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## 1 INTRODUCTION

WSP was retained by 221 Sterling Road Holdings Inc. to prepare a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) for the 221-227 Sterling Road Development in the City of Toronto. The site location and study area are shown in Figure 1-1.
The proposed development features 892 residential units. The site plan is shown in Figure 1-2. The proposed vehicular accesses are onto the proposed extension of Ruttan Street to connect to Sterling Road. The extension of Ruttan Street will be discussed in greater detail in Sections 4 and 6.
The main objective of this study is to evaluate the traffic impacts of the redevelopment on the study area transportation network and to ensure the proposed parking and loading arrangements are adequate.
A Terms of Reference was sent to the City of Toronto transportation staff prior to commencing the TIS and is documented in Appendix A. Our study approach and findings are documented herein.
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## 2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

This section of our assessment describes the existing road network and traffic conditions within the study area. Currently, Bloor Street West is undergoing construction for the Bloor Bikeway Extension project (herein referred to as the Bloor Bikeway project), reducing the cross-section from four lanes to two lanes as a result of the implementation of cycling facilities along the corridor. For the purpose of this assessment, two existing conditions scenarios were assessed.

The first scenario comprises of assessing turning movement counts collected along Bloor Street West prior to the implementation of the Bloor Bikeway Extension, which began in 2020. These traffic counts range from 2017 to 2018.
The second scenario involves assessing the study intersections along Bloor Street West after the implementation of the Bloor Bikeway project. By way of background, WSP was retained by the City of Toronto staff in 2020 to conduct the post-Bloor Bikeway project traffic assessment and forecast. Therefore, for consistency, the forecast turning movement counts developed by WSP for study intersections along Bloor Street have been adopted as the basis of this scenario. This post- Bloor Bikeway project scenario is the primary focus of the study and will be the basis of the future background and future total evaluations since the implementation of the active transportation improvement is already underway. An image of the latest configuration along Bloor Street West in the vicinity of the subject development at Bloor Street West and Ruttan Street is shown below (looking west along Bloor Street W).


### 2.1 BOUNDARY ROADWAYS

The following roadways make up the boundary road network that surrounds the subject site:
Bloor Street West, which is located north of the site, is an east-west arterial road with a posted speed limit of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Prior to the implementation of the bikeway, Bloor has a four-lane cross-section, with two lanes in each direction. On-street parking is prohibited on both sides at all times.

After the implementation of the bikeway initiative by the City, Bloor Street will have a two-lane crosssection, with one lane in each direction. In the vicinity of the site, from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., no eastbound left turn movements are permitted at the intersections with Dundas Street West and Lansdowne Avenue. Furthermore, no eastbound right turn and westbound left movements are permitted at the intersection with Lansdowne Avenue from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. These movement restrictions are accounted for in the assessment of the future traffic conditions.

Dundas Street West, which is located west of the site, is a north-south arterial road with a posted speed limit of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Dundas Street West has a four-lane cross-section, with two lanes in the south direction, and direction.
Lansdowne Avenue, which is located east of the site, is a north-south arterial road with a speed limit of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Lansdowne Avenue has a two-lane cross-section, with one lane in each direction.
Sterling Road / Symington Avenue, which directly borders the site to the west, is a local road that has a one-lane cross-section south of Bloor Street, as it is a one-way direction. North of Bloor Street West, Sterling Road becomes Symington Avenue, which does not align with the south leg. Symington Avenue has a two-lane cross-section, and a speed limit of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, whereas Sterling Road has a posted speed limit of $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.
Perth Avenue, which is located east of the site, is a predominately north-south local road, with a twolane cross-section and a speed limit of $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ in the vicinity of the site.
Ruttan Street, which is located west of the site, is a north-south local road with a two-lane cross-section and terminates today as a cul-de-sac near Merchant Lane. As part of the redevelopment proposal, Ruttan Street is proposed to be extended south from the cul-de-sac to connect to Sterling Road. Details of this initiative are provided in Section 4.
Merchant Lane, which is located north of the site, is an east-west private driveway that serves the residential uses north-east of the subject site.

Based on the subject site location and magnitude of redevelopment, the following study intersections have been evaluated in this TIS:

- Sterling Road / Symington Avenue at Bloor Street West (signalized);
- Dundas Street West at Bloor Street West (signalized);
- Lansdowne Avenue at Bloor Street West (signalized);
- Dundas Street West at Sterling Road (signalized);
- Ruttan Street at Bloor Street West (unsignalized);
- Ruttan Street at Merchant Lane (unsignalized); and
- Sterling Road at Perth Avenue (unsignalized).

The existing lane configurations at the study intersections prior to the implementation of the Bloor Bikeway Extension are illustrated in Figure 2-1. The lane configurations after the implementation of the Bloor Bikeway project are illustrated in Figure 2-2. The Bloor Bikeway project reduces the number of vehicular travel lanes from 4 lanes along Bloor to 2 lanes ( 1 lane in each direction).

Left and Right Turn Restrictions

### 2.2 EXISTING TRANSIT SERVICES

The site is situated in an area that is very well-served by the following Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) routes, resulting in a transit score of 99 out of 100 . In addition, the site is within close proximity ( 350 m ) to regional transit via the Bloor GO / UP Express Station.

- The 2 Bloor-Danforth subway route runs in a general east-west direction along Bloor Street West, Bloor Street East, and Danforth Avenue. It operates from the western area of Dundas Street West and Kipling Avenue, east to the area of Bloor Street and Yonge Street in downtown Toronto and continues east to the area of Eglinton Avenue East and Kennedy Road. Line 1 connects with Line 2 at BloorYonge, St George and Spadina stations, and it connects with Line 3 at Kennedy Station. The subject site is located within 520 m and 630 m of the Lansdowne and Dundas West stations, respectively, which makes the site very accessible to higher-order transit.
- The 506 Carlton streetcar route operates between Main Street Station on the Bloor-Danforth Subway and High Park Loop, generally in an east-west direction. It also serves the College and Queen's Park Stations on the Yonge-University-Spadina Subway. Both Main Street and Queen's Park Stations are accessible subway stations. The route is part of the 10 Minute Network, and operates 10 minutes or better, all day, every day.
- The 504 King streetcar route operates between Dundas West Station and Broadview Station on Line 2 Bloor-Danforth, generally in an east-west direction. It also serves the St Andrew and King stations on Line 1 Yonge-University. Dundas West, St. Andrew, and Broadview stations are accessible. Two services, 504A and 504B branches operates at all times, seven days a week.
- The 505 Dundas streetcar route operates between Dundas West Station and Broadview Station on the Bloor-Danforth Subway, generally in an east-west direction. It also serves the St. Patrick and Dundas Stations on the Yonge-University-Spadina Subway. Dundas West, Dundas and Broadview Stations are all accessible subway stations. One single service is operated, the 505 (Dundas West Station-Broadview Station) branch operates at all times, seven days a week.
- The 168 Symington bus route operates between Dundas West Station on the Bloor-Danforth Subway and the area of Rogers Road and Weston Road, generally in a north-south direction. Dundas West Station is an accessible subway station. Bike racks are available on this route. This route operates seven days a week.

Table 2-1 summarizes the above-noted transit services, along with their posted headways throughout the service period. It should be noted that the headways shown are for each direction of travel. A map of the above transit routes is shown in Figure 2-3.

Table 2-1: Existing Transit Services within the Study Area

| Route |  | Transit Service Operating Headways |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A.M. Peak | Weekday Midday | P.M. Peak | Weekday Night |
| 168 Symington | 5 minutes | 10 minutes | 7 minutes | 10 minutes |
| 506 Carlton | 4 minutes | 6 minutes | 6 minutes | 8 minutes |
| 2 Bloor-Danforth | 2 minutes | 3 minutes | 3 minutes | 4 minutes |
| 504 King | 4 minutes | 4 minutes | 4 minutes | 4 minutes |
| 505 Dundas | 7 minutes | 7 minutes | 7 minutes | 9 minutes |



### 2.3 TRAFFIC DATA

### 2.3.1 DATA PRIOR TO BLOOR BIKEWAY EXTENSION

Table 2-2 summarizes the turning movement counts (TMC) collected for this study, as well as the source and date of the counts. Traffic data was collected during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods prior to the implementation of the Bloor Bikeway Extension. Details of the turning movement counts are provided in Appendix B.

Table 2-2: Traffic Data Information Prior to Bloor Bikeway Extension

| Intersections | Date of the <br> count | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sterling Road / Symington <br> Avenue at Bloor Street West | November 9, <br> 2017 | BA Group Report, 72 Perth Avenue, <br> 2018 |
| Dundas Street West and <br> Bloor Street West | November 9, <br> 2017 | BA Group Report, 1515 Bloor Street <br> West, 2018 |
| Lansdowne Avenue and Bloor <br> Street West | November 9, <br> 2017 | BA Group Report, 1515 Bloor Street |
| West, 2018 |  |  |$|$

It should be noted that due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, current traffic patterns would be atypical. Therefore, all of the turning movement counts are either historical or derived from first principle. Historical counts were collected from sources including background development reports and the City of Toronto.
As noted in the table above, all of the intersections along Bloor Street, with the exception of the intersection of Bloor Street West / Ruttan Street, had their TMCs conducted prior to the installation of the Bloor Bikeway Extension, which commenced during the summer of 2020. Therefore, these TMCs would not be reflective of current conditions, given the reduction in lanes along Bloor Street West impacting vehicular traffic.
The turning movement counts collected prior to the Bloor Bikeway extension were assessed separately in this study as a scenario to understand the operations relative to the current conditions with the Bloor Bikeway in place. For the purposes of this existing conditions scenario, the historical turning movement counts from 2017 and 2018 were not grown to 2021 since traffic in the downtown environment has stabilized along many arterial roads.

The existing traffic volumes counted prior to the installation of the Bloor Bikeway Extension project are presented in Figure 2-4.


### 2.3.2 VOLUMES AFTER BLOOR BIKEWAY EXTENSION

As discussed earlier, the second existing conditions scenario involves the post Bloor Bikeway Extension Project along Bloor Street West in the vicinity of the site. WSP had assisted the City in preparing signal timing plans and projected traffic volumes for intersections along Bloor Street West impacted by the Bloor Bikeway Extension Project, which were accepted by City staff in the summer of 2020. These signal timings, volumes, and lane configurations have been applied in this study.

As part of the Bloor Bikeway Extension project, the City provided calibrated Synchro models along Bloor Street, which is the basis of the future background and future total conditions assessment in this study. For information and data regarding the Bloor Bikeway Extension Synchro volumes and lane configurations, please refer to Appendix B.
Table 2-3 summarizes the TMCs for the signalized intersections along Bloor Street West during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods, after to the implementation of the Bloor Bikeway Extension.

Table 2-3: Traffic Data Information after Bloor Bikeway Extension

| Intersections | Source |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sterling Road / Symington Avenue at Bloor Street West | WSP Canada Inc., Bloor Bikeway Extension Project, 2020 |
| Dundas Street West and Bloor Street West | WSP Canada Inc., Bloor Extension Bikeway Project, 2020 |
| Lansdowne Avenue and Bloor Street West | WSP Canada Inc., Bloor Extension Bikeway Project, 2020 |
| Dundas Street West and Sterling Road | November 18, 2018 City of Toronto TMC |
| Sterling Road and Perth Avenue | May 10, 2018, BA Group Report, 72 Perth Avenue |
| Merchant Lane and Ruttan Street | Volumes generated for existing residential uses based on 1405 Bloor Street West 2020 LEA Report trip generation rates plus ITE $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition Land Use Code 820-Retail for existing retail uses on site (discussed in Section 2.3.3) |
| Bloor Street West and Ruttan Street | Volumes generated for existing residential uses based on 1405 Bloor Street West 2020 LEA Report trip generation rates plus ITE $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition Land Use Code 820-Retail for existing retail uses on site (discussed in Section 2.3.3); and balanced volumes along Bloor from upstream intersection of Bloor Street West/Symington Avenue |

The post Bloor Bikeway Extension traffic volumes are illustrated in Figure 2-5.


### 2.3.3 TRIP GENERATION OF EXISTING SITE AND SURROUNDING USES

For the intersections of Merchant Lane / Ruttan Street, and Bloor Street West / Ruttan Street, no historical turning movement counts are available. The peak hour traffic volumes were derived at these two unsignalized intersections from first principles based on the land uses that the two intersections serve. Trip generation was conducted for the various land uses served by these two intersections.

Information on the existing retail uses currently on site were provided by the client, and ITE 10th Edition Land Use Code 820 - Retail average trip generation rates were applied to the retail Gross Floor Area (GFA).

To estimate the vehicle trips generated by the existing residential uses that rely on Ruttan Street for vehicular access, the local residential trip generation rates from the September 2020 LEA Consulting Ltd. TIS for the 1405-1490A Bloor Street West development were applied for residential trip generation in this study. This report was selected since the average residential trip generation rates were derived from proxy site surveys for residential developments in the downtown transit-rich context. These rates would adequately represent the modal split characteristics of downtown developments, which have access to various transit, pedestrian, and cycling options.

The trip generation rates applied for the existing retail uses onsite and the surrounding residential uses are presented in Table 2-4. Based on the detailed review of the surrounding land uses, there are 419 condo/townhouse units that rely on the intersection of Ruttan Street / Bloor Street West for vehicular access. The existing retail uses on site ( 61,000 sq.ft. GFA) will be displaced by the proposed development. The trip generation rates in the table below were applied to the respective land uses.

Table 2-4: Existing Site and Surrounding Residential Developments Trip Generation Rates

| Use | A.M. Peak Hour |  |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Multi-Unit <br> Residential <br> (Average Rate) | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.12 |
| Retail <br> (Average Rate) | 0.58 | 0.36 | 0.94 | 1.83 | 1.98 | 3.81 |

No non-auto reduction was applied to trip generation for the residential uses since the residential trip generation rates applied are already based on proxy surveys that account for modal split.

For the trip generation of the existing retail uses, the non-auto split derived from Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) 2016 survey data for zones $(105,106,107,114,115,116$ ) were applied. The modal split in the study vicinity for retail uses are summarized in Table 2-5.

Table 2-5: Study Area Mode Split Characteristics - Retail

| Primary Travel <br> Mode | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Inbound | Outbound | Inbound | Outbound |
| Auto - Driver | $49 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Auto - Passenger | $6 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Transit | $30 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| Walking and <br> Cycling | $15 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Non-Auto Total | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ |

The calculation of the peak hour trips generated by the existing retail onsite and the surrounding residential uses are summarized in Table 2-6.

Table 2-6: Existing Residential and Retail Vehicle Trip Generation

| Use | Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A.M. Peak Hour |  |  | Total | In | Out |
|  | In | Out | Total |  |  |  |
| Residential | 8 | 34 | 42 | 38 | 13 | 51 |
| Retail | 20 | 20 | 40 | 23 | 67 | 90 |

Based on the results in the table above, the existing retail uses onsite is forecast to generate 40 and 90 two-way trips in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively. The neighbouring residential uses currently generate 42 and 51 two-way trips during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively.

### 2.3.4 TRIP DISTRIBUTION RETAIL AND RESIDENTIAL USES

The vehicle trips generated by the existing retail onsite and surrounding residential properties were distributed at the intersections of Bloor Street West / Ruttan Street and Merchant Lane / Ruttan Street. The distribution patterns were based on 2016 TTS data of the zones $(105,106,107,114,115,116)$ for homebased and work-based trips. Tables 2-7 and 2-8 outline the resulting trip distribution for residential and retail trips. The traffic assignment of the trips were developed based on the trip distribution information and the most logical path for vehicles to travel in order to minimize travel time and distance. The detailed TTS queries are provided in Appendix G.

Table 2-7: TTS Trip Distribution for the Study Area - Residential Use

| Direction | A.M. Inbound | A.M. Outbound | P.M. Inbound | P.M. Outbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northwest | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| North | $3 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Northeast | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| East | $0 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Southeast | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| South | $9 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Southwest | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| West | $88 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Table 2-8: TTS Trip Distribution for the Study Area - Retail Use

| Direction | A.M. Inbound | A.M. Outbound | P.M. Inbound | P.M. Outbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northwest | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| North | $21 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Northeast | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| East | $10 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Southeast | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| South | $9 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Southwest | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| West | $60 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Figure 2-6 illustrates the trips generated from the neighbouring residential uses that are served by Ruttan Street. Figure 2-7 illustrates the trips generated by the existing retail uses onsite. It should be noted that the traffic volumes at the other intersections where historical volumes are available already account for the trips associated with the residential and retail uses served by Ruttan Street.
The eastbound and westbound through traffic volumes along Bloor Street West at the intersection of Bloor Street West / Ruttan Street were then balanced with the adjacent intersection of Bloor Street West / Symington Avenue.

### 2.3.5 EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

The existing traffic volumes prior to the Bloor Bikeway Extension were developed by superimposing the volumes in Figure 2-4 onto Figures 2-6 and 2-7. The resulting pre-Bloor Bikeway Extension weekday peak hour traffic volumes are shown in Figure 2-8.

The existing traffic volumes after the Bloor Bikeway Extension were developed by superimposing the volumes in Figure 2-5 onto Figures 2-6 and 2-7. The resulting post-Bloor Bikeway Extension weekday peak hour traffic volumes are shown in Figure 2-9.
These existing traffic volumes are the basis of the existing conditions assessment for the pre and post Bloor Bikeway Extension scenarios.





### 2.4 MODEL ASSUMPTIONS

In the pre-Bloor Bikeway scenario, the Synchro model was established based on the City of Toronto Synchro 9.0 Guidelines. The peak hour factors (PHF) for the intersections of Dundas/Bloor, Bloor/Symington, Lansdowne/Bloor, Dundas/Sterling and Sterling/Perth were calculated from the respective TMCs. Calculations for the PHF at these intersections are provided in Appendix B. At the intersections where the peak hour volumes had to be derived from first principles and balancing (Ruttan/Bloor and Merchant/Ruttan) the PHF applied are based on the recommendations from the City of Toronto Synchro 9.0 Guidelines (ranging from 0.90 to 0.95 depending on the movement and the period evaluated). In addition, a lost time of -1 second was applied at the signalized intersections. The pedestrian and heavy vehicle percentages have also been inputted to the Synchro model. Bus blockages have been incorporated as well.
For the Bloor Bikeway scenario, the PHF, lost time, pedestrian and bus blockage information of the signalized intersections along Bloor Street West are based on the City of Toronto's calibrated Synchro model (used for the Bloor Bikeway Extension Project). The calibration parameters applied at the other study intersections are consistent with those applied in the pre-Bloor Bikeway scenario as noted above.

### 2.5 EXISTING TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS

### 2.5.1 AUTO <br> METHODOLOGY

To analyze existing traffic conditions in the study area, capacity analyses were undertaken using the Synchro 10 traffic analysis software. This software incorporates the methodology outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), Transportation Research Board, 2000 and 2010. The signal timing plans for the study intersections were acquired from various background development studies and are provided in Appendix B.

An intersection capacity analysis provides an indication of traffic operations based on calculations of volume-to-capacity (v/c) and delays for individual movements at an intersection. Level of Service (LOS) denoted by letters ' $A$ ' through ' $D$ ', represent satisfactory traffic operations. LOS denoted by the letters ' $E$ ' and ' $F$ ' represent congested traffic operations. Appendix C provides the LOS definitions according to the HCM 2000 methodology.

## EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Traffic operations were analyzed at the study intersections to understand the existing LOS during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours for the two scenarios (before and after the Bloor Bikeway Extension volumes as shown in Figures 2-8 and 2-9). The results of the existing conditions assessment for both scenarios are summarized in Tables 2-9 and 2-10. Detailed Synchro worksheets for conditions before the bikeway are provided in Appendix D-1, and Synchro worksheets for conditions after the bikeway are provided in Appendix D-2.

Table 2-9: Existing Intersection Operations before Bloor Bikeway Extension

| Intersections | Weekday A.M. Peak Hour |  | Weekday P.M. Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS (Delay in Seconds) | Critical Movement (Volume/Capacity Ratio) | LOS (Delay in Seconds) | Critical Movement (Volume/Capacity Ratio) |
| Signalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |
| Dundas Street West and Bloor Street West | C (24 sec) | - | C (24 sec) | - |
| Bloor Street West and Symington Avenue / Sterling Road | C (29 sec) | - | D (36 sec) | - |
| Lansdowne Avenue and Bloor Street West | C (22 sec) | - | C (24 sec) | - |
| Dundas Street West and Sterling Road / Private Access | A (8 sec) | - | A (10 sec) | - |
| Unsignalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |
| Bloor Street West and Ruttan Street | C (23 sec) | NB-LR (0.22) | B (14 sec) | NB-LR (0.16) |
| Ruttan Street and Merchant Lane | A (9 sec) | WB-LR (0.04) | A (9 sec) | WB-LR (0.01) |
| Perth Avenue and Sterling Road | A (8 sec) | EB-LR (0.14) | A (9 sec) | NB-LT (0.27) |

1 For signalized intersections, the level of service is based on the overall delay of the intersection. Critical v/c ratios are only listed for movements with values over 0.90 .
2 For stop controlled intersections, the level of service is based on the delay associated with the critical movement.

The results presented in Table 2-9 indicate that all of the signalized study intersections operate at acceptable LOS ' D ' or better under existing conditions before the implementation of the Bloor Bikeway, with no critical movements that operate near or at capacity.
With regards to the unsignalized study intersections, all of the critical movements operate at LOS ' C ' or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Furthermore, all of the busiest movements operate well within capacity. The busiest unsignalized intersection of Bloor Street West and Ruttan Street serves the existing retail uses on sites (pre COVID-19) and the residential uses along Merchant Lane and Ruttan Street.

Table 2-10: Existing Intersection Operations after Bloor Bikeway Extension

| Intersections | Weekday A.M. Peak Hour |  | Weekday P.M. Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS (Delay in Seconds) | Critical Movement (Volume/Capacity Ratio) | LOS (Delay in Seconds) | Critical Movement (Volume/Capacity Ratio) |
| Signalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |
| Dundas Street West and Bloor Street West | C $(28 \mathrm{sec})$ | - | C (29 sec) | - |
| Bloor Street West and Symington Avenue / Sterling Road | $C(30 \mathrm{sec})$ | - | D (40 sec) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB-TR (0.97) } \\ & \text { NB-TR }(0.92) \end{aligned}$ |
| Lansdowne Avenue and Bloor Street West | C (31 sec) | - | D (35 sec) | SB-TR (0.92) |
| Dundas Street West and Sterling Road / Private Access | A (8 sec) | - | A (10 sec) | - |
| Unsignalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |
| Bloor Street West and Ruttan Street | C (24 sec) | NB-LR (0.22) | $C(24 \mathrm{sec})$ | NB-LR (0.30) |
| Ruttan Street and Merchant Lane | A (9 sec) | WB-LR (0.04) | A (9 sec) | WB-LR (0.01) |
| Perth Avenue and Sterling Road | A (8 sec) | EB-LR (0.14) | A (9 sec) | NB-LT (0.27) |

1 For signalized intersections, the level of service is based on the overall delay of the intersection. Critical v/c ratios are only listed for movements with values over 0.90.
2 For stop controlled intersections, the level of service is based on the delay associated with the critical movement.
The results presented in Table 2-10 indicate that all of the signalized study intersections continue to operate at acceptable LOS ' D ' or better under existing conditions after the implementation of the Bloor Bikeway extension. However, there are now some critical movements along Bloor Street at Symington Avenue/Sterling Road and Lansdowne Avenue in the p.m. peak hour. Since Bloor Street is narrowed from two to one in each in direction, the slight deterioration in intersection operations for the vehicular mode is not surprising given the shift in emphasis towards non-auto modes of transportation.
With regards to the existing unsignalized intersections, all of the intersections operate at LOS ' $C$ ' or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, and there is no movement that is near or at capacity.

### 2.5.2 PEDESTRIANS

The following pedestrian facilities were analyzed because they are expected to be the sidewalks with the highest pedestrian volumes and will be used by pedestrian trips generated by the proposed redevelopment.

- the sidewalk along the south side of Bloor Street West; and
- the sidewalk along the east side of Sterling Road/Symington Avenue.


## METHODOLOGY

The assessment of the pedestrian facilities is carried out using the HCM6 methodology. The HCM6 methodology involves the analysis of the pedestrian delays at intersections, the perceived width and flow rate of the sidewalk, as well as other factors such as distance to crossing locations and sidewalk pinch points. For example, the HCM6 has two separate methodologies for evaluating signalized and unsignalized intersections. The signalized intersections are evaluated based on both the time (delay) and space (geometric) characteristics of the intersection, while the unsignalized intersections are evaluated based on the time (delay) characteristics only.
The intersection analysis findings are then combined with a pedestrian link analysis between the intersections. This measures the average flow along the pedestrian link and compares it to the perceived width, proximity to vehicles, obstructions in the path of travel and other pedestrian realm characteristics. The link analysis generates a pedestrian level of service score, which is then attributed to a letter grade from 'A' to ' F ', representing the best and worst spectrum of performance, respectively.

## EXISTING PEDESTRIAN LEVEL-OF-SERVICE

The existing pedestrian analysis findings for the Bloor Street West and Sterling Road/Symington Avenue pedestrian facilities in the vicinity of the site are summarized in Table 2-11. The existing pedestrian volumes in the vicinity of the subject site were based on the turning movement counts at the intersection of Bloor Street West and Sterling Road/Symington Avenue and shown in the image below. The definitions for the pedestrian LOS and the detailed pedestrian intersection analyses are provided in Appendix E.

Table 2-11: Existing Pedestrian Conditions

| Segment | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bloor Street West | LOS C | LOS C |
| Sterling Road / <br> Symington Avenue | LOS B | LOS C |



Based on the LOS noted above, the pedestrian facilities along Bloor Street West and Sterling Road/Symington Avenue in proximity to the proposed development are adequately accommodating the existing pedestrian volumes.
The cycle tracks in place along Bloor Street West greatly enhances the capacity and safety of cyclist along the arterial road. Given how recent this cycling initiative was evaluated and implemented by the City, further assessment of the cycling infrastructure in this report is not warranted.

### 2.5.3 TRANSIT

Existing ridership volumes for the representative transit routes in the study area were purchased from TTC, and provided in Appendix B. The most recent typical (pre-COVID-19) average passenger volumes at the stops in the vicinity of the redevelopment were obtained, and transit utilization rates were calculated based on the standard bus, streetcar and subway capacity. The existing transit ridership at the study stops are presented in Table 2-12, along with the resulting utilization.

Table 2-12: Existing Transit Ridership Utilization

| Route | Capacity Per Transit Unit/hour | Direction | Weekday A.M. Peak Period |  | Weekday P.M. Peak Period |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average Hourly Ridership per transit route | Utilization | Average Hourly Ridership per transit route | Utilization |
| 168 | 51 | NB | 11 | 21\% | 38 | 74\% |
| Symington | 51 | SB | 41 | 80\% | 22 | 43\% |
| 506 Carlton | 74 | EB | 12 | 16\% | 5 | 7\% |
| 506 Carlton | 74 | WB | 3 | 4\% | 10 | 13\% |
| 2 Bloor- | 1000 | EB | 430 | 43\% | 600 | 60\% |
| Danforth | 1000 | WB | 430 | 43\% | 600 | 60\% |

As shown in Table 2-12, all of the transit routes evaluated operate within the available capacity during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods under existing conditions. It should be noted that for the 2 BloorDanforth line, the average ridership calculated in the respective peak hours was assumed for both directions on the route.

## 3 FUTURE BACKGROUND CONDITIONS

### 3.1 HORIZON YEAR

A horizon year of 2026 was assessed for the proposed development in this study. It is assumed that the development will be completed in one phase and by this horizon year.

### 3.2 BACKGROUND GENERAL TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Consistent with other TIS' in the area, no general growth rate was applied along the boundary road network. This takes into consideration the fact that the implementation of the Bloor Bikeway will have a significant impact on the traffic flow along Bloor Street West and shift the emphasis to active transportation and transit instead. Given the lane reduction along the Bloor Street West corridor, it is anticipated that general traffic volumes along the Bloor Street West corridor will stabilize as observed in other parts of the downtown area. Instead of general growth, increase in the future background volume in the study area are being accounted for through the inclusion of the site traffic generated by the background developments as noted in the following section.

### 3.3 BACKGROUND DEVELOPMENTS

Based on our review of the City's development application website, seven background developments have been included as part of this TIS. Details of these background developments are summarized in Table 3-1. Figure 3-1 illustrates the location of these background developments relative to the subject site, and Figure 3-2 illustrates the traffic volumes generated by these background developments, which were extracted from their respective TIS'. Including all seven background development is conservative since they are at different stages of City review.

Table 3-1: Background Development Information

| Development | Statistics | Traffic Volume Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1405-1409 Bloor Street West | 326 residential units, $237 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ retail | BA Group, April 2018 |
| 1439 Bloor Street West | 169 condominium units | GHD, August 2018 |
| 1540 Bloor Street West | 327 residential units, $8,685 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ retail | LEA Group, December 2019 |
| 72 Perth Avenue | 105 residential units, $484 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ commercial | BA Group, May 2018 |
| 2280 Bloor Street West | $\begin{gathered} 2600 \text { residential units, } 65,000 \\ \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { office, } \\ 20,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { retail } \end{gathered}$ | BA Group, April 2018 |
| 181 Sterling Road | 243 residential units, $1,079 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ retail | BA Group, 2017 |
| 1319 Bloor Street West | 634 residential units, $769 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ retail | BA Group, December $2020$ |




### 3.4 BACKGROUND ROAD NETWORK

For the future assessments in this study, only the Bloor Bikeway extension scenario has been evaluated since the infrastructure is now in place. Figure 2-2 illustrates the lane configurations of the boundary road network after the implementation of the bikeway, which will be the basis of the future background evaluation.

### 3.5 FUTURE BACKGROUND OPERATIONS

### 3.5.1 AUTO

The projected future background traffic volumes were developed by superimposing the background development volumes in Figure 3-2 onto the post-Bloor Bikeway Extension existing traffic volumes in Figure 2-9. The resulting 2026 future background volumes are shown in Figure 3-3. The future background intersection operations are outlined in Table 3-2 and the Synchro worksheets are in Appendix F. Signalized intersections had their splits optimized where necessary, but cycle lengths remain the same from existing conditions.

Table 3-2: 2026 Future Background Intersection Operations

| Intersections | Weekday A.M. Peak Hour |  | Weekday P.M. Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS (Delay in Seconds) | Critical Movement (Volume/Capacity Ratio) | LOS (Delay in Seconds) | Critical Movement (Volume/Capacity Ratio) |
| Signalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |
| Dundas Street West and Bloor Street West | D (37 sec) | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB-T (0.97) } \\ \text { SB-LTR (0.97) } \end{gathered}$ | C (33 sec) | - |
| Bloor Street West and Symington Avenue / Sterling Road | D (38 sec) | WB-TR (0.95) | E (55 sec) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB-TR (1.09) } \\ & \text { NB-TR (1.01) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Lansdowne Avenue and Bloor Street West | C (34 sec) | EB-T (0.90) | D (41 sec) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB-T (0.98) } \\ & \text { SB-TR }(0.94) \end{aligned}$ |
| Dundas Street West and Sterling Road / Private Access | A (10 sec) | -- | B (13 sec) | -- |
| Unsignalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |
| Bloor Street West and Ruttan Street | D (32 sec) | NB-LR (0.39) | D (34 sec) | NB-LR (0.43) |
| Ruttan Street and Merchant Lane | A (9 sec) | WB-LR (0.04) | A (9 sec) | WB-LR (0.01) |
| Perth Avenue and Sterling Road | A (8 sec) | EB-LR (0.23) | A (10 sec) | NB-LT (0.36) |

[^0]The results in Table 3-2 indicate that under future background conditions, most of the study intersections operate at acceptable LOS ' D ' or better with the critical movements operating within capacity. However, the addition of traffic associated with 7 background development results in the intersection of Bloor Street / Symington Avenue / Sterling Road operating at LOS 'E' with two critical movements over capacity during the p.m. peak hour. Both of these movements were already critical under existing conditions and the additional through traffic along Bloor Street West related to the developments result in the busier operations.
All of the unsignalized intersections continue to operate at acceptable LOS ' D ' or better with all movements operating within capacity.

The purpose of presenting the future background conditions is to compare the incremental increase in delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio when the site-generated traffic are added as part of the future total conditions.


### 3.5.2 PEDESTRIAN ASSESSMENT

The pedestrian volumes in the vicinity of the subject site have been assumed to grow by $1.5 \%$ per year over the next 5 years to the 2026 horizon. The future background pedestrian volumes are shown below.


The pedestrian LOS for the pedestrian facilities along Symington Avenue/Sterling Road and Bloor Street West were updated based on the projected volumes, and the results are summarized in Table 3-3. Detailed results and analysis of the pedestrian LOS are provided in Appendix E.

Table 3-3: Future Background Pedestrian Conditions

| Segment | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bloor Street West | LOS C | LOS C |
| Symington Avenue / Sterling Road | LOS C | LOS C |

As shown above, the general growth in pedestrian volumes results in a change in the pedestrian LOS during the a.m. peak hour along Symington Avenue/Sterling Road from LOS B under existing conditions to LOS C. However, this LOS along with other segments are still projected to adequately serve the pedestrian needs in the vicinity of the study area.

### 3.5.3 TRANSIT ASSESSMENT

The transit ridership under future background condition have been estimated using an annual ridership growth rate of $1.5 \%$ (no information was provided by TTC upon request). Based on the assumed growth rate, the resulting utilization rates of the bus routes within the study area by the 2026 horizon year are shown in Table 3-4.

Table 3-4: Future Background Transit Conditions

| Route | Capacity Per <br> Transit Unit/hour | Direction | Weekday A.M. Peak Period |  | Weekday P.M. Peak Period |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average Hourly Ridership per transit route | Utilization | Average Hourly Ridership per transit route | Utilization |
| 168 | 51 | NB | 12 | 23\% | 41 | 79\% |
| Symington | 51 | SB | 44 | 86\% | 24 | 46\% |
| 506 Carlton | 74 | EB | 13 | 18\% | 5 | 7\% |
| 506 Carlton | 74 | WB | 4 | 5\% | 10 | 14\% |
| 2 Bloor- | 1000 | EB | 463 | 46\% | 646 | 65\% |
| Danforth | 1000 | WB | 463 | 46\% | 646 | 65\% |

As shown in Table 3-4, all the transit routes evaluated continue to operate within the available capacity during both the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours under future background conditions.

## 4 SITE-GENERATED VOLUMES

### 4.1 SITE ACCESS \& RUTTAN STREET EXTENSION

The vehicular driveway for the site connects to the proposed extension of Ruttan Street as shown on the site plan in Figure 1-2. This proposed extension of Ruttan Street will connect Bloor Street West to Sterling Road thereby precluding the need for the existing cul-de-sac. Therefore, the site-generated traffic from the proposed development will have access to the intersection of Bloor/Ruttan and the signalized intersections of Sterling/Symington/Bloor to the north, and Dundas/Sterling to the south. The enhanced connectivity resulting from the proposed Ruttan Street extension also applies to the existing residential uses that currently only have access to the intersection of Bloor/Ruttan. Ruttan Street is a public road and the layout of the street extension is shown below and gives consideration to:


- The centreline of the Ruttan Street extension is based on the centreline of the existing segment to the north. On street parking is currently allowed on the east side of the street and streetlight poles are along the west side of the street.
- We have consulted the Development Infrastructure Policy \& Standards (DIPS) so that the desired 5.3 m boulevard is provided on the east side of the Rutan Street extension, which will be sufficient for the sidewalk and utilities. In addition, the pavement width of 8.5 m is also consistent with DIPS and allows for one vehicular lane in each direction as well as on street parking on the east side. On the west side of the Ruttan Street extension, 1.5 m is allocated for either a boulevard or eventually integrated with the development proposal at 1405-1409A Bloor Street West \& 229231A Sterling Road. A potential cross-section of the 15.3 m right-of-way (ROW) Ruttan Street extension is shown below (left) relative to the existing section of Ruttan Street (facing north).
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- It is important to note that the westerly limit of the proposed Ruttan street extension already straddles the westerly property line limit of the subject development at 221-227 Sterling Road. Therefore, to maintain the centreline alignment of Ruttan Street, any additional ROW that the City requires to fulfill the boulevard needs along the west side of the street would need to be allocated from the development at 1405-1409A Bloor Street West \& 229-231A Sterling Road.
Following this submission and with consideration of feedbacks from the City, a functional design (10\%) design will be prepared for the Ruttan Street extension.
The new intersection formed by the proposed extension of Ruttan Street and the site driveway will be evaluated in this study and are shown in the future total lane configurations illustrated in Figure 4-1.



### 4.2 TRIP GENERATION

### 4.2.1 AUTO TRIP GENERATION

The proposed development features a total of 892 residential units. The auto trip generation of the development is based on the area-specific trip generation rates applied in the September 2020 TIS for 1405-1409A Bloor Street West. As noted earlier in Section 2.3.3, these rates represent the downtown area modal split and was also applied for the trip generation of residential uses surrounding the proposed development. The average auto trip generation rates are presented in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1: Site Trip Generation Rates

| Use | Average Auto Trips/Unit |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A.M. Peak Hour |  |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |  |
|  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Multi-Unit Residential | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.12 |

The calculation of the peak hour auto trips generated by the development is summarized in Table 4-2.
Table 4-2: Site-Generated Vehicle Trips

| Use | Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A.M. Peak Hour |  |  | Total | In | Out |
|  | In | Out | Toal Hour |  |  |  |
| Residential | 18 | 71 | 89 | 80 | 27 | 107 |

The development is forecasted to generate a total of 89 and 107 auto trips during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively. With consideration of the displacement of the retail uses on the site today pre-COVID-19 (40 and 90 trips during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively), the net sitegenerated traffic for the development is 49 and 17 trips during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively. In comparison and for context, the City's TIS guideline has a threshold of 100 auto trips per hour in terms of determining when a TIS required. This indicates that the net impact of the redevelopment on the boundary road network is expected to be relatively minor.

### 4.2.2 TRANSIT AND PEDESTRIAN TRIP GENERATION

The transit and pedestrian trip generation of the proposed development were back calculated based on the auto trip generations in Table 4-2 and the proportion of auto mode use in the study area. Table 4-3 summarizes the modal split characteristics for residential uses in the study area based on the TTS data for zones ( $105,106,107,114,115$ and 116).

Table 4-3: Study Area Mode Split Characteristics - Residential

| Primary Travel <br> Mode | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Inbound | Outbound | Inbound | Outbound |
| Auto - Driver | $48 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Auto - Passenger | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Transit | $19 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Walking \& Cycling | $33 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Non-Auto Total | $\mathbf{5 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 \%}$ |

For clarification of the calculation, during the weekday a.m. peak hour, the 71 outbound auto trips tabulated in Table $4-2$ represents $26 \%$ of the total outbound trips in the site area as per the TTS findings. Thus, there would be a total of 273 outbound trips during the a.m. peak hour. Based on the transit and active transportation mode splits presented in Table 4-3, 137 of the 273 outbound trips are forecast to be via transit (50\%) and 57 trips via walking/cycling (21\%) during the weekday a.m. peak hour.
The resulting transit and pedestrian trip generations for the redevelopment are summarized below in Table 4-4.

Table 4-4: Non-Auto Trip Generation

| Primary Travel Mode | Modal Split Percentage |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |
|  | Inbound | Outbound | Inbound | Outbound |
| Site Generation Auto Trips | 18 | 71 | 80 | 27 |
| Site Generated Total Trips* | 38 | 273 | 296 | 77 |
| Transit Person Trips | 7 | 137 | 145 | 27 |
| Pedestrian Person Trips | 13 | 57 | 56 | 13 |

*Back calculated from the site auto trip generation in Table 4-2 and auto modal split in Table 4-3.

### 4.3 TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

### 4.3.1 AUTO

TTS trip distribution data of the study area's (zones $105,106,107,114,115,116$ ) home-based trips were reviewed to determine site traffic distribution patterns for the proposed development. Table 4-5 outlines the resulting trip distribution for the site-generated traffic. The TTS queries are provided in Appendix G.

Table 4-5: TTS Trip Distribution for the Study Area -Residential

| Direction | A.M. Inbound | A.M. Outbound | P.M. Inbound | P.M. Outbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northwest | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| North | $3 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Northeast | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| East | $0 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Southeast | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| South | $9 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Southwest | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| West | $88 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

The site-generated auto traffic was assigned based on the trip distribution information in Table 4-5, the future lane configuration shown in Figure 4-1 and the most logical path for vehicles to travel in order to minimize travel time and distance. For example a southbound outbound trip can either make a northbound right turn onto Bloor Street West or turn westbound left onto Sterling Road from the extension of Ruttan Street and connect over to Dundas Street.

Figure 4-2 illustrates the resulting traffic assignment of the site-generated trips to the boundary road network.

Since the proposed residential development will displace the existing retail uses on site, the traffic generated by the existing retail uses need to be removed to arrive at the net site-generated traffic volumes. Accordingly, Figure 4-3 illustrates the existing retail site traffic volumes that are to be removed from the boundary road network (based on the trip generation presented in Section 2.3.3), and Figure 44 illustrates the net site-generated traffic derived by combining the residential trips being added and the retail trips being removed.

### 4.3.2 PEDESTRIANS

For the purpose of the pedestrian evaluation, it is assumed that the majority of the site-generated pedestrians would walk along the east side of Symington Avenue/Sterling Road and along the south side of Bloor Street West since this is the closest signalized intersection to the development. The sitegenerated transit volumes were also assumed to walk along the east side of Symington Avenue/Sterling Road and along the south side of Bloor Street West to access the closest bus stops and Dundas West subway station. Both the site-generated pedestrian and transit trips have been considered in the pedestrian analysis for the future total conditions.

### 4.3.3 TRANSIT

Transit trips were distributed by direction using the Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) results. For the purpose of this assessment, the majority of transit trips (90\%) have been assigned to the BloorDanforth subway line in the east-west direction since it is the highest order of transit in the City. The remaining $10 \%$ were allocated evenly between the streetcar and bus routes.




## 5 FUTURE TOTAL CONDITIONS

### 5.1 AUTO

The 2026 future total traffic volumes were developed by superimposing the following volumes:

- 2026 future background volumes as shown in Figure 3-3; and
- Net site-generated traffic volumes as shown in Figure 4-4.

The resulting future total traffic volumes are shown in Figure 5-1. Based on these volumes, the future total intersection operations have been evaluated and documented in Table 5-1. Detailed Synchro worksheets are available in Appendix H.

Table 5-1: 2026 Future Total Intersection Operations

| Intersection | Weekday A.M. Peak Hour <br> LOS (Delay <br> in <br> Seconds) |  | Critical Movement <br> (Volume/Capacity <br> Ratio) | LOS (Delay <br> in <br> Seconds) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Critical Movement <br> (Volume/Capacity <br> Ratio) |  |  |  |
| Dundas Street West and <br> Bloor Street West | D (37 sec) | EB-T (0.97) <br> SB-LTR (0.97) | C (33 sec) |  |
| Bloor Street West and <br> Symington Avenue / <br> Sterling Road | D (41 sec) | WB-TR (0.98) | D (51 sec) | WB-TR (1.06) <br> NB-TR (1.01) |
| Lansdowne Avenue and <br> Bloor Street West | C (35 sec) | EB-T (0.92) | D (42 sec) | WB-T (0.98) <br> SB-TR (0.96) |
| Dundas Street West and <br> Sterling Road / Private <br> Access | B (10 sec) |  | - | B (13 sec) |
| Unsignalized Intersections |  |  |  |  |
| Bloor Street West and <br> Ruttan Street | E (44 sec) | NB-LR (0.59) | D (31 sec) | NB-LR (0.27) |
| Ruttan Street and <br> Merchant Lane | A (9 sec) | WB-LR (0.04) | A (9 sec) | WB-LR (0.01) |
| Perth Avenue and <br> Sterling Road | A (8 sec) | EB-LR (0.23) | A (10 sec) | NB-LT (0.38) |
| Site Access at <br> Ruttan Street | A (9 sec) | WB-LR (0.07) | A (9 sec) | WB-LR (0.03) |
| Sterling Road at <br> Ruttan Street Access | A (9 sec) | WB-LR (0.02) | B (10 sec) | WB-LR (0.00) |

1 For signalized intersections, the level of service is based on the overall delay of the intersection. Critical v/c ratios are only listed for movements with values over 0.90 .
2 For stop controlled intersections, the LOS is based on the delay associated with the critical movement.

The results in Table 5-1 indicate that the future total conditions are similar to the future background conditions. All of the study intersections, with the exception of Bloor Street West / Ruttan Street during the a.m. peak hour, continue to operate at acceptable LOS ' $D$ ' or better. The change in average intersection delay ( 0 to 3 seconds) and critical movement $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios ( 0 to 0.03 ) at the signalized intersections are minimal. In fact, the displacement of the retail trips generated by the existing uses on site result in improved operations at the signalized and unsignalized intersections of Bloor Street West and Symington Avenue/Sterling Road and Bloor Street West/ and Ruttan Street, respectively.

The unsignalized intersection of Bloor Street West/ Ruttan Street operates with LOS 'E' during the a.m. peak hour. However, the critical northbound movements still operates well within capacity at a v/c of 0.59 and for an unsignalized intersection in a downtown context, these levels of intersection operations are common. It is also worth noting that the evaluation at this unsignalized intersection is conservative since it does not consider the rerouting of the traffic generated by the adjacent development and existing residential uses that formerly only had vehicular access via Bloor Street West and Ruttan Street. Once the proposed Ruttan Street extension is in place, the traffic associated with these uses will have additional routing options via the signalized intersections of Bloor Street West and Sterling Road and Sterling Road and Dundas Street West. Therefore, motorists will be able to self-regulate between the enhanced road network.

The proposed minor-street stop controlled driveway onto the Ruttan Street extension is forecast to operate very well, which is to be expected given the opposing through volumes along Ruttan Street will be relatively low.
Overall, the findings indicate that the proposed development net site-generated auto traffic can be accommodated by the boundary road network.

### 5.2 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION ASSESSMENT

The pedestrian and transit volumes generated by the subject site were added to the future background pedestrian volumes traveling along the south side of Bloor Street West and the east side of Symington Avenue/Sterling Road. The future total pedestrian volumes are shown below.


The proposed development contributes a minor increase in the total pedestrian volumes along both streets. The resulting pedestrian LOS based on the future total pedestrian volumes are shown in Table 52 below.

Table 5-2: Future Total Pedestrian Conditions

| Segment | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bloor Street West | LOS C | LOS C |
| Symington Avenue <br> Sterling Road | LOS C | LOS C |

As shown in Table 5-2, the addition of the site-generated pedestrian volumes does not result in a change to the LOS of the pedestrian facilities relative to the future background conditions. The pedestrian facilities along the section of Bloor Street West and Symington Avenue/Sterling Road will continue to function at an adequate LOS. From a cyclist perspective, the proximity of the proposed development to the Bloor Bikeway extension (as shown below with the red star) offers a significant incentive for residents and visitors to cycle to and from the development. The proposed bicycle parking provision relative to the City's requirements are noted in Section 7.


### 5.3 TRANSIT ASSESSMENT

The future total transit trips were projected by aggregating the future background transit trips with the site-generated transit trips. Table 5-3 outlines the projected utilization rates for the various bus routes under future total conditions.

Table 5-3: Future Total Transit Conditions

| Route | Capacity Per Transit Unit/hour | Direction | Weekday A.M. Peak Period |  | Weekday P.M. Peak Period |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average Hourly Ridership per transit route | Utilization | Average Hourly Ridership per transit route | Utilization |
| 168 | 51 | NB | 12 | 24\% | 41 | 80\% |
| Symington | 51 | SB | 44 | 86\% | 24 | 48\% |
| 506 Carlton | 74 | EB | 14 | 18\% | 6 | 8\% |
|  | 74 | WB | 4 | 5\% | 11 | 15\% |
| 2 BloorDanforth | 1000 | EB | 466 | 47\% | 651 | 65\% |
|  | 1000 | WB | 464 | 46\% | 649 | 65\% |

The results presented in Table 5-3 indicate that all the transit routes will continue to operate within capacity with the additional transit trips generated by the proposed development.


## 6 SITE PLAN REVIEW

### 6.1 CITY LOADING REQUIREMENT

The loading requirements of the proposed development have been established based on the City of Toronto harmonized By-law 569-2013 as summarized in Table 6-1.

Table 6-1: Loading Requirement at the Proposed Site (Zoning By-Law 569-2013)

| Land Use | Magnitude | Number of Loading Space Required |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type A | Type B | Type C |  |
| Residential | 892 units | 1 | - | - | 1 |

As presented in Table 6-1, one Type ' $G$ ', one Type ' $C$ ', loading space are required. As shown on the site plan, two Type ' $G$ ' and one Type ' $C$ ' loading bays are proposed on the ground floor to serve the proposed development. The dimensions of the loading bays satisfy the By-law 569-2013 requirements for both Type ' $G$ ' and ' $C$ '. To facilitate public garbage pick-up, the structural design of the Type ' $G$ ' loading bays will comply with the City of Toronto Solid Waste Guideline, which requires the loading space and staging area to be built with reinforced concrete and have a vertical clearance of 6.1 m . The proposed loading arrangement will more than adequately serve the needs of the development.

### 6.2 PUBLIC ROAD DESIGN

As noted earlier in Section 4.1, Ruttan Street is proposed to be extended south from the current cul-desac terminus to connect to Sterling Road as shown in the site plan. Based on the correspondence with City staff as provided in Appendix A, staff advised that a minimum 16.5 m right-of-way (ROW) is required for the Ruttan Street extension as a public road. The project team proposes to convey 15.3 m of the subject site for the ROW of the Ruttan Street extension. The 15.3 m ROW and alignment has been designed based on the following factors:

- An 8.5 m pavement width that is generally consistent with the 9 m pavement width at the typical existing segment of Ruttan Street and is consistent with the City of Toronto Development Infrastructure Policy \& Standards (DIPS);
- The centreline of the vehicular travel portion of 8.5 m has been designed with consideration of the centreline of the existing section of Ruttan Street to minimize road offset;
- The 5.3 m wide boulevard on the east side of the street extension is consistent with the City of Toronto DIPS to accommodate various utilities, landscaping and a 2.1 m sidewalk; and
- The subject development has made fair provisions for a potential development along the west side of Ruttan Street (1405-1409A Bloor Street West \& 229-231A Sterling Road) by providing a 1.5 m wide section of boulevard ROW. It is important to note that the westerly limit of the 15.3 m ROW public road as shown coincides with the subject site's (221-227 Sterling Road) westerly property line. It is anticipated that if a development is approved along the west side of Ruttan Street that the development would need to also contribute towards the balance of the overall ROW required by the City (minimum 16.5 m ROW as per discussion with City staff). The project team will work with the City and the development team of the adjacent site to refine the public street ROW moving forward. At that point, a functional design will be prepared.


### 6.3 AT-GRADE AND UNDERGROUND CIRCULATION

The site layout has been reviewed from a transportation perspective through AutoTURN vehicle swept path analysis for a fire truck, garbage truck, delivery truck and passenger vehicles.

## Fire Truck Manoeuvres

A City of Toronto custom Fire Truck was used to test the movement of emergency vehicles serving the building (being with 15 m of the building entrance) from along both the extension of Ruttan Street and the internal driveway. As per Ontario Regulation 332/12: Building Code Section 3.2.5.5. Location of Access Routes, fire trucks need to get to a distance of less than 15 m from the principal entrances of the buildings. At the terminus of the internal driveway, a fire truck can make a 3-point turn to leave the site. The maneuvers work well as illustrated in Figures 6-1 and 6-2 with no maneuvering issues.

## Garbage Truck Manoeuvres

The maneuvers of a custom City of Toronto front-loading garbage truck as defined by the City's Solid Waste Guideline was tested entering the loading bay in a forward direction, and exiting the two proposed loading bays by reversing out while operating within the minimum inside ( 9.5 m ) and outside ( 14 m ) radius as specified in the City's Guideline. The garbage truck maneuvers work well as illustrated in Figures 6-3 and 6-4 with no manoeuvring issues.
On-site building staff will be available to assist as a flag person if desired. In addition, a flashing warning beacon system will be installed along the parking ramp adjacent to the loading bay to caution motorists exiting the garage to proceed with caution if there are any loading ongoing activities in the loading bay. Convex mirrors and signage will also be installed as appropriate to raise multi-modal awareness near the loading area.

## Loading Truck Manoeuvres

A TAC medium single unit truck was tested reversing into the Type $G$ loading bays and leaving the loading bays in a forward motion. The maneuvers work well as illustrated in Figures 6-5 and Figure 6-6.

A TAC LSU truck was tested accessing and egressing the Type C loading bay as shown in Figures 6-7 and 6-8. The manoeuvre works adequately.

## Passenger Vehicle Circulation

A P-TAC standard passenger vehicle was tested entering and exiting the site and circulating through the ramp to the underground parking levels. The maneuvers work well as illustrated in Figure 6-9. The ramp has been designed such that adequate transition slope area is provided at the top and bottom of the ramp. Convex mirrors will also be proposed at the turning area and at the top/bottom of the ramp to assist with motorist awareness.

## Underground Parking Levels

The circulation of a P-TAC vehicle template in the parking levels were tested and the maneuvers work well as shown in Figures 6-10 and 6-11. All of the spaces adjacent to physical structures have been reviewed to ensure there are appropriate buffers ( 0.3 m ). Convex mirrors are proposed at the corners of the driveways in all of the parking levels of the parking lot. All of the parking spaces meet the City of Toronto By-law 569-2013 requirements for regular and accessible parking spaces.
All of the drive aisles are 6 m wide and the ramp to the underground parking has a maximum slope within the City allowance of $15 \%$ and an adequate transition slope at the top and bottom of the ramp of $7.5 \%$.




## Figure 6-3

Garbage Truck Turning Movement Test - Inbound - Serving Building to the Left First 221 Sterling Road
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Garbage Truck Turning Movement Test - Inbound - Serving Building to the Right First 221 Sterling Road
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## 7 PARKING ASSESSMENT

### 7.1 MOTOR VEHICLE PARKING

Currently, based on the City of Toronto's Zoning By-law \#569-2013 R (d1.5) (x58) Chapter 10 as noted below:

[^1]
## Site Specific Provisions

(A) The lands must comply with exception 900.2.10(7).

Prevailing By-laws and Prevailing Sections:
(A) Section 12(2) 187 of former City of Toronto By-law 438-86;
(B) Section 12(2) 335 of former City of Toronto By-law 438-86; and
(C) On 2 Merchant Lane, former City of Toronto by-law 695-92.
(D) City of Toronto By-law 297-2003. [ By-law: OMB PL130592 ]

Notwithstanding the current zoning on the site, the harmonized By-law 569-2013 has been considered as the baseline for the subject site. Given the site's walking distance proximity to two TTC subway stations and various streetcar and bus routes as well as the recently built cycling infrastructure along Bloor Street, Policy Area 1 minimum rates as shown in Table 7-1 are appropriate for consideration. For context, the site has a transit score of 99 out of 100 and a bike score of 92 out of 100 .

Table 7-1: By-Law \#569-2013 Parking Rates for (Policy Area 1)

| Use | Parking rate |
| :---: | :---: |
| Studio | 0.30 Space per Unit |
| 1-Bedroom Unit | 0.50 Space per Unit |
| 2-Bedroom Unit | 0.80 Space per Unit |
| 3-Bedroom Unit | 1.0 Space per Unit |
| Visitor | 0.10 Space per Unit |

Based on the By-law parking rates noted in Table $7-1$, the resulting requirement for the proposed development is detailed in Table 7-2. The statistics include the rental replacement and live-work units.

Table 7-2: Parking Required for 221-227 Sterling Road

| Building | Unit Type | Parking Rate | Units / <br> GFA | Spaces |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bachelor | 0.3 Spaces per Unit | 67 | 20 |
|  | One-Bedroom | 0.5 Spaces per Unit | 591 | 295 |
|  | Two-Bedroom | 0.8 Spaces per Unit | 136 | 108 |
|  | Three-Bedroom | 1.0 Spaces per Unit | 98 | 98 |
|  | Total Residential | - | 892 | 521 |
|  | Visitor |  | 0.10 | 892 |
| Total for Proposed Building |  | $\mathbf{6 1 0}$ |  |  |

As shown above, a minimum of 610 parking spaces are required based on the application of PA-1 By-law rates to the development. In comparison, a total of 417 spaces are proposed for the development ( 5 at-grade and 412 underground over 2 levels). 87 spaces will be allocated as visitor parking while the remaining 330 spaces are allocated for residential use (average rate of 0.37 spaces/unit). Notwithstanding the City's By-law requirement, there are several justification factors in addition to the TDM measures being proposed.

### 7.2 ONGOING AND APPROVED REDUCED RESIDENTIAL VEHICULAR PARKING

While the parking needs of each development varies site by site, reduced vehicular parking provision (relative to the City By-law 569-2013) is common in urban environments with convenient transit and active transportation access. The proposed development is located within walking distance to Dundas West-Bloor Mobility Hub including the following services:

- 2 subway stations (Dundas West and Lansdowne) to access Line 2;
- Regional Kitchener GO and UP Express services at the Bloor Station;
- 3 streetcar routes that connect to various parts of the downtown core; and
- 1 regular bus route along Symington.

In addition, the site is steps from the recently completed Bloor Bikeway extension that provides protected cycle tracks and enhanced pedestrian realms for pedestrian. Based on the development's context, the past approvals and current development proposals in the City for reduced vehicular parking are summarized in Table 7-3. The average residential parking supply rate and transit/bike scores are presented relative to the proposed development.

Table 7-3: Developments with Reduced Residential Parking in Similar Context

| Development Address (magnitude) | Approval Process | Residential Parking Supply | Transit and Bike Scores |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 571 to 597 Bloor Street West, 783 to 782 Bathurst Street, 26 to 38 Lennox Street, 581 to 603 and 588 o 612 Markham Street - former Honest Ed's and Mirvish Village development (806 units) |  <br> Rezoning <br> Approved (Apr 28, 2017) | 248 spaces Resident ratio: 0.31 spaces/unit | 98 transit score 100 bike score |
| 158 Sterling Road (243 units) | Under review | 84 spaces Resident ratio: 0.35 spaces/unit | 98 transit score 100 bike score |
| 1660 Bloor Street West (133 units) | Under review | 40 spaces Resident ratio: 0.30 spaces/unit | 95 transit score 86 bike score |
| 155 Dundas Street East \& 200 Jarvis Street (384 units) | Approved Site Specific By-law 1612012 | 72 spaces Resident ratio: 0.19 spaces/unit | 100 transit score 75 bike score |
| 1405 Bloor Street West (326 units) | Under review | 101 spaces Resident ratio: 0.31 spaces/unit | 99 transit score 92 bike score |
| Average Residential Supply Rate |  | 0.29 spaces/unit | 98 transit score 91 bike score |
| Proposed Development |  | 0.37 spaces/unit | 99 transit score 92 bike score |

Based on the information presented above, the proposed development's residential vehicular parking supply rate of 0.37 spaces/unit is $28 \%$ higher than the average supply rate of other development sites that have similar transit and active transportation access. Overall, the residential supply is being reduced in areas with excellent non-auto mobility options to encourage more sustainable transportation.

### 7.3 PROXY SURVEYS

Given the current COVID-19 context and the associated travel restrictions and social distancing policies, proxy surveys are not feasible. As an alternative suggested by City staff in recent projects, representative proxy surveys of other condominiums with similar transit and active transportation context can be considered. Accordingly, various proxy results are presented in Table 7-4 to investigate the appropriateness of the proposed residential parking rate of 0.37 spaces/unit for the subject development. Many of the selected sites have walking distance access to subway stations and streetcar routes.

Table 7-4: Proxy Surveys at Condominiums with Similar Context

| Development (magnitude) | Transit \& Bike Scores | Peak <br> Residential Parking Rate Surveyed | Date of Surveys |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51 Trolley Crescent (352 units) | 100 transit <br> score 57 bike score | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ \text { spaces/unit } \end{gathered}$ | Saturday January 18, 2014 |
| 350 King Street W (465 units) | 100 transit score 97 bike score | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ \text { spaces/unit } \end{gathered}$ | Tuesday \& Saturday January 14/18, 2014 |
| $\begin{gathered} 21 \& 25 \text { Carlton St } \\ \text { (732 units) } \end{gathered}$ | 100 transit score 83 bike score | $\begin{gathered} 0.30 \\ \text { spaces/unit } \end{gathered}$ | Tuesday \& Saturday January 14/18, 2014 |
| 8 Mercer Street (412 units) | 100 transit <br> score <br> 90 bike score | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ \text { spaces/unit²} \end{gathered}$ | Wednesday \& Friday February 10/12, 2016 |
| Average | 100 transit score 82 bike score | 0.20 spaces/unit |  |
| Proposed Development | 99 transit <br> score <br> 92 bike <br> score | 0.37 spaces/unit |  |

1 Referenced from 2978 Dundas Street West TIS, January 2018
2 Referenced from 60, 64 Queen Street East and 131, 133, 135 Church Street TIS, January 2018
As shown in Table 7-4, the proposed residential supply rate of 0.37 spaces/unit is higher than the average and the maximum surveyed residential demands from four different sites. The comparison also indicates that the 4 proxy condominium sites have similar transit and bike scores as the subject site.

### 7.4 MARKETING DATA

WSP has worked with various developers in the downtown context with similar transit and bike scores to collect marketing data for vehicular parking demand. Marketing data is a strong indicator for demand in vehicular parking purchase when the sale of the space is unbundled from the unit (as is the case with the proposed development). Some relevant marketing data are presented in Table 7-5.

Table 7-5: Marketing Sales Data for Other Downtown Approved Developments

| Address | Transit \& Bike Scores | Unit Type | Parking Demand Rate (Based on sales) | Units | Blended Residential Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 215-219 <br> Church <br> Street | 100 transit score 84 bike score | Bachelor | 0.01 space per unit | 103 | 0.20 spaces/unit |
|  |  | One-Bedroom | 0.10 space per unit | 259 |  |
|  |  | Two-Bedroom | 0.33 space per unit | 196 |  |
|  |  | 3-Bedroom | 0.63 space per unit | 46 |  |
| 171 East Liberty Street | 92 transit score 86 bike score | Bachelor | 0 space per unit | 3 | 0.33 spaces/unit |
|  |  | One-Bedroom | 0.068 space per unit | 183 |  |
|  |  | Two-Bedroom | 0.754 space per unit | 61 |  |
|  |  | 3-Bedroom | 1.037 space per unit | 32 |  |
| 8 Mercer Street | 100 transit score 90 bike score | Bachelor | N/A | 68 | $0.30^{1}$ spaces/unit |
|  |  | One-Bedroom | N/A | 222 |  |
|  |  | Two-Bedroom | N/A | 112 |  |
|  |  | 3-Bedroom | N/A | 10 |  |
| Average | 96 transit score 85 bike score | 0.28 spaces/unit |  |  |  |
| Proposed Development | 99 transit score 92 bike score | Proposed residential supply: 0.37 spaces/unit |  |  |  |

1 Referenced from 88 North Mixed-use Development TIS, December 18, 2015
The results show that the proposed residential supply of 0.37 spaces/unit is higher than the average of the marketing demand observed at the three approved sites. The comparison of the parking demand is appropriate given the fact that the transit and bike scores are similar between the two sites and the proposed developments are all condominiums.

### 7.5 CITY PARKING MINIMUM POLICY REVIEW UNDERWAY

The City has recently acknowledged in publications and public notices such as PH 20.4 - proposed review of parking requirements for new development (Agenda Item History - 2021.PH20.4 (toronto.ca), that:

- This report responds to a request from Planning and Housing Committee for information related to parking requirements for new developments. The City establishes its parking requirements for new development in zoning by-laws. A review of these requirements is timely. The last review of these standards concluded in 2013.
- The demand for parking is shifting as a result of societal changes and other factors. Decreases in automobile ownership and increases in the popularity of automobile alternatives have influenced parking demand in many new developments. Ongoing significant investments in transit infrastructure are intended to provide travel choices to more people and reduce demand for automobile-based travel. Removing minimum automobile parking requirements from and increasing the use of maximum automobile parking requirements in zoning by-laws would also reduce the risk of a future oversupply of automobile parking.


### 7.6 AUTO PARKING SUMMARY

Based on the comprehensive review of the proposed/approved residential parking rates, proxy survey results and marketing data of other condominium developments with similar transit and active transportation context, it can be concluded that the proposed residential supply rate of 0.37 spaces/unit is adequate. Additional parking provided beyond this rate would either be underutilized or be a catalyst to encourage people to drive. The Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures proposed in Section 8 will also help encourage residents and visitors to adopt a non-auto mode of transportation. The proposed visitor parking rate of 0.10 spaces/unit meets the City's By-law requirement and will help ensure visitor parking needs are accommodated internal to the site. Therefore the overall parking rate of 0.47 spaces/unit for the development is appropriate given the site's transit and active transportation context.

### 7.7 BICYCLE PARKING

### 7.7.1 BICYCLE PARKING REQUIREMENTS

The bicycle parking requirements for the proposed development based on the harmonized By-law 5692013 and the Toronto Green Standard requirements have been calculated. The proposed development is located in Bicycle Zone 1. Table 7-1 summarizes the bicycle parking requirements for the site.

Table 7-1: Bicycle Parking Standards according to Zoning by-law 569-2013 (Bicycle Zone 1)

| Land Use | Bicycle Parking Rates |  | Units | Bicycle Parking <br> Requirements |  | Total <br> Required <br> Bicycle <br> Parking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Short-Term <br> (visitor) | Long-Term <br> (Residents) |  | Short- <br> Term <br> (visitor) | Long-Term |  |
| Residential | 0.1 spaces/Unit | 0.9 spaces/Unit | 892 | 90 <br> spaces | 803 spaces | 893 <br> spaces |

### 7.7.2 BICYCLE PARKING SUPPLY

A total of 952 bicycle parking spaces, including 106 short-term and 846 long-term spaces, are provided as part of the development. This supply more than satisfies the City's bicycle parking requirements for the proposed development. The extra 59 bicycle parking spaces proposed will help support the site to be less reliant on the auto mode and encourage active transportation given the site's proximity to the recently implemented Bloor cycle track.

## 8 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is a general concept that includes various strategies that increase transportation system efficiency by managing the demand for travel. TDM treats mobility as a means to an end, rather than an end in itself, and emphasizes the movement of people and goods rather than motor vehicles. Generally speaking, TDM initiatives discourage single-occupant vehicle travel and encourage more efficient modes such as walking, cycling, ridesharing, public transit and teleworking, particularly under congested conditions. In the context of an urban environment, TDM elements are an essential part of any progressive transportation and traffic plan for a proposed development.

The objective of the proposed TDM strategy is to inform, encourage and facilitate the utilization of the non-automobile travel opportunities within the study area. In order to achieve this, it is recommended that the marketing strategy for the proposed residential development highlight key characteristics based on the below items via knowledgeable sales staff and visually attractive information packages so as maximize the success of these TDM strategies and minimize the need for automobile use. The following TDM strategies are recommended to be considered as part of the proposed development.

### 8.1.1 TRANSIT AND PRESTO CARDS

Preloaded PRESTO cards (i.e. $\$ 25$ per card) could be provided to the residents as part of the move in welcome package as an incentive to use public transit. This initiative provides residents the opportunity to try the excellent transit services in proximity of the site and to adopt a transit-dependent life-style. Additional incentives could be provided to units that choose not to purchase a parking space.

### 8.1.2 UNBUNDLING OF PARKING

Parking spaces are expensive and add to the cost of rental or unit purchases. The parking spaces can be unbundled from the unit purchase so that residents are motivated and have the option to save cost by taking transit or using active transportation. The unbundling of parking from a unit sale has been a well documented TDM measure in urban context. At the other development sites noted in Section 7 where marketing data was available, it was observed that the unbundled approach resulted in lower auto parking purchases than the approved minimum parking requirements.

### 8.1.3 ON-SITE MOBILITY ALTERNATIVES INFORMATION AND INCENTIVES

Information regarding transit availability (i.e., schedule and stop locations) and available cycling facilities and connections will be available on-site in a convenient and logical location (i.e., elevator or lobby screen), and/or be included as part of the welcome package to residents of the development to inform them of the alternatives available to them. In addition, the site is within walking and cycling distance to a wide array of retail, service shop, recreational and community uses along Bloor Street West and Dundas Street West. For example, there is a Freshco, Loblaws, LCBO and secondary school within a 500 m radius of the subject site. The proximity of these utilitarian uses to the site allows residents to walk to these uses instead of driving the short distance and having to look for a parking space.

### 8.1.4 ENCOURAGING THE USE OF ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

Residents will have access to ample of bicycle parking internally ( 59 spaces beyond the City's minimum) as well as have easy access to one of the many City of Toronto Bikeshare stations as shown below with the green circles. Information about available City cycling facilities and infrastructure should be distributed to residents and displayed at prominent locations to maximize the utilization of these facilities and minimize the use of automobiles. As noted earlier, there are sidewalks on both sides of the study road network and the site is in close proximity to the recently installed cycle track along Bloor Street West. This ensures that residents and visitors have a suitable walking and cycling environment for both utilitarian and recreational uses. Providing an on-site bicycle repair station similar to those present at subway station entrances can also be a way to encourage cycling as a day to day mode of transportation.


## 9 CONCLUSIONS

This TIS has assessed the ability of the road network to accommodate the proposed residential redevelopment at 221-227 Sterling Road which is comprised of 892 units.
When considering the displacement of the existing retail uses on site, the subject development is forecasted to generate a net total of 49 and 17 auto trips during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively. The analysis indicates that the traffic impacts of the development proposal on the boundary road network are minimal and the auto trip generation can be readily accommodated by the study road network. The pedestrian and transit assessments also indicate no issues for non-auto modes.
The proposed loading supply features two Type " G " and one Type " C " loading spaces more than satisfy the By-law requirements.
As part of the development, the existing dead-end of Ruttan Street is proposed to be extended further south to connect to Sterling Road. The extension will form a public road frontage for the proposed development to front onto (including the site driveway) and enhance the connectivity for the community that currently rely on the intersection Bloor and Ruttan for vehicular access. 15.3 m of private property from the subject site is proposed towards the public road right-of-way (ROW). City staff have advised that the minimum overall ROW for the extension of Ruttan Street should be 16.5 m . Any further ROW required by the City would need to be contributed by future development along the west side of Ruttan Street.

From an auto parking perspective, the development proposes an overall rate of 0.47 spaces/unit ( 0.37 for residents and 0.10 for visitors). The residential parking supply rate of 0.37 spaces/unit is adequate based on the evaluation of marketing data, proxy surveys and approved or proposed rates from other condominium developments with similar transit and active transportation access. A robust package of TDM measures are recommended to further encourage residents and visitors to adopt a non-auto and sustainable mode of transportation.
The proposed bicycle parking supply of 952 spaces exceeds the City's requirements by 59 spaces and is an excellent means of encouraging cycling in tandem with the site proximity to the recently implemented Bloor Street cycle track.

## APPENDIX

A

## Terms of

 ReferenceTo: $\quad$ City of Toronto
Date: September 30, 2020
From: Peter Yu, WSP Canada Ltd.
Subject: Terms of Reference - TIS
221-225 Sterling Road
WSP is undertaking a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) for the proposed mixed-use development application located at 221 - 225 Sterling Road in the City of Toronto. The preliminary concept of the development is comprised of three condo towers (approximately 733 residential units), and ground floor retail space as shown below.

## Approximate Location of Development



Given the surrounding road network, one vehicular access will be provided onto the extension of Ruttan Street (extending from the current cul-de-sac south to connect to Sterling Road). The TIS will evaluate the multi-modal impact of the proposed development as well as the feasibility of the access arrangement.

The proposed scope of the TIS is outlined below for the City's confirmation:

## 1. Traffic Data Collection

Based on the type and location of the development, we have identified the following study intersections:

- Bloor Street West and Lansdowne Avenue (signalized);
- Bloor Street West and Ruttan Street (unsignalized);
- Bloor Street West and Symington Avenue (signalized);
- Bloor Street West and Sterling Road (signalized);
- Bloor Street West and Dundas Street West (signalized);
- Dundas Street West and Sterling Road (signalized);
- Ruttan Street and Merchant Lane (unsignalized);
- Sterling Road and Perth Avenue (unsignalized); and
- Sterling Road and Existing 221-225 Sterling Road site access (future Ruttan Street extension) (unsignalized intersection).

Due to the current COVID-19 pandemic conditions, new traffic data collection cannot be collected because volumes are not typical. As a result, WSP will purchase the available TMCs from the City and other sources for the typical weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours at the study intersections. We will also purchase traffic signal timing plans from the City for the signalized intersections noted above, as well as transit ridership data from the TTC for bus and subway routes.

## 2. Existing Traffic Analysis

We will analyze the existing conditions using the Synchro 10.0 Traffic Software, which is the software implementation of the Highway Capacity Manual 2010, the recognized standard for traffic operations analysis in North America. The existing conditions will be modelled based on the existing transportation network and the peak hour traffic volumes. The City of Toronto Synchro Guidelines will be referenced for this project.

## 3. Future Background Traffic Analysis

a. Based on the anticipated completion of the development, a five-year horizon period of 2025 will be evaluated for future conditions. We will review the City's historical AADT records to determine if general growth are applicable along the boundary roadways.
b. Confirm with the City any future road/intersection improvements within the study area, which are anticipated to be in place within the 5 -year horizon and incorporate future lane configurations, if applicable.
c. We will review the City's development application webpage to determine the applicable background developments to include within the study area.
d. Estimate the traffic increases related to these other developments (if not available through site specific traffic impact studies) and assign this traffic to the boundary roadways in the vicinity of the subject site.
e. Develop the future background traffic forecast for the 5-year horizon, on the basis of the existing traffic volumes, applicable traffic growth rate, and anticipated future traffic related to other developments in the vicinity of the site.
f. Analyze the future background traffic operations on the basis of 5-year background traffic forecasts. This includes identifying whether improvements to the study area road network are required as a result of other background developments and general background traffic growth in the area.
4. Trip Generation and Assignment
a. Develop the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour site traffic from the development using the methodology outlined in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation

Manual, 10th Edition. If available from the background review, the study will use established trip generation rate to reflect site-specific characteristics.
b. Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) information will be consulted to determine the applicable non-auto modal adjustments to be applied. Given the proximity of the site to higher order transit facilities, a substantial non-auto modal split is anticipated.
c. The site-generated traffic volume will be assigned to the study road network based on the existing traffic patterns, the future road network (i.e., Ruttan extension), as well as the TTS distribution information. The traffic volumes generated by the existing land uses on the site will also be removed from the study road network since these buildings will be displaced after the development is complete.

## 5. Future Total Traffic Analysis

a. The 2025 future total traffic volumes at the site driveway and boundary intersections will be developed by superimposing the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour site-generated traffic volumes onto the future background traffic forecasts.
b. Perform a detailed capacity analysis to determine the 2025 future total traffic operations for the study intersection and the proposed site driveway. Based on the findings, quantitative results and commentary on traffic operations within the study area will be provided. The focus of the assessment will be on the traffic operation impact associated with the proposed development.
c. Identify any road and/or traffic operation improvements that may be required based on the future total traffic operations. Sensitivity scenarios will be evaluated if necessary to understand the implication of different improvements.

## 6. Multi-Modal Analysis

A multi-modal analysis of pedestrian and transit modes will be conducted given the proximity of the development site to a wide range of transit services. As a result, a comprehensive review of the needs and impacts on these alternative travel modes will be undertaken. The methodology of the multi-modal analysis will be a hybrid of the City of Ottawa's MMLOS Guidelines developed in 2015 \& 2017, as well as the City's best practices.

## 7. Parking Review

a. Review the proposed automobile parking supply for the proposed development relative to the pertinent Zoning By-law and comment on the appropriateness of the arrangement based on the site context and proposed TDM measures.
b. Review the proposed bicycle parking supply of the development relative to the City of Toronto Zoning By-law 569-2013 Chapter 230 Bicycle Parking Space Regulations and Toronto Green Standards. This includes breakdown between visitor versus long-term spaces, and the location of the parking provision.
8. Loading Assessment

Evaluate the loading requirements of the proposed development with consideration of the City of the applicable By-law. This includes the dimensions of the loading bays, garbage room setup and design specifications.

Please provide your input on the above noted terms of reference at your earliest convenience.

Yours Sincerely,


Peter Yu, P. Eng., PMP
Project Manager
Transportation Planning and Advisory Services

## APPENDIX

Traffic Data






Notes: Sterling Rd is one way north. By-Law signs - No NB right turn on red. No SB right turn on red except with green arrow.









Peak Hour: 08:00 AM - 09:00 AM Weather: Overcast (4.6 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ )

| Start Time | N Approach PERTH AVE |  |  |  |  |  | E Approach BLOOR ST W |  |  |  |  |  | S Approach PERTH AVE |  |  |  |  |  | W Approach BLOOR ST W |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total (15 min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total |  |
| 08:00:00 | 31 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 29 | 36 | 7 | 200 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 214 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 16 | 267 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 309 | 561 |
| 08:15:00 | 35 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 43 | 38 | 2 | 164 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 24 | 246 | 30 | 0 | 1 | 300 | 509 |
| 08:30:00 | 30 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 32 | 5 | 169 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 34 | 247 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 316 | 531 |
| 08:45:00 | 23 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 29 | 34 | 7 | 156 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 175 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 21 | 241 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 297 | 508 |
| Grand Total | 119 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 134 | 140 | 21 | 689 | 32 | 0 | 5 | 742 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 65 | 5 | 95 | 1001 | 127 | 0 | 1 | 1222 | 2109 |
| Approach\% | 85\% | 7.9\% | 7.1\% | 0\% |  | - | 2.8\% | 92.9\% | 4.3\% | 0\% |  | - | 60\% | 0\% | 40\% | 0\% |  | - | 7.8\% | 81.9\% | 10.4\% | 0\% |  | - | - |
| Totals \% | 5.6\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0\% |  | 6.6\% | 1\% | 32.7\% | 1.5\% | 0\% |  | 35.2\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% | 4.5\% | 47.5\% | 6\% | 0\% |  | 57.9\% | - |
| PHF | 0.85 | 0.39 | 0.5 | 0 |  | 0.92 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.67 | 0 |  | 0.87 | 0.38 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 |  | 0.63 | 0.7 | 0.94 | 0.9 | 0 |  | 0.97 | - |
| Heavy | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 7 | 2 | 54 | 0 | 0 |  | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 48 | 7 | 0 |  | 58 | - |
| Heavy \% | 5\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% |  | 5\% | 9.5\% | 7.8\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 7.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 3.2\% | 4.8\% | 5.5\% | 0\% |  | 4.7\% | - |
| Lights | 113 | 11 | 9 | 0 |  | 133 | 19 | 635 | 32 | 0 |  | 686 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 5 | 92 | 953 | 119 | 0 |  | 1164 | - |
| Lights \% | 95\% | 100\% | 90\% | 0\% |  | 95\% | 90.5\% | 92.2\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 92.5\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 100\% | 96.8\% | 95.2\% | 93.7\% | 0\% |  | 95.3\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 24 | 0 | 0 |  | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 32 | 2 | 0 |  | 37 | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks \% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1.4\% | 4.8\% | 3.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 3.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 3.2\% | 3.2\% | 1.6\% | 0\% |  | 3\% | - |
| Buses | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 5 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 0 |  | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 0 |  | 21 | - |
| Buses \% | 3.4\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% |  | 3.6\% | 4.8\% | 3.9\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 3.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 1.6\% | 3.9\% | 0\% |  | 1.7\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| Articulated Trucks \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 130 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 56 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Pedestrians\% | - | - | - | - | 63.1\% |  | - | - | - | - | 2.4\% |  | - | - | - | - | 27.2\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0.5\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk\% | - | - | - | - | 1.9\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 4.4\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 4 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Road\% | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |

Peak Hour: 04:45 PM - 05:45 PM Weather: Overcast $\left(7.7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$

| Start Time | N Approach PERTH AVE |  |  |  |  |  |  | E Approach BLOOR ST W |  |  |  |  | S Approach PERTH AVE |  |  |  |  |  |  | W Approach BLOOR ST W |  |  |  |  | Int. Total ( 15 min ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total |  |
| 16:45:00 | 35 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 38 | 9 | 286 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 302 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 29 | 3 | 10 | 147 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 196 | 539 |
| 17:00:00 | 35 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 39 | 10 | 268 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 285 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 4 | 8 | 153 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 544 |
| 17:15:00 | 37 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 39 | 7 | 244 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 257 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 8 | 7 | 174 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 232 | 536 |
| 17:30:00 | 36 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 54 | 42 | 14 | 279 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 303 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 7 | 10 | 169 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 225 | 577 |
| Grand Total | 143 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 207 | 158 | 40 | 1077 | 30 | 0 | 3 | 1147 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 109 | 22 | 35 | 643 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 869 | 2196 |
| Approach\% | 90.5\% | 8.2\% | 1.3\% | 0\% |  | - | 3.5\% | 93.9\% | 2.6\% | 0\% |  | - | 50\% | 9.1\% | 40.9\% | 0\% |  | - | 4\% | 74\% | 22\% | 0\% |  | - | - |
| Totals \% | 6.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.1\% | 0\% |  | 7.2\% | 1.8\% | 49\% | 1.4\% | 0\% |  | 52.2\% | 0.5\% | 0.1\% | 0.4\% | 0\% |  | 1\% | 1.6\% | 29.3\% | 8.7\% | 0\% |  | 39.6\% | - |
| PHF | 0.97 | 0.81 | 0.25 | 0 |  | 0.94 | 0.71 | 0.94 | 0.75 | 0 |  | 0.95 | 0.55 | 0.25 | 0.56 | 0 |  | 0.69 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.87 | 0 |  | 0.94 | - |
| Heavy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 |  | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 |  | 12 | - |
| Heavy \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 2.9\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 2.7\% | 9.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 4.5\% | 2.9\% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1.4\% | - |
| Lights | 143 | 13 | 2 | 0 |  | 158 | 40 | 1046 | 30 | 0 |  | 1116 | 10 | 2 | 9 | 0 |  | 21 | 34 | 632 | 191 | 0 |  | 857 | - |
| Lights \% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 100\% | 100\% | 97.1\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 97.3\% | 90.9\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 95.5\% | 97.1\% | 98.3\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 98.6\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 |  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 1.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 2.9\% | 0.6\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.6\% | - |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |  | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | - |
| Buses \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1.1\% | 9.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 4.5\% | 0\% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.8\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| Articulated Trucks \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 201 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 104 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Pedestrians\% | - | - | - | - | 63\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0.6\% |  | - | - | - | - | 32.6\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk\% | - | - | - | - | 1.9\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0.3\% |  | - | - | - | - | 1.6\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Road\% | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |

## Peak Hour: 07:30 AM - 08:30 AM Weather: Overcast ( $4.6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ )

| Start Time | N Approach SYMINGTON AVE |  |  |  |  |  | E Approach BLOOR ST W |  |  |  |  |  | SE Approach SOUTHEAST CROSSWALK |  |  | S Approach TERLING RD |  |  |  |  | W Approach BLOOR ST W |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & (15 \mathrm{~min}) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | $\underset{\text { Turn }}{\text { Tu }}$ | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | $\begin{gathered} \text { U- } \\ \text { Turn } \end{gathered}$ | Peds | Approach Total | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | $\underset{\text { Turn }}{\text { Tu }}$ | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | $\begin{gathered} \text { U- } \\ \text { Turn } \end{gathered}$ | Peds | Approach Total |  |
| 07:30:00 | 38 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 15 | 67 | 10 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 155 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 17 | 0 | 258 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 275 | 514 |
| 07:45:00 | 37 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 16 | 71 | 13 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 168 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 18 | 0 | 207 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 228 | 485 |
| 08:00:00 | 36 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 17 | 86 | 15 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 185 | 21 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 241 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 263 | 552 |
| 08:15:00 | 32 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 15 | 79 | 15 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 145 | 30 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 15 | 20 | 0 | 217 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 247 | 491 |
| Grand Total | 143 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 63 | 303 | 53 | 600 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 653 | 70 | 0 | 10 | 29 | 34 | 0 | 44 | 73 | 0 | 923 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 1013 | 2042 |
| Approach\% | 47.2\% | 0\% | 52.8\% | 0\% |  | - | 8.1\% | 91.9\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | - |  | - | 13.7\% | 39.7\% | 46.6\% | 0\% |  | - | 0\% | 91.1\% | 8.9\% | 0\% |  | - | - |
| Totals \% | 7\% | 0\% | 7.8\% | 0\% |  | 14.8\% | 2.6\% | 29.4\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 32\% |  | 0\% | 0.5\% | 1.4\% | 1.7\% | 0\% |  | 3.6\% | 0\% | 45.2\% | 4.4\% | 0\% |  | 49.6\% | - |
| PHF | 0.94 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 |  | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0 | 0 |  | 0.88 |  | 0 | 0.63 | 0.81 | 0.71 | 0 |  | 0.91 | 0 | 0.89 | 0.75 | 0 |  | 0.92 | - |
| Heavy | 17 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  | 22 | 3 | 32 | 0 | 0 |  | 35 |  | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 |  | 9 | 0 | 29 | 15 | 0 |  | 44 | - |
| Heavy \% | 11.9\% | 0\% | 3.1\% | 0\% |  | 7.3\% | 5.7\% | 5.3\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 5.4\% |  | 0\% | 10\% | 13.8\% | 11.8\% | 0\% |  | 12.3\% | 0\% | 3.1\% | 16.7\% | 0\% |  | 4.3\% | - |
| Lights | 126 | 0 | 155 | 0 |  | 281 | 50 | 568 | 0 | 0 |  | 618 |  | 0 | 9 | 25 | 30 | 0 |  | 64 | 0 | 894 | 75 | 0 |  | 969 | - |
| Lights \% | 88.1\% | 0\% | 96.9\% | 0\% |  | 92.7\% | 94.3\% | 94.7\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 94.6\% |  | 0\% | 90\% | 86.2\% | 88.2\% | 0\% |  | 87.7\% | 0\% | 96.9\% | 83.3\% | 0\% |  | 95.7\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 5 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 0 |  | 21 |  | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 22 | 3 | 0 |  | 25 | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks \% | 2.8\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% |  | 1.7\% | 3.8\% | 3.2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 3.2\% |  | 0\% | 10\% | 13.8\% | 5.9\% | 0\% |  | 9.6\% | 0\% | 2.4\% | 3.3\% | 0\% |  | 2.5\% | - |
| Buses | 13 | 0 | 4 | 0 |  | 17 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 |  | 12 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 0 |  | 19 | - |
| Buses \% | 9.1\% | 0\% | 2.5\% | 0\% |  | 5.6\% | 1.9\% | 1.8\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1.8\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5.9\% | 0\% |  | 2.7\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | 13.3\% | 0\% |  | 1.9\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| Articulated Trucks \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.3\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 60 | - | - | - | - | - | 43 | - | 70 | - | - | - | - | - | 41 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Pedestrians\% | - | - | - | - | 27.1\% |  | - | - | - | - | 19.5\% |  | 31.7\% |  | - | - | - | - | 18.6\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk\% | - | - | - | - | 1.4\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0.5\% |  | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 1.4\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Road\% | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |

Peak Hour: 04:00 PM - 05:00 PM Weather: Overcast $\left(7.7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$

| Start Time | N Approach SYMINGTON AVE |  |  |  |  |  | E Approach BLOOR ST W |  |  |  |  |  | SE Approach SOUTHEAST CROSSWALK |  |  |  | S Approach TERLING RD |  |  |  | w Approach BLOOR ST W |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & (15 \mathrm{~min}) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U- } \\ & \text { Turn } \end{aligned}$ | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | U- Uurn | Peds | Approach Total | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | $\underset{\text { Turn }}{\text { U- }}$ | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Thru | Left | $\begin{gathered} \text { U- } \\ \text { Turn } \end{gathered}$ | Peds | Approach Total |  |
| 16:00:00 | 54 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 23 | 77 | 18 | 216 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 234 | 17 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 37 | 0 | 12 | 74 | 0 | 141 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 546 |
| 16:15:00 | 45 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 23 | 77 | 20 | 236 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 256 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 24 | 30 | 0 | 21 | 59 | 0 | 143 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 169 | 561 |
| 16:30:00 | 34 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 24 | 72 | 18 | 245 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 263 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 28 | 28 | 0 | 17 | 61 | 0 | 133 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 154 | 550 |
| 16:45:00 | 35 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 40 | 78 | 18 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 253 | 20 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 24 | 0 | 26 | 48 | 0 | 135 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 536 |
| Grand Total | 168 | 0 | 136 | 0 | 110 | 304 | 74 | 932 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 1006 | 59 | 0 | 23 | 100 | 119 | 0 | 76 | 242 | 0 | 552 | 89 | 0 | 1 | 641 | 2193 |
| Approach\% | 55.3\% | 0\% | 44.7\% | 0\% |  | - | 7.4\% | 92.6\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | - |  | - | 9.5\% | 41.3\% | 49.2\% | 0\% |  | - | 0\% | 86.1\% | 13.9\% | 0\% |  | - | - |
| Totals \% | 7.7\% | 0\% | 6.2\% | 0\% |  | 13.9\% | 3.4\% | 42.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 45.9\% |  | 0\% | 1\% | 4.6\% | 5.4\% | 0\% |  | 11\% | 0\% | 25.2\% | 4.1\% | 0\% |  | 29.2\% | - |
| PHF | 0.78 | 0 | 0.79 | 0 |  | 0.97 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0 | 0 |  | 0.96 |  | 0 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.8 | 0 |  | 0.82 | 0 | 0.97 | 0.86 | 0 |  | 0.95 | - |
| Heavy | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 13 | 4 | 23 | 0 | 0 |  | 27 |  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 |  | 17 | - |
| Heavy \% | 7.1\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% |  | 4.3\% | 5.4\% | 2.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 2.7\% |  | 0\% | 4.3\% | 3\% | 2.5\% | 0\% |  | 2.9\% | 0\% | 1.6\% | 9\% | 0\% |  | 2.7\% | - |
| Lights | 156 | 0 | 135 | 0 |  | 291 | 70 | 909 | 0 | 0 |  | 979 |  | 0 | 22 | 97 | 116 | 0 |  | 235 | 0 | 543 | 81 | 0 |  | 624 | - |
| Lights \% | 92.9\% | 0\% | 99.3\% | 0\% |  | 95.7\% | 94.6\% | 97.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 97.3\% |  | 0\% | 95.7\% | 97\% | 97.5\% | 0\% |  | 97.1\% | 0\% | 98.4\% | 91\% | 0\% |  | 97.3\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 0 |  | 18 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks \% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.7\% | 2.7\% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1.8\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 1.7\% | 0\% |  | 2.1\% | 0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1.1\% | - |
| Buses | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 11 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 |  | 9 | - |
| Buses \% | 6\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% |  | 3.6\% | 1.4\% | 0.6\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.7\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% |  | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 9\% | 0\% |  | 1.4\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | - |
| Articulated Trucks \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.4\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 4.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 104 | - | - | - | - | - | 53 | - | 59 | - | - | - | - | - | 72 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Pedestrians\% | - | - | - | - | 34.3\% |  | - | - | - | - | 17.5\% |  | 19.5\% |  | - | - | - | - | 23.8\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0.3\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk\% | - | - | - | - | 2\% |  | - | - | - | - | 1.3\% |  | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 1.3\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Road\% | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |

Peak Hour: 08:15 AM-09:15 AM Weather: Overcast ( $15.8^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ )

| Start Time | N Approach STERLING AVE |  |  |  |  | S Approach STERLING AVE |  |  |  |  | W Approach PERTH AVE |  |  |  |  | Int. Total (15 min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total |  |
| 08:15:00 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 32 | 63 |
| 08:30:00 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 31 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 36 | 63 |
| 08:45:00 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 24 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 56 |
| 09:00:00 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 26 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 58 |
| Grand Total | 2 | 24 | 0 | 4 | 26 | 81 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 90 | 109 | 15 | 0 | 13 | 124 | 240 |
| Approach\% | 7.7\% | 92.3\% | 0\% |  | - | 90\% | 10\% | 0\% |  | - | 87.9\% | 12.1\% | 0\% |  | - | - |
| Totals \% | 0.8\% | 10\% | 0\% |  | 10.8\% | 33.8\% | 3.8\% | 0\% |  | 37.5\% | 45.4\% | 6.3\% | 0\% |  | 51.7\% | - |
| PHF | 0.5 | 0.75 | 0 |  | 0.72 | 0.84 | 0.75 | 0 |  | 0.87 | 0.88 | 0.63 | 0 |  | 0.86 | - |
| Heavy | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 4 | - |
| Heavy \% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 3.8\% | 4.9\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 4.4\% | 2.8\% | 6.7\% | 0\% |  | 3.2\% | - |
| Lights | 1 | 24 | 0 |  | 25 | 77 | 9 | 0 |  | 86 | 106 | 14 | 0 |  | 120 | - |
| Lights \% | 50\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 96.2\% | 95.1\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 95.6\% | 97.2\% | 93.3\% | 0\% |  | 96.8\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 4 | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks \% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 3.8\% | 2.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 2.2\% | 2.8\% | 6.7\% | 0\% |  | 3.2\% | - |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| Buses \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 2.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 2.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| Articulated Trucks \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - | - | - | 13 | - | - |
| Pedestrians\% | - | - | - | 15.4\% |  | - | - | - | 34.6\% |  | - | - | - | 50\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk\% | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | - | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Road\% | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |


| Start Time | Peak Hour: 04:30 PM - 05:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  | Weather: Mostly Cloudy (19.7 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total ( 15 min ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N Approach STERLING AVE |  |  |  |  | S Approach STERLING AVE |  |  |  |  | W Approach PERTH AVE |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | Thru | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total | Right | Left | U-Turn | Peds | Approach Total |  |
| 16:30:00 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 42 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 48 | 21 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 81 |
| 16:45:00 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 42 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 44 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 66 |
| 17:00:00 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 47 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 50 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 86 |
| 17:15:00 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 51 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 59 | 25 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 96 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 32 | 0 | 5 | 32 | 182 | 19 | 0 | 13 | 201 | 81 | 15 | 0 | 9 | 96 | 329 |
| Approach\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | - | 90.5\% | 9.5\% | 0\% |  | - | 84.4\% | 15.6\% | 0\% |  | - | - |
| Totals \% | 0\% | 9.7\% | 0\% |  | 9.7\% | 55.3\% | 5.8\% | 0\% |  | 61.1\% | 24.6\% | 4.6\% | 0\% |  | 29.2\% | - |
| PHF | 0 | 0.73 | 0 |  | 0.73 | 0.89 | 0.59 | 0 |  | 0.85 | 0.81 | 0.63 | 0 |  | 0.86 | - |
| Heavy | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | - |
| Heavy \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.5\% | 5.3\% | 0\% |  | 1\% | 2.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 2.1\% | - |
| Lights | 0 | 32 | 0 |  | 32 | 181 | 18 | 0 |  | 199 | 79 | 15 | 0 |  | 94 | - |
| Lights \% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 100\% | 99.5\% | 94.7\% | 0\% |  | 99\% | 97.5\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 97.9\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.5\% | 5.3\% | 0\% |  | 1\% | 2.5\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 2.1\% | - |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| Buses \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| Articulated Trucks \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | 13 | - | - | - | - | 8 | - | - |
| Pedestrians\% | - | - | - | 18.5\% |  | - | - | - | 48.1\% |  | - | - | - | 29.6\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk\% | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | 3.7\% |  | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | - | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Bicycles on Road\% | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - |

## Turning Movement Count Summary Report

| DUNDAS ST W AT STERLING RD (PX 2366) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time <br> Period | Vehicle Type | Exits | NORTHBOUND |  |  | Total | Exits | EASTBOUND |  |  | Total | Exits | SOUTHBOUND |  |  |  | Total | Exits | WESTBOUND |  |  | Total | Peds |  | Bike | Other |
|  |  |  | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  | Left | Thru | Right |  |  | Left | Thru | Right |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | CAR | 138 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1,217 | 68 | 1,161 | 1 | 1,230 |  | 1 | 56 |  | 045 | 101 | 605 | 0 | 560 | 69 | 629 | N | 50 | 5 | 0 |
|  | TRK | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 32 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 31 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 03 | 5 | 28 | 0 | 24 | 3 | 27 | S | 27 | 7 | 0 |
| AM PEAK | BUS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 27 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 00 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 | E | 15 | 521 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | w | 38 | 887 | 0 |


|  | TOTAL: | 143 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1,276 | 70 | 1,217 | 1 | 1,288 | 1 | 58 | 0 | 48 | 106 | 668 | 0 | 619 | 72 | 691 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:30-17:30 | CAR | 205 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 797 | 70 | 735 | 0 | 805 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 83 | 145 | 1,267 | 0 | 1,184 | 135 | 1,319 | N | 34 | 4 | 0 |
|  | TRK | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 17 | S | 50 | 1 | 0 |
| PM PEAK | BUS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 21 | E | 19 | 42 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | w | 34 | 24 | 0 |


|  | TOTAL: | 211 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 821 | 73 | 756 | 0 | 829 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 84 | 149 | 1,303 | 0 | 1,219 | 138 | 1,357 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OFF HR AVG | CAR | 134 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 624 | 46 | 574 | 0 | 620 | 1 | 49 | 0 | 39 | 88 | 631 | 1 | 592 | 88 | 681 | N | 37 | 4 | 0 |
|  | TRK | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 23 | 3 | 20 | 1 | 24 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 26 | 1 | 23 | 2 | 26 | S | 34 | 0 | 0 |
|  | BUS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 23 | E | 10 | 14 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | w | 24 | 21 | 0 |


|  | TOTAL: | 139 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 670 | 49 | 617 | 1 | 667 | 3 | 51 | 0 | 41 | 92 | 680 | 2 | 638 | 90 | 730 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:30-09:30 | CAR | 287 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2,283 | 140 | 2,178 | 2 | 2,320 | 2 | 105 | 0 | 78 | 183 | 1,131 | 0 | 1,053 | 146 | 1,199 | N | 92 | 10 | 0 |
|  | TRK | 12 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 59 | 5 | 54 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 42 | 0 | 36 | 7 | 43 | S | 48 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 HR AM | BUS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 59 | E | 27 | 42 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W | 53 | 138 | 0 |


|  | TOTAL: | 299 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2,389 | 145 | 2,279 | 2 | 2,426 | 2 | 109 | 0 | 83 | 192 | 1,232 | 0 | 1,148 | 153 | 1,301 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:00-18:00 | CAR | 373 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,620 | 121 | 1,479 | 2 | 1,602 | 2 | 141 | 0 | 163 | 304 | 2,505 | 0 | 2,342 | 252 | 2,594 | N | 76 | 5 | 0 |
|  | TRK | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 30 | 0 | 28 | 5 | 33 | S | 97 | 2 | 0 |
| 2 HR PM | BUS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 47 | E | 34 | 87 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W | 52 | 45 | 0 |





Note: (A) Eastbound right-turn restriction is only from 7:00 A.M


ROUTE: 168 SYMINGTON
ROUTING CODE(S): _0,
COUNT: 3246 ON 2019-OCT-14:M-F (FROM 07:50 TO 16:50)
STOP CARD: 12 COUNT COVERAGE/METHOD: FULL(6X)/APC
STOPS: 1 TO 299
COMMENTS:

NB CONTROL POINT: 1 DUNDAS WEST STATION
TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION
NORTHBOUND PERIOD 1: 07:50 ROUTE STOP LOCATION

1 DUNDAS WEST STATION
4 SYMINGTON AT BLOOR ST W
SYMINGTON AT PATON
SYMINGTON AT WALLACE
SYMINGTON AT ANTLER
SYMINGTON AT DUPONT
SYMINGTON AT ADRIAN
DAVENPORT AT SYMINGTON
DAVENPORT AT LAUGHTON
DAVENPORT AT OSLER

| START | ONS | OFFS | ACCUM. | VEHICLES | AVG. LOAD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 116 | 0 | 116 | 11 | 10.5 |
| 0 | 15 | 11 | 120 | 11 | 10.9 |
| 0 | 6 | 2 | 124 | 11 | 11.3 |
| 0 | 7 | 2 | 129 | 11 | 11.7 |
| 0 | 5 | 19 | 115 | 11 | 10.5 |
| 0 | 9 | 18 | 106 | 11 | 9.6 |
| 0 | 0 | 16 | 90 | 11 | 8.2 |
| 0 | 9 | 14 | 85 | 11 | 7.7 |
| 0 | 8 | 10 | 83 | 11 | 7.5 |
| 0 | 7 | 18 | 72 | 11 | 6.5 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 11 | 6.5 |
| 0 | 14 | 25 | 61 | 11 | 5.5 |
| 0 | 5 | 0 | 66 | 11 | 6.0 |
| 0 | 9 | 15 | 60 | 11 | 5.5 |
| 0 | 0 | 4 | 56 | 11 | 5.1 |
| 0 | 5 | 4 | 57 | 11 | 5.2 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 56 | 11 | 5.1 |
| 0 | 1 | 14 | 43 | 11 | 3.9 |
| 0 | 2 | 5 | 40 | 11 | 3.6 |
| 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 11 | 0.0 |
| $\overline{0}$ | $\overline{218}$ | $\overline{218}$ | $\overline{1551}$ | 220 | 7.1 |

ROUTE: 168 SYMINGTON
ROUTING CODE(S): _0,
COUNT: 3246 ON 2019-OCT-14:M-F (FROM 07:50 TO 16:50)
STOP CARD: 12 COUNT COVERAGE/METHOD: FULL(6X)/APC
STOPS: 1 TO 299
COMMENTS:

NB CONTROL POINT: 1 DUNDAS WEST STATION
TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION
NORTHBOUND PERIOD 2: 15:51
ROUTE
STOP LOCATION

| START |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0 | ONS |
| 0 | 346 |
| 0 | 10 |
| 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 3 |
| 0 | 11 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 7 |
| 0 | 7 |
| 0 | 3 |
| 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 23 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 3 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 420 |


| OFFS | ACCUM. | VEHICLES | AVG. LOAD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 346 | 9 | 38.4 |
| 18 | 338 | 9 | 37.6 |
| 13 | 326 | 9 | 36.2 |
| 20 | 309 | 9 | 34.3 |
| 25 | 286 | 9 | 31.8 |
| 34 | 263 | 9 | 29.2 |
| 20 | 243 | 9 | 27.0 |
| 30 | 220 | 9 | 24.4 |
| 43 | 184 | 9 | 20.4 |
| 26 | 161 | 9 | 17.9 |
| 6 | 156 | 9 | 17.3 |
| 25 | 154 | 9 | 17.1 |
| 12 | 142 | 9 | 15.8 |
| 24 | 120 | 9 | 13.3 |
| 20 | 100 | 9 | 11.1 |
| 24 | 79 | 9 | 8.8 |
| 14 | 65 | 9 | 7.2 |
| 29 | 37 | 9 | 4.1 |
| 11 | 26 | 9 | 2.9 |
| 26 | 0 | 9 | 0.0 |
| $\overline{420}$ | 3555 | 180 | 19.8 |


| OFFS | ACCUM. | VEHICLES |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 346 | 9 | 38.4 |
| 18 | 338 | 9 | 37.6 |
| 13 | 326 | 9 | 36.2 |
| 20 | 309 | 9 | 34.3 |
| 25 | 286 | 9 | 31.8 |
| 34 | 263 | 9 | 29.2 |
| 20 | 243 | 9 | 27.0 |
| 30 | 220 | 9 | 24.4 |
| 43 | 184 | 9 | 20.4 |
| 26 | 161 | 9 | 17.9 |
| 6 | 156 | 9 | 17.3 |
| 25 | 154 | 9 | 17.1 |
| 12 | 142 | 9 | 15.8 |
| 24 | 120 | 9 | 13.3 |
| 20 | 100 | 9 | 11.1 |
| 24 | 79 | 9 | 8.8 |
| 14 | 65 | 9 | 7.2 |
| 29 | 37 | 9 | 4.1 |
| 11 | 26 | 9 | 2.9 |
| 26 | 0 | 9 |  |
| 420 | 3555 | 180 |  |

TOTALS FOR PERIOD 2: 15:51

ROUTE: 168 SYMINGTON
ROUTING CODE(S): _0,
COUNT: 3246 ON 2019-OCT-14:M-F (FROM 07:53 TO 18:18)
STOP CARD: 12 COUNT COVERAGE/METHOD: FULL(6X)/APC
STOPS: 1 TO 299
COMMENTS:

SB CONTROL POINT: 22 DUNDAS WEST STATION
TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION
SOUTHBOUND PERIOD 1: 07:53 ROUTE
STOP LOCATION
1 LOOP (AVON) AT WESTON RD
2 ROGERS RD AT BICKNELL
3 ROGERS RD AT KEELE ST
STAR

ROGERS RD AT SCOTT
OLD WESTON RD AT ROGERS RD
6 OLD WESTON RD AT LAVENDER
7 OLD WESTON RD AT TURNBERRY
8 OLD WESTON RD AT ROCKWELL
9 OLD WESTON RD AT ST CLAIR AVE W
10 DAVENPORT AT OLD WESTON RD
11 DAVENPORT AT OSLER
12 DAVENPORT AT LAUGHTON
13 DAVENPORT AT SYMINGTON
14 SYMINGTON AT KINGSLEY
15 SYMINGTON AT DUPONT
16 SYMINGTON AT ANTLER
17 SYMINGTON AT WALLACE
18 SYMINGTON AT ERNEST
19 SYMINGTON AT BLOOR ST W
20 BLOOR ST W AT DUNDAS ST W
22 DUNDAS WEST STATION
TOTALS FOR PERIOD 1: 07:53

| ACCUM. | VEHICLES |  | AVG. LOAD |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 11 | 3.9 |  |
| 51 | 11 | 4.6 |  |
| 98 | 11 | 8.9 |  |
| 109 | 11 | 9.9 |  |
| 148 | 11 | 13.5 |  |
| 187 | 11 | 17.0 |  |
| 228 | 11 | 20.7 |  |
| 248 | 11 | 22.5 |  |
| 213 | 11 | 19.4 |  |
| 223 | 11 | 20.3 |  |
| 260 | 11 | 23.6 |  |
| 312 | 11 | 28.4 |  |
| 346 | 11 | 31.5 |  |
| 370 | 11 | 33.6 |  |
| 389 | 11 | 35.4 |  |
| 415 | 11 | 37.7 |  |
| 434 | 11 | 39.5 |  |
| 448 | 11 | 40.7 |  |
| 448 | 11 | 40.7 |  |
| 413 | 11 | 37.5 |  |
| 0 | 11 | 0.0 |  |
| 5383 | 231 | 23.3 |  |

ROUTE: 168 SYMINGTON
ROUTING CODE(S): _0,
COUNT: 3246 ON 2019-OCT-14:M-F (FROM 07:53 TO 18:18)
STOP CARD: 12 COUNT COVERAGE/METHOD: FULL(6X)/APC
STOPS: 1 TO 299
COMMENTS:

SB CONTROL POINT: 22 DUNDAS WEST STATION
TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION
SOUTHBOUND PERIOD 2: 17:19 ROUTE
STOP LOCATION
1 LOOP (AVON) AT WESTON RD
2 ROGERS RD AT BICKNELL
ROGERS RD AT KEELE ST
ROGERS RD AT SCOTT
OLD WESTON RD AT ROGERS RD
OLD WESTON RD AT LAVENDER
OLD WESTON RD AT TURNBERRY
OLD WESTON RD AT ROCKWELL
9 OLD WESTON RD AT ST CLAIR AVE W
10 DAVENPORT AT OLD WESTON RD
11 DAVENPORT AT OSLER
12 DAVENPORT AT LAUGHTON
13 DAVENPORT AT SYMINGTON
14 SYMINGTON AT KINGSLEY

| START | ONS | OFFS | ACCUM. | VEHICLES | AVG. LOAD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 41 | 0 | 41 | 9 | 4.6 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 40 | 9 | 4.4 |
| 0 | 51 | 8 | 83 | 9 | 9.2 |
| 0 | 6 | 0 | 89 | 9 | 9.9 |
| 0 | 11 | 4 | 96 | 9 | 10.7 |
| 0 | 6 | 2 | 100 | 9 | 11.1 |
| 0 | 11 | 7 | 104 | 9 | 11.6 |
| 0 | 2 | 7 | 99 | 9 | 11.0 |
| 0 | 36 | 21 | 114 | 9 | 12.7 |
| 0 | 6 | 1 | 119 | 9 | 13.2 |
| 0 | 10 | 9 | 120 | 9 | 13.3 |
| 0 | 25 | 11 | 134 | 9 | 14.9 |
| 0 | 25 | 7 | 152 | 9 | 16.9 |
| 0 | 17 | 1 | 168 | 9 | 18.7 |
| 0 | 27 | 11 | 184 | 9 | 20.4 |
| 0 | 13 | 5 | 192 | 9 | 21.3 |
| 0 | 9 | 5 | 196 | 9 | 21.8 |
| 0 | 4 | 1 | 199 | 9 | 22.1 |
| 0 | 11 | 13 | 197 | 9 | 21.9 |
| 0 | 2 | 18 | 181 | 9 | 20.1 |
| 0 | 0 | 181 | 0 | 9 | 0.0 |
| $\bigcirc$ | $\overline{313}$ | $\overline{313}$ | $\overline{2608}$ | 189 | $\overline{13.8}$ |

RIDING COUNT - 2. PASSENGER ACTIVITY BY STOP REPORT
Report: TRIPS_DM - 002
ROUTE: 506 CARLTON
Version: 002
ROUTING CODE(S): _0,
COUNT: 3260 ON 2018-MAY-14:M-F (FROM 08:20 TO 18:01)
STOP CARD: 23 COUNT COVERAGE/METHOD: PART(GE95)/APC
STOPS: 1 TO 299
COMMENTS: Final coverage 99.2\%
For SSP use only.
EB CONTROL POINT: 28 COLLEGE AT YONGE ST
TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION
EASTBOUND PERIOD 1: 08:20

ROUTE
STOP

LOCATION
HIGH PARK STATION
3 PARKSIDE DR AT INDIAN VALLEY
howard pk at parkside
HOWARD PK AT INDIAN RD
howard pk at roncesvalles
howard Pk AT DUNDAS ST W
dUNDAS ST W AT SORAUREN
DUNDAS ST W AT STERLING RD
COLLEGE AT LANSDOWNE
COLLEGE AT BROCK
COLLEGE AT DUFFERIN ST
COLLEGE AT RUSHOLME
COLLEGE AT DOVERCOURT
COLLEGE AT OSSINGTON AVE
COLLEGE AT CRAWFORD
COLLEGE AT GRACE
college at euclid
college at bathurst st
college at borden
college at augusta
college at spadina ave
college at beverly
college at mccaul
College at university ave
COLLEGE AT ELIZABETH
college at bay st
COLLEGE AT YONGE ST
CARLTON AT CHURCH
CARLTON AT JARVIS ST
CARLTON AT SHERBOURNE
SHERBOURNE ST AT GERRARD
DUNDAS ST EAT ONTARIO
DUNDAS ST E AT PARLIAMENT
dundas ste at sackville
DUNDAS ST EAT SUMACH
GERRARD AT BLACKBURN
GERRARD AT BROADVIEW
GERRARD AT DEGRASSI
gerrard at logan
GERRARD AT CARLAW
GERRARD AT PAPE
GERRARD AT MARJORY
GERRARD AT JONES
gerrard at leslie
GERRARD AT ALTON

| START | ONS | OFFS | ACCUM. | VEHICLES | AVG. LOAD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 59 | 0 | 59 | 17 | 3.5 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 17 | 3.5 |
| 0 | 23 | 3 | 79 | 17 | 4.6 |
| 0 | 32 | 0 | 111 | 17 | 6.5 |
| 0 | 59 | 10 | 160 | 17 | 9.4 |
| 0 | 13 | 0 | 173 | 17 | 10.2 |
| 0 | 38 | 3 | 208 | 17 | 12.2 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 207 | 17 | 12.2 |
| 0 | 72 | 15 | 264 | 17 | 15.5 |
| 0 | 59 | 7 | 316 | 17 | 18.6 |
| 0 | 116 | 9 | 423 | 17 | 24.9 |
| 0 | 51 | 1 | 473 | 17 | 27.8 |
| 0 | 77 | 17 | 533 | 17 | 31.4 |
| 0 | 94 | 21 | 606 | 17 | 35.6 |
| 0 | 72 | 23 | 655 | 17 | 38.5 |
| 0 | 68 | 32 | 691 | 17 | 40.6 |
| 0 | 52 | 41 | 702 | 17 | 41.3 |
| 0 | 79 | 87 | 694 | 17 | 40.8 |
| 0 | 34 | 15 | 713 | 17 | 41.9 |
| 0 | 33 | 34 | 712 | 17 | 41.9 |
| 0 | 63 | 76 | 699 | 17 | 41.1 |
| 0 | 20 | 31 | 688 | 17 | 40.5 |
| 0 | 14 | 36 | 666 | 17 | 39.2 |
| 0 | 76 | 257 | 485 | 17 | 28.5 |
| 0 | 4 | 42 | 447 | 17 | 26.3 |
| 0 | 12 | 88 | 371 | 17 | 21.8 |
| 0 | 124 | 165 | 330 | 17 | 19.4 |
| 0 | 15 | 39 | 306 | 17 | 18.0 |
| 0 | 14 | 38 | 282 | 17 | 16.6 |
| 0 | 18 | 57 | 243 | 17 | 14.3 |
| 0 | 4 | 25 | 222 | 17 | 13.1 |
| 0 | 9 | 21 | 210 | 17 | 12.4 |
| 0 | 14 | 20 | 204 | 17 | 12.0 |
| 0 | 8 | 12 | 200 | 17 | 11.8 |
| 0 | 24 | 21 | 203 | 17 | 11.9 |
| 0 | 30 | 16 | 217 | 17 | 12.8 |
| 0 | 43 | 34 | 226 | 17 | 13.3 |
| 0 | 9 | 8 | 227 | 17 | 13.4 |
| 0 | 11 | 12 | 226 | 17 | 13.3 |
| 0 | 12 | 34 | 204 | 17 | 12.0 |
| 0 | 10 | 40 | 174 | 17 | 10.2 |
| 0 | 2 | 9 | 167 | 17 | 9.8 |
| 0 | 13 | 36 | 144 | 17 | 8.5 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 143 | 17 | 8.4 |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 141 | 17 | 8.3 |

RIDING COUNT - 2. PASSENGER ACTIVITY BY STOP REPORT
Report: TRIPS_DM - 002
ROUTE: 506 CARLTON
Version: 002
ROUTING CODE(S): _0,
COUNT: 3260 ON 2018-MAY-14:M-F (FROM 08:20 TO 18:01)
STOP CARD: 23 COUNT COVERAGE/METHOD: PART(GE95)/APC
STOPS: 1 TO 299
COMMENTS: Final coverage 99.2\%
For SSP use only.
EB CONTROL POINT: 28 COLLEGE AT YONGE ST
TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION

## EASTBOUND PERIOD 2: 17:02

ROUTE
STOP

LOCATION
HIGH PARK STATION
3 PARKSIDE DR AT INDIAN VALLEY
howard pk at parkside
HOWARD PK AT INDIAN RD
howard pk at roncesvalles
howard Pk AT DUNDAS ST W
dUNDAS ST W AT SORAUREN
DUNDAS ST W AT STERLING RD
COLLEGE AT LANSDOWNE
COLLEGE AT BROCK
COLLEGE AT DUFFERIN ST
COLLEGE AT RUSHOLME
COLLEGE AT DOVERCOURT
COLLEGE AT OSSINGTON AVE
COLLEGE AT CRAWFORD
COLLEGE AT GRACE
college at euclid
COLLEGE AT BATHURST ST
college at borden
COLLEGE AT AUGUSTA
college at spadina ave
college at beverly
college at mccaul
COLLEGE AT UNIVERSITY AVE
COLLEGE AT ELIZABETH
COLLEGE AT BAY ST
COLLEGE AT YONGE ST
CARLTON AT CHURCH
CARLTON AT JARVIS ST
CARLTON AT SHERBOURNE
SHERBOURNE ST AT GERRARD
DUNDAS ST EAT ONTARIO
DUNDAS ST E AT PARLIAMENT
dundas ste at sackville
DUNDAS STEAT SUMACH
GERRARD AT BLACKBURN
GERRARD AT BROADVIEW
GERRARD AT DEGRASSI
gerrard at logan
GERRARD AT CARLAW
gerrard at pape
GERRARD AT MARJORY
GERRARD AT JONES
gerrard at leslie
GERRARD AT ALTON

| START | ONS | OFFS | ACCUM. | VEHICLES | AVG. LOAD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 34 | 0 | 34 | 16 | 2.1 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 16 | 2.1 |
| 0 | 11 | 1 | 43 | 16 | 2.7 |
| 0 | 3 | 0 | 46 | 16 | 2.9 |
| 0 | 24 | 1 | 69 | 16 | 4.3 |
| 0 | 2 | 0 | 71 | 16 | 4.4 |
| 0 | 8 | 2 | 77 | 16 | 4.8 |
| 0 | 6 | 1 | 82 | 16 | 5.1 |
| 0 | 28 | 3 | 107 | 16 | 6.7 |
| 0 | 12 | 2 | 117 | 16 | 7.3 |
| 0 | 73 | 10 | 180 | 16 | 11.3 |
| 0 | 7 | 1 | 186 | 16 | 11.6 |
| 0 | 26 | 12 | 200 | 16 | 12.5 |
| 0 | 41 | 17 | 224 | 16 | 14.0 |
| 0 | 30 | 17 | 237 | 16 | 14.8 |
| 0 | 30 | 20 | 247 | 16 | 15.4 |
| 0 | 45 | 17 | 275 | 16 | 17.2 |
| 0 | 78 | 27 | 326 | 16 | 20.4 |
| 0 | 27 | 11 | 342 | 16 | 21.4 |
| 0 | 67 | 23 | 386 | 16 | 24.1 |
| 0 | 113 | 41 | 458 | 16 | 28.6 |
| 0 | 65 | 17 | 506 | 16 | 31.6 |
| 0 | 34 | 12 | 528 | 16 | 33.0 |
| 0 | 127 | 126 | 529 | 16 | 33.1 |
| 0 | 37 | 12 | 554 | 16 | 34.6 |
| 0 | 62 | 47 | 569 | 16 | 35.6 |
| 0 | 253 | 195 | 627 | 16 | 39.2 |
| 0 | 49 | 43 | 633 | 16 | 39.6 |
| 0 | 20 | 41 | 612 | 16 | 38.3 |
| 0 | 32 | 102 | 542 | 16 | 33.9 |
| 0 | 13 | 31 | 524 | 16 | 32.8 |
| 0 | 21 | 42 | 503 | 16 | 31.4 |
| 0 | 35 | 31 | 507 | 16 | 31.7 |
| 0 | 16 | 26 | 497 | 16 | 31.1 |
| 0 | 22 | 46 | 473 | 16 | 29.6 |
| 0 | 25 | 32 | 466 | 16 | 29.1 |
| 0 | 133 | 58 | 541 | 16 | 33.8 |
| 0 | 26 | 13 | 554 | 16 | 34.6 |
| 0 | 18 | 29 | 543 | 16 | 33.9 |
| 0 | 37 | 51 | 529 | 16 | 33.1 |
| 0 | 37 | 85 | 481 | 16 | 30.1 |
| 0 | 28 | 33 | 476 | 16 | 29.8 |
| 0 | 20 | 44 | 452 | 16 | 28.3 |
| 0 | 9 | 22 | 439 | 16 | 27.4 |
| 0 | 1 | 18 | 422 | 16 | 26.4 |

RIDING COUNT - 2. PASSENGER ACTIVITY BY STOP REPORT
Report: TRIPS_DM - 002
ROUTE: 506 CARLTON
ROUTING CODE(S): _0,
COUNT: 3260 ON 2018-MAY-14:M-F (FROM 08:07 TO 17:46)
STOP CARD: 23 COUNT COVERAGE/METHOD: PART(GE95)/APC
STOPS: 1 TO 299
COMMENTS: Final coverage 99.2\%
For SSP use only.
WB CONTROL POINT: 43 CARLTON AT YONGE ST
TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION
WESTBOUND PERIOD 1: 08:07
ROUTE
STOP LOCATION
47 COLLEGE AT MCCAUL
48 College at st. george
49 COLLEGE AT SPADINA AVE
50 COLLEGE AT MAJOR
51 COLLEGE AT BORDEN
52 COLLEGE AT BATHURST ST
53 COLLEGE AT EUCLID
54 COLLEGE AT GRACE
55 COLLEGE AT CRAWFORD
56 COLLEGE AT OSSINGTON AVE
57 COLLEGE AT DOVERCOURT
58 COLLEGE AT HAVELOCK
59 COLLEGE AT DUFFERIN ST
60 COLLEGE AT BROCK
61 COLLEGE AT LANSDOWNE
62 DUNDAS ST W AT STERLING RD
63 DUNDAS ST W AT SORAUREN

| START | ONS | OFFS | ACCUM. | VEHICLES | AVG. LOAD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 7 | 38 | 479 | 16 | 29.9 |
| 0 | 9 | 75 | 413 | 16 | 25.8 |
| 0 | 22 | 112 | 323 | 16 | 20.2 |
| 0 | 14 | 50 | 287 | 16 | 17.9 |
| 0 | 9 | 26 | 270 | 16 | 16.9 |
| 0 | 35 | 87 | 218 | 16 | 13.6 |
| 0 | 19 | 41 | 196 | 16 | 12.3 |
| 0 | 17 | 24 | 189 | 16 | 11.8 |
| 0 | 10 | 50 | 149 | 16 | 9.3 |
| 0 | 14 | 37 | 126 | 16 | 7.9 |
| 0 | 8 | 18 | 116 | 16 | 7.3 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 16 | 7.3 |
| 0 | 9 | 48 | 77 | 16 | 4.8 |
| 0 | 6 | 7 | 76 | 16 | 4.8 |
| 0 | 4 | 21 | 59 | 16 | 3.7 |
| 0 | 0 | 7 | 52 | 16 | 3.3 |
| 0 | 2 | 3 | 51 | 16 | 3.2 |
| 0 | 0 | 4 | 47 | 16 | 2.9 |
| 0 | 1 | 19 | 29 | 16 | 1.8 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 16 | 1.8 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 28 | 16 | 1.8 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 16 | 1.8 |
| 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 16 | 0.0 |
| $\overline{0}$ | $\overline{1869}$ | $\overline{1869}$ | $\overline{20067}$ | 1088 | $\overline{18.4}$ |

TOTALS FOR PERIOD 1: 08:07

RIDING COUNT - 2. PASSENGER ACTIVITY BY STOP REPORT
Report: TRIPS_DM - 002
ROUTE: 506 CARLTON
ROUTING CODE(S): _0,
COUNT: 3260 ON 2018-MAY-14:M-F (FROM 08:07 TO 17:46)
STOP CARD: 23 COUNT COVERAGE/METHOD: PART(GE95)/APC
STOPS: 1 TO 299
COMMENTS: Final coverage 99.2\%
For SSP use only.
WB CONTROL POINT: 43 CARLTON AT YONGE ST
TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION
WESTBOUND PERIOD 2: 16:47
ROUTE
STOP LOCATION
47 COLLEGE AT MCCAUL
48 COLLEGE AT ST. GEORGE
49 COLLEGE AT SPADINA AVE
50 COLLEGE AT MAJOR
51 COLLEGE AT BORDEN
52 COLLEGE AT BATHURST ST
53 COLLEGE AT EUCLID
54 COLLEGE AT GRACE
55 COLLEGE AT CRAWFORD
56 COLLEGE AT OSSINGTON AVE
57 COLLEGE AT DOVERCOURT
58 COLLEGE AT HAVELOCK
59 COLLEGE AT DUFFERIN ST
60 COLLEGE AT BROCK
61 COLLEGE AT LANSDOWNE
62 DUNDAS ST W AT STERLING RD
63 DUNDAS ST W AT SORAUREN
64 HOWARD PARK AT DUNDAS ST W
65 HOWARD PK AT RONCESVALLES
66 HOWARD PK AT INDIAN RD
67 HOWARD PK AT PARKSIDE
68 PARKSIDE DR AT INDIAN VALLEY
70 HIGH PARK STATION
TOTALS FOR PERIOD 2: 16:47

| START | ONS | OFFS | ACCUM. | VEHICLES | AVG. LOAD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 23 | 24 | 586 | 16 | 36.6 |
| 0 | 26 | 25 | 587 | 16 | 36.7 |
| 0 | 74 | 97 | 564 | 16 | 35.3 |
| 0 | 32 | 50 | 546 | 16 | 34.1 |
| 0 | 15 | 27 | 534 | 16 | 33.4 |
| 0 | 43 | 69 | 508 | 16 | 31.8 |
| 0 | 18 | 55 | 471 | 16 | 29.4 |
| 0 | 27 | 66 | 432 | 16 | 27.0 |
| 0 | 13 | 50 | 395 | 16 | 24.7 |
| 0 | 14 | 60 | 349 | 16 | 21.8 |
| 0 | 16 | 51 | 314 | 16 | 19.6 |
| 0 | 1 | 22 | 293 | 16 | 18.3 |
| 0 | 12 | 89 | 216 | 16 | 13.5 |
| 0 | 6 | 27 | 195 | 16 | 12.2 |
| 0 | 10 | 48 | 157 | 16 | 9.8 |
| 0 | 2 | 4 | 155 | 16 | 9.7 |
| 0 | 0 | 19 | 136 | 16 | 8.5 |
| 0 | 0 | 11 | 125 | 16 | 7.8 |
| 0 | 0 | 34 | 91 | 16 | 5.7 |
| 0 | 2 | 13 | 80 | 16 | 5.0 |
| 0 | 2 | 13 | 69 | 16 | 4.3 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 68 | 16 | 4.3 |
| 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 16 | 0.0 |
| 0 | $\overline{1596}$ | $\overline{1596}$ | $\overline{16114}$ | 1088 | 14.8 |

## LANSDOWNE STATION

SUBWAY STATION PLATFORM USAGE COUNT
2019


| Peak Hour Factor Based on Intersection Totals |  | PM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bloor and Symington | 514 | 546 |
|  | 485 | 561 |
|  | 552 | 550 |
|  | 491 | 536 |
|  | 2042 | 2193 |
|  | 0.92 | 0.98 |
| Bloor and Dundas | 934 | 911 |
|  | 891 | 920 |
|  | 910 | 953 |
|  | 831 | 946 |
|  | 3566 | 3730 |
|  | 0.95 | 0.98 |
| Bloor and Lansdowne | 696 | 673 |
|  | 636 | 660 |
|  | 648 | 630 |
|  | 612 | 621 |
|  | 2592 | 2584 |
|  | 0.93 | 0.96 |
| Sterling and Perth | 63 | 81 |
|  | 63 | 66 |
|  | 56 | 86 |
|  | 58 | 96 |
|  | 240 | 329 |
|  | 0.95 | 0.86 |
| Dundas and Sterling | 520 | 603 |
|  | 520 | 592 |
|  | 517 | 563 |
|  | 531 | 577 |
|  | 2088 | 2335 |
|  | 0.98 | 0.97 |

## APPENDIX



LOS
Definitions

## LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS AT SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS ${ }^{(1)}$

Level of service for signalized intersections is defined in terms of delay, which is a measure of driver discomfort and frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time. Specifically, level-of-service (LOS) criteria are stated in terms of the average control delay per vehicle, typically for a $15-\mathrm{min}$ analysis period. The criteria are given in the table below. Delay may be measured in the field or estimated using software such as Highway Capacity Software. Delay is a complex measure and is dependent upon a number of variables, including quality of progression, the cycle length, the green ratio, and the $v / c$ ratio for the lane group in question.

| Level of Service | Features | Control Delay per vehicle (sec) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | LOS A describes operations with very low delay, up to 10 sec per vehicle. This level of service occurs when progression is extremely favourable and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay. | $\leq 10$ |
| B | LOS B describes operations with delay greater than 10 and up to 20 sec per vehicle. This level generally occurs with good progression, short cycle lengths, or both. More vehicles stop than with LOS A, causing higher levels of average delay. | $>10$ and $\leq 20$ |
| C | LOS C describes operations with delay greater than 20 and up to 35 sec per vehicle. These higher delays may result from fair progression, longer cycle lengths, or both. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, though many still pass through the intersection without stopping. | $>20$ and $\leq 35$ |
| D | LOS D describes operations with delay greater than 35 and up to 55 sec per vehicle. At level D , the influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavourable progression, long cycle lengths, of high $v / c$ ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable. | $>35$ and $\leq 55$ |
| E | LOS E describes operations with delay greater than 55 and up to 80 sec per vehicle. This level is considered by many agencies to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high $v / c$ ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences. | $>55$ and $\leq 80$ |
| F | LOS F describes operations with delay in excess of 80 sec per vehicle. This level, considered to be unacceptable to most drivers, often occurs with oversaturation, that is, when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. It may also occur at high $v / c$ ratios below 1.0 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing causes to such delay levels. | > 80 |

(1) Highway Capacity Manual 2000

## LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS AT UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS ${ }^{(1)}$

The level of service criteria for unsignalized intersections are given in the table below. As used here, total delay is defined as the total elapsed time from when a vehicle stops at the end of the queue until the vehicle departs from the stop line; this time includes the time required for the vehicle to travel from the last-in-queue position to the first-in-queue position. The average total delay for any particular minor movement is a function of the service rate or capacity of the approach and the degree of saturation.

## Level of Service

A

B

C $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average traffic delays occur. Operations are generally } \\ & \text { stable, but drivers emerging from the minor street may } \\ & \text { experience difficulty in completing their movement. } \\ & \text { This may occasionally impact on the stability of flow on }\end{aligned}$
Average traffic delays occur. Operations are generally
stable, but drivers emerging from the minor street may
experience difficulty in completing their movement.
This may occasionally impact on the stability of flow on
Average traffic delays occur. Operations are generally
stable, but drivers emerging from the minor street may
experience difficulty in completing their movement.
This may occasionally impact on the stability of flow on
Average traffic delays occur. Operations are generally
stable, but drivers emerging from the minor street may
experience difficulty in completing their movement.
This may occasionally impact on the stability of flow on the major street. D $\begin{aligned} & \text { Long traffic delays occur. Motorists emerging from the } \\ & \text { minor street experience significant restriction and } \\ & \text { frustration. Drivers on the major street will experience } \\ & \text { congestion and delay as drivers emerging from the minor }\end{aligned}$ Long traffic delays occur. Motorists emerging from the
minor street experience significant restriction and
frustration. Drivers on the major street will experience
congestion and delay as drivers emerging from the minor Long traffic delays occur. Motorists emerging from the
minor street experience significant restriction and
frustration. Drivers on the major street will experience
congestion and delay as drivers emerging from the minor Long traffic delays occur. Motorists emerging from the
minor street experience significant restriction and
frustration. Drivers on the major street will experience
congestion and delay as drivers emerging from the minor street interfere with the major through movements.

E Very long traffic delays occur. Operations approach the $>35$ and $\leq 50$ capacity of the intersection.

F Saturation occurs, with vehicle demand exceeding the $>50$

Average Total Delay (sec/veh)
$\leq 10$

Little or no traffic delay occurs. Approaches appear open, turning movements are easily made, and drivers have freedom of operation.

Short traffic delays occur. Many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted in terms of freedom of operation.

[^2]APPENDIX

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { D-1 Existing } \\
& \text { Traffic } \\
& \text { Conditions } \\
& \text { before } \\
& \text { Bikeway } \\
& \text { Extension }
\end{aligned}
$$

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | ¢ ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  | \% | 个t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\stackrel{1}{ }$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 3 | 941 | 68 | 1 | 498 | 94 | 57 | 334 | 54 | 144 | 328 | 70 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 3 | 941 | 68 | 1 | 498 | 94 | 57 | 334 | 54 | 144 | 328 | 70 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width ( m ) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Storage Length ( m ) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 10.0 |  | 15.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( $m$ ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.96 |  | 0.90 | 0.96 |  | 0.87 | 0.97 |  |
| Frt |  | 0.990 |  |  | 0.976 |  |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.974 |  |
| FIt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3328 | 0 | 0 | 3164 | 0 | 1452 | 3079 | 0 | 1636 | 1644 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.954 |  |  | 0.954 |  | 0.488 |  |  | 0.373 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 3174 | 0 | 0 | 3019 | 0 | 671 | 3079 | 0 | 556 | 1644 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |  |  | 14 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 374.8 |  |  | 112.0 |  |  | 258.8 |  |  | 36.6 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 33.7 |  |  | 10.1 |  |  | 23.3 |  |  | 3.3 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/r) | 246 |  | 157 | 157 |  | 246 | 153 |  | 232 | 232 |  | 153 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 34\% | 4\% | 5\% | 0\% | 6\% | 3\% | 16\% | 10\% | 2\% | 3\% | 8\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 3 | 1012 | 73 | 1 | 535 | 101 | 61 | 359 | 58 | 155 | 353 | 75 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (yph) | 0 | 1088 | 0 | 0 | 637 | 0 | 61 | 417 | 0 | 155 | 428 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( m ) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Existing before Bikeway> AM Peak
1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West
2/18/202

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 |  | 26.0 | 26.0 |  | 22.0 | 22.0 |  | 6.0 | 22.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 10.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 50.0 | 50.0 |  | 50.0 | 50.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  | 11.0 | 40.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 55.6\% | 55.6\% |  | 55.6\% | 55.6\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  | 12.2\% | 44.4\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 44.0 | 44.0 |  | 44.0 | 44.0 |  | 23.0 | 23.0 |  | 7.0 | 34.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 1.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max |  | Max | Max |  | Max | Max |  | None | Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  |  | 15.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 45.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 37.0 | 35.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  | 0.27 | 0.27 |  | 0.41 | 0.39 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.69 |  |  | 0.42 |  | 0.34 | 0.50 |  | 0.48 | 0.66 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 19.9 |  |  | 15.4 |  | 33.2 | 29.0 |  | 22.7 | 27.8 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 19.9 |  |  | 15.4 |  | 33.2 | 29.0 |  | 22.7 | 27.8 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  | C | C |  | C | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 19.9 |  |  | 15.4 |  |  | 29.5 |  |  | 26.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |

$\frac{\text { Intersection Summary }}{\text { Area Type: }}$
Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: $53(59 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 70
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.69
Intersection Signal Delay: 21.9 $\quad$ Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 84.4\%
ICU Level of Service E
Splits and Phases: 1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West

| $\rightarrow \boldsymbol{Q}_{\boxed{ } 2(R)}$ | $\square_{\text {®3 }}$ | $4_{64}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 s | 11 s | 29 s |  |
| \%06 | $\downarrow$ ¢ |  |  |
| 50 s | 40 s |  |  |

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
2: Ruttan Street \& Bloor Street West
<Existing before Bikeway> AM Peak

|  | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 个t |  |  | $\uparrow^{4}$ | \% |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 1073 | 20 | 7 | 629 | 24 | 24 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1073 | 20 | 7 | 629 | 24 | 24 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.997 |  |  |  | 0.932 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.999 | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 3489 | 0 | 0 | 3496 | 1581 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.999 | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 3489 | 0 | 0 | 3496 | 1581 | 0 |
| Link Speed (kh) | 40 |  |  | 40 | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 69.7 |  |  | 374.8 | 79.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 6.3 |  |  | 33.7 | 9.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 1192 | 22 | 8 | 699 | 27 | 27 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 1214 | 0 | 0 | 707 | 54 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |  | 14 | 24 |  | 24 | 14 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | er |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 40.3\% Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 2: Ruttan Street \& Bloor Street West
 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4^ |  |  | 个t |  | \% | $\hat{F}$ |  | \% |  | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 90 | 923 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 53 | 34 | 29 | 10 | 160 | 0 | 143 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 90 | 923 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 53 | 34 | 29 | 10 | 160 | 0 | 143 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 0.96 |  | 0.88 |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.988 |  |  | 0.962 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.996 |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3381 | 0 | 0 | 3282 | 0 | 1504 | 1455 | 0 | 1620 | 0 | 1281 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.676 |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2287 | 0 | 0 | 3282 | , | 1504 | 1455 | 0 | 1418 | 0 | 1281 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) |  | 98.8 |  |  | 69.7 |  |  | 91.9 |  |  | 175.2 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 8.9 |  |  | 6.3 |  |  | 11.0 |  |  | 15.8 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 63 |  | 44 | 44 |  | 63 |  |  | 44 | 44 |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 17\% | 4\% | 2\% | 2\% | 6\% | 6\% | 12\% | 14\% | 10\% | 4\% | 0\% | 12\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/rr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 98 | 1003 | 0 | 0 | 652 | 58 | 37 | 32 | 11 | 174 | 0 | 155 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1101 | 0 | 0 | 710 | 0 | 37 | 43 | 0 | 174 | 0 | 155 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width( m ) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.16 |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  |  |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  |  | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left |  | Right |
| Leading Detector ( $m$ ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |  | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Existing before Bikeway> AM Peak 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot |  | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 21.0 |  |  | 21.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 20.0 |  |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 10.0 | 29.0 |  |  | 29.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 11.0 | 55.0 |  |  | 44.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 29.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 11.0\% | 55.0\% |  |  | 44.0\% |  | 16.0\% | 16.0\% |  | 29.0\% |  |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 7.0 | 47.0 |  |  | 36.0 |  | 9.0 | 9.0 |  | 22.0 |  |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  |  | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | C-Max |  |  | C-Max |  | None | None |  | None |  |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 7.0 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 53.2 |  |  | 37.0 |  | 9.2 | 9.2 |  | 21.4 |  | 32.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.53 |  |  | 0.37 |  | 0.09 | 0.09 |  | 0.21 |  | 0.33 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.84 |  |  | 0.58 |  | 0.27 | 0.32 |  | 0.50 |  | 0.37 |
| Control Delay |  | 28.0 |  |  | 27.3 |  | 47.0 | 48.8 |  | 40.3 |  | 20.0 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 28.0 |  |  | 27.3 |  | 47.0 | 48.8 |  | 40.3 |  | 20.0 |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  | D | D |  | D |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 28.0 |  |  | 27.3 |  |  | 48.0 |  |  | 30.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |

## Intersection Summary $\quad$ Other

Area Type:
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: $19(19 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6 :WBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.84
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: } 28.9 & \text { Intersection LOS: C } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization 77.3\% } & \text { ICU Level of Service D } \\ \text { Analysis Period (min) } 15 & \end{array}$


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

4：Dundas Street West \＆Bloor Street West
＜Existing before Bikeway＞AM Peak
02／16／2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个t |  | \％ | 中 |  |  | （4个 |  |  | ＊${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 39 | 1049 | 177 | 72 | 566 | 115 | 0 | 553 | 187 | 11 | 760 | 37 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 39 | 1049 | 177 | 72 | 566 | 115 | 0 | 553 | 187 | 11 | 760 | 37 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width（m） | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Storage Length（ $m$ ） | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 20.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Taper Length（ m ） | 50.0 |  |  | 55.0 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 0.88 | 0.96 |  | 0.97 | 0.94 |  |  | 0.91 |  |  | 0.98 |  |
| Frt |  | 0.978 |  |  | 0.975 |  |  | 0.962 |  |  | 0.993 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1636 | 3202 | 0 | 1546 | 3057 | 0 | 0 | 4154 | 0 | 0 | 3223 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.325 |  |  | 0.115 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.939 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 495 | 3202 | 0 | 182 | 3057 | 0 | 0 | 4154 | 0 | 0 | 3025 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 2 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Link Speed（kh） |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 75.1 |  |  | 318.0 |  |  | 159.9 |  |  | 139.1 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 6.8 |  |  | 28.6 |  |  | 14.4 |  |  | 12.5 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃hr） | 616 |  | 311 | 311 |  | 616 | 583 |  | 484 | 484 |  | 583 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  | 5 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 3\％ | 4\％ | 5\％ | 9\％ | 5\％ | 15\％ | 2\％ | 9\％ | 6\％ | 91\％ | 7\％ | 3\％ |
| Bus Blockages（\＃hr） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 41 | 1104 | 186 | 76 | 596 | 121 | 0 | 582 | 197 | 12 | 800 | 39 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 41 | 1290 | 0 | 76 | 717 | 0 | 0 | 779 | 0 | 0 | 851 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Righ |
| Median Width（m） |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  |  |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |  | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |

221－225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes，Volumes，Timings
4：Dundas Street West \＆Bloor Street West
4．Dundas Street West \＆Bloor Street West 02／16／2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 26.0 | 26.0 |  | 26.0 | 26.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Minimum Split（s） | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  |
| Total Split（s） | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 44.0 | 44.0 |  | 44.0 | 44.0 |  |
| Total Split（\％） | 51．1\％ | 51．1\％ |  | 51．1\％ | 51．1\％ |  | 48．9\％ | 48．9\％ |  | 48．9\％ | 48．9\％ |  |
| Maximum Green（s） | 40.0 | 40.0 |  | 40.0 | 40.0 |  | 38.0 | 38.0 |  | 38.0 | 38.0 |  |
| Yellow Time（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All－Red Time（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | －1．0 | －1．0 |  | －1．0 | －1．0 |  |  | －1．0 |  |  | －1．0 |  |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead／Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C－Max | C－Max |  | C－Max | C－Max |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Walk Time（s） | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk（s） | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls（\＃hr） | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Act Effict Green（s） | 46.3 | 46.3 |  | 46.3 | 46.3 |  |  | 33.7 |  |  | 33.7 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.51 | 0.51 |  | 0.51 | 0.51 |  |  | 0.37 |  |  | 0.37 |  |
| v／c Ratio | 0.16 | 0.78 |  | 0.82 | 0.45 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.75 |  |
| Control Delay | 15.7 | 23.3 |  | 81.7 | 15.8 |  |  | 22.2 |  |  | 28.6 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 15.7 | 23.3 |  | 81.7 | 15.8 |  |  | 22.2 |  |  | 28.6 |  |
| LOS | B | C |  | F | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 23.1 |  |  | 22.1 |  |  | 22.2 |  |  | 28.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |

## intersection Summary

Area Type：
Actuated Cycle Length： 90
Iffset： 78 （87\％），Referenced to phase 4：EBTL and 8：WBTL，Start of Green
Natural Cycle： 70
Control Type：Actuated－Coordinated
Maximum v／c Ratio： 0.82
Intersection Signal Delay： 23.9 Intersection LOS：C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 98．6\％ICU Level of Service F
Analysis Period（min） 15

| 402 | $\rightarrow \rightarrow_{84}(\mathrm{R})$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 44 s | 46 s |
| －$\square^{6}$ | －$\square_{88}(\mathrm{R})$ |


| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ ${ }_{\text {d }}$ |  |  | งิ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 70 | 1217 | 1 | 0 | 619 | 72 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 58 | 0 | 48 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 70 | 1217 | 1 | 0 | 619 | 72 | 1 | , | 1 | 58 | 0 | 48 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.984 |  |  | 0.955 |  |  | 0.939 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.997 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.984 |  |  | 0.973 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3393 | 0 | 0 | 3173 | 0 | 0 | 1049 | 0 | 0 | 1588 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.862 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.924 |  |  | 0.828 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2929 | 0 | 0 | 3173 | 0 | 0 | 973 | 0 | 0 | 1338 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 26 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( $m$ ) |  | 123.6 |  |  | 101.7 |  |  | 33.0 |  |  | 87.8 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.1 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 10.5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 50 |  | 27 | 27 |  | 50 | 38 |  | 15 | 15 |  | 38 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 5\% | 0\% | 2\% | 10\% | 5\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 4\% | 2\% | 7\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 71 | 1242 | 1 | 0 | 632 | 73 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 59 | 0 | 49 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1314 | 0 | 0 | 705 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 108 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( $m$ ) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width( m ) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
5: Private Access/Sterling Road \& Dundas Street West

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max |  | Max | Max |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 71.1 |  |  | 71.1 |  |  | 13.3 |  |  | 13.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.79 |  |  | 0.79 |  |  | 0.15 |  |  | 0.15 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{R}$ Ratio |  | 0.57 |  |  | 0.28 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.55 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 6.5 |  |  | 3.9 |  |  | 27.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 6.5 |  |  | 3.9 |  |  | 27.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |
| LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 6.5 |  |  | 3.9 |  |  | 27.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |

Area Type:
ycle Length: 90
Offset: $76(84 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.57
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: 7.6 } & \text { Intersection LOS: A } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization 85.3\% } & \text { ICevel of Service E }\end{array}$
Analysis Period (min) 15


21-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study
Synchro 10 Repor


Lane Width ( m )
$\begin{array}{lrrrrrr} & 3.5 & 3.5 & 3.5 & 3.5 & 3.5 & 3.5\end{array}$

| rt |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| 1 Protected | 0.890 |


|  | 0.991 |  |  |  | 0.985 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1625 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1814 |
| FIt Permitted | 0.991 |  |  |  |  | 0.985 |


|  | 1625 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1814 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FIt Permitted | 0.991 |  | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1814 |

Link Distance (m)
ravel Time (s)
Peak Hour Factor
Adj. Flow (vph)
hared Lane Traffic (\%)
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Lane Group Flow (vph) } & 38 & 0 & 22 & 0 & 0 & 30\end{array}$
Enter Blocked Intersection No No No No No No
ane Alignment
Median Width(m)
Cosswalk Width(
Crosswalk Width(m)
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Headway Factor } & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Turning Speed (k/h) } & 24 & 14 & & 14 & 24 & \\ \text { Sign Control } & \text { Stop } & & \text { Free } & & & \text { Free }\end{array}$

| Intersection Summary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type: Other |  |

Area Type:
Control Type: Unsignalized
Control Type: Unsignalized
Analysis Period (min) 15

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysi
6: Ruttan Street \& Merchant Lane


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

| Lanes, Volumes, 1 8: Sterling Road \& | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ings } \\ & \text { rth } \mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | <Existing before Bikeway> AM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 109 | 9 | 81 | 24 | 2 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 109 | 9 | 81 | 24 | 2 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width ( m ) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt | 0.881 |  |  |  | 0.990 |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.994 |  |  | 0.995 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1590 | 0 | 0 | 1789 | 1794 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.994 |  |  | 0.995 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1590 | 0 | 0 | 1789 | 1794 | 0 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) | 30 |  |  | 30 | 30 |  |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 70.2 |  |  | 16.3 | 54.8 |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 8.4 |  |  | 2.0 | 6.6 |  |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 4 | 90 | 13 |  |  | 13 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 7\% | 3\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 50\% |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 16 | 115 | 9 | 85 | 25 | 2 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 131 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 27 | 0 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 24 | 14 | 24 |  |  | 14 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 31.4\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West
<Existing before Bikeway> PM Peak

|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | А $\hat{\text { tr }}$ |  |  | * 1 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 个t |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 4 | 537 | 70 | 1 | 903 | 82 | 99 | 369 | 30 | 114 | 285 | 90 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 4 | 537 | 70 | 1 | 903 | 82 | 99 | 369 | 30 | 114 | 285 | 90 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Storage Length ( m ) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 10.0 |  | 15.0 | 40.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  | 0.94 |  |  | 0.97 |  | 0.88 | 0.98 |  | 0.84 | 0.92 |  |
| Frt |  | 0.983 |  |  | 0.988 |  |  | 0.989 |  |  | 0.964 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3266 | 0 | 0 | 3337 | 0 | 1620 | 3310 | 0 | 1604 | 1595 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.949 |  |  | 0.955 |  | 0.288 |  |  | 0.406 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 3099 | 0 | 0 | 3186 | 0 | 430 | 3310 | 0 | 573 | 1595 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  | 17 |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 374.8 |  |  | 112.0 |  |  | 258.8 |  |  | 36.6 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 33.7 |  |  | 10.1 |  |  | 23.3 |  |  | 3.3 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 297 |  | 298 | 298 |  | 297 | 264 |  | 341 | 341 |  | 264 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Heary Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 1\% | 2\% | 0\% | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% | 3\% | 17\% | 5\% | 6\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 4 | 559 | 73 | 1 | 941 | 85 | 103 | 384 | 31 | 119 | 297 | 94 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 636 | 0 | 0 | 1027 | 0 | 103 | 415 | 0 | 119 | 391 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West
<Existing before Bikeway> PM Peak
Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/18/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 |  | 26.0 | 26.0 |  | 6.0 | 22.0 |  | 6.0 | 22.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 10.0 | 28.0 |  | 10.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 50.0 | 50.0 |  | 50.0 | 50.0 |  | 11.0 | 29.0 |  | 11.0 | 29.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 55.6\% | 55.6\% |  | 55.6\% | 55.6\% |  | 12.2\% | 32.2\% |  | 12.2\% | 32.2\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 44.0 | 44.0 |  | 44.0 | 44.0 |  | 7.0 | 23.0 |  | 7.0 | 23.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 1.0 | 2.0 |  | 1.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max |  | Max | Max |  | None | Max |  | None | Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 19.0 | 19.0 |  |  | 15.0 |  |  | 15.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 45.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  | 33.9 | 24.1 |  | 34.6 | 26.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  | 0.38 | 0.27 |  | 0.38 | 0.29 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.41 |  |  | 0.64 |  | 0.39 | 0.46 |  | 0.38 | 0.82 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 15.2 |  |  | 19.0 |  | 21.3 | 29.0 |  | 20.8 | 46.0 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 15.2 |  |  | 19.0 |  | 21.3 | 29.0 |  | 20.8 | 46.0 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  | C | C |  | C | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 15.2 |  |  | 19.0 |  |  | 27.5 |  |  | 40.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |

Intersection Summary
Area Type:
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: 52 ( $58 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 70
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.82
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: } 23.7 & \text { Intersection LOS: C } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization } 68.6 \% & \end{array}$
tersection Capacity Utilization 68.6\%
CU Level of Service C
Splits and Phases: 1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West

| $\rightarrow \boldsymbol{D}_{2(\mathrm{R})}$ | ${ }_{\square 03}$ | $4_{64}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 s | 11 s | 29 s |  |
| $\square_{\square 6}$ | ${ }_{107}$ |  |  |
| 50 s | 11 s | 29 s |  |

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
2: Ruttan Street \& Bloor Street West
<Existing before Bikeway> PM Peak


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ $\uparrow$ |  |  | 个t |  | 7 | $\stackrel{1}{6}$ |  | 7 |  | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 89 | 552 | 0 | 0 | 932 | 74 | 119 | 100 | 23 | 136 | 0 | 168 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 89 | 552 | 0 | 0 | 932 | 74 | 119 | 100 | 23 | 136 | 0 | 168 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  | 0.98 |  | 0.85 | 0.97 |  | 0.86 |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.989 |  |  | 0.972 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.993 |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3443 | 0 | 0 | 3350 | 0 | 1636 | 1621 | 0 | 1668 | 0 | 1329 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.531 |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1841 | 0 | 0 | 3350 | 0 | 1394 | 1621 | 0 | 1428 | 0 | 1329 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance ( $m$ ) |  | 98.8 |  |  | 69.7 |  |  | 91.9 |  |  | 175.2 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 8.9 |  |  | 6.3 |  |  | 11.0 |  |  | 15.8 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 110 |  | 76 | 76 |  | 110 | 59 |  | 57 | 57 |  | 59 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 9\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 6\% | 3\% | 3\% | 5\% | 1\% | 0\% | 8\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 91 | 563 | 0 | 0 | 951 | 76 | 121 | 102 | 23 | 139 | 0 | 171 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 654 | 0 | 0 | 1027 | 0 | 121 | 125 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 171 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( m ) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.16 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  |  | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left |  | Right |
| Leading Detector (m) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |  | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Existing before Bikeway> PM Peak 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot |  | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 21.0 |  |  | 21.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 19.0 |  |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 10.0 | 29.0 |  |  | 29.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 11.0 | 53.0 |  |  | 42.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 29.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 11.0\% | 53.0\% |  |  | 42.0\% |  | 18.0\% | 18.0\% |  | 29.0\% |  |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 7.0 | 45.0 |  |  | 34.0 |  | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 22.0 |  |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  |  | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | C-Max |  |  | C-Max |  | None | None |  | None |  |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 7.0 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 47.4 |  |  | 35.0 |  | 13.3 | 13.3 |  | 20.3 |  | 26.7 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.47 |  |  | 0.35 |  | 0.13 | 0.13 |  | 0.20 |  | 0.27 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.68 |  |  | 0.87 |  | 0.65 | 0.58 |  | 0.41 |  | 0.48 |
| Control Delay |  | 23.9 |  |  | 39.8 |  | 58.5 | 51.9 |  | 38.8 |  | 23.4 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 23.9 |  |  | 39.8 |  | 58.5 | 51.9 |  | 38.8 |  | 23.4 |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  | E | D |  | D |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 23.9 |  |  | 39.8 |  |  | 55.1 |  |  | 30.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |

## Intersection Summary $\quad$ Other

Area Type:
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: 86 ( $86 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6 :WBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.87

| Intersection Signal Delay: 35.5 | Intersection LOS: D |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $86.4 \%$ | ICU Level of Service E |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |

Splits and Phases: 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street Weat


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West
<Existing before Bikeway> PM Peak
. Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West
4. Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 |  | 6.0 | 26.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 10.0 | 32.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 38.0 | 38.0 |  | 12.0 | 50.0 |  | 40.0 | 40.0 |  | 40.0 | 40.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 42.2\% | 42.2\% |  | 13.3\% | 55.6\% |  | 44.4\% | 44.4\% |  | 44.4\% | 44.4\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 8.0 | 44.0 |  | 34.0 | 34.0 |  | 34.0 | 34.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 1.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | C-Max | C-Max |  | C-Max | C-Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 19.0 | 19.0 |  |  | 19.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) | 32.6 | 32.6 |  | 44.1 | 42.1 |  |  | 37.9 |  |  | 37.9 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.36 | 0.36 |  | 0.49 | 0.47 |  |  | 0.42 |  |  | 0.42 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.48 | 0.68 |  | 0.33 | 0.80 |  |  | 0.62 |  |  | 0.42 |  |
| Control Delay | 42.2 | 26.8 |  | 14.9 | 24.6 |  |  | 22.3 |  |  | 20.2 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 42.2 | 26.8 |  | 14.9 | 24.6 |  |  | 22.3 |  |  | 20.2 |  |
| LOS | D | C |  | B | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 27.7 |  |  | 23.9 |  |  | 22.3 |  |  | 20.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  | Approach LOS

## ntersection Summar <br> Area Type:

Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: 77 ( $86 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 75
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.80
Intersection Signal Delay: 23.8 Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 95.0\% ICU Level of Service F
Analysis Period (min) 15


5: Private Access/Sterling Road \& Dundas Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 73 | 756 | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 84 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 73 | 756 | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 84 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.96 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.985 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.924 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.996 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.979 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3446 | 0 | 0 | 3386 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1598 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.698 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.864 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2414 | 0 | 0 | 3386 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1396 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( $m$ ) |  | 123.6 |  |  | 101.7 |  |  | 33.0 |  |  | 87.8 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.1 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 10.5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 34 |  | 50 | 50 |  | 34 | 34 |  | 19 | 19 |  | 34 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 5\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 75 | 779 | 0 | 0 | 1257 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 87 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 854 | 0 | 0 | 1399 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( $m$ ) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width( m ) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
5: Private Access/Sterling Road \& Dundas Street West

|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max |  | Max | Max |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 65.0 |  |  | 65.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 16.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.72 |  |  | 0.72 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.18 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.49 |  |  | 0.57 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.62 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 7.2 |  |  | 7.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 44.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 7.2 |  |  | 7.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 44.4 |  |
| LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 7.2 |  |  | 7.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 44.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |

## Area Type:

yctuated Cycle Lengtr
Dffset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.62
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: } 9.8 & \text { Intersection LOS: A } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utiization } 90.0 \% & \text { ICU Level of Service }\end{array}$
Analysis Period (min) 15


21-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study
Synchro 10 Repor

$\begin{array}{lrrrrrr}\text { Lane Width (m) } & 3.5 & 3.5 & 3.5 & 3.5 & 3.5 & 3.5\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Flt Protected } & 0.875 \\ & 0.996\end{array}$

|  | 0.996 |  |  |  | 0.972 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fit Protected | 0.992 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1605 | 0 | 1822 | 0 | 0 | 1790 |
| FIt Permitted | 0.996 |  |  |  |  | 0.972 |

$\begin{array}{lllllll} & 0.996 & 0 & 1822 & 0 & 0 & 1790 \\ \text { Flt Permitted } & 1605 & 0 & 1822 & 0 & 0 & 1790\end{array}$
Link Distance ( m )
Travel Time (s)
Peak Hour Factor
Adj. Flow (vph)
Shared Lane Traffic (\%)

|  | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Enter Blocked Intersection } & 14 & 0 & 73 & 0 & 0 & 58 \\ & \text { No } & \text { No } & \text { No } & \text { No } & \text { No } & \text { No }\end{array}$
ane Alignment
edian Width(m)
Cosswalk Width
Crosswalk Width(m)
wo way Left Turn La
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Headway Factor } & & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 \\ & 1.01\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lrrrrrr}\text { Headway Factor } & & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 \\ \text { Turning Speed (kh) } & 24 & 14 & & 14 & 24 & \\ \text { Sign Control } & \text { Stop } & & \text { Free } & & & \text { Free }\end{array}$
sign Control

| Intersection Summary |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type: Other |

Area Type:
Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 19.6\%
Analysis Period (min) 15

[^3]| HCM Unsignalized In 6: Ruttan Street \& M |  |  |  |  |  |  | <Existing before Bikeway> PM Peak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\hat{\square}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 12 | 64 | 6 | 32 | 23 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 1 | 12 | 64 | 6 | 32 | 23 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 1 | 13 | 67 | , | 34 | 24 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 162 | 70 |  |  | 73 |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 162 | 70 |  |  | 73 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| po queue free \% | 100 | 99 |  |  | 98 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 810 | 993 |  |  | 1527 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 14 | 73 | 58 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 1 | 0 | 34 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 13 | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 977 | 1700 | 1527 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.7 | 0.0 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.7 | 0.0 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 19.6\% |  | Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |




APPENDIX

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { D-2 Existing } \\
& \text { Traffic } \\
& \text { Conditions } \\
& \text { after Bikeway } \\
& \text { Extension }
\end{aligned}
$$ 1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 710 | 0 | 0 | 477 | 75 | 57 | 350 | 60 | 151 | 322 | 78 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 710 | 0 | 0 | 477 | 75 | 57 | 350 | 60 | 151 | 322 | 78 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 14.1 | 14.4 |  | 15.3 | 36.3 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  | 0.69 | 0.83 | 0.91 |  | 0.78 | 0.91 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.974 |  |  | 0.962 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1658 | 0 | 0 | 1602 | 1343 | 1458 | 2680 | 0 | 1501 | 1416 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.455 |  |  | 0.304 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1658 | 0 | 0 | 1602 | 931 | 576 | 2680 | 0 | 377 | 1416 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 |  |  | 19 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 374.8 |  |  | 112.0 |  |  | 258.8 |  |  | 36.6 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 33.7 |  |  | 10.1 |  |  | 23.3 |  |  | 3.3 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 261 |  | 188 | 188 |  | 261 | 149 |  | 271 | 271 |  | 149 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.50 | 1.00 | 0.76 | 0.90 | 0.95 | 0.69 | 0.75 | 0.93 | 0.75 | 0.80 | 0.99 | 0.70 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 2\% | 3\% | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 4\% | 6\% | 5\% | 1\% | 5\% | 3\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 710 | 0 | 0 | 502 | 109 | 76 | 376 | 80 | 189 | 325 | 111 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 710 | 0 | 0 | 502 | 109 | 76 | 456 | 0 | 189 | 436 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Righ |
| Median Width(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.21 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  |  |
| Number of Detectors |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template |  | Thru |  |  | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector (m) |  | 30.5 |  |  | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West
<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> AM Peak 1. Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type |  | NA |  |  | NA | Perm | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  | 2 |  |  | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 26.0 |  |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 |  | 6.0 | 22.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 34.0 |  |  | 34.0 | 34.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 10.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 59.0 |  |  | 59.0 | 59.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 13.0 | 41.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 59.0\% |  |  | 59.0\% | 59.0\% | 28.0\% | 28.0\% |  | 13.0\% | 41.0\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 52.4 |  |  | 52.4 | 52.4 | 22.0 | 22.0 |  | 9.0 | 35.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 3.6 |  |  | 3.6 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 1.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.6 |  |  | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode |  | C-Max |  |  | C-Max | C-Max | Max | Max |  | None | Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 19.0 |  |  | 19.0 | 19.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |  |  | 15.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 53.4 |  |  | 53.4 | 53.4 | 23.0 | 23.0 |  | 38.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.53 |  |  | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.23 | 0.23 |  | 0.38 | 0.36 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.80 |  |  | 0.59 | 0.22 | 0.58 | 0.72 |  | 0.74 | 0.84 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 21.8 |  |  | 19.3 | 13.8 | 53.5 | 41.0 |  | 42.0 | 44.1 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 21.8 |  |  | 19.3 | 13.8 | 53.5 | 41.0 |  | 42.0 | 44.1 |  |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | B | B | D | D |  | D | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 21.8 |  |  | 18.3 |  |  | 42.8 |  |  | 43.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |

## ntersection Summary

## rea Type:

Afset: 38 (38\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBT and 6:WBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.84
Intersection Signal Delay: $30.9 \quad$ Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 98.3\% ICU Level of Service F
Analysis Period (min) 15

| $\rightarrow \square_{\text {2 }}(\mathrm{R})$ | $\square_{03}$ | 404 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59 s | 13 s | 28. |
| $\leftarrow_{\emptyset 6(R)}$ | $\dagger{ }^{+08}$ |  |

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
2: Ruttan Street \& Bloor Street West
<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> AM Peak

|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | \% |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 763 | 20 | 7 | 589 | 24 | 24 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 763 | 20 | 7 | 589 | 24 | 24 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Utili. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.997 |  |  |  | 0.932 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.999 | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1837 | 0 | 0 | 1840 | 1581 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.999 | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1837 | 0 | 0 | 1840 | 1581 | 0 |
| Link Speed (kh) | 40 |  |  | 40 | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) | 69.7 |  |  | 374.8 | 79.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 6.3 |  |  | 33.7 | 9.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 848 | 22 | 8 | 654 | 27 | 27 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 870 | 0 | 0 | 662 | 54 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |  | 14 | 24 |  | 24 | 14 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | her |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 51.4\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis <Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> AM Peak 2: Ruttan Street \& Bloor Street West

<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> AM Peak 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> AM Peak 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  | Prot |  | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 21.0 |  |  | 21.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 19.0 |  |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 10.0 | 29.0 |  |  | 29.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 11.0 | 57.0 |  |  | 46.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 11.0\% | 57.0\% |  |  | 46.0\% |  | 16.0\% | 16.0\% |  | 27.0\% |  |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 7.0 | 49.3 |  |  | 38.3 |  | 9.0 | 9.0 |  | 20.0 |  |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 4.7 |  |  | 4.7 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -1.0 | -3.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 3.0 | 4.7 |  |  | 6.7 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  |  | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | C-Max |  |  | C-Max |  | None | None |  | None |  |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) |  | 28 |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) | 57.8 | 56.1 |  |  | 43.1 |  | 9.4 | 9.4 |  | 20.6 |  | 26.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.58 | 0.56 |  |  | 0.43 |  | 0.09 | 0.09 |  | 0.21 |  | 0.27 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.69 | 0.64 |  |  | 0.83 |  | 0.20 | 0.44 |  | 0.69 |  | 0.55 |
| Control Delay | 30.2 | 20.7 |  |  | 30.2 |  | 44.8 | 52.3 |  | 48.5 |  | 27.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 30.2 | 20.7 |  |  | 30.2 |  | 44.8 | 52.3 |  | 48.5 |  | 27.2 |
| LOS | C | C |  |  | C |  | D | D |  | D |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 22.7 |  |  | 30.2 |  |  | 49.9 |  |  | 38.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |

## ,

## Area Type: Other

Cycle Length: 10
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: $89(89 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 85
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.83
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: 30.3 } & \text { Intersection LOS: C } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization 71.6\% } & \text { ICU }\end{array}$
Intersection Capacity Utilization 71.6\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15

<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> AM Peak
4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |  | А触 |  |  | ¢ $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 600 | 202 | 72 | 551 | 117 | 0 | 411 | 159 | 10 | 800 | 42 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 600 | 202 | 72 | 551 | 117 | 0 | 411 | 159 | 10 | 800 | 42 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) | 0.0 |  | 17.5 | 26.4 |  | 31.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 50.0 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  | 0.74 | 0.90 |  | 0.60 |  | 0.82 |  |  | 0.96 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.955 |  |  | 0.991 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1623 | 1436 | 1589 | 1712 | 1358 | 0 | 3775 | 0 | 0 | 3224 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.940 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1623 | 1062 | 1426 | 1712 | 820 | 0 | 3775 | 0 | 0 | 3022 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 121 |  |  | 101 |  | 120 |  |  | 8 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) |  | 75.1 |  |  | 318.0 |  |  | 159.9 |  |  | 139.1 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 6.8 |  |  | 28.6 |  |  | 14.4 |  |  | 12.5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hrr) | 670 |  | 219 | 219 |  | 670 | 453 |  | 442 | 442 |  | 453 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 11 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.64 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.90 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.69 | 0.98 | 0.75 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 4\% | 3\% | 5\% | 6\% | 3\% | 11\% | 0\% | 7\% | 3\% | 100\% | 4\% | 0\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 600 | 243 | 73 | 574 | 131 | 0 | 419 | 177 | 14 | 816 | 56 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 600 | 243 | 73 | 574 | 131 | 0 | 596 | 0 | 0 | 886 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( $m$ ) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width( m ) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.09 | 1.18 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.10 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.09 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Number of Detectors |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | , | 2 |  |
| Detector Template |  | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( $m$ ) |  | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 2.0 | 30.5 |  | 2.0 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |  | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study


Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> AM Peak
4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West
2/16/202

|  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 4 | 1 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type |  | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 25.0 | 25.0 | 6.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 19.0 | 19.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 31.3 | 31.3 | 11.0 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 42.0 | 42.0 | 12.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 46.7\% | 46.7\% | 13.3\% | 60.0\% | 60.0\% | 34.4\% | 34.4\% |  | 34.4\% | 34.4\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 35.7 | 35.7 | 7.0 | 47.7 | 47.7 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 5.3 | 5.3 |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode |  | Max | Max | None | Max | Max | C-Max | C-Max |  | C-Max | C-Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 |  | 17.0 | 17.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) |  | 39.1 | 39.1 | 7.8 | 48.7 | 48.7 |  | 28.0 |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.09 | 0.54 | 0.54 |  | 0.31 |  |  | 0.34 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.85 | 0.46 | 0.53 | 0.62 | 0.27 |  | 0.47 |  |  | 0.85 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 38.0 | 12.8 | 53.9 | 18.0 | 5.0 |  | 21.6 |  |  | 36.3 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 38.0 | 12.8 | 53.9 | 18.0 | 5.0 |  | 21.6 |  |  | 36.3 |  |
| LOS |  | D | B | D | B | A |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 30.7 |  |  | 19.2 |  |  | 21.6 |  |  | 36.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |

Other
ycle Length: 9
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: $34(38 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.85
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.85
Intersection Signal Delay: 27.7 Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 79.5\%
ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street Wes


<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> AM Peak 5: Private Access/Sterling Road \& Dundas Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ ${ }_{\text {d }}$ |  |  | งิ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 70 | 1217 | 1 | 0 | 619 | 72 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 58 | 0 | 48 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 70 | 1217 | 1 | 0 | 619 | 72 | 1 | , | 1 | 58 | 0 | 48 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.984 |  |  | 0.955 |  |  | 0.939 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.997 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.984 |  |  | 0.973 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3393 | 0 | 0 | 3173 | 0 | 0 | 1049 | 0 | 0 | 1588 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.862 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.924 |  |  | 0.828 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2929 | 0 | 0 | 3173 | 0 | 0 | 974 | 0 | 0 | 1338 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 26 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( $m$ ) |  | 123.6 |  |  | 101.7 |  |  | 33.0 |  |  | 87.8 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.1 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 10.5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 50 |  | 27 | 27 |  | 50 | 38 |  | 15 | 15 |  | 38 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 5\% | 0\% | 2\% | 10\% | 5\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 4\% | 2\% | 7\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 71 | 1242 | 1 | 0 | 632 | 73 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 59 | 0 | 49 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1314 | 0 | 0 | 705 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 108 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( $m$ ) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width( m ) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> AM Peak 5: Private Access/Sterling Road \& Dundas Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max |  | Max | Max |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 71.1 |  |  | 71.1 |  |  | 13.3 |  |  | 13.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.79 |  |  | 0.79 |  |  | 0.15 |  |  | 0.15 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.57 |  |  | 0.28 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.55 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 6.5 |  |  | 3.9 |  |  | 27.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 6.5 |  |  | 3.9 |  |  | 27.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |
| LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 6.5 |  |  | 3.9 |  |  | 27.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |

## $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Atersection Summary } & \\ \text { Area Type: }\end{array}$

Area Type:
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: $76(84 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.57
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: 7.6 } & \text { Intersection LOS: A } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization 85.3\% } & \text { ICU Level of Service E }\end{array}$
Analysis Period (min) 15


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study
Synchro 10 Report


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis <Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> AM Peak 6: Ruttan Street \& Merchant Lane 02/16/2021

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | Y |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Trafic Volume (veh/h) | 6 | 28 | 20 | 0 | 8 | 19 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 6 | 28 | 20 | 0 | 8 | 19 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 7 | 31 | 22 | 0 | 9 | 21 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 61 | 22 |  |  | 22 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 61 | 22 |  |  | 22 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| po queue free \% | 99 | 97 |  |  | 99 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 940 | 1055 |  |  | 1593 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 38 | 22 | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 7 | 0 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 31 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1032 | 1700 | 1593 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th ( m ) | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.6 | 0.0 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.6 | 0.0 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity UtilizationAnalysis Period (min) |  |  | 18.0\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |
|  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Lanes, Volumes, Timings <br> 8: Sterling Road \& Perth Avenue |  |  |  |  |  | <Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> AM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 109 | 9 | 81 | 24 | 2 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 109 | 9 | 81 | 24 | 2 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt | 0.881 |  |  |  | 0.990 |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.994 |  |  | 0.995 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1590 | 0 | 0 | 1789 | 1794 | 0 |  |
| FIt Permitted | 0.994 |  |  | 0.995 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1590 | 0 | 0 | 1789 | 1794 | 0 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) | 30 |  |  | 30 | 30 |  |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 70.2 |  |  | 16.3 | 54.8 |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 8.4 |  |  | 2.0 | 6.6 |  |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 4 | 90 | 13 |  |  | 13 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 7\% | 3\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 50\% |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 16 | 115 | 9 | 85 | 25 | 2 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 131 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 27 | 0 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (Kh) | 24 | 14 | 24 |  |  | 14 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 31.4\% ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | 7 | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 575 | 0 | 0 | 660 | 122 | 120 | 381 | 38 | 105 | 261 | 73 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 575 | 0 | 0 | 660 | 122 | 120 | 381 | 38 | 105 | 261 | 73 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 14.1 | 14.4 |  | 15.3 | 36.3 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  | 0.68 | 0.79 | 0.94 |  | 0.76 | 0.86 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.984 |  |  | 0.962 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1674 | 0 | 0 | 1602 | 1343 | 1501 | 2882 | 0 | 1516 | 1361 |  |
| FIt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.284 |  |  | 0.361 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1674 | 0 | 0 | 1602 | 911 | 353 | 2882 | 0 | 441 | 1361 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |  |  | 18 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 374.8 |  |  | 112.0 |  |  | 258.8 |  |  | 36.6 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 33.7 |  |  | 10.1 |  |  | 23.3 |  |  | 3.3 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 329 |  | 292 | 292 |  | 329 | 280 |  | 352 | 352 |  | 280 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.63 | 1.00 | 0.63 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.73 | 0.94 | 0.90 | 0.73 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 3\% | 3\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#hr) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 575 | 0 | 0 | 660 | 140 | 136 | 433 | 52 | 112 | 290 | 100 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 575 | 0 | 0 | 660 | 140 | 136 | 485 | 0 | 112 | 390 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.21 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  |  |
| Number of Detectors |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template |  | Thru |  |  | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector (m) |  | 30.5 |  |  | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West
<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> PM Peak 1. Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type |  | NA |  |  | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  | 2 |  |  | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 26.0 |  |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 6.0 | 22.0 |  | 6.0 | 22.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 34.0 |  |  | 34.0 | 34.0 | 10.0 | 28.0 |  | 10.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 54.0 |  |  | 54.0 | 54.0 | 11.0 | 34.0 |  | 12.0 | 35.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 54.0\% |  |  | 54.0\% | 54.0\% | 11.0\% | 34.0\% |  | 12.0\% | 35.0\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 47.4 |  |  | 47.4 | 47.4 | 7.0 | 28.0 |  | 8.0 | 29.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 3.6 |  |  | 3.6 | 3.6 | 1.0 | 2.0 |  | 1.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 6.6 |  |  | 6.6 | 5.6 | 3.0 | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode |  | C-Max |  |  | C-Max | C-Max | None | Max |  | None | Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 19.0 |  |  | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 15.0 |  |  | 15.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 | 40 |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 47.4 |  |  | 47.4 | 48.4 | 39.3 | 29.5 |  | 40.7 | 30.1 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.47 |  |  | 0.47 | 0.48 | 0.39 | 0.30 |  | 0.41 | 0.30 |  |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.73 |  |  | 0.87 | 0.32 | 0.59 | 0.56 |  | 0.41 | 0.92 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 23.4 |  |  | 37.8 | 18.3 | 30.1 | 32.2 |  | 22.6 | 62.3 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 23.4 |  |  | 37.8 | 18.3 | 30.1 | 32.2 |  | 22.6 | 62.3 |  |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | D | B | C | C |  | C | E |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 23.4 |  |  | 34.4 |  |  | 31.7 |  |  | 53.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |

## htersection Summary <br> <br> rea Type:

 <br> <br> rea Type:}ycle Length: 100
Offset: 20 ( $20 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:EBT and 6:WBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.92
Intersection Signal Delay: $35.0 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 81.0\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15


Lanes, Volumes, Timings
2: Ruttan Street \& Bloor Street West
<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> PM Peak

|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | Y |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 605 | 37 | 18 | 699 | 53 | 23 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 605 | 37 | 18 | 699 | 53 | 23 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Utili. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.992 |  |  |  | 0.959 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.999 | 0.966 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1827 | 0 | 0 | 1840 | 1611 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.999 | 0.966 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1827 | 0 | 0 | 1840 | 1611 | 0 |
| Link Speed (kh) | 40 |  |  | 40 | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) | 69.7 |  |  | 374.8 | 79.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 6.3 |  |  | 33.7 | 9.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 637 | 39 | 19 | 736 | 56 | 24 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 676 | 0 | 0 | 755 | 80 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 | 4.8 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |  | 14 | 24 |  | 24 | 14 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | her |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service B |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 62.3\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis <Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> PM Peak 2: Ruttan Street \& Bloor Street West

<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> PM Peak 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |  | F |  | \% | F |  | 7 |  | \% |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 145 | 460 | 0 | 0 | 650 | 102 | 83 | 99 | 20 | 162 | 0 | 226 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 145 | 460 | 0 | 0 | 650 | 102 | 83 | 99 | 20 | 162 | 0 | 226 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) | 27.5 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| Taper Length ( $m$ ) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.91 |  | 0.83 |  | 0.82 |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.982 |  |  | 0.968 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1646 | 1818 | 0 | 0 | 1843 | 0 | 1685 | 1651 | 0 | 1668 | 0 | 1403 |
| FIt Permitted | 0.094 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 163 | 1818 | 0 | 0 | 1843 | 0 | 1685 | 1651 | 0 | 1381 | 0 | 1144 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 98.8 |  |  | 69.7 |  |  | 91.9 |  |  | 175.2 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 8.9 |  |  | 6.3 |  |  | 11.0 |  |  | 15.8 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 155 |  | 58 | 58 |  | 155 |  |  | 85 | 85 |  | 65 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.63 | 0.79 | 0.95 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 6\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 145 | 460 | 0 | 0 | 650 | 102 | 100 | 119 | 32 | 205 | 0 | 269 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 145 | 460 | 0 | 0 | 752 | 0 | 100 | 151 | 0 | 205 | 0 | 269 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.3 |  |  | 3.3 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 0.92 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.14 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  |  | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left |  | Right |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |  | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector $1 \mathrm{Size}(\mathrm{m})$ | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> PM Peak 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  | Prot |  | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 21.0 |  |  | 21.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 19.0 |  |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 10.0 | 29.0 |  |  | 29.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 11.0 | 57.0 |  |  | 46.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 11.0\% | 57.0\% |  |  | 46.0\% |  | 16.0\% | 16.0\% |  | 27.0\% |  |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 7.0 | 49.3 |  |  | 38.3 |  | 9.0 | 9.0 |  | 20.0 |  |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 4.7 |  |  | 4.7 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -1.0 | -1.5 |  |  | -3.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 3.0 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.7 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  |  | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | C-Max |  |  | C-Max |  | None | None |  | None |  |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) |  | 36 |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) | 54.4 | 51.2 |  |  | 41.7 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 |  | 20.6 |  | 25.6 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.54 | 0.51 |  |  | 0.42 |  | 0.10 | 0.10 |  | 0.21 |  | 0.26 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.70 | 0.49 |  |  | 0.97 |  | 0.60 | 0.92 |  | 0.60 |  | 0.75 |
| Control Delay | 34.8 | 18.3 |  |  | 39.6 |  | 58.6 | 97.1 |  | 44.0 |  | 37.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 34.8 | 18.3 |  |  | 39.6 |  | 58.6 | 97.1 |  | 44.0 |  | 37.1 |
| LOS | C | B |  |  | D |  | E | F |  | D |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 22.3 |  |  | 39.6 |  |  | 81.8 |  |  | 40.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |

## ntersection Summary

Cycle Length: 10
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: $64(64 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and $6: W B T$, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 95
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.97
Intersection Signal Delay: $39.8 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 79.8\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15

| $\rightarrow$ | ${ }^{\prime}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 57 s | 27 s | ${ }_{16 \mathrm{~s}}$ |
|  |  |  |

<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> PM Peak
4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West

|  |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | SBR

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study


Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> PM Peak 4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type |  | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 7.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 32.3 | 32.3 | 11.0 | 32.3 | 32.3 | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 40.0 | 40.0 | 12.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 33.0 | 33.0 |  | 33.0 | 33.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 44.4\% | 44.4\% | 13.3\% | 57.8\% | 57.8\% | 36.7\% | 36.7\% |  | 36.7\% | 36.7\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 33.7 | 33.7 | 8.0 | 45.7 | 45.7 | 27.0 | 27.0 |  | 27.0 | 27.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 3.3 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.3 | 5.3 | 3.0 | 5.3 | 5.3 |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode |  | Max | Max | None | Max | Max | C-Max | C-Max |  | C-Max | C-Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 19.0 | 19.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 34.7 | 34.7 | 9.0 | 46.7 | 46.7 |  | 30.0 |  |  | 33.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.10 | 0.52 | 0.52 |  | 0.33 |  |  | 0.37 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.80 | 0.34 | 0.81 | 0.83 | 0.46 |  | 0.71 |  |  | 0.57 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 35.9 | 9.9 | 74.8 | 28.2 | 10.3 |  | 28.9 |  |  | 25.0 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 35.9 | 9.9 | 74.8 | 28.2 | 10.3 |  | 28.9 |  |  | 25.0 |  |
| LOS |  | D | A | E | C | B |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 29.3 |  |  | 30.0 |  |  | 28.9 |  |  | 25.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |

pproach LOS
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Summary } & \\ \text { Area Type: Other }\end{array}$
le Lengt
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: 77 ( $86 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.83
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: 28.7 } & \text { Intersection LOS: C } \\ \text { ntersection Capacity Utilization 70.5\% }\end{array}$
ntersection Capacity Utilization 70.5\%
ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West


<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> PM Peak 5: Private Access/Sterling Road \& Dundas Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 73 | 756 | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 84 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 73 | 756 | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 84 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.96 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.985 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.924 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.996 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.979 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3446 | 0 | 0 | 3386 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1598 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.698 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.864 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2414 | 0 | 0 | 3386 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1396 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( $m$ ) |  | 123.6 |  |  | 101.7 |  |  | 33.0 |  |  | 87.8 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.1 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 10.5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 34 |  | 50 | 50 |  | 34 | 34 |  | 19 | 19 |  | 34 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 5\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 75 | 779 | 0 | 0 | 1257 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 87 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 854 | 0 | 0 | 1399 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( $m$ ) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width( m ) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> PM Peak 5: Private Access/Sterling Road \& Dundas Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Lead/Lag
_ead-Lag Optimize?

| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max | Max | Max | None | None | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 65.0 |  | 65.0 |  |  |  | 16.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.72 |  | 0.72 |  |  |  | 0.18 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{R}$ Ratio |  | 0.49 |  | 0.57 |  |  |  | 0.62 |
| Control Delay |  | 7.2 |  | 7.6 |  |  |  | 44.4 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 7.2 |  | 7.6 |  |  |  | 44.4 |
| LOS |  | A |  | A |  |  |  | D |
| Approach Delay |  | 7.2 |  | 7.6 |  |  |  | 44.4 |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  | A |  |  |  | D |

## Antersection <br> Area Type: Cycle Length: 90

Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.62
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: } 9.8 & \text { Intersection LOS: A } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization } 90.0 \% & \text { ICU Level of Service E }\end{array}$
Analysis Period (min) 15


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study
Synchro 10 Report


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis <Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> PM Peak

| 6: Ruttan Street \& Merchant Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 02/16/2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | $\hat{}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 12 | 64 | 6 | 32 | 23 |  |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 1 | 12 | 64 | 6 | 32 | 23 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 1 | 13 | 67 | 6 | 34 | 24 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conficticting volume | 162 | 70 |  |  | 73 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 162 | 70 |  |  | 73 |  |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 | 99 |  |  | 98 |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 810 | 993 |  |  | 1527 |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 14 | 73 | 58 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 1 | 0 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 13 | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 977 | 1700 | 1527 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th ( m ) | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.7 | 0.0 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.7 | 0.0 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 19.6\% |  | Leve | Service | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lanes, Volumes, <br> 8: Sterling Road 8 | ings <br> rth A | enue |  |  |  | <Existing w/ Bikeway Volumes> PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 81 | 19 | 182 | 32 | 0 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 81 | 19 | 182 | 32 | 0 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt | 0.886 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.992 |  |  | 0.995 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1610 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 1879 | 0 |  |
| FIt Permitted | 0.992 |  |  | 0.995 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1610 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 1879 | 0 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) | 30 |  |  | 30 | 30 |  |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 70.2 |  |  | 16.3 | 54.8 |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 8.4 |  |  | 2.0 | 6.6 |  |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 5 | 13 | 9 |  |  | 9 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 3\% | 6\% | 1\% | 0\% | 2\% |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 17 | 94 | 22 | 212 | 37 | 0 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 111 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 37 | 0 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (Kh) | 24 | 14 | 24 |  |  | 14 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: <br> Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 33.2\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## APPENDIX



Pedestrian LOS

| Segment Name: |  |  | Symington Avenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User defined value |  |  |  |
| Step 1: Free-Flow Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{Spf}_{\text {pf }}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | - |
| \% Elderly | 19\% | - | This is used to trigger the walking speed change recommended in the HCM |


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $W_{T}$ | 8 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $W_{\text {s,o }}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $W_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk (ft) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 23 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 23 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {ped }}$ | 45 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h})$ | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 2288.0 | pedestrian space $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{p}\right)$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |


| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | Crossing delay incurred by pedestrians waiting for a gap crossing an uncontrolled location (s) | Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross and uncontrolled, or there are significant observations of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed and/or controlled, type "no value". |
| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\text {Tp,seg }}$ | 3.19 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment (ft/s) | A travel speed of $4.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or more is considered desirable and a speed of $2.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or less is considered undesirable. |
| L | 500 | segment length (ft) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 2.43 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.38 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.33 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2.00 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci,d }}$ | 0 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D (0, 1, or 2) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 102.00 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a 15-min period (veh/In) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum v_{i}$ | 816 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk i (veh/h) | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 76 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it, and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{lt}, \mathrm{perm}}$ | 190 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro, otherwise if permitted: equal to \# of permitted movements. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 25.0 | 85th percentile vehicle speed at a midsegment location on the major street ( $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ ) | - - |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay (s/p) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized, try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise, look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{g}_{\text {wakl,mi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time + 4.0. For more guidance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.0 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.57 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.25 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.25 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 12.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0.00 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 12.50 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}{ }^{*}$ | 0.00 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ | 0.00 | width of paved outside shoulder (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{bl}}$ | 0.00 | width of bicycle lane (ft) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0.00 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk <br> (ft) | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the <br> roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1.00 | buffer area coefficient | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy <br> distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{A}}$ | 8.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 8.00 | total walkway width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{aA}}$ | 8.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{sw}}$ | 3.60 | sidewalk width coefficient | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to <br> subject sidewalk) (veh/h) |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 223 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject <br> direction of travel (lanes) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as <br> computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in <br> HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to <br> pedestrian travel. |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{th}}$ | 2.00 | motorized vehicle running speed (mi/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | 25.00 | mort |  |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Link |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| LOS | Link Based LOS Score |  |
| A | $\leq 1.50$ |  |
| B | $>1.50-2.50$ |  |
| C | $>2.50-3.50$ |  |
| D | $>3.50-4.50$ |  |
| E | $>4.50-5.50$ |  |
| F | $>5.50$ |  |


| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 <br> $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 109.00 | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled <br> on the leg attempting to be crossed |  |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian diversion delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 290.00 | diversion distance ( ft$)$ | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{dc}}$ | 145.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing ( ft$)$ | Define this distance as either 1/3 of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be <br> required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. Mainly the latter |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular <br> to the segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 1.98 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 2.43 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{seg}}$ | 2.67 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p} \text { link }}$ | 1.98 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 2.43 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 500 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


|  |  | Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | B |  |


| Segment Name: |  |  | Symington Avenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User defined value |  |  |  |
| Step 1: Free-Flow Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{Spf}_{\text {p }}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | - |
| \% Elderly | 19\% | - | This is used to trigger the walking speed change recommended in the HCM |


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{T}$ | 8 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk (ft) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.2 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {ped }}$ | 85 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h})$ | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.2 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 1211.2 | pedestrian space $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{p}\right)$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.2 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |


| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular <br> to the segment centerline (s) | It <br> $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| No Value | Crossing delay incurred by pedestrians waiting for a gap <br> crossing an uncontrolled location (s) | $N$ <br> of |  |

It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5.
Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross, or there are significant observations of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed, type "no value".

| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{Tp}, \mathrm{seg}}$ | 3.19 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment <br> $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | A travel speed of 4.0 ft/s or more is considered desirable and a speed of 2.0 ft/s or less is considered <br> undesirable. |
| L | 500 | segment length (ft) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 2.67 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.38 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{5}$ | 0.57 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2.00 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci,d }}$ | 0 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D (0, 1, or 2) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 174.25 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a $15-\mathrm{min}$ period (veh/In) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | 1394 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk i (veh/h) | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 102 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it, and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {It,perm }}$ | 162 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 25 | 85th percentile speed at a midsegment location on the major street (mi/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay (s/p) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{gwak}_{\text {walmi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time + 4.0. For more guiance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.1 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.57 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.39 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | 0.25 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 12.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 12.5 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}{ }^{*}$ | 0 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder ( ft$)$ | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {os }}$ | 0 | width of paved outside shoulder ( ft ) | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {bl }}$ | 0 | width of bicycle lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1 | buffer area coefficient | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {A }}$ | 8.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {T }}$ | 8.00 | total walkway width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{WaA}_{\text {a }}$ | 8.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\text {sw }}$ | 3.60 | sidewalk width coefficient | - |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 346 | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to subject sidewalk) (veh/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {th }}$ | 2 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject direction of travel (lanes) | - - |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | 25 | motorized vehicle running speed ( $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ ) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to pedestrian travel. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Link |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| LOS | Link Based LOS Score |  |
| A | $\leq 1.50$ |  |
| B | $>1.50-2.50$ |  |
| C | $>2.50-3.50$ |  |
| D | $>3.50-4.50$ |  |
| E | $>4.50-5.50$ |  |
| F | $>5.50$ |  |


| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 <br> $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 109.00 | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled <br> on the leg attempting to be crossed |  |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian diversion delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 290.00 | diversion distance ( ft$)$ | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{dc}}$ | 145.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing ( ft$)$ | Define this distance as either 1/3 of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be <br> required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular <br> to the segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.12 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 2.67 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{seg}}$ | 2.81 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p} \text { link }}$ | 2.12 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 2.67 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 500 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS |  |

Pedestrian LOS Analysis - Future Background AM

| Segment Name: |  |  | Symington Avenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User defined value |  |  |  |
| Step 1: Free-Flow Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{Spf}_{\text {pf }}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | - |
| \% Elderly | 19\% | - | This is used to trigger the walking speed change recommended in the HCM |


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $W_{T}$ | 8 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $W_{\text {s,o }}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $W_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk (ft) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{ped}}$ | 48 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h})$ | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 2123.8 | pedestrian space $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{p}\right)$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |


| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | Crossing delay incurred by pedestrians waiting for a gap crossing an uncontrolled location (s) | Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross, or there are significant observations of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed, type "no value". |
| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{Tp}, \mathrm{seg}}$ | 3.19 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment (ft/s) | A travel speed of $4.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or more is considered desirable and a speed of $2.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or less is considered undesirable. |
| L | 500 | segment length (ft) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 2.75 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.39 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{5}$ | 0.63 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci,d }}$ | 0 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D ( 0,1 , or 2 ) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 195.00 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a 15-min period (veh/In) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum v_{i}$ | 1560 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk $i(v e h / h)$ | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 84 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it, and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {lt,perm }}$ | 191 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 25 | 85th percentile speed at a midsegment location on the major street (mi/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay (s/p) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{g}_{\text {wakl,mi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time + 4.0. For more guiance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.0 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.57 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.27 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.25 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 12.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0.00 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 12.5 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}{ }^{*}$ | 0 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ | 0 | width of paved outside shoulder (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{bl}}$ | 0 | width of bicycle lane (ft) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk <br> (ft) | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the <br> roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1 | buffer area coefficient | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy <br> distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{A}}$ | 8.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 8.00 | total walkway width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{aA}}$ | 8.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{sw}}$ | 3.60 | sidewalk width coefficient | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to <br> subject sidewalk) (veh/h) |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 234 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject <br> direction of travel (lanes) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as <br> computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in <br> HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to <br> pedestrian travel. |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{th}}$ | 2 |  | motorized vehicle running speed (mi/h) |



| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ | 60.00 | crossing delay (s/p) | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled on the leg attempting to be crossed |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 109.15 | pedestrian diversion delay (s/p) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian waiting delay (s/p) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 290.00 | diversion distance (ft) | - - |
| $D_{\text {dc }}$ | 145.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing (ft) | Define this distance as either $1 / 3$ of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\text {p,link }}$ | 2.00 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 2.75 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { seg }}$ | 2.75 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p} \text {,link }}$ | 2.00 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 2.75 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 500 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS |  |
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| Segment Name: |  |  | Symington Avenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User defined value |  |  |  |
| Step 1: Free-Flow Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{Spf}_{\text {pf }}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | - |
| \% Elderly | 19\% | - | This is used to trigger the walking speed change recommended in the HCM |


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $W_{T}$ | 8 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $W_{\text {s,o }}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $W_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk (ft) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.2 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {ped }}$ | 92 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h})$ | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.2 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 1124.3 | pedestrian space $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{p}\right)$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.2 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |


| $d_{p c}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular <br> to the segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $d_{p w}$ | No Value | Crossing delay incurred by pedestrians waiting for a gap <br> crossing an uncontrolled location (s) | Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross, or there are significant observations <br> of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed, type <br> no value". |


| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{Tp}, \text { seg }}$ | 3.19 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment <br> $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | A travel speed of 4.0 ft/s or more is considered desirable and a speed of 2.0 ft/s or less is considered <br> undesirable. |
| L | 500 | segment length ( ft ) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed ( $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 3.09 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.38 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.98 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci,d }}$ | 0 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D (0, 1, or 2) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 189.38 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a 15-min period (veh/In) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum v_{i}$ | 1515 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk $i$ (veh/h) | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 104 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it, and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{lt}, \mathrm{perm}}$ | 163 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 40 | 85th percentile speed at a midsegment location on the major street (mi/h) | - - |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{g}_{\text {wakl,mi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time +4.0. For more guiance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.13 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.57 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.40 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | 0.25 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 12.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 12.5 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}} *$ | 0 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ | 0 | width of paved outside shoulder (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{bl}}$ | 0 | width of bicycle lane (ft) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk <br> (ft) | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the <br> roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1 | buffer area coefficient | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy <br> distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{A}}$ | 8.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 8.00 | total walkway width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{aA}}$ | 8.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{sw}}$ | 3.60 | sidewalk width coefficient | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to <br> subject sidewalk) (veh/h) |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 355 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject <br> direction of travel (lanes) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as <br> computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in <br> HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to <br> pedestrian travel. |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{th}}$ | 2 |  | motorized vehicle running speed (mi/h) |



| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ | 60.00 | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled <br> on the leg attempting to be crossed |  |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 109.16 | pedestrian diversion delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian waiting delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 290.00 | diversion distance (ft) |  |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{dc}}$ | 145.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing (ft) | Define this distance as either 1/3 of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be <br> required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular <br> to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.13 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 3.09 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { seg }}$ | 2.92 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.13 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 3.09 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 500 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| LOS | C |

Pedestrian LOS Analysis - Total Future AM

| Segment Name: |  |  | Symington Avenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | Step 1: Free-Flow Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) |  |
| $\%$ Elderly | $19 \%$ | - |  |


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $W_{T}$ | 8 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $W_{\text {s,o }}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $W_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk (ft) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.5 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {ped }}$ | 209 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h})$ | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.5 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 492.6 | pedestrian space $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{p}\right)$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.5 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |


| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | Crossing delay incurred by pedestrians waiting for a gap crossing an uncontrolled location (s) | Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross, or there are significant observations of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed, type "no value". |
| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{Tp}, \mathrm{seg}}$ | 3.19 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment (ft/s) | A travel speed of $4.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or more is considered desirable and a speed of $2.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or less is considered undesirable. |
| L | 500 | segment length (ft) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 3.15 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.39 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 1.03 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci,d }}$ | 0 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D (0, 1, or 2) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 198.75 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a 15-min period (veh/In) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum v_{i}$ | 1590 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk $i$ (veh/h) | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 84 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it, and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{lt}, \mathrm{perm}}$ | 191 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 40 | 85th percentile speed at a midsegment location on the major street (mi/h) | - - |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{g}_{\text {wakl,mi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time +4.0. For more guiance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.0 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.57 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.27 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | 0.25 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 12.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0.00 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 12.5 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}} *$ | 0 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ | 0 | width of paved outside shoulder (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{bl}}$ | 0 | width of bicycle lane (ft) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk <br> (ft) | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the <br> roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1 | buffer area coefficient | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy <br> distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{A}}$ | 8.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 8.00 | total walkway width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{aA}}$ | 8.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{sw}}$ | 3.60 | sidewalk width coefficient | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to <br> subject sidewalk) (veh/h) |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 234 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject <br> direction of travel (lanes) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as <br> computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in <br> HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to <br> pedestrian travel. |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{th}}$ | 2 |  | motorized vehicle running speed (mi/h) |



| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ | 60.00 | crossing delay (s/p) | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled on the leg attempting to be crossed |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 109.17 | pedestrian diversion delay (s/p) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian waiting delay (s/p) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 290.00 | diversion distance (ft) | - - |
| $D_{\text {dc }}$ | 145.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing (ft) | Define this distance as either $1 / 3$ of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\text {p,link }}$ | 2.00 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 3.15 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { seg }}$ | 2.85 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p} \text { link }}$ | 2.00 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 3.15 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 500 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS |  |

Pedestrian LOS Analysis - Total Future PM

| Segment Name: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | 


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $W_{T}$ | 8 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk (ft) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.7 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {ped }}$ | 272 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h})$ | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 6.5 | effective sidewalk width $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.7 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 377.9 | pedestrian space $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{p}\right)$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.7 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |


| $d_{p c}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular <br> to the segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $d_{p w}$ | No Value | Crossing delay incurred by pedestrians waiting for a gap <br> crossing an uncontrolled location (s) | Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross, or there are significant observations <br> of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed, type <br> no value". |


| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{Tp}, \text { seg }}$ | 3.19 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment <br> $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | A travel speed of 4.0 ft/s or more is considered desirable and a speed of 2.0 ft/s or less is considered <br> undesirable. |
| L | 500 | segment length ( ft ) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed ( $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 3.09 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.38 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.98 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2.00 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci,d }}$ | 0 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D (0, 1, or 2) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 189.25 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a 15-min period (veh/In) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum v_{i}$ | 1514 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk $i$ (veh/h) | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 104 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it, and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{lt}, \mathrm{perm}}$ | 163 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 40 | 85th percentile speed at a midsegment location on the major street (mi/h) | - - |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{g}_{\text {wakl,mi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time +4.0. For more guiance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.1 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.57 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.40 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | 0.25 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 12.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 12.5 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}} *$ | 0 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ | 0 | width of paved outside shoulder (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{bl}}$ | 0 | width of bicycle lane (ft) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk <br> (ft) | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the <br> roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1 | buffer area coefficient | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy <br> distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{A}}$ | 8.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | 8.00 | total walkway width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{aA}}$ | 8.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{sw}}$ | 3.60 | sidewalk width coefficient | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to <br> subject sidewalk) (veh/h) |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 355 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject <br> direction of travel (lanes) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as <br> computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in <br> HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to <br> pedestrian travel. |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{th}}$ | 2 |  | motorized vehicle running speed (mi/h) |



| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ | 60.00 | crossing delay (s/p) | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled on the leg attempting to be crossed |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 109.18 | pedestrian diversion delay (s/p) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian waiting delay (s/p) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 290.00 | diversion distance (ft) | - - |
| $D_{\text {dc }}$ | 145.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing (ft) | Define this distance as either $1 / 3$ of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\text {p,link }}$ | 2.13 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 3.09 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { seg }}$ | 2.92 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p} \text {,link }}$ | 2.13 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 3.09 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 500 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS |  |


| Segment Name: |  |  | Bloor Street West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User defined value |  |  |  |
| Step 1: Free-Flow Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{Spf}_{\text {p }}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | - |
| \% Elderly | 19\% | - | This is used to trigger the walking speed change recommended in the HCM |


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{T}$ | 12 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk (ft) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 23 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 23 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.0 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {ped }}$ | 28 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h})$ | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.0 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 5940.0 | pedestrian space $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{p})$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.0 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $d_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |


| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | Crossing delay incurred by pedestrians waiting for a gap crossing an uncontrolled location (s) | Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross and uncontrolled, or there are significant observations of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed and/or controlled, type "no value". |
| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\text {Tp,seg }}$ | 3.27 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment (ft/s) | A travel speed of $4.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or more is considered desirable and a speed of $2.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or less is considered undesirable. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed ( $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ ) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 1.92 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.17 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.03 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2.00 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci, }}$ | 1 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D (0, 1, or 2) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 9.13 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a 15-min period (veh/ln) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | 73 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk i (veh/h) | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 0 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it , and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{lt} \text {, perm }}$ | 0 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro, otherwise if permitted: equal to \# of permitted movements. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 25.0 | 85th percentile vehicle speed at a midsegment location on the major street (mi/h) | - $\quad-\quad$ l |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay (s/p) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized, try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise, look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{g}_{\text {wakl,mi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time +4.0. For more guidance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 3.0 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.51 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.89 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.55 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 9.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0.00 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 9.50 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}{ }^{*}$ | 0.00 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {os }}$ | 0.00 | width of paved outside shoulder ( ft ) | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{bl}}$ | 0.00 | width of bicycle lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0.00 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1.00 | buffer area coefficient | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {A }}$ | 12.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {T }}$ | 12.00 | total walkway width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{WaA}_{\text {a }}$ | 10.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\text {sw }}$ | 3.00 | sidewalk width coefficient | - |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 783.00 | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to subject sidewalk) (veh/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {th }}$ | 2.00 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject direction of travel (lanes) | - - |
| $S_{\text {R }}$ | 37.00 | motorized vehicle running speed ( $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ ) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to pedestrian travel. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Link |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| LOS | Link Based LOS Score |  |
| A | $\leq 1.50$ |  |
| B | $>1.50-2.50$ |  |
| C | $>2.50-3.50$ |  |
| D | $>3.50-4.50$ |  |
| E | $>4.50-5.50$ |  |
| F | $>5.50$ |  |


| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ | 60.00 | crossing delay (s/p) | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled on the leg attempting to be crossed |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 156.88 | pedestrian diversion delay (s/p) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian waiting delay (s/p) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 500.00 | diversion distance (ft) | Doubles the distance to nearest crossing to account for full deviation route. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{dc}}$ | 250.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing (ft) | Define this distance as either $1 / 3$ of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. Mainly the latter |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.97 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 1.92 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { seg }}$ | 3.32 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.97 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 1.92 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS |  |


| Segment Name: |  |  | Bloor Street West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User defined value |  |  |  |
| Step 1: Free-Flow Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{Spf}_{\text {pf }}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | - |
| \% Elderly | 19\% | - | This is used to trigger the walking speed change recommended in the HCM |


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{T}$ | 12 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk (ft) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width ( $\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min}$ ) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {ped }}$ | 58 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h})$ | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 2867.6 | pedestrian space $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{p}\right)$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $d_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |



Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s)

It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5.
Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross, or there are significant observations of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed, type "no value".

| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\text {Tp,seg }}$ | 3.27 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment <br> $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | A travel speed of 4.0 ft/s or more is considered desirable and a speed of 2.0 ft/s or less is considered <br> undesirable. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 1.93 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.13 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.08 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2.00 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci,d }}$ | 1 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D (0, 1, or 2) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 25.25 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a 15-min period (veh/In) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum v_{i}$ | 202 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk $i$ (veh/h) | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 0 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it, and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {It,perm }}$ | 0 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 25 | 85th percentile speed at a midsegment location on the major street (mi/h) | - - |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay (s/p) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{gwak}_{\text {wimi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time +4.0. For more guiance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.8 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.51 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.73 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.55 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 9.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 9.5 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}{ }^{*}$ | 0 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {os }}$ | 0 | width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{bl}}$ | 0 | width of bicycle lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1 | buffer area coefficient | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {A }}$ | 12.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {T }}$ | 12.00 | total walkway width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{WaA}_{\text {a }}$ | 10.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\text {sw }}$ | 3.00 | sidewalk width coefficient | - |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 642 | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to subject sidewalk) (veh/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {th }}$ | 2 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject direction of travel (lanes) | - - |
| $S_{\text {R }}$ | 37 | motorized vehicle running speed ( $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ ) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to pedestrian travel. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Link |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| LOS | Link Based LOS Score |  |
| A | $\leq 1.50$ |  |
| B | $>1.50-2.50$ |  |
| C | $>2.50-3.50$ |  |
| D | $>3.50-4.50$ |  |
| E | $>4.50-5.50$ |  |
| F | $>5.50$ |  |


| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ | 60.00 | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled <br> on the leg attempting to be crossed |  |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 156.88 | pedestrian diversion delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian waiting delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 500.00 | diversion distance (ft) |  |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{dc}}$ | 250.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing (ft) | Define this distance as either 1/3 of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be <br> required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular <br> to the segment centerline ( s ) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.81 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 1.93 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { seg }}$ | 3.20 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p} \text { link }}$ | 2.81 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 1.93 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS | C |

Pedestrian LOS Analysis - Future Background AM

| Segment Name: |  |  | Bloor Street West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User defined value |  |  |  |
| Step 1: Free-Flow Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{Spf}_{\text {p }}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | - |
| \% Elderly | 19\% | - | This is used to trigger the walking speed change recommended in the HCM |


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {T }}$ | 12 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{5,1}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{s}, 0}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk ( ft ) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{0, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.0 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {ped }}$ | 30 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h})$ | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.0 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 5513.9 | pedestrian space $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{p})$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.0 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $d_{p p}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |


| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $d_{p w}$ | No Value | Crossing delay incurred by pedestrians waiting for a gap crossing an uncontrolled location (s) | Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross, or there are significant observations of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed, type "no value". |
| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\text {Tp,seg }}$ | 3.27 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment (ft/s) | A travel speed of $4.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or more is considered desirable and a speed of $2.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or less is considered undesirable. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 1.77 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.00 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.04 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci, }}$ | 0 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D (0, 1, or 2) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 13.00 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a 15-min period (veh/In) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum v_{i}$ | 104 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk i (veh/h) | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 0 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it, and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\text {lt,perm }}$ | 0 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 25 | 85th percentile speed at a midsegment location on the major street (mi/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay (s/p) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{g}_{\text {wakl,mi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time +4.0. For more guiance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 3.0 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.51 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.96 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.55 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 9.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0.00 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 9.5 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}{ }^{*}$ | 0 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {os }}$ | 0 | width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{bl}}$ | 0 | width of bicycle lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1 | buffer area coefficient | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {A }}$ | 12.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {T }}$ | 12.00 | total walkway width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{WaA}_{\text {a }}$ | 10.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\text {sw }}$ | 3.00 | sidewalk width coefficient | - |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 846 | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to subject sidewalk) (veh/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {th }}$ | 2 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject direction of travel (lanes) | - - |
| $S_{\text {R }}$ | 37 | motorized vehicle running speed ( $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ ) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to pedestrian travel. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Link |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| LOS | Link Based LOS Score |  |
| A | $\leq 1.50$ |  |
| B | $>1.50-2.50$ |  |
| C | $>2.50-3.50$ |  |
| D | $>3.50-4.50$ |  |
| E | $>4.50-5.50$ |  |
| F | $>5.50$ |  |


| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ | 60.00 | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled <br> on the leg attempting to be crossed |  |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 156.88 | pedestrian diversion delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian waiting delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 500.00 | diversion distance (ft) |  |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{dc}}$ | 250.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing (ft) | Define this distance as either 1/3 of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be <br> required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular <br> to the segment centerline ( s ) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 3.04 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 1.77 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { seg }}$ | 3.36 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 3.04 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 1.77 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS | C |
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| Segment Name: |  |  | Bloor Street West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Step 1: Free-Flow Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | User defined value |  |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) |  |
| $\%$ Elderly | $19 \%$ | - | This is used to trigger the walking speed change recommended in the HCM |


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $W_{T}$ | 12 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{5,1}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk (ft) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/ft/min) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {ped }}$ | 62 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) (p/h) | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 2661.8 | pedestrian space $\left(\mathrm{ft}^{2} / \mathrm{p}\right)$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $d_{p p}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |


| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $d_{p w}$ | No Value | Crossing delay incurred by pedestrians waiting for a gap crossing an uncontrolled location (s) | Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross, or there are significant observations of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed, type "no value". |
| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\text {Tp,seg }}$ | 3.27 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment (ft/s) | A travel speed of $4.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or more is considered desirable and a speed of $2.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or less is considered undesirable. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 1.89 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.00 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | 0.17 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci,d }}$ | 0 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D (0, 1, or 2) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 32.13 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a 15-min period (veh/In) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum v_{i}$ | 257 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk $i$ (veh/h) | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 0 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it, and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{lt}, \mathrm{perm}}$ | 0 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 40 | 85th percentile speed at a midsegment location on the major street (mi/h) | - - |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay (s/p) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{gwak}_{\text {walmi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time +4.0. For more guiance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.87 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.51 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.79 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | 0.55 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 9.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 9.5 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}{ }^{*}$ | 0 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {os }}$ | 0 | width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{bl}}$ | 0 | width of bicycle lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1 | buffer area coefficient | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {A }}$ | 12.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {T }}$ | 12.00 | total walkway width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{WaA}_{\text {a }}$ | 10.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\text {sw }}$ | 3.00 | sidewalk width coefficient | - |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 692 | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to subject sidewalk) (veh/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {th }}$ | 2 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject direction of travel (lanes) | - |
| $S_{\text {R }}$ | 37 | motorized vehicle running speed ( $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ ) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to pedestrian travel. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Link |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| LOS | Link Based LOS Score |  |
| A | $\leq 1.50$ |  |
| B | $>1.50-2.50$ |  |
| C | $>2.50-3.50$ |  |
| D | $>3.50-4.50$ |  |
| E | $>4.50-5.50$ |  |
| F | $>5.50$ |  |


| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ | 60.00 | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled <br> on the leg attempting to be crossed |  |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 156.88 | pedestrian diversion delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian waiting delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p})$ | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 500.00 | diversion distance ( ft$)$ |  |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{dc}}$ | 250.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing (ft) | Define this distance as either 1/3 of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be <br> required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular <br> to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.87 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 1.89 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { seg }}$ | 3.24 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.87 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 1.89 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS | C |

Pedestrian LOS Analysis - Total Future AM

| Segment Name: |  |  | Bloor Street West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User defined value |  |  |  |
| Step 1: Free-Flow Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{Spf}_{\text {pf }}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | - |
| \% Elderly | 19\% | - | This is used to trigger the walking speed change recommended in the HCM |


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $W_{T}$ | 12 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{5,1}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk (ft) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width (p/tt/min) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {ped }}$ | 84 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h})$ | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 1987.9 | pedestrian space $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{p})$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.1 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |


| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $d_{p w}$ | No Value | Crossing delay incurred by pedestrians waiting for a gap crossing an uncontrolled location (s) | Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross, or there are significant observations of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed, type "no value". |
| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\text {Tp,seg }}$ | 3.27 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment (ft/s) | A travel speed of $4.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or more is considered desirable and a speed of $2.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or less is considered undesirable. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 1.79 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.00 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.07 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci, }}$ | 0 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D (0, 1, or 2) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 13.00 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a 15-min period (veh/In) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum v_{i}$ | 104 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk i (veh/h) | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 0 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it, and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\text {lt,perm }}$ | 0 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 40 | 85th percentile speed at a midsegment location on the major street (mi/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay (s/p) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{g}_{\text {wakl,mi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time +4.0. For more guiance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 3.0 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.51 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.97 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.55 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 9.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0.00 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 9.5 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}{ }^{*}$ | 0 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {os }}$ | 0 | width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{bl}}$ | 0 | width of bicycle lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1 | buffer area coefficient | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {A }}$ | 12.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{T}$ | 12.00 | total walkway width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{WaA}_{\text {a }}$ | 10.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\text {sw }}$ | 3.00 | sidewalk width coefficient | - |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 849 | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to subject sidewalk) (veh/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {th }}$ | 2 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject direction of travel (lanes) | - |
| $S_{\text {R }}$ | 37 | motorized vehicle running speed ( $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ ) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to pedestrian travel. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Link |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Link Based LOS Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | $\leq 1.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | $>1.50-2.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | $>2.50-3.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | $>3.50-4.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | $>4.50-5.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | $>5.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 <br> $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 150.00 | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled <br> on the leg attempting to be crossed |  |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian waiting delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 500.00 | diversion distance ( ft$)$ | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{dc}}$ | 250.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing (ft) | Define this distance as either 1/3 of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be <br> required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular <br> to the segment centerline ( s ) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 3.05 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 1.79 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { seg }}$ | 3.36 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 3.05 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 1.79 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS | C |

Pedestrian LOS Analysis - Total Future PM

|  |  | Segment Name: | Bloor Street West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User defined value |  |  |  |
| Step 1: Free-Flow Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | - |
| \% Elderly | 19\% | - | This is used to trigger the walking speed change recommended in the HCM |


| Step 2: Average Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A: Effective Sidewalk Width |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $W_{T}$ | 12 | total walkway width (ft) | This is measured from the point of the sidewalk furthest from the road to the road, including any buffer space. If you have evidence that suggests the width extends past the sidewalk edge (or in the case of no sidewalk) include that width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | This captures the fact that people tend to give way to trees, benches, etc. Note that it is dependent on the shy distance, so if the width of the object is less than the shy distance (or if it is fully contained within the buffer) it may have no impact on the effective sidewalk width. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | adjusted fixed-object effective width on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Similar to above, but for objects on the side further from the road. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{i}}$ | 1.5 | shy distance on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to the edge of a sidewalk, note that when a buffer greater than or equal to 1.5 ft is included the whole width of the sidewalk will be included in the effective sidewalk width (less any other width reductions). |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | shy distance on the outside of sidewalk (ft) | The natural space that pedestrians give to objects immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. If there is empty space greater than 3 ft beyond the edge of the sidewalk (that has not been included in the total walkway width) this value should be 0 , as pedestrians will use the entire sidewalk. |
| $W_{\text {Buf }}$ | 0 | buffer width between roadway and sidewalk (ft) | Measured from the curb to the edge of the sidewalk, again this is included in the total walkway width if it exists. |
| $p_{\text {window }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a window display (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {building }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a building face (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $p_{\text {fence }}$ | 0 | proportion of sidewalk length adjacent to a fence or low wall (decimal) | Measure or estimate this if required. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{0, \mathrm{i}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on inside (curb side) of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |
| $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{o}}$ | 0 | effective width of fixed objects on outside of sidewalk (ft) | Used to calculate the fixed-object widths above. Theses values are contained in Chapter 24 of the HCM. |


| Part B: Pedestrian Flow Rate per Unit Width |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.2 | pedestrian flow per unit width ( $\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min}$ ) | The calculation from this part used in the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {ped }}$ | 123 | pedestrian flow rate in the subject sidewalk (walking in <br> both directions) $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h})$ | This can be approximated from the crossing volumes at the adjacent intersections, in the case of very <br> high pedestrian volumes a count should be conducted. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | 10.5 | effective sidewalk width (ft) | Calculated from Step 2 Part B. |


| Part C: Average Walking Speed |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Value must be at least half of the average free-flow walking speed. The calculation from this part used in <br> the remainder of Step 2. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.2 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pf}}$ | 4.4 | average free-flow pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 1. |


| Part D: Pedestrian Space |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 1355.1 | pedestrian space $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{p})$ | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.4 | pedestrian walking speed $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 0.2 | pedestrian flow per unit width $(\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{min})$ | Determined in Step 2 Part B. |


| Step 3: Pedestrian Delay at Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both <br> perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |


| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular to the segment centerline (s) | It is currently assumed that there is a signalized intersection with equivalent walk time for both perpendicular and parallel crossings. This value is calculated as part of Step 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | Crossing delay incurred by pedestrians waiting for a gap crossing an uncontrolled location (s) | Note, this parameter should only have a value if it is legal to cross, or there are significant observations of occurrence, look to HCM6 Chapter 20 for guidance. If illegal and/or no crossings are observed, type "no value". |
| Step 4: Pedestrian Travel Speed |  |  |  |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\text {Tp,seg }}$ | 3.27 | travel speed of through pedestrians for the segment (ft/s) | A travel speed of $4.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or more is considered desirable and a speed of $2.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ or less is considered undesirable. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | This length includes the boundary intersection width associated with the crossing delay. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed ( $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ ) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.245 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 5: Pedestrian LOS Score for Intersection |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 1.89 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | This value will be set to $\mathbf{0}$ if crossing an intersection where pedestrians have the right-of-way (as they will experience minimal delay). Note that this is only for 1 crosswalk, and the variables will have to be changed for other crosswalks. One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | 0.97 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.00 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | 0.17 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {delay }}$ | 0.15 | pedestrian delay adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 2 | number of traffic lanes crossed when traversing crosswalk D (lanes) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {rtci,d }}$ | 0 | number of right-turn channelizing islands along Crosswalk D (0, 1, or 2) | - |
| $\mathrm{n}_{15, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 32.13 | count of vehicles traveling on the major street during a 15-min period (veh/In) | The term "major street" is used when crossing the "minor street" and vice versa. |
| $\sum v_{i}$ | 257 | sum of demand flow rate for movements crossing crosswalk $i$ (veh/h) | This value is from all movements crossing the crosswalk, including those which would never physically share the space with them. For example, if assessing the south crossswalk this would consist of the NBR, NBT, NBL, EBR, WBL, and SBT. |
| $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | - | set of all motorized vehicle movements | This variable is used to express the movements listed in the demand flow rate, and does not have a numerical value. It is provided for reference. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\text {rtor }}$ | 0 | RTOR flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | Estimate this value from Synchro to establish the number of vehicles. Consider the saturation flow rate of RTOR vs. the number of right-turners, using the saturation flow rate if the number of right turners is higher than it, and the actual turns if lower to be conservative. |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{lt}, \mathrm{perm}}$ | 0 | permitted left turn flow rate crossing crosswalk (v/h) | If permitted-protected left, estimate this value from Synchro. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{85, \mathrm{mj}}$ | 40 | 85th percentile speed at a midsegment location on the major street (mi/h) | - - |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d}}$ | 43.25 | pedestrian delay (s/p) | If the intersection is two-way stop controlled (where pedestrians do not have to wait for a gap the value is 0 . If signalized try to assess the delay from Synchro HCM measures, otherwise look to HCM6 Chapter 19 for guidance. |
| C | 100 | Cycle length (s) | - - |
| $\mathrm{gwak}_{\text {walmi }}$ | 7 | walk time (s) | Effective walk time is based on the type of signal control. For most cases allow for walk time +4.0. For more guiance consult Chapter 19 of the HCM.If the walk time is not the same for multiple legs this value will need to be changed for each crosswalk. |


| Step 6: Pedestrian LOS Score for Link |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.9 | pedestrian LOS score for link | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{w}}$ | -4.51 | cross-section adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 0.81 | motorized vehicle volume adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | 0.55 | motorized vehicle speed adjustment factor | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{v}}$ | 9.50 | effective total width of outside through lane, bicycle <br> lane, and shoulder as a function of traffic volume (ft) | This value is conditional on the flow and sidewalk width |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{l}}$ | 0.00 | total width of shoulder, bicycle lane, and parking lane <br> (ft) | This value is conditional on the parking and non-travel lane width |
| $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | proportion of on-street parking occupied (decimal) |  |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{oi}}$ | 9.5 | width of outside through lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}{ }^{*}$ | 0 | adjusted width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | If there is a curb, subtract 1.5 from $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{os}}$ |


| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {os }}$ | 0 | width of paved outside shoulder (ft) | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{bl}}$ | 0 | width of bicycle lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{pk}}$ | 0 | width of striped parking lane (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {buff }}$ | 0.00 | buffer width between roadway and available sidewalk (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1 | buffer area coefficient | If there is a continous barrier at least 3 ft high located between the sidewalk and the otuside edge of the roadway use 5.37, otherwise use 1.00 |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\text {A }}$ | 12.00 | available sidewalk width (ft) | This value may be different than the effective width, as it does not consider object widths or shy distance. |
| $\mathrm{W}_{T}$ | 12.00 | total walkway width (ft) | Determined in Step 2 Part A. |
| $\mathrm{WaA}_{\text {a }}$ | 10.00 | adjusted available sidewalk width (ft) | - |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\text {sw }}$ | 3.00 | sidewalk width coefficient | - |
| $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | 715 | midsegment demand flow rate (direction nearest to subject sidewalk) (veh/h) | - |
| $\mathrm{N}_{\text {th }}$ | 2 | number of through lanes on the segment in the subject direction of travel (lanes) | - |
| $S_{\text {R }}$ | 37 | motorized vehicle running speed ( $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ ) | Note: Unless explicitly required, it is recommended that the speed limit is used for this value, as computing this parameter requires significant data regarding the segment, which is summarized in HCM6 chapter 19. A speed survey could also be conducted to assess the speed of vehicles adjacent to pedestrian travel. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Link |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Link Based LOS Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | $\leq 1.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | $>1.50-2.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | $>2.50-3.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | $>3.50-4.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | $>4.50-5.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | $>5.50$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Step 8: Roadway Crossing Difficulty Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description | Commentary |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS. Must be between 0.8 and 1.2 |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{px}}$ | 60.00 | Note: The crossing delay should not be 0 unless the intersection that is being crossed is stop-controlled <br> on the leg attempting to be crossed |  |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pd}}$ | 156.88 | pedestrian diversion delay ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p}$ ) | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pw}}$ | No Value | pedestrian waiting delay $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{p})$ | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 500.00 | diversion distance ( ft$)$ |  |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{dc}}$ | 250.00 | distance to nearest signal-controlled crossing ( ft$)$ | Define this distance as either 1/3 of the distance between two crossings, or the distance that would be <br> required to deviate from an established pedestrian path. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pc}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection perpendicular <br> to the segment centerline (s) | Determined in Step 3. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { link }}$ | 2.89 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { int }}$ | 1.89 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |


| Step 9: Pedestrian LOS Score for Segment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Value | HCM Description |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \text { seg }}$ | 3.26 | pedestrian LOS score for segment | One key component in calculating overall LOS (along with corner and crosswalk geometrics) |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{cd}}$ | 1.2 | roadway crossing difficulty factor | One key component in calculating overall LOS |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p} \text { link }}$ | 2.89 | pedestrian LOS score for link | Determined in Step 6. |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{int}}$ | 1.89 | pedestrian LOS score for intersection | Determined in Step 5. |
| L | 550 | segment length (ft) | Determined in Step 4. |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | 4.40 | pedestrian walking speed (ft/s) | Determined in Step 2 Part C. |
| $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{pp}}$ | 43.25 | Crossing delay of boundary intersection parallel to the <br> segment centerline $(\mathrm{s})$ | Determined in Step 3. |


| Step 7: Pedestrian LOS for Segment |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS |  |

## APPENDIX



Future
Background Traffic Conditions

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F | * | $\uparrow{ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  | ${ }_{1}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 781 | 0 | 0 | 532 | 75 | 62 | 365 | 60 | 151 | 327 | 98 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 781 | 0 | 0 | 532 | 75 | 62 | 365 | 60 | 151 | 327 | 98 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 14.1 | 14.4 |  | 15.3 | 36.3 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  | 0.69 | 0.85 | 0.91 |  | 0.79 | 0.89 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.975 |  |  | 0.955 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1658 | 0 | 0 | 1602 | 1343 | 1458 | 2692 | 0 | 1501 | 1383 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.375 |  |  | 0.318 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1658 | 0 | 0 | 1602 | 931 | 488 | 2692 | 0 | 397 | 1383 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 |  |  | 24 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) |  | 374.8 |  |  | 112.0 |  |  | 258.8 |  |  | 36.6 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 33.7 |  |  | 10.1 |  |  | 23.3 |  |  | 3.3 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 261 |  | 188 | 188 |  | 261 | 149 |  | 271 | 271 |  | 149 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.50 | 1.00 | 0.76 | 0.90 | 0.95 | 0.69 | 0.75 | 0.93 | 0.75 | 0.80 | 0.99 | 0.70 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 2\% | 3\% | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 4\% | 6\% | 5\% | 1\% | 5\% | 3\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 781 | 0 | 0 | 560 | 109 | 83 | 392 | 80 | 189 | 330 | 140 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 781 | 0 | 0 | 560 | 109 | 83 | 472 | 0 | 189 | 470 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Righ |
| Median Width(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.21 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Number of Detectors |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template |  | Thru |  |  | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) |  | 30.5 |  |  | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector ( m ) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West

1. Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type |  | NA |  |  | NA | Perm | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  | 2 |  |  | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 26.0 |  |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 |  | 6.0 | 22.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 34.0 |  |  | 34.0 | 34.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 10.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 58.0 |  |  | 58.0 | 58.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 11.0 | 42.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 58.0\% |  |  | 58.0\% | 58.0\% | 31.0\% | 31.0\% |  | 11.0\% | 42.0\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 51.4 |  |  | 51.4 | 51.4 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 7.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 3.6 |  |  | 3.6 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 1.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.6 |  |  | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode |  | C-Max |  |  | C-Max | C-Max | Max | Max |  | None | Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 19.0 |  |  | 19.0 | 19.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |  |  | 15.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 52.4 |  |  | 52.4 | 52.4 | 26.0 | 26.0 |  | 39.0 | 37.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.52 |  |  | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.26 | 0.26 |  | 0.39 | 0.37 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.90 |  |  | 0.67 | 0.22 | 0.66 | 0.66 |  | 0.78 | 0.89 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 29.3 |  |  | 22.3 | 14.4 | 60.0 | 36.5 |  | 46.1 | 49.8 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 29.3 |  |  | 22.3 | 14.4 | 60.0 | 36.5 |  | 46.1 | 49.8 |  |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | C | B | E | D |  | D | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 29.3 |  |  | 21.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  |  | 48.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type: |  |
| CBD |  |

Area Type:
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: 38 (38\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBT and 6:WBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.90
Intersection Signal Delay: $34.3 \quad$ Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 104.4\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15


|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 824 | 22 | 11 | 670 | 45 | 29 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 824 | 22 | 11 | 670 | 45 | 29 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.997 |  |  |  | 0.947 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.999 | 0.970 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1837 | 0 | 0 | 1840 | 1597 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.999 | 0.970 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1837 | 0 | 0 | 1840 | 1597 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 40 |  |  | 40 | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 69.7 |  |  | 374.8 | 79.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 6.3 |  |  | 33.7 | 9.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 916 | 24 | 12 | 744 | 50 | 32 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 940 | 0 | 0 | 756 | 82 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |  | 14 | 24 |  | 24 | 14 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 55.6\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service B |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
: Ruttan Street \& Bloor Street West
 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Future Background> AM Peak
3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West $\qquad$

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  | Prot |  | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 21.0 |  |  | 21.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 19.0 |  |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 10.0 | 29.0 |  |  | 29.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 10.0 | 57.0 |  |  | 47.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 10.0\% | 57.0\% |  |  | 47.0\% |  | 16.0\% | 16.0\% |  | 27.0\% |  |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 6.0 | 49.3 |  |  | 39.3 |  | 9.0 | 9.0 |  | 20.0 |  |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 4.7 |  |  | 4.7 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -1.0 | -3.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 3.0 | 4.7 |  |  | 6.7 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  |  | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | C-Max |  |  | C-Max |  | None | None |  | None |  |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) |  | 28 |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) | 57.7 | 56.0 |  |  | 44.0 |  | 9.5 | 9.5 |  | 20.6 |  | 25.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.58 | 0.56 |  |  | 0.44 |  | 0.10 | 0.10 |  | 0.21 |  | 0.26 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.87 | 0.71 |  |  | 0.95 |  | 0.42 | 0.51 |  | 0.69 |  | 0.58 |
| Control Delay | 61.4 | 23.0 |  |  | 41.4 |  | 51.0 | 55.5 |  | 48.7 |  | 30.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 61.4 | 23.0 |  |  | 41.4 |  | 51.0 | 55.5 |  | 48.7 |  | 30.4 |
| LOS | E | C |  |  | D |  | D | E |  | D |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 30.6 |  |  | 41.4 |  |  | 53.4 |  |  | 40.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |

## Area Type: Other

Cycle Length: 10
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: 89 (89\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6 :WBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 95
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.95
Intersection Signal Delay: 38.0 $\quad$ Intersection LOS: D
ntersection Capacity Utilization 77.0\%
ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15


| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |  | ¢个守 |  |  | ¢1 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 698 | 202 | 72 | 646 | 117 | 0 | 551 | 159 | 10 | 885 | 61 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 698 | 202 | 72 | 646 | 117 | 0 | 551 | 159 | 10 | 885 | 61 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) | 0.0 |  | 17.5 | 26.4 |  | 31.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 50.0 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  | 0.74 | 0.91 |  | 0.60 |  | 0.85 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.964 |  |  | 0.988 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1623 | 1436 | 1589 | 1712 | 1358 | 0 | 3969 | 0 | 0 | 3184 |  |
| FIt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.938 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1623 | 1063 | 1447 | 1712 | 820 | 0 | 3969 | 0 | 0 | 2982 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 121 |  |  | 86 |  | 89 |  |  | 10 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 75.1 |  |  | 318.0 |  |  | 159.9 |  |  | 139.1 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 6.8 |  |  | 28.6 |  |  | 14.4 |  |  | 12.5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 670 |  | 219 | 219 |  | 670 | 453 |  | 442 | 442 |  | 453 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 11 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.64 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.90 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.69 | 0.98 | 0.75 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 4\% | 3\% | 5\% | 6\% | 3\% | 11\% | 0\% | 7\% | 3\% | 100\% | 4\% | 0\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/rr) |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 698 | 243 | 73 | 673 | 131 | 0 | 562 | 177 | 14 | 903 | 81 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 698 | 243 | 73 | 673 | 131 | 0 | 739 | 0 | 0 | 998 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( m ) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.09 | 1.18 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.10 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.09 |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Number of Detectors |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template |  | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) |  | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 2.0 | 30.5 |  | 2.0 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |  | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

| Lane Group | $\varnothing 1$ | ø5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) |  |  |  |
| Future Volume (vph) |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |
| Storage Lanes |  |  |  |
| Taper Length ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor |  |  |  |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  |  |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) |  |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  |  |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |
| Confi. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/rr) |  |  |  |
| Parking (\#hr) |  |  |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |  |  |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |  |  |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |  |  |  |
| Lane Alignment |  |  |  |
| Median Width( $m$ ) |  |  |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width( $m$ ) |  |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor |  |  |  |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |  |  |  |
| Number of Detectors |  |  |  |
| Detector Template |  |  |  |
| Leading Detector ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Type |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  |  |  |
| 221-225 Ster | ation | act Study | Synchro 10 Report |

<Future Background> AM Peak 4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector $2 \mathrm{Size}(\mathrm{m})$ |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type |  | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 25.0 | 25.0 | 6.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 19.0 | 19.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 31.3 | 31.3 | 11.0 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 43.0 | 43.0 | 11.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 47.8\% | 47.8\% | 12.2\% | 60.0\% | 60.0\% | 34.4\% | 34.4\% |  | 34.4\% | 34.4\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 36.7 | 36.7 | 6.0 | 47.7 | 47.7 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 5.3 | 5.3 |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode |  | Max | Max | None | Max | Max | C-Max | C-Max |  | C-Max | C-Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 |  | 17.0 | 17.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) |  | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 39.9 | 39.9 | 7.0 | 48.7 | 48.7 |  | 28.0 |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.08 | 0.54 | 0.54 |  | 0.31 |  |  | 0.34 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.97 | 0.45 | 0.59 | 0.73 | 0.27 |  | 0.57 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 54.7 | 12.3 | 61.0 | 21.4 | 6.0 |  | 25.1 |  |  | 50.9 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 54.7 | 12.3 | 61.0 | 21.4 | 6.0 |  | 25.1 |  |  | 50.9 |  |
| LOS |  | D | B | E | C | A |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 43.8 |  |  | 22.4 |  |  | 25.1 |  |  | 50.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |

pproach LOS

| ntersection Summary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type: Other |  |

ycle Lengt
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: $34(38 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 110
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.97
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: 36.6 } & \text { Intersection LOS: D } \\ \text { ntersection Capacity Utilization 87.8\% }\end{array}$
Intersection Capacity Utilization 87.8\%
ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West

 5: Private Access/Sterling Road \& Dundas Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | งิ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 82 | 1280 | 1 | 0 | 654 | 105 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 72 | 0 | 54 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 82 | 1280 | 1 | 0 | 654 | 105 | 1 | , | 1 | 72 | 0 | 54 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.955 |  |  | 0.942 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.997 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.984 |  |  | 0.972 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3394 | 0 | 0 | 3149 | 0 | 0 | 1049 | 0 | 0 | 1595 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.834 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.933 |  |  | 0.822 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2834 | 0 | 0 | 3149 | 0 | 0 | 984 | 0 | 0 | 1335 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 38 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( $m$ ) |  | 123.6 |  |  | 101.7 |  |  | 33.0 |  |  | 87.8 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.1 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 10.5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 50 |  | 27 | 27 |  | 50 | 38 |  | 15 | 15 |  | 38 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 5\% | 0\% | 2\% | 10\% | 5\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 4\% | 2\% | 7\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 84 | 1306 | 1 | 0 | 667 | 107 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 73 | 0 | 55 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1391 | 0 | 0 | 774 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 128 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( m ) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width( m ) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max |  | Max | Max |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 66.3 |  |  | 66.3 |  |  | 14.7 |  |  | 14.7 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.74 |  |  | 0.74 |  |  | 0.16 |  |  | 0.16 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.67 |  |  | 0.33 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.59 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 8.9 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 25.7 |  |  | 45.0 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 8.9 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 25.7 |  |  | 45.0 |  |
| LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 8.9 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 25.7 |  |  | 45.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |

## tersection <br> \section*{Area Type. Length: 90}

Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: 76 ( $84 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 70
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.67
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: } 9.6 & \text { Intersection LOS: A } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization 89.1\% } & \text { ICU Level of Service E }\end{array}$
Analysis Period (min) 15


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study
Synchro 10 Repor

| 6: Ruttan Street \& Merchant Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  | 02/16/2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\dagger$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | $\stackrel{1}{ }$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 6 | 28 | 20 | 0 | 8 | 19 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 6 | 28 | 20 | 0 | 8 | 19 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.890 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.991 |  |  |  |  | 0.985 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1625 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1814 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.991 |  |  |  |  | 0.985 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1625 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1814 |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 30 |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) | 40.4 |  | 89.3 |  |  | 79.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 4.8 |  | 10.7 |  |  | 9.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 7 | 31 | 22 | 0 | 9 | 21 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 38 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 30 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 | 14 |  | 14 | 24 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: OtherControl Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 18.0\% ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

| 6: Ruttan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 02/16/2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\dagger$ |  | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | , | 28 | 20 | 0 | 8 | 19 |  |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | - | 28 | 20 | 0 | 8 | 19 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 7 | 31 | 22 | 0 | 9 | 21 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conficicting volume | 61 | 22 |  |  | 22 |  |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 61 | 22 |  |  | 22 |  |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{t}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |
| po queue free \% | 99 | 97 |  |  | 99 |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 940 | 1055 |  |  | 1593 |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 38 | 22 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 7 | 0 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 31 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1032 | 1700 | 1593 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.6 | 0.0 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.6 | 0.0 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 18.0\% |  | Level of | Service | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lanes, Volumes, 8: Sterling Road \& | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ings } \\ & \text { inth A } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | <Future Background> AM Peak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 39 | 168 | 12 | 88 | 24 | 2 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 39 | 168 | 12 | 88 | 24 | 2 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fit | 0.890 |  |  |  | 0.990 |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.991 |  |  | 0.994 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1597 | 0 | 0 | 1789 | 1794 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.991 |  |  | 0.994 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1597 | 0 | 0 | 1789 | 1794 | 0 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) | 30 |  |  | 30 | 30 |  |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) | 70.2 |  |  | 16.3 | 54.8 |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 8.4 |  |  | 2.0 | 6.6 |  |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/rr) | 4 | 90 | 13 |  |  | 13 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 7\% | 3\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 50\% |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 41 | 177 | 13 | 93 | 25 | 2 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 218 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 27 | 0 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 24 | 14 | 24 |  |  | 14 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: <br> Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 35.8\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | 个t |  | 7 | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 617 | 0 | 0 | 709 | 122 | 135 | 386 | 38 | 105 | 276 | 88 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 617 | 0 | 0 | 709 | 122 | 135 | 386 | 38 | 105 | 276 | 88 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Storage Length ( m ) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 14.1 | 14.4 |  | 15.3 | 36.3 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  | 0.68 | 0.81 | 0.94 |  | 0.76 | 0.85 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.984 |  |  | 0.958 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1674 | 0 | 0 | 1602 | 1343 | 1501 | 2884 | 0 | 1516 | 1335 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.266 |  |  | 0.383 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1674 | 0 | 0 | 1602 | 911 | 342 | 2884 | 0 | 463 | 1335 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  | 21 |  |
| Link Speed (Kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 374.8 |  |  | 112.0 |  |  | 258.8 |  |  | 36.6 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 33.7 |  |  | 10.1 |  |  | 23.3 |  |  | 3.3 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 329 |  | 292 | 292 |  | 329 | 280 |  | 352 | 352 |  | 280 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/r) |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.63 | 1.00 | 0.63 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.73 | 0.94 | 0.90 | 0.73 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 3\% | 3\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#hr) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 617 | 0 | 0 | 709 | 140 | 153 | 439 | 52 | 112 | 307 | 121 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 617 | 0 | 0 | 709 | 140 | 153 | 491 | 0 | 112 | 428 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.21 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.16 | 1.25 |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Number of Detectors |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template |  | Thru |  |  | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) |  | 30.5 |  |  | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West
<Future Background> PM Peak Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type |  | NA |  |  | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  | 2 |  |  | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 26.0 |  |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 6.0 | 22.0 |  | 6.0 | 22.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 34.0 |  |  | 34.0 | 34.0 | 10.0 | 28.0 |  | 10.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 52.0 |  |  | 52.0 | 52.0 | 10.0 | 38.0 |  | 10.0 | 38.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 52.0\% |  |  | 52.0\% | 52.0\% | 10.0\% | 38.0\% |  | 10.0\% | 38.0\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 45.4 |  |  | 45.4 | 45.4 | 6.0 | 32.0 |  | 6.0 | 32.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 3.6 |  |  | 3.6 | 3.6 | 1.0 | 2.0 |  | 1.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 6.6 |  |  | 6.6 | 5.6 | 3.0 | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode |  | C-Max |  |  | C-Max | C-Max | None | Max |  | None | Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 19.0 |  |  | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 15.0 |  |  | 15.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 | 40 |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) |  | 45.4 |  |  | 45.4 | 46.4 | 42.0 | 33.0 |  | 42.0 | 33.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.45 |  |  | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.42 | 0.33 |  | 0.42 | 0.33 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.81 |  |  | 0.98 | 0.33 | 0.68 | 0.51 |  | 0.42 | 0.94 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 29.2 |  |  | 56.1 | 19.8 | 35.3 | 28.5 |  | 21.6 | 62.7 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 29.2 |  |  | 56.1 | 19.8 | 35.3 | 28.5 |  | 21.6 | 62.7 |  |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | E | B | D | C |  | C | E |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 29.2 |  |  | 50.1 |  |  | 30.1 |  |  | 54.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |

## Intersection Summary <br> <br> rea Type:

 <br> <br> rea Type:}ffset: 20 ( $20 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:EBT and 6:WBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 90
Ontrol Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.98
Intersection Signal Delay: $41.2 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 86.9\% ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15


|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\hat{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | M |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 649 | 43 | 40 | 761 | 62 | 26 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 649 | 43 | 40 | 761 | 62 | 26 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.992 |  |  |  | 0.960 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.998 | 0.966 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1827 | 0 | 0 | 1838 | 1612 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.998 | 0.966 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1827 | 0 | 0 | 1838 | 1612 | 0 |
| Link Speed (kh) | 40 |  |  | 40 | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) | 69.7 |  |  | 374.8 | 79.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 6.3 |  |  | 33.7 | 9.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 683 | 45 | 42 | 801 | 65 | 27 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 728 | 0 | 0 | 843 | 92 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |  | 14 | 24 |  | 24 | 14 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | her |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 84.4\% Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service E |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
2: Ruttan Street \& Bloor Street West


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |  | F |  | \% | ${ }_{\text {F }}$ |  | 7 |  | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 146 | 490 | 0 | 0 | 719 | 104 | 113 | 105 | 39 | 163 | 0 | 229 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 146 | 490 | 0 | 0 | 719 | 104 | 113 | 105 | 39 | 163 | 0 | 229 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) | 27.5 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| Taper Length ( $m$ ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.88 |  | 0.84 |  | 0.82 |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.983 |  |  | 0.951 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1646 | 1818 | 0 | 0 | 1851 | 0 | 1685 | 1572 | 0 | 1668 | 0 | 1403 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.096 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 166 | 1818 | 0 | 0 | 1851 | 0 | 1685 | 1572 | 0 | 1395 | 0 | 1144 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 98.8 |  |  | 69.7 |  |  | 91.9 |  |  | 175.2 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 8.9 |  |  | 6.3 |  |  | 11.0 |  |  | 15.8 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 155 |  | 58 | 58 |  | 155 |  |  | 85 | 85 |  | 65 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.63 | 0.79 | 0.95 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 6\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 146 | 490 | 0 | 0 | 719 | 104 | 136 | 127 | 62 | 206 | 0 | 273 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 146 | 490 | 0 | 0 | 823 | 0 | 136 | 189 | 0 | 206 | 0 | 273 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.3 |  |  | 3.3 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 0.92 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.14 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  |  | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left |  | Right |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |  | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Future Background> PM Peak 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  | Prot |  | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 21.0 |  |  | 21.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 19.0 |  |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 10.0 | 29.0 |  |  | 29.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 10.0 | 55.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 10.0\% | 55.0\% |  |  | 45.0\% |  | 18.0\% | 18.0\% |  | 27.0\% |  |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 6.0 | 47.3 |  |  | 37.3 |  | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 20.0 |  |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 4.7 |  |  | 4.7 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -1.0 | -1.5 |  |  | -3.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 3.0 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.7 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  |  | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | C-Max |  |  | C-Max |  | None | None |  | None |  |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 36 |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 52.4 | 49.2 |  |  | 40.7 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 20.6 |  | 24.6 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.52 | 0.49 |  |  | 0.41 |  | 0.12 | 0.12 |  | 0.21 |  | 0.25 |
| V/c Ratio | 0.77 | 0.55 |  |  | 1.09 |  | 0.67 | 1.01 |  | 0.60 |  | 0.79 |
| Control Delay | 43.2 | 20.7 |  |  | 71.2 |  | 59.8 | 112.8 |  | 44.1 |  | 43.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 43.2 | 20.7 |  |  | 71.2 |  | 59.8 | 112.8 |  | 44.1 |  | 43.5 |
| LOS | D | C |  |  | E |  | E | F |  | D |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 25.8 |  |  | 71.2 |  |  | 90.6 |  |  | 43.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |

## Itersection Summary

yrea Type:
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: 64 (64\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 105
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.09
Intersection Signal Delay: $55.4 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 91.0\% ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15



221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

| Lane Group | $\varnothing 1$ | ø5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) |  |  |  |
| Future Volume (vph) |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |
| Storage Lanes |  |  |  |
| Taper Length ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor |  |  |  |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  |  |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) |  |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  |  |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |
| Confi. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |
| Bus Blockages (\#/rr) |  |  |  |
| Parking (\#hr) |  |  |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |  |  |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |  |  |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |  |  |  |
| Lane Alignment |  |  |  |
| Median Width( $m$ ) |  |  |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width( $m$ ) |  |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor |  |  |  |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |  |  |  |
| Number of Detectors |  |  |  |
| Detector Template |  |  |  |
| Leading Detector ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Type |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  |  |  |
| 221-225 Ster | ation | act Study | Synchro 10 Report |

<Future Background> PM Peak 4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type |  | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 7.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 32.3 | 32.3 | 11.0 | 32.3 | 32.3 | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 42.0 | 42.0 | 12.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 46.7\% | 46.7\% | 13.3\% | 60.0\% | 60.0\% | 34.4\% | 34.4\% |  | 34.4\% | 34.4\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 35.7 | 35.7 | 8.0 | 47.7 | 47.7 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 3.3 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.3 | 5.3 | 3.0 | 5.3 | 5.3 |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode |  | Max | Max | None | Max | Max | C-Max | C-Max |  | C-Max | C-Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 19.0 | 19.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 36.7 | 36.7 | 9.0 | 48.7 | 48.7 |  | 28.0 |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.10 | 0.54 | 0.54 |  | 0.31 |  |  | 0.34 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.85 | 0.32 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 0.44 |  | 0.84 |  |  | 0.77 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 38.4 | 9.1 | 74.8 | 29.2 | 8.9 |  | 35.6 |  |  | 32.5 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 38.4 | 9.1 | 74.8 | 29.2 | 8.9 |  | 35.6 |  |  | 32.5 |  |
| LOS |  | D | A | E | C | A |  | D |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 31.6 |  |  | 30.3 |  |  | 35.6 |  |  | 32.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |

pproach LOS
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Summary } & \\ \text { Area Type: Other }\end{array}$
cle Length
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: 77 ( $86 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.86
Intersection Signal Delay: 32.6 Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 76.4\%
ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West

 5: Private Access/Sterling Road \& Dundas Street West 02/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ ${ }_{\text {d }}$ |  |  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 83 | 793 | 0 | 0 | 1269 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 97 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 83 | 793 | 0 | 0 | 1269 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 97 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.96 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.983 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.933 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.995 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.975 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3442 | 0 | 0 | 3376 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1609 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.641 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.840 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2217 | 0 | 0 | 3376 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1371 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( $m$ ) |  | 123.6 |  |  | 101.7 |  |  | 33.0 |  |  | 87.8 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.1 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 10.5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 34 |  | 50 | 50 |  | 34 | 34 |  | 19 | 19 |  | 34 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 5\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 86 | 818 | 0 | 0 | 1308 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 100 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 904 | 0 | 0 | 1475 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( $m$ ) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width( m ) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max |  | Max | Max |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 62.0 |  |  | 62.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 19.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.69 |  |  | 0.69 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.21 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.59 |  |  | 0.63 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.70 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 10.3 |  |  | 9.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 45.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 10.3 |  |  | 9.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 45.4 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 10.3 |  |  | 9.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 45.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |

pproach LOS

## Antersection

Area Type:
Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 65
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.70
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: } 12.8 & \text { Intersection LOS: B } \\ \text { ntersection Capacity Utilization } 94.7 \% & \text { ICU Level of Service }\end{array}$
Analysis Period (min) 15


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study
Synchro 10 Repor

| Lanes, Volumes, $T$ 6: Ruttan Street \& | ings rchan |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r}\text { <Future Background> PM Peak } \\ 02 / 16 / 2021 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\downarrow$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\hat{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 1 | 12 | 64 | 6 | 32 | 23 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1 | 12 | 64 | 6 | 32 | 23 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.875 |  | 0.989 |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.996 |  |  |  |  | 0.972 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1605 | 0 | 1822 | 0 | 0 | 1790 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.996 |  |  |  |  | 0.972 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1605 | 0 | 1822 | 0 | 0 | 1790 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) | 30 |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 41.6 |  | 87.0 |  |  | 79.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 5.0 |  | 10.4 |  |  | 9.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 1 | 13 | 67 | 6 | 34 | 24 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 14 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 58 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (khh) | 24 | 14 |  | 14 | 24 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: <br> Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 19.6\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysi
6: Ruttan Street \& Merchant Lane

|  | $\dagger$ | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 12 | 64 | 6 | 32 | 23 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 1 | 12 | 64 | 6 | 32 | 23 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 1 | 13 | 67 | 6 | 34 | 24 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 162 | 70 |  |  | 73 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 162 | 70 |  |  | 73 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| po queue free \% | 100 | 99 |  |  | 98 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 810 | 993 |  |  | 1527 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane\# | WB 1 | NB1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 14 | 73 | 58 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 1 | 0 | 34 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 13 | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 977 | 1700 | 1527 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.7 | 0.0 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.7 | 0.0 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 19.6\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |


| Lanes, Volumes, 8: Sterling Road \& | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ings } \\ & \text { inth A } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | <Future Background> PM Peak $02 / 16 / 2021$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 24 | 113 | 28 | 228 | 32 | 0 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 24 | 113 | 28 | 228 | 32 | 0 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt | 0.889 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.991 |  |  | 0.994 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1615 | 0 | 0 | 1839 | 1879 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.991 |  |  | 0.994 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1615 | 0 | 0 | 1839 | 1879 | 0 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) | 30 |  |  | 30 | 30 |  |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) | 70.2 |  |  | 16.3 | 54.8 |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 8.4 |  |  | 2.0 | 6.6 |  |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/rr) | 5 | 13 | 9 |  |  | 9 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 3\% | 6\% | 1\% | 0\% | 2\% |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 28 | 131 | 33 | 265 | 37 | 0 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 159 | 0 | 0 | 298 | 37 | 0 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 24 | 14 | 24 |  |  | 14 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: <br> Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 37.7\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



APPENDIX

TTS

## TTS Trip Distribution Summary

In order to inform the trip assignment stage of the analysis, informaton about the general trip distribution is required to inform the analysis. The distribution represents the proportion of trips to and away from the site in any given direction. The following pages summarizes the general trip distribution results, which were calculated using Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) 2016 trip origin and destination data. Trips were grouped under cardinal directions based on the relative angle between trip origin and destination, and appropriate adjustments were made to the calculation to conform to local geography and street grid.
The "TTS Directional Distribution Summary" on the next page presents a summary of the calculations described above, along with notes on any details specific to the analysis in this report. The table shows the total number of trips to and from the subject site categorized into general directions (North, Northeast, East etc.) and the percentage share of trips in each general direction in all directions.

The pages after show graphical illustrations of the categorizations for all Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ) in the TTS survey area. Note that the latest survey zones were last updated in 2006.
These results are used as reference information for the trip assignment. They do not directly determine the trip assignment on the study network. The final trip assignments are completed based on a combination of local context, engineering experience, and engineering judgement, with the trip distribution information presented here to illustrate general travel behaviour.

TTS Directional Distribution Summary: 221 Sterling Road - Retail

## Notes:

1. Directions determined based on centroid coordinates of destination/origin planning districts.
2. 'Internal' refers to local trips made within the home planning district(s), while 'External' refers to trips made to areas outside of the home planning district(s).
3. 'I' refers to local trips made within the subject TAZ that do not have a cardinal direction assigned to them. These trips are excluded from the analysis.




## TTS Trip Distribution Summary

In order to inform the trip assignment stage of the analysis, informaton about the general trip distribution is required to inform the analysis. The distribution represents the proportion of trips to and away from the site in any given direction. The following pages summarizes the general trip distribution results, which were calculated using Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) 2016 trip origin and destination data. Trips were grouped under cardinal directions based on the relative angle between trip origin and destination, and appropriate adjustments were made to the calculation to conform to local geography and street grid.
The "TTS Directional Distribution Summary" on the next page presents a summary of the calculations described above, along with notes on any details specific to the analysis in this report. The table shows the total number of trips to and from the subject site categorized into general directions (North, Northeast, East etc.) and the percentage share of trips in each general direction in all directions.

The pages after show graphical illustrations of the categorizations for all Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ) in the TTS survey area. Note that the latest survey zones were last updated in 2006.
These results are used as reference information for the trip assignment. They do not directly determine the trip assignment on the study network. The final trip assignments are completed based on a combination of local context, engineering experience, and engineering judgement, with the trip distribution information presented here to illustrate general travel behaviour.

## TTS Directional Distribution Summary: 221 Sterling Road - Residential

## Notes:

1. Directions determined based on centroid coordinates of destination/origin planning districts
2. 'Internal' refers to local trips made within the home planning district(s), while 'External' refers to trips made to areas outside of the home planning district(s).
3. 'I' refers to local trips made within the subject TAZ that do not have a cardinal direction assigned to them. These trips are excluded from the analysis.

|  |  |  | Internal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | External |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Time Period | Direction | 1 | NW | N | NE | E | SE | S | SW | W | Total | NW | N | NE | E | SE | S | SW | W | Total |
|  | A.M. | Inbound | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 829 | 915 |
| Trips | A.M. | Outbound | 0 | 0 | 640 | 0 | 304 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 622 | 1566 | 0 | 1041 | 0 | 1072 | 0 | 6854 | 0 | 6135 | 15102 |
| Trips |  | Inbound | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0 | 246 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 514 | 1360 | 0 | 911 | 0 | 778 | 0 | 5714 | 0 | 6103 | 13506 |
|  | M. | Outbound | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 291 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 654 | 0 | 2017 | 2783 |
|  | A M | Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 6\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 9\% | 0\% | 85\% | 94\% |
|  |  | Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 9\% | 0\% | 6\% | 0\% | 6\% | 0\% | 41\% | 0\% | 37\% | 91\% |
|  | P M | Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% | 9\% | 0\% | 6\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 38\% | 0\% | 41\% | 91\% |
|  | P.M. | Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% | 9\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 21\% | 0\% | 66\% | 91\% |




## AM Inbound - Residential

Fri Jan 082021 12:53:00 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time) - Run Time: 3037ms
Cross Tabulation Query Form - Trip - 2016 v1.1
Row: 2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06_orig
Column: 2006 GTA zone of destination - gta06_dest
Table: Primary travel mode of trip - mode_prime

Filters:
2006 GTA z $\quad 106$
and
Start time of trip - start_time In 630-930
and
Trip purpose of destination - purp_dest ln h

Trip 2016
Table: Transit excluding GO rail

|  | 105 | 106 | 107 | 115 | 116 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 |
| 59 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 110 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 173 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 |
| 317 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 371 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 |

Trip 2016
Table: Cycle

|  | 105 | 106 | 114 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 113 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 118 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 125 | 0 | 8 | 0 |

## AM Outbound - Residential

Fri Jan 082021 12:51:25 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time) - Run Time: 3336ms

Cross Tabulation Query Form - Trip - 2016 v1.1

Row: 2006 GTA zone of destination - gta06_dest
Column: 2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06_orig
Table: Primary travel mode of trip - mode_prime

| Auto | 4317 | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Auto Passe | 418 | $\mathbf{3 \%}$ |
| Transit | 8370 | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ |
| Cycle | 1836 | $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ |
| Walk | 1727 | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ |
|  | 16668 |  |

Filters:
2006 GTA i $106 \quad 107 \quad 114 \quad 115 \quad 116$
and
Start time of trip - start_time In 630-930 and
Trip purpose of origin - purp_orig $\ln \mathrm{h}$

Trip 2016
Table: Transit excluding GO rail


PM Inbound - Residential
Fri Jan 082021 12:52:41 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time) - Run Time: 2935ms
Cross Tabulation Query Form - Trip - 2016 v1.1
Row: 2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06_orig
Column: 2006 GTA zone of destination - gta06_dest
Table: Primary travel mode of trip - mode_prime

Filters:
2006 GTA i $\quad 106$
and
Start time of trip - start_time ln 1530-1830
and
Trip purpose of destination - purp_dest ln h

Trip 2016
Table: Transit excluding GO rail


| Auto | 4027 | $\mathbf{2 7 \%}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Auto Passe | 700 | $\mathbf{5 \%}$ |
| Transit | 7308 | $\mathbf{4 9 \%}$ |
| Cycle | 1241 | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ |
| Walk | 1674 | $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ |
|  | 14950 |  |

PM Outbound - Residential
Fri Jan 082021 12:51:53 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time) - Run Time: 3197ms
Cross Tabulation Query Form - Trip - 2016 v1.1
Row: 2006 GTA zone of destination - gta06_dest
Column: 2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06_orig
Table: Primary travel mode of trip - mode_prime

Filters:
2006 GTA z $106 \quad 107 \quad 114 \quad 115 \quad 116$
and
Start time of trip - start_time In 1530-1830
and
Trip purpose of origin - purp_orig $\ln \mathrm{h}$
Trip 2016
Table: Transit excluding GO rail

|  | 105 | 106 | 107 | 114 | 115 | 116 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| 37 | 74 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 38 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 23 |
| 48 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 50 | 63 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 |
| 59 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 |
| 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 77 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 94 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 96 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 105 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 0 |
| 120 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 186 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 203 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 277 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 306 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 312 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 464 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3816 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Trip 2016
Table: Cycle

|  | 105 | 107 | 114 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 74 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 93 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 95 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 97 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 98 | 41 | 0 | 0 |
| 101 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| 109 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 113 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| 125 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 251 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| 270 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| 273 | 0 | 7 | 0 |

## AM Inbound - Retail

Fri Jan 082021 12:05:21 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time) - Run Time: 3118ms

Cross Tabulation Query Form - Trip - 2016 v1.1

Row: 2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06_orig
Column: 2006 GTA zone of destination - gta06_dest
Table: Primary travel mode of trip - mode_prime

| Auto | 2906 | $49 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Auto Passe | 344 | $6 \%$ |
| Transit | 1761 | $30 \%$ |
| Cycle | 423 | $7 \%$ |
| Walk | 485 | $8 \%$ |
|  | 5919 |  |

Filters:
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { (2006 GTA } & 106 & 107 & 114 & 115 & 116\end{array}$
and
Start time of trip - start_time In 630-930
and
Trip purpose of destination - purp_dest In w)

Trip 2016
Table: Transit excluding GO rail

|  | 105 | 106 | 107 | 114 | 115 | 116 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| 34 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 46 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 60 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 66 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 |
| 90 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 |
| 105 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 106 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 |
| 119 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| 124 | 14 | 0 | 68 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 127 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 134 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| 140 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 147 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 151 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 164 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 166 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| 172 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 188 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 |
| 210 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 211 | 33 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 212 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

AM Outbound - Retail
Fri Nov 132020 16:33:40 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time) - Run Time: 2836ms

Cross Tabulation Query Form - Trip - 2016 v1.1

Row: 2006 GTA zone of destination - gta06_dest
Column: 2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06_orig
Table: Primary travel mode of trip - mode_prime

Filters:
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { (2006 GTA } & 107 & 114 & 115 & 116\end{array}$
and
Start time of trip - start_time In 630-930
and
Trip purpose of origin - purp_orig $\ln \mathrm{w}$ )

Trip 2016
Table: Cycle

| Auto | 76 | $65 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Auto Passe | 31 | $26 \%$ |
| Transit |  | $0 \%$ |
| Cycle | 10 | $9 \%$ |
| Walk |  | $0 \%$ |

Trip 2016
Table: Auto driver

|  | 106 | 107 | 114 | 115 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 170 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| 537 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| 3812 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Trip 2016
Table: Paid rideshare

$$
115
$$

222

PM Inbound - Retail
Fri Jan 082021 12:04:50 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time) - Run Time: 2897ms

Cross Tabulation Query Form - Trip - 2016 v1.1

Row: 2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06_orig
Column: 2006 GTA zone of destination - gta06_dest
Table: Primary travel mode of trip - mode_prime

| Auto | 55 | $21 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Auto Passenger |  | $0 \%$ |
| Transit | 46 | $18 \%$ |
| Cycle | 159 | $61 \%$ |
| Walk |  |  |
|  | 260 |  |
|  |  |  |

Filters:
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { (2006 GTA } & 106 & 107 & 114 & 115 & 116\end{array}$
and
Start time of trip - start_time In 1530-1830
and
Trip purpose of destination - purp_dest $\ln \mathbf{w}$ )

Trip 2016
Table: Transit excluding GO rail

|  | 107 | 114 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 99 | 0 | 19 |
| 222 | 27 | 0 |

Trip 2016
Table: Auto driver

|  | 105 | 106 | 107 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 101 | 0 | 22 | 0 |
| 239 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 2072 | 15 | 0 | 0 |

Trip 2016
Table: Walk

|  | 114 | 116 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 99 | 19 | 0 |
| 106 | 0 | 7 |
| 109 | 17 | 0 |
| 114 | 116 | 0 |

## PM Outbound - Retail

Fri Jan 082021 12:03:42 GMT-0500 (Eastern Standard Time) - Run Time: 3375ms

Cross Tabulation Query Form - Trip - 2016 v1.1

Row: 2006 GTA zone of destination - gta06_dest
Column: 2006 GTA zone of origin - gta06_orig
Table: Primary travel mode of trip - mode_prime

Filters:
$\begin{array}{llllll}(2006 \text { GTA } & 106 & 107 & 114 & 115 & 116\end{array}$
and
Start time of trip - start_time $\ln$ 1530-1830
and
Trip purpose of origin - purp_orig $\ln \mathrm{w}$ )

Trip 2016
Table: Transit excluding GO rail

|  | 105 | 106 | 107 | 114 | 115 | 116 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 34 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 46 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 60 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 |
| 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| 90 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 93 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 102 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 106 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 119 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| 120 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 127 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 134 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 140 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 151 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 |
| 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 172 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 173 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 183 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 188 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 |
| 211 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 212 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 214 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 219 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 220 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 249 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 |
| 251 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 257 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 258 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |


| Auto | 2528 | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Auto Passe | 427 | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ |
| Transit | 1283 | $\mathbf{2 4 \%}$ |
| Cycle | 380 | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ |
| Walk | 729 | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ |
|  | 5347 |  |

## APPENDIX



Future Total Traffic Conditions


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West
<Future Total> AM Peak 1. Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West 04/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type |  | NA |  |  | NA | Perm | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  | 2 |  |  | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 26.0 |  |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 |  | 6.0 | 22.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 34.0 |  |  | 34.0 | 34.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 10.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 58.0 |  |  | 58.0 | 58.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 11.0 | 42.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 58.0\% |  |  | 58.0\% | 58.0\% | 31.0\% | 31.0\% |  | 11.0\% | 42.0\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 51.4 |  |  | 51.4 | 51.4 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 7.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 3.6 |  |  | 3.6 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 1.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.6 |  |  | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 3.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode |  | C-Max |  |  | C-Max | C-Max | Max | Max |  | None | Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 19.0 |  |  | 19.0 | 19.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |  |  | 15.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 52.4 |  |  | 52.4 | 52.4 | 26.0 | 26.0 |  | 39.0 | 37.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.52 |  |  | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.26 | 0.26 |  | 0.39 | 0.37 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.92 |  |  | 0.67 | 0.22 | 0.65 | 0.66 |  | 0.78 | 0.88 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 31.4 |  |  | 22.2 | 14.4 | 58.7 | 36.5 |  | 46.1 | 48.2 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 31.4 |  |  | 22.2 | 14.4 | 58.7 | 36.5 |  | 46.1 | 48.2 |  |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | C | B | E | D |  | D | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 31.4 |  |  | 21.0 |  |  | 39.8 |  |  | 47.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |

## pproach LOS

## tersection Summary

Area Type:
yctuated Cycle Length: 10
ffset: $38(38 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBT and $6: W B T$, Start of Green
atural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.92
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: } 34.5 & \text { Intersection LOS: C } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization 105.0\% } & \text { ICU Level of Service }\end{array}$
Intersection Capacity Utilization 105.0\%
Analysis Period (min) 15
ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15


|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | \% |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 824 | 25 | 6 | 670 | 71 | 43 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 824 | 25 | 6 | 670 | 71 | 43 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Utili. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.996 |  |  |  | 0.949 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  | 0.970 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1835 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 1600 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  | 0.970 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1835 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 1600 | 0 |
| Link Speed (kh) | 40 |  |  | 40 | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) | 69.7 |  |  | 374.8 | 79.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 6.3 |  |  | 33.7 | 9.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 916 | 28 | 7 | 744 | 79 | 48 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 944 | 0 | 0 | 751 | 127 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( $m$ ) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |  | 14 | 24 |  | 24 | 14 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | her |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service B |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 58.1\% Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 04/16/2021

|  |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | SBR

Two way Left Turn Lane

| Headway Factor | 1.04 | 1.19 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 0.92 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  |  | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left |  | Right |
| Leading Detector ( $m$ ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |  | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  |  |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Future Total> AM Peak
3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  | Prot |  | ptoo |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 21.0 |  |  | 21.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 19.0 |  |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 10.0 | 29.0 |  |  | 29.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 10.0 | 57.0 |  |  | 47.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 10.0\% | 57.0\% |  |  | 47.0\% |  | 16.0\% | 16.0\% |  | 27.0\% |  |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 6.0 | 49.3 |  |  | 39.3 |  | 9.0 | 9.0 |  | 20.0 |  |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 4.7 |  |  | 4.7 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -1.0 | -3.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 3.0 | 4.7 |  |  | 6.7 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  |  | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | C-Max |  |  | C-Max |  | None | None |  | None |  |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 28 |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 57.7 | 56.0 |  |  | 44.0 |  | 9.5 | 9.5 |  | 20.6 |  | 25.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.58 | 0.56 |  |  | 0.44 |  | 0.10 | 0.10 |  | 0.21 |  | 0.2 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.87 | 0.71 |  |  | 0.98 |  | 0.42 | 0.51 |  | 0.69 |  | 0.58 |
| Control Delay | 61.4 | 23.1 |  |  | 48.5 |  | 51.0 | 55.5 |  | 48.7 |  | 30. |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 61.4 | 23.1 |  |  | 48.5 |  | 51.0 | 55.5 |  | 48.7 |  | 30. |
| LOS | E | C |  |  | D |  | D | E |  | D |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 30.6 |  |  | 48.5 |  |  | 53.4 |  |  | 40.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |

rea Type: ..... Other

Cycle Length: 100
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: $89(89 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6 :WBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 95
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.98
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: 40.7 } & \text { Intersection LOS: D } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization 78.3\% } & \text { ICU Level of Service D }\end{array}$


| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |  | ¢个分 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 701 | 202 | 75 | 667 | 119 | 0 | 551 | 159 | 10 | 885 | 61 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 701 | 202 | 75 | 667 | 119 | 0 | 551 | 159 | 10 | 885 | 61 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Storage Length ( m ) | 0.0 |  | 17.5 | 26.4 |  | 31.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 50.0 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  | 0.74 | 0.91 |  | 0.60 |  | 0.85 |  |  | 0.95 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.964 |  |  | 0.988 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1623 | 1436 | 1589 | 1712 | 1358 | 0 | 3969 | 0 | 0 | 3184 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.938 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1623 | 1063 | 1447 | 1712 | 820 | 0 | 3969 | 0 | 0 | 2982 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 121 |  |  | 85 |  | 89 |  |  | 10 |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 75.1 |  |  | 318.0 |  |  | 159.9 |  |  | 139.1 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 6.8 |  |  | 28.6 |  |  | 14.4 |  |  | 12.5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 670 |  | 219 | 219 |  | 670 | 453 |  | 442 | 442 |  | 453 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 11 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.64 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.90 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.69 | 0.98 | 0.75 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 4\% | 3\% | 5\% | 6\% | 3\% | 11\% | 0\% | 7\% | 3\% | 100\% | 4\% | 0\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#hr) |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 701 | 243 | 77 | 695 | 134 | 0 | 562 | 177 | 14 | 903 | 81 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 701 | 243 | 77 | 695 | 134 | 0 | 739 | 0 | 0 | 998 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.09 | 1.18 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.10 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.09 |
| Turning Speed (khh) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Number of Detectors |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template |  | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) |  | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 2.0 | 30.5 |  | 2.0 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |  | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

<Future Total> AM Peak 4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West 04/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type |  | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 25.0 | 25.0 | 6.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 19.0 | 19.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 31.3 | 31.3 | 11.0 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 43.0 | 43.0 | 11.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 47.8\% | 47.8\% | 12.2\% | 60.0\% | 60.0\% | 34.4\% | 34.4\% |  | 34.4\% | 34.4\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 36.7 | 36.7 | 6.0 | 47.7 | 47.7 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 5.3 | 5.3 |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode |  | Max | Max | None | Max | Max | C-Max | C-Max |  | C-Max | C-Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 |  | 17.0 | 17.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 39.9 | 39.9 | 7.0 | 48.7 | 48.7 |  | 28.0 |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.08 | 0.54 | 0.54 |  | 0.31 |  |  | 0.34 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.97 | 0.45 | 0.63 | 0.75 | 0.28 |  | 0.57 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 55.7 | 12.3 | 63.7 | 22.4 | 6.2 |  | 25.1 |  |  | 50.9 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 55.7 | 12.3 | 63.7 | 22.4 | 6.2 |  | 25.1 |  |  | 50.9 |  |
| LOS |  | E | B | E | C | A |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 44.5 |  |  | 23.5 |  |  | 25.1 |  |  | 50.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |

## rea Type: Other

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: 34 ( $38 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 110
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.97
Intersection Signal Delay: 37.0 Intersection LOS: D
ntersection Capacity Utilization 87.9\%
ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15




|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | 4T |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 82 | 1280 | 1 | 0 | 654 | 105 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 83 | 0 | 54 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 82 | 1280 | 1 | 0 | 654 | 105 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 83 | 0 | 54 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 0.98 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.955 |  |  | 0.947 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.997 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.984 |  |  | 0.971 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3394 | 0 | 0 | 3149 | 0 | 0 | 1049 | 0 | 0 | 1607 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted |  | 0.834 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.934 |  |  | 0.813 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2834 | 0 | 0 | 3149 | 0 | 0 | 985 | 0 | 0 | 1331 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 38 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) |  | 123.6 |  |  | 101.7 |  |  | 33.0 |  |  | 87.8 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.1 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 10.5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 50 |  | 27 | 27 |  | 50 | 38 |  | 15 | 15 |  | 38 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 5\% | 0\% | 2\% | 10\% | 5\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 4\% | 2\% | 7\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 84 | 1306 | 1 | 0 | 667 | 107 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 85 | 0 | 55 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1391 | 0 | 0 | 774 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
5: Private Access/Sterling Road \& Dundas Street West

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max |  | Max | Max |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 65.4 |  |  | 65.4 |  |  | 15.6 |  |  | 15.6 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.73 |  |  | 0.73 |  |  | 0.17 |  |  | 0.17 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.68 |  |  | 0.34 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.61 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 9.6 |  |  | 5.2 |  |  | 24.7 |  |  | 44.9 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 9.6 |  |  | 5.2 |  |  | 24.7 |  |  | 44.9 |  |
| LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 9.6 |  |  | 5.2 |  |  | 24.7 |  |  | 44.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |

## rea Type:

Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: $76(84 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 70
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.68
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: } 10.3 & \text { Intersection LOS: B } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization } 89.5 \% & \text { ICU Level of Service E }\end{array}$
Analysis Period (min) 15

$21-225$ Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

| 6: Ruttan Street \& Merchant Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  | 04/16/2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\downarrow$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 1 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 6 | 28 | 60 | 0 | 8 | 17 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 6 | 28 | 60 | 0 | 8 | 17 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Utili. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.890 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.991 |  |  |  |  | 0.984 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1625 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1813 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.991 |  |  |  |  | 0.984 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1625 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1813 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) | 30 |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) | 20.2 |  | 89.3 |  |  | 79.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 2.4 |  | 10.7 |  |  | 9.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 7 | 31 | 67 | 0 | 9 | 19 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 38 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 28 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |  |
| Median Width( $m$ ) | 3.5 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 | 14 |  | 14 | 24 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 18.0\% ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
<Future Total> AM Peak

| 6: Ruttan Street \& Merchant Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 04/16/2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\hat{}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 6 | 28 | 60 | 0 | 8 | 17 |  |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 6 | 28 | 60 | 0 | 8 | 17 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 7 | 31 | 67 | 0 | 9 | 19 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX , platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conficting volume | 104 | 67 |  |  | 67 |  |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 104 | 67 |  |  | 67 |  |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |
| po queue free \% | 99 | 97 |  |  | 99 |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 889 | 997 |  |  | 1535 |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane\# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 38 | 67 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 7 | 0 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 31 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 975 | 1700 | 1535 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.8 | 0.0 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.8 | 0.0 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 18.0\% |  | Level | Service | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
<Future Total> AM Peak
8: Sterling Road \& Perth Avenue

| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\stackrel{1}{ }$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 39 | 168 | 12 | 88 | 35 | 2 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 39 | 168 | 12 | 88 | 35 | 2 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fit | 0.890 |  |  |  | 0.993 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.991 |  |  | 0.994 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1597 | 0 | 0 | 1789 | 1819 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted | 0.991 |  |  | 0.994 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1597 | 0 | 0 | 1789 | 1819 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 30 |  |  | 30 | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 70.2 |  |  | 16.3 | 35.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 8.4 |  |  | 2.0 | 4.3 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 4 | 90 | 13 |  |  | 13 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#hr) |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 7\% | 3\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 50\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 41 | 177 | 13 | 93 | 37 | 2 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 218 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 39 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 24 | 14 | 24 |  |  | 14 |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | her |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 35.8\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
<Future Total> AM Peak
8: Sterling Road \& Perth Avenue 04/16/2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Stop |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Sign Control |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 39 | 168 | 12 | 88 | 35 | 2 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 39 | 168 | 12 | 88 | 35 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 41 | 177 | 13 | 93 | 37 | 2 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total (vph) | 218 | 106 | 39 |

$\begin{array}{lll}218 & 106 & 39\end{array}$
Volume Left (vph)
Volume Right (vph)
$\begin{array}{lrrr}\text { Volume Right (vph) } & 177 & 0 & 2 \\ \text { Hadj (s) } & -0.39 & 0.10 & 0.01 \\ \text { Departur Headway (s) } & 3.9 & 45 & 45\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lrrrr}\text { Departure Headway (s) } & 3.9 & 4.5 & 4.5 \\ \text { Degree Utilization, } \mathrm{x} & 0.23 & 0.5 & 0.05\end{array}$
Degree Utilization, $x$
Copacitry Delay (s)

|  | 0.23 | 0.13 | 748 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 8.0 | 759 | 748 |

$\begin{array}{lrrr}\text { pproach LOS } & 8.0 & 8.2 & 7.7\end{array}$
Itersection Summary
Delay

| Level of Service |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 8.0 |

Intersection Capacity Utilization $\quad 35.8 \%$ A
Analysis Period (min)
${ }^{35}$.
CU Level of Servic


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
<Future Total> AM Peak 9: Ruttan Street \& Site Acces

|  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 11 | 60 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 6 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 11 | 60 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 6 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 12 | 67 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 7 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 46 | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 46 | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| po queue free \% | 99 | 94 |  |  | 99 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 953 | 1084 |  |  | 1622 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 79 | 1 | 26 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 12 | 0 | 19 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 67 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 1062 | 1700 | 1622 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th ( $m$ ) | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.7 | 0.0 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.7 | 0.0 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity UtilizationAnalysis Period (min) |  |  | 18.9\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |


| Lanes, Volumes, Timings <br> 11: Sterling Road \& Ruttan Street Extension |  |  |  |  |  |  | <Future Total> AM Peak 04/16/2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\dagger$ | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 17 | 0 | 127 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 17 | 0 | 127 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Utili. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.999 |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1750 | 0 | 1840 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1750 | 0 | 1840 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) | 30 |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 22.2 |  | 35.7 |  |  | 19.2 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 2.7 |  | 4.3 |  |  | 2.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 19 | 0 | 141 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 19 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 | 14 |  | 14 | 24 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: <br> Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 16.7\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
<Future Total> AM Peak 11: Sterling Road \& Ruttan Street Extension 04/16/2021

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 17 | 0 | 127 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 17 | 0 | 127 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 19 | 0 | 141 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conficting volume | 142 | 142 |  |  | 142 |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 142 | 142 |  |  | 142 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 98 | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 851 | 906 |  |  | 1441 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 19 | 142 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 19 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 851 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.02 | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity UtilizationAnalysis Period (min) |  |  | 16.7\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |
|  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study
Synchro 10 Repor


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West
<Future Total> PM Peak 1. Lansdowne Avenue \& Bloor Street West 04/16/2021

Intersection Summary

```
rea Type: \(\quad\) CBD
Actuated Cy: 100 enth: 100
```

offset: $20(20 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBT and 6:WBT, Start of Green
atural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/C Ratio: 0.98
Intersection Signal Delay: 42.3 Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization $88.4 \%$
ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15

| $\rightarrow 02(\mathrm{R})$ | ${ }^{03}$ | $\psi_{04}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52 s | 10 s | 38 s |
| $\psi_{\sigma 6(R)}$ | 407 | $\dagger$ ¢8 |


|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | \% |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 649 | 66 | 62 | 761 | 38 | 11 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 649 | 66 | 62 | 761 | 38 | 11 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.988 |  |  |  | 0.969 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.996 | 0.963 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1820 | 0 | 0 | 1835 | 1622 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.996 | 0.963 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1820 | 0 | 0 | 1835 | 1622 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 40 |  |  | 40 | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) | 69.7 |  |  | 374.8 | 79.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 6.3 |  |  | 33.7 | 9.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 683 | 69 | 65 | 801 | 40 | 12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  | 0 | 866 | 52 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane $1.01-1.01-1.01-1.01-1.09$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |  | 14 | 24 |  | 24 | 14 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |
| $\frac{\text { Intersection Summary }}{\text { Area Type: }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 95.0\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service F |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
<Future Total> PM Peak 2: Ruttan Street \& Bloor Street West
 3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 04/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | f |  | \% |  | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 146 | 513 | 0 | 0 | 695 | 104 | 113 | 105 | 39 | 163 | 0 | 229 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 146 | 513 | 0 | 0 | 695 | 104 | 113 | 105 | 39 | 163 | 0 | 229 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) | 27.5 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.88 |  | 0.84 |  | 0.82 |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.982 |  |  | 0.951 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1646 | 1818 | 0 | 0 | 1847 | 0 | 1685 | 1572 | 0 | 1668 | 0 | 1403 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.096 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 166 | 1818 | 0 | 0 | 1847 | 0 | 1685 | 1572 | 0 | 1395 | 0 | 1144 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 40 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 98.8 |  |  | 69.7 |  |  | 91.9 |  |  | 175.2 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 8.9 |  |  | 6.3 |  |  | 11.0 |  |  | 15.8 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#hr) | 155 |  | 58 | 58 |  | 155 |  |  | 85 | 85 |  | 65 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.63 | 0.79 | 0.95 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 6\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 146 | 513 | 0 | 0 | 695 | 104 | 136 | 127 | 62 | 206 | 0 | 273 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 146 | 513 | 0 | 0 | 799 | 0 | 136 | 189 | 0 | 206 | 0 | 273 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.3 |  |  | 3.3 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 0.92 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 1.01 | 1.14 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  |  | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left |  | Right |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |  | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector ( m ) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West
3: Sterling Road/Symington Avenue \& Bloor Street West 04/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | NA |  |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  | Prot |  | pt+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 35 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 21.0 |  |  | 21.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 19.0 |  |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 10.0 | 29.0 |  |  | 29.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 10.0 | 55.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 27.0 |  |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 10.0\% | 55.0\% |  |  | 45.0\% |  | 18.0\% | 18.0\% |  | 27.0\% |  |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 6.0 | 47.3 |  |  | 37.3 |  | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 20.0 |  |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 4.7 |  |  | 4.7 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -1.0 | -1.5 |  |  | -3.0 |  | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 3.0 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.7 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead |  |  |  | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Recall Mode | Max | C-Max |  |  | C-Max |  | None | None |  | None |  |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  | 8.0 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 14.0 |  |  | 14.0 |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#hr) |  | 36 |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 52.4 | 49.2 |  |  | 40.7 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 20.6 |  | 24.6 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.52 | 0.49 |  |  | 0.41 |  | 0.12 | 0.12 |  | 0.21 |  | 0.25 |
| V/c Ratio | 0.77 | 0.57 |  |  | 1.06 |  | 0.67 | 1.01 |  | 0.60 |  | 0.79 |
| Control Delay | 43.2 | 21.3 |  |  | 59.4 |  | 59.8 | 112.8 |  | 44.1 |  | 43.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 43.2 | 21.3 |  |  | 59.4 |  | 59.8 | 112.8 |  | 44.1 |  | 43.5 |
| LOS | D | C |  |  | E |  | E | F |  | D |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 26.1 |  |  | 59.4 |  |  | 90.6 |  |  | 43.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |

## Itersection Summary

Area Type:
Cycle Lenghn: 100
Offset: 64 (64\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 105
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.06
Intersection Signal Delay: 50.9 Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 89.7\% ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15


|  |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | SBR

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

<Future Total> PM Peak 4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West 04/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type |  | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |  | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 7.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 32.3 | 32.3 | 11.0 | 32.3 | 32.3 | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 42.0 | 42.0 | 12.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 46.7\% | 46.7\% | 13.3\% | 60.0\% | 60.0\% | 34.4\% | 34.4\% |  | 34.4\% | 34.4\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 35.7 | 35.7 | 8.0 | 47.7 | 47.7 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 3.3 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 | -1.0 |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.3 | 5.3 | 3.0 | 5.3 | 5.3 |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode |  | Max | Max | None | Max | Max | C-Max | C-Max |  | C-Max | C-Max |  |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 19.0 | 19.0 |  | 19.0 | 19.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |  | 40 | 40 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 36.7 | 36.7 | 9.0 | 48.7 | 48.7 |  | 28.0 |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.10 | 0.54 | 0.54 |  | 0.31 |  |  | 0.34 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.88 | 0.32 | 0.81 | 0.84 | 0.43 |  | 0.85 |  |  | 0.77 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 41.5 | 9.1 | 74.8 | 27.5 | 8.7 |  | 35.7 |  |  | 32.6 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 41.5 | 9.1 | 74.8 | 27.5 | 8.7 |  | 35.7 |  |  | 32.6 |  |
| LOS |  | D | A | E | C | A |  | D |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 34.2 |  |  | 29.2 |  |  | 35.7 |  |  | 32.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |

Approach Delay

## Area Type: Other

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 90
offset: 77 ( $86 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 90
Ontrol Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.88
Itersection Signal Delay: $32.9 \quad$ Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 75.3\%
ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 4: Dundas Street West \& Bloor Street West



| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ $\hat{\square}$ |  |  | ¢ ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 83 | 793 | 0 | 0 | 1269 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 0 | 97 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 83 | 793 | 0 | 0 | 1269 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 0 | 97 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width ( $m$ ) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.96 |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  | 0.982 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.933 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.995 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.975 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3442 | 0 | 0 | 3371 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1609 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.639 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.840 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2210 | 0 | 0 | 3371 | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 0 | 0 | 1371 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 40 |  |  | 40 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance ( $m$ ) |  | 123.6 |  |  | 101.7 |  |  | 33.0 |  |  | 87.8 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.1 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 10.5 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/r) | 34 |  | 50 | 50 |  | 34 | 34 |  | 19 | 19 |  | 34 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Heary Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 5\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 86 | 818 | 0 | 0 | 1308 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 100 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 904 | 0 | 0 | 1487 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  |  |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector ( m ) | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |

221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
5. Private Access/Sterling Road \& Dundas Street West 04/16/2021

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 31.0 | 31.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 61.0 | 61.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  | 29.0 | 29.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 67.8\% | 67.8\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  | 32.2\% | 32.2\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |  | -1.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ead/Lag

| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max | Max | Max | None | None | None | None |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |


|  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Walk Time (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |  |  |


| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Pedestrian Calls $(\# h r)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green $(\mathrm{s})$ |  | 62.0 |  | 62.0 |  |  |  | 10.0 |

and Effct Green (s)
ctuated $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio
Ratio
ontrol Delay
Queue Delay
Total D

| Approach Delay | 10.3 | 10.0 | 45.3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach LOS | B | A | D |

## tersection <br> Area Type:

Actuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 65
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.70
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: 12.8 } & \text { Intersection LOS: B } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization } 95.1 \% & \text { ICU Level of Service F }\end{array}$
Analysis Period (min) 15


221-225 Sterling Road Transportation Impact Study

| 6: Ruttan Street \& Merchant Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  | 04/16/2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 1 | 12 | 25 | 6 | 32 | 68 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1 | 12 | 25 | 6 | 32 | 68 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.875 |  | 0.975 |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.996 |  |  |  |  | 0.984 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1605 | 0 | 1796 | 0 | 0 | 1813 |  |
| FIt Permitted | 0.996 |  |  |  |  | 0.984 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1605 | 0 | 1796 | 0 | 0 | 1813 |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 30 |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 20.8 |  | 87.0 |  |  | 79.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 2.5 |  | 10.4 |  |  | 9.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 1 | 13 | 26 | 6 | 34 | 72 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 14 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 106 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 | 14 |  | 14 | 24 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | ther |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 22.0\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Lanes, Volumes, Timings

| 8: Sterling Road \& Perth Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  | 04/16/2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | Y |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 24 | 113 | 28 | 240 | 31 | 0 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 24 | 113 | 28 | 240 | 31 | 0 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt | 0.889 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.991 |  |  | 0.995 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1615 | 0 | 0 | 1841 | 1879 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.991 |  |  | 0.995 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1615 | 0 | 0 | 1841 | 1879 | 0 |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 30 |  |  | 30 | 30 |  |  |
| Link Distance ( $m$ ) | 70.2 |  |  | 16.3 | 27.0 |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 8.4 |  |  | 2.0 | 3.2 |  |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 5 | 13 | 9 |  |  | 9 |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 3\% | 6\% | 1\% | 0\% | 2\% |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 28 | 131 | 33 | 279 | 36 | 0 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 159 | 0 | 0 | 312 | 36 | 0 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 | 14 | 24 |  |  | 14 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: OtherControl Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 38.3\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
8: Sterling Road \& Perth Avenue

| 8: Sterling Road \& Perth Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 04/16/2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $y$ | $\geqslant$ | 4 | 4 | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 24 | 113 | 28 | 240 | 31 | 0 |  |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 24 | 113 | 28 | 240 | 31 | 0 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 28 | 131 | 33 | 279 | 36 | 0 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 159 | 312 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 28 | 33 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 131 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | -0.42 | 0.05 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.19 | 0.38 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 777 | 801 | 732 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.3 | 10.0 | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.3 | 10.0 | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 9.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 38.3\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lanes, Volumes, Timings <br> 11: Sterling Road \& Ruttan Street Extension |  |  |  |  |  |  | <Future Total> PM Peak 04/16/2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $t$ | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 3 | 0 | 252 | 18 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 3 | 0 | 252 | 18 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.991 |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1750 | 0 | 1825 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1750 | 0 | 1825 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 48 |  | 48 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 25.9 |  | 27.0 |  |  | 26.3 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 1.9 |  | 2.0 |  |  | 3.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 3 | 0 | 265 | 19 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 3 | 0 | 284 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.5 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 24 | 14 |  | 14 | 24 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 24.4\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

11: Sterling Road \& Ruttan Street Extension 04/16/2021

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | Y |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | , | 0 | 252 | 18 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 3 | 0 | 252 | 18 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 3 | 0 | 265 | 19 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conflicting volume | 274 | 274 |  |  | 284 |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 274 | 274 |  |  | 284 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 715 | 764 |  |  | 1278 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 3 | 284 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSH | 715 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th ( m ) | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 10.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 10.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 24.4\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |
|  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |



HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
<Future Total> PM Peak



[^0]:    1 For signalized intersections, the level of service is based on the overall delay of the intersection. Critical v/c ratios are only listed for movements with values over 0.90 .
    2 For stop controlled intersections, the level of service is based on the delay associated with the critical movement.

[^1]:    58) Exception R 58

    The lands, or a portion thereof as noted below, are subject to the following Site Specific Provisions, Prevailing By-laws and Prevailing Sections:

[^2]:    (1) Highway Capacity Manual 2000.

[^3]:    Ansis

