Claude Marchand, CET
Senior Engineering Technologist
Ainley \& Associates Limited
550 Welham Road
Barrie, ON L4N $8 Z 7$
Dear Mr. Marchand:

## Re: County of Simcoe

Environmental Resource Recovery Centre Traffic Impact Study Addendum

The County of Simcoe (County) continues to pursue the development of the proposed Environmental Resource Recovery Centre (ERRC) located at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West in the Township of Springwater (Township). In support of the ERRC, applications for Amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law were submitted to Township Planning staff on November 18, 2016. In addition to these Amendments, a number of supporting studies were also submitted, including a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) prepared by MMM Group (MMM).

Following the submission of the TIS, review comments were prepared by Ainley \& Associates Limited (Ainley) on behalf of the Township and submitted to the County on January 24, 2017. A meeting was also held on June 16, 2017 between the County, the Township, Ainley, and GHD to discuss the TIS review comments.

In response to these comments, MMM has prepared the attached Addendum to the TIS. The Addendum is meant to supplement the original TIS, providing responses to the review comments, as well as, supporting calculations and other information where requested. For ease of reference, review comments have been included with the responses provided in Section 2.0 of the Addendum.

We trust that this Addendum addresses all review comments. To further the Planning process, we kindly request that Ainley provide a response confirming that they are satisfied with the TIS Addendum by Friday, November 17, 2017.

Sincerely,
GHD


Brian Dermody, P. Eng.
Environmental Engineer
BD/sw/2
Encl.
cc: $\quad$ David Parks, MCIP, RPP - Director of Planning, Development and Tourism - County of Simcoe Brent Spagnol, MCIP, RPP - Director of Planning Services and By-law Enforcement - Township of Springwater
Nathan Westendorp, MCIP, RPP - Manager of Development - County of Simcoe

## Attachment <br> TIS Addendum
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Prepared for: County of Simcoe

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE RECOVERY CENTRE 2976 HORSESHOE VALLEY ROAD WEST TOWNSHIP OF SPRINGWATER

MMM Group Limited
100 Commerce Valley Drive West
Thornhill, ON Canada L3T OA1
t: 905.882.1100 |f: 905.882 .0055
wnw.mmmgrouplimited.com
October 23, 2017
16M-00480-01 T01
Ms Stephanie Mack, P.Eng.
Special Projects Supervisor
Solid Waste Management
County of Simcoe
1110 Highway 26
Midhurst, ON LOL 1X0
Dear Ms Mack:

| Subject: $\quad$Traffic Impact Study Addendum <br> Proposed Environmental Resource Recovery Centre |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West |
|  | Township of Springwater |

### 1.0 Introduction

WSP | MMM was retained by the Solid Waste Management (SWM) Department of the County of Simcoe to prepare a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for the proposed Environmental Resource Recovery Centre (ERRC) to be located at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West in the Township of Springwater. Following this study, comments prepared by Ainley Group dated January 24, 2017 were received from the Township. This addendum supplements our original TIS and responds to the comments from the review agencies. These comments are replicated in bold italics in the boxes and our response to each of the comments following thereafter.

### 2.0 Comments and Responses

## (1) Section 2.1 Boundary Roadways

a) The consultant should identify road classification based on the Township's Official Plan (i.e. Gill Road is a collector road. Old Second South Road is an arterial road).
b) For County Road 27 the consultant should specify the number of northbound lanes and southbound lane instead of a three lane cross-section (i.e. two northbound lanes and one southbound lane).

Noted. The associated paragraphs in Section 2.1 are updated as below:

- Gill Road is a north-south collector road under the jurisdiction of the Township of Springwater. This road has a two-lane cross-section and a posted speed limit of 60 km/h.
- County Road 27 is a north-south arterial road with a three-lane cross-section to a point approximately 300 m to the north of County Road 22. There are two northbound lanes and one southbound lane. It has a posted speed limit of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.
- Old Second South Road is a north-south arterial road under the jurisdiction of the Township of Springwater. This road has a two-lane cross-section, but no posted speed limit signs, so 80 km/h has been assumed.
(2) Figure 2.1 Existing Lane Configurations
a) For the intersection of County Road 22 at County Road 27, a southbound left turn lane is missing.
b) For the intersection of County Road 22 at Highway 400 southbound on/off-ramps, the westbound through-right shared lane should be a westbound through lane and a channelized westbound right turn lane.
c) For the intersection of County Road 22 at Highway 400 northbound on/off-ramps, the northbound left-right shared lane should be a northbound left turn lane and a channelized northbound right turn lane. The eastbound shared through-right lane should be an eastbound through lane and a channelized eastbound right turn lane.

Figure 2.1 has been updated and is appended to this document. Please note that these lane configurations were programmed accurately in our Synchro analysis.
(3) Sections 2.3 Table 2.2 Intersection Capacity Analysis Existing Traffic Conditions Level of service and delay should also be provided for all lane groups of each intersection in addition to v/c ratio.

The V/C ratios play the most important role in the interpretation of intersection capacity analysis results since they directly relate to the ability of a roadway to physically accommodate the traffic demands during a given time period. The vast majority of review agencies throughout Ontario consistently require of only V/C ratios to be provided. Levels of service and delays for individual lane group are generally ancillary, and only required to be included in the appendices which we have done in this case.
(4) Section 3.0 Site-Generated Traffic

The consultant should specify what SWM stands for.

SWM stands for Solid Waste Management, which was explained in Section 1.0.
(5) Section 3.5 Table 3.6 Traffic Distribution at the Site Access It doesn't make sense for $95 \%$ of the site trucks coming from the west and $100 \%$ of them leaving to the east on Highway 400. This is not the worst case scenario as a potentially needed westbound right turn lane on County Road 22 at the site access would not be warranted because of this assumption. If the facility will be serving the whole County, given the location of the facility at the centre of County, site truck trips should be evenly distributed to/from the east, west, north and south. Therefore, the site truck trip distribution should be revised.

For the outbound truck volumes during the peak hours, it has been confirmed with the County that on service days, the majority of them leave the fueling station located near Mapleview Drive East and Bayview Drive in the City of Barrie. They proceed directly to the service area and then on to the proposed ERRC facility thereafter. These trucks only complete a single waste pickup per day, and after unloading their collected materials, they return directly to the fueling station via Highway 400. This is the rationale for assigning $100 \%$ of the outbound trips from the ERRC to Horseshoe Valley Road eastbound.

For the inbound truck volumes, their distribution is subject to the location of the service areas. Based on the service map which was provided by the County, these areas differ by weekday, and are not evenly distributed. For example, on Thursdays and Fridays they are primarily located to the southwest and west of the subject site. Therefore, the assumed distribution covered these two days. It is noteworthy that the traffic volumes on Friday were the highest and, therefore, the "worst case scenario" was captured. For the remainder of weekdays, the service areas are not concentrated. For example, on Wednesdays, approximately $40 \%$ are to the southwest of the site and $60 \%$ are to the east. For Tuesdays, approximately $50 \%$ are to the north with the remainder to the east. On Mondays, the service areas are generally evenly distributed to the northwest, northeast and southeast of the site. For these three weekdays, it is not necessary to investigate additional sets of scenarios. The Wednesday scenario whereby $60 \%$ of the site traffic is from the east and $40 \%$ from the west on County Road 22, can capture the worst case scenario for the intersections to the east of the site access under total future conditions. Applying the largest volume of inbound traffic, which is 61 in the 2049 horizon, results in 36 inbound trips from the east for this scenario. In comparison to the future background traffic, this amount is minimal, and is not expected to have a significant impact on the studied intersections to the east of the access. For the westbound right turn lane, it has been confirmed with the County that a direct taper will be provided at this access.

Detailed explanations of the trip generation of different types of trucks were included in Appendix D of our report. The service area map cannot be provided since it is confidential information.
(6) Figure 3.2 Site-Generated Trips for Staff 2021 Horizon Inbound traffic is missing and should be included.

Based on our consultations with the County, it has been confirmed that staff arrive before the weekday a.m. peak hour, and there is no inbound staff traffic during the weekday p.m. peak hour.
(7) Figure 3.3 Site-Generated Trips for Trucks 2021 Horizon Site PM outbound traffic (45 trucks) does not match with the number shown in Table 3.5 (65 trucks).

Table 3.5 also includes staff traffic which was represented by Categories 7 and 16.
(8) Figure 3.4 Site-Generated Trips for Staff - 2026 \& 2031 Horizons Inbound traffic is missing and should be included.

Please see the response to Comment (6).
(9) Figure 3.5 Site-Generated Trips for Trucks 2026 \& 2031 Horizons Site PM outbound traffic ( 67 trucks) does not match with the number shown in Table 3.5 (87 trucks).

Please see the response to Comment (7). It is acknowledged that five additional trucks were shown on Figure 3.5 for the p.m. outbound traffic. However, given the small magnitude of this "overestimate", our conclusions will not be affected.
(10) Sections 4.4 Table 4.3 Intersection Capacity Analysis Future Background Traffic Conditions Level of service and delay should also be provided for all lane groups of each intersection in addition to v/c ratio.

Please see the response to Comment (3).

## (11) Section 4.4 Future Background Traffic Conditions

a) Page 21-the paragraph under the Table, "northbound left/through/right movement (NB-LTR)" should read "southbound left/through/right movement (SB-LTR)".
b) The report should point out that a poor level of service "F" occurs on the northbound left turn lane on Highway 400 Northbound off-ramp at County Road 22 during the PM peak hour in the 2026 horizon.
c) The report should address improvement needs for the 2026 and 2031 horizons (i.e. left/right turn lanes, traffic signals, additional through lanes etc.).
a) and b) The associated paragraph is updated as below:

Under the 2021 and 2026 future background conditions, the majority of the study area intersections are expected to continue operating at a reasonable LOS ' $E$ ' or better during all study peak hours. Two exceptions are identified. One is the shared southbound left/through/right movement (SB-LTR) at the Old Second South intersection which has a LOS of ' $F$ ' during the Friday p.m. peak period. The other is the northbound left turn movement (NBL) at the Highway 400 north ramp intersection during the p.m. peak period. However, the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios of 0.33 and 0.61 indicate that ample reserve capacity will be available on these two movements. All of the critical movements identified will still operate well within the available roadway capacity.
c) Given the highly "optimistic" assumptions associated with the background developments, it is premature at this time to investigate the need and timing of road improvements. Therefore, we recommended that traffic conditions within the study area be monitored. Road improvements should be identified through future traffic studies completed for the Site Plan Applications (SPA) for these background developments, or studies initiated by the County.
(12) Section 4.5 Table 4.4 Intersection Capacity Analysis Total Future Traffic Conditions a) Level of service and delay should also be provided for all lane groups of each intersection in addition to v/c ratio.
b) The percent of heavy vehicles should be revised in the Synchro model based on the number of site truck trips added on the road system
a) Please see the response to Comment (3).
b) The "worst" scenario which is the total future 2031 analysis is updated and summarized in the following table. Detailed Synchro sheets are appended to this document. The updated results are very similar to those included in our study. This is not unexpected given the low volume of site-generated trucks relative to the background traffic. The revisions to truck percentages at the boundary intersections have negligible impacts on our analysis. The original conclusions in our report remain valid.

INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS 2031 TOTAL FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

| Intersections with County Road 22 | Control Type | Weekday A.M. Peak Hour |  | Weekday P.M. Peak Hour |  | Friday P.M. Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS (Delay) in Seconds | Critical Movements In Bold (v/c) | LOS (Delay) in Seconds | Critical <br> Movements <br> In Bold <br> (v/c) | LOS (Delay) in Seconds | Critical Movements In Bold (v/c) |
| County Road 27 | Signalized | D (44) | EB-L (0.15) EB-TR (0.38) WB-LTR (1.01) NB-L $(0.33)$ NB-TR (0.71) SB-L (0.82) SB-T $(0.95)$ SB-R (0.09) | F (130) |  <br> EB-L (0.20) <br> EB-TR (0.72) <br> WB-LTR <br> $1.58)$ <br> NB-L (0.35) <br> NB-LR (1.09) <br> SB-L (1.35) <br> SB-T (0.98) <br> SB-R (0.06) | F (182) | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB-L (0.19) } \\ \text { EB-TR (0.88) } \\ \text { WB-LTR (2.01) } \\ \text { NB-L }(0.35) \\ \text { NB-TR (1.25) } \\ \text { SB-L (1.34) } \\ \text { SB-T }(0.89) \\ \text { SB-R }(0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| County Road 93 | Signalized | C (25) | EB-L (0.51) EB-TR (0.56) WB-L (0.23) WB-TR $(0.94)$ NB-L $(0.27)$ NB-TR $(0.26)$ SB-L $(0.39)$ SB-TR $(0.42)$ | D (38) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB-L (1.13) } \\ & \text { EB-TR }(0.96) \\ & \text { WB-L }(0.80) \\ & \text { WB-TR }(0.88) \\ & \text { NB-L }(0.12) \\ & \text { NB-TR }(0.66) \\ & \text { SB-L }(0.78) \\ & \text { SB-TR }(0.39) \end{aligned}$ | E (66) | EB-L (0.78) <br> EB-TR (1.06) <br> WB-L (0.55) <br> WB-TR (1.00) <br> NB-L (0.34) <br> NB-TR (0.85) <br> SB-L (0.77) <br> SB-TR (0.32) |
| Gill Road | Unsignalized | E (36) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { EB-LTR (0.01) } \\ \text { WB-LTR (0.01) } \\ \text { NB-LTR (0.10) } \\ \text { SB-LTR }(0.15) \end{array}$ | F (69) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { EB-LTR ( } 0.02) \\ \text { WB-LTR ( } 0.03) \\ \text { NB-LTR (0.3) } \\ \text { SB-LTR ( } 0.35) \end{array}$ | F (127) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EB-LTR (0.03) } \\ & \text { WB-LTR (0.02) } \\ & \text { NB-LTR (0.14) } \\ & \text { SB-LTR }(0.61) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Fox Farm Road | Unsignalized | D (33) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB-TR (0.31) } \\ & \text { WB-TL }(0.04) \\ & \text { NB-LR }(0.58) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | F (144) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB-TR }(0.63) \\ & \text { WB-TL }(0.20) \\ & \text { NB-LR }(\mathbf{0 . 9 4 )} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | F (375) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB-TR (0.76) } \\ & \text { WB-TL (0.24) } \\ & \text { NB-LR (1.49) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Old Second South | Unsignalized | E (37) | EB-LTR (0) <br> WB-LTR (0.01) <br> NB-LTR ( 0.144 <br> SB-LTR (0.12) <br> EBTL $(0.17)$ | F (169) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB-LTR ( }(0.02) \\ & \text { WB-LTR }(0.01) \\ & \text { NB-LTR }(0.81) \\ & \text { SB-LTR }(0.56) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | F (370) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EB-LTR (0.01) } \\ & \text { WB-LTR }(0.01) \\ & \text { NB-LTR }(0.62) \\ & \text { SB-LTR }(0.96) \\ & \hline \text { ED TI } 0.011) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hwy 400 South Ramp | Unsignalized | C (21) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB-TL ( }(.17) \\ & \text { WB-T }(0.42) \\ & \text { WB-R }(0.19) \\ & \text { SBB-LR }(0.34) \end{aligned}$ | E (44) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB-TL ( }(0.28) \\ & \text { WB-T } \\ & \text { WB-R }(0.14) \\ & \text { SB-LR }(0.61) \end{aligned}$ | F (88) | EB-TL (0.21) WB-T (0.45) WB-R (0.11) SB-LR (0.84) |
| Hwy 400 North Ramp | Unsignalized | F (51) | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB-T (0.24) } \\ \text { EB-R }(0.05) \\ \text { WB-TL }(0.03) \\ \text { NB-L }(0.42) \\ \text { NB-R }(0.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | F (293) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB-T }(0.44) \\ & \text { EB-R }(0.07) \\ & \text { WB-TL }(0.05) \\ & \text { NB-L (1.38) } \\ & \text { NB-R (1.03) } \\ & \hline \hline \end{aligned}$ | F (276) | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB-T }(0.49) \\ \text { EB-R (0.16) } \\ \text { WB-TL }(0.05) \\ \text { NB-L (1.30) } \\ \text { NB-R (1.08) } \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ |

## (13) Section 4.5 Total Future Traffic Conditions

a) The report should point out that as a result of the increase in site traffic, a poor level of service "F" occurs on the southbound left/through/right shared lane on Old Second Road at County Road 22 during the Friday PM peak hour in the 2021 horizon and on the southbound left/through/right shared lane on Gill Road at County Road 22

# during the Friday PM peak hour in the 2026 horizon. 

b) Therefore site traffic triggers improvement needs at the intersection of Old Second Road/County Road 22 in the 2021 horizon and at the Gill Road/County Road 22 intersection in the 2026 horizon.
c) The report should identify any additional improvement needs as a result of the increase in site traffic (i.e. additional turn lane lengths etc.) in the 2026 and 2031 horizon.
a) This is the circumstance where the LOS is ' $F$ ' but $v / c$ ratios are relatively low. Relevant discussions were included in Section 2.3 of our original report.
b) In comparison to background traffic, the site-generated traffic represents a very small portion (approximately 0 to 6\%) of the total traffic on County Road 22. As noted previously, given the highly "optimistic" assumptions associated with the background developments, it is premature to investigate the need and timing of road improvements at this time.
c) Please see the response above.

## (14) Section 5.1 Sightline Assessment

Based on MTO Geometric Design Standards for Ontario Highways and a design speed of $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, sightline should be reduced by 10 m for a $3 \%$ upgrade and increased by 15 m and 30 m for a downgrade of 3\% and 6\% respectively. The easterly sightline 220 m is insufficient if the road grade is less than $\mathbf{3 \%}$. In this case, a 230 m sightline is required. Similarly the westerly sightline $245 m$ is insufficient if the road grade is more than $\mathbf{3 \%}$. In this case, a 260 m sightline is required.
The sightline assessment was based on the County's Entrance By-law No. 5544. For the easterly sightline, we agreed that 230 m is required. The increase of 10 m on this sightline does not have an impact on the location of the proposed access since there is no significant change of grade in the immediate area to the east of the location from where the 220 m sightline was measured.

For the westerly sightline, according to the County's By-law, an additional 15 m rather than 30 m is required for instances where a $6 \%$ grade exists. Therefore, 245 m is sufficient.

## (15) Section 5.2 Lane Configurations

a) Table 5.1 Eastbound Left Turn Lane Warrant Analysis at Site Access needs to be updated based on the updated site truck trip distribution in Comment \#5. It is noted that the MTO left turn lane warrant charts are based on passenger car dimensions and operating characteristics. An equivalent factor of 2 and 3 should be applied for an empty truck and loaded truck respectively.
b) The need for a westbound right turn lane on County Road 22 at the site access should be reviewed based on the updated site truck trip distribution in Comment \#5.
c) Site entrance design should be in accordance with MTO Commercial Site Access Policy and Standard Designs CSAS23 Truck Access.
d) The report should specify the required truck climbing lane.
a) Given that we have recommended a westbound left turn lane, this will not alter our conclusion.
b) Please see the above response.
c) Noted. This will be included in the SPA stage.
d) Noted. This will be included in the SPA stage.
(16) Section 5.3 Traffic Conditions and Signal Warrant
a) Signal warrant analysis in Appendix L indicates a restricted flow condition. This should be revised to a free flow condition.
b) Given the poor level of service and long delays on the site access in the 2021 horizon during the Friday PM peak hour, a traffic signal should be recommended.
c) Turn lane storage lengths on each approach of the site access should be reassessed based on a signal control condition.
a) The signal warrant analysis has been updated and is appended to this document.
b) We agree. However, given the highly "optimistic" background development assumptions noted earlier, we recommended that "provisions be made to signalize this intersection. This would include the installation of the necessary underground ducts and handwells to enable signals to be installed in the future. Accordingly, this intersection can be monitored periodically to confirm if the warrants are satisfied."
c) Queuing information was included in the appendices.
(17) Section 6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

The report should summarize the road network improvement needs triggered by the background traffic for each horizon as well as the road network improvement needs triggered by the subject site for each horizon.
Please see the response to Comment (11) c).
(18) There is an existing off-road/recreational trail running from the southeast corner of site along the north side of County Road 22 to the existing site access and then running through site to Rainbow Valley Road East. The report should include a future plan for this off-road/recreational trail.
This will be examined during the SPA stage.

We trust that the above adequately addresses the transportation-related issues raised by Ainley Group on behalf of the Township of Springwater in their review of the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning Bylaw Amendment applications for the proposed ERRC. However, should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us at 905-882-7302 or 905-882-4211 ext. 6478 at your convenience.

Yours very truly,
MMM GROUP LIMITED


David B. Richardson, P.Eng., PTOE Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning


Fei Yang, M.A.Sc., P.Eng.
Senior Project Engineer
Transportation Planning

## ATTACHMENTS



Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: County Road 27 \& County Road 22
15/09/2017

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 1 | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | * | 个t |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 40 | 275 | 17 | 113 | 498 | 173 | 23 | 584 | 107 | 97 | 503 | 40 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 275 | 17 | 113 | 498 | 173 | 23 | 584 | 107 | 97 | 503 | 40 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length ( m ) | 110.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 130.0 |  | 0.0 | 125.0 |  | 110.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.991 |  |  | 0.970 |  |  | 0.977 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.993 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1700 | 1523 | 0 | 0 | 1712 | 0 | 1417 | 3292 | 0 | 1526 | 1824 | 1342 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.307 |  |  |  | 0.887 |  | 0.160 |  |  | 0.252 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 549 | 1523 | 0 | 0 | 1529 | 0 | 239 | 3292 | 0 | 405 | 1824 | 1342 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 5 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 24 |  |  |  | 50 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 515.9 |  |  | 1538.1 |  |  | 209.3 |  |  | 305.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 23.2 |  |  | 69.2 |  |  | 9.4 |  |  | 13.7 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 21\% | 43\% | 4\% | 6\% | 6\% | 26\% | 3\% | 22\% | 17\% | 3\% | 19\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 42 | 289 | 18 | 119 | 524 | 182 | 24 | 615 | 113 | 102 | 529 | 42 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 42 | 307 | 0 | 0 | 825 | 0 | 24 | 728 | 0 | 102 | 529 | 42 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( $m$ ) |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 6 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 27.8 | 27.8 |  | 27.8 | 27.8 | 27.8 |
| Total Split (s) | 54.6 | 54.6 |  | 54.6 | 54.6 |  | 35.4 | 35.4 |  | 35.4 | 35.4 | 35.4 |
| Total Split (\%) | 60.7\% | 60.7\% |  | 60.7\% | 60.7\% |  | 39.3\% | 39.3\% |  | 39.3\% | 39.3\% | 39.3\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 47.5 | 47.5 |  | 47.5 | 47.5 |  | 27.6 | 27.6 |  | 27.6 | 27.6 | 27.6 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 5.9 | 5.9 |  | 5.9 | 5.9 |  | 5.9 | 5.9 |  | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.2 | 1.2 |  | 1.2 | 1.2 |  | 1.9 | 1.9 |  | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 7.1 | 7.1 |  |  | 7.1 |  | 7.8 | 7.8 |  | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) | 47.5 | 47.5 |  |  | 47.5 |  | 27.6 | 27.6 |  | 27.6 | 27.6 | 27.6 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.53 | 0.53 |  |  | 0.53 |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.15 | 0.38 |  |  | 1.01 |  | 0.33 | 0.71 |  | 0.82 | 0.95 | 0.09 |
| Control Delay | 12.6 | 14.1 |  |  | 56.2 |  | 38.7 | 31.2 |  | 77.3 | 59.1 | 6.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

07/11/2016 Total Future 2031 AM
Synchro 9 Report MMM

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: County Road 27 \& County Road 22

|  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group | 12.6 | 14.1 |  | 56.2 |  | 38.7 | 31.2 |  | 77.3 | 59.1 | 6.4 |  |
| Total Delay | B | B |  | E |  | D | C |  | E | E | A |  |
| LOS |  | 13.9 |  | 56.2 |  | 31.5 |  |  | 58.6 | C | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | B |  |  |  | C |  | E |  |  |  |  |


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

Cycle Length: 90
ctuated Cycle Length: 90
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase $4:$ :EBTL and $8:$ WBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 90
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.01

| Maximum | Intersection LOS: D |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Signnal Delay: 44.0 | ICU Level of Service H |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 126.5\% |  |

ntersection Capacity Utilization 126.5\%
ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15


Queues
1: County Road 27 \& County Road 22

|  | $\geqslant$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 42 | 307 | 825 | 24 | 728 | 102 | 529 | 42 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.15 | 0.38 | 1.01 | 0.33 | 0.71 | 0.82 | 0.95 | 0.09 |
| Control Delay | 12.6 | 14.1 | 56.2 | 38.7 | 31.2 | 77.3 | 59.1 | 6.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 12.6 | 14.1 | 56.2 | 38.7 | 31.2 | 77.3 | 59.1 | 6.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 3.7 | 30.6 | ~143.6 | 3.4 | 59.4 | 17.1 | 93.4 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 9.7 | 49.5 | \#230.0 | 11.9 | 80.4 | \#47.4 | \#157.3 | 6.3 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 491.9 | 1514.1 |  | 185.3 |  | 281.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( $m$ ) | 110.0 |  |  | 130.0 |  | 125.0 |  | 110.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 289 | 806 | 818 | 73 | 1026 | 124 | 559 | 446 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.15 | 0.38 | 1.01 | 0.33 | 0.71 | 0.82 | 0.95 | 0.09 |

$\frac{\text { Intersection Summary }}{\text { Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. }}$
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
2: Gill Road \& County Road 22
15/09/2017

|  | \% | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 1 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |  | ${ }^{4}$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 10 | 481 | 8 | 11 | 762 | 16 | 7 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 3 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 10 | 481 | 8 | 11 | 762 | 16 | 7 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 3 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt |  | 0.998 |  |  | 0.997 |  |  | 0.926 |  |  | 0.980 |  |
| FIt Protected |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.983 |  |  | 0.966 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1553 | 0 | 0 | 1765 | 0 | 0 | 1284 | 0 | 0 | 1779 |  |
| FIt Permitted |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.983 |  |  | 0.966 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1553 | 0 | 0 | 1765 | 0 | 0 | 1284 | 0 | 0 | 1779 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 50 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 1538.1 |  |  | 370.7 |  |  | 296.2 |  |  | 94.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 69.2 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 17.8 |  |  | 6.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 21\% | 25\% | 18\% | 6\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 44\% | 0\% | 0\% |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 11 | 506 | 8 | 12 | 802 | 17 | 7 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 3 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 525 | 0 | 0 | 831 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | R |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |

rosswalk Wiath(m)
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { eeadway Factor } & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.11 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01\end{array}$
Turning Speed (kh)
25

- $15 \quad 25$
$15 \quad 2$
$15 \quad 2$
Sign Control

\section*{\section*{Itersectio <br> <br> Area Type: <br> <br> Area Type: <br> ontrol Type: Unsignalized}

tersection Capacity Utilization 56.6\%
Analysis Period (min) 15

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
3: Fox Farm Road \& County Road 22/Country Road 22


Lanes, Volumes, Timings
5: Country Road 22 \& Highway 400 South Ramp


Lanes, Volumes, Timings
6: Highway 400 North Ramp \& County Road 22


Lanes, Volumes, Timings
7: County Road 93 \& County Road 22
15/09/2017

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 7 | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\text { a }}$ |  | 7 | F |  | \% | F |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 54 | 485 | 44 | 75 | 817 | 106 | 70 | 68 | 40 | 115 | 79 | 107 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 54 | 485 | 44 | 75 | 817 | 106 | 70 | 68 | 40 | 115 | 79 | 107 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) | 180.0 |  | 0.0 | 185.0 |  | 0.0 | 157.0 |  | 0.0 | 150.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( m ) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.988 |  |  | 0.983 |  |  | 0.945 |  |  | 0.914 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1668 | 1654 | 0 | 1428 | 1705 | 0 | 17 | 1633 | 0 | 1733 | 1618 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.106 |  |  | 0.376 |  |  | 0.592 |  |  | 0.684 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 186 | 1654 | 0 | 565 | 1705 | 0 | 1090 | 1633 | 0 | 1248 | 1618 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 10 |  |  | 15 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 82 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) |  | 1121.3 |  |  | 305.8 |  |  | 269.5 |  |  | 271.6 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 80.7 |  |  | 22.0 |  |  | 19.4 |  |  | 19.6 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 7\% | 13\% | 4\% | 25\% | 9\% | 3\% | 2\% | 8\% | 10\% | 3\% | 9\% | 4\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 57 | 511 | 46 | 79 | 860 | 112 | 74 | 72 | 42 | 121 | 83 | 113 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 57 | 557 | 0 | 79 | 972 | 0 | 74 | 114 | 0 | 121 | 196 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( m ) |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |

$\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Two way Left Turn Lane } & & & & & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 \\ \text { Headway Factor } & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01\end{array}$

| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |

Turn Type
rotected Phases
Minimum Split (s)


Maximum Green (s)
Yellow Time (s)
All-Red Time (s)
Lost Time Adjust (s)
ead/Lag

| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Walk Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 48.0 | 48.0 | 48.0 | 48.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Act Efct Green (s) | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

07/11/2016 Total Future 2031 AM
Synchro 9 Report MMM

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
7: County Road 93 \& County Road 22

|  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group | 0.51 | 0.56 |  | 0.23 | 0.94 |  | 0.27 | 0.26 | 0.39 | 0.42 |  |
| V/c Ratio | 30.1 | 12.1 |  | 9.7 | 34.1 |  | 27.5 | 18.9 | 29.4 | 17.7 |  |
| Control Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Delay | 30.1 | 12.1 |  | 9.7 | 34.1 |  | 27.5 | 18.9 | 29.4 | 17.7 |  |
| Total Delay | C | B | A | C | C | B | C | B |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | 13.8 |  | 32.3 |  | 22.3 |  | 22.1 |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | B |  | C |  | C |  | C |  |  |  |

Intersection Summary

## Intersection Summary <br> Area Type:

Actuated Cycle Length: 80
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ) Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Pretimed
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.94
Intersection Signal Delay: 24.7 Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 110.7\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15

| 402(R) | $\rightarrow \rightarrow_{64}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 s | 54 s |  |
| $\downarrow{ }^{\prime}{ }^{66}$ (R) | ヶø |  |
| 26 s | 54 s |  |

Queues
7: County Road 93 \& County Road 22

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 57 | 557 | 79 | 972 | 74 | 114 | 121 | 196 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.51 | 0.56 | 0.23 | 0.94 | 0.27 | 0.26 | 0.39 | 0.42 |
| Control Delay | 30.1 | 12.1 | 9.7 | 34.1 | 27.5 | 18.9 | 29.4 | 17.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 30.1 | 12.1 | 9.7 | 34.1 | 27.5 | 18.9 | 29.4 | 17.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 4.8 | 47.5 | 5.3 | 128.2 | 9.6 | 10.0 | 16.1 | 14.7 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#23.7 | 75.3 | 12.8 | \#226.6 | 21.2 | 23.4 | 31.7 | 33.4 |
| Internal Link Dist ( m ) |  | 1097.3 |  | 281.8 |  | 245.5 |  | 247.6 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 180.0 |  | 185.0 |  | 157.0 |  | 150.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 111 | 996 | 339 | 1029 | 272 | 434 | 312 | 466 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.51 | 0.56 | 0.23 | 0.94 | 0.27 | 0.26 | 0.39 | 0.42 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
8: County Road 22 \& Site Access

| ane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |  | * | $\bar{\square}$ |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 47 | 459 | 782 | 3 | 41 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 47 | 459 | 782 | 3 | 41 |  |
| deal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (m) | 15.0 |  |  | 15.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  |  | 7.5 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |

ane Util. Factor
$\begin{array}{llllll}1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00\end{array}$
Frt

| Satd. Flow (prot) | 892 | 1678 | 1767 | 0 | 1044 | 1099 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

892
0.950
$\begin{array}{lllll}0.950 & & 1767 & 0 & 1044 \\ 892 & 1678 & 1767 & & 0.950\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lrrrrrr}\text { Satd. Flow (perm) } & 892 & 1678 & 1767 & 0 & 1044 & 1099\end{array}$
Link Distance ( m )
$\begin{array}{llll}370.7 & 855.3 & 443.0\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Travel Time (s) } & & 16.7 & 38.5 & & 31.9 \\ \text { Peak Hour Factor } & 0.95 & 0.95 & 0.95 & 0.95 & 0.95\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { eak Hour Factor } & 0.95 & 0.9 & 0.95 & 0.95 & 0.95 & 0.95\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lrrrrrr}\text { Heavy Vehicles (\%) } & 100 \% & 12 \% & 6 \% & 100 \% & 71 \% & 71 \% \\ \text { Adj. Flow (vph) } & 49 & 483 & 823 & 3 & 43 & 0\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { lane Group Flow (vph) } & 49 & 483 & 826 & 0 & 43 & 0\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllll} & \text { N } & \text { N } & \text { No } \\ \text { Enter Blocked Intersection } & \text { No } & \text { No } & \text { No } & \text { No } & \text { No } & \text { No } \\ \text { Lane Alignment } & \text { Left } & \text { Left } & \text { Left } & \text { Right } & \text { Left } & \text { Right }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lrrrrr}\text { Lane Alignment } & \text { Left } & \text { Left } & \text { Left } & \text { Right } & \text { Left } \\ \text { Median Width }(\mathrm{m}) & & 3.5 & 3.5 & & 3.5\end{array}$
( $\begin{array}{ll}3.5 & 3.5 \\ 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll} & 3.5 & 3.5 & \\ \text { Crosswalk Width(m) } & 4.8 & 4.8 & 4.8\end{array}$
wo way Left Turn Lane
Headway Factor
Turning Speed (Kh)
$\begin{array}{llllll}1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 \\ 25 & & & 15 & 25 & \end{array}$
Sign Control
25 Free Free $\begin{array}{llr} & 15 & 25 \\ & & \\ & & \end{array}$
Intersection Summary
Area Type:
Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 51.3\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: County Road 27 \& County Road 22
15/09/2017

|  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 1 | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 9 | F |  |  | 4 |  | \% | 个t |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 56 | 577 | 23 | 92 | 437 | 178 | 17 | 758 | 222 | 164 | 648 | 33 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 56 | 577 | 23 | 92 | 437 | 178 | 17 | 758 | 222 | 164 | 648 | 3 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length ( m ) | 110.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 130.0 |  | 0.0 | 125.0 |  | 110.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Fit |  | 0.994 |  |  | 0.966 |  |  | 0.966 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| FIt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.994 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1767 | 1711 | 0 | 0 | 1712 | 0 | 1700 | 3395 | 0 | 1580 | 1842 | 1597 |
| FIt Permitted | 0.313 |  |  |  | 0.524 |  | 0.105 |  |  | 0.087 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 582 | 1711 | 0 | 0 | 903 | 0 | 188 | 3395 | 0 | 145 | 1842 | 1597 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 2 |  |  | 18 |  |  | 27 |  |  |  | 32 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 515.9 |  |  | 1538.1 |  |  | 209.3 |  |  | 305.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 23.2 |  |  | 69.2 |  |  | 9.4 |  |  | 13.7 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 9\% | 13\% | 8\% | 7\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 7\% | 13\% | 2\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 59 | 607 | 24 | 97 | 460 | 187 | 18 | 798 | 234 | 173 | 682 | 35 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 59 | 631 | 0 | 0 | 744 | 0 | 18 | 1032 | 0 | 173 | 682 | 35 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  | 7 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 4 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 27.8 | 27.8 |  | 12.8 | 27.8 | 27.8 |
| Total Split (s) | 79.0 | 79.0 |  | 79.0 | 79.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 15.0 | 61.0 | 61.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 56.4\% | 56.4\% |  | 56.4\% | 56.4\% |  | 32.9\% | 32.9\% |  | 10.7\% | 43.6\% | 43.6\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 71.9 | 71.9 |  | 71.9 | 71.9 |  | 38.2 | 38.2 |  | 7.2 | 53.2 | 53.2 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 5.9 | 5.9 |  | 5.9 | 5.9 |  | 5.9 | 5.9 |  | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.2 | 1.2 |  | 1.2 | 1.2 |  | 1.9 | 1.9 |  | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 7.1 | 7.1 |  |  | 7.1 |  | 7.8 | 7.8 |  | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) | 71.9 | 71.9 |  |  | 71.9 |  | 38.2 | 38.2 |  | 53.2 | 53.2 | 53.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.51 | 0.51 |  |  | 0.51 |  | 0.27 | 0.27 |  | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.72 |  |  | 1.58 |  | 0.35 | 1.09 |  | 1.35 | 0.98 | 0.06 |
| Control Delay | 20.7 | 31.9 |  |  | 296.4 |  | 63.4 | 103.6 |  | 229.7 | 71.4 | 9.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

11/07/2016 Total Future 2031 PM
Synchro 9 Report MMM

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: County Road 27 \& County Road 22

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Total Delay | 20.7 | 31.9 |  |  | 296.4 |  | 63.4 | 103.6 |  | 229.7 | 71.4 | 9.9 |
| LOS | C | C |  |  | F |  | E | F |  | F | E | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 30.9 |  |  | 296.4 |  |  | 102.9 |  |  | 99.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |


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

Cycle length
Cycle Length: 140
Actuated Cycle Length: 140
Actuated Cycle Length: 140
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 4:SBTL and 8:NBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 150
Control Type: Pretimed

| Maximun | Intersection LOS: F |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 130.0 | ICU Level of Service H |

Analysis Period (min) 15


Queues
1: County Road 27 \& County Road 22

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 59 | 631 | 744 | 18 | 1032 | 173 | 682 | 35 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.72 | 1.58 | 0.35 | 1.09 | 1.35 | 0.98 | 0.06 |
| Control Delay | 20.7 | 31.9 | 296.4 | 63.4 | 103.6 | 229.7 | 71.4 | 9.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 20.7 | 31.9 | 296.4 | 63.4 | 103.6 | 229.7 | 71.4 | 9.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 9.1 | 137.6 | -306.7 | 4.3 | ~175.1 | $\sim 51.2$ | 194.5 | 0.5 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 18.9 | 186.8 | \#387.0 | 13.7 | \#219.6 | \#101.5 | \#278.2 | 8.1 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 491.9 | 1514.1 |  | 185.3 |  | 281.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( $m$ ) | 110.0 |  |  | 130.0 |  | 125.0 |  | 110.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 298 | 879 | 472 | 51 | 945 | 128 | 699 | 626 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.72 | 1.58 | 0.35 | 1.09 | 1.35 | 0.98 | 0.06 |

$\xrightarrow{\text { Intersection Summary }} \sim$ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

- 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer

Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
2: Gill Road \& County Road 22
15/09/2017

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SB |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 13 | 964 | 18 | 17 | 703 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 9 | 15 | 0 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 13 | 964 | 18 | 17 | 703 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 9 | 15 | 0 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 190 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3. |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.0 |
| Frt |  | 0.998 |  |  | 0.998 |  |  | 0.949 |  |  | 0.939 |  |
| FIt Protected |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.976 |  |  | 0.973 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1722 | 0 | 0 | 1787 | 0 | 0 | 1444 | 0 | 0 | 1662 |  |
| FIt Permitted |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.976 |  |  | 0.973 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1722 | 0 | 0 | 1787 | 0 | 0 | 1444 | 0 | 0 | 1662 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 50 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 1538.1 |  |  | 370.7 |  |  | 296.2 |  |  | 94.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 69.2 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 17.8 |  |  | 6.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.9 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 9\% | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 33\% | 6\% | 0\% | $0 \%$ |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 14 | 1015 | 19 | 18 | 740 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 16 | - |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1048 | 0 | 0 | 769 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 29 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Righ |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |

rosswalk Wiath(m)
wo way Left Turn Lane
adway Faclor
Turning Speed (kh)
Sign Control

## rea Type: <br> Area Type: $\quad$ O Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection Capacity Utilization $68.0 \%$ ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15

Synchro 9 Report

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
3: Fox Farm Road \& County Road 22/Country Road 22

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | \% |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 958 | 65 | 117 | 690 | 35 | 63 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 958 | 65 | 117 | 690 | 35 | 63 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Fit | 0.991 |  |  |  | 0.913 |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.993 | 0.982 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1747 | 0 | 0 | 1774 | 1685 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.993 | 0.982 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1747 | 0 | 0 | 1774 | 1685 | 0 |
| Link Speed (kh) | 80 |  |  | 50 | 80 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 153.6 |  |  | 1063.4 | 320.8 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 6.9 |  |  | 76.6 | 14.4 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 7\% | 0\% | 12\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 1008 | 68 | 123 | 726 | 37 | 66 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 1076 | 0 | 0 | 849 | 103 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 3.5 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 | 4.8 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (kh) |  | 15 | 25 |  | 25 | 15 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 113.0\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  | ICU Level of Service H |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Analysis Period (min) 15
ICU Level of Service H

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
4: Old Second Road
15/09/2017

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\AA$ |  |  | $\AA$ |  |  | $\AA$ |  |  | $\AA$ |  |

aaffic Volume (vph) $\quad 13$

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| deal Flow (yphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |


|  | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Flt Protected
Satd. Flow (prot)
It Permitted
Satd. Flow (perm)
ink Speed (kh)
Link Distance ( $m$ )
Travel Time (s)
Peak Hour Factor
Heavy Vehicles (\%)
Adj. Flow (vph)

Shared Lane Traffic (\%)
ane Group Flow (vph)
Enter Blocked Intersection
Iane Alignment
Median Wioth(m)
Crosswalk Width(m)
Two way Left Turn Lane
Headway Factor
Uurning Speed (K
Sign Control
$\begin{array}{rrrr}0 & 1067 & 0 & 0 \\ \text { No } & \text { No } & \text { No } & \text { No }\end{array}$
No No No No
Left Left Right No

| 881 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |


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

Intersection Capacity Utilization 71.3\%
Analysis Period (min) 15

ICU Level of Service C

| 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | Free | 15 | 25 | Free | 15 | 25 |  |  | Stop | 15 | 25 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Stop | 1 |

$\qquad$ C

## 11/07/2016 Total Future 2031 PM

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
5: Country Road 22 \& Highway 400 South Ramp


Lanes, Volumes, Timings
7: County Road 93 \& County Road 22
15/09/2017

|  | $\geqslant$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 1 | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | \% | F |  | \% | F |  | 7 | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 157 | 928 | 69 | 68 | 689 | 197 | 29 | 114 | 198 | 123 | 82 | 93 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 157 | 928 | 69 | 68 | 689 | 197 | 29 | 114 | 198 | 123 | 82 | 93 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length ( $m$ ) | 180.0 |  | 0.0 | 185.0 |  | 0.0 | 157.0 |  | 0.0 | 150.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length ( $m$ ) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.990 |  |  | 0.967 |  |  | 0.905 |  |  | 0.920 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1767 | 1826 | 0 | 1733 | 1743 | 0 | 1623 | 1676 | 0 | 1785 | 1674 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.131 |  |  | 0.083 |  |  | 0.615 |  |  | 0.355 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 244 | 1826 | 0 | 151 | 1743 | 0 | 1050 | 1676 | 0 | 667 | 1674 |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 8 |  |  | 32 |  |  | 104 |  |  | 68 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) |  | 1121.3 |  |  | 305.8 |  |  | 269.5 |  |  | 271.6 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 80.7 |  |  | 22.0 |  |  | 19.4 |  |  | 19.6 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 2\% | 0\% | 3\% | 4\% | 5\% | 10\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 165 | 977 | 73 | 72 | 725 | 207 | 31 | 120 | 208 | 129 | 86 | 98 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 165 | 1050 | 0 | 72 | 932 | 0 | 31 | 328 | 0 | 129 | 184 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( m ) |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width( m ) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Two way Left Turn Lane } & & & & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01\end{array} 1.01 \quad 1.01$

| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turning Speed $(k / h)$ | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |

Turn Type
rotected Phases
Minimum Split (s)


Maximum Green (s)
Yellow Time (s)
All-Red Time (s)
otal Lost Time (s)
Lead/Lag

| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Walk Time (s) | s | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flast Dont Walk (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#l/r) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 48.0 | 48.0 | 48.0 | 48.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |

11/07/2016 Total Future 2031 PM
Synchro 9 Report MMM

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
7: County Road 93 \& County Road 22

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v/c Ratio | 1.13 | 0.96 |  | 0.80 | 0.88 |  | 0.12 | 0.66 |  | 0.78 | 0.39 |  |
| Control Delay | 136.9 | 35.4 |  | 73.5 | 25.2 |  | 24.7 | 25.4 |  | 60.9 | 18.4 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 136.9 | 35.4 |  | 73.5 | 25.2 |  | 24.7 | 25.4 |  | 60.9 | 18.4 |  |
| LOS | F | D |  | E | C |  | C | C |  | E | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 49.2 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 25.4 |  |  | 35.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |

Intersection Summary
Area Type:
Cycle Lengin: 80
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ) Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Pretimed
Control Yype: Pretimed
Intersection Signal Delay: $37.7 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 122.8\% - ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15

| 402(R) | $\rightarrow \rightarrow_{64}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 s | 54 s |  |
| $\downarrow{ }^{\prime}{ }^{66}$ (R) | ヶø |  |
| 26 s | 54 s |  |

[^0]Queues
7: County Road 93 \& County Road 22

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 165 | 1050 | 72 | 932 | 31 | 328 | 129 | 184 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 1.13 | 0.96 | 0.80 | 0.88 | 0.12 | 0.66 | 0.78 | 0.39 |
| Control Delay | 136.9 | 35.4 | 73.5 | 25.2 | 24.7 | 25.4 | 60.9 | 18.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 136.9 | 35.4 | 73.5 | 25.2 | 24.7 | 25.4 | 60.9 | 18.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | ~31.0 | 141.7 | 8.0 | 111.1 | 3.8 | 31.7 | 19.2 | 15.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#45.8 | \#243.5 | \#35.1 | \#205.6 | 10.8 | 60.2 | \#49.2 | 33.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 1097.3 |  | 281.8 |  | 245.5 |  | 247.6 |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 180.0 |  | 185.0 |  | 157.0 |  | 150.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 146 | 1098 | 90 | 1058 | 262 | 497 | 166 | 469 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 1.13 | 0.96 | 0.80 | 0.88 | 0.12 | 0.66 | 0.78 | 0.39 |

$\xrightarrow[\sim]{\text { Intersection Summary }}$ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
8: County Road 22 \& Site Access

$1107 / 2016$ Total Future 2031 PM
MMM

Synchro 9 Report

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: County Road 27 \& County Road 22
15/09/2017

|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  |  | $\leftarrow$ |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\stackrel{\text { F }}{ }$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | 7 | 个令 |  | * | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 57 | 733 | 16 | 80 | 448 | 165 | 27 | 831 | 233 | 163 | 570 | 66 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 57 | 733 | 16 | 80 | 448 | 165 | 27 | 831 | 233 | 163 | 570 | 66 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length ( m ) | 110.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 130.0 |  | 0.0 | 125.0 |  | 110.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.997 |  |  | 0.968 |  |  | 0.967 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.994 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1767 | 1702 | 0 | 0 | 1714 | 0 | 1700 | 3407 | 0 | 1580 | 1842 | 1597 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.321 |  |  |  | 0.390 |  | 0.177 |  |  | 0.091 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 597 | 1702 | 0 | 0 | 673 | 0 | 317 | 3407 | 0 | 151 | 1842 | 1597 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 1 |  |  | 17 |  |  | 25 |  |  |  | 69 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 515.9 |  |  | 1538.1 |  |  | 209.3 |  |  | 305.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 23.2 |  |  | 69.2 |  |  | 9.4 |  |  | 13.7 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 10\% | 13\% | 8\% | 7\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 6\% | 13\% | 2\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 60 | 772 | 17 | 84 | 472 | 174 | 28 | 875 | 245 | 172 | 600 | 69 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 60 | 789 | 0 | 0 | 730 | 0 | 28 | 1120 | 0 | 172 | 600 | 69 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width( m ) |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  | 7 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 4 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 27.8 | 27.8 |  | 12.8 | 27.8 | 27.8 |
| Total Split (s) | 81.0 | 81.0 |  | 81.0 | 81.0 |  | 44.0 | 44.0 |  | 15.0 | 59.0 | 59.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 57.9\% | 57.9\% |  | 57.9\% | 57.9\% |  | 31.4\% | 31.4\% |  | 10.7\% | 42.1\% | 42.1\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 73.9 | 73.9 |  | 73.9 | 73.9 |  | 36.2 | 36.2 |  | 7.2 | 51.2 | 51.2 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 5.9 | 5.9 |  | 5.9 | 5.9 |  | 5.9 | 5.9 |  | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.2 | 1.2 |  | 1.2 | 1.2 |  | 1.9 | 1.9 |  | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 7.1 | 7.1 |  |  | 7.1 |  | 7.8 | 7.8 |  | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) | 73.9 | 73.9 |  |  | 73.9 |  | 36.2 | 36.2 |  | 51.2 | 51.2 | 51.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.53 | 0.53 |  |  | 0.53 |  | 0.26 | 0.26 |  | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.19 | 0.88 |  |  | 2.01 |  | 0.35 | 1.25 |  | 1.34 | 0.89 | 0.11 |
| Control Delay | 19.4 | 41.8 |  |  | 487.4 |  | 56.3 | 162.0 |  | 227.5 | 58.7 | 6.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

11/07/2016 Total Future 2031 Friday PM
Synchro 9 Report MMM

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
1: County Road 27 \& County Road 22

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 1 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Total Delay | 19.4 | 41.8 |  |  | 487.4 |  | 56.3 | 162.0 |  | 227.5 | 58.7 | 6.7 |
| LOS | B | D |  |  | F |  | E | F |  | F | E | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 40.3 |  |  | 487.4 |  |  | 159.4 |  |  | 89.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |


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

Cycle Lenth
Cycle Length: 140
Actuated Cycle Length: 140
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 4:SBTL and 8:NBTL, Start of Green
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Refe
Control Type: Pretimed
Maximum v/c Ratio 201

| Maximsection Signal Delay: 181.6 | Intersection LOS: F |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 149.1\% | ICU Level of Service H |

ntersection Capacity Utilization 149.1\%
ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 1: County Road 27 \& County Road 22


Queues
1: County Road 27 \& County Road 22

|  | $\prime$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 60 | 789 | 730 | 28 | 1120 | 172 | 600 | 69 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.19 | 0.88 | 2.01 | 0.35 | 1.25 | 1.34 | 0.89 | 0.11 |
| Control Delay | 19.4 | 41.8 | 487.4 | 56.3 | 162.0 | 227.5 | 58.7 | 6.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 19.4 | 41.8 | 487.4 | 56.3 | 162.0 | 227.5 | 58.7 | 6.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 8.9 | 196.3 | $\sim 227.7$ | 6.7 | $\sim 211.3$ | $\sim 50.7$ | 163.7 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 18.6 | \#285.2 | \#307.4 | 17.8 | \#256.1 | \#100.4 | \#234.1 | 10.5 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 491.9 | 1514.1 |  | 185.3 |  | 281.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( $m$ ) | 110.0 |  |  | 130.0 |  | 125.0 |  | 110.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 315 | 898 | 363 | 81 | 899 | 128 | 673 | 627 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.19 | 0.88 | 2.01 | 0.35 | 1.25 | 1.34 | 0.89 | 0.11 |

$\frac{\text { Intersection Summary }}{\text { Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. }}$
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
2: Gill Road \& County Road 22
15/09/201

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SB |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }^{4}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 21 | 1155 | 10 | 13 | 743 | 17 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 1 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 21 | 1155 | 10 | 13 | 743 | 17 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 1 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 190 |
| Lane Width (m) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3. |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.0 |
| Frt |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.997 |  |  | 0.961 |  |  | 0.934 |  |
| FIt Protected |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1739 | 0 | 0 | 1786 | 0 | 0 | 1649 | 0 | 0 | 1664 |  |
| FIt Permitted |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1739 | 0 | 0 | 1786 | 0 | 0 | 1649 | 0 | 0 | 1664 |  |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 80 |  |  | 80 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 50 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 1538.1 |  |  | 370.7 |  |  | 296.2 |  |  | 94.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 69.2 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 17.8 |  |  | 6.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.9 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 8\% | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 6\% | 0\% | 0 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 22 | 1216 | 11 | 14 | 782 | 18 | 3 | , | 2 | 19 | 1 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1249 | 0 | 0 | 814 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 39 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Rig |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |

rosswalk Wiath(m)
wo way Left Turn Lane
adway Faclor
Turning Speed (kh)
Sign Control

## Intersectio <br> Area Type: <br> ontrol Type: Unsignalized

tersection Capacity Utilization 82.7\%
Analysis Period (min) 15

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
3: Fox Farm Road \& County Road 22/Country Road 22


Analysis Period (min) 15

11/07/2016 Total Future 2031 Friday PM

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
4: Old Second Road

15/09/2017 | Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\AA$ |  |  | $\AA$ |  |  | $\AA$ |  |  | $\AA$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 4 | 1222 | 8 | 7 | 833 | 23 | 5 | 16 | 9 | 14 | 5 | 6 | raffic Volume (vph)



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1922 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |


|  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.990 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.996 |  |  | 0.961 |  |  | 0.969 |  |

FIt Protected
Satd. Flow (prot)
It Permitted
Satd. Flow (perm)
Link Speed (kh)
Link Distance ( $m$ )
Travel Time (s)
Peak Hour Factor
Heavy Vehicles (\%)
Adj. Flow (vph)
Shared Lane Traffic (\%)
lane Group Flow (vph) $\quad 1298$ O 000 O 31 Enter Blocked Intersection No No No No No No No No No No No No ane Alignment
Median Width( $m$ )
Crosswalk Width (m)
Two way Left Turn Lane
Headway Factor
Turning Speed (k
Sign Control

## Intersection Su

## Area Type: Ont <br> Intersection Capacity Utilization 77.7\%

Analysis Period (min) 15
ICU Level of Service D

## 11/07/2016 Total Future 2031 Friday PM

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
5: Country Road 22 \& Highway 400 South Ramp

| ane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | 7 | Y |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 163 | 1066 | 730 | 184 | 16 | 117 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 163 | 1066 | 730 | 184 | 16 | 117 |
| deal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| it |  |  |  | 0.850 | 0.881 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.993 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1702 | 1824 | 1581 | 1583 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.993 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1702 | 1824 | 1581 | 1583 | 0 |
| Link Speed (kh) |  | 50 | 50 |  | 50 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 661.0 | 382.0 |  | 499.1 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 47.6 | 27.5 |  | 35.9 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 7\% | 10\% | 3\% | 1\% | 25\% | 1\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 172 | 1122 | 768 | 194 | 17 | 123 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1294 | 768 | 194 | 140 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| ane Alignment | Left | Left | Left | Right | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 3.5 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 | 4.8 |  | 4.8 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (kh) | 25 |  |  | 15 | 25 | 15 |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ntersection Capacity Utilization 121.6\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service |  |  |

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
6: Highway 400 North Ramp \& County Road 22


Lanes, Volumes, Timings
7: County Road 93 \& County Road 22

|  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | $\pm$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | \% | F |  | \% | F |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 146 | 987 | 68 | 62 | 711 | 178 | 69 | 133 | 156 | 127 | 67 | 82 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 146 | 987 | 68 | 62 | 711 | 178 | 69 | 133 | 156 | 127 | 67 | 82 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length ( m ) | 180.0 |  | 0.0 | 185.0 |  | 0.0 | 157.0 |  | 0.0 | 150.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| Taper Length (m) | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.990 |  |  | 0.970 |  |  | 0.919 |  |  | 0.918 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1767 | 1826 | 0 | 1733 | 1749 | 0 | 1623 | 1695 | 0 | 1785 | 1672 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted | 0.051 |  |  | 0.054 |  |  | 0.657 |  |  | 0.189 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 95 | 1826 | 0 | 99 | 1749 | 0 | 1122 | 1695 | 0 | 355 | 1672 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 4 |  |  | 14 |  |  | 37 |  |  | 43 |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |
| Link Distance ( m ) |  | 1121.3 |  |  | 305.8 |  |  | 269.5 |  |  | 271.6 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 80.7 |  |  | 22.0 |  |  | 19.4 |  |  | 19.6 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 1\% | 2\% | 0\% | 3\% | 4\% | 5\% | 10\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 154 | 1039 | 72 | 65 | 748 | 187 | 73 | 140 | 164 | 134 | 71 | 86 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 154 | 1111 | 0 | 65 | 935 | 0 | 73 | 304 | 0 | 134 | 157 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |  | 3.5 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  | 4.8 |  |

$\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Two way Leff Turn Lane } & & & & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01 \\ \text { Headway Factor } & 25 & 1.01 & 1.01 & 1.01\end{array}$

| Turning Speed (k/h) | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 | 25 |  | 15 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turn Type | $\mathrm{pm}+\mathrm{pt}$ | NA |  | $\mathrm{pm}+\mathrm{pt}$ | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | $\mathrm{pm}+\mathrm{pt}$ | NA |  |

Protected Phase ormitted Phases

## Minimum Split (s)



Maximum Green (s)
Yellow Time (s)
All-Red Time (s)
Lost Time Adjust (s)
otal Lost Time (s)
Lead/Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize? Walk Time (s)
Flash Dont Walk (s)
edestrian Calls (\#/
Actuated gIC Ratio
11/07/2016 Total Future 2031 Friday PM

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
7: County Road 93 \& County Road 22

|  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group | SBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.78 | 1.06 |  | 0.55 | 1.00 |  | 0.34 | 0.85 | 0.77 | 0.32 |  |
| Control Delay | 57.0 | 76.0 |  | 33.0 | 61.5 |  | 53.7 | 69.2 | 69.4 | 31.2 |  |
| Queue Delay | 07.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay | 57.0 | 76.0 |  | 33.0 | 61.5 |  | 53.7 | 69.2 | 69 | 31.2 |  |
| LOS | E | E | C | E | D | E | E | C |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 73.7 |  | 59.7 |  | 66.2 |  | 48.8 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | $E$ |  | E |  | E |  | D |  |  |  |

tersection Summary
Area Type:

## Other

ycle Length: 140
Ifset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2:NBTL and 6:SBTL, Start of Gree
Natural Cycle: 130
Natural Cycle: Type: Pretimed
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.06
Maximum VIC Ratio: 1.06 Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 112.3\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 7: County Road 93 \& County Road 22


[^1]Synchro 9 Report

Queues
7: County Road 93 \& County Road 22

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 154 | 1111 | 65 | 935 | 73 | 304 | 134 | 157 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.78 | 1.06 | 0.55 | 1.00 | 0.34 | 0.85 | 0.77 | 0.32 |
| Control Delay | 57.0 | 76.0 | 33.0 | 61.5 | 53.7 | 69.2 | 69.4 | 31.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 57.0 | 76.0 | 33.0 | 61.5 | 53.7 | 69.2 | 69.4 | 31.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 27.4 | $\sim 355.9$ | 6.4 | 261.7 | 18.5 | 76.6 | 30.2 | 26.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#63.6 | \#441.1 | 18.6 | \#363.7 | 34.9 | \#126.8 | \#60.5 | 47.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 1097.3 |  | 281.8 |  | 245.5 |  | 247.6 |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 180.0 |  | 185.0 |  | 157.0 |  | 150.0 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 198 | 1045 | 119 | 936 | 217 | 359 | 173 | 487 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.78 | 1.06 | 0.55 | 1.00 | 0.34 | 0.85 | 0.77 | 0.32 |

$\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles

Lanes, Volumes, Timings
8: County Road 22 \& Site Access


107/2016 Total Future 2031 Friday PM
MMM

Synchro 9 Report

PROJECTED TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS FORM FOR INTERSECTION CONTROL Minimum warrants for installation of traffic signal for roadways with two or more lanes perOTM Book 12 Sec 4.10 *NOTES: Does not consider pedestrian crossing volumes, which need to be added where appropriate and available Only Projected Warrants can be conducted with Peak Hour counts; remaining warrants require 8 hours


## WARRANT 1

ALL APPROACHES

|  | PERCENTAGE WARRANT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HOUR ENDING | AM PEAK | PM PEAK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volumes | 666 | 1022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum: 720 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100\% FULFILLED | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Minimum: 863 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% FULFILLED | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 |
| Actual if Below |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% Value | 0.62 |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.62 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.42 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | on | nt | 71\% |

MINOR STREET BOTH APPROACHES

|  | PERCENTAGE WARRANT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HOUR ENDING | AM PEAK | PM PEAK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volumes | 21 | 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum: 383 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100\% FULFILLED | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Minimum: 304 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% FULFILLED | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Actual it Below |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% Value | 0.05 | 0.12 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pa | nta | 9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | ti | arr |  |  | 9\% |

WARRANT 2
MAJOR STREET BOTH APPROACHES

|  | PERCENTAGE WARRANT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HOUR ENDING | AM PEAK | PM PEAK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volumes | 646 | 976 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum: 1080 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100\% FULFILLED | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Minimum: 863 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% FULFILLED | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 |
| Actual it Below $80 \%$ Value | 0.60 |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.60 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.40 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ion | nt | 70\% |


|  | PERCENTAGE WARRANT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HOUR ENDING | AM PEAK | PM PEAK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volumes | 41 | 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum: 113 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100\% FULFILLED | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Minimum: 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% FULFILLED | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Actual if Below |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% Value | 0.36 | 0.76 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1.12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ona | nt | 56\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | ti | arr |  |  | 56\% |


[^0]:    11/07/2016 Total Future 2031 PM
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