September 14, 2020

Via Email: cpc@calgary.ca

Calgary Planning Commission
The City of Calgary
P.O. Box 2100, Station " $M$ "

Calgary, AB T2P 2M5

Attention: Matthias Tita, Chair
Kimberly Holberton

Dear Mr. Chair and Commissioners:

## RE: CPC Meeting September 13, 2020 - Agenda Item 7.2.3 Land Use Amendment application LOC2020-0065/CPC2020-0990 Property: 362512 Street NE; Funeral Home and Crematorium

Square One Properties Ltd. is the registered owner of the property 123136 Avenue NE, located to the immediate west of the proposed Funeral Home and Crematorium location.

Kindly accept the attached correspondence from our company to Ms. Sarah Hbeichi, File Manager, regarding the subject application. We respectfully request that you consider our submission during the review of the Administration Report.

Despite the information mentioned in the Administration Report, the applicant's public engagement about the application was less than transparent. Neither the applicant nor the property owners of the site contacted us or our tenants.

For the reasons outlined in the attached letter, we are opposed to the proposed land use amendment. From a planning and transportation perspective, the subject parcel is an inappropriate location for the use of a funeral home.

Yours truly,

## SQUARE ONE PROPERTIES LTD.

## Dan Brink, President

Encl.: Letter Square One Properties Ltd. to File Manager Report JCB Engineering Ltd.

Cc: CPC Members
PAC@calgary.ca \& Kimberly.Holberton@calgary.ca
Ray Jones - Ward Councillor (ray.jones@calgary.ca)
Sarah Hbeichi

June 17, 2020
P.O. Box 27103

Calgary, AB
T3L 2Y1

## Attn: Vyetta Sunderland, Property Manager

## Re: Transportation Impact Assessment - Northeast Funeral Home Land Use Amendment Calgary, Alberta <br> LOC 2020-0065

JCB Engineering Ltd. (JCB) is pleased to present this preliminary transportation impact assessment (TIA) in opposition of a land use amendment for a proposed funeral home in the northeast of the City of Calgary, located at 362512 Street NE.

## 1. Development Information

The proposed development is on a site on the west side of 12 Street $N E$, between the intersections of 34 Avenue NE and 36 Avenue NE. The existing building on the site has a footprint of $681 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$; it is not known from the application submitted to the City for the land use amendment if this existing building will be repurposed or demolished for a new building. The intended use of the site is for a funeral home with a crematorium; no further details have been provided in the application.

## 2. Land Use Bylaw Parking Requirements

Based on the City of Calgary Land Use Bylaw (LUB) a 'funeral home' (Part 4, Division 1, Section 200) has the same calculations for the capacity of the assembly area as a 'place of worship' (Part 4, Division 1, Sections 260 to 262). No information has been provided on the size of the assembly area for the proposed funeral home, the only area is the overall footprint of the building of $681 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. As there will be the assembly area, crematorium, offices, and other minor uses within the building, it is assumed that the assembly area in the building will be $300 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, the maximum size for an assembly area for a 'place of worship - small' in the Calgary LUB. This is just below $50 \%$ of the total building footprint area, and so is a reasonable assumption to make.

The parking requirements, for both staff and visitors, of a 'funeral home' in the LUB is a combination of:

- 2.0 motor vehicle parking stalls per $100.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of gross useable floor area for non-assembly areas
- 1.0 motor vehicle parking stalls per 4 person capacity of the assembly area

As the assembly areas of funeral homes typically have non-fixed seating (i.e. individual chairs), the calculation of the capacity of the assembly area from the LUB is 1 person per $0.75 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. For the assumed area of $300 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, this results in a capacity of 400 people.

The total number of vehicle parking stalls required from the LUB are as follows:

- 2.0 motor vehicle parking stalls per $100.0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ for $381 \mathrm{~m}^{2}-8$ stalls
- 1.0 motor vehicle parking stalls per 4 person capacity for 400 people -100 stalls

This is a total of 108 parking stalls required on the site as per the City of Calgary LUB to support the proposed land use of a 'funeral home'.

## 3. Trip and Parking Generation

To determine what impact this proposed land use may have on the transportation network the expected trip and parking generation had to be calculated.

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual does not have a land use specific to the subject development; there is no 'funeral home' or 'crematorium', but it is mentioned in the ITE land use for a 'cemetery' that there are possibly buildings used for memorial services, a mausoleum, and a crematorium included. However, it is not clear from the data which of the sites surveyed for 'cemeteries' which ones had memorial services and if the trip surveys were conducted during a funeral. As a result, another approach was needed to determine the expected trip and parking generation for the proposed funeral home.

As discussed previously, the calculations for the capacity of an assembly area for a 'funeral home' is the same as a 'place of worship' in the City of Calgary LUB. It would also be reasonable to assume that the trip generation for a church would be similar to that of a funeral home of the same size during a memorial service; often memorial services are held in a church or similar religious institution. Using the land use for a 'church' in the ITE trip and parking generation databases, the following information was calculated for a 400 person capacity assembly area:

- 175 to 216 trips generated in the peak hour
- 88 stalls average parking demand

This is based on Sunday data for the 'church' as this is when the primary services were surveyed for the ITE studies; output from the ITE trip and parking generation applications are attached to this letter. Only one peak hour was provided for the Sunday, but values were provided using both an average rate and a best fit distribution equation. Because AM traffic volumes are typically lower in Calgary than PM traffic volumes, it was decided to use the lower peak hour value for the AM peak hour analysis (see Section 5) and the higher value for the PM peak hour.

## 4. Available Parking Supply

There is on-street parking available on 36 Avenue NE north of the subject site and on 34 Avenue NE to the south, but no parking is allowed on 12 Street NE or any public parking areas within the vicinity. All of the parking areas are attached to various businesses.

On both 34 Avenue and 36 Avenue NE there is parking allowed on only one side of each roadway; based on this information there is space for approximately 30 vehicles to park on 34 Avenue NE and 45 vehicles on 36 Avenue NE (east and west of 12 Street NE). This is based on a calculation of the available curb length on both roadways; a survey was not be conducted due to the current situation with the COVID-19 pandemic. With many businesses still closed the typical parking demand in the area could not be accurately collected; anecdotally it was mentioned that on a typical day the majority of on-street parking is in use, but this could not be confirmed.

There is no parking layout plan provided for the subject site in the land use submission, and the site is not currently laid out optimally for parking, the east section of the site is currently used for storage. Based on the area of the site and the standard size of a parking stall and drive aisles for the City of Calgary, it is estimated that 72 parking stalls could be provided on the site. It should be noted that for funeral processions there is usually a staging area required in the parking area, but without a more detailed site plan available there is no information on how much of the potential parking area may have to be used. As a result, the estimate of 72 parking stalls is likely a number that is higher than will actually be able to be accommodated on the site.

When compared to the LUB and ITE calculations, there will be a deficiency in parking on the site, thus requiring visitors to park on 34 Avenue and 36 Avenue NE.

- 16 stall (22\%) deficiency based on ITE average parking generation demand
- 36 stall ( $50 \%$ ) deficiency based on City of Calgary LUB parking requirements

For a typical service held at the proposed funeral home it can be expected that 16 to 36 vehicles will need to park on the adjacent roadways.

## 5. Development Generated Traffic Impacts on Adjacent Roadways

The most likely distribution of the trips generated by the proposed funeral home will be to have the majority of trips to and from 32 Avenue NE as this is the nearest arterial roadway and access to Deerfoot Trail to the subject site. There is also the likelihood of trips to and from the north using McKnight Boulevard NE instead of 32 Avenue NE, but this McKnight Boulevard NE is further away from the site, fewer trips would use that route.

2017 intersection traffic counts were available from the City of Calgary on 12 Street NE at both 32 Avenue NE and at McKnight Boulevard NE; and there is a permanent station on McKnight Boulevard NE just west of the interchange with Deerfoot Trail that has counts from 2017 to 2020. The numbers from the month of February were used as comparisons because the volumes decline significantly in March 2020 due to the shutdown measures that were started in that month to contain the COVID-19 pandemic. Using this information 2020 intersection traffic volumes were extrapolated for use in the analysis conducted for this TIA. The signal timing summary for the intersection of 12 Street and McKnight Boulevard NE was provided by the City of Calgary, but the summary for the intersection of 12 Street and 32 Avenue NE was not available in time to use for this study. Signal timings were assumed for this intersection using the parameters from the City of Calgary guidelines and observation of the operation of the traffic signal.

Attached to this letter are spreadsheets illustrating the subject intersections for analysis as schematics, with the pre-development traffic volumes for the intersections of 12 Street and 32 Avenue NE, and 12 Street and McKnight Boulevard NE shown. The distribution of the trips calculated in Section 3 of this TIA were then assigned to the two intersections to create post-development traffic volumes.

The intersection operational analysis for this TIA was conducted using Synchro (version 8) software, by Trafficware; this software utilizes the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 methodology for determining the level of service of traffic operations. The parameters for Synchro used for this analysis are based on the City of Calgary TIA guidelines, and on site observations; if there is no guideline or observation for a specific parameter, then the default value in the software is utilized. A summary of the results of the traffic operations for the subject intersections is provided in the following tables; the level of service (LOS), highest control delay, maximum volume to capacity ratio ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ), and longest queue length are provided for each intersection approach. If an intersection approach has unacceptable operations, it is highlighted in the summary table; unacceptable operations are defined as:

- LOS of 'D' or worse; Control delay greater than 35 seconds for traffic signal control
- V/C ratio of greater than 0.90 (volumes are $90 \%$ of capacity)
- A queue length for any movement that significantly blocks another movement, or exceeds storage requirements for the movement

Table 5-1: 2020 Pre-Development Intersection Traffic Operations

| Traffic Signal | 12 Street and 32 Avenue NE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| Direction | LOS | Delay (sec) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { Ratio } \end{aligned}$ | Queue <br> (m) | LOS | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} \text { V/C } \\ \text { Ratio } \end{gathered}$ | Queue <br> (m) |
| Eastbound Left | B | 10.1 | 0.80 | 39 | C | 32.3 | 0.75 | 40 |
| Eastbound Thru | A | 8.8 | 0.80 | 126 | A | 6.3 | 0.39 | 58 |
| Westbound | A | 7.7 | 0.37 | 58 | B | 20.0 | 0.90 | 216 |
| Southbound | C | 28.8 | 0.56 | 24 | C | 31.5 | 0.73 | 77 |

Table 5-2: 2020 Post-Development Intersection Traffic Operations

| Traffic Signal | 12 Street and 32 Avenue NE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| Direction | LOS | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} \text { V/C } \\ \text { Ratio } \end{gathered}$ | Queue (m) | LOS | Delay (sec) | $\begin{gathered} \text { V/C } \\ \text { Ratio } \end{gathered}$ | Queue (m) |
| Eastbound Left | B | 18.7 | 0.80 | 77 | C | 34.5 | 0.83 | 52 |
| Eastbound Thru | A | 8.8 | 0.80 | 177 | A | 6.2 | 0.37 | 59 |
| Westbound | A | 7.7 | 0.37 | 58 | C | 26.5 | 0.93 | 280 |
| Southbound | C | 28.8 | 0.56 | 28 | D | 38.2 | 0.76 | 43 |

Note that only the intersection of 12 Street and 32 Avenue NE is summarised in these tables. When the intersection of 12 Street and McKnight Boulevard NE was analysed it was found that the intersection is
failing, all approaches and in both peak hours, this can be seen in the Synchro reports attached to this letter. The volume of traffic that the proposed funeral home is adding to this intersection is an increase of approximately $1 \%$, which is insignificant with regards to impacting the operation of an already failing intersection. Because the majority of trips generated by the development will impact the nearer intersection of 12 Street and 32 Avenue NE, it was decided to focus the analysis on this intersection.

In the AM peak hour, the eastbound left turn movement has a queue that extends beyond the capacity of the auxiliary lane and is expected to spillover into the eastbound through lane on 32 Avenue NE. This is due to the additional development generated traffic turning onto 12 Street NE after coming from the west, most likely Deerfoot Trail. But it is in the PM peak hour that the development generated traffic has a much larger impact to the operations of the 12 Street and 32 Avenue NE intersection. In the predevelopment scenario, the westbound approach is at capacity, being at the $90 \%$ threshold, so when the post-development scenario was analysed that approach exceeded capacity. Adjustments were made to the signal timing to resolve this issue but providing more green time for the westbound traffic only resulted in unacceptable operations for other movements competing for time within the signal cycle. The results shown in Table 5-2 was the best compromise that could be achieved for the intersection overall; even then there are unacceptable operations for some movements.

This analysis does not take into account that often funeral processions proceed together along the roadways between the funeral home and final resting place for the deceased. This would create a larger impact to the operation of the subject intersections as temporary traffic control could be used to stop other traffic movements to allow the procession to proceed along their route without being separated by changing traffic signals.

## 6. Summary of Conclusions

### 6.1. Parking

It is expected that there will be a shortfall in parking provided on the site for the proposed funeral home, 16 to 36 vehicles will need to park on the adjacent roadways. Information provided anecdotally is that there may not be sufficient parking on the nearby roadways of 34 Avenue NE and 36 Avenue NE to accommodate this shortfall. A complete parking assessment should be provided to demonstrate if there will be a parking shortfall for the development and if so, how this shortfall will be mitigated.

### 6.2. Traffic

The additional traffic expected to be generated by the funeral home will have an impact on the operation of the intersection of 12 Street and 32 Avenue NE. Primarily during the typical PM peak hour scenario, the intersection will have unacceptable operations due to the westbound approach being over capacity and competing for green time with other movements that have had their volumes increased by development generated traffic. A more detailed and full transportation impact assessment is required to confirm what impacts, and the size of these impacts, the development generated traffic will have on the roadways and intersections in the area.

There will also be an impact of the development generated traffic on the intersection of 12 Street and McKnight Boulevard NE, but this impact is less than at 32 Avenue NE. The intersection at McKnight Boulevard NE is failing under existing conditions and the increase in traffic due to the development does not change this. This does demonstrate that traffic generated by the development is more likely to use the 12 Street and 32 Avenue NE intersection and create the unacceptable operational issues that have been noted in the analysis completed for this study.

It is my professional opinion, the limited information provided with the land use amendment application has resulted in raising issues that need to be addressed before the funeral home land use should be approved.

If you wish to discuss any items within this letter, please feel free to contact the undersigned at jcbarrett@jcbengineering.ca or at (403) 714-5798.

Sincerely,

# PERMIT TO PRACTICE 

 JCB ENGINEERING LTD.RM SIGNATURE Pustion Barotit
RM APEGA ID \#: 77644
DATE: June 17, 2020
PERMIT NUMBER: P012310
The Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA)

Justin Barrett, P. Eng., PTOE
President and Transportation Engineer
JCB Engineering Ltd.

## Attachments

- ITE Trip Generation Graph
- ITE Parking Generation Graph
- City of Calgary Traffic Counts
- City of Calgary Traffic Signal Timing Summary
- Transportation Network Schematics
- Synchro Output Reports


## Church <br> (560)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Seats
On a: Sunday, Peak Hour of Generator

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 17
Avg. Num. of Seats: 853
Directional Distribution: 49\% entering, 51\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Seat

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.54 | $0.05-1.14$ | 0.28 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Church <br> (560)

| Peak Period Parking Demand vs: | Seats |
| ---: | :--- |
| On a: | Sunday |
| Setting/Location: | General Urban/Suburban |
| Peak Period of Parking Demand: | $9: 00$ a.m. $\mathbf{- 1 : 0 0}$ p.m. |
| Number of Studies: | 11 |
| Avg. Num. of Seats: | 369 |

Peak Period Parking Demand per Seat

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | 33rd / 85th <br> Percentile | 95\% Confidence <br> Interval | Standard Deviation <br> (Coeff. of Variation) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.22 | $0.13-0.65$ | $0.15 / 0.34$ | ${ }^{* * *}$ | $0.15(68 \%)$ |

## Data Plot and Equation



## Traffic Count Reports

Intersection Id: 8723
Status: Valid
Study Name: 6 Hour Intersection Count

Study Date: Wednesday, 28 June 2017
Location: 12 ST NE \& 32 AV NE (WEST INT)
Weather:


[^0]Intersection Id: 8723
Status: Valid
Study Name: Standard TMC Diagrams

Study Date: Wednesday, 28 June 2017
Location: 12 ST NE \& 32 AV NE (WEST INT)
Weather:


[^1] responsibility or liability which may arise from any incorrect or incomplete data or results, or for any improper or inappropriate use or interpretation made by anyperson

## Traffic Count Reports

Intersection Id: 8709 Status: Valid

Study Name: 6 Hour Intersection Count

Study Date: Thursday, 29 June 2017
Location: MCKNIGHT BV NE \& AVIATION BV NE
Weather:


[^2]Intersection Id: 8709
Status: Valid
Study Name: Standard TMC Diagrams

Study Date: Thursday, 29 June 2017
Location: MCKNIGHT BV NE \& AVIATION BV NE Weather:


Information contained herein is intended, designed, and collected for specific municipal purposes and may not be suitable for other applications. The city of Calgary accepts no responsibility or liability which may arise from any incorrect or incomplete data or results, or for any improper or inappropriate use or interpretation made by anyperson

Traffic Count Reports

Average Annual Weekday Traffic Conversion Factors for 2017
Location: W of the Intersection DEERFOOT TR NE \& MCKNIGHT BV NE (Both Directions)

| Month/Days <br> Average/Days <br> Factor | Monday |  | Tuesday |  | Wednesday |  | Thursday |  | Friday |  | Monthly |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| January | 41496 | 5 | 1.10 |  | 1.07 | 4 | 46879 | 1.06 | 47267 | 4 | 1.10 |  |
| February | 42263 | 3 | 1.08 |  | 4656 | 4 | 47666 | 4 | 47343 | 4 | 46129 | 19 |
| March | 46151 | 4 | 48103 | 4 | 4858 | 5 | 49125 | 5 | 49570 | 5 | 48409 | 23 |
| April | 46944 | 3 | 49529 | 4 | 50692 | 4 | 51029 | 4 | 51394 | 3 | 0.99 |  |
| May | 50270 | 4 | 51720 | 5 | 51793 | 5 | 52815 | 4 | 53252 | 4 | 51951 | 22 |
| June | 50672 | 4 | 52537 | 4 | 5328 | 4 | 53554 | 5 | 53473 | 5 | 52777 |  |
| July | 45514 | 5 | 49662 | 4 |  | 4 | 51038 | 4 | 50903 | 4 | 49382 | 21 |
| August | 48088 | 3 | 50418 | 5 |  | 5 | 51049 | 5 | 50851 | 4 | 50497 | 22 |
| September | 50221 | 3 | 51763 | 4 |  | 4 | 52861 | 4 |  | 5 | 52264 | 20 |
| October | 48385 | 4 | 51282 | 5 |  | 4 | 53288 | 4 | 54291 | 4 | 51832 | 21 |
| November | 46599 | 4 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 5 |  | 4 | 49292 | 22 |
| December | 48478 | 3 | 48788 | 3 |  | 4 | 47512 | 4 |  | 5 | 47754 | 19 |
| Yearly | 46919 |  |  |  |  | $52$ | 50539 |  | 50810 |  | 49655 |  |


| Total Traffic | 12463362 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Days | 251 |
| AAWT | 49655 |

AAWT factor calculations do not include statutory holidays or missing data.
Information contained herein is intended, designed, and collected for specific municipal purposes and may not be suitable for other applications. The City of Calgary accepts no responsibility or liability which may arise from any incorrect or incomplete data or results, or for any improper or inappropriate use or interpretation made by any person

Traffic Count Reports

Average Annual Weekday Traffic Conversion Factors for 2020
Location: W of the Intersection DEERFOOT TR NE \& MCKNIGHT BV NE (Both Directions)

| Month/Days <br> Average/Days <br> Factor | Monday |  | Tuesday |  | Wednesday |  | Thursday |  | Friday |  | Monthly |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| January | 43279 |  | 0.91 |  | 0.88 |  | 0.99 |  | 1.03 | 5 | 41856 | 0.95 |
| February | 42789 | 3 | 0.81 | 4 | 0.78 | $4$ | 49985 | 4 | $49371$ | $4$ | 48666 | 0.82 |
| March | 38454 | 5 | 38572 | 5 | $0.96$ |  | 41199 | 4 | 39581 | 4 | 39717 | 22 |
| April | 29628 | 3 | 30328 | 4 | 29989 | $5$ | $31181$ | 5 | $30623$ | 3 | 30396 | 20 |
| May | 35477 |  | 37399 | 4 | $38234$ | $4$ | 37857 | 4 | $39258$ | 5 | 37834 | 20 |
| June | 40787 |  | 41723 | 1 | 0 | $0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41255 | 2 |
| July |  | N/A |  | N/A |  | N/A |  | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  | N/A | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| August | N/A | $N / A$ |  | N/A |  | N/A |  | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  | N/A | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| September | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  | N/A |  | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  | N/A |  | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| October | N/A | $N / A$ |  | N/A |  | N/A |  | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  | N/A | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| November | N/A | N/A |  | N/A |  | N/A |  | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  | N/A | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| December | N/A | N/A |  | N/A |  | N/A |  | N/A |  | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | N/A | N/A |
| Yearly | 38414 |  | 39823 |  | 40498 | $21$ |  | $22$ | 39863 | $21$ | 39680 | $105$ |


| Total Traffic | 4166362 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Days | 105 |
| AAWT | 39680 |

AAWT factor calculations do not include statutory holidays or missing data.
Information contained herein is intended, designed, and collected for specific municipal purposes and may not be suitable for other applications. The City of Calgary accepts no responsibility or liability which may arise from any incorrect or incomplete data or results, or for any improper or inappropriate use or interpretation made by any person


Notes: The offset point is referenced to the beginning of the first column of traffic movements.
If the max time is less than the pedestrian time, the extra unused pedestrian time is passed to the main street unless otherwise noted.
If any of the summary is unclear, please contact the Signals Division with the City of Calgary, by phoning 311.

LOCATION:
INT \#:


|  | MAX | 112 | $26.5+1.5^{*}$ | $25.5+2.5^{*}$ | $11.5-4^{*}$ | 1 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MIN if Actuated | 21 | $10+18^{*}$ | $10+18^{*}$ | 7 | - |  |  |
| *Wedestrian | $8+13$ | $8+20$ | $8+20$ | - | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| TIMING PLAN NO: | P11 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CYCLE LENGTH: | 200 |
| OFFSET: | 0 |
| START TIME: | - |
| END TIME: | - |

NB \& SB DEERFOOT CLOSURE

$\frac{\text { MAX }}{\text { MIN if Actuated }}$

Pedestrian

| 106 | $26.5+1.5^{*}$ | $24.5+3.5^{*}$ | 12.5 | $7-5^{*}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | $10+18^{*}$ | $10+18^{*}$ | 7 | - |  |  |
| $8+13$ | $8+20$ | $8+20$ | - | - |  |  |


|  | Pro | Pro/ | Per |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Only | Per | Only |  |
| NBLT | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
| SBLT | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
| EBLT | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
| WBLT | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| TIMING PLAN NO: | $\mathbf{P 1 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| CYCLE LENGTH: | $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ |
| OFFSET: | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| START TIME: | - |
| END TIME: | - |
| NB DEERFOOT CLOSURE |  |



WBL
NB DEERFOOT CLOSURE

$$
4.5+1.5 \quad 3.5+3 \quad 3.5+3 \quad 3.5+1
$$

|  | MAX | 103 | $25.5+2.5^{*}$ | $24.5+3.5^{*}$ | 12.5 | $11-6^{*}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MIN if Actuated | 21 | $10+18^{*}$ | $10+18^{*}$ | 7 | - |  |
| Pedestrian | $8+13$ | $8+20$ | $8+20$ | - | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: The offset point is referenced to the beginning of the first column of traffic movements.
If the max time is less than the pedestrian time, the extra unused pedestrian time is passed to the main street unless otherwise noted. If any of the summary is unclear, please contact the Signals Division with the City of Calgary, by phoning 311.

## Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Scenario: Collected Traffic Counts
Year: 2017

AM Peak Hour


PM Peak Hour


| 12 Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | 401 | N/A | 343 | 205 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 2,138 |  |  | 32 <br> Avenue |
|  |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |
| Avenue |  |  | 132 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
|  |  |  | 1,071 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |

Legend

|  | Road B |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road A | North Approach |  |  | Right <br> Thru Left | East Approach |  |
|  | Right | Thru | Left |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Left | Left | Thru | Right |
|  |  | pproach | Thru |  | outh Appr |  |
|  |  |  | Right |  |  |  |

100 Total traffic volume for movement
N/A Movement does not exist



PM Peak Hour

| PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 654 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1,754 |  |  |  |
| McKnight | 425 | 124 | 478 | 65 |  |  | McKnight |
| Blvd |  |  | 209 | 337 | 250 | 213 | Blvd |
|  |  |  | 1,350 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 115 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 216 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 2,256 |  |  |  |
| 32 | 423 | N/A | 362 | N/A |  |  | 32 |
| Avenue |  |  | 139 | N/A | N/A | N/A | Avenue |
|  |  |  | 1,130 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |

Legend


[^3]N/A Movement does not exist


Peak Hour Trip Distribution

Scenario: All Trips
Year: All Horizons


PM Peak Hour



Legend

|  | Road B |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road A | North Approach |  |  | Right <br> Thru | East Approach |  |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | Left |  |  |
|  |  |  | Left | Left | Thru | Right |
|  |  | pproach | Thru |  | uth Appr |  |
|  |  |  | Right |  |  |  |

100\% Percent of distribution based on total trips
100\% Entering trips
100\% Exiting trips


Peak Hour Trip Assignment

Scenario: All Trips
Year: All Horizons
AM Peak Hour


PM Peak Hour


Legend


100 Trips assigned to intersection movement
100 Entering trips


## Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Scenario: Post-Development
Year: 2020

AM Peak Hour


PM Peak Hour

| 12 Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 654 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1,754 |  |  |  |
| McKnight | 425 | 130 | 478 | 71 |  |  | McKnight |
| Blvd |  |  | 209 | 359 | 256 | 219 | Blvd |
|  |  |  | 1,350 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 136 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 12 Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | 495 | N/A | 367 | 222 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 2,256 |  |  | 32 <br> Avenue |
|  |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |
| Avenue |  |  | 208 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
|  |  |  | 1,130 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |

Legend


100 Total traffic volume for movement
N/A Movement does not exist


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 332 | 2740 | 1010 | 290 | 234 | 220 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.53 | 0.82 | 0.60 | 0.44 | 0.47 | 0.55 |
| Control Delay | 9.5 | 11.3 | 20.0 | 7.8 | 29.6 | 10.3 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 9.5 | 11.3 | 20.0 | 7.8 | 29.6 | 10.3 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 11.1 | 77.0 | 37.2 | 6.8 | 15.5 | 1.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 38.9 | 125.8 | 57.6 | 27.2 | 23.6 | 17.3 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 180.4 | 169.9 |  | 282.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 60.0 |  |  | 20.0 |  | 20.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 625 | 3333 | 1683 | 656 | 1249 | 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 | 0.53 | 0.82 | 0.60 | 0.44 | 0.19 | 0.31 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Cycle Length | 70 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Control Type | Actuated-Coordinated |
| Natural Cycle | 90 |
| Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of Green |  |

Splits and Phases: 1:32 Avenue \& 12 Street


|  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 376 | 2548 | 612 | 139 | 1334 | 427 | 112 | 253 | 362 | 201 | 255 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.85 | 1.29 | 0.74 | 0.61 | 0.99 | 0.59 | 0.68 | 0.70 | 1.24 | 0.34 | 0.54 |
| Control Delay | 71.4 | 171.3 | 21.1 | 73.4 | 75.7 | 7.7 | 83.5 | 65.3 | 182.3 | 54.9 | 10.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 71.4 | 171.3 | 21.1 | 73.4 | 75.7 | 7.7 | 83.5 | 65.3 | 182.3 | 54.9 | 10.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 110.6 | $\sim 370.7$ | 71.4 | 41.5 | ~164.1 | 0.0 | 37.6 | 36.9 | ~139.9 | 29.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#163.3 | \#397.3 | 124.0 | \#85.4 | \#217.3 | 32.2 | 55.6 | 47.8 | \#195.8 | 40.7 | 22.3 |
| Internal Link Dist ( m ) |  | 184.1 |  |  | 186.5 |  |  | 282.4 |  | 181.3 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 80.0 |  | 125.0 | 80.0 |  | 60.0 |  | 30.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 449 | 1977 | 828 | 228 | 1341 | 723 | 268 | 567 | 292 | 585 | 469 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.84 | 1.29 | 0.74 | 0.61 | 0.99 | 0.59 | 0.42 | 0.45 | 1.24 | 0.34 | 0.54 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 种 | F＇ | \％ | 帆 | 「 | \％ | ＊$\hat{*}$ |  | 7 | 个 $\uparrow$ | F |
| Volume（veh／h） | 346 | 2344 | 563 | 133 | 1281 | 410 | 105 | 142 | 63 | 315 | 175 | 222 |
| Number | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1796 | 1796 | 1796 | 1729 | 1729 | 1729 | 1667 | 1667 | 1850 | 1652 | 1652 | 1652 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 376 | 2548 | 0 | 139 | 1334 | 0 | 97 | 205 | 0 | 362 | 201 | 0 |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Cap，veh／h | 396 | 2484 | 774 | 110 | 1613 | 502 | 132 | 278 | 0 | 294 | 586 | 262 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.23 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1711 | 4903 | 1527 | 1647 | 4720 | 1470 | 1587 | 3333 | 0 | 1573 | 3138 | 1404 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 376 | 2548 | 0 | 139 | 1334 | 0 | 97 | 205 | 0 | 362 | 201 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1711 | 1634 | 1527 | 1647 | 1573 | 1470 | 1587 | 1667 | 0 | 1573 | 1569 | 1404 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 32.5 | 76.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 38.9 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 32.5 | 76.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 38.9 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 396 | 2484 | 774 | 110 | 1613 | 502 | 132 | 278 | 0 | 294 | 586 | 262 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.95 | 1.03 | 0.00 | 1.27 | 0.83 | 0.00 | 0.73 | 0.74 | 0.00 | 1.23 | 0.34 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 405 | 2484 | 774 | 110 | 1613 | 502 | 296 | 622 | 0 | 294 | 586 | 262 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 56.8 | 37.0 | 0.0 | 70.0 | 45.3 | 0.0 | 67.1 | 67.2 | 0.0 | 61.0 | 53.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 31.7 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 173.6 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 130.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／ln | 18.8 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 22.8 | 3.7 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 88.5 | 61.9 | 0.0 | 243.6 | 50.3 | 0.0 | 73.8 | 70.5 | 0.0 | 191.7 | 53.4 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | F |  | F | D |  | E | E |  | F | D |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 2924 |  |  | 1473 |  |  | 302 |  |  | 563 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 65.3 |  |  | 68.5 |  |  | 71.5 |  |  | 142.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |


| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |  |  |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 14.5 | 82.0 | 34.5 | 39.2 | 57.3 | 19.0 |  |  |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.5 |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 10.0 | 60.5 | 28.0 | 35.5 | 35.0 | 28.0 |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c +11$)$ ，s | 12.0 | 78.0 | 30.0 | 34.5 | 40.9 | 11.0 |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.5 |  |  |

Intersection Summary
HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay
HCM 2010 LOS
74.8

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．

|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ | 1 |  | $\nsim$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | WBL | EBT | SBTL | EBL | WBT | NBTL |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None | C-Min | None | None | C-Min | None |
| Maximum Split (s) | 14.5 | 66.5 | 34.5 | 40 | 41 | 34.5 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 9.7\% | 44.3\% | 23.0\% | 26.7\% | 27.3\% | 23.0\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 9.5 | 27 | 34.5 | 9.5 | 27 | 34.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1.5 | 3 | 1 | 1.5 | 3 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 10 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 13 | 20 |  | 13 | 20 |
| Dual Entry | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 110 | 124.5 | 41 | 110 | 0 | 75.5 |
| End Time (s) | 124.5 | 41 | 75.5 | 0 | 41 | 110 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 120 | 35 | 69 | 145.5 | 35 | 103.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 120 | 22 | 49 | 145.5 | 22 | 83.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 110 | 124.5 | 41 | 110 | 0 | 75.5 |
| Local Yield (s) | 120 | 35 | 69 | 145.5 | 35 | 103.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 120 | 22 | 49 | 145.5 | 22 | 83.5 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length 150

Control Type Actuated-Coordinated
Natural Cycle 150
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBT and 6:WBT, Start of Green
Splits and Phases: 4: 12 Street \& McKnight Boulevard


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 153 | 1242 | 2535 | 243 | 476 | 557 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.72 | 0.49 | 1.21 | 0.35 | 0.43 | 0.93 |
| Control Delay | 32.5 | 13.0 | 122.1 | 13.2 | 21.6 | 42.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 32.5 | 13.0 | 122.1 | 13.2 | 21.6 | 42.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 11.4 | 45.8 | ~189.3 | 18.1 | 28.7 | 62.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#39.6 | 57.9 | \#216.0 | 35.3 | 33.7 | 77.4 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) |  | 180.4 | 169.9 |  | 282.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 60.0 |  |  | 20.0 |  | 20.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 213 | 2547 | 2103 | 694 | 1188 | 641 |
| 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 | 0.72 | 0.49 | 1.21 | 0.35 | 0.40 | 0.87 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\longleftarrow$ | 4 | * | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 恌 | 率 | F | ${ }^{7 *}$ | 7 |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 139 | 1130 | 2256 | 216 | 362 | 423 |  |  |
| Number | 5 | 2 | 6 | 16 | 7 | 14 |  |  |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1745 | 1745 | 1814 | 1814 | 1779 | 1779 |  |  |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 153 | 1242 | 2535 | 0 | 476 | 0 |  |  |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.76 | 0.76 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 |  |  |
| Cap, veh/h | 205 | 3189 | 2830 | 881 | 655 | 301 |  |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.67 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.00 |  |  |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1662 | 4922 | 5115 | 1542 | 3287 | 1512 |  |  |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 153 | 1242 | 2535 | 0 | 476 | 0 |  |  |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1662 | 1588 | 1650 | 1542 | 1643 | 1512 |  |  |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 2.8 | 9.3 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 2.8 | 9.3 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 205 | 3189 | 2830 | 881 | 655 | 301 |  |  |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.75 | 0.39 | 0.90 | 0.00 | 0.73 | 0.00 |  |  |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 209 | 3189 | 2830 | 881 | 1191 | 548 |  |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.00 |  |  |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 18.9 | 5.9 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 13.4 | 0.4 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| \%ile BackOfQ( $50 \%$ ),veh/ln | 2.8 | 4.1 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 32.3 | 6.3 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 31.5 | 0.0 |  |  |
| LnGrp LOS | C | A | B |  | C |  |  |  |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1395 | 2535 |  | 476 |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 9.1 | 20.0 |  | 31.5 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A | B |  | C |  |  |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{C})$, $s$ |  | 59.6 |  | 20.4 | 7.8 | 51.7 |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+$ Rc), s |  | 6.0 |  | 4.5 | 3.0 | 6.0 |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 40.5 |  | 29.0 | 5.0 | 32.5 |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 11.3 |  | 12.8 | 4.8 | 38.0 |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 27.3 |  | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 17.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |



| Cycle Length | 80 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Control Type | Actuated-Coordinated |
| Natural Cycle | 110 |
| Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of Green |  |

Splits and Phases: $1: 32$ Avenue \& 12 Street


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 222 | 1436 | 122 | 68 | 1827 | 681 | 337 | 651 | 498 | 129 | 443 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 1.48 | 0.77 | 0.19 | 0.63 | 1.08 | 0.78 | 1.12 | 0.98 | 1.47 | 0.19 | 1.06 |
| Control Delay | 290.3 | 41.7 | 5.5 | 88.8 | 89.2 | 15.5 | 138.1 | 78.2 | 267.4 | 47.5 | 97.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 290.3 | 41.7 | 5.5 | 88.8 | 89.2 | 15.5 | 138.1 | 78.2 | 267.4 | 47.5 | 97.1 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | $\sim 88.6$ | 137.7 | 0.0 | 19.6 | ~216.6 | 38.1 | $\sim 123.6$ | 92.4 | $\sim 199.0$ | 16.6 | $\sim 106.0$ |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#142.4 | 157.9 | 13.7 | \#39.0 | \#247.4 | 96.3 | \#163.5 | \#110.2 | \#270.3 | 26.6 | \#175.9 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) |  | 184.1 |  |  | 186.5 |  |  | 282.4 |  | 181.3 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 80.0 |  | 125.0 | 80.0 |  | 60.0 |  | 30.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 150 | 1868 | 657 | 116 | 1697 | 878 | 301 | 664 | 338 | 676 | 417 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 1.48 | 0.77 | 0.19 | 0.59 | 1.08 | 0.78 | 1.12 | 0.98 | 1.47 | 0.19 | 1.06 |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | * | $\rightarrow$ |  | 4 |  |  |  | 4 | $p$ | $t$ | $\frac{1}{1}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 444 | 7 | ${ }^{7}$ | 444 | 7 | ${ }^{7}$ | $4{ }^{4}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 44 | \% |
| Volume (veh/h) | 209 | 1350 | 115 | 65 | 1754 | 654 | 337 | 250 | 213 | 478 | 124 | 425 |
| Number | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1779 | 1779 | 1779 | 1814 | 1814 | 1814 | 1745 | 1745 | 1850 | 1779 | 1779 | 1779 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 222 | 1436 | 0 | 68 | 1827 | 0 | 242 | 553 | 0 | 498 | 129 | 0 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Cap, veh/h | 151 | 1945 | 606 | 86 | 1787 | 556 | 302 | 635 | 0 | 339 | 676 | 302 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.09 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1694 | 4856 | 1512 | 1727 | 4951 | 1542 | 1662 | 3491 | 0 | 1694 | 3380 | 1512 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 222 | 1436 | 0 | 68 | 1827 | 0 | 242 | 553 | 0 | 498 | 129 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1694 | 1619 | 1512 | 1727 | 1650 | 1542 | 1662 | 1745 | 0 | 1694 | 1690 | 1512 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 12.5 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 50.5 | 0.0 | 19.5 | 21.6 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 12.5 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 50.5 | 0.0 | 19.5 | 21.6 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 151 | 1945 | 606 | 86 | 1787 | 556 | 302 | 635 | 0 | 339 | 676 | 302 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 1.47 | 0.74 | 0.00 | 0.79 | 1.02 | 0.00 | 0.80 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 1.47 | 0.19 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 151 | 1945 | 606 | 117 | 1787 | 556 | 332 | 698 | 0 | 339 | 676 | 302 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 63.8 | 35.7 | 0.0 | 65.8 | 44.7 | 0.0 | 54.8 | 55.7 | 0.0 | 56.0 | 46.6 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 242.8 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 22.1 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 226.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 16.0 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 27.5 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 34.4 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 306.6 | 38.3 | 0.0 | 87.9 | 71.9 | 0.0 | 65.4 | 65.2 | 0.0 | 282.9 | 46.7 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | D |  | F | F |  | E | E |  | F | D |  |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1658 |  |  | 1895 |  |  | 795 |  |  | 627 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 74.2 |  |  | 72.5 |  |  | 65.3 |  |  | 234.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |


| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |  |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c), s$ | 11.5 | 62.1 | 34.5 | 17.0 | 56.5 | 32.0 |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.5 |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 9.5 | 51.0 | 28.0 | 12.5 | 48.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s | 7.5 | 37.2 | 30.0 | 14.5 | 52.5 | 23.6 |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 |  |

Intersection Summary
HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay
92.3

HCM 2010 LOS
F

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

|  |  | $\rightarrow$ | 1 | 4 |  | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | WBL | EBT | SBTL | EBL | WBT | NBTL |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None | C-Min | None | None | C-Min | None |
| Maximum Split (s) | 14 | 57 | 34.5 | 17 | 54 | 34.5 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 10.0\% | 40.7\% | 24.6\% | 12.1\% | 38.6\% | 24.6\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 9.5 | 27 | 34.5 | 9.5 | 27 | 34.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1.5 | 3 | 1 | 1.5 | 3 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 10 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 13 | 20 |  | 13 | 20 |
| Dual Entry | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 123 | 137 | 54 | 123 | 0 | 88.5 |
| End Time (s) | 137 | 54 | 88.5 | 0 | 54 | 123 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 132.5 | 48 | 82 | 135.5 | 48 | 116.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 132.5 | 35 | 62 | 135.5 | 35 | 96.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 123 | 137 | 54 | 123 | 0 | 88.5 |
| Local Yield (s) | 132.5 | 48 | 82 | 135.5 | 48 | 116.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 132.5 | 35 | 62 | 135.5 | 35 | 96.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length 140 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBT and 6:WBT, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 4: 12 Street \& McKnight Boulevard


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | 4 | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 390 | 2740 | 1010 | 295 | 238 | 287 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.62 | 0.85 | 0.67 | 0.48 | 0.43 | 0.67 |
| Control Delay | 15.8 | 13.9 | 23.1 | 9.0 | 27.0 | 16.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 15.8 | 13.9 | 23.1 | 9.0 | 27.0 | 16.1 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 20.5 | 77.5 | 42.6 | 8.0 | 15.8 | 9.7 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#77.4 | \#177.2 | 57.6 | 27.7 | 21.5 | 27.7 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) |  | 180.4 | 169.9 |  | 282.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 60.0 |  |  | 20.0 |  | 20.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 633 | 3238 | 1502 | 610 | 1249 | 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 | 0.62 | 0.85 | 0.67 | 0.48 | 0.19 | 0.41 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Cycle Length | 70 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Control Type | Actuated-Coordinated |
| Natural Cycle | 90 |
| Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBT, Start of Green |  |

Splits and Phases: 1:32 Avenue \& 12 Street


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 376 | 2548 | 632 | 143 | 1334 | 427 | 130 | 268 | 362 | 206 | 255 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.87 | 1.29 | 0.76 | 0.68 | 1.01 | 0.59 | 0.72 | 0.69 | 1.24 | 0.35 | 0.54 |
| Control Delay | 74.8 | 171.3 | 21.7 | 79.1 | 79.9 | 7.8 | 84.5 | 63.0 | 182.3 | 55.1 | 10.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 74.8 | 171.3 | 21.7 | 79.1 | 79.9 | 7.8 | 84.5 | 63.0 | 182.3 | 55.1 | 10.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 110.6 | ~370.7 | 75.3 | 43.4 | ~170.9 | 0.0 | 43.7 | 39.0 | ~139.9 | 29.9 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#172.5 | \#397.3 | 130.8 | \#96.9 | \#217.3 | 32.2 | 62.7 | 49.5 | \#195.8 | 41.6 | 22.3 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 184.1 |  |  | 186.5 |  |  | 282.4 |  | 181.3 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 80.0 |  | 125.0 | 80.0 |  | 60.0 |  | 30.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 439 | 1977 | 835 | 210 | 1319 | 718 | 268 | 567 | 292 | 585 | 469 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.86 | 1.29 | 0.76 | 0.68 | 1.01 | 0.59 | 0.49 | 0.47 | 1.24 | 0.35 | 0.54 |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 个个个 | 7 | ${ }^{7}$ | 个个个 | F | \％ | $\uparrow \hat{*}$ |  | \％ | 个个 | F |
| Volume（veh／h） | 346 | 2344 | 581 | 137 | 1281 | 410 | 123 | 147 | 68 | 315 | 179 | 222 |
| Number | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1796 | 1796 | 1796 | 1729 | 1729 | 1729 | 1667 | 1667 | 1850 | 1652 | 1652 | 1652 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 376 | 2548 | 0 | 143 | 1334 | 0 | 106 | 228 | 0 | 362 | 206 | 0 |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Cap，veh／h | 396 | 2447 | 762 | 110 | 1577 | 491 | 144 | 303 | 0 | 294 | 586 | 262 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.23 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1711 | 4903 | 1527 | 1647 | 4720 | 1470 | 1587 | 3333 | 0 | 1573 | 3138 | 1404 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 376 | 2548 | 0 | 143 | 1334 | 0 | 106 | 228 | 0 | 362 | 206 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1711 | 1634 | 1527 | 1647 | 1573 | 1470 | 1587 | 1667 | 0 | 1573 | 1569 | 1404 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 32.5 | 74.9 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 39.3 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 32.5 | 74.9 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 39.3 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 396 | 2447 | 762 | 110 | 1577 | 491 | 144 | 303 | 0 | 294 | 586 | 262 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.95 | 1.04 | 0.00 | 1.30 | 0.85 | 0.00 | 0.73 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 1.23 | 0.35 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 405 | 2447 | 762 | 110 | 1577 | 491 | 296 | 622 | 0 | 294 | 586 | 262 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 56.8 | 37.6 | 0.0 | 70.0 | 46.3 | 0.0 | 66.4 | 66.5 | 0.0 | 61.0 | 53.1 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 31.7 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 187.5 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 130.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 18.8 | 40.6 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 22.8 | 3.7 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 88.5 | 67.6 | 0.0 | 257.5 | 52.1 | 0.0 | 72.2 | 69.6 | 0.0 | 191.7 | 53.5 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | F |  | ． | D |  | E | E |  | F | D |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 2924 |  |  | 1477 |  |  | 334 |  |  | 568 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 70.3 |  |  | 72.0 |  |  | 70.4 |  |  | 141.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |


| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |  |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 14.5 | 80.9 | 34.5 | 39.2 | 56.1 | 20.1 |  |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.5 |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 10.0 | 60.5 | 28.0 | 35.5 | 35.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 12.0 | 76.9 | 30.0 | 34.5 | 41.3 | 12.0 |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.6 |  |

Intersection Summary
HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay
78.4

HCM 2010 LOS
E

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．

|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ | 1 |  | $\nsim$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | WBL | EBT | SBTL | EBL | WBT | NBTL |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None | C-Min | None | None | C-Min | None |
| Maximum Split (s) | 14.5 | 66.5 | 34.5 | 40 | 41 | 34.5 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 9.7\% | 44.3\% | 23.0\% | 26.7\% | 27.3\% | 23.0\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 9.5 | 27 | 34.5 | 9.5 | 27 | 34.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1.5 | 3 | 1 | 1.5 | 3 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 10 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 13 | 20 |  | 13 | 20 |
| Dual Entry | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 110 | 124.5 | 41 | 110 | 0 | 75.5 |
| End Time (s) | 124.5 | 41 | 75.5 | 0 | 41 | 110 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 120 | 35 | 69 | 145.5 | 35 | 103.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 120 | 22 | 49 | 145.5 | 22 | 83.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 110 | 124.5 | 41 | 110 | 0 | 75.5 |
| Local Yield (s) | 120 | 35 | 69 | 145.5 | 35 | 103.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 120 | 22 | 49 | 145.5 | 22 | 83.5 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length 150

Control Type Actuated-Coordinated
Natural Cycle 150
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBT and 6:WBT, Start of Green

Splits and Phases: 4: 12 Street \& McKnight Boulevard


|  |  | $\rightarrow$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 229 | 1242 | 2535 | 249 | 483 | 651 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.80 | 0.41 | 1.06 | 0.32 | 0.59 | 0.89 |
| Control Delay | 39.5 | 9.7 | 64.8 | 16.3 | 33.6 | 24.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 39.5 | 9.7 | 64.8 | 16.3 | 33.6 | 24.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 26.9 | 39.2 | $\sim 196.1$ | 21.5 | 42.0 | 34.6 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 52.1 | 58.7 | \#279.6 | 51.4 | 43.0 | 41.3 |
| Internal Link Dist ( $m$ ) |  | 180.4 | 169.9 |  | 282.4 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( m ) | 60.0 |  |  | 20.0 |  | 20.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 446 | 3051 | 2384 | 768 | 1052 | 805 |
| 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 | 0.51 | 0.41 | 1.06 | 0.32 | 0.46 | 0.81 |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |




Splits and Phases: $1: 32$ Avenue \& 12 Street


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 222 | 1436 | 145 | 74 | 1827 | 681 | 350 | 679 | 498 | 135 | 443 |
| v/c Ratio | 1.48 | 0.80 | 0.22 | 0.67 | 1.08 | 0.78 | 1.16 | 1.03 | 1.47 | 0.20 | 1.07 |
| Control Delay | 290.3 | 44.1 | 5.3 | 92.1 | 89.2 | 15.8 | 151.9 | 90.0 | 267.4 | 47.6 | 99.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 290.3 | 44.1 | 5.3 | 92.1 | 89.2 | 15.8 | 151.9 | 90.0 | 267.4 | 47.6 | 99.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | $\sim 88.6$ | 137.7 | 0.0 | 21.4 | $\sim 216.6$ | 39.1 | $\sim 132.3$ | ~104.5 | $\sim 199.0$ | 17.4 | $\sim 108.0$ |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#142.4 | 157.9 | 14.8 | \#43.9 | \#247.4 | 97.6 | \#172.1 | \#120.3 | \#270.3 | 27.6 | \#177.9 |
| Internal Link Dist ( m ) |  | 184.1 |  |  | 186.5 |  |  | 282.4 |  | 181.3 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 80.0 |  | 125.0 | 80.0 |  | 60.0 |  | 30.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 150 | 1785 | 647 | 116 | 1697 | 876 | 301 | 660 | 338 | 676 | 414 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 1.48 | 0.80 | 0.22 | 0.64 | 1.08 | 0.78 | 1.16 | 1.03 | 1.47 | 0.20 | 1.07 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  | \％ | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 掚 | F | \％ | 率 | 「 | \％ | ＊$\hat{6}$ |  | \％ | 个4 | 1 |
| Volume（veh／h） | 209 | 1350 | 136 | 71 | 1754 | 654 | 359 | 256 | 219 | 478 | 130 | 425 |
| Number | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1779 | 1779 | 1779 | 1814 | 1814 | 1814 | 1745 | 1745 | 1850 | 1779 | 1779 | 1779 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 222 | 1436 | 0 | 74 | 1827 | 0 | 253 | 582 | 0 | 498 | 135 | 0 |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 | ， | 4 |  | 4 |
| Cap，veh／h | 151 | 1897 | 591 | 93 | 1758 | 547 | 312 | 656 | 0 | 339 | 676 | 302 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.09 | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1694 | 4856 | 1512 | 1727 | 4951 | 1542 | 1662 | 3491 | 0 | 1694 | 3380 | 1512 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 222 | 1436 | 0 | 74 | 1827 | 0 | 253 | 582 | 0 | 498 | 135 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1694 | 1619 | 1512 | 1727 | 1650 | 1542 | 1662 | 1745 | 0 | 1694 | 1690 | 1512 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 12.5 | 35.8 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 49.7 | 0.0 | 20.4 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 4.7 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 12.5 | 35.8 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 49.7 | 0.0 | 20.4 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 4.7 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 151 | 1897 | 591 | 93 | 1758 | 547 | 312 | 656 | 0 | 339 | 676 | 302 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 1.47 | 0.76 | 0.00 | 0.80 | 1.04 | 0.00 | 0.81 | 0.89 | 0.00 | 1.47 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 151 | 1897 | 591 | 117 | 1758 | 547 | 332 | 698 | 0 | 339 | 676 | 302 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 63.8 | 36.9 | 0.0 | 65.5 | 45.1 | 0.0 | 54.5 | 55.4 | 0.0 | 56.0 | 46.7 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 242.8 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 25.3 | 32.5 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 226.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／ln | 16.0 | 16.5 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 27.9 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 34.4 | 2.2 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 306.6 | 39.8 | 0.0 | 90.8 | 77.6 | 0.0 | 65.6 | 66.2 | 0.0 | 282.9 | 46.8 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | D |  | F | F |  | E | E |  | F | D |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1658 |  |  | 1901 |  |  | 835 |  |  | 633 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 75.5 |  |  | 78.1 |  |  | 66.0 |  |  | 232.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |


| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |  |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c), s$ | 12.0 | 60.7 | 34.5 | 17.0 | 55.7 | 32.8 |  |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.5 |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 9.5 | 51.0 | 28.0 | 12.5 | 48.0 | 28.0 |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 7.9 | 37.8 | 30.0 | 14.5 | 51.7 | 24.8 |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 12.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 |  |

Intersection Summary
HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay
94.7

HCM 2010 LOS
F

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．

|  |  | $\rightarrow$ | 1 | 4 | $\Perp$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Number | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| Movement | WBL | EBT | SBTL | EBL | WBT | NBTL |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None | C-Min | None | None | C-Min | None |
| Maximum Split (s) | 14 | 57 | 34.5 | 17 | 54 | 34.5 |
| Maximum Split (\%) | 10.0\% | 40.7\% | 24.6\% | 12.1\% | 38.6\% | 24.6\% |
| Minimum Split (s) | 9.5 | 27 | 34.5 | 9.5 | 27 | 34.5 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1 | 1.5 | 3 | 1 | 1.5 | 3 |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 10 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 8 | 8 |  | 8 | 8 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 13 | 20 |  | 13 | 20 |
| Dual Entry | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Inhibit Max | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Start Time (s) | 123 | 137 | 54 | 123 | 0 | 88.5 |
| End Time (s) | 137 | 54 | 88.5 | 0 | 54 | 123 |
| Yield/Force Off (s) | 132.5 | 48 | 82 | 135.5 | 48 | 116.5 |
| Yield/Force Off 170(s) | 132.5 | 35 | 62 | 135.5 | 35 | 96.5 |
| Local Start Time (s) | 123 | 137 | 54 | 123 | 0 | 88.5 |
| Local Yield (s) | 132.5 | 48 | 82 | 135.5 | 48 | 116.5 |
| Local Yield 170(s) | 132.5 | 35 | 62 | 135.5 | 35 | 96.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length 140 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:EBT and 6:WBT, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 4: 12 Street \& McKnight Boulevard



June 22, 2020

Via Email: sarah.hbeichi@calgary.ca

The City of Calgary
Planning \& Development
P.O. Box 2100, Station " $M$ "

Calgary, AB T2P $2 \mathrm{M}_{5}$

Attention: Sarah Hbeichi

Dear Ms. Hbeichi:

## RE: Land Use Amendment application LOC2020-0065; Property: 362512 Street NE; Funeral Home and Crematorium

Square One Properties Ltd. is the registered owner of the property 123136 Avenue NE, located to the immediate west of the proposed Funeral Home and Crematorium. Our property contains a building with 14 bays that are leased to 9 industrial businesses. These businesses are all long term tenants who have operated from our property for many years. Our property and the surrounding properties are all zoned "Industrial-General (I-G)" District. All our tenants' businesses were open and operated from the premises during the Covid-19 pandemic emergency rules in effect.

## Lack of Information

There is a complete lack of information about the application; no details other than the intent to redesignate the site to allow for the use of "Funeral Home" and "Crematorium", have been made available. For example, no information has been provided regarding the size of the assembly area for the proposed funeral home. The only information regarding the size of the potential development is the overall footprint of the existing building of 681 square metres. No information has been provided about the number of staff or business vehicles, the number of expected memorial services and visitors, the number of parking stalls, etc. In our view this information is necessary to properly assess the impact of the proposed use on the adjacent properties and businesses.

## No Engagement with Stakeholders

Our property manager attempted to inquire with the applicant and property owner about the application, but to no avail; No responses were received. Furthermore, the applicant has made no attempt to engage the adjacent property owners and surrounding businesses. This is contrary to the City's engagement policies and to best practices in land use planning.

## Concerns

We have several concerns with respect to the subject application. The subject parcel and surrounding parcels are all zoned I-G District. This is an industrial area with considerable traffic volumes on 12 Street NW, and the area serves as an important employment district in the city. In our opinion a funeral home is an inappropriate use for the subject location due to the expected traffic generated by the use and resulting parking issues expected from the proposed funeral home. The operation of industrial businesses in inner Calgary is important to the city's economy and we are concerned that allowing a use like a funeral home will create conflicts between the workers who rely on this area for their employment and the potential large groups of people who will visit the funeral home. We fear there will be an overflow of parking on our site and on neighboring properties. There are also no public sidewalks in the area, suggesting this area is not appropriate for large gatherings of people.

## Negative Impacts on Adjacent Properties \& Businesses

We are concerned that the proposed funeral home will negatively impact the use, enjoyment and value of our property and unduly affect our tenants' businesses. These tenants and businesses need unrestricted access for their clients and employees and for the delivery and pick-up of goods and products to their shops/units. Our building contains several metal fabrication shops that have deliveries by large tractor trailer vehicles. These vehicles need a large turning ratio for access and egress to the loading bays located at the rear of our building and the tenants' shops. The businesses cannot afford to have visitors of the proposed funeral home block access to and from our site. Parking on our property is at capacity and our tenants' staff typically need to park on the street. In addition, it should be noted that there is limited parking available on 36 Avenue as on-street parking on the north side of the avenue is prohibited. No parking is allowed on 12 Street. Moreover, we are concerned about the impact of funeral processions.

## Municipal Development Plan

In addition, we feel that the use of a Funeral Home is incompatible within an area identified within the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) as a "Standard Industrial Area." Policies within the MDP clearly state that within Standard Industrial Areas, industrial uses should continue to be the primary use and that the retention of a broad range of industrial uses is important (Section 3.7.1). Given that a funeral home in the Bylaw is considered to be a commercial use
(or akin to a commercial use), allowing for such a use within a Standard Industrial Area would be to allow the encroachment of non-industrial uses in the general area, which could set a precedent for the erosion of our inner city industrial land supply by uses that would be better located elsewhere. The subject parcel is just too small and an inappropriate location to accommodate the propose use of a funeral home.

## Transportation Impact Assessment

Our company commissioned a preliminary transportation impact assessment by JCB Engineering Ltd. (Justin Barrett, a Transportation Engineer) to evaluate the potential effects of the approval of this application. See the attached report. JCB concludes that it is expected that there will be a shortfall in parking provided on the site for the proposed funeral home and that there may not be sufficient parking on the nearby roadways of 34 Avenue NE and 36 Avenue NE to accommodate this shortfall. According to JCB a complete parking assessment should be provided to demonstrate if there will be a parking shortfall for the development.
$J C B$ further concludes that the additional traffic expected to be generated by the funeral home will have an impact on the operation of the intersection of 12 Street and 32 Avenue NE. Primarily during the typical PM peak hour scenario, the intersection will have unacceptable operations due to the westbound approach being over capacity and competing for green time with other movements that have had their volumes increased by traffic generated by the proposed development. JCB determined that a more detailed and full transportation impact assessment is required to confirm what impacts, and the magnitude of these impacts, the traffic generated by the proposed development will have on the roadways and intersections in the area. There will also be an impact of the development generated traffic on the intersection of 12 Street and McKnight Boulevard NE. This intersection is failing under existing conditions. This demonstrates that traffic generated by the proposed use and development is more likely to use the 12 Street and 32 Avenue NE intersection and create the unacceptable operational issues noted in the JCB report.

## Land Use Bylaw

It is the clear intent of the Land Use Bylaw to ensure compatibility between land uses. Based on sound planning principles, funeral homes are incompatible with general industrial areas. The Land Use Bylaw expressly and purposely limits funeral homes as a listed use to only five commercial districts: C-C2, C-COR 2, C-COR3, C-R2 and C-R3 Districts, generally to avoid an influx of vehicles and customers on industrial roads that are intended for trucks and the movement of goods that are critical to our city's economy. Funeral homes are located in the larger commercial land use districts that can accommodate parking or shared parking and good access to major roads. Due to associated traffic and parking demand, under the Land Use Bylaw the use of "Funeral Home" is more akin to commercial uses. Hence why the Bylaw treats it as such.

For your information, there is a funeral home located at 471513 Street NE, south of McKnight Boulevard. However, according to a review of the City records, that funeral home does not have development permit approval, in contravention of the Land Use Bylaw and the I-G zoning of the site does not allow the use. Therefore, it cannot be used as a reference for approval of the subject land use application.

In case the City Administration would recommend approval of the land use amendment application, we respectfully request that the City Administration requires the applicant to submit a concurrent development permit application to enable a proper assessment of the proposed land use application so that impacts can be evaluated holistically.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, for the aforementioned reasons we are opposed to the proposed land use amendment. From a planning and transportation perspective, the subject parcel is an inappropriate location for the use of a funeral home.


Square One Properties Ltd.

Encl.: Report JCB Engineering Ltd.

Cc: Ward Councillor (ray.jones@calgary.ca)


[^0]:    Frequent backups in lanes accessing southbound Deerfoot.

[^1]:    Information contained herein is intended, designed, and collected for specific municipal purposes and maynot be suitable for other applications. The city of Calgary accepts no

[^2]:    Northbound right turn often treated as double turn lane. Traffic backups on northbound left turn (12St).

[^3]:    100 Total traffic volume for movement

