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## STANDARD LIMITATIONS

This report was prepared by MMM Group Limited (MMM) for the account of Rainy River Resources (the Client). The disclosure of any information contained in this report is the sole responsibility of the client. The material in this report reflects MMM's best judgment in light of the information available to it at the time of preparation. Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties. MMM accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by a third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report.

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Rainy River Resources retained MMM Group Limited (MMM) to conduct a transportation impact study (TIS) as supporting material for an Environmental Assessment west of Fort Frances, Ontario. The proposed development will consist of an open pit and underground gold mining and processing complex, to be located between the intersections of Highway 71 at Korpi Road, and Highway 600 at Tait Road, as indicated in Figure 1.1. The TIS is focused on the intersection of Highway 71 at Korpi Road, as this intersection is proposed to be the only access point to the mine site once the mine is in operation. Construction mitigation on Highway 600 at Tait Road is also discussed due to the realignment of Highway 600 and additional construction traffic that will need to be accommodated. The Ministry of Transportation for Ontario (MTO) have indicated that a hybrid of a traffic impact study and a traffic impact statement is appropriate for the proposed development.

This study investigates the potential traffic impacts related to the proposed mine on the adjacent highway network and recommends any necessary upgrades to the proposed intersection and roadway. This study includes weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour analysis for the peak year in 2022, as the mine workforce decreases in the following years due to decommissioning of the open pit mine and underground mine. The Highway 71 analysis also addresses summer traffic given the difference between summer and winter traffic volumes along Highway 71. The study follows the Ministry of Transportation for Ontario (MTO) General Guidelines for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies.

This draft document will be submitted to MTO as part of the PDR process associated with the proposed mine development.

Figure 1.1 illustrates the approximate location of the proposed Rainy River mine.


Figure 1.1: Development Location

### 2.0 HIGHWAY 71 AT KORPI ROAD / EAST ACCESS ROAD TIS

### 2.1 Study Area

The proposed mine site is located west of Fort Frances. Land use in the vicinity of the development includes farmland and forested areas. A convenience store/restaurant is located on the north-east corner of the Highway 71 at Korpi Road intersection. The development area is illustrated in Figure 1.1.

Highway 71 is a two-lane undivided paved roadway with gravel shoulders and a speed limit of 90 kilometres per hour adjacent to the proposed development. Highway 71 is classified as a Rural Collector road.

Korpi Road is a narrow two-lane undivided gravel roadway with no posted speed limit. It serves as an access road to the farms in the area. Korpi Road is classified as a Rural Local road.

The intersection of Highway 71 at Korpi Road is a two-way stop intersection, with Korpi Road and Lampi Road (the road adjacent to Highway 71 on the east side) being the roads with stop control. The shoulders on Highway 71 are paved at the intersection, and the condition of the roadway is good. There is currently no illumination at the intersection and there are no major intersections in the vicinity.

### 2.2 Proposed Development

The proposed development site plan is illustrated in Figures 2.1 and 2.2. Korpi Road is planned to be extended as the East Access Road by January 2015 and will provide the only access to the mine once construction is completed. The East Access Road will also provide access for traffic from Marrs Road to Highway 71. The development is anticipated to include an open pit mine and an underground mine, together with an associated processing area when it opens in 2016. The mine is expected to reach an employee peak in year 2022, and then to decrease in stages thereafter until mine decommissioning, expected to commence in 2032.


Source: BBA
Figure 2.1: Mine Site Plan


Source: BBA
Figure 2.2: Process Plant Site Plan

### 2.3 Traffic Volumes

### 2.3.1 Existing Traffic

The weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours were selected for analysis in this study as they are busy time periods for through traffic, construction traffic and mine related traffic on Highway 71. However, the background traffic peak hours occur mid-morning and mid-afternoon, therefore the hours analyzed do not coincide with the background traffic peak hours. Section 2.3.3 provides an explanation for this.

Daily traffic information for Highway 71 near the proposed development was obtained from the MTO website. MTO road segment traffic data is provided in the form of Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) and Summer Average Daily Traffic (SADT). A turning movement count was provided by MTO at a nearby intersection (Highway 71 at Highway 600), and a count was performed by MMM staff at the intersection of Highway 71 at Korpi Road on August $8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$, 2013 for both the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak times. All traffic data is included in Appendix A.

The Highway 71 at Highway 600 turning movement count was primarily used to determine background volumes at Highway 71 at Korpi Road. The count was started at 8:00 a.m., and completed at 5:00 p.m., but background volumes are required for the analysis starting at 7:00 a.m. and ending at 8:00 p.m. The rate of change from the a.m. peak hour to the start time was calculated, with the hourly start times beginning in 15 minute intervals (for example; 9:00 to 10:00, then $8: 45$ to $9: 45$ ). The rates were averaged, and the average rate was used to extrapolate the hourly volumes to the hour being analysed. The same was done for the afternoon; the rate of change was calculated for each hour from the p.m. peak hour to the end of the count, the rates were averaged, and the average was applied to determine hourly volumes for the later times under consideration. These volumes are only slightly higher than the volumes observed by MMM staff at the intersection of Highway 71 at Korpi Road, so they provide a conservative estimate. To provide a more accurate estimate of the activity at the intersection being analysed, the ratio of each turning movement peak hour volume observed during the counts performed by MMM staff to the overall intersection peak hour volume was determined, and the ratios were applied to the extrapolated volumes from the MTO turning movement count.

The percent of heavy vehicles was provided in the Highway 71 at Highway 600 count. The percent trucks in the northbound and southbound directions on Highway 71 were averaged for both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The a.m. peak hour had 13.5 percent trucks, and the p.m.
peak hour had 16 percent trucks. It was assumed that the same would apply to Highway 71 at Korpi Road.

### 2.3.2 Future Traffic

Historical AADT and SADT counts mentioned in Section 2.3 .1 were used to determine the historical growth rate on Highway 71. This data is illustrated in Figure 2.3. Table 2.1 summarizes the growth rates for the last five and 10 years of data.


Figure 2.3: Historical Daily Traffic Information - Hwy 71

Table 2.1: Hwy 71 Growth Rates

|  | Five Year Growth <br> Rate | Ten Year Growth <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT | $0.0 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| SADT | $0.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

Historical data indicates that traffic volumes have fluctuated over the past 10 years on Highway 71, with an overall minor increase in volumes. A conservative growth rate of one percent per year was selected for Highway 71 based on the historical data and because there has been minimal development near the proposed mine site in recent years.

Background traffic volumes for the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours and average daily traffic are illustrated in Figures 2.4 to 2.7.


Figure 2.4: 2013 Peak Hour Background Traffic Volumes (6-7 a.m. \& 7-8 p.m.)


Figure 2.5: 2022 Peak Hour Background Traffic Volumes (6-7 a.m. \& 7-8 p.m.)


Figure 2.6: 2022 Average Daily Background Traffic Volumes (AADT)


Figure 2.7: 2022 Average Daily Background Traffic Volumes (SADT)

### 2.3.3 Diverted Traffic

Marrs Road is a local road in the area that currently connects to Highway 600 via other local roads. The construction of the mine will remove that connection, however, Marrs Road will connect to the Korpi Road / East Access Road once it is completed and have direct access to Highway 71. Based on an assessment of the surrounding area utilizing Google Earth, it appears that there are less than five properties along Marrs Road. It is therefore assumed that 10 trips are generated by the development on Marrs Road during the peak hour periods: five trips leaving in the a.m. peak hour and five trips returning in the p.m. peak hour. These trips would all use the intersection of Highway 71 at Korpi Road, and it was assumed that half would travel north and half would travel south. This applies to both the construction and the post development periods being analyzed, as the peak construction month occurs after the East Access Road is completed.


Figure 2.8: Diverted Traffic

### 2.3.4 Site Generated Traffic

Trip generation for the mine was provided by the mining engineering firm involved in the project (BBA). Approximately 360 trips per weekday are forecast to visit the mine at its peak in 2022.

The following assumptions used in this study were provided by BBA and Rainy River Resources:
> Salaried employees work Monday to Friday shifts, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.;
> Hourly employees work 12 hour shifts from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.;
> There are a total of 601 project personnel in the peak year of 2022, with 111 being salaried employees and 490 being hourly employees. All salaried employees work Monday to Friday, and approximately one quarter of all hourly employees (125 hourly personnel) work per shift;
> It was assumed that employees drive to work in a typical car, with no car-pooling; and
> All deliveries are made on weekdays, with an average of 5 trucks per weekday.

Higher volumes are generated by the hourly employees in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours than by the salaried employees. When one hourly shift is leaving another is arriving. Therefore, the hour before and after the daytime hourly shift was analysed. To be conservative, it was assumed that hourly employees leaving their nighttime shift would leave within the same hour as the hourly employees arriving to start their daytime shift, and vice versa.

MMM also analysed Highway 71 at Korpi Road based on the addition of construction traffic. As described in The Highway 600 Construction Traffic Mitigation Study in Appendix D prepared by TBT Engineering, construction of the East Access Road and the realignment of Highway 600 will coincide with the proposed mine development and is anticipated to continue over a period of six months. After this period, the additional traffic on Highway 600 will be removed, and all of the construction traffic will use the East Access Road (Korpi Road). During the six month construction of the East Access Road, traffic from Marrs Road will be diverted to Highway 600. Following the completion of the East Access Road, this traffic will use the East Access Road to access Highway 71. It was determined that the period of concurrent highway and mine construction is not the critical period with respect to traffic. Greater monthly workforce forecasts occur in the fall of 2015, with 400 workers required daily in October of 2015. The following assumptions were made by TBT Engineering and MMM Group:
> The construction traffic will access the sites via Highway 71. For the purpose of this analysis, it was assumed that all the construction related traffic would travel via Highway 71;
> Construction worker shifts are from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.;
> All construction workers arrive to site within one hour (6:00 to 7:00 a.m.), and leave within one hour (7:00 to 8:00 p.m.);
> No carpooling was assumed, which is a very conservative assumption; and
> Although more trucks will be required during construction, their use will be dispersed throughout the day rather than being in use during shift change time. For this reason, truck traffic during the peak hours of construction traffic is assumed to be minimal.

It should be noted that the average number of construction workers required on site per day is approximately 215 . Therefore, the peak month of 400 workers over-represents the average daily trips.

Trip generation for the proposed Rainy River Resources mine and the construction period are outlined in Table 2.2. The a.m. and p.m. peak periods for the hourly workers had higher trip generation than a.m. and p.m. peak periods for the salaried workers, and were therefore chosen to be analysed. In 2022 the mine is forecast to generate a total of 720 vehicles per day ( 360 inbound and 360 outbound), and 250 vehicles per hour ( 125 inbound and 125 outbound) during both the weekday peak hours. The peak construction month is forecast to generate a total of 890 vehicles per day ( 445 inbound and 445 outbound), 400 vehicles per hour in the a.m. peak hour ( 400 inbound and 0 outbound) and 400 vehicles per hour in the p.m. peak hour (0 inbound and 400 outbound).

It should be noted that the mine and construction peak hours vary from the background traffic peak hours. The background traffic peak hours occur mid-morning and mid-afternoon, whereas the mine and construction peak hours are earlier in the morning and later in the afternoon. The traffic volumes generated by the construction and mine during shift change time are higher than the background traffic volumes during the background peak hours, therefore the development peak hours were determined to be the critical hours and were analysed.

Table 2.2: Construction and Mine Trip Generation

| Trip Generation |  | Peak Construction Month |  |  | Peak Year (2022) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Weekday AM Peak Hour (6-7) | Weekday PM Peak Hour (7-8) | Weekday | Weekday AM Peak Hour (6-7) | Weekday PM Peak Hour (7-8) | Weekday |
| Trip Direction | Inbound | 100 \% | 0 \% | 50 \% | 50 \% | 50 \% | 50 \% |
|  | Outbound | 0 \% | 100 \% | 50 \% | $50 \%$ | 50 \% | 50 \% |
| Employee Trips | Inbound | 400 | 0 | 400 | 125 | 125 | 360 |
|  | Outbound | 0 | 400 | 400 | 125 | 125 | 360 |
|  | Total | 400 | 400 | 800 | 250 | 250 | 720 |
| Heavy <br> Vehicle <br> Trips | Inbound | 0 | 0 | $\sim 45$ | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | Outbound | 0 | 0 | $\sim 45$ | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | Total | 0 | 0 | $\sim 90$ | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Total Trips | Inbound | 400 | 0 | 445 | 125 | 125 | 360 |
|  | Outbound | 0 | 400 | 445 | 125 | 125 | 360 |
|  | Total | 400 | 400 | 890 | 250 | 250 | 720 |

### 2.3.5 Trip Distribution and Assignment

Trip distribution refers to the directional split of traffic entering and exiting the study area, and trip assignment refers to the assignment of distributed trips to the adjacent road network. Trip distribution for the construction and mine traffic is based on the surrounding communities that employees would likely live in, and was provided by the client. The following trip distribution was used:
> 20 percent to/from the north on Highway 71; and
> 80 percent to/from the south on Highway 71.
New trips generated by construction and the proposed mine were distributed and assigned to the road network based on the split noted above. Background traffic was combined with the diverted traffic and additional traffic generated, distributed and assigned to the road network to determine traffic projections for the peak construction and post development scenarios. Peak construction and post development traffic volumes for the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours and average daily traffic are illustrated in Figures 2.9 to 2.12.


Figure 2.9: Peak Construction Period- Peak Hour Traffic Volumes


Figure 2.10: 2022 Peak Hour Post Development Traffic Volumes


Figure 2.11: 2022 Average Daily Post Development Traffic Volumes (AADT)


Figure 2.12: 2022 Average Daily Post Development Traffic Volumes (SADT)

### 2.4 Traffic Analysis

### 2.4.1 Intersection Analysis

The traffic analysis for the proposed development was undertaken using Synchro 8.0 traffic analysis software. The relative performance of an intersection is measured in terms of level of service (LOS). LOS ranges from A (excellent) to F (beyond capacity). In general, LOS E is considered to be at capacity. LOS for un-signalized intersections is defined in terms of delay. Delay is the total elapsed time from when a vehicle stops at the end of the queue until the vehicle departs from the stop line. This includes the time required for the vehicle to travel from the last-in-queue position to the first.

LOS B or better for the overall intersection is widely considered desirable in a rural area during peak traffic periods. At un-signalized intersections, LOS C or better is generally considered acceptable for minor roads accessing major provincial roads and highways, with LOS B or better acceptable for through movements on the highway.

Intersection capacity utilization level of service (ICU LOS) provides additional insight into how an intersection is functioning and how much extra capacity is available to handle traffic fluctuations and incidents. ICU LOS ranges from A (excellent) to H (beyond capacity), with ICU LOS E generally considered to be at practical capacity.

For this analysis, it is assumed that the northbound and southbound approaches on Highway 71 will remain free-flowing while eastbound and westbound vehicles on Korpi Road and Lampi Road will remain under stop control at the intersection with Highway 71. All four approaches at the intersection were assumed to consist of a single approach lane.

Table 2.3 summarizes the results of the background, peak construction period, and post development intersection analyses for Highway 71 and Korpi Road. The detailed Synchro results are included in Appendix B.

Table 2.3: Hwy 71 and Korpi Road Intersection Analysis

| Scenario | Overall Intersection |  |  | Critical Movement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Delay | ICU LOS | Intersection Utilization | Movement | LOS (Delay) |
| 2022 AM Background | 0 sec | A | 13\% | WB | A (9 sec) |
| 2022 PM Background | 0 sec | A | 13\% | WB | A (9 sec) |
| Peak Construction Period AM Peak (6-7) | 6 sec | A | 35\% | EB | B (14 sec) |
| Peak Construction Period PM Peak (7-8) | 9 sec | A | 36\% | WB | B (12 sec) |
| 2022 AM Peak (6-7) | 7 sec | A | 29\% | WB | A (10 sec) |
| 2022 PM Peak (7-8) | 6 sec | A | 30\% | WB | B (11 sec) |

The data provided in Table 2.3 indicates the following:
> All scenarios feature less than 10 seconds of average delay per vehicle for the overall intersection.
> All scenarios feature ICU LOS A for the overall intersection.
> The AM Peak Construction Period scenarios features LOS B and 14 seconds of delay for the eastbound movement.

### 2.4.2 Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Based on the low background and post development traffic volumes, it was concluded that traffic signals would not be warranted and a traffic signal warrant analysis was therefore not performed.

### 2.5 Improvement Analysis

### 2.5.1 Intersection Treatment Warrant

The intersection treatment warrant analysis was completed following the MTO Geometric Design Standards for Ontario Highways, Chapter E- At-Grade Intersections. Warrants were completed for the peak construction period, the average construction period, and 2022 post development traffic volumes. The detailed warrant analysis is included in Appendix C. The results of the warrant analysis are summarized in Table 2.4.

Table 2.4: Hwy 71 at Korpi Rd Intersection Treatment Warrant Analysis

| Scenario | Highway 71 |  | Korpi Road / East <br> Access Road |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left-turn Lane | Right-turn <br> Channelization | Right-turn <br> Channelization |
| Peak Construction <br> Period | Warranted | Warranted | Warranted |
| Average <br> Construction | Not Warranted | Not Warranted | Warranted |
| 2022 Post <br> Development | Not Warranted | Not Warranted | Warranted |

The left-turn lane warrant analysis was performed based on the volumes in Figure 2.8 and Figure 2.9 (peak construction period and 2022 post development a.m. and p.m. peak hours), a design speed of 110 kilometers per hour and on 40 percent of the advancing traffic being leftturns, which is the maximum left-turn percentage available in the Geometric Design Standards for Ontario Highways. In reality, the percent of left-turns varied from 60 to 95 percent in the scenarios analysed. With the majority of traffic travelling northbound on Highway 71 making a left-turn it is unlikely that a vehicle travelling straight through the Highway 71 and Korpi Road intersection will encounter a vehicle waiting to turn left. See Appendix C for figures outlining the parameters involved in the intersection treatment warrant analyses.

A northbound left-turn lane is warranted for the month with 400 construction workers working on site. However, at approximately 350 workers the left-turn lane is no longer warranted, and there are only 4 months out of the 20 months of construction that have more than 350 workers. As mentioned in Section 2.4.3, the average number of construction workers employed over the construction period is 215 , which is much lower than the peak period. The addition of a left turn lane is therefore not recommended.

The same methodology applies to the right-turn channelization warrant. MTO warrants rightturn channelization when 60 vehicles per hour make a right turn. This is warranted for the southbound direction in the peak construction period, and every month with 300 or more workers driving to site every day, which is a total of six months out of the entire construction period. It is not recommended that right-turn channelization be implemented based on the short time that it is warranted.

Right-turn channelization is warranted for the eastbound right-turn movement from Korpi Road onto Highway 71 in all scenarios. It is therefore recommended that eastbound right-turn channelization be constructed on Korpi Road at Highway 71.

The shoulders on Highway 71 at Korpi Road are currently paved, and it is recommended that they continue to be maintained as paved shoulders as vehicles making a right-turn from southbound Highway 71 onto Korpi Road will likely use the shoulder.

### 2.5.2 Illumination Warrant

An MTO illumination warrant was conducted for the intersection of Highway 71 at Korpi Road as per MTO Directives PLNG-B-05 and 06. A benefit / cost (B/C) ratio calculation template to determine the need for illumination has been developed by MTO for several highway categories. The category that applies to the Highway 71 / Mine access road intersection is "non-freeway intersection". MTO typically requires partial illumination at non-freeway intersections with a $B / C$ ratio greater than $2: 1$. If the $B / C$ is less than $2: 1$, a warrant analysis (also developed by MTO) is undertaken. If this analysis yields a result of 62 or more warrant points, illumination is required.

MMM utilized the B/C ratio calculation template for the "non-freeway intersection" category to determine the B/C ratio at the Highway 71 / Mine access road intersection. As actual values were unknown for several input items, default values were used (which are considered conservative). It was assumed that there would be one nighttime collision per year, two poles at the intersection, and 0 percent of the poles would be hit at night per year. The latter value was obtained from MTO. The analysis undertaken (see Table 2.5) calculated a B/C ratio of 11.14:1, resulting in the need for illumination at the intersection. It was therefore not necessary to complete a warrant analysis as the $B / C$ calculation determined that illumination is required.

Table 2.5: Illumination Benefit / Cost Analysis

| Factor | Input | MTO Suggestion/Description |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Posted Speed (km/hr) | 90 | Enter your data |
| Number of nighttime collision per year | 2 | Enter your data |
| \% Reduction in Nighttime Collision due to <br> Illumination | 30 | Studies indicate that, in general, resulted in 30\% <br> reduction (i.e., CMF $=0.70$ ) |


| \% Expected growth in collision | 1 | 1\% to coincide with traffic growth rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Horizon in years | 20 | say 20 years |
| Est. Construction Cost | \$20,000.00 | Approx. 80\% of Capital Cost |
| Est. Capital Overhead Cost | \$5,000.00 | Approx. 20\% of Capital Cost |
| Total Capital Cost (C) | \$25,000.00 | Sum of Construction and Overhead Cost |
| Annual Energy Cost per pole | \$250.00 | say $\$ 250.00$ or better yet, the actual value |
| Ave. Annual Maintenance Cost per pole | \$150.00 | say $\$ 150.00$ or better yet, the actual value |
| Total Annual Operating Cost per pole | \$400.00 | sum of the 2 values immediately above |
| \% of Total poles (nighttime hit/year) | 0 | Enter your data |
| Replacement Cost/pole | \$4,000.00 | say \$4,000/pole or better yet, the actual cost |
| Number of Poles | 2 | Enter your data |
| Pole collision results in a Property Damage Only (PDO) collision |  |  |
| Average Vehicle Collision Cost | \$35,000.00 | Information from the "Miscellaneous Data" of HEIR |
| PDO Collision Cost | \$8,000.00 | Information from the "Miscellaneous Data" of HEIR |
| Discount (Interest) Rate (I) | 0.05 | Information from the "Miscellaneous Data" of HEIR |
| Traffic Growth Rate | 0.01 | 1\% used in study |
| Number of Years | 20 | say 20 years |
| Present Worth Factors (PWF) 0\% Traffic Growth, Disbenefits | 12.462210 | Use when solving for Disbenefit (No Traffic Growth Rate) |
| Present Worth Factors (PWF), Benefits | 13.503080 | Use when solving for Benefit (this includes Traffic Growth Rate) |
| Annual Benefit | \$21,000.00 | Ave. Vehicle collision Cost x \% Reduction in Nighttime Collision due to Illumination |
| Present Value Benefit (B) | \$283,564.68 | Annual Benefit x PWF |
| Total Annual Operating Cost per pole | \$400.00 | Same as above |
| Pole Replacement Cost | \$0.00 | \% of Total hityear x no. of poles x pole replacement cost |
| Social Cost | \$0.00 | \% of total pole hitlyr x Number of poles x PDO Collision Cost |
| Total Annual Disbenefits | \$400.00 | Sum of the 3 values immediately above |
| Present Value of Disbenefits(D) | \$4,984.88 | Total Annual Disbenefit x PWFzero |
| Benefit Cost Ratio = | 11.14 : 1 | (B-D) / C |

### 3.0 HIGHWAY 600 CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION

The Highway 600 Construction Traffic Mitigation Study done by TBT Engineering for Rainy River Resources was reviewed and is attached in Appendix D. MMM concurs with the assumptions and conclusions made by TBT, and the Township of Chapple is in agreement with the chosen detour alternative.

### 4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions and recommendations are made for the proposed Rainy River Resources mine based on the results of the analysis:
> During the peak construction period, construction activities are forecast to generate 400 new trips ( 400 entering and 0 exiting) during the a.m. peak hour, 400 new trips ( 0 entering and 400 exiting) during the p.m. peak hour, and 890 new daily trips (445 entering and 445 exiting).
> The proposed mine is forecast to generate 250 new trips ( 125 entering and 125 exiting) during both the weekday a.m. and weekday p.m. peak hours and 720 new daily trips (360 entering and 360 exiting).
> The proposed mine will remove access from Marrs Road to Highway 600, but the construction of the East Access Road (extension of Korpi Road) will provide access from Marrs Road to Highway 71. It was assumed that because of this diversion, five extra vehicles would enter the Highway 71 at Korpi Road intersection per peak hour. The trips would be distributed equally between the north and south directions on Highway 71, with the vehicles travelling away from Marrs Road in the a.m. peak, and returning in the p.m. peak.
> 80 percent of the construction and mine traffic is expected to access the site to/from the south on Highway 71 and 20 percent of the construction and mine traffic is expected to access the site to/from the north on Highway 71.
> The intersection of Highway 71 at Korpi Road is forecast to operate at an acceptable level of service with both the construction traffic and the proposed mine traffic. Northbound and southbound vehicles on Highway 71 will be free-flowing while westbound and eastbound traffic will approach a stop sign at the intersection.
> Traffic signals are not warranted at the Highway 71 and Korpi Road intersection based on the low forecast 2022 post development traffic volumes. However, it is recommended that "Trucks Turning Ahead" signs be installed on Highway 71 north and south of the intersection as an added safety measure.
> The intersection of Highway 71 at Korpi Road was analyzed to determine the need for upgrades utilizing the MTO warrant template. The results of the analysis indicated that upgrades are not warranted on Highway 71 except during the 30 day peak construction
period and are therefore not recommended. However, eastbound right-turn channelization from Korpi Road onto Highway 71 is warranted and recommended. It is recommended that the traffic volumes on Highway 71 at Korpi Road be monitored and that the intersection upgrade warrants be re-evaluated once activity at the mine is underway.
> Illumination is warranted and recommended at the intersection of Highway 71 at Korpi Road based on the benefit / cost analysis results.
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|  | START TIME | NBL |  | NBT | NBR |  | SBL |  | SBT | SBR |  | WBL |  | WBT |  | WBR |  | EBL |  | EBT |  | EBR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (8) | 8:15 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $80$ | 8:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8:45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PK HR VOLS |  | 0 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
|  | 9:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9:15 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9:30 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { c }}{\square}$ | 9:45 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\stackrel{\circ}{O}}{\square}$ | 10:00 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  | 18 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\mathfrak{x}}{8}$ | 10:15 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{-}{1}$ | 10:30 |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  | 22 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N | 10:45 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PK HR VOLS |  | 0 | 37 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 63 |  | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |


|  | 2:30 |  | 8 | 1 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2:45 |  | 7 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3:00 |  | 10 | 1 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 뭉 | 3:15 |  | 13 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\substack{0}}{0}$ | 3:30 |  | 14 |  | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\square}{2}$ | 3:45 |  | 14 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{-}{1}$ | 4:00 |  | 12 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\gtrless$ | 4:15 |  | 11 | 2 | 1 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PK HR VOLS | 0 | 51 | 2 | 2 | 25 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4:45 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| (8) | 5:00 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 | 5:15 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | 5:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 主 | PK HR VOLS | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |


|  | TURNING MOVEMENT RATIOS TO TOTAL PEAK HOUR VOLUME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | EBL | EBT | EBR |
| AM PEAK | 0\% | 35\% | 0\% | 0\% | 59\% | 0\% | 3\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| PM PEAK | 0\% | 62\% | 2\% | 2\% | 30\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| AM PEAK | 0\% | 67\% | 0\% | 0\% | 33\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| PM PEAK | 0\% | 40\% | 0\% | 0\% | 40\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 20\% | 0\% | 0\% |

## APPENDIX B: Synchro Results

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 25 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 27 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 66 | 64 | 45 | 64 | 77 | 18 | 59 |  |  | 18 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 66 | 64 | 45 | 64 | 77 | 18 | 59 |  |  | 18 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.2 |  |  | 4.2 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.3 |  |  | 2.3 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 926 | 827 | 1025 | 931 | 813 | 1060 | 1472 |  |  | 1523 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 0 | 3 | 18 | 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 2 | 0 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1013 | 1472 | 1523 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 13.3\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 61 | 2 | 2 | 30 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 66 | 2 | 2 | 33 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 105 | 105 | 33 | 104 | 104 | 67 | 33 |  |  | 68 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 105 | 105 | 33 | 104 | 104 | 67 | 33 |  |  | 68 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.3 |  |  | 4.3 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.3 |  |  | 2.3 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 872 | 783 | 1041 | 875 | 785 | 996 | 1493 |  |  | 1448 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 0 | 2 | 68 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 931 | 1493 | 1448 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 13.3\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 28 | 0 | 103 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 25 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 30 | 0 | 112 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 109 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 27 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 283 | 281 | 45 | 393 | 295 | 18 | 59 |  |  | 18 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 283 | 281 | 45 | 393 | 295 | 18 | 59 |  |  | 18 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 95 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 93 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 632 | 583 | 1025 | 477 | 573 | 1060 | 1545 |  |  | 1598 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 142 | 3 | 127 | 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 30 | 1 | 109 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 112 | 2 | 0 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 904 | 754 | 1545 | 1598 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 4.5 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.7 | 9.8 | 6.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.7 | 9.8 | 6.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 6.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 28.9\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 320 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 80 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 348 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 87 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 791 | 789 | 75 | 792 | 833 | 18 | 118 |  |  | 18 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 791 | 789 | 75 | 792 | 833 | 18 | 118 |  |  | 18 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 99 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 76 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 251 | 246 | 986 | 250 | 232 | 1060 | 1470 |  |  | 1598 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 7 | 3 | 366 | 118 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 3 | 1 | 348 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 3 | 2 | 0 | 87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 400 | 509 | 1470 | 1598 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.24 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.4 | 0.2 | 7.4 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 14.2 | 12.1 | 7.9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 14.2 | 12.1 | 7.9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 6.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 35.3\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | - | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{*}$ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 25 | 0 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 103 | 61 | 2 | 2 | 30 | 28 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 27 | 0 | 109 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 112 | 66 | 2 | 2 | 33 | 30 |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 345 | 345 | 48 | 452 | 359 | 67 | 63 |  |  | 68 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 345 | 345 | 48 | 452 | 359 | 67 | 63 |  |  | 68 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $t \mathrm{~F}$ (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 95 | 100 | 89 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 93 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 575 | 535 | 1021 | 436 | 526 | 996 | 1540 |  |  | 1533 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 136 | 2 | 180 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 27 | 1 | 112 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 109 | 1 | 2 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 884 | 607 | 1540 | 1533 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 4.3 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.8 | 11.0 | 4.9 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | B | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.8 | 11.0 | 4.9 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 30.2\% |  | CU Level | Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 80 | 0 | 320 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 61 | 2 | 2 | 30 | 3 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 87 | 0 | 348 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 66 | 2 | 2 | 33 | 3 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 114 | 114 | 34 | 460 | 114 | 67 | 36 |  |  | 68 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 114 | 114 | 34 | 460 | 114 | 67 | 36 |  |  | 68 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 90 | 100 | 67 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 860 | 774 | 1039 | 339 | 773 | 996 | 1575 |  |  | 1533 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 435 | 2 | 72 | 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 87 | 1 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 348 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 997 | 506 | 1575 | 1533 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 18.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 11.4 | 12.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | B | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 11.4 | 12.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 9.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 36.1\% |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX C: Intersection Treatment Warrant

## Intersection Treatment Warrants



Northbound Left Turn:

$$
V a=117
$$

$$
V_{0}=54
$$

$V L=100 ; \% V L=86 \%$
Vo<100, Not Warranted
Southbound Right Turn: <60, Not Warranted
Eastbound Right Turn: $>60$, Warranted

2015 Peak Construction Period - AM Peak


Northbound Left Turn:
$\mathrm{Va}=336$
$V_{0}=107$
$\mathrm{VI}=320 ; \% \mathrm{VI}=95 \%$
Warranted
Southbound Right Turn: >60, Warranted
Eastbound Right Turn: <60, Not Warranted

Average Construction Period - AM Peak


Northbound Left Turn:

$$
V a=188
$$

$$
V_{0}=70
$$

VL $=172 ; \% V L=91 \%$ Vo<100, Not Warranted
Southbound Right Turn: <60, Not Warranted Eastbound Right Turn: <60, Not Warranted

2022 PM Peak PD


Northbound Left Turn:

$$
V a=166
$$

$$
V_{0}=60
$$

$V L=100 ; \% V L=61 \%$
Vo<100, Not Warranted
Southbound Right Turn: <60, Not Warranted
Eastbound Right Turn: $>60$, Warranted


Northbound Left Turn:
$\mathrm{Va}=62$
Vo=33
VL=3; \%VL=5\%
Vo<100, Not Warranted
Southbound Right Turn: <60, Not Warranted
Eastbound Right Turn: $>60$, Warranted

Average Construction Period - PM Peak


Northbound Left Turn:
$\mathrm{Va}=62$
Vo $=33$
$\mathrm{VL}=3$; \% VL=5\%
Vo<100, Not Warranted
Southbound Right Turn: <60, Not Warranted Eastbound Right Turn: >60, Warranted

## APPENDIX D: Highway 600 Construction Traffic Mitigation Study

## RAINY RIVER

# Highway 600 Construction Traffic Mitigation Study 

Prepared for<br>Rainy River Resources Limited

By TBT Engineering


May 1, 2013

### 1.0 Introduction

TBT Engineering Consulting Group (TBTE) was commissioned by Rainy River Resources Limited (RRR) to provide a Construction Traffic Mitigation Study for accommodating local and provincial highway traffic during the construction of a proposed realignment of Highway 600 in the District of Rainy River, Ontario.

The existing Highway 600 alignment traverses through a proposed mine development area near the community of Blackhawk. Following completion of a separate Feasibility Study in February 2012 and consultation with the Township of Chapple it was recommended to permanently relocate Highway 600 south of the proposed mine development area.

During the period when the new Highway 600 alignment is being constructed anticipated mine development is expected to result in a significant increase in local traffic volumes.

This current study will identify anticipated impacts associated with proposed construction activities, evaluate proposed alternatives for mitigating construction traffic impacts on local motorists, and provide recommendations for implementation of measures designed to safely accommodate local and provincial road users as well as construction personnel and equipment involved with development of the mine and the new highway alignment.

### 2.0 Study Area

Highway 600 is a minor secondary provincial highway running northerly from Rainy River for 27 km then generally easterly 62 km to Kings Highway 71.

The study area for this report includes Highway 600 from Highway 617 to Highway 71. Enclosure 1 identifies the section of Highway 600 included under this study.

This study area is larger than the proposed mine development and proposed realignment of Highway 600 to allow for evaluation of construction staging and detour options during construction.

### 3.0 Existing Conditions

Land uses along Highway 600 include agricultural, residential, recreational/hunting properties and timber extraction.

Highway 600 is classified as a rural local undivided (RLU) facility and within the study area has a granular surface with a posted speed limit of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$.

Existing annual average daily traffic volumes (AADT) within the study area are 110 vehicles/day.

### 4.0 Proposed Development

Rainy River Resources is proposing to construct a new mine development along Highway 600 in the vicinity of Blackhawk.

To accommodate the proposed mine development a section of Highway 600 extending from Dearlock to Blackhawk is recommended for relocation. A feasibility study was completed that considered eight options for the Highway 600 relocation. The options were presented to the Township of Chapple and subsequently the Township of Chapple provided a correspondence letter indicating Alternate C was the preferred option.

Enclosure 2 identifies the proposed new (Alternate C) alignment for Highway 600 south of the proposed mine development area.

Ultimately a new access road will be constructed to the mine development from Highway 71. Enclosure 2 identifies the proposed location of the East Access Road.

### 5.0 Development Stages

## Road Construction

This stage is anticipated to take approximately 6 months and is currently scheduled for the period from Aug 1, 2014 to Jan 31, 2015.

Construction of the East Access Road and the realignment of Highway 600 south of the proposed mine development will be coincidental with construction activities associated with the mine development.

Accordingly it is anticipated that significant increases over the existing traffic volume (AADT 110) will be experienced during this stage, and the increased number and nature of the construction vehicles working in vicinity of existing Highway 600 will result in a change in the character of the current traffic flow.

During this period construction traffic associated with the road construction and mine construction will access the development area via existing Highway 600, primarily from Highway 71.

## Mine Construction

This stage is anticipated to take approximately 23 months and is currently scheduled for the period from Aug 15, 2014 to July 15, 2016.

After the new Highway 600 bypass is opened in February 2015 impacts to the local and provincial highway users on Highway 600 will be negligible.

Mine construction traffic will be primarily facilitated by the East Access Road from Highway 71 once that link is completed.

## Mine Operation

During this stage mine traffic will primarily be facilitated via the East Access Road.

## Mine Closure

This stage will extend from the mine closure date and extend until decommissioning is completed however ongoing monitoring requirements may result in periodic access to the development after completion of closure activities.

During this stage mine traffic will primarily be facilitated via the East Access Road.

### 6.0 Anticipated Traffic Generation

Anticipated traffic volumes associated with the development are estimated to result in a cumulative count of 4,272 personnel vehicles over a 23 month period resulting in an additional AADT of approximately 200 additional vehicles per day.

Anticipate construction traffic volumes associated with the development are estimated to result in a cumulative count of 1918 trucks/loads/deliveries over a 23 month period resulting in an additional AADT of approximately 90 vehicles per day.

Taken cumulatively it is estimated that the proposed development will result in an increase in the current AADT of 110 vehicles per day to an estimated 400 vehicles per day with $25 \%$ trucks.

It is noted that once the East Access Road is completed mine traffic will be limited to Highway 71 then access to the site along existing and new municipal roadways. At that time traffic volumes on Highway 600 are expected to return to current level.

### 7.0 Construction Traffic Mitigation Study

The purpose of this study is to identify methods of mitigating impacts of anticipated construction traffic associated with the development, with primary focus on the stage when road construction is occurring coincidentally with mine construction.

During this period of time accommodating existing road users along Highway 600 while safely conducting construction activities will require comprehensive construction traffic safety measures as Highway 600 through the proposed development area will remain open until the new Highway 600 alignment is completed and transferred to the Province.

Staging was considered as an option to mitigate potential impacts however current schedule constraints negate the opportunity to construct the bypass in advance of the mine development.

Construction of the new Highway 600 alignment has been included with the overall Mine EA process, and as such pre-construction of this new roadway cannot proceed until EA clearance and associated permitting for the mine development is achieved.

Delay of initiating mine construction to allow for construction of the new Highway 600 alignment is not feasible as mine development plans are contingent on construction of water retention facilities in 2014 to ensure sufficient process water is available for mine start-up in 2016.

Closing existing Highway 600 during the period is not feasible as there are local land owners who access their property and residences via this route. School buses, utility companies with existing plant along Highway 600 and emergency response vehicles may also continue to require access along this route.

Accordingly, although the road will remain open, the recommended means of mitigating potential traffic impacts during this initial stage will include a proposed detour of non-local road users along Highway 600.

It is recommended that a detour will be established along Highway 617, Highway 11 and Highway 71 to route non-local traffic around the development area for the road construction stage (Aug 15, 2014 - Feb 1, 2015).

Enclosures 3 and 4 provide details regarding the proposed detour route and signage.

Within the development area local road users will still be allowed access along Highway 600 and appropriate construction signage in accordance with OTM Book 7 are recommended as identified in Enclosures 3 and 4.

Once construction of the East Access Road is complete local road users within the development area will access Highway 71 via the newly constructed East Access Road. This will allow local traffic to bypass mine construction and eliminate the need for existing Highway 600 to provide local traffic access to Highway 71.

### 8.0 Recommendations and Conclusions

TBTE was commissioned by Rainy River Resources to complete a Construction Traffic Mitigation Study for the initial stage when construction of the new Highway 600 alignment and East Access Road are scheduled to occur coincidently with mine construction activities.

On the basis of this study a 6 month detour of non-local users of Highway 600 is recommended via provincial Highway 617, Highway 11 and Highway 71.

Consultation with Ministry of Transportation of Ontario, Township of Chapple, Municipality of Stratton, school bus operators, utility companies and emergency response groups will be completed upon approval of the recommendations of this study.

Prepared By:


Rob Frenette, P. Eng. President TBT Engineering Consulting Group

# APPENDIX 

Enclosures 1-4

Estimated Traffic Volumes Township of Chapple Correspondence Letter





Construction Manpower Light Vehicles－Including CM Team（ Assuming No Busing to Site ）

| $\stackrel{0}{\omega}$ |  | $\frac{\infty}{7}$ |  | $\stackrel{8}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{-}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{7}}{ }$ | gr | N |  | 咢 | $\stackrel{7}{\sim}$ | 우N | \％ | N | $\underset{\sim}{m}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | N | $\stackrel{1}{7}$ | 尔 | ${ }_{7}$ | 운 | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | － |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | a | $\xrightarrow{-1}$ | $\pm$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\sim$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | － | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | 7 |  |
|  |  | Oi |  | $\underset{\sim}{A}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | 员 | N | $\underset{\infty}{\underset{\infty}{2}}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \infty \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{gathered}$ | 岕 | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 9 \\ \underset{\sim}{f} \\ \vec{i} \end{array}\right\|$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \\ & -1 \end{aligned}$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c} \underset{\sim}{c} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{array}\right.$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\lambda} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{n}{n}}{\underset{m}{n}}$ | － | N |  |
|  |  | 윽 | $\underset{-1}{\substack{-1 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline}}$ | ${ }_{\sim}^{2}-1 \underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | 국 | o | $\infty$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | － | $\infty$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | N | $\stackrel{\circ}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | － | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | － | $\stackrel{\sim}{7}$ | 악 | § | $\rightarrow$ | O |
|  | $\underset{\Delta}{\stackrel{y}{\mid c}}$ | $\mathfrak{c}$ |  |  | $\underset{\Delta}{4}$ | $\stackrel{\substack{4 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline}}{ }$ | $\begin{gathered} \pm \\ \sum_{0} \\ \Delta \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{n}{n}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{n}{2}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \stackrel{n}{2} \\ \stackrel{n}{n} \\ \sum_{2} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\stackrel{n}{n}$ | $\stackrel{n}{3}$ | $\frac{n}{a n}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & n \\ & \frac{n}{2} \\ & 0 \\ & n \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\frac{n}{n}$ | $\underset{0}{0}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 0 \\ \\ \\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \frac{1}{8} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¹ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ |

Duration Aug 2014－April 2016
100\％Construction Manpower

| DATE | MANPOWER <br> MONTHLY <br> FORECAST | CUMULATIVE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aug／14 | 145 | 145 |
| Sep／14 | 248 | 393 |
| Oct／14 | 309 | 702 |
| Nov／14 | 172 | 874 |
| Dec／14 | 131 | 1,005 |
| Jan／15 | 90 | 1,095 |
| Feb／15 | 35 | 1,130 |
| Mar／15 | 38 | 1,168 |
| Apr／15 | 117 | 1,285 |
| May／15 | 247 | 1,532 |
| Jun／15 | 298 | 1,830 |
| Jul／15 | 368 | 2,198 |
| Aug／15 | 356 | 2,554 |
| Sep／15 | 383 | 2,937 |
| Oct／15 | 400 | 3,337 |
| Nov／15 | 326 | 3,663 |
| Dec／15 | 228 | 3,891 |
| Jan／16 | 171 | 4,062 |
| Feb／16 | 147 | 4,209 |
| Mar／16 | 63 | 4,272 |
| Apr／16 | 1 | 4,273 |
| TOTAL | 4,272 |  |

Assuming Construction Manpower use 25\％Ride Share
Construction Equipment, Trailers \& Bulk Material Deliveries
Civil Bulk Earthworks ( Excluding Pre Stripping )

|  | Bomag Smooth Drum 1Total | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 38 |
|  | Site Facilities - Trailers | 5 |
|  | Fuel Delivery ( 8 Tankers / month $\times 15 \mathrm{mo}$ ) | 120 |
|  | Misc Service Trucks | 30 |
|  | Total Heavy / Legal Loads for Civil Bulk Earthworkks | 193 |
| 3 | Concrete Supply ( On Site Batch Plant - Local Aggregates ) |  |
|  | Duration August 2014-April 2016 |  |
|  | Set Up Site Batch Plant | 6 |
|  | Ancillary Equipment - Loaders / Cement Trucks | 8 |
|  | Cement Powder Deliveries ( Avg 275kg / m $3 \times 38,000 \mathrm{~m} 3$ ) | 500 |
|  | Additives / Fly Ash Deliveries ( Avg 100kg/m3) | 190 |
|  | Site Facilities - Trailers | 2 |
|  | Fuel Delivery ( 1 Tankers / month $\times 21 \mathrm{mo}$ ) | 21 |
|  | Misc Service Trucks | 30 |
|  | Total Concrete Supply | 757 |
| 4 | Concrete Placement Contractor |  |
|  | Duration August 2014-April 2016 |  |
|  | Concrete Pumpers | 2 |
|  | Mobile Cranes ( 100T Hyd) | 1 |
|  | Formwork Deliveries | 30 |



Scaffolding / Falseworks
Construction Equipment - General
C Cans - Storage / Warehousing
Misc Metals, Embeds, Anchor Bolts etc
Site Facilities - Trailers
Fuel Delivery ( 2 Tankers / month $\times 21$ mo )
Misc Service Trucks
Total Concrete Placement


[^0]

Piping Installations


- 윽ㄱN~N

G

Pipe Material Deliveries ( Assume 50 lengths avg / load )
Valves, Fitting \& Supports
Mobile Cranes ( 60 T Hyd )
Fork Lift ( $20,000 \mathrm{lb}$ )
Compressors
Diesel Welding Machines
Construction Equipment - General
C Cans - Storage / Warehousing
Site Facilities - Trailers
Fuel Delivery ( 1 Tankers / month $\times 20 \mathrm{mo}$ )
Misc Service Trucks
Total Piping

Electrical \& Instrumentation - Incl 230kV Powerline

## Duration August 2014-April 2016

 Delivery of Purchased Packages by BBACable \& Tray Deliveries - Process Plant Cable \& Post Deliveries - 230kV Powerline Mobile Cranes ( 75 T Hyd) Fork Lift ( $20,000 \mathrm{lb}$ ) Compressors

Diesel Welding Machines Diesel Welding Machines Construction Equipment - General
C Cans - Storage / Warehousing Site Facilities - Trailers Misc Service Trucks Fuel Delivery ( 1 Tankers / month $\times 10$ mo ) Total Electrical $\&$ Ins
Summary For Construction Equipment, Trailers \& Bulk Material Deliveries


# CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF CHAPPLE 

P.O. Box 4<br>BARWICK, ONTARIO POW 1A0<br>Phone 807-487-2354 Fax 807-487-2406<br>OFFICE OF THE CLERK-TREASURER<br>e-mail: chapple@tbaytel.net

January 16, 2012
Rainy River Resources Ltd.
1111 Victoria Avenue East
Thunder Bay, Ontario
P7C 1B7

Attention: Kyle Stanfield, P.Eng. Director, Environment \& Sustainability

Dear Kyle Stanfield:
Re: Highway 600 - Realignment Options
Please be advised after consideration of Council and Public Works Superintendent, Randy Both, the following ranking of options was agreed upon:

1) Alternative $C$
2) Alternative $D, B$ or $A$
3) Alternative $E$
4) Alternative $F$

The Township of Chapple was in agreement that they prefer one of the southerly options to better accommodate local traffic. It was felt with Alternative C, there would be less impact to local landowners when obtaining land for the construction - that with this option the majority of highway would follow municipal road allowances. It was noted that there is the need to consider school bus routes and access to the Richardson landfill and gravel pit. As mentioned in your presentation, a portion of Alternative E would also be necessary to provide access to the Marr Road.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.
Sincerely,


[^0]:    Architectura
    Duration October 2014 - December 2015
    Delivery of Purchased Packages by BBA

