.1 | 14.7 | 12.9 | 5.5 | 16.1 | 15.4 | 5.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 1.5 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 31.8 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 24.5 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 4.9 | 32.6 | 4.6 | 19.9 | 51.6 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 9.4 | 4.5 | 25.7 | 45.0 | 5.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 1346.7 |  |  | 1342.5 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  | 130.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 35.0 |  | 28.0 | 30.0 |  | 21.0 | 35.0 |  | 28.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 360 | 984 | 866 | 585 | 1012 | 788 | 178 | 1361 | 681 | 542 | 1512 | 725 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.06 | 0.26 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.39 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.28 | 0.43 | 0.06 |

Intersection Summary

K:IETPS|Programs|Roads|TrafficlOperlChris|Airport Road EAISynchrolRevisionsINEW2021|4 lanelFuture 2021 - AM 4SgnehwoReal|epepdrold School-Hea


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 15 | 77 | 13 | 55 | 227 | 138 | 16 | 895 | 27 | 19 | 332 | 9 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.04 | 0.17 | 0.49 | 0.30 | 0.04 | 0.49 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.19 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 17.9 | 19.2 | 9.5 | 19.6 | 24.2 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 11.4 | 6.8 | 10.3 | 9.0 | 5.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 17.9 | 19.2 | 9.5 | 19.6 | 24.2 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 11.4 | 6.8 | 10.3 | 9.0 | 5.6 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 1.2 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 21.1 | 3.9 | 0.8 | 29.4 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 9.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 4.7 | 14.6 | 3.1 | 11.6 | 37.2 | 14.3 | 3.6 | 51.2 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 17.8 | 1.9 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 3361.2 |  |  | 290.8 |  |  | 1946.4 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 409 | 663 | 512 | 467 | 656 | 618 | 421 | 1898 | 810 | 241 | 1811 | 868 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.35 | 0.22 | 0.04 | 0.47 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.18 | 0.01 |

[^11]

|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 56 | 370 | 17 | 50 | 292 | 141 | 59 | 764 | 102 | 74 | 242 | 31 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.16 | 0.57 | 0.03 | 0.20 | 0.46 | 0.23 | 0.13 | 0.49 | 0.13 | 0.31 | 0.17 | 0.04 |
| Control Delay | 14.7 | 20.1 | 7.9 | 15.9 | 18.0 | 7.2 | 13.4 | 14.9 | 4.6 | 18.1 | 12.3 | 5.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 14.7 | 20.1 | 7.9 | 15.9 | 18.0 | 7.2 | 13.4 | 14.9 | 4.6 | 18.1 | 12.3 | 5.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 4.1 | 31.3 | 0.3 | 3.7 | 23.6 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 29.2 | 0.7 | 4.9 | 7.8 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 10.2 | 51.1 | 3.2 | 9.8 | 39.9 | 12.6 | 10.9 | 50.2 | 8.1 | 15.6 | 16.1 | 4.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 1346.7 |  |  | 1342.5 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  | 204.9 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 28.0 | 40.0 |  | 21.0 | 35.0 |  | 28.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 482 | 898 | 786 | 348 | 881 | 808 | 487 | 1621 | 796 | 251 | 1491 | 744 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.12 | 0.41 | 0.02 | 0.14 | 0.33 | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.47 | 0.13 | 0.29 | 0.16 | 0.04 |

[^12]
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## Appendix L

## 2031 Intersection Operations Do Nothing

|  |  | $\mathbf{4}$ |  | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group | 230 | 15 | 256 | 522 | 28 | 1194 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0.67 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.49 | 0.04 | 0.51 |
| v/c Ratio | 48.8 | 14.7 | 7.6 | 2.5 | 7.9 | 11.0 |
| Control Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Delay | 48.8 | 14.7 | 7.6 | 2.5 | 7.9 | 11.0 |
| Total Delay | 63.4 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 60.0 |
| Queue Length 50th ( m ) | 67.9 | 5.2 | 17.4 | 12.5 | 5.9 | 93.2 |
| Queue Length 95th ( m ) | 124.0 |  | 413.6 |  |  | 265.7 |
| Internal Link Dist $(\mathrm{m})$ |  |  |  | 145.0 | 70.0 |  |
| Turn Bay Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | 589 | 537 | 1981 | 1061 | 690 | 2328 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0.39 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.49 | 0.04 | 0.51 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^13]





|  | $\dagger$ |  | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 635 | 30 | 1059 | 220 | 9 | 565 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.87 | 0.04 | 0.69 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.37 |
| Control Delay | 41.0 | 6.6 | 29.3 | 4.1 | 24.6 | 23.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 41.0 | 6.6 | 29.3 | 4.1 | 24.6 | 23.1 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 117.5 | 0.4 | 94.2 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 41.9 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 165.2 | 5.3 | 140.0 | 15.1 | 5.2 | 65.9 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 124.0 |  | 413.6 |  |  | 265.7 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  | 145.0 | 70.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 945 | 858 | 1525 | 792 | 119 | 1510 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.67 | 0.03 | 0.69 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.37 |

[^14]



|  |  | $\rightarrow$ | $\dagger$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | , | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 69 | 471 | 57 | 527 | 68 | 1005 | 90 | 314 |
| V/c Ratio | 0.79 | 0.89 | 0.61 | 1.02 | 0.13 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 0.34 |
| Control Delay | 83.7 | 48.2 | 55.5 | 73.2 | 9.2 | 47.6 | 108.5 | 10.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 83.7 | 48.2 | 55.5 | 73.2 | 9.2 | 47.6 | 108.5 | 10.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 9.0 | 63.4 | 7.0 | ~73.4 | 4.4 | 130.0 | 11.3 | 21.7 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#31.4 | \#115.5 | \#24.8 | \#133.5 | 10.2 | \#218.8 | \#26.7 | 36.8 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) |  | 1346.7 |  | 1342.5 |  | 2950.1 |  | 3069.4 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 60.0 |  | 35.0 |  | 40.0 |  | 35.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 87 | 527 | 93 | 516 | 535 | 1005 | 94 | 924 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.79 | 0.89 | 0.61 | 1.02 | 0.13 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 0.34 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\ddagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\hat{}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{1}$ |  |
| Volume (vph) | 69 | 451 | 20 | 57 | 355 | 172 | 68 | 886 | 119 | 90 | 276 | 38 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 6.2 | 6.2 |  | 6.2 | 6.2 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1545 | 1872 |  | 1513 | 1762 |  | 1684 | 1836 |  | 1668 | 1685 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.19 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 | 1.00 |  | 0.56 | 1.00 |  | 0.10 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 310 | 1872 |  | 331 | 1762 |  | 984 | 1836 |  | 172 | 1685 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 69 | 451 | 20 | 57 | 355 | 172 | 68 | 886 | 119 | 90 | 276 | 38 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 69 | 469 | 0 | 57 | 504 | 0 | 68 | 999 | 0 | 90 | 308 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 4\% | 2\% | 1\% | 18\% | 4\% | 3\% | 6\% | 3\% | 1\% | 7\% | 13\% | 4\% |
| Parking (\#hr) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turn Type | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 21.0 | 21.0 |  | 21.0 | 21.0 |  | 40.8 | 40.8 |  | 40.8 | 40.8 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 21.0 | 21.0 |  | 21.0 | 21.0 |  | 40.8 | 40.8 |  | 40.8 | 40.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.28 | 0.28 |  | 0.28 | 0.28 |  | 0.54 | 0.54 |  | 0.54 | 0.54 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 6.2 | 6.2 |  | 6.2 | 6.2 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 87 | 524 |  | 93 | 493 |  | 535 | 999 |  | 94 | 917 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | 0.25 |  |  | c0.29 |  |  | c0.54 |  |  | 0.18 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.22 |  |  | 0.17 |  |  | 0.07 |  |  | 0.52 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.79 | 0.89 |  | 0.61 | 1.02 |  | 0.13 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 0.34 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 25.0 | 25.9 |  | 23.5 | 27.0 |  | 8.4 | 17.1 |  | 16.3 | 9.5 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 42.1 | 18.6 |  | 16.1 | 46.3 |  | 0.2 | 28.2 |  | 79.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Delay (s) | 67.1 | 44.6 |  | 39.5 | 73.3 |  | 8.6 | 45.3 |  | 95.7 | 10.0 |  |
| Level of Service | E | D |  | D | E |  | A | D |  | F | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 47.4 |  |  | 70.0 |  |  | 43.0 |  |  | 29.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 47.8 |  | HCM Leve | of Service |  |  | D |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 1.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 75.0 |  | Sum of los | time (s) |  |  | 13.2 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 118.3\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | H |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Analysis Period (min)
c Critical Lane Group

## Appendix M

# 2031 Intersection Operations at Offset Old School Road - Healey Road Existing Configuration 

Future 2031 AM (Airport/Healey Offset)

|  | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 245 | 158 | 247 | 1287 | 7 |
| v/c Ratio | 1.18 | 0.84 | 0.33 | 1.14 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 175.3 | 99.2 | 13.3 | 100.9 | 8.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 175.3 | 99.2 | 13.3 | 100.9 | 8.6 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | -87.4 | 46.9 | 30.5 | $\sim 445.7$ | 0.5 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#142.3 | \#85.1 | 46.7 | \#526.4 | 2.4 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 3361.2 | 290.8 | 1946.4 | 2950.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |  |  | 45.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 207 | 190 | 750 | 1130 | 817 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 1.18 | 0.83 | 0.33 | 1.14 | 0.01 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |



Future 2031 PM (Airport/Healey Offset) 2 Lane

|  | - | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 127 | 513 | 1084 | 403 | 11 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.73 | 1.14 | 1.18 | 0.51 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 89.2 | 135.9 | 127.5 | 27.4 | 10.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 89.2 | 135.9 | 127.5 | 27.4 | 10.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 37.2 | -178.1 | -388.1 | 78.1 | 0.3 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#65.3 | \#247.8 | \#469.3 | 108.4 | 3.7 |
| Internal Link Dist ( m ) | 3361.2 | 290.8 | 1946.4 | 2950.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) |  |  |  |  | 45.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 181 | 450 | 916 | 798 | 813 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.70 | 1.14 | 1.18 | 0.51 | 0.01 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |

Future 2031 PM (Airport/Healey Offset) 2 Lane


## Appendix $\mathbf{N}$

## 2031 Intersection Operations at Airport Road and King Street with Auxiliary Lanes

|  | $\stackrel{4}{ }$ |  |  | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 7 | 200 | 38 | 43 | 82 | 33 | 3 | 213 | 31 | 66 | 1221 | 7 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.03 | 0.68 | 0.14 | 0.29 | 0.28 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.97 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 32.0 | 48.4 | 17.6 | 38.7 | 35.7 | 12.7 | 7.7 | 5.8 | 1.9 | 5.4 | 35.7 | 4.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 32.0 | 48.4 | 17.6 | 38.7 | 35.7 | 12.7 | 7.7 | 5.8 | 1.9 | 5.4 | 35.7 | 4.6 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 0.9 | 30.1 | 1.5 | 6.1 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 166.6 | 0.3 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 4.4 | \#50.7 | 9.1 | 15.0 | 23.2 | 7.1 | 1.1 | 18.6 | 2.3 | 7.0 | \#271.0 | 1.5 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 3361.2 |  |  | 290.8 |  |  | 1946.4 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 40.0 |  | 7.0 | 40.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 219 | 308 | 287 | 155 | 311 | 292 | 55 | 1134 | 995 | 781 | 1253 | 875 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.03 | 0.65 | 0.13 | 0.28 | 0.26 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.97 | 0.01 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


|  | $\rangle$ |  | 7 | $\dagger$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | P |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 27 | 308 | 59 | 158 | 478 | 30 | 11 | 144 | 42 | 187 | 781 | 57 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.23 | 0.55 | 0.11 | 0.58 | 0.83 | 0.06 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.06 | 0.31 | 0.87 | 0.07 |
| Control Delay | 24.1 | 24.4 | 5.8 | 30.1 | 36.8 | 10.3 | 14.1 | 10.4 | 3.3 | 12.3 | 28.9 | 5.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 24.1 | 24.4 | 5.8 | 30.1 | 36.8 | 10.3 | 14.1 | 10.4 | 3.3 | 12.3 | 28.9 | 5.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 2.4 | 30.3 | 0.0 | 15.7 | 52.4 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 12.6 | 79.2 | 1.5 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 8.2 | 50.9 | 6.4 | 32.5 | \#94.0 | 5.6 | 3.5 | 17.4 | 3.7 | 24.1 | \#143.3 | 5.9 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 1346.7 |  |  | 1342.5 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  | 3069.4 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 60.0 |  | 21.0 | 35.0 |  | 21.0 | 40.0 |  | 21.0 | 35.0 |  | 21.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 119 | 582 | 545 | 283 | 599 | 478 | 84 | 805 | 758 | 599 | 895 | 795 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.23 | 0.53 | 0.11 | 0.56 | 0.80 | 0.06 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.06 | 0.31 | 0.87 | 0.07 |

Intersection Summary
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 18 | 93 | 16 | 67 | 277 | 168 | 20 | 1031 | 33 | 23 | 380 | 11 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.13 | 0.27 | 0.06 | 0.28 | 0.81 | 0.45 | 0.04 | 0.88 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0.34 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 29.8 | 30.2 | 13.6 | 31.5 | 50.7 | 16.9 | 5.8 | 23.0 | 4.6 | 12.0 | 7.8 | 3.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 29.8 | 30.2 | 13.6 | 31.5 | 50.7 | 16.9 | 5.8 | 23.0 | 4.6 | 12.0 | 7.8 | 3.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 2.1 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 37.4 | 8.0 | 0.9 | 106.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 22.0 | 0.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 7.3 | 22.7 | 4.5 | 18.2 | \#71.2 | 23.5 | 3.1 | \#195.7 | 3.8 | 5.1 | 35.0 | 1.7 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 361.2 |  |  | 290.8 |  |  | 1946.4 |  |  | 950.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 40.0 |  | 7.0 | 40.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 140 | 353 | 278 | 244 | 350 | 380 | 477 | 1175 | 950 | 108 | 1121 | 1018 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.13 | 0.26 | 0.06 | 0.27 | 0.79 | 0.44 | 0.04 | 0.88 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0.34 | 0.01 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


Future 2031 PM (Airport/Healey Realigned) Auxiliary lanes

|  | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 1 | ( | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 69 | 451 | 20 | 57 | 355 | 172 | 68 | 886 | 119 | 90 | 276 | 38 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.34 | 0.85 | 0.04 | 0.50 | 0.68 | 0.32 | 0.12 | 0.90 | 0.13 | 0.89 | 0.30 | 0.04 |
| Control Delay | 25.4 | 41.0 | 8.6 | 38.8 | 29.9 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 29.6 | 2.2 | 89.9 | 10.5 | 3.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 25.4 | 41.0 | 8.6 | 38.8 | 29.9 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 29.6 | 2.2 | 89.9 | 10.5 | 3.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 6.5 | 50.7 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 37.6 | 4.8 | 3.9 | 89.3 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 17.4 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 16.2 | \#93.3 | 4.0 | \#18.8 | 61.8 | 16.7 | 9.2 | \#160.0 | 5.7 | \#33.9 | 30.0 | 3.3 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 1346.7 |  | 1342.5 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  | 3069.4 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 60.0 |  |  | 35.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  |  | 35.0 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 208 | 541 | 491 | 117 | 531 | 549 | 553 | 985 | 912 | 101 | 907 | 851 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.33 | 0.83 | 0.04 | 0.49 | 0.67 | 0.31 | 0.12 | 0.90 | 0.13 | 0.89 | 0.30 | 0.04 |

Intersection Summary
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


## Appendix 0

## 2031 Intersection Operations - Widen to Four Lanes

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  | 1 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 7 | 200 | 38 | 43 | 82 | 33 | 3 | 213 | 31 | 66 | 1221 | 7 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.03 | 0.54 | 0.11 | 0.20 | 0.22 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.57 | 0.01 |
| Control Delay | 23.4 | 32.9 | 10.6 | 26.8 | 26.1 | 9.5 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 3.0 | 7.6 | 10.7 | 6.3 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 23.4 | 32.9 | 10.6 | 26.8 | 26.1 | 9.5 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 3.0 | 7.6 | 10.7 | 6.3 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 0.7 | 23.5 | 0.4 | 4.7 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 45.1 | 0.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.4 | 40.6 | 6.7 | 12.1 | 18.9 | 5.8 | 1.2 | 10.9 | 3.0 | 8.8 | 71.6 | 1.7 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 3361.2 |  |  | 629.9 |  |  | 1946.4 |  | 2950.1 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 341 | 480 | 437 | 280 | 485 | 437 | 144 | 1940 | 899 | 695 | 2143 | 789 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.02 | 0.42 | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.57 | 0.01 |

[^15]

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{~}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| Volume (vgh) | 7 | 200 | 38 | 43 | 82 | 33 | 3 | 213 | 31 | 66 | 1221 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |


|  | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Lane Width | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1785 | 1860 | 1597 | 1716 | 1879 | 1597 | 1190 | 3147 | 1439 | 1733 | 3476 | 1278 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.70 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.60 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.19 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.62 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1322 | 1860 | 1597 | 1086 | 1879 | 1597 | 233 | 3147 | 1439 | 1128 | 3476 | 1278 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 7 | 200 | 38 | 43 | 82 | 33 | 3 | 213 | 31 | 66 | 1221 | 7 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 7 | 200 | 11 | 43 | 82 | 7 | 3 | 213 | 19 | 66 | 1221 | 6 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 16\% | 11\% | 3\% | 5\% | 25\% |


| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  | Perm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 15.4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 47.8 | 47.8 | 47.8 | 47.8 | 47.8 | 47.8 |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 15.4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 47.8 | 47.8 | 47.8 | 47.8 | 47.8 | 47.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.62 |
| Clearance Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 263 | 370 | 317 | 216 | 373 | 317 | 144 | 1941 | 888 | 696 | 2144 | 788 |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | c0.11 |  |  | 0.04 |  |  | 0.07 |  |  | c0.35 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.01 |  | 0.01 | 0.04 |  | 0.00 | 0.01 |  | 0.01 | 0.06 |  | 0.00 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.03 | 0.54 | 0.03 | 0.20 | 0.22 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.57 | 0.01 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 25.0 | 27.9 | 25.0 | 25.9 | 26.0 | 25.0 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 8.8 | 5.7 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.1 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
| Delay (s) | 25.1 | 30.7 | 25.1 | 26.9 | 26.6 | 25.0 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 6.2 | 9.3 | 5.7 |
| Level of Service | C | C | C | C | C | C | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 29.7 |  |  | 26.4 |  |  | 6.1 |  |  | 9.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM Average Control Delay | 12.8 | HCM Level of Service | B |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.56 |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 77.5 | Sum of lost time (s) | 14.3 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $84.8 \%$ | ICU Level of Service | E |

Analysis Period (min)
15
c Critical Lane Group

|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 27 | 308 | 59 | 158 | 478 | 30 | 11 | 144 | 42 | 187 | 781 | 57 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.13 | 0.43 | 0.09 | 0.41 | 0.65 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.39 | 0.58 | 0.09 |
| Control Delay | 13.6 | 16.0 | 4.3 | 17.4 | 20.3 | 4.6 | 16.7 | 14.0 | 5.3 | 18.5 | 18.1 | 4.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 13.6 | 16.0 | 4.3 | 17.4 | 20.3 | 4.6 | 16.7 | 14.0 | 5.3 | 18.5 | 18.1 | 4.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 1.8 | 23.7 | 0.3 | 12.1 | 41.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 36.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 6.0 | 39.9 | 5.3 | 24.4 | 65.6 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 11.0 | 4.9 | 31.6 | 55.5 | 5.6 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 1346.7 |  |  | 1342.5 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  | 130.4 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 35.0 |  | 28.0 | 30.0 |  | 21.0 | 35.0 |  | 28.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 259 | 896 | 795 | 485 | 922 | 723 | 125 | 1239 | 628 | 482 | 1377 | 670 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.10 | 0.34 | 0.07 | 0.33 | 0.52 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.39 | 0.57 | 0.09 |

[^16]

|  | $\downarrow$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | - | 4 |  | $\dagger$ | 7 | , | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 18 | 93 | 16 | 67 | 277 | 169 | 20 | 1031 | 33 | 23 | 380 | 11 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.06 | 0.18 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.54 | 0.37 | 0.06 | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.26 | 0.02 |
| Control Delay | 13.2 | 14.1 | 7.2 | 14.6 | 19.4 | 13.5 | 9.6 | 14.4 | 6.7 | 12.7 | 9.9 | 5.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 13.2 | 14.1 | 7.2 | 14.6 | 19.4 | 13.5 | 9.6 | 14.4 | 6.7 | 12.7 | 9.9 | 5.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 1.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 18.4 | 8.1 | 0.9 | 34.7 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 10.2 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 4.2 | 13.0 | 2.9 | 10.5 | 34.3 | 19.0 | 3.7 | 51.1 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 17.0 | 1.9 |
| Internal Link Dist ( m ) | 3361.2 |  |  | 290.8 |  |  | 1946.4 |  | 2950.1 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 | 30.0 |  | 7.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 343 | 582 | 454 | 405 | 576 | 516 | 320 | 1512 | 650 | 145 | 1442 | 694 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.04 | 0.17 | 0.48 | 0.33 | 0.06 | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.26 | 0.02 |

[^17]|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


|  | $\rangle$ |  | 7 | $\dagger$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 69 | 451 | 20 | 57 | 355 | 172 | 68 | 886 | 119 | 90 | 276 | 38 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.23 | 0.73 | 0.04 | 0.29 | 0.59 | 0.30 | 0.16 | 0.62 | 0.16 | 0.50 | 0.21 | 0.06 |
| Control Delay | 14.2 | 23.3 | 7.0 | 16.8 | 18.3 | 9.8 | 11.1 | 14.2 | 3.0 | 24.3 | 10.4 | 3.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 14.2 | 23.3 | 7.0 | 16.8 | 18.3 | 9.8 | 11.1 | 14.2 | 3.0 | 24.3 | 10.4 | 3.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 3.9 | 31.2 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 23.1 | 6.5 | 3.4 | 29.2 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 7.4 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 10.7 | \#63.0 | 3.1 | 10.1 | 41.9 | 16.3 | 9.3 | 43.4 | 6.1 | \#19.9 | 13.1 | 3.5 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 1346.7 |  |  | 1342.5 |  |  | 2950.1 |  |  | 204.9 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 30.0 |  | 14.0 | 30.0 |  | 28.0 | 40.0 |  | 21.0 | 35.0 |  | 28.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 320 | 653 | 590 | 210 | 640 | 604 | 417 | 1431 | 739 | 181 | 1316 | 673 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.22 | 0.69 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.55 | 0.28 | 0.16 | 0.62 | 0.16 | 0.50 | 0.21 | 0.06 |

## Intersection Summary

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.


## Appendix $P$

## ARCADY Roundabout Analysis 2031 Traffic Volumes

## Airport Road at Old School / Healey Road 2031

Multi Lane Roundabout 2 lane N,S Approaches 2 Lane Cross Section

Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | V-Approach <br> road hal-width <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | E-Entry <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | I' - Effective <br> flare length $(\boldsymbol{m})$ | R-Entry <br> radius $(\boldsymbol{m})$ | D- Inscribed <br> circle diameter <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | PHI- Conflict <br> $($ entry) angle <br> (deg) | Exit <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Healey <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> North | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Old School <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> South | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue <br> (Veh) | 95\% Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/C Ratio | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | N/ S Dual 2 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 0.20 | ? | 4.18 | 0.17 | A | 14.73 | B | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ \text { [Old School Road] } \end{gathered}$ |
| Airport Road North | 5.74 | 20.00 | 15.07 | 0.86 | C |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 2.39 | 8.00 | 33.53 | 0.72 | D |  |  |  |
| Airport <br> Road South | 0.25 | ? | 3.30 | 0.20 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | N/ S Dual 2 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 23.98 | 63.00 | 146.40 | 1.05 | F | 38.41 | E | $\begin{gathered} -10 \% \\ \text { [Healey Road] } \end{gathered}$ |
| Airport Road North | 0.47 | 1.00 | 3.74 | 0.32 | A |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 0.19 | ? | 4.80 | 0.16 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 2.50 | 4.00 | 7.65 | 0.72 | A |  |  |  |

## Airport Road at Old School / Healey Road 2031

Multi Lane Roundabout 2 Lane N,S Approaches with Healey Road RT Bypass 2 Lane Cross Section

Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | V-Approach <br> road hal-width <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | E-Entry <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | r- - Effective <br> flare length $(\boldsymbol{m})$ | R-Entry <br> radius $(\mathbf{m})$ | D- Inscribed <br> circle diameter <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | PH1- Conflict <br> $($ entry) angle <br> (deg) | Exit <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Healey <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> North | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Old School <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> South | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% Queue (Veh) (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/C <br> Ratio | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | N/ S Dual with Healey Bypass 2 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 0.15 | ? | 4.03 | 0.13 | A | 14.72 | B | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ \text { [Old School Road] } \end{gathered}$ |
| Airport <br> Road North | 5.74 | 20.00 | 15.07 | 0.86 | C |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 2.39 | 8.00 | 33.53 | 0.72 | D |  |  |  |
| Airport <br> Road South | 0.25 | ? | 3.30 | 0.20 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | N/ S Dual with Healey Bypass 2 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 2.26 | 6.00 | 22.27 | 0.70 | C | 10.04 | B | 6\% <br> [Healey Road] |
| Airport Road North | 0.48 | 1.00 | 3.80 | 0.32 | A |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 0.19 | ? | 4.81 | 0.16 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 2.50 | 4.00 | 7.65 | 0.72 | A |  |  |  |

## Airport Road at Old School / Healey Road 2031

## Multi Lane Roundabout 2 Lane N, S, E approaches 2 Lane Cross Section

| Roundabout Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leg | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V- Approach } \\ & \text { road half-width } \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ | E-Entry width (m) | I' - Effective flare length (m) | R-Entry radius $(m)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { D - Inscribed } \\ \text { circle diameter } \\ (\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ | PHI - Conflict (entry) angle (deg) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exit } \\ & \text { Only } \end{aligned}$ |
| Healey Road | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport Road North | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Old School Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport Road South | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/C <br> Ratio | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | N/S/E Dual 2 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 0.09 | ? | 2.40 | 0.08 | A | 14.59 | B | $0 \%$[Old School Road] |
| Airport Road North | 5.74 | 20.00 | 15.07 | 0.86 | C |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 2.39 | 8.00 | 33.53 | 0.72 | D |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 0.25 | ? | 3.30 | 0.20 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue <br> (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | DC N/ S/E Dual 2 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey <br> Road | 0.61 | 1.00 | 5.87 | 0.38 | A | 6.29 | A | 30\% |
| Airport Road North | 0.48 | 1.00 | 3.80 | 0.32 | A |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 0.19 | ? | 4.81 | 0.16 | A |  |  | [Airport Road South] |
| Airport Road South | 2.50 | 4.00 | 7.65 | 0.72 | A |  |  |  |

## Airport Road at Old School / Healey Road 2031

## Multi Lane Roundabout 2 lane N, S, approaches Healey Road RT Bypass 4 Lane Cross Section

Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | V-Approach <br> road hal-width <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | E-Entry <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | I' - Effective <br> flare length $(\boldsymbol{m})$ | R-Entry <br> radius $(\mathbf{m})$ | D- Inscribed <br> circle diameter <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | PHI- Conflict <br> (entry) angle <br> (deg) | Exit <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Healey <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> North | 7.50 | 8.00 | 10.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Old School <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> South | 7.50 | 8.00 | 10.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue <br> (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | N/ S Dual with Bypass 4 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 0.15 | ? | 4.03 | 0.13 | A | 8.79 | A | $0 \%$[Old School Road] |
| Airport Road North | 2.43 | 4.00 | 6.20 | 0.71 | A |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 2.42 | 8.00 | 33.85 | 0.72 | D |  |  |  |
| Airport <br> Road South | 0.20 | ? | 2.60 | 0.16 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue <br> (Veh) |  | Delay (s) | V/ C Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | N/ S Dual with Bypass 4 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 2.27 | 6.00 | 22.27 | 0.70 | C | 8.20 | A | 6\% <br> [Healey Road] |
| Airport Road North | 0.36 | ? | 2.87 | 0.27 | A |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 0.19 | ? | 4.81 | 0.16 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 1.45 | 1.00 | 4.41 | 0.59 | A |  |  |  |

## Airport Road at Old School / Healey Road

Multi Lane Roundabout 2 lane N, S, E approaches 4 Lane Cross Section

Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | V-Approach <br> road hal-width <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | E-Entry <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | I' - Effective <br> flare length $(\boldsymbol{m})$ | R-Entry <br> radius $(\mathbf{m})$ | D- Inscribed <br> circle <br> $($ diameter | PHI-Conflict <br> (entry) angle <br> (deg) | Exit <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Healey <br> Road | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> North | 7.50 | 8.00 | 10.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Old School <br> Road | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> South | 7.50 | 8.00 | 10.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | N/S/E Dual 4 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 0.09 | ? | 2.40 | 0.08 | A | 8.66 | A | $0 \%$[Old School Road] |
| Airport Road North | 2.43 | 4.00 | 6.20 | 0.71 | A |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 2.42 | 8.00 | 33.84 | 0.72 | D |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 0.20 | ? | 2.60 | 0.16 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | DC N/ S/E Dual 4 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healey Road | 0.61 | 1.00 | 5.87 | 0.38 | A | 4.45 | A | $41 \%$ <br> [Healey Road] |
| Airport Road North | 0.36 | ? | 2.87 | 0.27 | A |  |  |  |
| Old School Road | 0.19 | ? | 4.81 | 0.16 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 1.45 | 1.00 | 4.41 | 0.59 | A |  |  |  |

## Airport Road at King Street 2031

Multilane Roundabout -2 lanes N, S and E Approaches 2 Lane Cross Section

Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | V-Approach <br> rood half) <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | E-Entry <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | r- Effective <br> flare length $(\mathbf{m})$ | R-Entry <br> radius $(\mathbf{m})$ | D- Inscribed <br> circle diameter <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | PH1- Conflict <br> (entry) angle <br> $($ deg $)$ | Exit <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| King Street <br> East | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 48.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport Road <br> North | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 48.00 | 20.00 |  |
| King Street <br> West | 4.25 | 4.25 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 55.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport Road <br> South | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 48.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM <br>  <br> (Veh) |  |  |  |  |  | Queue <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay <br> (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Intersection <br> Delay (s) | Intersection <br> LOS | Network <br> Residual <br> Capacity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dual lane East, North, South approaches -2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue <br> (Veh) | 95\% Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C C } \\ & \text { Ratio } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | Dual lane East, North, South approaches - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| King Street East | 2.37 | 4.00 | 13.64 | 0.71 | B | 34.53 | D | $-5 \%$ <br> [Airport Road South] |
| Airport Road North | 0.53 | 1.00 | 4.30 | 0.35 | A |  |  |  |
| King Street West | 1.96 | 3.00 | 12.08 | 0.67 | B |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 21.43 | 79.00 | 66.30 | 0.99 | F |  |  |  |

## Airport Road at King Street 2031

## 2 Lane Roundabout All Approaches 4 Lane Cross Section

Roundabout Geometry

| Leg | V-Approach <br> road hal-width <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | E-Entry <br> width $(\mathbf{m})$ | I' - Effective <br> flare length $(\mathbf{m})$ | R-Entry <br> radius $(\mathbf{m})$ | D- Inscribed <br> circle diameter <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | PHI- Conflict <br> (entry) angle <br> (deg) | Exit <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| King <br> Street East | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> North | 7.50 | 8.00 | 10.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |
| King <br> Street <br> West | 4.25 | 8.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |
| Airport <br> Road <br> South | 7.50 | 8.00 | 10.00 | 25.00 | 49.00 | 20.00 |  |


|  | AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | 95\% <br> Queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio | LOS | Intersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | Dual lane West, East, North, South approaches - 4 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| King Street East | 0.80 | 1.00 | 3.93 | 0.44 | A | 6.96 | A | 19\% |
| Airport Road North | 2.78 | 5.00 | 9.02 | 0.74 | A |  |  |  |
| King Street West | 1.03 | 2.00 | 8.62 | 0.51 | A |  |  | [Airport Road North] |
| Airport Road South | 0.16 | ? | 2.59 | 0.14 | A |  |  |  |


|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) |  | Delay (s) | V/ C <br> Ratio | LOS | I ntersection Delay (s) | I ntersection LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | DC Dual lane West, East, North, South approaches - 4 lane - 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| King Street East | 2.47 | 6.00 | 14.22 | 0.72 | B | 9.67 | A | 11\%[King Street East] |
| Airport Road North | 0.39 | ? | 3.19 | 0.28 | A |  |  |  |
| King Street West | 0.69 | 1.00 | 4.20 | 0.41 | A |  |  |  |
| Airport Road South | 3.91 | 11.00 | 12.25 | 0.80 | B |  |  |  |
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## APPENDICES

Appendix A - Collision History

# AIRPORT ROAD FROM STREET ‘A’ TO KING STREET ROAD SAFETY AUDIT 

This report documents a Road Safety Review of Airport Road (Regional Road 7) 1.0km north of Mayfield Road (Regional Road 14) from Street 'A' to 0.6 km north of King Street (Regional Road 9).

## 1. BACKGROUND

The Region of Peel has initiated a Class ' $C$ ' Environmental Assessment (EA) Project \# 12-4380 for Airport Road and is investigating roadway widening from two lanes (one lane per direction) to four lanes (two lanes per direction) in order to address the operational deficiencies and the need for additional north-south capacity in the area. A safety review was conducted as part of the EA process and details the findings of our investigation.

The purpose of this audit was to examine the facility's safety performance and to identify engineering related factors and opportunities for improvement and recommend potential mitigative solutions.

It is acknowledged that safety is one of many considerations that the Region of Peel needs to balance in undertaking any EA project, including, but not necessarily limited to; cost, environmental protection, traffic management, and community impacts. This report is focused on safety, with the anticipation that in general, the safety enhancements identified will be considered for inclusion in the planning process.

## 2. STUDY AREA

The study area consists of the zone on Airport Road, 1.0km north of Mayfield Road to 0.6 km north of King Street, approximately 5.75 kms . For the purpose of this audit, the intersection of Street ' $A$ ' that is to the south of the southern limit of the study area has been included to provide a definite boundary to the study area (Figure 1).

Airport Road is a two-lane (single lane per direction), hard-surfaced, rural roadway serving an arterial function in the northeast quadrant under the jurisdiction of the Region of Peel in the Town of Caledon. For the purposes of this report, Airport Road will be described as running in a north-south direction.


Figure 1: Study Area
(Source: Google Maps)
Airport Road has a posted speed limit of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ from Street 'A' to 610 m south of King Street, and $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ from 610 m south of King Street to 305 m north of King

Airport Road EA (1KM north of Mayfield Road to 0.6KM North of King Street)
Street. Airport Road from 305m north of King Street to the project limits has a posted speed limit of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

There are two signalized intersections in the study zone: Street ' $A$ ' and King Street; and two stop controlled offset intersections: Healey Road and Old School Road.

The pavement width is nominally 7.2 metres, with gravel shoulders for Airport Road. Land use adjacent to the study zone is presently predominantly rural agricultural, low density commercial and low-density rural residential. The intersection of Street ' $A$ ' which is to the south of the southern limit of the study area and has been included to provide a defined boundary to the study zone. . There are four intersections along this stretch of the study area:

- Street 'A' - It is a signalized "T" intersection to the east of Airport Road. It is a private access road. (Figure 2)
- Healey Road - It is a two lane rural roadway under the jurisdiction of the Town of Caledon. It is a stop controlled, offset "T" intersection to the east of Airport Road with a posted speed limit of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (Figure 3).
- Old School Road - It is a two lane rural roadway under the jurisdiction of the Town of Caledon. It is a stop controlled, offset "T" intersection to the west of Airport Road with a speed limit of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (Figure 3).
- King Street - It is a two lane East/West arterial roadway under the jurisdiction of the Region of Peel. It is a signalized intersection with a posted speed limit of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ through the intersection of Airport Road (Figure 4).


Figure 2: Airport Road at Street "A" (Source: Google Earth)


Figure 3: Offset intersections of Healey Road and Old School Road (Source: Google Earth)


Figure 4: Airport Road at King Street (Source: Google Earth)
3. METHODOLOGY

### 3.1. COLLISION HISTORY

The first step in the process consisted of conducting an in-office review. A collision analysis of the most recent five years (2006-2010) of collision data was undertaken. This preliminary review was undertaken for the following reasons:

1. To identify the dominant collision type and collision frequency in the zone in the past five years.
2. To acquire documented evidence of collision data in order to identify causal patterns that may indicate underlying issues.
3. To calculate the collision rates for the zone.
4. To conduct a safety review with mitigative countermeasures for possible inclusion in the EA.

Road Safety Audit
Airport Road EA (1KM north of Mayfield Road to 0.6 KM North of King Street)
The results identified 43 reportable collisions occurring in the study zone on Airport Road from Street 'A' to 0.6 km north of King Street over the five-year (2006-2010) review period. A summary of reported collisions is presented in Table 1 and a summary of collisions per year is presented as a bar graph in Exhibit 1.

| Location | Fatal | Non Fatal Injury | PDO | Total | Collision Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Airport Road at Street ' $A$ ' | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No Reported Collisions |
| Airport Road between Street 'A' and Healey Road | 0 | 2 | 9 | 11 | SMV other (11) |
| Airport Road at Healey Road | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | Rear End (1) <br> Turning Movement (1) |
| Airport Road between Healey Road and Old School Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No Reported Collisions |
| Airport Road at Old School Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No Reported Collisions |
| Airport Road between Old School Road and King Street | 0 | 1 | 11 | 12 | Rear End (3) <br> Sideswipe (2) <br> SMV other (7) |
| Airport Road at King Street | 0 | 4 | 10 | 14 | Angle (4) <br> Rear End (6) <br> Sideswipe (2) <br> SMV other (1) <br> Turning Movement (1) |
| Airport Road up to 0.6 km north of King Street | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | Rear End (1) <br> SMV other (2) <br> Other (1) |
| Total | 0 | 7 | 36 | 43 |  |

Table 1: Summary of Reported Collisions along Airport Road (2006-2010)


Exhibit 1: Collisions per Year (2006-2010)
The 'Single Motor Vehicle (SMV) other' type of collision was the dominant type of collision with $48.8 \%$ followed by 'Rear End', which consisted of $25.6 \%$ of collisions and $11.6 \%$ of 'Right Angle' type of collisions (Exhibit 2). SMV - other typically involves a loss of control and/or run off road vehicle type of collision.

It should be noted that the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) uses the terms 'Turning Movement' and 'Angle’ interchangeably when reporting a collision. There were about $83.7 \%$ of 'Property Damage Only' type of collisions which were the majority of the collisions in this zone (Exhibit 3). There were no fatal collisions in this zone in the study period. Further, $72.1 \%$ of the collisions occurred under clear environmental conditions (Exhibit 4) and 58.1\% with favourable road conditions (Exhibit 5).


Exhibit 2: Collisions by Initial Impact Type (2006-2010)

## Airport Road from Street 'A' to north of King Street Classification of Accident (2006-2010)



Injury, 7, 16.3\%
Total Collisions: 43
Exhibit 3: Classification of Accident (2006-2010)


Exhibit 4: Collisions by Environmental Condition (2006-2010)


Exhibit 5: Collisions by Road Surface Condition (2006-2010)

Airport Road EA (1KM north of Mayfield Road to 0.6KM North of King Street) It should be noted that there was a high percentage of 'SMV Other' type of collisions on Airport Road between Street ' $A$ ' and Healey Road. The number of 'SMV Other' (Run-off-road) type of collision on this road section is $100 \%$ of which $54.6 \%$ were snow related (Exhibit 6). On Airport Road between Old School Road and King Street $50 \%$ of the total reported collisions were due to unfavourable road conditions (Exhibit 7).

The number of 'SMV-Other' type of collisions were considerably higher than the Regional average of 5\% based on the 2007-2009 data.


Exhibit 6: Collisions by Road Surface Condition (2006-2010) between Healey Road and Street ' $A$ '


Exhibit 7: Collisions by Road Surface Condition (2006-2010) between King Street and Old School Road

The land use adjacent to this road section is rural farms. During the winter months, mitigative measures to address the amount of blowing and drifting snow from the open fields on either side of the roadway is already being undertaken with the placement of snow fencing. However, loss of control and Run-off-road type of collisions are still occurring as indicated from the historical collision records. As such, staff will further enhance the snow fencing in the area and provide Shoulder Rumble Strips to further improve safety in the area.

The average collision rate in the zone for the previous five years (2006-2010) is 0.22 (based on 1 million vehicles entering). A comparative analysis was conducted for Airport Road with other Regional Roads in the area with similar geometrics, traffic and environmental characteristics, and the results indicated that the average collision rate on Airport Road is similar to like facilities in the area. Detailed collision history has been provided in Appendix ' $\mathbf{A}$ '.

Historically speaking, our records do not indicate a significant increase in the number of collisions occurring in the zone. Our monitoring of collision activity in

Airport Road EA (1KM north of Mayfield Road to 0.6KM North of King Street) this zone will continue as part of the scoping and monitoring process of safety programs.

### 3.2. NETWORK SCREENING AND RANKING

The network screening and ranking process establishes a priority system to rank the intersections and midblock road segments based on their Potential for Safety Index (PSI). In other words, this system ranks different locations according to where the safety of road users could potentially see the greatest increase.

The Empirical Bayes (EB) method is used to estimate the long-term safety performance of each location. The long-term safety performance of each location is compared with its peers (i.e. other locations with similar geometric, traffic, and environment characteristics). If the safety performance of the subject location is worse than the average safety of its peers, i.e. average predicted number of collisions obtained from Safety Performance Functions (SPF), then the subject location has a potential for safety improvement.

The PSI is calculated as the difference between the expected number of collisions and the predicted number of collisions. It is then calculated for severe and for property damage only (PDO) type collisions. The PSI for the severe collisions is also adjusted as a function of the societal cost of collisions for fatal and injury collisions. Intersections and Midblock road segments are then independently ranked from the highest to the lowest.

Presently there are 587 intersections and 777 road sections in the Region of Peel ranked based on their PSI. The PSI ranking of the intersections and the road segments in the study zone are provided in Table 2. None of the intersections and road sections in the zone are among the top 100 locations in the PSI ranking.

| LOCATION | PSI <br> Ranking' |
| :--- | :---: |
| Airport Road at Street 'A' | 584 |
| Airport Road between Healey Road and Street 'A' | 416 |
| Airport Road at Healey Road | 493 |
| Airport Road between Healey Road and Old School Road | 264 |
| Airport Road at Old School Road | 555 |
| Airport Road between King Street and Old School Road | 191 |
| Airport Road at King Street | 252 |

Table 2: Potential for Safety Index (PSI) Ranking
*As per the "2009 Networking Screening Report"

### 3.3. SPEED DATA

Speed data from Automatic Traffic Recorder's (ATR) at two locations was analyzed to determine the operating characteristics of the vehicles, as they pertain to speed, in the area. These locations are:

1. 0.1 km north of Old School Road
2. 2.1 km north of Mayfield Road

The Mean speed and the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed were calculated from the results of the speed data. Mean speed is the average speed of all the vehicles and $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile is the speed at or below which $85 \%$ of motorists feel is a safe and comfortable operating speed.

The posted Speed limit in the zone is $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for Airport Road 0.1 km north of Old School Road. Recorded northbound and southbound speed data returned the following (Table 3 - Table 5):

| Northbound <br> Direction | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85th Percentile | 80 | 113 | 99 | 109 | 89 |
| Mean Speed <br> (Average) | 68 | 65 | 86 | 92 | 78 |

Table 3: Northbound direction - 0.1 Km N of Old School Road

| Southbound <br> Direction | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85th Percentile <br> (Average) | $\mathbf{8 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 5}$ | 98 | 96 | 106 |

Table 4: Southbound direction - 0.1 Km N of Old School Road

| Northbound / <br> Southbound <br> Direction | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85th Percentile | 81 | 99 | 99 | 104 | 100 |
| Mean Speed <br> (Average) | 68 | 71 | 86 | 87 | 86 |

Table 5: Northbound /Southbound direction - 0.1 Km N of Old School Road

The posted speed limit in the zone is $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for Airport Road 2.1 km north of Mayfield Road where the second ATR was installed. Recorded northbound and southbound speed data returned the following (Table 6 -Table 8):

| Northbound <br> Direction | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85th Percentile | 80 | 98 | 89 | 97 | 89 |
| Mean Speed <br> (Average) | 57 | 80 | 79 | 86 | 76 |

Table 6: Northbound direction - 2.1km north of Mayfield Road

| Southbound <br> Direction | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85th Percentile | 80 | 95 | 98 | 98 | 91 |
| Mean Speed <br> (Average) | 60 | 82 | 86 | 88 | 79 |

Table 7: Southbound direction - 2.1km north of Mayfield Road

| Northbound / <br> Southbound <br> Direction | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85th Percentile 80 96 95 <br> Mean Speed <br> (Average) 58 81 83 <br> 87 78   |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8: Northbound/ Southbound direction - 2.1km north of Mayfield Road
The results indicate that speeding infractions are occurring in the area and are not to be unexpected as the zone is primarily rural in nature. Although the Region of Peel does not condone speeding, it is unlikely that sporadic enforcement will have any long term effect on driver behaviour unless the enforcement is maintained on a frequent and sustained basis.

## 4. SITE INVESTIGATION

The second phase of the investigation consisted of a site visit on January 5, 2012. Although there was no significant increase in the number or severity of collisions identified in our preliminary collision history review; staff have taken a proactive approach to safety by conducting on-site reviews to determine what elements could be enhanced in this zone.

The site investigation consisted of a positive guidance review and conformance check to determine what role information deficiencies and violation of driver

Airport Road EA (1KM north of Mayfield Road to 0.6KM North of King Street) expectations may have played in contributing to crash potential. The site investigations consisted of:

- Review of the geometric elements including lane configuration
- Signing review
- Identification of potential hazards
- Illumination
- Pavement markings/ pavement condition


### 4.1. POTENTIAL SAFETY ENHANCEMENTS

There were potential safety enhancements identified in the study zone during the review that can be implemented to improve the overall safety of the zone. The enhancements on Airport Road as well as on the municipal roads intersecting it have been identified. The safety enhancements identified on municipal roads are under the jurisdiction of the Town of Caledon. Every intersection has a luminaire unless stated otherwise.

Identified potential safety enhancements are as follows:
a. Advance 'street name’ sign is recommended on Healey Road approaching Airport Road in the westbound direction (Figure 5).


Figure 5: Advance Street Name Sign required on westbound Healey Road
b. Advance 'street name’ sign is recommended on Old School Road approaching Airport Road in the eastbound direction (Figure 6).


Figure 6: Advance Street Name Sign required on eastbound Old School Road
c. Street Name sign on Airport Road at Old School Road is damaged and needs to be replaced (Figure 7).


Figure 7: Damaged Street Name Sign Airport Road at Old School Road
d. Ladder crosswalks and Pedestrian Countdown signal heads should be provided at the intersection of Airport Road at King Street for the safety of the vulnerable road users (Figure 8). It has to be noted that pedestrian cross buttons have been provided at this intersection.


Figure 8: Crosswalk required at Airport Road at King Street
e. A luminaire is provided at the offset intersections of Old School Road and Healey Road (Figure 9) on Airport Road. However, the location should be reviewed and upgraded to the new current ANSI Roadway Lighting RP-8-00 standards at the time of reconstruction of the intersection. This is to increase the visibility of the roadway and its immediate environment, thereby permitting the drivers to manoeuvre efficiently and safely.


Figure 9: Luminaire at Old School Road and Healey Road on Airport Road
f. For the road section on Airport Road between Street 'A' and Healey Road 'SMV Other' (Run-off-road) was the only type of collision that occurred. Speeding and weather were noted to be the leading causes for these collisions. Countermeasures were explored to mitigate the situation; one of which was installing raised reflective markers on the centerline as well as on the lane markings within the zone.
g. Missing guide wire should be replaced with guiderail with reflectors on the support post on the west side of Airport Road between Street ' $A$ ' and Healey Road for the safety of vehicles that might run off road (Figure 10).


Figure 10: Replace marker post wire between Street ' $A$ ' and Healey Road

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

This report identifies some safety improvements in the study area and contains recommendations that should be implemented to further enhance the safety and conspicuousity of the intersections and road segments in the study area.

As part of this EA, constructing a roundabout at the offset intersection of Airport Road with Healey Road and Old School Road is being considered to improve the traffic flow and reduce the potential of collision of left turning vehicles. Meanwhile, signalization of the said offset intersection is warranted based on volumes and, as a result, temporary signals are recommended as an interim measure. Roundabout or permanent signals will be considered as a long-term solution. Detailed review of both the options will be part of the Traffic report.

Further, this review incorporates recommended signage enhancements that may be beyond the jurisdiction of the Regional Municipality of Peel. It is recommended that the Town of Caledon be contacted regarding any signage that is under their jurisdiction.

## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS

There were potential safety enhancements identified in the study zone during the safety audit, which can be implemented to improve the overall safety of the zone. Identified recommendations are as follows:

## Signage (Town of Caledon Jurisdiction):

1. Install advance "street name" sign on Healey Road approaching Airport Road in the westbound direction.
2. Install advance "street name" sign on Old School Road approaching Airport Road in the eastbound direction.

## Pavement Marking:

3. Install ladder crosswalk at the intersection of Airport Road at King Street to increase the safety and conspicuity of the intersection.

## Illumination:

4. Lighting through the study area on Airport Road be reviewed and upgraded to the new current ANSI Roadway Lighting RP-8-00 standards, at the time of reconstruction.

## Others

5. Install pedestrian countdown signal heads at the intersection of Airport Road at King Street to increase the safety of the pedestrians and conspicuity of the intersection.

## Geometrics

6. Marker posts wire should be upgraded to guiderail with reflectors on the support posts on the west side of Airport Road between Street 'A' and Healey Road

## Pilot:

7. Install new yellow raised reflective markers in the centre line as well as white raised reflective markers on the lane markings on Airport Road between Street ' $A$ ' and King Street to enhance the visibility of the roadway during low light and poor environmental conditions.
8. For the road section on Airport Road between Street ' $A$ ' and Healey Road, some of the countermeasures to mitigate the Run-off-road type of collisions are:
I. Shoulder Rumble Strip: the installation of shoulder rumble strip can be used to warn drivers by creating vibration and noise when driven over. As per Highway Safety Manual 2010 "The vibratory effect of the Rumble Strip can be felt in snowy and icy conditions and may act as a guide to drivers in inclement weather".

This countermeasure does have some impact to the movement of some cyclists. As such, designed breaks in the Shoulder Rumble Strip will be provided as per input from the Region's Active Transportation Group (Figure 11).


Figure 11: Shoulder Rumble Strip
(Source - FHWA)
II. Snow Fence: Enhancing the snow fence that is installed during the winter months will further address blowing snow from the open fields on either side of the roadway. Additionally, the Region of Peel's 'Living Snow Fence Program' will be considered. Living snow fences are tree and shrub windbreaks strategically planted in critical locations to assist in minimizing the hazards caused by drifting snow. The trees and shrubs are planted a minimum of 30 meters from the travelled portion of the roadway (Figure 12). If the landowners on this stretch of the roadway are willing to participate in this program, it may be incorporated as a mitigative measure to prevent the snow from blowing onto the roadway hence, improving road safety.

A new install technique for standard snow fence can be piloted by installing the snow fence slightly above the ground to get higher yield of snow and prevent majority of it from blowing onto the roadway. Consideration should also be made for double snow fencing if standard snow fencing is used as a mitigative measure.


Figure 12: Examples of a Snow Fence
9. This entire zone would be a good pilot area for "Safety Edge". Safety edge is a process where the edge of the paved roadway is finished at a 30 angle (Figure 13). This roadway treatment can assist in the reduction of (SMV
other) Run-off-road type collisions by eliminating pavement drop off and assisting in recovery. The drop off unfinished asphalt lip creates a significant amount of tire scrub that can cause a driver to over compensate when attempting to return to the paved surface if the vehicle has driven off the pavement.


Figure 13: Safety Edge (Source - FHWA)

## REFERENCES:

Highway Safety Manual $1^{\text {st }}$ Edition 2010
Ontario Traffic Manual
Federal Highway Administration

| MIDBLock ID: | 966 |  |  | DESCRIPTION: | AIRPORT ROAD BE | etween healey | road \& Street "A" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accident ID | Date \& Time | Light | Environment Condition 1 | Road 1 Surface Condition | Initial Impact Type | Classification of Accident | Apparent Driver 1 Action | Apparent Driver 2 Action | Initial <br> Direction of Travel 1 | Initial <br> Direction of Travel 2 | Vehicle 1 Manoeuver | Vehicle 2 Manoeuver | Sequence of Events 1 | Sequence of Events 2 |
| 60000201 | 04-Feb-06 7:55 PM | Snow | Dark | Loose snow | SMV - Other | P. D. only | Lost control | Other | North | Other | Skidding/sliding | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 60000267 | 25-Feb-06 7:11 AM | Clear | Daylight | Loose snow | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Speed too fast for condition | Other | South | Other | Skidding/sliding | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 00060648 | 17-Jun-06 3:45 AM | Clear | Dark | Dry | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Lost control | Other | North | Other | Skidding/sliding | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 06000996 | 02-Oct-06 4:25 AM | Clear | Dawn | Dry | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Lost control | Other | South | Other | Other | Other | Unknown | Other |
| 08020017 | 08-Mar-08 2:00 PM | Snow | Daylight | Packed snow | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Speed too fast for condition | Other | South | Other | Skidding/sliding | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 08020638 | 04-Aug-08 4:50 AM | Clear | Dark | Dry | SMV - Other | Non-fatal injury | Improper passing | Other | South | Other | Ditch | Other | Overtaking | Other |
| 09000287 | 22-Feb-09 4:00 PM | Driting snow | Daylight | Loose snow | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Lost control | Other | South | Other | Pole (sign, parking meter) | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 09000937 | 15-Aug-09 11:45 AM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | SMV - Other | Non-fatal injury | Lost control | Other | North | Other | Skidding/sliding | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 10000158 | 10-Feb-10 12:15 AM | Snow | Dark | Loose snow | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Lost control | Other | South | Other | Ran off road | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 10000541 | 19-May-10 7:30 PM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Lost control | Other | North | Other | Other | Ditch | Going ahead | Other |
| 10001278 | 13-Dec-10 2:05 PM | Clear | Daylight | Slush | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Speed too fast for condition | Other | North | Other | Skidding/sliding | Rollover | Going ahead | Other |
| LOCATION TOTAL COLLISIONS: 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INTERSECTION ID: INT_1228 |  |  |  | DESCRIPTION: | AIRPORT ROAD @ HEALEY ROAD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accident ID | Date \& Time | Light | Environment Condition 1 | Road 1 Surface Condition | Initial Impact Type | Classification of Accident | Apparent Driver 1 Action | Apparent Driver 2 Action | Initial Direction of Travel 1 | Initial <br> Direction of <br> Travel 2 | Vehicle 1 Manoeuver | Vehicle 2 Manoeuver | Sequence of Events 1 | Sequence of Events 2 |
| 08020523 | 10-Aug-08 3:05 PM | Rain | Daylight | Wet | Rear end | P.D. only | Improper passing | Driving properly | South | South | Other motor vehicle | Other | Going ahead | Turning left |
| 10000979 | 08-Oct-10 9:50 AM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Turning movement | P. D. only | Improper turn | Driving properly | West | North | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Turning left | Going ahead |
| LOCATION TOTAL COLLISIONS: 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MIDBLOCK ID: | 358 |  |  | DESCRIPTION: | AIRPORT ROAD BETWEEN KING STREET \& OLD SCHOOL ROAD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accident ID | Date \& Time | Light | Environment Condition 1 | Road 1 Surface Condition | Initial Impact Type | Classification of Accident | Apparent Driver 1 Action | Apparent Driver 2 Action | Initial <br> Direction of <br> Travel 1 | Initial Direction of Travel 2 | Vehicle 1 Manoeuver | Vehicle 2 Manoeuver | Sequence of Events 1 | Sequence of Events 2 |
| 06000212 | 14-Feb-06 7:50 PM | Clear | Dark | Wet | SMV - Other | P. D. only | Other | Other | North | Other | Ran off road | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 06000363 | 23-Mar-06 1:20 AM | Clear | Dark | Dry | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Driving properly | Other | South | Other | Animal - domestic | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 64000046 | 06-Apr-06 10:50 AM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Lost control | Other | South | Other | Ran off road | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 60000554 | 19-May-06 2:00 PM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Lost control | Other | South | Other | Ran off road | Other | Slowing or stopping | Other |
| 07001268 | 19-Nov-07 5:55 PM | Rain | Dark | Wet | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Other | Other | North | Other | Other | Other | Turning right | Other |
| 08000189 | 08-Feb-08 4:05 PM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Rear end | P.D. only | Following too close | Driving properly | North | North | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Going ahead | Stopped |
| 08021817 | 04-Nov-08 6:20 AM | Fog, mist, smoke, dust | Dark | wet | Sideswipe | P.D. only | Driving properly | Failed to yield right-of-way | South | South | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Going ahead | Making "U" turn |
| 09000979 | 28-Aug-09 8:45 AM | Rain | Daylight | wet | Rear end | P.D. only | Following too close | Driving properly | South | South | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Slowing or stopping | Turning left |
| 09001429 | 18-Dec-09 12:30 PM | Clear | Daylight | Wet | Sideswipe | P.D. only | Other | improper turn | North | North | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Going ahead | Turning right |
| 10000062 | 23-Dec-09 9:35 PM | Clear | Dark | ıe | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Speed too fast for condition | Other | North | Other | Ran off road | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 10000353 | 30-Mar-10 4:00 PM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Rear end | Non-fatal injury | Following too close | Driving properly | North | North | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Going ahead | Stopped |
| 10001166 | 20-Nov-10 8:40 PM | Clear | Dark | Dry | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Improper turn | Other | North | Other | Ditch | Other motor vehicle | Turning left | Other |

LOCATION TOTAL COLLISIONS: 12

| INTERSECTION | INT_1170 |  |  | DESCRIPTION: | AIRPORT ROAD @ | @ King street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accident ID | Date \& Time | Light | Environment Condition 1 | Road 1 Surface Condition | Initial Impact Type | Classification of Accident | Apparent Driver 1 Action | Apparent Driver 2 Action | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Initial } \\ \text { Direction of } \\ \text { Travel 1 } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Initial <br> Direction of <br> Travel 2 | Vehicle 1 Manoeuver | Vehicle 2 Manoeuver | Sequence of Events 1 | Sequence of Events 2 |
| 06000348 | 16-Mar-06 3:53 PM Cid | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Sideswipe | P.D. only | Improper passing | Driving properly | East | East | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Overtaking | Turning left |
| 06000718 | 01-Jul-06 12:45 PM C- | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Rear end | P.D. only | Speed too fast for condition | Driving properly | North | North | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Going ahead | Stopped |
| 07000939 | 10-Aug-07 3:10 PM C- | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Rear end | P.D. only | Other | Driving properly | South | South | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Going ahead | Stopped |
| 08000177 | 01-Feb-08 2:00 PM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Rear end | P.D. only | Driving properly | Driving properly | South | South | Other motor vehicle | Other | Slowing or stopping | Stopped |
| 08020555 | 03-Aug-08 9:05 PM C- | Clear | Dusk | Dry | Sideswipe | Non-fatal injury | Failed to yield right-of-way | Driving properly | South | South | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Turning right | Going ahead |
| 08020727 | 30-Aug-08 12:10 AM | Clear | Dark | Dry | Angle (t-bone) | Non-fatal injury | Driving properiy | Disobeyed trafic control | North | East | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Going ahead | Going ahead |
| 08020647 | 19-Sep-08 10:51 AM | Clear | Dayight | Dry | Angle (t-bone) | P.D. only | Disobeyed trafic control | Driving properly | North | West | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Going ahead | Going ahead |
| 08021140 | 25-Dec-08 11:32 AM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Angle (t-bone) | P.D. only | Driving properiy | Failed to yield right-of-way | West | South | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Going ahead | Going ahead |
| 09000342 | 22-Feb-09 4:50 PM C | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Rear end | P.D. only | Other | Driving properiy | West | West | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Reversing | Stopped |
| 09000483 | 24-Mar-09 12:25 PM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Angle (t-bone) | Non-fatal injury | Disobeyed trafic control | Driving properly | South | West | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Going ahead | Going ahead |
| 09001144 | 22-Jun-09 7:55 AM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Rear end | P.D. only | Following too close | Other | South | South | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Going ahead | Stopped |
| 10000123 | 26-Jan-10 4:50 PM | Clear | Daylight | Dry | Turning movement | P.D. only | Failed to yield right-of-way | Driving properiy | East | North | Other motor vehicle | Other | Turning left | Going ahead |
| 10000504 | 27-May-10 5:23 PM | Rain | Daylight | Wet | Rear end | P.D. only | Following too close | Driving properly | West | West | Other motor vehicle | Other | Going ahead | Stopped |
| 10000968 | 13-Oct-10 5:54 PM | Rain | Daylight | Wet | SMV - Other | Non-fatal injury | Speed too fast for condition | Other | West | Other | Ran off road | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| LOCATION TOTAL COLLISIONS: 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MIDBLOCK ID: 301 DESCRIPTION: AIRPORT ROAD UPTO 0.6KM North of king street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accident ID | Date \& Time | Light | Environment Condition 1 | Road 1 Surface Condition | Initial Impact Type | Classification of Accident | Apparent Driver 1 Action | Apparent Driver 2 Action | Initial <br> Direction of <br> Travel 1 | Initial Direction of Travel 2 | Vehicle 1 Manoeuver | Vehicle 2 Manoeuver | Sequence of Events 1 | Sequence of Events 2 |
| 60000790 | 23-Jul-06 2:41 AM | Clear | Dark | Dry | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Lost control | Other | North | Other | Rollover | Other | Going ahead | Other |
| 07028694 | 15-Feb-07 5:00 PM C- | Clear | Dawn | Wet | Other | P.D. only | Driving properly | Driving properly | North | South | Other | Other | Going ahead | Going ahead |
| 07001348 | 29-Nov-07 4:00 PM S | Snow | Dawn | Ice | Rear end | P.D. only | Following too close | Driving properly | South | South | Other motor vehicle | Other motor vehicle | Slowing or stopping | Stopped |
| 10000245 | 25-Feb-10 10:52 PM S | Snow | Dark | Loose snow | SMV - Other | P.D. only | Lost control | Other | South | Other | skidding/sliding | Other | Going anead | Other |

## LOCATION TOTAL COLLISIONS: 4

## GRAND TOTAL FOR THE ZONE: 43
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