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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WSP Canada Inc. was retained by Elkay Developments Ltd. and Spire General Partner Ltd. (Elkay / Spire) to complete a traffic impact assessment for the proposed Blackfalds Crossing Area Structure Plan (ASP) located within the southern limits of the Town of Blackfalds in NE 22-39-27-W4M.

The purpose of this study is to identify and assess the potential traffic impacts on the study intersections associated with the proposed development, and to suggest required mitigation measures (if any) to allow that the adjacent roadways safely accommodate the proposed development.
The proposed Blackfalds Crossing Area Structure Plan (ASP) is located west of Highway 2A and north of Highway 597 encompassing a total of approximately 40 hectares of land. The proposed ASP area is anticipated to be developed in four stages. According to the development concept plan (Appendix A), Stage 1 will include a food anchored shopping centre along Highway 2A. Stage 2 will include highway commercial development along Highway 597 and row housing and multi-family residential development. Stages 3 and 4 will include single family, row housing, and live/work mixed use housing residential development. A total of 602 units of residential housing are anticipated to be developed in the proposed ASP area. It is anticipated that Stages 1 and 2 will be completed within 3 years by 2018 and the entire development will be fully built out by 2025. The land at the northeast corner of the NE 22-39-27-W4M is anticipated to be developed by others and is included in this study.

Primary vehicular access to the development will be obtained via Highway 2A, Highway 597, Broadway Avenue, East Railway Street, a proposed North-South Collector Road onto Highway 597 (South Access), and a proposed East-West Collector Road onto Highway 2A (East Access). The following intersections were analyzed in this study:

```
-> Highway 2A / Highway 597,
-> Highway 2A / Proposed East-West Collector Road,
H Highway 597 / Proposed South Access, and
-> South Street / East Railway Street.
```

The existing Highway 2A / 597 intersection is a four-legged intersection. A two-lane modern roundabout was recently constructed at this intersection. Highway 2A was widened to four lanes from Highway 597 to Broadway Avenue.

The existing Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue intersection is a three-legged intersection with two northbound through lanes. This intersection is currently controlled by a stop sign on Broadway Avenue with free flow conditions on Highway 2A. It is anticipated that Broadway Avenue will be realigned and intersect with the proposed east-west collector road when the proposed subdivision is developed.

The existing South Street / East Railway Street intersection is a three-legged intersection and is controlled by a stop sign on the east approach with free flow conditions in the north and west directions.

The following conclusions and recommendations were reached:

## HIGHWAY 2A / HIGHWAY 597

$\rightarrow$ All traffic movements at the Highway 2A / Highway 597 intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS C or better during both the AM and PM peak periods at the 10 year horizon and LOS D or better at the 20 year horizon under the post-development traffic conditions. The roundabout at the

Highway 2A / Highway 597 intersection will be capable of accommodating the forecasted postdevelopment traffic.

## HIGHWAY 2A / BROADWAY AVENUE / EAST-WEST COLLECTOR

$\rightarrow$ The eastbound traffic movements on Broadway Avenue currently operate at LOS E during the AM peak hours at the existing Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue intersection.
$\rightarrow$ Traffic signals will be warranted at the proposed Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road intersection in 2016 when Stage 1 is fully built out.
$\rightarrow$ The following intersection lane configurations are recommended when traffic signals are installed at this intersection:

- Eastbound: two left turn lanes and one right turn lane;
- Northbound: one left turn lane and two through lanes, and
- Southbound: two through lanes and one right turn lane.
$\rightarrow$ When the proposed Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road intersection is under signal control, all traffic movements will operate at an acceptable LOS C or better during both the AM and PM peak periods up to the 20 year horizon. The proposed intersection lane configurations will be capable of accommodating the forecasted post-development traffic.
$\rightarrow$ To improve the traffic operational performance at this intersection up to the 20-year horizon, traffic signals are proposed to be installed at the same time as the geometric improvements to an alldirectional intersection. As the upgraded intersection nears capacity, the feasibility of a roundabout should be assessed at that time; however, the right of way for a future roundabout should be protected as the surrounding lands are developed.


## HIGHWAY 597 / SOUTH ACCESS

$\rightarrow$ A Type IV left turn lane will be warranted for eastbound traffic under the 3 year horizon postdevelopment traffic conditions. An additional 10 m storage length (total parallel deceleration lane length 65 m ) will be required to accommodate the forecasted 20 year horizon traffic. The existing raised median on Highway 597 will need to be removed to provide room for the proposed eastbound left turn lane.
$\rightarrow$ It is recommended that two through lanes be provided for the westbound traffic on Highway 597 between the Highway 2A / 597 roundabout and the existing two lanes approximately 200 m west of the proposed South Access. One eastbound through lane is expected to be capable of accommodating the forecasted post-development traffic. The proposed South Access intersection is located east of and out of the eastbound two-lane to one-lane transition zone on Highway 597. The proposed intersection treatment concept plan is shown in Figure 11 and attached in Appendix C.
$\rightarrow$ Alberta Transportation is requiring that two eastbound through lanes be provided at the South Access intersection up to the existing two lanes west of the Highway 2A / 597 roundabout to provide better safety and operational performance for the eastbound traffic. Alberta Transportation's requested intersection improvement concept plan is shown in Figure 12 and attached in Appendix C. Construction cost sharing with Alberta Transportation is anticipated to be required regarding these upgraded intersection improvements.
$\rightarrow$ All traffic movements at the Highway 597 / South Access intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during both the AM and PM peak periods at the 10 and 20 year horizons under the post-development traffic conditions.
$\rightarrow$ The intersection sight distances along Highway 597 at the South Access intersection appear to be adequate.
$\rightarrow$ Signals will not be warranted at this intersection up to the 20 year horizon.
$\rightarrow$ Delineation lighting will be warranted at the Highway 597 / South Access intersection.

## SOUTH STREET / EAST RAILWAY STREET

$\rightarrow$ This intersection will become a four-legged intersection with the proposed N-S Collector Road forming the south leg. It is recommended that an additional stop sign be installed on the west approach when the proposed N -S Collector Road is constructed. No auxiliary lane (i.e., left or right turn lane) is recommended for this intersection.
$\rightarrow$ All traffic movements at the South Street / East Railway Street intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS C or better during both the AM and PM peak periods at the 20 year horizon. The proposed intersection control type and lane configurations will be capable of accommodating the forecasted post-development traffic. South Street will operate at acceptable level of services with the existing two-lane cross section up to the 20 year horizon.
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WSP Canada Inc. was retained by Elkay Developments Ltd. and Spire General Partner Ltd. (Elkay / Spire) to complete a traffic impact assessment for a proposed Blackfalds Crossing Area Structure Plan (ASP) located within the southern limits of the Town of Blackfalds in the NE 22-39-27-W4M. The subject site location is shown in Figure 1A.

### 1.1 STUDY PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to identify and assess the potential traffic impacts on the study intersections associated with the proposed development, and to suggest required mitigation measures (if any) to allow that the adjacent roadways safely accommodate the proposed development.

### 1.2 SITE AND VICINITY DESCRIPTION

### 1.2.1 SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposed Blackfalds Crossing Area Structure Plan area is bounded by Highway 2A to the east, Highway 597 to the south, South Street to the north, and the Blackfalds RCMP and Fire Department to the immediate west. A Canadian Pacific railway line runs north-south across the north-west corner of the proposed ASP area.

The proposed Blackfalds Crossing ASP area is located west of Highway 2A and north of Highway 597 encompassing a total of approximately 40 hectares of land. The proposed development is anticipated to be developed in four stages. According to the development concept plan, Stage 1 will include a food anchored shopping centre along Highway 2A. Stage 2 will include highway commercial development along Highway 597 and row housing and multi-family residential development. Stages 3 and 4 will include single family, row housing, and live/work mixed use housing residential development. The proposed development in the Blackfalds Crossing ASP is summarized in Table 1A. A total of 602 units of residential housing are anticipated to be developed in the proposed ASP area. For the purpose of this study, it is assumed that the Blackfalds Crossing ASP will be fully built out by 2025. The proposed development concept plan is shown in Figure 1B and the proposed staging plan is illustrated in Figure 1C.

The triangular parcel ( 2.05 hectares) west of the CP rail line is expected to be developed by the Town of Blackfalds for use as a community dog park.

The land at the northeast corner of the NE 22-39-27-W4 is anticipated to be developed by others. The assumed land uses on this land are illustrated in Table 1B. To distinguish the development on this land from the Blackfalds Crossing ASP, hereinafter, the land at the northeast corner of the NE 22-39-$27-\mathrm{W} 4$ is called future development.

Table 1A. Proposed Development Summary

| PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT |  | SIZE | ANTICIPATED BUILD OUT YEAR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stage 1 | Food Anchored Shopping Centre | 11.80 Acres (Land Area) | 2016 |
| Stage 2 | Highway Commercial | 7.51 Acres (Land Area) | 2018 |
|  | Row houses (R-2) | 36 units |  |
|  | Multi-Family Housing (R-4) | 140 units |  |
| Stage 3 | Single Family Housing (R-1S) | 88 units | 2023 |
| Stage 4 | Single Family Housing (R-1S) | 80 units | 2025 |
|  | Row houses (R-2) | 25 units |  |
|  | Mixed Use Housing | 233 units |  |
| Blackfalds Crossing ASP Total Residential |  | 602 Units | 2025 |

Table 1B. Future Development (Land at Northeast Corner of NE 22-39-27-W4)

| PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT | SIZE | ANTICIPATED <br> BUILD OUT YEAR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single Family Housing (R-1S) | 16 units | 2025 |
| Highway Commercial | 7.25 Acres (Land Area) |  |

### 1.2.2 TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Primary vehicular access to the development will be obtained via Highway 2A, Highway 597, Broadway Avenue, East Railway Street, a proposed north-south collector road onto Highway 597 (South Access), and a proposed east-west collector road onto Highway 2A (East Access). Therefore, the following intersections were analyzed in this study:
$\rightarrow$ Highway 2A / Highway 597;
$\rightarrow$ Highway 597 / Proposed South Access;
$\rightarrow$ Highway 2A / Proposed East Access, and
$\rightarrow$ South Street / East Railway Street / North-South Collector Road.
Highway 2A runs north-south parallel to the QE II Freeway and serves as the southern and northern gateway to the Town of Blackfalds. Highway 2A is a two-lane undivided provincial highway with a posted speed limit of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ in the vicinity of the proposed development. The current Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) and Average Summer Daily Traffic (ASDT) are estimated to be approximately 13,430 and 14,050 vehicles per day respectively, of which approximately $4 \%$ are trucks.

Highway 597 is a paved undivided provincial highway that connects the QEII and Highway 2A and provides access to the rural communities east of Blackfalds. The traffic volume on Highway 597 at the Highway 2A intersection is approximately 5,290 vehicles per day, of which approximately $11 \%$ are trucks. Highway 597 will eventually be twinned from Highway 2A to the CP rail bridge. However, the timing of Highway 597 twinning is unknown at present.
South Street is a two-lane local road with a posted speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ and is paved except for the segment between Broadway Avenue and East Railway Street which is graveled. South Street runs east-west and connects with Highway 597 to the west via Vista Trail.

The existing Highway 2A / 597 intersection is a four-legged intersection. A two-lane modern roundabout was recently constructed at this intersection. Highway 2A was widened to four lanes from Highway 597 to Broadway Avenue.
The existing Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue intersection is a three-legged intersection with two northbound through lanes. This intersection is currently controlled by a stop sign on Broadway Avenue with free flow conditions on Highway 2A. It is anticipated that Broadway Avenue will be realigned and intersect with the proposed east-west collector road when the proposed subdivision is developed.
The existing South Street / East Railway Street intersection is a three-legged intersection and is controlled by a stop sign on the east approach with free flow conditions in the north and west directions.
The Town of Blackfalds is planning to complete a Functional Design of Highway 2A from Highway 597 to South Street. It is unknown at present when the Town will commence the functional design.

### 1.3 ANALYSIS HORIZONS

Three analysis horizons were established in this study:
$\rightarrow 3$ year short term horizon (2018);
$\rightarrow 10$ year medium term horizon (2025), and
$\rightarrow 20$ year long term horizon (2035).


Figure 1A. Site Location


Figure 1B. Development Land Use


Figure 1C. Development Staging Plan

### 1.4 SCOPE OF WORK

The scope of this study includes the following:
$\rightarrow$ Determine current traffic operating conditions for the study intersections.
$\rightarrow$ Forecast background traffic volumes at the analysis horizons based on the average annual linear growth rate.
$\rightarrow$ Determine the number of new trips generated by the proposed development at each stage.
$\rightarrow$ Distribute the generated trips to different geographic areas (origins and destinations) that will be served by the development.
$\rightarrow$ Assign the generated trips to specific routes to and from the development.
$\rightarrow$ Forecast post development (combined) traffic volumes at the study intersections at the analysis horizons.
$\rightarrow$ Propose the appropriate lane configurations and traffic control (if needed) for the study intersections.
$\rightarrow$ Evaluate the traffic operating conditions at the study intersections at each analysis horizon.
$\rightarrow$ Conduct signal and illumination warrants based on Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) guidelines.
$\rightarrow$ Determine roadway, intersection, and access improvements required to provide acceptable levels of service (LOS) and safety.

### 1.5 METHODOLOGY

In order to meet the study objectives and accomplish the works stated above, the following methodology was used:
$\rightarrow$ Conduct AM and PM peak hour traffic counts at the Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue and South Street / East Railway Street intersections.
$\rightarrow$ Obtain traffic turning movement information at the Highway 2A / 597 intersection from Alberta Transportation (AT).
$\rightarrow$ Obtain historical traffic volumes on Highway 2A and Highway 597 adjacent to the study intersections from AT.
$\rightarrow$ Estimate current weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes for each turning movement at the study intersections.
$\rightarrow$ Estimate the trips generated by the proposed development based on ITE's Trip Generation Manual (9 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition).
$\rightarrow$ Conduct left and right tune lane warrant analyses based on the procedure provided in AT's Highway Geometric Design Guide.
$\rightarrow$ Analyze the delay, LOS and queue lengths of the study intersections at weekday AM and PM peak periods for the analysis horizon traffic using Synchro Studio 9 (Synchro) and SIDRA Intersection 6.1 (SIDRA) software.
$\rightarrow$ Identify any improvements necessary for the intersections to accommodate the forecasted traffic volumes.

## 2

## TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

This section analyzes the existing (2015), 3 year horizon (2018), 10 year horizon (2025), and the 20 year horizon (2035) traffic conditions for the study intersections. The background traffic volumes at the analysis horizons were determined by applying a linear traffic growth rate to the existing traffic volumes.

### 2.1 EXISTING TRAFFIC

WSP conducted AM and PM peak hour traffic counts from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on March 19 and July 9, 2015 at the Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue and South Street / East Railway Street intersections, respectively.
To estimate the existing (2015) traffic turning movements at the Highway 2A / 597 intersection, a $2.5 \%$ increase was applied to Alberta Transportation 2014 traffic volumes which are the latest available traffic data posted on their website at the time of this study.

Figure 3 shows the existing weekday AM and PM peak hour turning movement traffic volumes at the study intersections.

### 2.2 TRAFFIC GROWTH

The traffic growth history obtained from Alberta Transportation's website for Highway 2A and Highway 597 adjacent to the study intersections is summarized in Table 1. The complete file is attached in Appendix B.

Table 2. Historical Traffic Growth

| YEAR | HIGHWAY 2A NORTH of HWY 597 |  | HIGHWAY 597 WEST OF HWY 2A |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AADT | GROWTH | AADT | GROWTH |
| 2003 | 9,420 | - | 2,240 | - |
| 2004 | 9,910 | $5.2 \%$ | 2,560 | $14.3 \%$ |
| 2005 | 10,610 | $7.1 \%$ | 2,720 | $6.3 \%$ |
| 2006 | 11,250 | $6.0 \%$ | 2,900 | $6.6 \%$ |
| 2007 | 11,290 | $0.4 \%$ | 2,940 | $1.4 \%$ |
| 2008 | 11,070 | $-1.9 \%$ | 2,940 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 2009 | 10,800 | $-2.4 \%$ | 3,660 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 2010 | 10,990 | $1.8 \%$ | 3,730 | $1.9 \%$ |
| 2011 | 11,270 | $2.5 \%$ | 3,730 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 2012 | 12,620 | $12.0 \%$ | 4,620 | $23.9 \%$ |
| 2013 | 12,880 | $2.1 \%$ | 5,060 | $9.5 \%$ |
| 2014 | 13,100 | $1.7 \%$ | 5,160 | $2.0 \%$ |

Based on the historical traffic volumes on Highway 2A and Highway 597, Figure 2 illustrates the traffic growth trends including the linear AADT regression equations on the two highways in the vicinity of the study intersections. Using the regression equation, future traffic volumes on Highway 2A and Highway 597 were calculated and it was found that the future annual growth in traffic on Highway 2A is approximately $2.1 \%$ of the estimated 2015 volumes and the annual traffic growth on Highway 597 is approximately $5 \%$ of the 2015 traffic volumes.

In consulting with Alberta Transportation, the Ministry advised that the provincial average growth rate of $2.5 \%$ would be appropriate to estimate the future traffic for both Highway 2A and Highway 597. Therefore, in this study, a traffic growth rate of $2.5 \%$ was used to estimate the future traffic volumes on Highway 2A and Highway 597 at the 10 and 20 year horizons. A growth rate of $5 \%$ was used to estimate the 3 year horizon traffic volumes on Highway 597.


Figure 2. Traffic Growth Trends

### 2.3 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC

Background traffic (non-site traffic) is the traffic that exists without the addition of the trips generated by the proposed development.
Based on the anticipated traffic growth rates, the forecasted background traffic volumes in terms of weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic at the 3, 10 and 20 year horizons are presented in Figures 4 to 6.


Figure 3. Existing (2015) Traffic


Figure 4. 3 Year Horizon (2018) Background Traffic
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Figure 5. 10 Year Horizon (2025) Background Traffic


Figure 6. 20 Year Horizon (2035) Background Traffic

### 2.4 TRIP GENERATION

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual ( $9^{\text {th }}$ Edition) was used in this study to estimate the traffic generated by the proposed development.

The corresponding land uses in the ITE Trip Generation Manual that were used to estimate the traffic generated by the proposed developments are summarized in Table 3.
Table 3. Corresponding ITE Land Uses

| PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT | ITE LAND USE (CODE) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Food Anchored Shopping Centre | Supermarket (850) |
| Highway Commercial | N/A |
| Single-Family Housing | Single-Family Detached Housing (210) |
| Row Housing | Residential Condominium / Townhouse (230) |
| Multi-Family Housing | Mid-Rise Apartment (223) |
| Mixed Use Housing | Mid-Rise Apartment (223) |
|  |  |

It should be noted that Highway Commercial is not a specific land use, and is better defined as a zoning category. In other words, Highway Commercial is defined as a mixed use site and includes a wide variety of land uses such as restaurants, gas bars, truck stops, and hotels. The ITE Trip Generation Manual does not provide trip generation rates for Highway Commercial land use.
Bunt \& Associates Engineering Ltd. (Bunt) prepared a report for a C-TEP research project "Trip and Parking Generation Rates for Land Uses in Small Towns in Alberta" in 2005. In the report, Bunt recommended the AM and PM peak hour trip generation rates for Highway Commercial land use in Alberta. For the purpose of this study, the trip generation rates (AM: $2.56 / 1,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}, \mathrm{PM}: 4.21 / 1,000$ $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) recommended by Bunt were used to estimate the trips generated by the proposed highway commercial development. The trip directional distributions for Highway Commercial are based on the trip directional distribution rates for Shopping Center (Code: 820) in the ITE Trip Generation Manual.
The Mixed Use Live/Work housing land use combines living and working quarters for individuals who can live and work in the same building. The ground floor will be used for business purposes, such as office, retail, or service. For the purpose of this study, it was assumed that $60 \%$ of the ground area of the mixed use housing would be used for commercial. The trip generation rates for Shopping Center were used to estimate the traffic that would be generated by the mixed use housing commercial uses.
A Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.20 was used to calculate the Gross Floor Area (GFA) of the proposed food anchored shopping centre and commercial development.

### 2.4.1 THREE YEAR HORIZON

In accordance with the developer, Stages 1 and 2 will be completed within three years by the year 2018. The estimated traffic volumes generated by the proposed developments in the two stages are illustrated in Tables 4A to 4D. It is anticipated that the proposed Stages 1 and 2 developments would generate a total of approximately 13,535 daily trips, 582 AM peak hour trips, and 1,151 PM peak hour trips

Table 4A. Trip Generation - Food Anchored Shopping Centre (Stage 1)

| SUPERMARKET <br> GFA: 102,800 <br> $\mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |
|  | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Rate (Trips/1000 $\left.\mathrm{ft}^{2}\right) /$ <br> Regression Equation | 102.24 | 34.08 | 34.08 | 3.40 | 2.11 | 1.29 | Ln $(T)=0.74 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+3.25$ |  |  |
| Total Trips | 10510 | 5255 | 5255 | 350 | 217 | 133 | 795 | 405 | 390 |

*T=Vehicle Trips; X $=1000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ GFA.

Table 4B. $\quad$ Trip Generation - Highway Commercial (Stage 2)

| GFA: 65,400 ft ${ }^{2}$ | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |
| Directional Distribution | 100\% | 50\% | 50\% | 100\% | 62\% | 38\% | 100\% | 48\% | 52\% |
| Rate (Trips/1000 ft ${ }^{2}$ ) | 33.85 | 16.93 | 16.93 | 2.56 | 1.59 | 0.97 | 4.21 | 2.02 | 2.19 |
| Total Trips | 2214 | 1107 | 1107 | 167 | 104 | 64 | 275 | 132 | 143 |

Table 4C. $\quad$ Trip Generation - Row Housing (Stage 2)

| UNITS: 36 | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |
| Directional Distribution | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Regression Equations | $\operatorname{Ln}(T)=0.87 \operatorname{Ln}(X)+2.46$ |  | $\operatorname{Ln}(T)=0.80 \operatorname{Ln}(X)+0.26$ | $\operatorname{Ln}(T)=0.82 \operatorname{Ln}(X)+0.32$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Trips | 264 | 132 | 132 | 23 | 4 | 19 | 26 | 17 | 9 |

Table 4D. Trip Generation - Multi-Family Housing (Stage 2)

| UNITS: 140 | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |
| Directional Distribution | 100\% | 50\% | 50\% | 100\% | 31\% | 69\% | 100\% | 58\% | 42\% |
| Rate (Trips / Unit) | 3.90 | 1.95 | 1.95 | 0.30 | 0.09 | 0.21 | 0.39 | 0.23 | 0.16 |
| Total Trips | 546 | 273 | 273 | 42 | 13 | 29 | 55 | 32 | 23 |

### 2.4.2 FULL BUIDL OUT

The proposed Blackfalds Crossing ASP is anticipated to be fully built out by 2025. The estimated traffic volumes generated by the proposed development in stage 3 and 4 are illustrated in Tables 4E to 41 . It is assumed that the land at the northeast corner of the NE 22-39-27-W4 would be developed by 2025. The anticipated trips that would be generated by this land are summarized in Tables 4J and 4 K .

Table 4E. Trip Generation - Single Family Housing (Stage 3)

| UNITS: 88 | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Directional Distribution | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regression Equations | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.92 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+2.72$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{~T}=0.70(\mathrm{X})+9.74$ |  |  | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{~T})=0.90 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+0.51$ |  |
| Total Trips | 934 | 467 | 467 | 71 | 18 | 54 | 94 | 59 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*T=Vehicle Trips; X = Dwelling Units.
Table 4F. Trip Generation - Single Family Housing (Stage 4)

| UNITS: 80 | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |
| Directional Distribution | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Regression Equations | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.92 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+2.72$ |  | $\mathrm{~T}=0.70(\mathrm{X})+9.74$ |  | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{~T})=0.90 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+0.51$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Trips | 855 | 428 | 428 | 66 | 16 | 49 | 86 | 54 | 32 |

*T=Vehicle Trips; $\mathrm{X}=$ Dwelling Units.
Table 4G. Trip Generation - Row Housing (Stage 4)

| UNITS: 25 | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Directional Distribution | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regression Equations | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.87 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+2.46$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{~T})=0.80 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+0.26$ |  | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{~T})=0.82 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+0.32$ |
| Total Trips | 193 | 96 | 96 | 17 | 3 | 14 | 19 | 13 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4H. Trip Generation - Mixed Use Housing Residential (Stage 4)

| UNITS: 233 | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |
| Directional Distribution | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
| Rate (Trips / Unit) | 3.90 | 1.95 | 1.95 | 0.30 | 0.09 | 0.21 | 0.39 | 0.23 | 0.16 |
| Total Trips | 909 | 454 | 454 | 70 | 22 | 48 | 91 | 53 | 38 |

Table 4I. $\quad$ Trip Generation - Mixed Use Housing Commercial (Stage 4)

| GFA: $40,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |
| Directional Distribution | 100\% | 50\% | 50\% | 100\% | 62\% | 38\% | 100\% | 48\% | 52\% |
| Rate (Trips/1000 ft ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ ) | 42.70 | 21.35 | 21.35 | 0.96 | 0.60 | 0.36 | 3.71 | 1.78 | 1.93 |
| Total Trips | 1708 | 854 | 854 | 38 | 24 | 15 | 148 | 71 | 77 |

Table 4J. Trip Generation - Single Family Housing (Future Development)

| UNITS: 16 | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Directional Distribution | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regression Equations | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.92 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+2.72$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | T=0.70(X)+9.74 |  | Ln $(\mathrm{T})=0.90 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+0.51$ |
| Total Trips | 195 | 97 | 97 | 21 | 5 | 16 | 20 | 13 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4K. Trip Generation - Highway Commercial (Future Development)

| GFA: 63,200 ft ${ }^{2}$ | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |
| Directional Distribution | 100\% | 50\% | 50\% | 100\% | 62\% | 38\% | 100\% | 48\% | 52\% |
| Rate (Trips/1000 ft ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ ) | 33.85 | 16.93 | 16.93 | 2.56 | 1.59 | 0.97 | 4.21 | 2.02 | 2.19 |
| Total Trips | 2139 | 1070 | 1070 | 162 | 100 | 61 | 266 | 128 | 138 |

It is estimated that the proposed development would generate a total of approximately 20,470 daily trips, 1,027 AM peak hour trips, and 1,875 PM peak hour trips when the whole development area is fully built out.

### 2.4.3 INTERNAL AND PASS-BY TRIPS

Internal trips should be considered for a multi-use development. According to the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, a multi-use development is typically a single real-estate project that consists of two or more ITE land use classifications between which trips can be made without using the off-site road system. The internal trips can be made either by walking or by vehicles using internal roadways. In this study, the proposed development is deemed to be a multi-use development (residential, shopping centre, and highway commercial), thus to estimate the trips made on the external streets, the internal trips that are not made on the major street system should be deducted from the total trips. To account for the internal trips, the following internal capture rates were used. It should be noted that vehicles travelling from / to the residential development may stop by the commercial development. These internal pass-by trips were considered as internal trips for commercial development.
$\rightarrow$ Residential: 20\%
$\rightarrow$ Food Anchored Shopping Centre: 10\%
$\rightarrow$ Highway Commercial: 10\%
$\rightarrow$ Live/Work Housing Commercial development: 10\%
According to the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, pass-by trips are defined as the trips that are made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary trip destination without a route diversion. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on an adjacent street or roadway that offers direct access to the generator. Pass-by trips will not add new traffic to the adjacent street system. In this study, the proposed shopper centre and highway commercial developments will attract pass-by trips. In accordance with the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, an average $36 \%$ of the trips generated by supermarket are pass-by trips. In this study, it is assumed that $35 \%$ of the total trips generated by the commercial development will be pass-by trips. Table 5 summarizes the estimated new trips that will be generated by the proposed development at full build out.
Table 5. Trip Generation Summary

| DEVELOPMENT | WEEKDAY |  |  | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT |
| Residential (Blackfalds Crossing ASP) | 3701 | 1850 | 1850 | 289 | 76 | 213 | 370 | 228 | 143 |
| Commercial (Blackfalds Crossing ASP) | 14432 | 7216 | 7216 | 555 | 344 | 211 | 1219 | 609 | 610 |
| Total (Blackfalds Crossing ASP) | 18133 | 9066 | 9066 | 844 | 420 | 424 | 1589 | 837 | 752 |
| Residential (Future Development) | 195 | 97 | 97 | 21 | 5 | 16 | 20 | 13 | 7 |
| Commercial (Future Development) | 2139 | 1070 | 1070 | 162 | 100 | 61 | 266 | 128 | 138 |
| Total (Future Development) | 2334 | 1167 | 1167 | 183 | 106 | 77 | 286 | 140 | 146 |
| Total Trips | 20467 | 10233 | 10233 | 1027 | 526 | 501 | 1875 | 977 | 898 |
| Internal Trips | 2436 | 1218 | 1218 | 134 | 61 | 73 | 227 | 122 | 105 |
| External Trips | 18030 | 9015 | 9015 | 893 | 465 | 428 | 1649 | 855 | 793 |
| Pass-by Trips (35\% of Commercial) | 5220 | 2610 | 2610 | 226 | 140 | 86 | 468 | 232 | 236 |
| Non-Pass-by Trips | 12810 | 6405 | 6405 | 667 | 325 | 342 | 1181 | 623 | 558 |

## $2.5 \quad$ TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

Trip distributions for the proposed development were estimated based on the traffic turning movement patterns at the existing intersections on Highway 2A and the road network in the vicinity of the proposed development.

Figures 7A and 7B illustrate the estimated site generated trips at the 3 year horizon (Stages 1 and 2) and full build out, respectively. The detailed trip distribution and assignment for each land use are attached in Appendix B.

### 2.6 COMBINED TRAFFIC

Combined traffic volumes (post-development traffic) include both background traffic and the traffic generated by the proposed development. Combined traffic volumes for the study intersections at the 3, 10 and 20 year horizons are shown in Figures 8 to 10.

### 2.7 SHORTCUTTING TRAFFIC

The proposed north-south collector road on site will provide a new connection between South Street and Highway 597. Some traffic travelling from the Town may use the proposed collector road as a shortcutting route to access onto Highway 597. However, based on the surrounding road network in the vicinity of the proposed development, it is anticipated that the volume of shortcutting traffic would be relatively small and would not significantly impact the Highway 597 / South Access intersection. Therefore, the shortcutting traffic was not included in this study.
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Figure 7A. $\quad$ Site Traffic - Stages 1 and 2
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Figure 7B. Site Traffic - Full Build Out
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Figure 8. 3 Year Horizon (2018) Combined Traffic
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Figure 9. 10 Year Horizon (2025) Combined Traffic
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Figure 10. 20 Year Horizon (2035) Combined Traffic

## SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS

Signal warrant analyses were conducted for the proposed Highway 2A / East Access, Highway 597 / South Access, and South Street / East Railway Street intersections based on the forecasted traffic volumes.
The signal warrant analysis followed the procedure recommended in the Traffic Signal Warrant Handbook (2014) published by the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC). A value of 100 cumulative warrant points is considered the minimum value required to warrant a traffic signal. The warrant analysis files are attached in Appendix C, and the analysis results are outlined in Table 6.

Table 6. Signal Warrant Analysis

| INTERSECTION | SCENARIO | WARRANT <br> POINTS | SIGNALS? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue / <br> East-West Collector Road | Existing (2015) | 73 | Not Warranted |
|  | 2018 Background | 80 | Not Warranted |
|  | Stage 1 Combined | 170 | Nearly Warranted |
|  | 2018 Combined | 200 | Warranted |
|  | 2025 Combined | 317 | Warranted |
| Highway 597 / South Access | 2018 Combined | 21 | Not Warranted |
|  | 2025 Combined | 48 | Not Warranted |
|  | 2035 Combined | 58 | Not Warranted |
| South Street / East Railway Street | 2035 Combined | 13 | Not Warranted |

Table 6 reveals that traffic signals will be warranted at the intersection of Highway 2A and the proposed East-West Collector Road under the 3 year horizon traffic conditions. It should be noted that traffic signals will be warranted in 2016 when Stage 1 is built out.
Traffic signals will not be warranted at the Highway 597 / South Access and South Street / East Railway Street intersection up to the 20 year horizon under the projected post-development traffic conditions.
It should be noted that Highway 2A is under Alberta Transportation's jurisdiction and in accordance with Design Bulletin \#68/2010, Alberta Transportation may require that a roundabout feasibility assessment be conducted prior to installing traffic signals at the Highway 2A / East Access intersection.

The proposed East-West Collector Road intersection on Highway 2A will be located on a vertical sag curve with the gradient less than $4 \%$ in both northbound and southbound directions. In addition, there are no sight line constraints at this intersection. Therefore, a roundabout may be a feasible option for the proposed Highway 2A / East Access intersection. Based on the Technical Memo prepared by Stantec (Appendix A), traffic signals should be strongly considered as a more economical alternative
than a roundabout over the 20 year period and the Town of Blackfalds and Elkay / Spire wish to proceed with the construction of an upgraded signalized intersection.
Alberta Transportation indicated that they were prepared to consider the implementation of a signalized intersection at the Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue intersection on the condition that the Town of Blackfalds is responsible for constructing any future intersection improvements generated by developments, at the Town's cost and for addressing any operational concerns in a timely manner that may arise.
It is recommended that the right of way for a future roundabout at the Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue intersection should be protected as the surrounding lands are developed.

## 4

## INTERSECTION ANALYSIS

This section presents the intersection analysis procedures that are specified in Alberta Transportation's Highway Geometric Design Guide, and covers the left and right turn lane criteria that were used in this study. The proposed Highway 597 / South Access intersection will not warrant traffic signals. Left and right turn lane warrant analyses were conducted for this intersection to determine if auxiliary lanes are required.

### 4.1 LEFT TURN LANE WARRANT ANALYSIS

Left turn warrants are based on the level of probability that a vehicle in the advancing traffic stream will not arrive at an intersection when another vehicle, traveling in the same direction, is stopped waiting to make a left turn. The interference caused by standing left turning vehicles in the through advancing traffic lane can reduce capacity and create a safety hazard. The amount of interference is dependent on opposing volumes, advancing volumes, and the number of left turning vehicles. The addition of a left turn lane with the required storage space will minimize this interference.

The analysis of left turn manoeuvres at the proposed Highway 597 / South Access intersection is based on the forecasted combined traffic volumes.
Table 7 summarizes the AM and PM peak hour turning information for the eastbound traffic on Highway 597 at the proposed South Access intersection under the 3, 10, and 20 year horizon combined traffic conditions. The left turn lane warrant analysis for the Highway 597 / South Access intersection was based on a design speed of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

Table 7. Left Turn Lane Warrant Analysis - Highway 597 / South Access

| EB AM PEAK | ADVANCING | OPPOSING | LEFT TURNS | \% LEFT TURN | TRUCKS IN LT | WARRANTED? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2018 Combined | 272 | 273 | 30 | $11 \%$ | $10 \%$ | Yes, Type III |
| 2025 Combined | 306 | 318 | 46 | $15 \%$ | $10 \%$ | Yes, Type IV |
| 2035 Combined | 364 | 373 | 46 | $13 \%$ | $10 \%$ | Yes, Type IV |
| EB PM PEAK | ADVANCING | OPPOSING | LEFT TURNS | \% LEFT TURN | TRUCKS IN LT | WARRANTED? |
| 2018 Combined | 388 | 348 | 49 | $13 \%$ | $10 \%$ | Yes, Type IV |
| 2025 Combined | 451 | 433 | 92 | $20 \%$ | $10 \%$ | Yes, Type IV |
| 2035 Combined | 530 | 509 | 92 | $17 \%$ | $10 \%$ | Yes, Type IV |

Table 7 reveals that a Type IV left turn lane will be warranted at the Highway 597 / South Access intersection for the eastbound traffic under the 3 year horizon post-development traffic conditions. An additional 10 m storage length (total parallel deceleration lane length 65 m ) will be required to accommodate the forecasted 20 year horizon traffic. The existing raised median on Highway 597 will need to be removed to provide room for the proposed eastbound left turn lane.

### 4.2 RIGHT TURN LANE WARRANT ANALYSIS

According to Alberta Transportation's Highway Geometric Design Guide, the warrant for an exclusive right turn lane requires that all of the following conditions be met:
$\rightarrow$ Main (or through) road AADT $\geq 1800$,
$\rightarrow$ Intersecting road AADT $\geq 900$, and
$\rightarrow$ Right turn daily traffic volume $\geq 360$ for the movement in question.
Based on the forecasted traffic volumes, a westbound right turn lane will be warranted at the proposed Highway 597 / South Access intersection under the 3 year horizon post-development traffic conditions.
Based on the Highway 2A / 597 roundabout plan, the proposed right turn lane taper at the Highway 597 / South Access intersection will overlap the westbound two lanes to one lane merging taper located approximately 80 m east of the South Access on Highway 597. It is recommended that two through lanes be provided for the westbound traffic on Highway 597 between the Highway 2A / 597 roundabout and the existing two lanes approximately 200 m west of the proposed South Access.
The proposed Highway 597 / South Access intersection improvement concept plan is shown in Figure 11 and attached in Appendix C. The South Access intersection is located east and out of the two-lane to one-lane transition zone on Highway 597.
Alberta Transportation is requiring that two eastbound through lanes be provided at the South Access intersection up to the existing two lanes west of the Highway 2A / 597 roundabout to provide better safety and operational performance for the eastbound traffic. Alberta Transportation prefers the intersection improvement concept plan shown in Figure 12 and attached in Appendix C. Discussion on construction cost sharing with Alberta Transportation is anticipated to be required on the upgraded intersection improvement.


Figure 11. Proposed Intersection Improvement Concept Plan (South Access)


Figure 12.

## 5 <br> CAPACITY ANALYSIS

This section describes the method used for the capacity analysis and evaluates the operating level of service of the study intersections under the 3,10, and 20 year horizon traffic conditions.

### 5.1 METHODOLOGY

To determine the operating conditions of an intersection or roadway, the concept of level of service (LOS) is generally used. The LOS of an intersection is a qualitative measure of capacity and operating conditions and is directly related to vehicle delay. LOS is given a letter designation from A to F , with LOS A representing very short delays and LOS F representing very long delays.
For this study, WSP developed Synchro Studio 9 (Synchro) intersection simulation models for signal and stop controlled intersections. Synchro 9 implements the methods of the Highway Capacity Manual, 2010 (HCM 2010) and follows the LOS criteria that is listed in Table 8. For two-way stop controlled intersections, the delay is typically calculated for the movements at the minor approaches only, since the major roads are considered to be operating at free flow conditions.
To evaluate the traffic operational performance for a roundabout, SIDRA Intersection 6.1 (SIDRA) was used. SIDRA employs a combined geometry and gap-acceptance modelling approach in order to take into account the effect of roundabout geometry on driver behaviour directly through gapacceptance modelling. The LOS criteria for unsignalized intersections in Table 8 were used for assessing the traffic operational performance for a roundabout.

Table 8. Level of Service Criteria for Intersections (HCM 2010)

| SIGNALIZED | UNSIGNALIZED | LOS BY VOLUME-TO-CAPACITY RATIO |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CONTROL DELAY (s) | CONTROL DELAY $(\mathrm{s})$ | $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c} \leq 1.0$ | $\mathrm{~A} / c>1.0$ |
| $\leq 10$ | $\leq 10$ | A | F |
| $>10$ and $\leq 20$ | $>10$ and $\leq 15$ | B | F |
| $>20$ and $\leq 35$ | $>15$ and $\leq 25$ | C | F |
| $>35$ and $\leq 55$ | $>25$ and $\leq 35$ | D | F |
| $>55$ and $\leq 80$ | $>35$ and $\leq 50$ | F | F |
| $>80$ | $>50$ | F | F |

### 5.2 CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS

Traffic simulation models (Synchro and SIDRA) were created for the study intersections under the traffic conditions for each analysis horizon.
5.2.1 HIGHWAY 2A / HIGHWAY 597

The existing Highway 2A / 597 intersection is a four-legged intersection. A two-lane modern roundabout was recently constructed at this intersection.
Tables 9A to 9D summarize the anticipated traffic operational performance at the Highway 2A / 597 intersection under the analysis horizon traffic conditions when the two-lane modern roundabout is in operational. The detail SIDRA outputs are attached in Appendix D.

Table 9A. Capacity Analysis: Existing (2015) Traffic - Highway 2A / 597 (Roundabout)

| LANE | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | V/C | 95 <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Quelay <br> (s) | LOS | V/C | 95 <br> Length (m) |
| NBLT | 4.7 | A | 0.17 | 6.8 | 7.9 | A | 0.42 | 17.3 |
| NBTR | 4.2 | A | 0.17 | 6.7 | 7.2 | A | 0.42 | 17.8 |
| WBLT | 4.5 | A | 0.12 | 3.8 | 8.2 | A | 0.20 | 7.0 |
| WBTR | 3.9 | A | 0.12 | 3.7 | 6.5 | A | 0.20 | 7.5 |
| SBLT | 9.4 | A | 0.54 | 25.2 | 5.7 | A | 0.25 | 9.3 |
| SBTR | 8.6 | A | 0.54 | 25.9 | 5.3 | A | 0.25 | 9.6 |
| EBLT | 9.0 | A | 0.16 | 5.4 | 5.8 | A | 0.18 | 6.0 |
| EBTR | 7.7 | A | 0.23 | 8.8 | 5.3 | A | 0.18 | 6.5 |
| INT Summary | 7.5 | A | 0.54 | - | 6.6 | A | 0.42 | - |

Table 9B. Capacity Analysis: 2018 Combined Traffic - Highway 2A / 597 (Roundabout)

| LANE | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length (m) | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| NBLT | 5.2 | A | 0.21 | 8.7 | 9.6 | A | 0.49 | 22.5 |
| NBTR | 4.7 | A | 0.21 | 8.6 | 8.5 | A | 0.49 | 22.6 |
| WBLT | 5.0 | A | 0.14 | 4.6 | 9.9 | A | 0.26 | 9.4 |
| WBTR | 4.3 | A | 0.14 | 4.6 | 7.7 | A | 0.26 | 10.1 |
| SBLT | 11.5 | B | 0.62 | 35.2 | 6.6 | A | 0.31 | 12.0 |
| SBTR | 10.5 | B | 0.62 | 35.3 | 6.1 | A | 0.31 | 12.5 |
| EBLT | 11.2 | B | 0.23 | 8.1 | 6.9 | A | 0.25 | 8.7 |
| EBTR | 9.8 | A | 0.32 | 13.2 | 6.3 | A | 0.25 | 9.6 |
| INT Summary | 9.0 | A | 0.62 | - | 7.8 | A | 0.49 | - |

Table 9C. Capacity Analysis: 2025 Combined Traffic - Highway 2A / 597 (Roundabout)

| LANE | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length (m) | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | 95 <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| NBLT | 5.8 | A | 0.25 | 10.8 | 13.8 | B | 0.65 | 39.9 |
| NBTR | 5.2 | A | 0.25 | 10.7 | 12.1 | B | 0.65 | 40.6 |
| WBLT | 5.5 | A | 0.17 | 5.6 | 15.1 | B | 0.38 | 15.3 |
| WBTR | 4.7 | A | 0.17 | 5.5 | 11.2 | B | 0.38 | 16.9 |
| SBLT | 15.5 | C | 0.73 | 53.6 | 8.3 | A | 0.40 | 16.0 |
| SBTR | 14.0 | B | 0.73 | 54.4 | 7.5 | A | 0.40 | 16.8 |
| EBLT | 15.5 | C | 0.33 | 12.2 | 8.6 | A | 0.33 | 12.1 |
| EBTR | 15.3 | C | 0.49 | 24.3 | 7.9 | A | 0.33 | 13.8 |
| INT Summary | 11.9 | B | 0.73 | - | 10.8 | B | 0.65 | - |

Table 9D. Capacity Analysis: 2035 Combined Traffic - Highway 2A / 597 (Roundabout)

| LANE | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | 95 <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| NBLT | 6.7 | A | 0.31 | 14.1 | 23.5 | C | 0.82 | 70.2 |
| NBTR | 5.9 | A | 0.31 | 14.1 | 20.5 | C | 0.82 | 72.9 |
| WBLT | 6.3 | A | 0.21 | 7.3 | 27.8 | D | 0.58 | 26.8 |
| WBTR | 5.3 | A | 0.21 | 7.3 | 20.0 | C | 0.58 | 31.2 |
| SBLT | 27.8 | D | 0.88 | 102.8 | 10.5 | B | 0.50 | 23.6 |
| SBTR | 25.1 | D | 0.88 | 106.0 | 9.4 | A | 0.50 | 24.6 |
| EBLT | 28.3 | D | 0.52 | 22.1 | 11.4 | B | 0.43 | 17.9 |
| EBTR | 34.7 | D | 0.75 | 46.9 | 10.2 | B | 0.43 | 20.4 |
| INT Summary | 20.8 | C | 0.88 | - | 17.0 | C | 0.82 | - |

The capacity analysis results reveal that all traffic movements at the Highway 2A / 597 intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS C or better during both the AM and PM peak periods at the 10 year horizon and LOS D or better at the 20 year horizon under the post-development traffic conditions. The roundabout at the Highway 2A / 597 intersection will be capable of accommodating the forecasted post-development traffic.

### 5.2.2 HIGHWAY 2A / EAST-WEST COLLECTOR ROAD

Based on the signal warrant analysis results, the Highway 2A / East-west Collector Road intersection will warrant traffic signals at the 3 year horizon (2018) when Stage 1 and Stage 2 are fully built out.
Table 10A summarizes the current traffic operational performance at this intersection under the existing traffic conditions. Tables 10B to 10D summarize the traffic operational performance at the analysis horizons under the post-development traffic conditions when the intersection is under signal control. The detailed Synchro outputs are attached in Appendix D. The following intersection lane configurations are recommended when traffic signals are installed at this intersection:
$\rightarrow$ Eastbound: two left turn lanes and one right turn lane;
$\rightarrow$ Northbound: one left turn lane and two through lanes, and
$\rightarrow$ Southbound: two through lanes and one right turn lane.
Table 10A. Capacity Analysis: Existing Traffic - Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue (Stop Control)

| TRAFFIC <br> MOVEMENTS | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |  |
| EBL | 43.2 | E | 0.65 | 43.5 | 13.3 | B | 0.13 | 3.5 |  |
| NBL | 11.2 | B | 007 | 1.6 | 9.0 | A | 0.15 | 4.0 |  |
| INT Summary | 4.6 | A | 0.65 | - | 1.9 | A | 0.15 | - |  |

Table 10B. Capacity Analysis: 2018 Combined Traffic - Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road (Signal Control)

| TRAFFIC <br> MOVEMENTS | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |  |
| EBL,L | 20.8 | C | 0.13 | 6.6 | 17.4 | B | 0.29 | 13.5 |  |
| EBR | 9.5 | A | 0.56 | 14.9 | 7.1 | A | 0.38 | 11.3 |  |
| NBL | 5.8 | A | 0.24 | 6.8 | 7.0 | A | 0.47 | 18.4 |  |
| NBT,T | 4.3 | A | 0.15 | 10.2 | 5.8 | A | 0.38 | 28.0 |  |
| SBT,T | 15.2 | B | 0.69 | 91.7 | 15.1 | B | 0.53 | 27.8 |  |
| SBR | 3.3 | A | 0.14 | 7.4 | 4.5 | A | 0.29 | 8.9 |  |
| INT Summary | 12.0 | B | 0.69 | - | 9.1 | A | 0.53 | - |  |

Table 10C. Capacity Analysis: 2025 Combined Traffic - Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road (Signal Control)

| TRAFFIC <br> MOVEMENTS | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | 95 <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| EBL,L | 25.1 | C | 0.17 | 12.1 | 22.6 | C | 0.40 | 21.8 |
| EBR | 18.3 | B | 0.64 | 36.5 | 7.5 | A | 0.43 | 14.1 |
| NBL | 7.1 | A | 0.35 | 8.0 | 9.2 | A | 0.58 | 24.6 |
| NBT,T | 4.9 | A | 0.17 | 12.2 | 7.4 | A | 0.51 | 39.8 |
| SBT,T | 18.7 | B | 0.82 | 97.5 | 20.5 | C | 0.62 | 45.2 |
| SBR | 2.5 | A | 0.21 | 8.0 | 5.0 | A | 0.38 | 13.0 |
| INT Summary | 15.2 | B | 0.82 | - | 11.9 | B | 0.62 | - |

Table 10D. Capacity Analysis: 2035 Combined Traffic - Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road (Signal Control)

| TRAFFIC <br> MOVEMENTS | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| EBL,L | 32.6 | C | 0.21 | 14.3 | 23.4 | C | 0.41 | 22.3 |
| EBR | 27.0 | C | 0.74 | 51.2 | 7.8 | A | 0.44 | 14.4 |
| NBL | 7.9 | A | 0.35 | 10.7 | 12.8 | B | 0.66 | 32.4 |
| NBT,T | 4.0 | A | 0.19 | 13.0 | 8.5 | A | 0.63 | 52.1 |
| SBT,T | 20.9 | C | 0.88 | 138.3 | 20.9 | C | 0.70 | 52.8 |
| SBR | 2.0 | A | 0.19 | 7.4 | 4.3 | A | 0.36 | 12.0 |
| INT Summary | 17.6 | B | 0.88 | - | 12.9 | B | 0.70 | - |

The above capacity analysis results reveal that the existing eastbound traffic movements on Broadway Avenue currently operate at LOS E during the AM peak hours. When the proposed Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road intersection is under signal control, all traffic movements at this intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS C or better during both the AM and PM peak periods up to the 20 year horizon. The proposed intersection lane configurations will be capable of accommodating the forecasted post-development traffic.
As previously stated in Section 3, Alberta Transportation requires that a roundabout feasibility assessment be conducted prior to installing traffic signals at an intersection on provincial highways. A two-lane roundabout concept plan was developed for illustrative purposes and attached in Appendix C.

Tables 10E to 10G summarize the anticipated traffic operational performance at the Highway 2A / East Access intersection under the analysis horizon traffic conditions when the proposed roundabout is constructed.

Table 10E. Capacity Analysis: 2018 Combined Traffic - Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road (Roundabout)

| LANE | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | 95 <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Quelay <br> (s) | LOS | V/C | 95 <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |  |
| NBLT | 3.8 | A | 0.14 | 5.6 | 7.7 | A | 0.46 | 23.2 |  |
| NBT | 3.6 | A | 0.14 | 5.8 | 7.2 | A | 0.46 | 24.0 |  |
| SBT | 7.1 | A | 0.46 | 22.1 | 6.1 | A | 0.29 | 11.9 |  |
| SBTR | 6.6 | A | 0.46 | 22.2 | 5.6 | A | 0.29 | 12.2 |  |
| EBL | 7.9 | A | 0.11 | 3.1 | 4.7 | A | 0.17 | 5.6 |  |
| EBR | 6.9 | A | 0.27 | 9.0 | 5.4 | A | 0.17 | 5.5 |  |
| INT Summary | 6.3 | A | 0.46 | - | 6.6 | A | 0.46 | - |  |

Table 10F. Capacity Analysis: 2025 Combined Traffic - Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road (Roundabout)

| LANE | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| NBLT | 4.3 | A | 0.18 | 7.2 | 10.9 | B | 0.60 | 36.1 |
| NBT | 4.1 | A | 0.18 | 7.5 | 10.1 | B | 0.60 | 36.8 |
| SBT | 8.9 | A | 0.56 | 31.8 | 7.7 | A | 0.39 | 18.3 |
| SBTR | 8.2 | A | 0.56 | 32.1 | 7.1 | A | 0.39 | 19.0 |
| EBL | 9.4 | A | 0.20 | 6.0 | 6.0 | A | 0.25 | 9.3 |
| EBR | 9.0 | A | 0.36 | 13.9 | 6.7 | A | 0.24 | 8.1 |
| INT Summary | 7.8 | A | 0.56 | - | 8.8 | A | 0.60 | - |

Table 10G. Capacity Analysis: 2035 Combined Traffic - Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road (Roundabout)

| LANE | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | 95 <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |  |
| NBLT | 4.6 | A | 0.21 | 9.0 | 14.2 | B | 0.71 | 57.8 |  |
| NBT | 4.3 | A | 0.21 | 9.3 | 13.1 | B | 0.71 | 58.3 |  |
| SBT | 11.4 | B | 0.67 | 46.8 | 8.9 | A | 0.46 | 23.5 |  |
| SBTR | 10.4 | B | 0.67 | 47.0 | 8.1 | A | 0.46 | 24.5 |  |
| EBL | 11.6 | B | 0.23 | 7.6 | 6.7 | A | 0.28 | 10.3 |  |
| EBR | 11.6 | B | 0.43 | 18.3 | 7.7 | A | 0.26 | 9.1 |  |
| INT Summary | 9.7 | A | 0.67 | - | 11.0 | B | 0.71 | - |  |

The roundabout capacity analysis results reveal that all traffic movements will operate at an acceptable LOS B or better during both the AM and PM peak periods up to the 20 year horizon if a roundabout is constructed at the Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road intersection.The proposed roundabout will be capable of accommodating the forecasted post-development traffic.

### 5.2.3 HIGHWAY 597 / SOUTH ACCESS

Tables 11A to 11C summarize the traffic operational performance at this intersection under the analysis horizon traffic conditions. The detailed Synchro outputs are attached in Appendix D.

Table 11A. Capacity Analysis: 2018 Combined Traffic - Highway 597 / South Access

| TRAFFIC <br> MOVEMENTS | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| EBL | 7.9 | A | 0.03 | 0.6 | 8.1 | A | 0.04 | 1.1 |
| SBLR | 11.6 | B | 0.20 | 3.3 | 13.9 | B | 0.22 | 6.2 |
| INT Summary | 1.8 | A | 0.20 | - | 2.2 | A | 0.22 | - |

Table 11B. Capacity Analysis: 2025 Combined Traffic - Highway 597 / South Access

| TRAFFIC <br> MOVEMENTS | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| EBL | 8.0 | A | 0.04 | 1.0 | 8.3 | A | 0.08 | 2.4 |
| SBLR | 14.2 | B | 0.31 | 9.8 | 21.9 | C | 0.51 | 21.7 |
| INT Summary | 3.3 | A | 0.31 | - | 4.7 | A | 0.51 | - |

Table 11C. Capacity Analysis: 2035 Combined Traffic - Highway 597 / South Access

| TRAFFIC <br> MOVEMENTS | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> (s) | LOS | $V / C$ | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | $V / C$ | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |  |
| EBL | 8.1 | A | 0.04 | 1.1 | 8.5 | A | 0.09 | 2.5 |  |
| SBLR | 15.9 | C | 0.34 | 11.5 | 28.2 | D | 0.59 | 28.3 |  |
| INT Summary | 3.2 | A | 0.34 | - | 5.1 | A | 0.59 | - |  |

The capacity analysis results reveal that all traffic movements at the Highway 597 / South Access intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during both the AM and PM peak periods at the 10 and 20 year horizons under the post-development traffic conditions. The proposed intersection treatment is expected to be capable of accommodating the forecasted future traffic volumes.

### 5.2.4 SOUTH STREET / EAST RAILWAY STREET

The existing South Street / East Railway Street intersection is a three-legged intersection and is controlled by one stop sign on the east approach with free flow conditions in the north and west directions. This intersection is proposed to become a four-legged intersection with the proposed N-S Collector Road forming the south leg. It is recommended that an additional stop sign be installed on the west approach when the proposed N-S Collector Road is constructed. No auxiliary lane (i.e., left or right turn lane) is recommended for this intersection.

Tables 12A to 12C summarize the traffic operational performance at this intersection under the analysis horizon traffic conditions with the proposed intersection control type. The detailed Synchro outputs are attached in Appendix D.

Table 12A. Capacity Analysis: 2018 Combined Traffic - South Street / East Railway Street

| TRAFFIC <br> MOVEMENTS | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| EBLTR | 10.1 | B | 0.12 | 3.1 | 12.1 | B | 0.37 | 12.7 |
| WBLTR | 10.4 | B | 0.02 | 0.4 | 10.1 | B | 0.01 | 0.2 |
| NBL | 7.6 | A | 0.01 | 0.3 | 7.5 | A | 0.03 | 0.7 |
| SBL | 7.2 | A | 0.00 | 0.0 | 7.3 | A | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| INT Summary | 3.7 | A | 0.12 | - | 8.7 | A | 0.37 | - |

Table 12B. Capacity Analysis: 2025 Combined Traffic - South Street / East Railway Street

| TRAFFIC <br> MOVEMENTS | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| EBLTR | 10.3 | B | 0.14 | 3.8 | 13.9 | C | 0.44 | 17.1 |
| WBLTR | 10.8 | B | 0.02 | 0.4 | 10.7 | B | 0.01 | 0.2 |
| NBL | 7.7 | A | 0.03 | 0.6 | 7.5 | A | 0.05 | 1.1 |
| SBL | 7.3 | A | 0.00 | 0.0 | 7.3 | A | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| INT Summary | 4.0 | A | 0.14 | - | 9.3 | A | 0.44 | - |

Table 12C. Capacity Analysis: 2035 Combined Traffic - South Street / East Railway Street

| TRAFFIC <br> MOVEMENTS | AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ | Delay <br> $(\mathrm{s})$ | LOS | V/C | $95^{\text {th }}$ Queue <br> Length $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| EBLTR | 10.3 | B | 0.14 | 3.8 | 13.9 | C | 0.44 | 17.1 |
| WBLTR | 10.8 | B | 0.02 | 0.4 | 10.7 | B | 0.01 | 0.2 |
| NBL | 7.7 | A | 0.03 | 0.6 | 7.5 | A | 0.05 | 1.1 |
| SBL | 7.3 | A | 0.00 | 0.0 | 7.3 | A | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| INT Summary | 4.0 | A | 0.14 | - | 9.3 | A | 0.44 | - |

The above capacity analysis results reveal that all traffic movements at the South Street / East Railway Street intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS C or better during both the AM and PM peak periods at the 20 year horizon. The proposed intersection control type and lane configurations will be capable of accommodating the forecasted post-development traffic. South Street will operate at acceptable level of services with the existing two-lane cross section up to the 20 year horizon.

## ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

This section is intended as a general overview of a number of site aspects. Some additional issues have been identified for consideration.
6.1 SIGHT DISTANCE

The intersection sight distances along Highway 2A and Highway 597 at the study intersections were checked utilizing Alberta Transportation's TIMS based on the sight distance requirements in Alberta Transportation's Geometric Design Guide. The sight distances are adequate at the study intersections.

### 6.2 OPERATIOANL ANALYSIS

The proposed realigned Broadway Avenue intersection on the East-West Collector Road will be located approximate 100 m (center line to center line) west of Highway 2A. The stacking distance between the Broadway Avenue / East-West Collector Road and Highway 2A / East-West Collector intersection is more than 50 m which is adequate to accommodate two 25 m long WB- 23 vehicles.

The East-West Collector Road and Broadway Avenue intersection will be controlled by one stop sign on Broadway Avenue with free flow conditions on the East-West Collector Road. Therefore, no vehicle queue is expected to occur for the westbound traffic on the East-West Collector Road at the Broadway Avenue / East-West Collector Road intersection. As such, westbound traffic on the EastWest Collector Road will not spill onto Highway 2A.

### 6.3 PEDESTRIANS AND ILLUMINATION

Currently there are no pedestrian facilities (e.g., sidewalks or trails) provided along Highway 2A or in the vicinity of the Broadway Avenue intersection. If the Town wants to provide pedestrian facilities in the future, pedestrian traffic will be accommodated by providing marked crosswalks and pedestrian signals at the proposed signalized intersection.
Lighting is currently provided at the Highway 2A / Highway 597, Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue, and South Street / East Railway Street intersections. The Highway 597 / South Access intersection was evaluated for illumination requirements based on the latest revision of the Transportation Association of Canada's (TAC) Guide for the Design of Roadway Lighting. The following factors were evaluated:

- Geometric - geometric features of the intersection and associated roadways.
- Operational - present and proposed AADT, roadway classification and operating speeds on all connecting legs.
- Environmental - proximity to other lighted developments within the area.
- Collision - night-time highway collision history in the area that may be attributed to lack of illumination.
Based on the TAC requirements, delineation lighting will be warranted at the Highway 597 / South Access intersection. The illumination warrant analysis can be found in Appendix C.


## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has examined the traffic impacts associated with the proposed residential and commercial development located within the southern limits of the Town of Blackfalds. The conclusions and recommendations are summarized below:
HIGHWAY 2 A / HIGHWAY 597
$\rightarrow$ All traffic movements at the Highway 2A / Highway 597 intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS C or better during both the AM and PM peak periods at the 10 year horizon and LOS D or better at the 20 year horizon under the post-development traffic conditions. The roundabout at the Highway 2A / Highway 597 intersection will be capable of accommodating the forecasted post-development traffic.

## HIGHWAY 2A / BROADWAY AVENUE / EAST-WEST COLLECTOR ROAD

$\rightarrow$ The eastbound traffic movements on Broadway Avenue currently operate at LOS E during the AM peak hours at the existing Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue intersection.
$\rightarrow$ Traffic signals will be warranted at the proposed Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road intersection in 2016 when Stage 1 is built out.
$\rightarrow$ The following intersection lane configurations are recommended when traffic signals are installed at this intersection:

- Eastbound: two left turn lanes and one right turn lane;
- Northbound: one left turn lane and two through lanes, and
- Southbound: two through lanes and one right turn lane.
$\rightarrow$ When the proposed Highway 2A / East-West Collector Road intersection is under signal control, all traffic movements will operate at an acceptable LOS C or better during both the AM and PM peak periods up to the 20 year horizon. The proposed intersection lane configurations will be capable of accommodating the forecasted post-development traffic.
$\rightarrow$ To improve the traffic operational performance at this intersection up to the 20-year horizon, traffic signals are proposed to be installed at the same time as the geometric improvements to an all-directional intersection. As the upgraded intersection nears capacity, the feasibility of a roundabout should be assessed at that time; however, the right of way for a future roundabout should be protected as the surrounding lands are developed. A roundabout concept plan was developed for this intersection and attached in Appendix C.


## HIGHWAY 597 / SOUTH ACCESS

$\rightarrow$ A Type IV left turn lane will be warranted for eastbound traffic under the 3 year horizon postdevelopment traffic conditions. An additional 10 m storage length (total parallel deceleration lane length 65 m ) will be required to accommodate the forecasted 20 year horizon traffic. The existing raised median on Highway 597 will need to be removed to provide room for the proposed eastbound left turn lane.
$\rightarrow$ It is recommended that two through lanes be provided for the westbound traffic on Highway 597 between the Highway 2A / 597 roundabout and the existing two lanes approximately 200 m west of the proposed South Access. One eastbound through lane is expected to be capable of accommodating the forecasted post-development traffic. The proposed South

Access intersection is located east of and out of the eastbound two-lane to one-lane transition zone on Highway 597.
$\rightarrow$ Alberta Transportation is requiring that two eastbound through lanes be provided at the South Access intersection up to the existing two lanes west of the Highway 2A / 597 roundabout to provide better safety and operational performance for the eastbound traffic. Alberta Transportation's requested intersection improvement concept plan is shown in Figure 12 and attached in Appendix C. Construction cost sharing with Alberta Transportation is anticipated to be required regarding these upgraded intersection improvements.
$\rightarrow$ All traffic movements at the Highway 597 / South Access intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during both the AM and PM peak periods at the 10 and 20 year horizons under the post-development traffic conditions.
$\rightarrow$ The intersection sight distances along Highway 597 at the South Access intersection appear to be adequate.
$\rightarrow$ Signals will not be warranted at this intersection up to the 20 year horizon.
$\rightarrow$ Delineation lighting will be warranted at the Highway 597 / South Access intersection.

## SOUTH STREET / EAST RAILWAY STREET

$\rightarrow$ This intersection will become a four-legged intersection with the proposed N-S Collector Road forming the south leg. It is recommended that an additional stop sign be installed on the west approach when the proposed North-South Collector Road is constructed. No auxiliary lane (i.e., left or right turn lane) is recommended for this intersection.
$\rightarrow$ All traffic movements at the South Street / East Railway Street intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS C or better during both the AM and PM peak periods at the 20 year horizon. The proposed intersection control type and lane configurations will be capable of accommodating the forecasted post-development traffic. South Street will operate at acceptable level of services with the existing two-lane cross section up to the 20 year horizon.

## CLOSURE

This report has been prepared by WSP based on the best information available at the time for the exclusive use of Elkay Developments Ltd. and Spire General Partner Ltd. Use by third parties, without the express written permission of WSP Canada Inc., is not permitted.

# Appendix A 

## PROJECT INFORMATION

- Proposed Site Plan
- Highway 2A / 597 Roundabout Plan
- AT's Comments
- Stantec Roundabout \& Traffic Signals Life Cost Analysis



Office of the Operations Manager
Central Region
\#401, 4920-51 Street
Red Deer, Alberta

Telephone 403/340-5166
Fax 403/340-4876

September $27^{\text {th }}, 2016$
File: Blackfalds (ASP)

Town of Blackfalds
Box 220, 5018 Waghorn St
Blackfalds, AB TOM OJO
Sent via email to: MThompson@blackfalds.com
Attention: Myron Thompson, Chief Administrative Officer

## RE: STANTEC TECHNICAL MEMO - REVIEW OF ROUNDABOUT \& TRAFFIC SIGNALS NE 22-39-27-W4 (ELKAY DEVELOPMENTS) HIGHWAY 2A \& BROADWAY AVENUE, BLACKFALDS CROSSING

Thank you for the technical memo and updated Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) comparing signalized intersection and roundabout treatment options at the Highway 2A \& Broadway Avenue intersection.

We have reviewed the technical memo and in deciding between traditional traffic signals and a roundabout, we have considered the site-specific characteristics of this intersection, and given the life cycle costs of both are comparable, we prefer the roundabout option that offers lower collision costs, lower greenhouse gas cost, and better passenger and truck reliability (reduction in delays and improvements in traffic flow).

The LCCA clearly demonstrates the lower initial capital costs of traditional signals are offset by higher future collision costs. Within the context of similar overall life cycle costs, although our preference is to select the solution with the lower collision costs, we recognize the importance of the development to the Town of Blackfalds and we are prepared to consider the implementation of a signalized intersection at Highway 2A \& Broadway Avenue on the condition that the Town of Blackfalds is responsible for constructing any future intersection improvements generated by developments, at the Town's cost and for addressing any operational concerns in a timely manner that may arise.

If the Town is amenable to accepting responsibility for all future Highway 2A and Broadway Avenue intersection improvements (which may include future twinning of Highway 2A to ensure adjacent intersections do not conflict) and operational issues, WSP is to incorporate the recommendation contained in Stantec's Technical Memo into a revised Traffic Impact Assessment for Alberta Transportation's acceptance.

If you have any questions, please contact me or Sandy Choi at 403-340-5166.
Sincerely,


Mike Baik
Operations Manager
SC/sc

## cc: Stantec - Brad.VanderHeyden@stantec.com Preston Weran - pweran@blackfalds.com Russ Watts - Russell.Watts@gov.ab.ca

Office of the Operations Manager Central Region
\#401, 4920-51 Street
Red Deer, Alberta

Telephone 403/340-5166
Fax 403/340-4876

[^0]
## Technical Memorandum

| To: | Stuart Richardson | From: | Brad Vander Heyden <br> Alberta Transportation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| File: | $113928147-346$ | Date: | Stantec Consulting Ltd. |

## Reference: Proposed Broadway Avenue Intersection Upgrades - Life Cycle Cost Analysis Review of Roundabout \& Traffic Signals

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On June 15, 2016, Elkay Developments, the Town of Blackfalds, WSP, and Stantec met with Alberta Transportation to discuss the options of upgrading the Highway 2A and Broadway Avenue intersection as two potential improvements - a signalized intersection as well as a roundabout. At that meeting, a preliminary copy of the Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) was provided for discussion purposes. At the conclusion of the meeting, Alberta Transportation was understanding of the subjectivity of the comparison and open-minded to resubmitting the LCCA with supporting information for their decision making process.

On behalf of the Town of Blackfalds and Elkay Developments, Stantec and WSP have collaborated on the preparation of this updated LCCA to serve our respective clients in a united manner and we are pleased to submit it to you accordingly. The LCCA, was developed using the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Life Cycle Cost Estimation Tool. The NCHRP tool compares the long term costs of constructing an upgraded signalized intersection to the costs of a roundabout intersection.

In general, roundabouts have historically been demonstrated to typically function safer and more efficiently than traffic signals, but in most cases, roundabouts cost considerably more for this type of highway project. In completing our review, we have made effort to remain technically-neutral to the pros and cons of each alternative to ensure that a design alternative solution is chosen to meet the satisfactory requirements of all stakeholders involved.

The LCCA was completed to compare the 20 year life cycle costs of the two alternatives (traffic signals and roundabout improvements), to each other as well as the base alternative scenario of "do nothing". In addition to the costs of construction, the LCCA also factors in the costs of passenger time, truck time, and safety (i.e. cost of collisions). It should be noted that these costs are very subjective and as such, they should be well supported with supplementary information

The benefit-cost ratio, shown on the summary sheet, is relative to the base case only (no development and no improvements) and in our opinion, should not be taken into consideration in comparing the signals and the roundabout alternatives. The formulas that calculate the benefit-cost ratio also seems to be significantly skewed and don't compare the life cycle costs of the signals and the roundabout directly to each other.

### 2.0 LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS - CRITERIA INPUT

The following items were reviewed in chronological order with WSP's draft document and updated in the spreadsheet for comparative discussion:

September 21, 2016
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## Reference: Proposed Broadway Avenue Intersection Upgrades

### 2.1 Cost Parameters

The Alberta Transportation Project Benefit Cost Model User Guide (April 8, 2015) has identified the following collision costs.

Table 3.1 - Accident Costs, by Type

| Accident Type | Stantec |
| :--- | ---: |
| Fatality | $\$ 9,464,015$ |
| Injury | $\$ 66,744$ |
| Property Damage Only | $\$ 5,851$ |

It should be noted that Greenhouse Gas costs have not been included. Example case studies provided by the NCHRP that have included them have generally shown that the associated costs are very small relative to the overall cost and are not typically relevant in comparison.

Alberta Transportation uses as discount rate of $4 \%$.
The demand and travel delays were based on the numbers provided by WSP are consistent with numbers used in the Alberta Transportation Project Benefit Cost Model User Guide (April 8, 2015).

### 2.2 Demand Parameters

The traffic demand parameters are based off of the Traffic Impact Assessment completed by WSP. As shown in the TIA, the signalized intersection will operate at an acceptable level of service beyond the standard 20 year design horizon.

### 2.3 Cost Base Inputs (Base Case, Alternative 1 - Signals, and Alternative 2 - Roundabout)

The Base Case is be a "do nothing" scenario, which is not an option to the Town and the Developer. Inherently, no development would mean no new upfront construction and design costs.

Table 3.2 - Costs of Construction and Professional Services

| Direct Costs | Base Case | Alt 1 - Signals | Alt 2 - Roundabout |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning <br> and Design | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 200,000$ | $\$ 300,000$ |
| Construction <br> (Total) | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 1,600,000$ | $\$ 4,000,000$ |
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### 2.4 Collision Projections

Perhaps the most challenging and subjective component of the analysis is the Safety costs, which are based on the number of fatal, injury only, and property damage only (PDO) collision types in the model. These are difficult to predict and they can vary substantially between model methodologies, Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) intersection types, posted speed limits, climate conditions, and unique site considerations. Rather than basing the estimated future collisions on models, we have taken a conservative approach of reviewing past collision history along the Highway 597 and Highway 2A corridors and inflating them quite conservatively to reflect future traffic growth. The data, which is discussed further below, was provided by the RCMP to the Town for information purposes. The projected collisions for the roundabout alternative were developed by WSP using the Collision Prediction Models for British Columbia in conjunction with the traffic volumes as per the TIA.

Table 3.3 - Projected Annual Collision Rates in Stantec Model

| Collision <br> Yype | Base Case | Alt 1-Signals | Alt 2-Roundabout |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fatality | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.0 |
| Injury | 0.67 | 0.109 | 0.26 |
| PDO | 2.7 | 11 | 2.43 |

As shown in Table 3.4 below, there were 13 non-fatal collisions over a weighted 5 year period at the 5 intersections on Highways 2A and 597 in the Town limits, which averages 0.104 non-fatal collisions per year. Four of the five intersections used in the historical assessment are four legged intersections. The Broadway Avenue intersection is a tee intersection, which has less conflict points and lower collision rates than four legged intersections as illustrated in the TAC images below.

Figure 3.0 - Conflict Points and Collision Rates of Three and Four-Leg Intersections



Design with community in mind
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* Image from Transportation of Canada Design Guide for Canadian Roads

The current AADT for Highway 2A north of Highway 597 is approximately 12,910. At an annual increase of $2.5 \%$, it will reach approximately 21,150 in 2035 . On average over the 20 year timespan, it is reasonable to increase the collision rate by a factor of 1.5 for the traffic volume increase and multiply the collision rate per year by a factor of 0.70 for a three legged intersection. Stantec has modeled the collision rate as follows:

$$
\text { Collision rate }=(0.104 \text { collisions } / \text { year }) \times(0.70) \times 1.5=0.109
$$

Over the 6 year period (weighted to 5 years), there was one fatality among the five signalized intersections, which results in an average of 0.04 fatalities per year. The fatality was at the signalized intersection of Highway 2A and Highway 597, which at the time, had a posted speed limit of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$. The posted speed limit at the proposed signalized intersection locations would only be $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$, which would have a much lower rate of fatality. For conservation reasons, the LCCA has maintained the 0.04 fatalities per intersection per year and has not reduced it for the reduction in conflict points of a tee intersection in comparison to a four-legged intersection.

Table 3.4 -Fatal \& Non-Fatal Collision History at Signalized Intersections Since 2010

| Signalized <br> Intersections | Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Highway 597 and <br> Vista Trail |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Highway 597 and <br> Highway 2A | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | $22^{\text {a }}$ | $44^{\text {b }}$ |
| Highway 2A and <br> Park Street |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Highway 2A and <br> Panorama Drive / <br> Gregg Street |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Highway 2A and <br> Cottonwood Drive | Not signalized until 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |

a) One of the two collisions in 2014 at the Highway 2A and Highway 597 intersection resulted in a fatality.
b) 2015 was the first full year that the roundabout was open

As shown in Table 3.5 below, there were zero fatal collisions and 4 non-fatal collisions among the 6 unsignalized intersections over the 6 year period. Two of them were at Broadway Avenue, and as such Stantec is proposing to use a collision rate of 0.67 ( 2 collisions / 6 years $\times$ 2.0 Conservation Factor) for the unsignalized intersection.
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Table 3.5 - Collision History at Unsignalized Intersections (No fatalities)

| Unsignalized <br> Intersections | Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Highway 2A and <br> Broadway Avenue |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Highway 2A and <br> South Street |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Highway 2A and <br> Indiana Street (RIRO) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highway 2A and <br> Cottonwood Drive |  |  |  |  | Signalized in 2013 |  |
| Highway 2A and TWP <br> Rd 40-0 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |

The property damage only (PDO) projection developed by Stantec was based on the 2015 PDO data provided by the RCMP to the Town. To be conservative in the modeling, the rate was multiplied by a Factor of 2 based on the charts in the TAC collision rates and the projected AADT. The rate was developed as follows:

PDO Collision Rate $=[(8$ collisions) $/(0.5$ years) $/ 3$ Intersections] $\times 2=10.6$ (Rounded up to 11)

### 3.0 CONCLUSION AND OTHER ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

Using the information entered above, which is highly conservative in the professional judgment of Stantec and WSP, the signalized intersections and the roundabout alternatives have 20 year life cycle costs of approximately $\$ 6.0$ Million and $\$ 6.1$ Million, respectively. Therefore, the traffic signals option should be strongly considered as a more economical alternative than a roundabout over the 20 year period. The additional $\boldsymbol{\$} \mathbf{2} .5 \mathrm{M}$ construction value of the roundabout alternative over the signals is not considered economically viable to the Development, which is only approximately 90 acres in size, and development cannot proceed at this time if a roundabout will be required.

In addition, we would like Alberta Transportation to consider the additional economic benefits that will be realized by society if the development is able to proceed:

1. The construction of the servicing works for the first phase will provide jobs, income and additional tax revenue to the community and the province (approximately $\$ 3.5$ million for construction of the servicing works for phase 1).
2. The construction of commercial buildings for the first phase will provide jobs, income and additional tax revenue to the community and the province (approximately $\$ 15$ million for construction of approximately $80,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . of commercial/retail space).
3. Upon buildout the first phase commercial development will generate approximately $\$ 180,000$ to $\$ 200,000$ in tax revenue.
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4. The completion of the first phase will be the catalyst to future phases (approximately 320 residential units and 10 additional acres of commercial land plus acres of Municipal Reserve).
5. Blackfalds requires additional retail services and conveniences which Blackfalds Crossing will provide.

It should also be noted that the "Do Nothing" scenario of no improvements to the Broadway Avenue intersection is the least favorable for public safety costs.

In summary, the Town of Blackfalds and Elkay Developments wish to proceed with the construction of an upgraded signalized intersection. We trust that this technical memo will meet your requirements, but if you have any questions or comments, we welcome the opportunity to discuss further to assist in moving this exciting project forward.

Sincerely,

## STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.



Brad Vander Heyden, P.Eng.
Associate
Phone: 403-341-3320
Fax: 403-342-0969
brad.vanderheyden@stantec.com
Attachment: Model Summary
c. Town of Blackfalds, Elkay Developments, WSP

## LIMITATIONS

The recommendations provided in this document are based strictly on the historical data that was provided to Stantec as well as the criteria shown in Alberta Transportation's Project Benefit Cost Model User Guide (April 8, 2015). The projected costs for safety are highly subjective and vary depending on the modeling techniques and other considerations that would need to be taken into account at the detailed design level.
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THIS ASSESSMENT WAS COMPLETED WITH THE INTENT OF COMPARING THE SIGNALS AND ROUNDABOUT ALTERNATIVES TO
EACHOTHER AND THEREFORE

## A COMPARISON TO THE BASE

 CASE (NO DEVELOPMENT) SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED\#401, 4920-51 Street
Red Deer, Alberta

March $16^{\text {th }}, 2016$
File: Blackfalds (ASP)

Town of Blackfalds<br>Box 220<br>5018 Waghorn St<br>Blackfalds, AB TOM OJO<br>Sent via email to: PWeran@blackfalds.com<br>Attention: Preston Weran, Director of Infrastructure and Property Services

## RE: PROPOSED BLACKFALDS CROSSING TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT (TIA) NE 22-39-27-W4 (ELKAY DEVELOPMENTS) HIGHWAYS 2A \& 597, BLACKFALDS CROSSING

Our department has reviewed the information that was provided in the TIA and notes the following:

- Page 3: The Town may wish to ensure that this TIA does not conflict with the Town's future Functional Design of Highway 2A from Highway 587 to the South Street. Please also ensure that the Functional Design is in accordance with Alberta Transportation's Highway 597 Functional Plan.
- Research for C-TEP by Bunt \& Associates were used as trip generation for Highway Commercial. Please provide us with the background information on how the numbers were attained.
- For the other trip generation categories, the ITE 9th Edition were used as per Alberta Transportation TIA guidelines, however, during our review, we noticed inconsistencies between our numbers and the TIA. Appendix 1 contains a sample of numbers we derived from our review for comparison purposes.
- Page 20 and 21: Figure 7A and 7B site traffic show negative traffic. Clarification is required as to what negative traffic means.
- Page 27: Based on the left turn lane warrant analysis, a Type IV intersection is recommended. Please confirm the specific intersection treatment type recommended (i.e. Type IVa)
- Page 29: The geometry of this intersection's eastbound lanes needs to be looked at again as it does not appear to match any of Alberta Transportation's Type IV standards.
- We are unable to accommodate the proposed right-in and right-out (RI/RO) on Highway 2A. There does not appear to be a demonstrated need for the addition of a new RI/RI as southbound right turns from 2A operate at LOS A and eastbound rights out of the development at LOS C according to the analysis at the 2035 signalized horizon. Furthermore, the proposed RI/RO introduces a potential weaving issue for traffic originating from the highway commercial lot turning right onto Highway 2A requiring a quick transition for those needing to get into the left lane of the roundabout. Also, the RI/RO contributes to additional conflict points from non-conforming northbound Highway 2A left turns into the RI/RO. The proposed location of the RI/RO approximately 150 metres south of the realigned Broadway Avenue intersection would also not meet our access spacing requirements.
- We also require an operational analysis (showing design vehicle turning left into the development, left out of the development) at this intersection to determine if there will be any stacking distance issues between the first access from Highway 2A and the realigned Broadway Avenue, as well as a drawing that shows storage lengths.
- There does not appear to developments east or south of the development where pedestrians require access, and accordingly, pedestrian warrants are not needed. Please confirm pedestrian requirements with the Town.
- In addition to the roundabout analysis, we also require a cost/benefit analysis (as per design bulletin \#68/2010) since the TIA finds that a roundabout works at this location.
- The Town of Blackfalds is responsible for to submit a Roadside Development Application and a Traffic Accommodation Strategy (TAS) for the proposed Broadway Avenue realignment, and the new intersection on Highway 597.
- The Town of Blackfalds/Developer is responsible for arranging all the required intersectional improvements to accommodate the proposed development.

We look forward to receiving a revised copy with these amendments incorporated in the TIA for review prior to final endorsement. If you have any questions please contact me at 403-340-7179.

Sincerely,


Sandy Choi
Development \& Planning
SC/sc
cc. WSP (Craig Suchy - Craig.Suchy@wspgroup.com)

Stuart Richardson, Alberta Transportation

Office of the Operations Manager
\#401, 4920-51 Street
Telephone 403/340-5166
Central Region
Red Deer, Alberta
Fax 403/340-4876
This link includes access to the associated report and also a newly developed "Life-Cycle Cost Estimation Tool" that can be used to compare intersection designs such as roundabouts vs signals.

Prior to Alberta Transportation accepting the TIA, please provide the additional information requested. Should you have any questions regarding any of the points above or wish to schedule a meeting, please contact me at 403-340-7179.

Sincerely,


Sandy Choi
Development \& Planning
SC/sc
cc: WSP (Craig Suchy - Craig.Suchy@wspgroup.com)
Town of Blackfalds (Prestan Weran - PWeran@blackfalds.com)
Town of Blackfalds (Terry Topolnitsky - Terry@blackfalds.com)

Office of the Operations Manager Transportation
Central Region

Telephone 403/340-5166
Fax 403/340-4876

## Appendix 1

| Total Generated Trips |  |  | Total Distribution of Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Daily | AM Hour | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PM } \\ \text { Hour } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | AM In | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { AM } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | Pass-By | PM In | PM Out | Pass-By |


| Supermarket 850 | KSF $^{2}$ | 102.8 | 10,510 | 350 | 975 | 139 | 85 | 126 | 318 | 306 | 351 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single Family <br> Homes 210 | DU | 40.0 | 381 | 30 | 40 | 8 | 23 | 0 | 25 | 15 | 0 |
| Resd. <br> Condo/Townhouse <br> 230 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Town of Blackfalds

## RE: PROPOSED BLACKFALDS CROSSING TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT (TIA) NE 22-39-27-W4 (ELKAY DEVELOPMENTS) HIGHWAYS 2A \& 597, BLACKFALDS CROSSING

Thank you for addressing our comments on the Blackfalds Crossing TIA. Alberta Transportation's (AT) response to your comments is below:

1. AT's Original Comment: Research for C-TEP by Bunt \& Associates were used as trip generation for Highway Commercial. Please provide us with the background information on how the numbers were attained.
WSP's Response: We will provide a copy of C-TEP's report for the Department review.
AT's Response: We have received a copy of C-TEP's report and advise if we have any feedback.
2. AT's Original Comment: For the other trip generation categories, the ITE $9^{\text {th }}$ Edition were used as per Alberta Transportation TIA guidelines, however, during our review, we noticed inconsistencies between our numbers and the TIA. Appendix 1 contains a sample of number we derived from our review for comparison purposes.
WSP's Response: WSP also used the ITE $9^{\text {th }}$ Edition Trip Generation Manual in the process of trip generation estimate. ITEP Trip General Manual provides Average Trip Generation Rates and Fitted Curve Equations for most land uses in the manual. The process for selecting Average Rate or Equation for the proposed development followed the step-by-step procedure recommended in the ITP Trip Generation Handbook, Third Edition. In this study, when the equations were selected to estimate the trips generated by the development. The estimated trips will be different from that were estimated based on the average rates (AT used in the sample).
AT's Response: Acknowledged.
3. AT's Original Comment: Page 20 \& 21: Figure 7A and 7B site traffic show negative traffic. Clarification is required as to what negative traffic means.
WSP's Response: The negative traffic numbers are pass-by trips for commercial development. Pass-by trips are drawn from the passing traffic stream and do not add new traffic to the adjacent road system. The detailed pass-by trip analysis for each commercial development is attached in Appendix B in the TIA report.
AT's Response: Acknowledged.
4. AT's Original Response: Page 27: Based on the left turn lane warrant analysis, a Type IV intersection is recommended. Please confirm the specific intersection treatment type recommended (i.e. Type IVa).
WSP's Response: The left turn lane warrant analysis indicated that a Type IV left turn lane (exclusive left turn lane) will be warranted for the eastbound traffic at the intersection. Highway

597 is not an Alberta Transportation's standard two-land highway (Raised median and fourlane cross-section to the west). It's hard and not necessary to apply a standard Type IV intersection treatment to this intersection. Since this is a three-legged intersection, Type IVa may be appropriate if we need to specify the intersection treatment type.

## AT's Response:

a. Eastbound Hwy 597

The proposed intersection is located in a transition zone between a divided and undivided roadway. Merging of lanes at the intersection are potential operational and safety issues. It is undesirable to have a proposed intersection located within a transition zone. Issues include not meeting driver expectations, increase driver workload, high potential for confusion, sideswipe and rear end type collisions with the proposed two eastbound lane transitioning into a single lane through the intersection.

The warranted left turn lane EB to NB should be provided along with either a painted island or a preferred small raised island (1.5m minimum curb face to curb face width should be provided for hazard sign /keep right assembly) on the east leg. However, to reduce the potential operational/safety concerns, the two eastbound through lanes should be maintain past the proposed intersection. The two through lanes transition (or tie in) to the existing single lane should occur further east of the proposed intersection location or if possible, continue the two lanes east to the existing two lane (west of the roundabout).

## b. Westbound Hwy 597

The right side eastbound lane (shown as through/right arrow pavement markings) has not accommodated for slower vehicles (WB to NB) to decelerate and turn right from the eastbound through lane. Deceleration and acceleration tapers should be provided east and west of the proposed intersection treatment respectively.
c. What is the radius of the horizontal curve and superelevation rate on Hwy 597? Intersections on horizontal curves are considered undesirable. As indicated in the AT HGDG (page B-29), Table B3.6a, for design speeds from $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ to $90 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, intersections are only permitted if e is less than or equal to 0.038 . Highway 597 is posted at $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (design typical $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ).
d. The existing north intersection immediately east of proposed intersection should be closed.
5. AT's Original Comment: Page 29: The geometry of this intersection's eastbound lanes needs to be looked at again as it does not appear to match any of Alberta Transportation's Type IV standards).
WSP's Response: Similar reason as above, the proposed intersection treatment is not a standard Type IV intersection. The eastbound left turn lane will be provided by removing the raised median on the west leg. The eastbound through lane alignment will not change. An AT's Standard Type IV left turn lane on a two-lane highway is provided by shifting through lane to shoulder side by 3.5 m . A approaching tape and a departure taper (recovery taper) are required to accommodate the through traffic movement shifting. In our case, the eastbound through movement will not need to shift to the shoulder side and will stay in the existing through lane since the left turn lane will be provided by removing the raised median. As such, no tapers for the EB through lane will be required. That's why the proposed intersection treatment does not match AT's Type IV standard.
AT's Response: See AT's response to Section \#4.
6. AT's Original Comment: We are unable to accommodate the proposed right-in and right-out (RI/RO) on Highway 2A. There does not appear to be a demonstrated need for the addition of a new $\mathrm{RI} / \mathrm{RO}$ as the southbound right turns from 2 A operate at LOS A and eastbound rights out of the development at LOS C according to the analysis at the 2035 signalized horizon.
WSP's Response: The right-in/right-out access was determined to be removed from the proposed site plan.
AT's response: Thank you and acknowledged.
7. AT's Original Comment: We also require an operational analysis (showing design vehicle turning left into the development, left out of the development) At this intersection to determine if there will be any stacking distance issues between the first access from Highway 2A and the realigned Broadway Avenue, as well as a drawing that shows storage lengths.
WSP's Response: The proposed realigned Broadway Avenue intersection on the East-West Collector Road will be located approximately 100m (center line to center line) west of Highway 2 A . The stacking distance is adequate for two 25 m long WB-23 vehicles. The capacity analysis results show that the eastbound vehicle queue at the Highway 2A intersection will not reach the Broadway Avenue intersection. The design vehicle operational analysis will be conducted in preliminary and detail design stages.
AT's Response: The capacity analysis results showing eastbound vehicle queue at the Highway 2A intersection will not reach the Broadway Avenue intersection addresses local road concerns. We would like to see the design vehicle operational analysis done at the TIA stage to look at whether traffic spills onto Highway 2A and reaffirm the appropriate location of the local road intersection from Highway 2A.
8. AT's Original Comment: There does not appear to be developments east or south of the development where pedestrians require access, and accordingly, pedestrian warrants are not needed. Please confirm pedestrian requirements with the Town.
WSP's Response: Pedestrians are not anticipated crossing Highway 2A and Highway 597.
AT's response: How do you envision the potential for pedestrian traffic wanting to access the commercial destination at Blackfalds Crossing from the east side of Highway 2A?
9. AT's Original Comment: In addition to the roundabout analysis, we also require a cost/benefit analysis (as per design bulletin \#68/2010) since the TIA finds that a roundabout works at this location.
WSP's Response: The purpose of the roundabout analysis in the TIA is to preliminarily identify if a roundabout is physically feasible for the geometrics of the roadway location and if a roundabout is able to accommodate the forecasted future traffic volumes. A cost/benefit analysis should be conducted in a detailed Roundabout Feasibility Study which is out of the scope of work of the TIA.
AT's Response: Section 1.0 Economic Analysis of the design bulletin requires that "an economic analysis shall be undertaken to assist in evaluating the preferred type of intersection control as per the current version of the Department's Benefit Cost Guide, that accounts for all cost and benefits over the design period". Alberta Transportation has consulted with the Town of Blackfalds and we would like to see an economic analysis as part of this TIA to establish the feasibility of a roundabout at this location.

Here is a link to a Transportation Research Board project on "Estimating the Life-Cycle Cost of Intersection Designs." http://www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/173928.aspx

Office of the Operations Manager
\#401, 4920-51 Street
Telephone 403/340-5166
Central Region
Red Deer, Alberta
Fax 403/340-4876
This link includes access to the associated report and also a newly developed "Life-Cycle Cost Estimation Tool" that can be used to compare intersection designs such as roundabouts vs signals.

Prior to Alberta Transportation accepting the TIA, please provide the additional information requested. Should you have any questions regarding any of the points above or wish to schedule a meeting, please contact me at 403-340-7179.

Sincerely,


Sandy Choi
Development \& Planning
SC/sc
cc: WSP (Craig Suchy - Craig.Suchy@wspgroup.com)
Town of Blackfalds (Prestan Weran - PWeran@blackfalds.com)
Town of Blackfalds (Terry Topolnitsky - Terry@blackfalds.com)

May 30, 2016

Alberta Transportation - Central Region
\#401, 4920 - 51 Street
Red Deer, AB T4N 6K8
Attention: Sandy Choi, Development and Planning Technologist

## Re: PROPOSED BLACKFALDS CROSSING TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT (TIA) NE 22-39-27-W4 (ELKAY DEVELOPMENTS) HIGHWAYS 2A \& 597, BLACKFALDS CROSSING

O/Ref: 151-02471-00

Thank you for your comments on the Blackfalds Crossing TIA Report. The following details our responses to your comments dated May 11, 2016:

1. (Comment \#4) Page 27: Based on the left turn lane warrant analysis, a Type IV intersection is recommended. Please confirm the specific intersection treatment type recommended (i.e. Type IVa).

## a. Eastbound Hwy 597

The proposed intersection (Highway 597 / South Access) is located in a transition zone between a divided and undivided roadway. Merging of lanes at the intersection are potential operational and safety issues. It is undesirable to have a proposed intersection located within a transition zone. Issues include not meeting driver expectations, increase driver workload, high potential for confusion, sideswipe and rear end type collisions with the proposed two eastbound lane transitioning into a single lane through the intersection.

Response: We have developed a new concept plan and the proposed two eastbound through lanes continue to the existing two through lanes to the east.
b. Westbound Hwy 597

The right side eastbound lane (shown as through/right arrow pavement markings) has not accommodated for slower vehicles (WB to NB) to decelerate and turn right from the eastbound through lane. Deceleration and acceleration tapers should be provided east and west of the proposed intersection treatment respectively.

Response: We have developed a new concept plan with the proposed deceleration and acceleration tapers for the westbound traffic.
c. What is the radius of the horizontal curve and superelevation rate on Hwy 597? Intersections on horizontal curves are considered undesirable. As indicated in the AT HGDG (page B-29), Table B3.6a, for design speeds from $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ to $90 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, intersections are only permitted if $e$ is less than or equal to 0.038 . Highway 597 is posted at $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ (design typical $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ).

Response: The radius of the horizontal curve is approximately 840 m and the super-elevation is approximately 0.046. The superelevation will be adjusted to
meet the department requirements during the detail design stage. The existing horizon curve radius ( 840 m ) is capable of accommodating a design speed of 80 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ with a superelevation of 0.035 .
d. The existing north intersection immediately east of proposed intersection should be closed.

Response: Yes, the existing access will be closed.
2. (Comment \#7) We also require an operational analysis (showing design vehicle turning left into the development, left out of the development) at this intersection to determine if there will be any stacking distance issues between the first access from Highway 2A and the realigned Broadway Avenue, as well as a drawing that shows storage lengths.

The capacity analysis results showing eastbound vehicle queue at the Highway 2 A intersection will not reach the Broadway Avenue intersection addresses local road concerns. We would like to see the design vehicle operational analysis done at the TIA stage to look at whether traffic spills onto Highway 2A and reaffirm the appropriate location of the local road intersection from Highway 2A.

> Response: The East-West Collector Road and Broadway Avenue intersection will be controlled by one stop sign on Broadway Avenue with free flow conditions on the Collector Road. Therefore, no vehicle queue will occur for the westbound traffic on the Collector Road at the Broadway Avenue intersection. As such, traffic will not spill onto Highway $2 A$.
3. (Comment \#8) There does not appear to be developments east or south of the development where pedestrians require access, and accordingly, pedestrian warrants are not needed. Please confirm pedestrian requirements with the Town.

How do you envision the potential for pedestrian traffic wanting to access the commercial destination at Blackfalds Crossing from the east side of Highway $2 A$ ?

Response: Currently there are no pedestrian facilities (e.g., sidewalks or trails) provided along Highway 2A or in the vicinity of the Broadway Avenue intersection. If the Town wants to provide pedestrian facilities in the future, pedestrian traffic will be accommodated by providing marked crosswalks and pedestrian signals at the signalized intersection; or marked pedestrian crosswalks with associated signing, with the crossings safely located in accordance with NCHRP 672 - Roundabouts: An Information Guide if a roundabout is constructed.
4. (Comment \#9) In addition to the roundabout analysis, we also require a cost/benefit analysis (as per design bulletin \#68/2010) since the TIA finds that a roundabout works at this location.

Section 1.0 Economic Analysis of the design bulletin requires that "an economic analysis shall be undertaken to assist in evaluating the preferred type of intersection control as per the current version of the Department's Benefit Cost Guide, that accounts for all cost and benefits over the design period". Alberta

Transportation has consulted with the Town of Blackfalds and we would like to see an economic analysis as part of this TIA to establish the feasibility of a roundabout at this location.

Response: WSP performed an economic analysis based on TRB's "Estimating the Life-Cycle Cost of Intersection Designs". The results reveal that the roundabout option will have a lower life-cycle cost than signals. However, the initial construction costs of the roundabout are much higher than the proposed signalized intersection. The stacking distance between Highway 2A and Broadway Avenue for the roundabout will be shorter than that for signals since a roundabout will occupy more land area than a signalized intersection. WSP recommends installing traffic signals and protecting the right-of-way for a potential future roundabout.

Thank you for your comments. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at james.sun@wspgroup.com or 780.233.0757.

Yours truly,

## WSP Canada Inc.

James Sun, MSc., P. Eng.
Transportation Engineer

Cc: Craig Suchy, P. Eng., Branch Manager - Red Deer
Janis Fong, P. Eng., Urban Transportation Manager - Northern Alberta

WSP
300, 9925 - 109 Street
Edmonton, AB T5K 2J8
Sent via email to: James.Sun@wspgroup.com
Attention: James Sun, Transportation Engineer

## RE: PROPOSED BLACKFALDS CROSSING TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT (TIA) NE 22-39-27-W4 (ELKAY DEVELOPMENTS), HIGHWAYS 2A \& 597

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the Blackfalds Crossing TIA review. I would advise that Alberta Transportation has reviewed your comments provided on May $30^{\mathrm{th}}, 2016$ and offer the following comments:

1. As you are aware, Design Bulletin \#68/2010 is a new policy requiring TIAs to review and assess roundabout as the first option for improvements to existing intersections or when constructing new intersections on the provincial highway network. Since the cost benefit analysis clearly demonstrates the economic, social and environmental benefits of a roundabout compared to a conventional signalized intersection at this location, a roundabout option is to be implemented at the Developer's/Town's cost.
2. Please revise the TIA to reflect the implementation of a roundabout at Highway $2 A$ and the realigned Broadway Avenue intersection.
3. The Area Structure Plan (ASP) may need to be revised as well, and the roundabout is to be protected for at the subdivision stage.
4. I would confirm that the Town of Blackfalds would be responsible for arranging all required intersectional improvements to accommodate the proposed development. A Roadside Development Permit Application is required for Highway 2A \& Broadway Avenue and Highway 597 \& the North-South Collector Access.

We look forward to receiving a revised copy with these amendments incorporated in the TIA and if required, the ASP, for review prior to final endorsement.

Should you wish to schedule a meeting to clarify or discuss any of these points, please contact me at 403-340-5166.
Sincerely,


Sandy Choi
Development \& Planning
SC/sc
cc: $\quad$ Preston Weran - PWeran@blackfalds.com Terry Topolnitsky - Terry@blackfalds.com Stuart Richardson, Infrastructure

# Appendix <br>  

## TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

- Traffic Turning Movements
- Traffic Volume History on Highway 2A and Highway 597
- Trip Distribution and Assignment for Each Land Use
- C-TEP Trip Generation Rates for Highway Commercial


## Turning Movement Summary Diagram

Reference No.: 89330

## Intersection of:

A \& 597 S OF BLACKFALDS

| North On |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle Type | Vol | $\%$ |
| A: Passenger Vehicle | 12539 | 95.7 |
| B: Recreational Vehicle | 38 | 0.3 |
| C: Bus | 9 | 0.1 |
| D: Single Unit Truck | 390 | 3.0 |
| E: Tractor Trailer Unit | 124 | 0.9 |
| ASDT 13710 | AADT | 13100 |



## Turning Movement Summary Diagram

Reference No.: 89330
Intersection of:
A \& 597 S OF BLACKFALDS

| North On 2 2A |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle Type | Vol | $\%$ |
| A: Passenger Vehicle | 1405 | 97.2 |
| B: Recreational Vehicle | 0 | 0.0 |
| C: Bus | 1 | 0.1 |
| D: Single Unit Truck | 23 | 1.6 |
| E: Tractor Trailer Unit | 17 | 1.2 |
| 1446 |  |  |



## Turning Movement Summary Diagram

Reference No.: 89330
Intersection of:
$2 A \& 597$ S OF BLACKFALDS


Intersection of:
Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue
Town of Blackfalds, AB
2015 AM and PM Traffic Count
7:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.
4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

Turning Movement Summary Diagram


Turning Movement Summary Diagram

## Intersection of: <br> Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue <br> Town of Blackfalds, AB

2015 a.m. 100th Highest Hour ESTIMATES


## Turning Movement Summary Diagram

## Intersection of: <br> Highway 2A / Broadway Avenue <br> Town of Blackfalds, AB

2015 p.m. 100th Highest Hour ESTIMATES


Intersection of:
Turning Movement Summary Diagram
South Street / East Railway Street Town of Blackfalds, AB

2015 AM and PM Traffic Count
7:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.
4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

| North On East Railway Street |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Type | Vol | $\%$ |  |
| A: Passenger Vehicle | 774 | 98.7 |  |
| B: Recreational Vehicle | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| C: Bus | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| D: Single Unit Truck | 6 | 0.8 |  |
| E: Tractor Trailer Unit | 4 | 0.5 |  |
| ASDT | AADT | 784 |  |

## Intersection of:

South Street / East Railway Street
Twon of Blackfalds, AB
2015 a.m. 100th Highest Hour ESTIMATES

| North On East Railway Street |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Type | Vol | $\%$ |  |
| A: Passenger Vehicle | 223 | 97.8 |  |
| B: Recreational Vehicle | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| C: Bus | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| D: Single Unit Truck | 2 | 0.9 |  |
| E: Tractor Trailer Unit | 3 | 1.3 |  |
| Total 228 |  |  |  |

## 18WSP



## Intersection of:

South Street / East Railway Street
Town of Blackfalds, AB
2015 p.m. 100th Highest Hour ESTIMATES

| North On East Railway Street |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle Type | Vol | $\%$ |
| A: Passenger Vehicle | 274 | 99.3 |
| B: Recreational Vehicle | 0 | 0.0 |
| C: Bus | 0 | 0.0 |
| D: Single Unit Truck | 2 | 0.7 |
| E: Tractor Trailer Unit | 0 | 0.0 |
| \|r |  |  |
| 276 |  |  |

## 局WSP



|  |  |  |  |  | $2005$ | $2006$ | $2007$ | $2008$ | $2009$ | $2010$ | $2011$ | $2012$ | $2013$ | $2014$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hwy | CS | TCS | Muni L | Location Description | AADT | AADT | AADT | AADT | AADT | AADT | AADT | AADT | AADT | AADT |
| 2 A | 16 | 08 | RdDr | N OF BOUNDRY ST, PENHOLD 25-36-28-410200000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2920 | 3100 | 3280 | 3360 |
| 2 A | 16 | 08 | RdDr S | S OF 42 \& 592 N OF PENHOLD | 3960 | 4140 | 4580 | 4130 | 5320 | 5440 | 5580 | 5970 | 6330 | 6600 |
| 2 A | 16 | 08 | RdDr 0 | 0.8 KM N OF 2A \& 42 PENHOLD | 4690 | 5000 | 5400 | 4800 | 5940 | 6100 | 6170 | 6570 | 6950 | 7200 |
| 2 A | 16 | 12 | RdDr | N OF 42 \& 592 N OF PENHOLD | 4580 | 4760 | 5260 | 4660 | 5710 | 5830 | 6140 | 6550 | 6930 | 7140 |
| 2 A | 16 | 12 | RdDr | S OF TWP RD 372 12-37-28-402000000 | 4450 |  |  |  |  | 6070 | 6140 | 6550 | 6930 | 7140 |
| 2 A | 16 | 12 | RdDr | N OF TWP RD 372 12-37-28-402000000 | 5320 |  |  |  |  | 8100 | 7990 | 8520 | 9040 | 9510 |
| 2 A | 16 | 12 | RdDr | S OF MCKENZIE RD 19-37-27-406500000 | 5960 | 6200 | 6840 | 6780 | 7940 | 8100 | 7990 | 8520 | 9040 | 9510 |
| 2 A | 16 | 12 | RdDr | N OF MCKENZIE RD 19-37-27-406500000 | 6740 | 7010 | 7730 | 6250 | 7320 | 7480 | 7010 | 7480 | 7900 | 8290 |
| 2 A | 16 | 12 | RdDr | S OF LANTERN ST, RED DEER 32-37-27-415501560 |  |  |  | 6250 | 7320 | 7480 | 7010 | 7480 | 7900 | 8290 |
| 2 A | 16 | 12 | RdDr | N OF LANTERN ST, RED DEER 32-37-27-415501560 |  |  |  | 10650 | 11810 | 11560 | 11900 | 12700 | 13360 | 14050 |
| 2 A | 16 | 99 | CoRD | W OF 2 \& TAYLOR DR IN RED DEER | 8000 | 8450 | 9610 | 10650 | 11810 | 12070 | 13020 | 13890 | 14610 | 15350 |
| 2 A | 18 | 16 | RdDr | N OF 11A AT RED DEER | 13920 | 14900 | 15020 | 14140 | 13870 | 14130 | 14530 | 14850 | 15170 | 15420 |
| 2 A | 18 | 16 | RdDr | S OF CENTRAL PARK RD 3-39-27-406000000 | 13490 | 14440 | 14560 | 13710 | 12990 | 13230 | 13550 | 14500 | 14800 | 15050 |
| 2 A | 18 | 16 | RdDr | N OF CENTRAL PARK RD 3-39-27-406000000 | 12880 | 13790 | 13910 | 13600 | 12900 | 13140 | 13470 | 14130 | 14430 | 14680 |
| 2 A | 18 | 16 | RdDr 1 | 1.6 KM N OF 2A \& 11A RED DEER | 12880 | 13940 | 13830 | 13640 | 12810 | 13220 | 13510 | 14110 | 14450 | 14770 |
| 2 A | 18 | 16 | RdDr | S OF NORTHLAND IND ACC 14-39-27-414251400 | 11450 | 12250 | 12350 | 12070 | 11440 | 11210 | 11490 | 11830 | 12090 | 12310 |
| 2 A | 18 | 16 | RdDr | N OF NORTHLAND IND ACC 14-39-27-414251400 | 11610 | 12430 | 12550 | 12270 | 11640 | 11300 | 11580 | 11920 | 12180 | 12400 |
| 2 A | 18 | 16 | Laco S | S OF 597 S OF BLACKFALDS | 11050 | 11860 | 11960 | 11700 | 11020 | 11220 | 11500 | 11900 | 12160 | 12360 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco N | N OF 597 S OF BLACKFALDS | 10610 | 11250 | 11290 | 11070 | 10800 | 10990 | 11270 | 12620 | 12880 | 13100 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco S | S OF INDIANA ST IN BLACKFALDS 26-39-27-413401350 | 10440 | 11080 | 11120 | 10900 | 10140 | 10340 | 10600 | 11560 | 11800 | 12660 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco N | N OF INDIANA ST IN BLACKFALDS 26-39-27-413401350 | 8680 | 9220 | 9240 | 9060 | 9080 | 9260 | 9500 | 10360 | 10580 | 11600 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco S | S OF PARK ST IN BLACKFALDS 26-39-27-413101230 | 8680 | 9220 | 9240 | 9060 | 9080 | 9260 | 9500 | 10360 | 10580 | 11600 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco N | N OF PARK ST IN BLACKFALDS 26-39-27-413101230 | 7130 | 7570 | 7350 | 7210 | 7240 | 7370 | 7550 | 7520 | 7660 | 8260 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco S | S OF GREGG ST IN BLACKFALDS 26-39-27-411750805 | 7130 | 7570 | 7350 | 7210 | 7240 | 7370 | 7550 | 7520 | 7660 | 8260 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco N | N OF GREGG ST IN BLACKFALDS 26-39-27-411750805 | 7310 | 7770 | 7720 | 7600 | 7640 | 7790 | 7990 | 7010 | 7150 | 7590 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco S | S OF C\&E TRAIL 26-39-27-409500325 SJ | 7320 | 7780 | 7730 | 7610 | 7650 | 7800 | 8000 | 7010 | 7150 | 7590 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco N | N OF C\&E TRAIL 26-39-27-409500325 SJ | 6680 | 7100 | 7050 | 6810 | 6870 | 7000 | 7180 | 6250 | 6370 | 6750 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco S | S OF TWP RD 400 35-39-27-408050000 | 6680 | 7100 | 7050 | 6810 | 6870 | 7000 | 7180 | 6250 | 6370 | 6750 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco N | N OF TWP RD 400 35-39-27-408050000 | 6800 | 7220 | 7200 | 7020 | 7170 | 7300 | 7480 | 6590 | 6630 | 7040 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco S | S OF C \& E TRAIL S OF LACOMBE 13-40-27-404000030 NJ | 6930 | 7350 | 7350 | 7240 | 7310 | 7450 | 7400 | 6520 | 6560 | 6980 |
| 2 A | 18 | 20 | Laco N | N OF C \& E TRAIL S OF LACOMBE 13-40-27-404000030 NJ | 5730 | 6070 | 6070 | 6100 | 6070 | 6190 | 5900 | 5220 | 5260 | 5600 |
| 2 A | 20 | 04 | Laco S | S OF LACOMBE AIRPORT ACC 32-40-26-402000000 | 5300 | 5500 | 5760 | 5980 | 5940 | 6060 | 6000 | 5660 | 6480 | 6890 |
| 2 A | 20 | 04 | Laco N | N OF LACOMBE AIRPORT ACC 32-40-26-402000000 | 4360 | 4520 | 4740 | 4500 | 4480 | 4560 | 4520 | 4430 | 5080 | 5410 |
| 2 A | 20 | 04 | Laco 4 | 4.9 KM N OF 2A \& 12 LACOMBE | 4030 | 4200 | 4370 | 4440 | 4390 | 4530 | 4460 | 4450 | 5090 | 5470 |
| 2 A | 20 | 04 | Laco S | S OF C\&E TRAIL 4-41-26-408050000 | 4030 | 4180 | 4370 | 4440 | 4410 | 4500 | 4460 | 4430 | 5080 | 5410 |
| 2 A | 20 | 04 | Laco N | N OF C\&E TRAIL 4-41-26-408050000 | 4310 | 4480 | 4650 | 4720 | 4690 | 4780 | 4770 | 4970 | 5710 | 6080 |
| 2 A | 20 | 04 | Laco S | S OF MILTON RD 9-41-26-407501300 | 4310 | 4480 | 4650 | 4720 | 4690 | 4780 | 4770 | 4970 | 5710 | 6080 |
| 2 A | 20 | 04 | Laco N | N OF MILTON RD 9-41-26-407501300 | 3510 | 3640 | 4030 | 4080 | 4050 | 4120 | 4210 | 4380 | 5030 | 5360 |
| 2 A | 22 | 04 | Laco E | E OF 2 SW OF MORNINGSIDE | 4160 | 4360 | 4400 | 4390 | 4300 | 4440 | 4360 | 4400 | 4800 | 5100 |
| 2 A | 22 | 04 | Pnka | S OF 604 N OF MORNINGSIDE | 4170 | 4370 | 4400 | 4390 | 4300 | 4440 | 4600 | 4640 | 4850 | 5150 |


| 2014 |
| :--- |
| AADT |
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PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Distribution (Shopping Center - Stage 1) - Non-Pass-By Trips


PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Distribution (Shopping Center - Stage 1) - Pass-By Trips


PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Distribution (Highway Commercial - Stage 2) - Non-Pass-By Trips
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PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Distribution (Highway Commercial - Phase 2) - Pass-By Trips
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Trip Distribution (Residential)


PROPOSED MIXED USE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Distribution (Mixed Use Housing - Commercial) - Non-Pass-by Trips
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PROPOSED MIXED USE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Distribution (Mixed Use Housing - Commercial) - Pass-by Trips
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PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Distribution (Highway Commercial - Future Development) - Non-Pass-By Trips


PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Distribution (Highway Commercial - Future Development) - Pass-By Trips
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PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Assignment (Shopping Center) - Non-Pass-By Trips


PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Assignment (Shopping Center) - Pass-By Trips
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DR PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Assignment (Highway Commercial - Stage 2) - Non-Pass-By Trips
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PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Assignment (Highway Commercial - Stage 2) - Pass-By Trips


Trip Assignment (Residential - 3 Year Horizon)
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PROPOSED MIXED USE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Assignment (Mixed Use Housing Commercial) - Non-Pass-by Trips
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PROPOSED MIXED USE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Assignment (Mixed Use Housing Commercial) - Pass-by Trips


PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Assignment (Highway Commercial - Future Development) - Non-Pass-By Trips
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$\square$ PROPOSED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Trip Assignment (Highway Commercial - Future Development) - Pass-By Trips

Table 1.2: Recommended Site Traffic Generation Rate

| Land Use | Recommendation | Time Period | Industry (ITE) | Empirical Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hotel | Use ITE <br> Further study | AM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0.56/room } \\ & 0.69 / \mathrm{emp} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0.36/room } \\ & 2.64 / \mathrm{emp} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Further study Further study | PM | $\begin{aligned} & 0.59 / \mathrm{room} \\ & 0.80 / \mathrm{emp} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0.33/room } \\ & \text { 2.61/emp } \end{aligned}$ |
| Residential Dwellings | Use ITE | AM | 0.78/unit | 0.62/unit |
|  | Use ITE | PM | 1.01/unit | 0.76/unit |
| High School | Use ITE Use local data | AM | $\begin{aligned} & 0.41 / \text { stu } \\ & 4.63 / \mathrm{emp} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.45 / \mathrm{stu} \\ & 5.75 / \mathrm{emp} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Further study Use local data | PM | 0.41/stu <br> 1.55/emp | 0.26/stu <br> 3.43/emp |
| Highway Commercial | Use local data | AM | N/A | $2.56 / 93 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA |
|  | Use local data | PM | N/A | 4.21/93 m ${ }^{2}$ GFA |
| Multi-Family Dwellings | Use ITE | AM | 0.30-0.67 per unit | 0.34/unit |
|  | Use ITE | PM | 0.8-0.78 per unit | 0.51/unit |
| General Office | Use ITE Use ITE | AM | $\begin{aligned} & 1.55 / 93 \mathrm{~m} 2 \mathrm{GFA} \\ & 0.48 / \mathrm{mp} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.82 / 93 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GFA} \\ & 0.86 / \mathrm{mp} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Use ITE <br> Further study | PM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1.49/93 m2 GFA } \\ & 0.46 / \mathrm{mp} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.23/93 m}{ }^{2} \text { GFA } \\ & 1.01 / \mathrm{emp} \end{aligned}$ |
| Medical/Dental Office | Further study Further study | AM | $\begin{aligned} & 2.48 / 93 \mathrm{~m} 2 \mathrm{GFA} \\ & 0.53 / \mathrm{emp} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9.19/93 } \mathrm{m}^{2} \text { GFA } \\ & \text { 2.87/emp } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Use local data | PM | $\begin{aligned} & 3.72 / 93 \mathrm{~m} 2 \mathrm{GFA} \\ & 1.06 / \mathrm{mp} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.42 / 93 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GFA } \\ & \text { 2.64/emp } \end{aligned}$ |
| Strip Mall | Further study | AM | 1.03/93 m2 GLA | 2.83/93 m ${ }^{2}$ GFA |
|  | Further study Use ITE | PM | 3.76 per 93 m 2 GLA | 4.03/93 m ${ }^{2}$ GFA |
| Big Box Shopping | Use local dada | AM | N/A | 1.99/93 m ${ }^{2}$ GFA |
|  | Use local data | PM | N/A | 2.52/93 m ${ }^{2}$ GFA |
| Sit-Down <br> Restaurant | Use ITE Use ITE | AM | $\begin{aligned} & 0.47 / \text { seat } \\ & 11.52 / 93 \mathrm{~m} 2 \mathrm{GFA} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.30 / \text { seat } \\ & 7.36 / 93 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GFA} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Further study Use local data | PM | $\begin{aligned} & 0.41 / \text { seat } \\ & 10.92 / 93 \mathrm{~m} 2 \mathrm{GFA} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25 / \text { seat } \\ & 5.63 / 93 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GFA } \end{aligned}$ |
| Fast Food Restaurant | Further study Further Study | AM | $\begin{aligned} & 1.32 / \text { seat } \\ & 53.11 / 93 \mathrm{~m} 2 \mathrm{GFA} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.93 / \text { seat } \\ & 26.58 / 93 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GFA} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Use ITE <br> Further Study | PM | $\begin{aligned} & 0.94 / \text { seat } \\ & 34.64 / 93 \mathrm{~m} 2 \mathrm{GFA} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0.83/seat } \\ & 21.15 / 93 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GFA } \end{aligned}$ |
| Elementary School | Use ITE Use ITE | AM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0.42/stu } \\ & \text { 5.19/emp } \end{aligned}$ | 0.42/stu <br> 4.74/emp |
|  | Use ITE <br> Further Study | PM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0.28/stu } \\ & \text { 3.45/emp } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25 / \mathrm{stu} \\ & 2.75 / \mathrm{emp} \end{aligned}$ |

# Appendix 

## INTERSECTION ANALYSIS

- Signal Warrant Analysis
- Left Turn Lane Warrant Analysis
- Illumination Warrant Analysis
- Proposed Intersection Improvement Concept plan for Highway 597 / South Access


## Alberta Transportation - Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



| Set Peak Hours <br> Traffic Input |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ped1 | Ped2 | Ped3 | Ped4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | NS | NS | EW | EW |
|  | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | W Side | E Side | N Side | S Side |
| 7:00-8:00 | 37 | 266 |  |  | 1035 | 5 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 145 |  |  |  |  |
| 8:00-9:00 | 28 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 776 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 109 |  |  |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 73 | 429 | 0 | 0 | 604 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 80 |  |  |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 60 | 354 | 0 | 0 | 472 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 62 |  |  |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 145 | 806 |  |  | 476 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 55 |  |  |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 123 | 685 | 0 | 0 | 405 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 47 |  |  |  |  |
| Total (6-hour peak) | 466 | 2,740 | 0 | 0 | 3,768 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 498 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average (6-hour peak) | 78 | 457 | 0 | 0 | 628 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Average 6-hour

Peak Turning Movements
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## Alberta Transportation - Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



| Road Authority: | Alberta Transportation |
| :---: | :---: |
| City: | Town of Blackfalds |
| Analysis Date: | 2015 Apr 23, Thu |
| Count Date: | 2015 Mar 19, Thu |
| Date Entry Format: | (yyyy-mm-dd) |


| Demographics |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elem. School/Mobility Challenged | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Senior's Complex | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Pathway to School | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Metro Area Population | $(\#)$ | 8,000 |
| Central Business District | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |



## Average 6-hour <br> Peak Turning Movements



## Alberta Transportation - Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



| Road Authority: | Alberta Transportation |
| ---: | :---: |
| City: | Town of Blackfalds |
| Analysis Date: | 2015 Apr 23, Thu |
| Count Date: | 2015 Mar 19, Thu |
| Date Entry Format: | (yyyy-mm-dd) |


| Lane Configuration |  | $\begin{aligned} & \ddagger \\ & \vec{~} \\ & \text { ( } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\leftrightarrows}{3} \\ & \approx \\ & \ddagger \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{F} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{F}{\sim} \\ & \approx \\ & \text { E } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway 2A | NB | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 3,000 | 2 |
| Highway 2A | SB |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 | 730 | 2 |
| Broadway Avenue | WB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadway Avenue | EB |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Are the Broadway Avenue EB right turns significantly impeded by through movements? (y/n) |  |  |  |  |  |  | n |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n |  |  |


| Demographics |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elem. School/Mobility Challenged | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Senior's Complex | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Pathway to School | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Metro Area Population | $(\#)$ | 8,000 |
| Central Business District | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
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## Alberta Transportation - Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



|  | Direction (EW or NS) <br> Direction (EW or NS) | NS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EW |
| Comments | 3 Year Horizon Combined (2018) | Traffic |


| Road Authority: | Alberta Transportation |
| ---: | :---: |
| City: | Town of Blackfalds |
| Analysis Date: | 2015 Aug 23, Sun |
| Count Date: | 2015 Mar 19, Thu |
| Date Entry Format: | (yyyy-mm-dd) |
|  |  |



| Demographics |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elem. School/Mobility Challenged | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Senior's Complex | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Pathway to School | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Metro Area Population | $(\mathrm{\#})$ | 8,000 |
| Central Business District | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |


| Other input |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Speed } \\ (\mathrm{Km} / \mathrm{h}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Truck \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { Bus Rt } \\ (\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n}) \end{gathered}$ | Median (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway 2A | NS | 80 | 5.0\% | n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadway Avenue | EW |  | 2.0\% | n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Set Peak Hours |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ped1 | Ped2 | Ped3 | Ped4 |
| Traffic Input |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  | NS | NS | EW | EW |
|  | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | W Side | E Side | N Side | S Side |
| 7:00-8:00 | 74 | 280 |  |  | 1088 | 105 |  |  |  | 54 |  | 213 |  |  |  |  |
| 8:00-9:00 | 56 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 816 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 160 |  |  |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 134 | 426 | 0 | 0 | 618 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 142 |  |  |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 112 | 351 | 0 | 0 | 482 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 113 |  |  |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 262 | 786 |  |  | 458 | 141 |  |  |  | 164 |  | 143 |  |  |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 223 | 668 | 0 | 0 | 389 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 122 |  |  |  |  |
| Total (6-hour peak) | 861 | 2,721 | 0 | 0 | 3,851 | 623 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 557 | 0 | 893 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average (6-hour peak) | 144 | 454 | 0 | 0 | 642 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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## Alberta Transportation - Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



|  | Direction (EW or NS) <br> Direction (EW or NS) | NS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EW |
| Comments | 10 Year Horizon Combine (2025) | Traffic |



| Road Authority: | Alberta Transportation |
| ---: | :---: |
| City: | Town of Blackfalds |
| Analysis Date: | 2015 Apr 23, Thu |
| Count Date: | 2015 Mar 19, Thu |
| Date Entry Format: | (yyyy-mm-dd) |


| Other input |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Speed } \\ (\mathrm{Km} / \mathrm{h}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Truck \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { Bus Rt } \\ (\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n}) \end{gathered}$ | Median (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway 2A | NS | 80 | 5.0\% | n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadway Avenue | EW |  | 2.0\% | n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Set Peak Hours |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ped1 | Ped2 | Ped3 | Ped4 |
| Traffic Input |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  | NS | NS | EW | EW |
|  | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | W Side | E Side | N Side | S Side |
| 7:00-8:00 | 96 | 324 |  |  | 1267 | 157 |  |  |  | 95 |  | 256 |  |  |  |  |
| 8:00-9:00 | 72 | 243 | 0 | 0 | 950 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 192 |  |  |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 163 | 514 | 0 | 0 | 731 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 174 |  |  |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 135 | 424 | 0 | 0 | 570 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 0 | 138 |  |  |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 312 | 962 |  |  | 560 | 208 |  |  |  | 233 |  | 180 |  |  |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 265 | 818 | 0 | 0 | 476 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 0 | 153 |  |  |  |  |
| Total (6-hour peak) | 1,043 | 3,285 | 0 | 0 | 4,554 | 924 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 836 | 0 | 1,093 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average (6-hour peak) | 174 | 548 | 0 | 0 | 759 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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## Alberta Transportation - Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



| Lane Configuration |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \approx \\ & \stackrel{\Xi}{E} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\alpha} \\ & \stackrel{y}{*} \\ & \stackrel{\leftrightarrows}{E} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{v}}{\stackrel{y}{w}}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway 597 | WB |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 3,000 | 2 |
| Highway 597 | EB | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 800 | 2 |
| South Access | NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Access | SB |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Are the South Access SB right turns significantly impeded by through movements? (y/n) |  |  |  |  |  |  | n |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n |  |  |


| Other input |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Speed } \\ (\mathrm{Km} / \mathrm{h}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Truck } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Bus Rt ( $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n}$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Median } \\ (\mathrm{m}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway 597 | EW | 80 | 11.0\% | n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Access | NS |  | 5.0\% | n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Set Peak Hours |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ped1 | Ped2 | Ped3 | Ped4 |
| Traffic Input | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | NS | NS | EW | EW |
|  | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | W Side | E Side | N Side | S Side |
| 7:00-8:00 | 0 | 0 |  | 42 | 0 | 30 |  | 231 | 42 | 30 | 242 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 8:00-9:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 173 | 32 | 23 | 182 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 208 | 41 | 32 | 232 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 167 | 33 | 26 | 188 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 0 | 0 |  | 61 | 0 | 42 |  | 288 | 60 | 49 | 339 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 245 | 51 | 42 | 288 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Total (6-hour peak) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 | 0 | 184 | 0 | 1,312 | 259 | 202 | 1,471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average (6-hour peak) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 219 | 43 | 34 | 245 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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## Alberta Transportation - Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



| Lane Configuration |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \approx \\ & \stackrel{\Xi}{E} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\alpha} \\ & \stackrel{y}{*} \\ & \stackrel{\leftrightarrows}{E} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{v}}{\stackrel{y}{w}}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway 597 | WB |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 3,000 | 2 |
| Highway 597 | EB | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 800 | 2 |
| South Access | NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Access | SB |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Are the South Access SB right turns significantly impeded by through movements? (y/n) |  |  |  |  |  |  | n |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n |  |  |
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## Alberta Transportation - Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis



| Lane Configuration |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \approx \\ & \stackrel{\Xi}{E} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\alpha} \\ & \stackrel{y}{*} \\ & \stackrel{\leftrightarrows}{E} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{v}}{\stackrel{y}{w}}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway 597 | WB |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 3,000 | 2 |
| Highway 597 | EB | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 800 | 2 |
| South Access | NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Access | SB |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Are the South Access SB right turns significantly impeded by through movements? (y/n) |  |  |  |  |  |  | n |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | n |  |  |
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Warrant for Intersection Lighting (See Note 2)


Notes:

[^1]
# Alberta Transportation Intersection Left Turn Lane Warrant Analysis For Two-Lane Highways 

Project Number:
Project Name: Intersection:
Roadway:
Direction:
Time Period:
Scenario:
Design Speed:

151-02471-00
Blackfalds Crossing ASP TIA
Highway 597 / South Accesws
Highway 597
EB
PM Peak Hour
2018 Combined Traffic
70 km/h

Traffic Information:
a. Number of Left Turning Vehicles per Hour
b. Advancing Volume:
c. Proportion of Left Turns in Va
d. Opposing Volume
$V \ell=49 \mathrm{vph}$
$\mathrm{Va}=388 \mathrm{vph}$
$\mathrm{L}=\mathrm{V} \ell / \mathrm{Va}=49 / 388=13 \%$
$\mathrm{Vo}=348 \mathrm{vph}$

## $\therefore$ A Left Turn Lane is Warranted (Type IV)



# Alberta Transportation Intersection Left Turn Lane Warrant Analysis For Two-Lane Highways 

Project Number:
Project Name: Intersection:
Roadway:
Direction:
Time Period:
Scenario:
Design Speed:

151-02471-00
Blackfalds Crossing ASP TIA
Highway 597 / South Accesws
Highway 597
EB
PM Peak Hour
2035 Combined Traffic
70 km/h

Traffic Information:
a. Number of Left Turning Vehicles per Hour
b. Advancing Volume:
c. Proportion of Left Turns in Va
d. Opposing Volume

$$
L=\text { V } \ell / \mathrm{Va}=92 / 530=17 \% \mathrm{ve}=92 \mathrm{vph} \text { V } \begin{array}{r}
\text { Va }=530 \mathrm{vph} \\
\text { Vo }=509 \mathrm{vph}
\end{array}
$$

## $\therefore$ A Left Turn Lane is Warranted (Type IV)





# Appendix 

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS

- Synchro Outputs
- SIDRA Outputs


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 43.2 | 1.6 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | E |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 621 | - | 246 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.065 | - | 0.65 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 11.2 | 0.3 | 43.2 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | A | E | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.2 | - | 4 | - | - |



| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.3 | 2.2 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1049 | -495 | - | - |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.15 | -0.125 | - | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9 | 1 | 13.3 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.5 | - | 0.4 | - | - |


|  | 4 |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ** | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 | 44 | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 54 | 213 | 74 | 280 | 1088 | 105 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 54 | 213 | 74 | 280 | 1088 | 105 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Storage Length (m) | 50.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |  |  | 60.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 3380 | 1559 | 1742 | 3322 | 3484 | 1525 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.129 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 3380 | 1559 | 237 | 3322 | 3484 | 1525 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 232 |  |  |  | 114 |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 50 |  |  | 60 | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 336.5 |  |  | 588.3 | 280.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 24.2 |  |  | 35.3 | 16.9 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 7\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 59 | 232 | 80 | 304 | 1183 | 114 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 59 | 232 | 80 | 304 | 1183 | 114 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 5 | 2 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | 12.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | 12.0 | 41.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 36.9\% | 36.9\% | 18.5\% | 63.1\% | 44.6\% | 44.6\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 35.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Min | Min | Min |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 31.7 | 31.7 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.49 | 0.49 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.13 | 0.56 | 0.24 | 0.15 | 0.69 | 0.14 |
| Control Delay | 20.8 | 9.5 | 5.8 | 4.3 | 15.2 | 3.3 |


|  | 4 | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 4 | $\frac{1}{1}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 20.8 | 9.5 | 5.8 | 4.3 | 15.2 | 3.3 |
| LOS | C | A | A | A | B | A |
| Approach Delay | 11.8 |  |  | 4.6 | 14.2 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | A | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 2.6 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 4.4 | 47.8 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 6.6 | 14.9 | 6.8 | 10.2 | \#91.7 | 7.4 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 312.5 |  |  | 564.3 | 256.9 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 50.0 |  | 60.0 |  |  | 60.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1212 | 707 | 327 | 2414 | 1710 | 806 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.05 | 0.33 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.69 | 0.14 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

```
Area Type: Other
```

Cycle Length: 65
Actuated Cycle Length: 50.9
Natural Cycle: 65
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.69
Intersection Signal Delay: 12.0
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 55.9\%
ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 2: Highway 2A \& Broadway Avenue


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 个4 | ¢4 | 「 | \% |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 30 | 242 | 231 | 42 | 42 | 30 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 30 | 242 | 231 | 42 | 42 | 30 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 650 | - | - | 300 | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Mumt Flow | 33 | 263 | 251 | 46 | 46 | 33 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 251 | 0 | - | 0 | 448 | 126 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 251 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 197 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.2 | - | - | - | 6.9 | 7 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.25 | - | - | - | 3.55 | 3.35 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1290 | - | - | - | 532 | 891 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 759 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 808 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - | 518 | 891 |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1290 | - | - | - | 518 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 759 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 787 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.9 | 0 | 11.6 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | B |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1290 | - | - | -627 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.025 | - | - | -0.125 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.9 | - | - | -11.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | - | -0.4 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | \& |  |  | \$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 61 | 5 | 26 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 18 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 165 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 61 | 5 | 26 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 18 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 165 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvut Flow | 66 | 5 | 28 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 20 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 179 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Minor1 |  |  | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 162 | 157 | 102 | 174 | 246 | 14 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 104 | 104 | - | 53 | 53 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 58 | 53 | - | 121 | 193 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 803 | 735 | 953 | 789 | 656 | 1066 | 1383 | - | - | 1604 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 902 | 809 | - | 960 | 851 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 954 | 851 | - | 883 | 741 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 784 | 723 | 953 | 752 | 646 | 1066 | 1383 | - | - | 1604 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 784 | 723 | - | 752 | 646 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 888 | 808 | - | 946 | 838 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 929 | 838 | - | 850 | 740 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10 |  |  | 10.4 |  |  | 4.4 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1383 | - | - | 821 | 683 | 1604 | - |


|  | $4$ |  | 4 |  |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 71 | 「 | 7 | 44 | 44 | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 164 | 143 | 262 | 786 | 458 | 141 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 164 | 143 | 262 | 786 | 458 | 141 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Storage Length (m) | 50.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |  |  | 60.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 3380 | 1559 | 1742 | 3484 | 3417 | 1525 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.335 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 3380 | 1559 | 614 | 3484 | 3417 | 1525 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 155 |  |  |  | 153 |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 50 |  |  | 60 | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 336.5 |  |  | 588.3 | 280.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 24.2 |  |  | 35.3 | 16.9 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 178 | 155 | 285 | 854 | 498 | 153 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 178 | 155 | 285 | 854 | 498 | 153 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 5 | 2 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | 12.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | 12.0 | 36.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 40.0\% | 40.0\% | 20.0\% | 60.0\% | 40.0\% | 40.0\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 7.5 | 30.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Min | Min | Min |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 7.2 | 7.2 | 24.9 | 25.2 | 10.9 | 10.9 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.29 | 0.38 | 0.47 | 0.38 | 0.53 | 0.29 |
| Control Delay | 17.4 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 5.8 | 15.1 | 4.5 |


|  | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4 | $\frac{1}{\square}$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 17.4 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 5.8 | 15.1 | 4.5 |
| LOS | B | A | A | A | B | A |
| Approach Delay | 12.6 |  |  | 6.1 | 12.6 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | A | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 5.7 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 15.8 | 15.9 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 13.5 | 11.3 | 18.4 | 28.0 | 27.8 | 8.9 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 312.5 |  |  | 564.3 | 256.9 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 50.0 |  | 60.0 |  |  | 60.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1641 | 836 | 616 | 2650 | 1660 | 819 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.46 | 0.32 | 0.30 | 0.19 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

```
Area Type: Other
```

Cycle Length: 60
Actuated Cycle Length: 39.3
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.53
Intersection Signal Delay: 9.1
Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 46.7\%
ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 8: Highway 2A \& East Access


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 个4 | 个4 | 「 | M |  |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 49 | 339 | 288 | 60 | 61 | 42 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 49 | 339 | 288 | 60 | 61 | 42 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized |  | None | － | None | － | None |
| Storage Length | 650 | － | － | 300 | 0 | － |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | － | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 5 | 9 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Mumt Flow | 53 | 368 | 313 | 65 | 66 | 46 |


| Major／Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 313 | 0 | - | 0 | 604 | 157 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 313 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 291 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.2 | - | - | - | 6.9 | 7 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | - |
| Follow－up Hdwy | 2.25 | - | - | - | 3.55 | 3.35 |
| Pot Cap－1 Maneuver | 1223 | - | - | - | 423 | 851 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 706 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 724 | - |
| Platoon blocked，\％ |  | - | - | - | 405 | 851 |
| Mov Cap－1 Maneuver | 1223 | - | - | - | 405 | - |
| Mov Cap－2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 706 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 693 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | 13.9 |  |
| HCM Control Delay，S | 1 |  |  | $B$ |  |  |


| Minor Lane／Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity（veh／h） | 1223 | - | - | -515 |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | 0.044 | - | - | -0.217 |
| HCM Control Delay（s） | 8.1 | - | - | -13.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \％tile Q（veh） | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| （ver |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 8.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 212 | 10 | 46 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 43 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 63 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 212 | 10 | 46 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 43 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 63 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - |  | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 230 | 11 | 50 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 47 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 68 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 171 | 169 | 54 | 199 | 203 | 19 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 56 | 56 | - | 113 | 113 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 115 | 113 | - | 86 | 90 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 792 | 724 | 1013 | 760 | 693 | 1059 | 1508 | - | - | 1596 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 956 | 848 | - | 892 | 802 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 890 | 802 | - | 922 | 820 | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 12.1 | 10.1 | 5.3 | 0.1 |
| HCM LOS | B | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1508 | - | -797 | 718 | 1596 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.031 | - | -0.366 | 0.009 | 0.001 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.5 | 0 | - | 12.1 | 10.1 | 7.3 | 0 |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | B | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | - | 1.7 | 0 | 0 | - |
| ( |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | $\ddagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*} 1$ | T | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 | 44 | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 95 | 256 | 96 | 324 | 1267 | 157 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 95 | 256 | 96 | 324 | 1267 | 157 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Storage Length (m) | 50.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |  |  | 60.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 3380 | 1559 | 1742 | 3322 | 3484 | 1525 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.119 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 3380 | 1559 | 218 | 3322 | 3484 | 1525 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 181 |  |  |  | 171 |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 50 |  |  | 60 | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 336.5 |  |  | 588.3 | 280.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 24.2 |  |  | 35.3 | 16.9 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 7\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 103 | 278 | 104 | 352 | 1377 | 171 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 103 | 278 | 104 | 352 | 1377 | 171 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 5 | 2 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 6.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 16.0 | 16.0 | 10.5 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 10.5 | 52.0 | 41.5 | 41.5 |
| Total Split (\%) | 25.7\% | 25.7\% | 15.0\% | 74.3\% | 59.3\% | 59.3\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 6.0 | 46.0 | 35.5 | 35.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Min | Min | Min |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 11.2 | 11.2 | 38.6 | 37.0 | 29.3 | 29.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.63 | 0.61 | 0.48 | 0.48 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.17 | 0.64 | 0.35 | 0.17 | 0.82 | 0.21 |
| Control Delay | 25.1 | 18.3 | 7.1 | 4.9 | 18.7 | 2.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 25.1 | 18.3 | 7.1 | 4.9 | 18.7 | 2.5 |
| LOS | C | B | A | A | B | A |


| 4 |  | 4 |  | $\ddagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Approach Delay 20.2 |  |  | 5.4 | 16.9 |  |
| Approach LOS C |  |  | A | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) 5.6 | 10.7 | 3.4 | 7.0 | 67.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) 12.1 | \#36.5 | 8.0 | 12.2 | 97.5 | 8.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) 312.5 |  |  | 564.3 | 256.9 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) 50.0 |  | 60.0 |  |  | 60.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) 700 | 466 | 296 | 2517 | 2136 | 1001 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio 0.15 | 0.60 | 0.35 | 0.14 | 0.64 | 0.17 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other <br> Cycle Length: 70  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 60.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.82 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 15.2 |  |  | Intersection LOS: B |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 63.5\% |  |  | ICU Level of Service B |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 2: Highway 2A \& Broadway Avenue


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 | 中4 | 「 | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 46 | 260 | 249 | 69 | 100 | 58 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 46 | 260 | 249 | 69 | 100 | 58 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 650 | - | - | 300 | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 50 | 283 | 271 | 75 | 109 | 63 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 271 | 0 | - | 0 | 512 | 135 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 271 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 241 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.2 | - | - | - | 6.9 | 7 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.25 | - | - | - | 3.55 | 3.35 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1268 | - | - | - | 484 | 880 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 741 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 768 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - | 465 | 880 |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1268 | - | - | - | 465 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 741 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 738 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | 14.2 |  |
| HCM Control Delay, S | 1.2 |  |  | $B$ |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1268 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.039 | - | - | -0.306 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| H | 1.3 |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 61 | 5 | 38 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 31 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 165 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 61 | 5 | 38 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 31 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 165 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 66 | 5 | 41 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 34 | 27 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 179 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |  | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 210 | 206 | 108 | 229 | 295 | 28 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 110 | 110 | - | 95 | 95 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 100 | 96 | - | 134 | 200 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 747 | 691 | 946 | 726 | 616 | 1047 | 1375 | - | - | 1585 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 895 | 804 | - | 912 | 816 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 906 | 815 | - | 869 | 736 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 723 | 673 | 946 | 676 | 600 | 1047 | 1375 | - | - | 1585 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 723 | 673 | - | 676 | 600 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 873 | 803 | - | 889 | 796 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 873 | 795 | - | 825 | 735 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.3 |  |  | 10.8 |  |  | 4.2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1375 | - | - | 788 | 634 | 1585 | - |


|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  | 4 |  |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1 *}$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 | 44 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 233 | 180 | 312 | 962 | 560 | 208 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 233 | 180 | 312 | 962 | 560 | 208 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Storage Length (m) | 50.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 |  |  | 60.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 3380 | 1559 | 1742 | 3484 | 3417 | 1525 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.278 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 3380 | 1559 | 510 | 3484 | 3417 | 1525 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 196 |  |  |  | 226 |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 50 |  |  | 60 | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 336.5 |  |  | 588.3 | 280.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 24.2 |  |  | 35.3 | 16.9 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 253 | 196 | 339 | 1046 | 609 | 226 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 253 | 196 | 339 | 1046 | 609 | 226 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 5 | 2 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 6.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 16.0 | 16.0 | 10.5 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 17.0 | 17.0 | 20.0 | 43.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 28.3\% | 28.3\% | 33.3\% | 71.7\% | 38.3\% | 38.3\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 11.0 | 11.0 | 15.5 | 37.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Min | Min | Min |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.2 | 10.2 | 33.8 | 32.3 | 15.8 | 15.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.62 | 0.59 | 0.29 | 0.29 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.40 | 0.43 | 0.58 | 0.51 | 0.62 | 0.38 |
| Control Delay | 22.6 | 7.5 | 9.2 | 7.4 | 20.5 | 5.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 22.6 | 7.5 | 9.2 | 7.4 | 20.5 | 5.0 |
| LOS | C | A | A | A | C | A |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 个个 | 个4 | 「 | Y |  |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 92 | 359 | 305 | 138 | 122 | 75 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 92 | 359 | 305 | 138 | 122 | 75 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized |  | None | － | None | － | None |
| Storage Length | 600 | － | － | 300 | 0 | － |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | － | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 5 | 9 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Mumt Flow | 100 | 390 | 332 | 150 | 133 | 82 |


| Major／Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 332 | 0 | - | 0 | 727 | 166 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 332 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 395 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.2 | - | - | - | 6.9 | 7 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | - |
| Follow－up Hdwy | 2.25 | - | - | - | 3.55 | 3.35 |
| Pot Cap－1 Maneuver | 1203 | - | - | - | 353 | 840 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 690 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 641 | - |
| Platoon blocked，\％ |  | - | - | - | 324 | 840 |
| Mov Cap－1 Maneuver | 1203 | - | - | - | 324 | - |
| Mov Cap－2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 690 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 588 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | 21.9 |  |
| HCM Control Delay，S | 1.7 |  |  |  | C |  |


| Minor Lane／Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity（veh／h） | 1203 | - | - | -423 |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | 0.083 | - | - | -0.506 |
| HCM Control Delay（s） | 8.3 | - | - | -21.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - |
| CO |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \％tile Q（veh） | 0.3 | - | - | - |
| C |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 9.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 212 | 10 | 69 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 65 | 32 | 1 | 1 | 37 | 63 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 212 | 10 | 69 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 65 | 32 | 1 | 1 | 37 | 63 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 230 | 11 | 75 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 71 | 35 | 1 | 1 | 40 | 68 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |  | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 256 | 254 | 74 | 297 | 288 | 35 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 77 | 77 | - | 177 | 177 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 179 | 177 | - | 120 | 111 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 697 | 650 | 988 | 655 | 622 | 1038 | 1481 | - | - | 1575 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 932 | 831 | - | 825 | 753 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 823 | 753 | - | 884 | 804 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 666 | 618 | 988 | 574 | 591 | 1038 | 1481 | - | - | 1575 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 666 | 618 | - | 574 | 591 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 886 | 830 | - | 785 | 716 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 777 | 716 | - | 805 | 803 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.9 | 10.7 | 5 | 0.1 |
| HCM LOS | B | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1481 | - | -720 | 633 | 1575 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.048 | - | -0.439 | 0.01 | 0.001 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.6 | 0 | - | 13.9 | 10.7 | 7.3 | 0 |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | B | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | - | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | - |
| H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  | 4 |  |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7} 1$ | T | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 | 44 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 95 | 256 | 96 | 400 | 1562 | 157 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 95 | 256 | 96 | 400 | 1562 | 157 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Storage Length (m) | 50.0 | 40.0 | 60.0 |  |  | 60.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 3380 | 1559 | 1742 | 3322 | 3484 | 1525 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.089 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 3380 | 1559 | 163 | 3322 | 3484 | 1525 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 179 |  |  |  | 171 |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 50 |  |  | 60 | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 64.5 |  |  | 588.3 | 280.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 4.6 |  |  | 35.3 | 16.9 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 7\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 103 | 278 | 104 | 435 | 1698 | 171 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 103 | 278 | 104 | 435 | 1698 | 171 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 5 | 2 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 16.0 | 16.0 | 12.5 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 16.0 | 16.0 | 12.5 | 64.0 | 51.5 | 51.5 |
| Total Split (\%) | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 15.6\% | 80.0\% | 64.4\% | 64.4\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 58.0 | 45.5 | 45.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Min | Min | Min |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.5 | 10.5 | 50.9 | 49.4 | 40.2 | 40.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.70 | 0.68 | 0.56 | 0.56 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.21 | 0.74 | 0.35 | 0.19 | 0.88 | 0.19 |
| Control Delay | 32.6 | 27.0 | 7.9 | 4.0 | 20.9 | 2.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 32.6 | 27.0 | 7.9 | 4.0 | 20.9 | 2.0 |
| LOS | C | C | A | A | C | A |


|  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $\frac{1}{*}$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Approach Delay | 28.5 |  |  | 4.7 | 19.1 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | A | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 7.4 | 14.3 | 3.4 | 8.9 | 105.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 14.3 | \#51.2 | 10.7 | 13.0 | 138.3 | 7.4 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 40.5 |  |  | 564.3 | 256.9 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 50.0 | 40.0 | 60.0 |  |  | 60.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 488 | 378 | 297 | 2620 | 2291 | 1061 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.21 | 0.74 | 0.35 | 0.17 | 0.74 | 0.16 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 72.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 17.6 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: B |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 73.1\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service D |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 2: Highway 2A \& E-W Collector Road


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 44 | 4 4 | F | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 46 | 318 | 304 | 69 | 100 | 58 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 46 | 318 | 304 | 69 | 100 | 58 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized |  | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 650 | - | - | 300 | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 50 | 346 | 330 | 75 | 109 | 63 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 330 | 0 | - | 0 | 603 | 165 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 330 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 273 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.2 | - | - | - | 6.9 | 7 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.25 | - | - | - | 3.55 | 3.35 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1205 | - | - | - | 424 | 841 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 692 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 739 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - | 406 | 841 |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1205 | - | - | - | 406 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 692 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 708 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  |  | 15.9 |  |
| HCM Control Delay, S | 1 |  |  |  | C |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1205 | - | - | -501 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.041 | - | - | -0.343 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.1 | - | - | -15.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| C | 1.5 |  |  |  |

HCM 2010 TWSC
4: N-S Collector/East Railway Street \& South Street

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 61 | 5 | 38 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 31 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 165 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 61 | 5 | 38 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 31 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 165 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 66 | 5 | 41 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 34 | 27 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 179 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |  | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 210 | 206 | 108 | 229 | 295 | 28 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 110 | 110 | - | 95 | 95 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 100 | 96 | - | 134 | 200 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 747 | 691 | 946 | 726 | 616 | 1047 | 1375 | - | - | 1585 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 895 | 804 | - | 912 | 816 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 906 | 815 | - | 869 | 736 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 723 | 673 | 946 | 676 | 600 | 1047 | 1375 | - | - | 1585 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 723 | 673 | - | 676 | 600 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 873 | 803 | - | 889 | 796 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 873 | 795 | - | 825 | 735 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.3 |  |  | 10.8 |  |  | 4.2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1375 | - | - | 788 | 634 | 1585 | - |


|  | 4 |  | 4 | 9 |  | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 7 | ${ }^{*}$ | 中4 | 44 | T |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 233 | 180 | 312 | 1201 | 693 | 208 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 233 | 180 | 312 | 1201 | 693 | 208 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.5 |
| Storage Length (m) | 50.0 | 30.0 | 60.0 |  |  | 60.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 3380 | 1559 | 1742 | 3484 | 3417 | 1525 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.213 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 3380 | 1559 | 391 | 3484 | 3417 | 1525 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 196 |  |  |  | 226 |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 50 |  |  | 60 | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 71.0 |  |  | 588.3 | 280.9 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 5.1 |  |  | 35.3 | 16.9 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 253 | 196 | 339 | 1305 | 753 | 226 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 253 | 196 | 339 | 1305 | 753 | 226 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 5 | 2 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  | 6 |
| Detector Phase | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 16.0 | 16.0 | 12.5 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 16.0 | 16.0 | 18.0 | 44.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 26.7\% | 26.7\% | 30.0\% | 73.3\% | 43.3\% | 43.3\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 13.5 | 38.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Min | Min | Min |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.1 | 10.1 | 34.6 | 33.1 | 17.4 | 17.4 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.63 | 0.60 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.41 | 0.44 | 0.66 | 0.63 | 0.70 | 0.36 |
| Control Delay | 23.4 | 7.8 | 12.8 | 8.5 | 20.9 | 4.3 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 23.4 | 7.8 | 12.8 | 8.5 | 20.9 | 4.3 |
| LOS | C | A | B | A | C | A |


|  | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Approach Delay | 16.6 |  |  | 9.4 | 17.1 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | A | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 11.7 | 0.0 | 12.9 | 37.2 | 34.5 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 22.3 | 14.4 | 32.4 | 52.1 | 52.8 | 12.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 47.0 |  |  | 564.3 | 256.9 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 50.0 | 30.0 | 60.0 |  |  | 60.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 616 | 444 | 577 | 2412 | 1245 | 699 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.41 | 0.44 | 0.59 | 0.54 | 0.60 | 0.32 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 55.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 12.9 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: B |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 59.5\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service B |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 2: Highway 2A \& E-W Collector Road


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 性 | 个个 | 「 | M |  |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 92 | 438 | 371 | 138 | 122 | 75 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 92 | 438 | 371 | 138 | 122 | 75 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized |  | None | － | None | － | None |
| Storage Length | 650 | － | － | 300 | 0 | － |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | － | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 5 | 9 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 100 | 476 | 403 | 150 | 133 | 82 |



| Minor Lane／Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity（veh／h） | 1131 | - | - | -363 |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | 0.088 | - | - | -0.59 |
| HCM Control Delay（s） | 8.5 | - | - | -38.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \％tile Q（veh） | 0.3 | - | - | - |
| D | 3.6 |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 9.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | BR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 212 | 10 | 69 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 65 | 32 | 1 | 1 | 37 | 63 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 212 | 10 | 69 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 65 | 32 | 1 | 1 | 37 | 63 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 230 | 11 | 75 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 71 | 35 | 1 | 1 | 40 | 68 |


| Major/Minor | Minor2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |  | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 256 | 254 | 74 | 297 | 288 | 35 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 77 | 77 | - | 177 | 177 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 179 | 177 | - | 120 | 111 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 697 | 650 | 988 | 655 | 622 | 1038 | 1481 | - | - | 1575 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 932 | 831 | - | 825 | 753 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 823 | 753 | - | 884 | 804 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 666 | 618 | 988 | 574 | 591 | 1038 | 1481 | - | - | 1575 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 666 | 618 | - | 574 | 591 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 886 | 830 | - | 785 | 716 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 777 | 716 | - | 805 | 803 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.9 | 10.7 | 5 | 0.1 |
| HCM LOS | B | B |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR EBLn1WBLn1 | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1481 | - | -720 | 633 | 1575 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.048 | - | -0.439 | 0.01 | 0.001 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.6 | 0 | - | 13.9 | 10.7 | 7.3 | 0 |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | B | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | - | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | - |
| H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / 597 (2018 Combined Traffic AM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. Satn v/c | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane } \\ & \text { Util. } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Bac <br> Veh | $\begin{gathered} \text { ueue } \\ \text { Dist } \\ \text { m } \end{gathered}$ | Lane Config | Lane Length m | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cap. } \\ \text { Adj. } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Prob. Block. \% |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 230 | 14.2 | 1091 | 0.211 | 100 | 5.2 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.7 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 266 | 9.0 | 1260 | 0.211 | 100 | 4.7 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 496 | 11.4 |  | 0.211 |  | 4.9 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |
| East: WB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 138 | 6.6 | 981 | 0.141 | 100 | 5.0 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 164 | 2.0 | 1164 | 0.141 | 100 | 4.3 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 302 | 4.1 |  | 0.141 |  | 4.6 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 677 | 2.0 | 1097 | 0.617 | 100 | 11.5 | LOS B | 4.9 | 35.2 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 770 | 2.8 | 1248 | 0.617 | 100 | 10.5 | LOS B | 4.9 | 35.3 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1447 | 2.4 |  | 0.617 |  | 11.0 | LOS B | 4.9 | 35.3 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 110 | 6.1 | 469 | 0.234 | $73^{5}$ | 11.2 | LOS B | 1.1 | 8.1 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 208 | 10.0 | 647 | 0.321 | 100 | 9.8 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.2 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 318 | 8.7 |  | 0.321 |  | 10.3 | LOS B | 1.7 | 13.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 2562 | 5.1 |  | 0.617 |  | 9.0 | LOS A | 4.9 | 35.3 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

5 Lane under-utilisation found by the program
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach

## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / 597 (2018 Combined Traffic PM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} =10 w s \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. Satn v/c | Lane Util. \% | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Bac <br> Veh | $\begin{array}{r} \text { ueue } \\ \text { Dist } \\ \mathrm{m} \end{array}$ | Lane Config | Lane Length m | Cap. Adj. \% | Prob. Block \% |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 486 | 4.1 | 989 | 0.492 | 100 | 9.6 | LOS A | 3.1 | 22.5 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 568 | 3.3 | 1156 | 0.492 | 100 | 8.5 | LOSA | 3.1 | 22.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1054 | 3.7 |  | 0.492 |  | 9.0 | LOS A | 3.1 | 22.6 |  |  |  |  |
| East: WB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 148 | 10.8 | 564 | 0.262 | 100 | 9.9 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.4 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 199 | 8.4 | 759 | 0.262 | 100 | 7.7 | LOSA | 1.3 | 10.1 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 347 | 9.4 |  | 0.262 |  | 8.7 | LOS A | 1.3 | 10.1 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 323 | 2.8 | 1030 | 0.313 | 100 | 6.6 | LOS A | 1.7 | 12.0 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 361 | 4.9 | 1152 | 0.313 | 100 | 6.1 | LOSA | 1.7 | 12.5 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 684 | 3.9 |  | 0.313 |  | 6.4 | LOS A | 1.7 | 12.5 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 207 | 5.7 | 838 | 0.247 | 100 | 6.9 | LOS A | 1.2 | 8.7 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 232 | 14.6 | 938 | 0.247 | 100 | 6.3 | LOSA | 1.2 | 9.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 439 | 10.4 |  | 0.247 |  | 6.6 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 2524 | 5.7 |  | 0.492 |  | 7.8 | LOS A | 3.1 | 22.6 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach

SIDRA INTERSECTION 6.1 | Copyright © 2000-2015 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
Organisation: WSP CANADA INC. | Processed: November-21-16 9:35:39 AM
Project: N:\151-02471-00 Blackfalds Subdivision TIAlTransportation\Sidra\2018 C PM.sip6

## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / 597 (2025 Combined Traffic AM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. Satn v/c | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane } \\ & \text { Util. } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Bac <br> Veh | $\begin{gathered} \text { ueue } \\ \text { Dist } \\ \text { m } \end{gathered}$ | Lane Config | Lane Length m | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cap. } \\ \text { Adj. } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Prob. Block. \% |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 266 | 14.3 | 1057 | 0.252 | 100 | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.8 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 310 | 9.0 | 1230 | 0.252 | 100 | 5.2 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.7 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 576 | 11.4 |  | 0.252 |  | 5.5 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |
| East: WB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 155 | 6.7 | 932 | 0.166 | 100 | 5.5 | LOS A | 0.8 | 5.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 186 | 2.0 | 1121 | 0.166 | 100 | 4.7 | LOS A | 0.8 | 5.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 341 | 4.1 |  | 0.166 |  | 5.0 | LOS A | 0.8 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 771 | 2.0 | 1061 | 0.727 | 100 | 15.5 | LOS C | 7.5 | 53.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 884 | 2.7 | 1216 | 0.727 | 100 | 14.0 | LOS B | 7.6 | 54.4 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1655 | 2.4 |  | 0.727 |  | 14.7 | LOS B | 7.6 | 54.4 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 126 | 6.3 | 385 | 0.327 | $66^{5}$ | 15.5 | LOS C | 1.7 | 12.2 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 268 | 10.0 | 544 | 0.493 | 100 | 15.3 | LOS C | 3.2 | 24.3 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 395 | 8.8 |  | 0.493 |  | 15.4 | LOS C | 3.2 | 24.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 2967 | 5.2 |  | 0.727 |  | 11.9 | LOS B | 7.6 | 54.4 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if v/c > irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

5 Lane under-utilisation found by the program
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach

## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / 597 (2025 Combined Traffic PM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. <br> Satn <br> v/c | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane } \\ & \text { Util. } \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Bac <br> Veh | $\begin{gathered} \text { eue } \\ \text { Dist } \\ \text { m } \end{gathered}$ | Lane Config | Lane Length m | Cap. <br> Adj. <br> \% | Prob. Block. \% |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 609 | 4.5 | 942 | 0.647 | 100 | 13.8 | LOS B | 5.5 | 39.9 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 724 | 3.2 | 1119 | 0.647 | 100 | 12.1 | LOS B | 5.6 | 40.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1333 | 3.8 |  | 0.647 |  | 12.9 | LOS B | 5.6 | 40.6 |  |  |  |  |
| East: WB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 169 | 10.7 | 440 | 0.384 | 100 | 15.1 | LOS C | 2.0 | 15.3 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 239 | 8.5 | 623 | 0.384 | 100 | 11.2 | LOS B | 2.3 | 16.9 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 408 | 9.4 |  | 0.384 |  | 12.8 | LOS B | 2.3 | 16.9 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 376 | 2.8 | 948 | 0.396 | 100 | 8.3 | LOS A | 2.2 | 16.0 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 429 | 4.8 | 1082 | 0.396 | 100 | 7.5 | LOS A | 2.3 | 16.8 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 804 | 3.9 |  | 0.396 |  | 7.8 | LOS A | 2.3 | 16.8 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 248 | 5.6 | 761 | 0.326 | 100 | 8.6 | LOS A | 1.6 | 12.1 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 275 | 18.6 | 843 | 0.326 | 100 | 7.9 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.8 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 523 | 12.5 |  | 0.326 |  | 8.3 | LOS A | 1.7 | 13.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 3067 | 6.0 |  | 0.647 |  | 10.8 | LOS B | 5.6 | 40.6 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if v/c > irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D)
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach

SIDRA INTERSECTION 6.1 | Copyright © 2000-2015 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
Organisation: WSP CANADA INC. | Processed: November-21-16 9:38:45 AM
Project: N:\151-02471-00 Blackfalds Subdivision TIAlTransportation\Sidra\2025 C PM.sip6

## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / 597 (2035 Combined Traffic AM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. Satn v/c | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane } \\ & \text { Util. } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Bac <br> Veh | Queue Dist m | Lane Config | Lane Length m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cap. } \\ & \text { Adj. } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Prob. Block. \% |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 313 | 14.1 | 1015 | 0.309 | 100 | 6.7 | LOS A | 1.8 | 14.1 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 367 | 9.0 | 1189 | 0.309 | 100 | 5.9 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.1 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 680 | 11.4 |  | 0.309 |  | 6.3 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.1 |  |  |  |  |
| East: WB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 183 | 6.8 | 871 | 0.210 | 100 | 6.3 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.3 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 224 | 2.0 | 1067 | 0.210 | 100 | 5.3 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.3 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 407 | 4.2 |  | 0.210 |  | 5.7 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.3 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 891 | 2.0 | 1007 | 0.885 | 100 | 27.8 | LOS D | 14.4 | 102.8 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 1032 | 2.7 | 1167 | 0.885 | 100 | 25.1 | LOS D | 14.8 | 106.0 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1923 | 2.4 |  | 0.885 |  | 26.4 | LOS D | 14.8 | 106.0 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 145 | 6.3 | 281 | 0.516 | $69^{5}$ | 28.3 | LOS D | 3.0 | 22.1 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 302 | 10.0 | 404 | 0.747 | 100 | 34.7 | LOS D | 6.2 | 46.9 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 447 | 8.8 |  | 0.747 |  | 32.6 | LOS D | 6.2 | 46.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 3457 | 5.2 |  | 0.885 |  | 20.8 | LOS C | 14.8 | 106.0 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

5 Lane under-utilisation found by the program
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach

## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / 597 (2035 Combined Traffic PM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { =lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. Satn v/c | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane } \\ & \text { Util. } \\ & \text { \% } \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Ba Veh | $\begin{array}{r} \text { ueue } \\ \text { Dist } \\ \mathrm{m} \end{array}$ | Lane Config | Lane Length m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cap. } \\ & \text { Adj. } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Prob. Block. \% |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 713 | 4.4 | 875 | 0.815 | 100 | 23.5 | LOS C | 9.7 | 70.2 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 860 | 3.2 | 1055 | 0.815 | 100 | 20.5 | LOS C | 10.1 | 72.9 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1573 | 3.7 |  | 0.815 |  | 21.8 | LOS C | 10.1 | 72.9 |  |  |  |  |
| East: WB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 195 | 10.5 | 334 | 0.584 | 100 | 27.8 | LOS D | 3.5 | 26.8 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 288 | 8.7 | 493 | 0.584 | 100 | 20.0 | LOS C | 4.1 | 31.2 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 483 | 9.4 |  | 0.584 |  | 23.1 | LOS C | 4.1 | 31.2 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 440 | 2.8 | 885 | 0.497 | 100 | 10.5 | LOS B | 3.3 | 23.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 509 | 4.8 | 1025 | 0.497 | 100 | 9.4 | LOS A | 3.4 | 24.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 949 | 3.9 |  | 0.497 |  | 9.9 | LOS A | 3.4 | 24.6 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB Highway 597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 284 | 5.7 | 669 | 0.425 | 100 | 11.4 | LOS B | 2.4 | 17.9 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 326 | 17.5 | 768 | 0.425 | 100 | 10.2 | LOS B | 2.5 | 20.4 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 610 | 12.0 |  | 0.425 |  | 10.8 | LOS B | 2.5 | 20.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 3614 | 5.9 |  | 0.815 |  | 17.0 | LOS C | 10.1 | 72.9 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach

SIDRA INTERSECTION 6.1 | Copyright © 2000-2015 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
Organisation: WSP CANADA INC. | Processed: November-21-16 9:40:52 AM
Project: N:\151-02471-00 Blackfalds Subdivision TIAlTransportation\Sidra\2035 C PM.sip6

## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / East Access (2018 Combined Traffic AM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. Satn v/c | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane } \\ & \text { Util. } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Bac <br> Veh | $\begin{gathered} \text { ueue } \\ \text { Dist } \\ \text { m } \end{gathered}$ | Lane Config | Lane Length m | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cap. } \\ \text { Adj. } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Prob. Block. \% |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 188 | 4.8 | 1339 | 0.141 | 100 | 3.8 | LOS A | 0.8 | 5.6 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 ( T$)^{\text {d }}$ | 205 | 7.0 | 1456 | 0.141 | 100 | 3.6 | LOS A | 0.8 | 5.8 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 393 | 6.0 |  | 0.141 |  | 3.7 | LOS A | 0.8 | 5.8 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (T) | 623 | 2.0 | 1364 | 0.457 | 100 | 7.1 | LOS A | 3.1 | 22.1 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 702 | 2.0 | 1538 | 0.457 | 100 | 6.6 | LOS A | 3.1 | 22.2 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1326 | 2.0 |  | 0.457 |  | 6.8 | LOS A | 3.1 | 22.2 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB East Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (L) | 60 | 2.0 | 551 | 0.109 | 100 | 7.9 | LOS A | 0.4 | 3.1 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane $2(\mathrm{R})^{\text {d }}$ | 237 | 2.0 | 881 | 0.269 | 100 | 6.9 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.0 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 297 | 2.0 |  | 0.269 |  | 7.1 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 2016 | 2.8 |  | 0.457 |  | 6.3 | LOS A | 3.1 | 22.2 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach
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## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / East Access (2018 Combined Traffic AM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. Satn v/c | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane } \\ & \text { Util. } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Bac Veh | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deue } \\ & \text { Dist } \\ & \text { m } \end{aligned}$ | Lane Config | Lane Length m | Cap. Adj. \% | Prob. Block. \% |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 552 | 3.4 | 1208 | 0.457 | 100 | 7.7 | LOS A | 3.2 | 23.2 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 ( T$)^{\text {d }}$ | 613 | 5.0 | 1341 | 0.457 | 100 | 7.2 | LOS A | 3.3 | 24.0 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1164 | 4.3 |  | 0.457 |  | 7.5 | LOS A | 3.3 | 24.0 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (T) | 315 | 2.0 | 1092 | 0.288 | 100 | 6.1 | LOS A | 1.7 | 11.9 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 351 | 2.0 | 1216 | 0.288 | 100 | 5.6 | LOS A | 1.7 | 12.2 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 666 | 2.0 |  | 0.288 |  | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.7 | 12.2 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB East Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (L) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 182 | 2.0 | 1100 | 0.166 | 100 | 4.7 | LOS A | 0.8 | 5.6 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (R) | 159 | 2.0 | 951 | 0.167 | 100 | 5.4 | LOS A | 0.8 | 5.5 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 341 | 2.0 |  | 0.167 |  | 5.0 | LOS A | 0.8 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 2171 | 3.2 |  | 0.457 |  | 6.6 | LOS A | 3.3 | 24.0 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach
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## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / East Access (2025 Combined Traffic AM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. Satn v/c | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane } \\ & \text { Util. } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Bac <br> Veh | $\begin{array}{r} \text { ueue } \\ \text { Dist } \\ \mathrm{m} \end{array}$ | Lane Config | Lane Length m | Cap. Adj. \% | Prob. Block \% |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 224 | 4.6 | 1270 | 0.176 | 100 | 4.3 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.2 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 ( T$)^{\text {d }}$ | 243 | 7.0 | 1376 | 0.176 | 100 | 4.1 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.5 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 467 | 5.9 |  | 0.176 |  | 4.2 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (T) | 743 | 2.0 | 1329 | 0.559 | 100 | 8.9 | LOS A | 4.5 | 31.8 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 839 | 2.0 | 1502 | 0.559 | 100 | 8.2 | LOS A | 4.5 | 32.1 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1582 | 2.0 |  | 0.559 |  | 8.5 | LOS A | 4.5 | 32.1 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB East Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (L) | 106 | 2.0 | 534 | 0.198 | 100 | 9.4 | LOS A | 0.9 | 6.1 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane $2(\mathrm{R})^{\text {d }}$ | 284 | 2.0 | 782 | 0.364 | 100 | 9.0 | LOS A | 2.0 | 13.9 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 390 | 2.0 |  | 0.364 |  | 9.1 | LOS A | 2.0 | 13.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 2439 | 2.7 |  | 0.559 |  | 7.8 | LOS A | 4.5 | 32.1 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach
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## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / East Access (2025 Combined Traffic PM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. Satn v/c | Lane Util. \% | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Bac <br> Veh | $\begin{gathered} \text { ueue } \\ \text { Dist } \\ \text { m } \end{gathered}$ | Lane Config | Lane Length m | Cap. <br> Adj. <br> \% | Prob. Block. \% |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 668 | 3.4 | 1119 | 0.597 | 100 | 10.9 | LOS B | 5.0 | 36.1 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (T) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 748 | 5.0 | 1252 | 0.597 | 100 | 10.0 | LOS B | 5.0 | 36.8 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1416 | 4.3 |  | 0.597 |  | 10.4 | LOS B | 5.0 | 36.8 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 ( T ) | 401 | 2.0 | 1023 | 0.392 | 100 | 7.7 | LOS A | 2.6 | 18.3 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 452 | 2.0 | 1152 | 0.392 | 100 | 7.1 | LOS A | 2.7 | 19.0 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 853 | 2.0 |  | 0.392 |  | 7.4 | LOS A | 2.7 | 19.0 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB East Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (L) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 259 | 2.0 | 1021 | 0.253 | 100 | 6.0 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.3 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (R) | 200 | 2.0 | 851 | 0.235 | 100 | 6.7 | LOS A | 1.1 | 8.1 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 459 | 2.0 |  | 0.253 |  | 6.3 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 2728 | 3.2 |  | 0.597 |  | 8.8 | LOS A | 5.0 | 36.8 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach
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## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / East Access (2035 Combined Traffic AM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand <br> Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. Satn v/c | Lane Util. $\%$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Bac <br> Veh | ueue Dist m | Lane Config | Lane Length m | Cap. Adj. $\qquad$ | Prob. Block $\qquad$ |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 264 | 5.0 | 1268 | 0.208 | 100 | 4.6 | LOS A | 1.2 | 9.0 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (T) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 287 | 7.0 | 1382 | 0.208 | 100 | 4.3 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.3 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 551 | 6.0 |  | 0.208 |  | 4.5 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.3 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (T) | 895 | 2.0 | 1333 | 0.671 | 100 | 11.4 | LOS B | 6.6 | 46.8 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 1015 | 2.0 | 1513 | 0.671 | 100 | 10.4 | LOS B | 6.6 | 47.0 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1910 | 2.0 |  | 0.671 |  | 10.9 | LOS B | 6.6 | 47.0 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB East Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (L) | 106 | 2.0 | 455 | 0.232 | 100 | 11.4 | LOS B | 1.1 | 7.6 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane $2(\mathrm{R})^{\text {d }}$ | 284 | 2.0 | 664 | 0.428 | 100 | 11.6 | LOS B | 2.6 | 18.3 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 390 | 2.0 |  | 0.428 |  | 11.5 | LOS B | 2.6 | 18.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 2851 | 2.8 |  | 0.671 |  | 9.7 | LOS A | 6.6 | 47.0 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach
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## LANE SUMMARY

## Site: Highway 2A / East Access (2035 Combined Traffic PM Peak)

EF: 1.1
Roundabout

| Lane Use and Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Cap. veh/h | Deg. Satn v/c | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane } \\ & \text { Util. } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Bac <br> Veh | $\begin{array}{r} \text { ueue } \\ \text { Dist } \\ \mathrm{m} \end{array}$ | Lane Config | Lane Length m | Cap. Adj. \% | Prob. Block \% |
| South: NB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (LT) | 791 | 3.7 | 1115 | 0.709 | 100 | 14.2 | LOS B | 8.0 | 57.8 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 ( T$)^{\text {d }}$ | 890 | 5.0 | 1255 | 0.709 | 100 | 13.1 | LOS B | 8.0 | 58.3 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1681 | 4.4 |  | 0.709 |  | 13.6 | LOS B | 8.0 | 58.3 |  |  |  |  |
| North: SB Highway 2A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (T) | 470 | 2.0 | 1014 | 0.463 | 100 | 8.9 | LOS A | 3.3 | 23.5 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (TR) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 531 | 2.0 | 1146 | 0.463 | 100 | 8.1 | LOS A | 3.4 | 24.5 | Full | 500 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 1001 | 2.0 |  | 0.463 |  | 8.5 | LOS A | 3.4 | 24.5 |  |  |  |  |
| West: EB East Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane 1 (L) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 259 | 2.0 | 940 | 0.275 | 100 | 6.7 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.3 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lane 2 (R) | 200 | 2.0 | 765 | 0.261 | 100 | 7.7 | LOS A | 1.3 | 9.1 | Full | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Approach | 459 | 2.0 |  | 0.275 |  | 7.1 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | 3141 | 3.3 |  | 0.709 |  | 11.0 | LOS B | 8.0 | 58.3 |  |  |  |  |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>$ irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
d Dominant lane on roundabout approach
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[^0]:    Stuart Richardson - Stuart.Richardson@gov.ab.ca

[^1]:    1 If the intersecition is not signalized, the user should choose EITHER the AADT OR the signalization factor. The points from either factor, but not both factors, may be used for the warrant point calculations,
    2 The number of certain types of vulnerable pedestrians should be factored to reflect their increased need for visibility.
    The number of child pedestrians (ages 12 and under) should be multiplied by two, and the number of senior pedestrians (age 65 and over) should be multiplied by 1.5
    385 th percentile nightime speed should be used, if available. Otherwise the posted speed may be used.
    4 Reported collisions, rounded to the nearest whole number.

