



CBM-Caledon Quarry

CAART COMMENT SUMMARY TABLE RESPONSE #1 – [TRANSPORTATION]

Please accept the following as feedback from the Caledon Aggregate Review Team (CAART). Fully addressing each comment will expedite the potential for resolution of the consolidated CAART comments and individual agency objections. **Additional comments may be provided once a response has been prepared to the comments raised below and additional information provided.**

Colour Code	Description
	Resolved
	Resolved subject to additional information being provided to CAART Reviewers (e.g, Implementation Guide, Report Addendums)
(no colour)	Response provided, but no further action taken or required by Project Team

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Transportation Impact Study			Author: TYLin				
1.	The Saturday peak hour counts in the report do not match the counts presented in Appendix B. Clarification/explanation of why the counts in the main body of report does not match the counts in the appendix should be provided.	Page 9, Section 3.2					
2.	A graphic showing the existing truck restrictions and haul routes would be supportive. Figure 4-3 shows roads with truck restrictions in Section 4.7 and may be more appropriate in this section.	Page 10, Section 4.1					
3.	TAC Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads (GDG) is 200 metres. However, this spacing is more appropriate for signal spacing in urban conditions, while for suburban conditions a minimum intersection spacing of 400 metres would be desirable according to TAC.	Page 11, Section 4.2					

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Transportation Impact Study			Author: TYLin				
4.	Based on the Peel Region Road Characterization Study spacing of 600m, a midblock entrance on Charleston Side Road for the subject quarry is preferred. The proposed driveway design could impact the snow storage facility. The location should be evaluated against other criteria in addition to intersection spacing, such as sightlines and the design of the proposed entrance. If other criteria suggest a location outside of the midblock segment may be preferable for an access, then a spacing that is less than 600 metres away may be acceptable based on a comparison of the trade-offs between meeting intersection spacing and avoiding design and operations conflicts with adjacent driveways.	Page 11, Section 4.2					
5.	The “Left/Right-Turn SSD” should be characterized as Stopping Sight Distance only as it is not related to turning vehicles.	Page 12, Section 4.4					
6.	For a more conservative sightline analysis, the 100 km/h design speed should be selected.	Table 4-1 on page 12, Section 4.4					
7.	The note under the table should be revised mentioning this assertion is not applicable in environments with very little vertical deflection. We do agree that the use of regular passenger vehicle stopping sight distance requirements is appropriate.	Table 4-1 on page 12					
8.	In our opinion, a range of locations for sight measurements should have been tested to identify all locations within the midblock segment that provide acceptable sight distances, independent of other selection criteria.	Page 12, Section 4.4					
9.	The purpose of the figure is unclear. A legend is required.	Figure 4-1 on page 13					

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Transportation Impact Study			Author: TYLin				
10.	It is unclear why left-turn ISD at the Mississauga Road entrance was not captured, since the majority of trucks will be turning left on to Mississauga Road to continue south towards Charleston Sideroad.	Page 12, Section 4.4					
11.	The sightline requirements in addition to the available sight distances should be better documented and additional figures and/or tables may be beneficial to better document the sight distances observed in the field in relation to the required sight distance.	Page 12, Section 4.4					
12.	The sight distances measured in the field should use the existing property line as an obstruction to reflect that in future conditions which can be roughly estimated as being in the same location as the existing fence which runs along the north side of Charleston Sideroad i.e. on the south side of the subject site property.	Page 12, Section 4.4					
13.	The purpose of providing the available turn lanes and existing driveways at Charleston Sideroad and Main Street does not appear relevant to the discussion related to the proposed entrance. It suggests that an access to Mississauga Road has already been disqualified. The purpose of this section should be better documented as it appears to be a repeat of Section 4.2 but includes discussion on existing left-turn lanes.	Page 14, Section 4.6					
14.	Figure 4-2 depicts locations where the site access is not recommended but requires more details and measurements to describe the purpose and provide more guidance to the reader on the selection criteria.	Figure 4-2 on page 15					
15.	This report section would be better suited with a graphic that captures all the criteria which were considered in the selection of the preferring access location: sightlines, physical constraints, vehicular conflicts, traffic operations, haul routes, roadway	Page 16, Section 4.7					

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Transportation Impact Study				Author: TYLin			
	classifications. Figure 4-3 appears to be more appropriate for Section 4.1.						
16.	The traffic generated from staff working at 1420 Charleston Sideroad (6 employees) should be considered as a component of site traffic.	Page 16, Section 4.7					
17.	The horizon year should be adjusted to represent 10-years post build-out as opposed to 10-years beyond existing conditions.	Page 17, Section 5.1					
18.	Correspondence details relating to the background growth assumptions are missing in Appendix A.	Page 20, Section 6.1					
19.	Section 6.1.2 refers to truck data which is not presented in the report. Available weigh scale data or similar data from a proxy site should be provided in greater detail, if available.	Page 20, Section 6.1.2					
20.	More details on the time-of-day distribution of truck trips will be beneficial as opposed to assuming even distribution of trucks throughout the week / year with an arbitrary adjustment factor of a 50% increase applied to the weekday AM peak hour.	Page 21, Section 6.1.2					
21.	The queries used to support the employee (passenger car) distribution shown in Table 6-4 should be provided in the appendices for review.	Page 23, Section 6.2					

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Transportation Impact Study			Author: TYLin				
22.	It is preferable to provide separate site traffic for trucks and passenger cars in Figure 6-1.	Figure 6-1 on page 24					
23.	The storage requirements should be revisited to ensure that at least one truck length can be accommodated in the proposed storage for all turn lanes at the site access.	Page 29, Section 9.1					
24.	Access location should be reconsidered towards west of the proposed access as the design elements overlap with snow storage access. Spacing criteria of 600m as advised in Road Characterization Study may not be satisfied but it should not be used as the only criteria.	Page 30, Section 9.2					
25.	It would be more appropriate to use an articulated dump truck that accurately reflects the largest design vehicles anticipated to enter the site.	Page 30, Section 9.3					
26.	The figure does not show edge of the existing pavement. The graphic should also indicate the required widening through the section of the roadway where the access is proposed.	Figure 9-1 on page 30					
27.	Lost time adjustment should only be applied if the existing operations are indicating over-capacity operations when the demand is known and can be supported through field observations. Operations without calibration should be showed first for comparison with the calibrated operations.	Page 32, Section 10.1					

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Transportation Impact Study			Author: TYLin				
28.	Table 10-2 indicates storage for the intersection of Hurontario Street and Charleston Sideroad only and is not accurately representative of existing conditions. The calculation of effective storage should be revisited so that none of the taper or deceleration components of the turn lanes are reportioned as storage.	Table 10-2 on Page 33					
29.	Analyze proposed site access under stop control prior to analysis under signal control to provide for comparison with signalized operations.	Table 10-4 on Page 35					
30.	It may be beneficial to include a comparison of 95th percentile queues from Synchro in addition to the SimTraffic queues.	Page 38, Section 11					
31.	Site truck traffic is expected to use the available haul routes (Charleston Sideroad and Highway 10) without cutting through side streets or other minor roadways unless there are roadway blockages or conditions which render the haul routes unusable. Congestion and typical delays does not constitute an acceptable reason for trucks to divert from the haul routes along Charleston Sideroad and Highway 10. The report should include discussion about the surrounding non-haul route road network, why it would be used (road closures, local trips, or employee/passenger vehicle traffic), and should provide rationale why the side streets would not be utilized during typical operations (truck restrictions, indirect routing etc.)	Throughout					
32.	Collision Analysis – should be updated to capture 5 years before/after the Covid-19 period to ensure the analysis is based on typical conditions. The analysis should also focus on specific turning movements and intersections to identify ‘hotspots’ and to	Attachment D of Response to the Town of Caledon and Cuesta Planning					

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Transportation Impact Study			Author: TYLin				
	identify potential mitigation. The analysis should be extended to include all intersections along the haul route from the site entrance to Highway 10, as well as the midblock segments.	Consultants Inc. – Aggregate Resources Act Comments of November 17, 2023 - St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada) - Proposed Caledon Pit/Quarry Class A Licence #626600 OUR FILE 8816AF – Attachment D (Collision History Review by TYLin) dated August 13, 2024					