
















D






Appendix D MMLOS Analysis: Post Development without Improvements













Actual	C	B	D	D	B
SCENARIO: 100 Ave & 109 St Post-Development AM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	100 Ave District Connector			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	B	D	D	B
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					Yes
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0	> 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	Less than 9	Less than 9	21 - 35	C	21 - 35
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 - 105	91 - 105	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.6 - 2.0	1.0			






Actual	D	B	E	E	C
SCENARIO: 100 Ave & 109 St Post-Development PM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	100 Ave District Connector			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	B	E	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					Yes
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0	> 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	Less than 9	Less than 9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.6 - 2.0	1.0			






Actual	C	E	D	E	C
SCENARIO: Jasper Ave & 109 St Post-Development AM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	E	D	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	85 - 100%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	36 - 55	F	Greater than 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	Greater than 3			






Actual	C	E	E	E	C
SCENARIO: Jasper Ave & 109 St Post-Development PM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	E	E	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	85 - 100%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	56 - 80	E	56 - 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	Greater than 3			






Actual	C	E	C	E	D
SCENARIO: 104 Ave & 109 St Post-Development AM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT 110X Rapidbus R9X Rapidbus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	E	C	E	D
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	11 - 12	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	36 - 55	F	Greater than 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.6 - 2.0	Greater than 3			






Actual	C	E	C	E	D
SCENARIO: 104 Ave & 109 St Post-Development PM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT 110X Rapidbus R9X Rapidbus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	E	C	E	D
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	11 - 12	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	36 - 55	E	56 - 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.6 - 2.0	Greater than 3			






Actual	C	B	E	E	E
SCENARIO: 102 Ave & 124 St Post-Development AM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	102 Ave District Connector			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	B	E	E	E
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					Yes
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	> 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	13 - 14	10 - 34%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	Greater than 80	F	Greater than 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 - 105	91 - 105	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	1.0			






Actual	C	C	E	E	E
SCENARIO: 102 Ave & 124 St Post-Development PM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	102 Ave District Connector			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	C	E	E	E
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					Yes
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	> 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	13 - 14	10 - 34%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	Greater than 80	F	Greater than 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	1.0			






Actual	C	D	C	E	D
SCENARIO: SPR & 124 St Post-Development AM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	C	E	D
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	36 - 55	E	56 - 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	1.6 - 2.0			






Actual	C	D	C	E	C
SCENARIO: SPR & 124 St Post-Development PM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	C	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	1.6 - 2.0			






Actual	C	D	D	D	C
SCENARIO: 107 Ave & 124 St Post-Development AM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	D	D	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	C	21 - 35
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 3.0			






Actual	C	D	D	E	C
SCENARIO: 107 Ave & 124 St Post-Development PM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	D	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 3.0			






Actual	C	D	D	D	C
SCENARIO: 111 Ave & 124 St Post-Development AM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Areas				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	D	D	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	10 - 34%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	Less than 9	Less than 9	21 - 35	C	21 - 35
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	2.6 - 3.0			






Actual	C	D	D	E	D
SCENARIO: 111 Ave & 124 St Post-Development PM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Areas				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	D	E	D
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	10 - 34%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	Less than 9	Less than 9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 -120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	2.6 - 3.0			






Actual	C	D	D	E	C
SCENARIO: 118 Ave & 124 St Post-Development AM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	C	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	None	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)			R12 Rapid Bus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	D	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	Greater than 3			






Actual	C	E	D	E	C
SCENARIO: 118 Ave & 124 St Post-Development PM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	C	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	None	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)			R12 Rapid Bus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	E	D	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	Greater than 3			






Actual	C	D	C	D	B
SCENARIO: 104 Ave & 121 St Post-Development AM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	121 Ave District Connector	Valley Line LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	C	D	B
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					Yes
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0.26 - 0.50	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	C	21 - 35
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	2.1 - 2.5			






Actual	C	D	C	E	C
SCENARIO: 104 Ave & 121 St Post-Development PM Peak (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	121 Ave District Connector	Valley Line LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	C	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					Yes
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0.26 - 0.50	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	2.1 - 2.5			






Actual	C	E	C	E	C
SCENARIO: 104 Ave & 116 St Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	E	C	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	Greater than 3			






Actual	C	E	C	E	C
SCENARIO: 104 Ave & 116 St Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	E	C	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	E	56 - 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	Greater than 3			






Actual	C	D	C	E	C
SCENARIO: 104 Ave & 112 St (Post Development AM Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	C	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	11 - 20	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 3.0			






Actual	C	E	C	E	C
SCENARIO: 104 Ave & 112 St (Post Development PM Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	E	C	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	11 - 20	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 3.0			






Actual	C	B	D	C	C
SCENARIO: Jasper Ave & 121 St Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	121 St District Connector			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	B	D	C	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					Yes
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	> 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	10 - 34%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	11 - 20	B	11 - 20
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	1.0			






Actual	C	B	D	D	D
SCENARIO: Jasper Ave & 121 St Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	121 St District Connector			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	B	D	D	D
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					Yes
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	> 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	10 - 34%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	1.0			






Actual	C	D	D	E	C
SCENARIO: Jasper Ave & 116 St Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	D	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	Less than 9	Less than 9	36 - 55	E	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	2.6 - 3.0			

Actual	C	D	D	E	C
SCENARIO: Jasper Ave & 116 St Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Main Street					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	D	E	C
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	Less than 9	Less than 9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 -120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	2.6 - 3.0			

Actual	C	D	E	E	D
SCENARIO: 100 Ave & 116 St Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Boulevard					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	D		E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	E	E	D
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					No
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	10 - 34%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	56 - 80	E	56 - 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	2.1 - 2.5			

Actual	C	D	E	E	D
SCENARIO: 100 Ave & 116 St Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Boulevard					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	D		E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	E	E	D
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement markings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					No
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					No
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	10 - 34%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	56 - 80	E	56 - 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 - 120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	2.1 - 2.5			

Actual	B	C	D	A	A
SCENARIO: SPR & 102 Ave Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Boulevard					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	C	B	D		E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	B	C	D	A	A
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					Yes
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0.01 - 0.25	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Greater than 18	85 - 100%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	Less than 9	Less than 9	11 - 20	B	11 - 20
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 -120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.0	1.0			

Actual	B	C	D	B	B
SCENARIO: SPR & 102 Ave Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)					
Area Type: Urban Boulevard					
MODE					
Type SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	C	B	D		E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	B	C	D	B	B
Active Transportation Design Check					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?					Yes
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?					Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?					Yes
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)?					Yes
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?					Yes
MMLOS Evaluation					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.76 - 1	0.01 - 0.25	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Greater than 18	85 - 100%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
	Less than 9	Less than 9	21 - 35	C	21 - 35
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 -120	106 - 120	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.0	1.0			