Actual	D	Е	D	Е	D				
SCENARIO: Area Type:	SPR & 142 St Post-Developm  Neighbourhood Connector	ent AM (Without Improveme	ents)						
HIEU Type.									
MODE	<b> </b>	<b>%</b>	1 🛋						
Гуре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS						
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	В	D	D				
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None				
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	LRT Access								
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None				
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)									
Actual	D	Е	D	Е	D				
		Active Transportation	on Design Check						
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	gs provided to connect all approa	aching pedestrian facilities?		Yes				
Does the approaching bike f	idth up to the edge of the inters	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No					
ls a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inte	rsection?	No				
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nnying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inte	rsection?	No				
	· · ·				No				
Is a continuou  Does the intersection design provide	· · ·				No Yes				
	· · ·	e intended turn movements for							
	de features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing						
	de features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing		Yes				
	de features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility ed?		Yes				
	de features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility ed?	space, protected intersection,  Average Effective Turning Radius	Yes Yes % of Movements with				
	de features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria standai	e intended turn movements for etc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considered MMLOS EV	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing  nd municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures	space, protected intersection,	Yes				
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria standai	e intended turn movements for etc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considered MMLOS EV	nd municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all	space, protected intersection,  Average Effective Turning Radius	Yes Yes % of Movements with				
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontarial standal	e intended turn movements for etc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considered  MIMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	nd municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%				
Does the intersection design provided in the intersection design p	de features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontarial standal  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1	e intended turn movements for etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) ands (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	nd municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all	space, protected intersection,  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes				
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontarial standal  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius	e intended turn movements for etc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius	nd municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%				
Does the intersection design provided in the intersection design p	de features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontarial standal  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) ands (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing  and municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13 - 14  Car Level of Service	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)				
Does the intersection design provided in the intersection design p	de features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontarial standal  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) ands (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing  and municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13 - 14  Car Level of Service	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)				
Does the intersection design provided in the intersection design p	de features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13.0 - 14.9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	e intended turn movements for etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13.0 - 14.9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  36 - 55  Pedestrian Level of Service	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13 - 14  Car Level of Service	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)				
Does the intersection design provided Measure 1  Measure 2	de features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13.0 - 14.9	e intended turn movements for etc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13.0 - 14.9	nd municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13 - 14  Car Level of Service	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)				
Does the intersection design provided Measure 1  Measure 2	de features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontarial standal  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13.0 - 14.9  Signal Cycle Length (s)  106 -120  Number of Uncontrolled	e intended turn movements for etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13.0 - 14.9  Signal Cycle Length (s)  106 - 120  Number of Uncontrolled	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  36 - 55  Pedestrian Level of Service	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13 - 14  Car Level of Service  F	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)				
Does the intersection design provided Measure 1  Measure 2	de features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13.0 - 14.9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	e intended turn movements for etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13.0 - 14.9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  36 - 55  Pedestrian Level of Service	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  13 - 14  Car Level of Service	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)				

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what yo	u know and for detailed or summary results រុ	presentation			
Actual	D	E	С	Е	D
SCENARIO: Area Type:	SPR & 142 St Post-Developm  Neighbourhood Connector	ent PM (Without Improveme	nts)		
MODE	<b> </b>	्रं	<b>1</b> ₽		
ype	_	_	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		_
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	В	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)  Adjustment for Strategic Policy	LRT Access	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	None	None	None	None
Actual	D	F	С	Е	D
		Active Transportation		_	
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	rsection?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for ( etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and discriptions (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
ivieasui e 1	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	13 - 14	60 - 84%
Massura 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	21 - 35	F	Greater than 80
Mooning 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-

	u know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation 			_
Actual	CDD 0 140 Ct Doot Doorloom	A.B.O. (18/24) 1	С	В	В
CENARIO: rea Type:	Neighbourhood Main Street	ent AM (Without Improveme	nts)		
MODE	ķ	<b>%</b> o	<u>1</u>		
			CICNALIZED INTERCECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS  C	D	D
					_
Adjustment for Planning Direction  Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Upwards Pedestrian Priority Area	None	Upwards Valley Line LRT	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	rtone	rtone	Ttone	Tronc
Actual	D	F	С	В	В
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
ivieasui e 1	>1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all 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)
Measure 2			Transit Movement Delay (s)  21 - 35	Car Level of Service	
	(m)	(m)			Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2  Measure 3	(m) Greater than or Equal to 18	(m) Greater than or Equal to 18	21 - 35		Intersection Delay (s) 36 - 55
	(m)  Greater than or Equal to 18  Signal Cycle Length (s)	(m)  Greater than or Equal to 18  Signal Cycle Length (s)	21 - 35  Pedestrian Level of Service		Intersection Delay (s)

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what yo		presentation 			
Actual	COD 9 440 Ct Deet Develope	ent PM (Without Improveme	С	В	В
CENARIO: Irea Type:	Neighbourhood Main Street	ent Pivi (without Improveme	пізј		
MODE	<b> </b>	॔	<u>1</u>		<b>=</b>
			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
/pe Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	C	D	D
					_
Adjustment for Planning Direction  Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Upwards Pedestrian Priority Area	None	Upwards Valley Line LRT	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	None	None	None	None
Actual	D	E	С	В	В
		Active Transportation			
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for ( etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Manage 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	>1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all 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)
Measure 2	Greater than or Equal to 18	Greater than or Equal to 18	21 - 35	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
ivieasure 3	91 -105	91 - 105	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
IVICUSUI C 4					

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results	presentation								
Actual	С		С	E	С					
CENARIO:	SPR & 156 St Post-Developm Urban Main Street	ent AM (Without Improveme	ents)							
Area Type:										
MODE	<b>X</b>	<b>~</b>	1=		<b>=</b>					
уре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS							
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D					
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None					
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT R12 Rapidbus							
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None					
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)										
Actual	С	С	С	Е	С					
		Active Transportatio	n Design Check							
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes					
Does the approaching bike fa	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No					
Is a continuou	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No					
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes					
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes					
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		JL					
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes					
Measure 1	> 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%					
Maaa 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)					
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	E	56 - 80					
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-					
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	С							
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-					
ivicasul C 4	2.1 - 2.5	1.0								

AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results	presentation						
Actual	С		С	D	В			
	SPR & 156 St Post-Developm Urban Main Street	ent PM (Without Improveme	ents)					
MODE	<b>X</b>	्र	1=					
pe			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D			
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None			
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT R12 Rapidbus					
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None			
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)								
Actual	С	С	С	D	В			
		Active Transportatio	n Design Check					
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes			
Does the approaching bike for	acility continue at a consistent wi	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No			
Is a continuou	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No			
Does the intersection design provio	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes			
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes			
		MMLOS Eva	aluation					
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes			
Measure 1	> 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%			
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)			
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	11 - 20	С	21 - 35			
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-			
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	С					
Manager	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-			
Measure 4	2.1 - 2.5	1.0						

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation			
Actual	С	С	D	D	D
	SPR & 158 St Post-Developm Urban Main Street	ent AM (Without Improveme	ents)		
Area Type:					
MODE	<b>   </b>	<b>ీ</b>	1 🛋		
ype	_		SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		_
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)  Adjustment for Strategic Policy	Pedestrian Priority Area None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	None	None	None	None
Actual		С	D	D	D
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	aching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike fa	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline:	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for ( etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
ivieasure 1	0.76 - 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	Less than 10%
Manager 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	11 - 20	В	11 - 20
Moreura 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	61 - 75	61 - 75	С		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
measure 7	2.6 - 3.0	1.0			

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results ı	presentation			
Actual	С	С	D	D	D
CENARIO:	SPR & 158 St Post-Developm Urban Main Street	ent PM (Without Improveme	nts)		
rea Type:  MODE	†	<b>ં</b>	<b>!</b> ₽		
/pe	_		SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS	_	_
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	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)			<b>D</b>	D	D.
Actual		Active Transportation	D Design Check	D	D
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike t	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the inters	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Ev	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Wedsure 1	0.76 - 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	Less than 10%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Massira 2		l .	1		
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	11 - 20	В	11 - 20
	9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	9.0 - 10.9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	11 - 20 Pedestrian Level of Service	В -	11 - 20
Measure 2  Measure 3					
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation							
Actual	E	Е	F	F	D				
SCENARIO:	SPR & 163 St Post-Developm Urban Main Street	ent AM (Without Improveme	nts)						
Area Type:  MODE	<b>*</b>	<b>Š</b>	<b>1</b> ₩		<b>A</b>				
Туре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS						
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	C	D	D				
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None				
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)  Adjustment for Strategic Policy	Pedestrian Priority Area None	163 St District Connector None	R12 Rapid Bus None	None	None				
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	None	None	None	None				
Actual	Е	F	F	F	D				
	_	Active Transportation	•						
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes				
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No				
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No				
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for ( etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes				
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and discontinuous (if applicable) been considere			Yes				
		MMLOS Eva	aluation						
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes				
ivieasure 1	0	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%				
Magazza 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)				
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	Greater than 80	F	Greater than 80				
Moneyee 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-				
Measure 3	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	E						
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-				
ivicasule 4	2.6 - 3.0	2.6 - 3.0							

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation			
Actual	D	D	E	E	С
SCENARIO:	SPR & 163 St Post-Developm Urban Main Street	ent PM (Without Improveme	nts)		
Area Type:					
MODE	<b>*</b>	<b>્</b>	1=		
- Type			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	163 St District Connector	R12 Rapid Bus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	D	E	E	С
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
M 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
Manuary 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	D		
	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
Measure 4					

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation			
Actual	С	С	С	E	С
SCENARIO: Area Type:	95 Ave & 156 St Post-Develo	pment AM (Without Improve	ments)		
MODE	<b>         </b>	<b>્</b>	<u> 1</u>		
Гуре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	C	D	E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	None	Valley Line LRT	Tronc	IVOITE
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	С	С	С	Е	С
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		T
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline:	ated for cyclists through the inter	rsection?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for ( etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		<u> </u>
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0.76 - 1	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Manager 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	D	36 - 55
Manager 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	С		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
ivicasule 4	2.1 - 2.5	1.1 - 1.5			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you Actual	_			F	
SCENARIO:	C 95 Ave & 156 St Post-Develo	C	ments!	Е	С
rea Type:	Urban Boulevard	oment rivi (vvitnoat improvei	ments		
MODE	<b>         </b>	<b>Š</b>	<b>!</b> ₽		
уре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С	D	E
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	С	С	С	E	С
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike fa	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inte	rsection?	Yes
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for a etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Maraum 4	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0.76 - 1	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	11 - 20	D	36 - 55
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	С		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
meddare 4	2.1 - 2.5	1.1 - 1.5			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	រ know and for detailed or summary results ជ	resentation			
Actual	D	Е	С	D	С
SCENARIO: Area Type:	87 Ave & Meadowlark Rd Po Neighbourhood Connector	st-Development AM (Withou	t Improvements)		
MODE MODE	<b>         </b>	<b>Š</b>	<u>:</u>		
			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	B	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction		None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Upwards Pedestrian Priority Area	None	None	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	Ε	С	D	С
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		T.
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for ( etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		<u> </u>
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
ivieasure 1	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	13 - 14	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)
ivicasure 2	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	11 - 20	D	36 - 55
Manager 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
IVICASUI E 4	2.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 3.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	រ know and for detailed or summary results ជ	resentation			
Actual	D	Е	С	D	С
SCENARIO: Area Type:	87 Ave & Meadowlark Rd Po Neighbourhood Connector	st-Development PM (Withou	t Improvements)		
MODE MODE	<b> </b>	<b>%</b>	<b>!</b> ₽		
			CICNALIZED INTERCECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS	D	D
			В		_
Adjustment for Planning Direction  Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Upwards Pedestrian Priority Area	None	None	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	None	None	None	IVOIIC
Actual	D	Е	С	D	С
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline:	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for ( etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
ivieasui e 1	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	13 - 14	60 - 84%
Massure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	11 - 20	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
iviedsure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
IVICASUI E 4	2.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 3.0			

Actual		resentation	_		_
	C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	D	D D	D	В
CENARIO: rea Type:	82 Ave & 109 St Post-Develog Urban Main Street	oment Aivi (Without Improve	тепізі		
MODE	<b> </b>	॔	<b>!</b>		
			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
/pe Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	None	Future BRT - B1/B2	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	С	D	D	D	В
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		Transfer of the second
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the inters	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	ous amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes
Does the intersection design prov	Have Accessibility for Ontaria		nd municipal accessibility	space, protected intersection,	Yes Yes
Does the intersection design prov	Have Accessibility for Ontaria	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	nd municipal accessibility d?	space, protected intersection,	
	Have Accessibility for Ontaria	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere	nd municipal accessibility d?	Average Effective Turning Radius	
Does the intersection design prov	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar	etc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere  MMLOS EV	nd municipal accessibility d? aluation	Average Effective Turning Radius	Yes % of Movements with
Measure 1	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar	etc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS Evantable (Bioycle Facilities)	nd municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius	etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) and sids (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS Evaluation of the second o	aluation  Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11	Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84%
Measure 1  Measure 2	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) ands (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS Events and the second of the s	aluation  Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service	Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 1	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9	etc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere  MMLOS Ev.  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9	aluation  Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service	Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 1  Measure 2	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) ands (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV.  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	nd municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  21 - 35  Pedestrian Level of Service	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service	Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)

Actual	u know and for detailed or summary results p									
Actual	С	D	D	E	С					
SCENARIO: Area Type:	82 Ave & 109 St Post-Develop Urban Main Street	oment PM (Without Improve	ments)							
	<b>*</b>	<b>Š</b>	<b>†</b> ₩							
MODE	λ	010	I (24)	<u>~</u> ~						
Гуре	ype SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS									
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D					
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None					
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B1/B2							
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None					
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)										
Actual	С	Active Transportation	D	E	С					
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes					
Does the approaching bike f	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No					
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No					
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for ( etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes					
			Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?							
					Yes					
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		Yes					
Mossuro 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	MMLOS Eva	aluation  Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1				% of Movements with					
		Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any	(m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes					
Measure 1  Measure 2	0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius	Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	(m) Less than 11	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84%					
Measure 2	0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)	(m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s)					
	0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9	Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  36 - 55	(m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service  D	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s) 36 - 55					
Measure 2	0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  36 - 55  Pedestrian Level of Service	(m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service  D	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s) 36 - 55					

S AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what yo Actual	Α	Α	В	С	Α	
CENARIO:	83 Ave & 109 St AM (Sole Sci					
rea Туре:	Urban Main Street					
MODE	<b>†</b>	<b>%</b> 0	<b>1</b> ₩			
rpe			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS			
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С	D	D	
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	83 Ave District Connector	Future BRT - B1/B2			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None	
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)						
Actual	Α	Α	В	С	Α	
		Active Transportatio	n Design Check			
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	gs provided to connect all approa	ching 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)?						
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	anying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes	
Is a continuo  Does the intersection design prov					Yes Yes	
	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for c	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing			
	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for c etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d?		Yes	
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for c etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar rds (if applicable) been considere	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d?		Yes	
	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria standa	e intended turn movements for cetc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere	eyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d?  Sluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all	space, protected intersection,  Average Effective Turning Radius	Yes Yes % of Movements with	
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontaria standal  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	e intended turn movements for cetc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) arrds (if applicable) been considere  MMLOS Eva	ryclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d?  Bluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a	space, protected intersection,  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes	
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all th  Have Accessibility for Ontaria standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius	e intended turn movements for cetc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) arrds (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS Eva  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  > 1  Average Effective Turning Radius	ryclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d?  Aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 11	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%	
Does the intersection design prov  Measure 1  Measure 2	ide features which facilitate all the  Have Accessibility for Ontaria standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for cetc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) arrds (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS Eva  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  > 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	ryclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d?  Aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%  Intersection Delay (s)	
Does the intersection design prov	Have Accessibility for Ontaria standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9	e intended turn movements for cetc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) arrds (if applicable) been considere  MMLOS Eva  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  > 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9	nd municipal accessibility d?  Sluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  0 - 10	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service	Yes  Yes  Wof Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%  Intersection Delay (s)	
Does the intersection design prov  Measure 1  Measure 2	Have Accessibility for Ontaria standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0.76 - 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	e intended turn movements for cetc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) arros (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS Eva  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  > 1  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	ryclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d?  Aluation  Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  0 - 10  Pedestrian Level of Service	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service	Yes  Yes  Wof Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%  Intersection Delay (s)	

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p				
Actual	A	Α	В	С	Α
SCENARIO: Area Type:	83 Ave & 109 St PM (Sole Sce Urban Main Street	enario)			
MODE	<b>         </b>	<b>%</b>	<b>!</b> ₽		
Гуре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	83 Ave District Connector	Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	Α	A Active Transportatio	В	С	Α
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	rsection?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for c etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	> 1	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	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)
Measure 2	Less than 9	Less than 9	0 - 10	А	0 - 10
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
ivicasure 3	61 - 75	61 - 75	В		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.0	1.0			

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results រូ	presentation								
Actual	D	D	В	С	D					
CENARIO:		pment AM (Without Improve	ments)							
геа Туре:	Urban Main Street									
MODE		<b>1</b>	<b>↑</b>							
			41-1							
уре	pe UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS									
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D					
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None					
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B1/B2							
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None					
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)										
Actual	D	D	В	С	D					
		Active Transportatio	on Design Check							
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No					
Does the approaching bike t	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No					
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No					
Does the intersection design provi	ide features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	No					
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			No					
		MMLOS Eva	aluation							
Measure 1	Average Crossing Distance (m)	Presence of Bicycle Facilities	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Intersection Delay (s)					
	9.0 - 11.0	No bike facility	0 - 10	Less than 11	0 - 10					
Measure 2	Marked Crossings	Requirement to stop	Pedestrian Level of Service	Car Level of Service	-					
Wicasal C Z	Less than 50% of movements	Greater than 85%	D	А						
M2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	-	-	-					
Measure 3	Less than 9	Less than 9								
Manager 4		-	-		-					
Measure 4										

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation			
Actual	D	D	В	С	D
SCENARIO: Area Type:	86 Ave & 109 St Post-Develo	pment PM (Without Improve	ments)		
MODE	<b> </b>	<b>%</b> o	<u>•</u>		
Гуре			JNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION	IS.	
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	None	Future BRT - B1/B2	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	D	В	С	D
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inte	rsection?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	No
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and discontinuous (if applicable) been considere			No
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Average Crossing Distance (m)	Presence of Bicycle Facilities	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Intersection Delay (s)
	9.0 - 11.0	No bike facility	0 - 10	Less than 11	0 - 10
	Marked Crossings	Requirement to stop	Pedestrian Level of Service	Car Level of Service	-
Measure 2	Less than 50% of movements	Greater than 85%	D	А	
Mari	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	-	-	-
Measure 3	Less than 9	Less than 9			
Manaura 4		-	-	-	-
Measure 4					

The second of th	u know and for detailed or summary results μ	presentation			
Actual	С	D	С	E	В
CENARIO: rea Type:	87 Ave & 109 St Post-Develo	pment AM (Without Improve	ments)		
MODE	<b>*</b>	<b>ં</b>	<u>•</u>		
			CICNALIZED INTERCECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	С	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS	D	D
	В		C		D
Adjustment for Planning Direction  Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Upwards Pedestrian Priority Area	None	Upwards Future BRT - B1/B2	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	None	rtone	None	None
Actual	C	D	С	E	В
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for ( etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	
ivicasui e 1	A				% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
	0.26 - 0.5	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	
Massura 2	0.26 - 0.5  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	minimum of one but not all	Less than 11  Car Level of Service	Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius	Average Effective Turning Radius	minimum of one but not all approaches for transit		Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%  Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2  Measure 3	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  36 - 55	Car Level of Service	Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%  Intersection Delay (s)  36 - 55
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  36 - 55  Pedestrian Level of Service	Car Level of Service	Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%  Intersection Delay (s)  36 - 55

	u know and for detailed or summary results μ	resentation			
Actual	D	D	D	E	В
CENARIO:	87 Ave & 109 St Post-Develo	pment PM (Without Improve	ments)		
rea Туре:	Urban Main Street				
MODE	<b> </b>	<b>્</b>	1=		
уре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	D	D	E	В
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike (	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures				
Moocuro 1	Lillanced Fedestrian Weasures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.26 - 0.5	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0	Transit Priority Measures  Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit		
			Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all	(m)	Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1  Measure 2	0.26 - 0.5  Average Effective Turning Radius	0  Average Effective Turning Radius	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	(m) Less than 11	Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%
Measure 2	0.26 - 0.5  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)	(m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service	Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%  Intersection Delay (s)
	0.26 - 0.5  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9	0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  36 - 55	(m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service  D	Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%  Intersection Delay (s)  36 - 55
Measure 2	0.26 - 0.5  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	O  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  Less than 9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  36 - 55  Pedestrian Level of Service	(m)  Less than 11  Car Level of Service  D	Dedicated Turn Lanes  85 - 100%  Intersection Delay (s)  36 - 55

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	В	В	D	D	В
SCENARIO:		ill/Saskatchewan Drive Post-	Development AM (Without Ir	nprovements)	
Агеа Туре:	Urban Main Street				
MODE	<b>*</b>	्र	1=		
Туре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	District Connector Confluence	Future BRT - B1		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	В	В	D	D	В
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
ls a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for a etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		JL
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	>1	0.76 - 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	60 - 84%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	21 - 35	С	21 - 35
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	91 -105	91 - 105	В		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
Meddule 4	1.0	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	В	С	D	D	С
SCENARIO:		ill/Saskatchewan Drive Post-	Development PM (Without In	nprovements)	
Агеа Туре:	Urban Main Street	•	_		
MODE	<b>*</b>	<b>્</b>	1₩		
Туре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	District Connector Confluence	Future BRT - B1		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	В	С	D	D	С
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike fa	acility continue at a consistent wi	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
ls a continuou	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and discount of the considered the			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		JL
M1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	> 1	0.76 - 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	60 - 84%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	В		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
Wicasule 4	1.0	1.0			

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	រ know and for detailed or summary results រុ	resentation			
Actual	D	Е	С	С	В
CENARIO:		St Post-Development AM (W	(ithout Improvements)		
rea Туре:	Neighbourhood Connector				
MODE	<b>*</b>	्र	1=		
vpe			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	С	С	В	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	Current Cycling Corridor			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Actual	D		С	С	В
		Active Transportatio	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	rsection?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	15 - 16	85 - 100%
Massura 3	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	15.0 - 17.9	15.0 - 17.9	11 - 20	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
ivicasule 3	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.6 - 2.0	1.6 - 2.0			

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation			
Actual	D	Е	D	D	С
SCENARIO:	82 Ave/University Ave & 114	St Post-Development PM (W	ithout Improvements)		
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector		_		
MODE	<b>*</b>	<b>%</b>	1=		
уре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	С	С	В	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	<b>Current Cycling Corridor</b>			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Actual	D	E	D	D	С
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	rsection?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	15 - 16	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)
ivicasui e 2	15.0 - 17.9	15.0 - 17.9	36 - 55	E	56 - 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
ivicasul e s	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1				

	u know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	D	D	Е	D	С
CENARIO:	87 Ave & 114 St Post-Develo	pment AM (Without Improve	ements)		
rea Туре:	Urban Boulevard	•			
MODE	<b> </b>	्रं	<u>1</u>		
уре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С		E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B2 920X Rapidbus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	D	E	D	С
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	aching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	facility continue at a consistent wi	idth up to the edge of the inters	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes
					163
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a			Yes
		ds (if applicable) been considere	ed?		
			ed?	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	
Measure 1	standar	ds (if applicable) been considere  MMLOS Ev	ed? aluation		Yes % of Movements with
	standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	ds (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	aluation  Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any	(m)	Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1 Measure 2	Standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0  Average Effective Turning Radius	MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  O  Average Effective Turning Radius	Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	(m) 11 - 12	Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 35 - 59%
Measure 2	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  O  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)	(m)  11 - 12  Car Level of Service	Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  35 - 59%  Intersection Delay (s)
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  11.0 - 12.9	MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  11.0 - 12.9	Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  36-55	(m)  11 - 12  Car Level of Service  D	Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  35 - 59%  Intersection Delay (s)  36 - 55
Measure 2	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  11.0 - 12.9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  11.0 - 12.9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  36 - 55  Pedestrian Level of Service	(m)  11 - 12  Car Level of Service  D	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  35 - 59%  Intersection Delay (s)

S AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what yo	u know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	E	Е	F	E	D
ENARIO:	87 Ave & 114 St Post-Develo	pment PM (Without Improve	ements)		
еа Туре:	Urban Boulevard				
MODE	<b>*</b>	्र	1=		
pe			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С		E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B2 920X Rapidbus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	E	E	F	E	D
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	aching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike t	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the inters	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
ls a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
					No Yes
	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s		
	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been consider	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility ed?		Yes
Does the intersection design provi	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility ed?		Yes
	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar	e intended turn movements for etc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS EV	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing sound municipal accessibility ed?	space, protected intersection,  Average Effective Turning Radius	Yes Yes % of Movements with
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for etc)?  ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing sound municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any	Space, protected intersection,  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  O  Average Effective Turning Radius	e intended turn movements for etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) and set (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  O  Average Effective Turning Radius	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing sound municipal accessibility ed?  Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) and set (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing sound municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  11 - 12  Car Level of Service	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  11.0 - 12.9	e intended turn movements for etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) and (if applicable) been considered.  MIMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  11.0 - 12.9	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing sound municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  Greater than 80	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  11 - 12  Car Level of Service	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 1  Measure 2	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar  Enhanced Pedestrian Measures  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  11.0 - 12.9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	e intended turn movements for etc)?  Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) and (if applicable) been considered  MMLOS EV  Enhanced Bicycle Facilities  0  Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  11.0 - 12.9  Signal Cycle Length (s)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing stand municipal accessibility ed?  aluation  Transit Priority Measures  No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit  Transit Movement Delay (s)  Greater than 80  Pedestrian Level of Service	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)  11 - 12  Car Level of Service	Yes  Yes  % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes  60 - 84%  Intersection Delay (s)

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation			
Actual	С	D	D	D	В
SCENARIO:	82 Ave & 112 St Post-Develor Urban Main Street	pment AM (Without Improve	ments)		
Area Type:	†	র্	<b>!</b>		
			CICNALIZED INTERCECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	С	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS	D	D
	B		D		
Adjustment for Planning Direction  Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Upwards Pedestrian Priority Area	None	None	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	None	None	None	None
Actual	С	D	D	D	В
		Active Transportation			
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the inters	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Ev	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Weasure 1	0.76 - 1	0	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)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	С	21 - 35
Manuss 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	91 -105	91 - 105	С		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
iricasaic 4	1.6 - 2.0	1.6 - 2.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation			
Actual	С	D	D	E	С
SCENARIO:	82 Ave & 112 St Post-Develo	pment PM (Without Improve	ments)		
Агеа Туре:	Urban Main Street		_		
MODE	<b>*</b>	<b>%</b>	1=		
T			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Type  Target (Custom if necessary)	D	С		D	D
	В		D		D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards Pedestrian Priority Area	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)  Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	None	None	None	None
Actual	С	D	D	E	С
		Active Transportation	_		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike fa	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuou	is amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline:	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for ( etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
ivieasure 1	0.76 - 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
Massure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
Magazine 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	С		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
ivicasui c 4	1.6 - 2.0	1.6 - 2.0			

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	В	В	С	С	В
CENARIO:	87 Ave & 110 St Post-Develo	pment AM (Without Improve	ments)		
Area Type:	Urban Boulevard	•			
MODE	<b> </b>	<b>્</b>	<b>1</b> ₽		
уре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С		Е
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	110 St Neighbourhood Route	Future BRT - B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	В	В	С	С	В
		Active Transportatio	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike fa	acility continue at a consistent wi	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		JL
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
ivieasure 1	> 1	> 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	10 - 34%
Manager 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	Less than 9	Less than 9	0 - 10	А	0 - 10
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		
Measure 3	91 -105	91 - 105	В		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
ivicasure 4	1.1 - 1.5	1.0			

	<b>B</b> 87 Ave & 110 St Post-Develo <sub>i</sub> Urban Boulevard	B pment PM (Without Improve	C ments)	D	С
еа Туре:		pment PM (Without Improve	ments)		
	Urban Boulevara				
MODE	•	•			
Mode	<b>*</b>	्र	<b>1</b>		
pe			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С		E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	110 St Neighbourhood Route	Future BRT - B2	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	None	None	None	None
Actual	В	В	С	D	С
l de la companya de	-	Active Transportatio	_	_	
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike fa	cility continue at a consistent wi	dth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuous	s amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes
Does the intersection design provid	e features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	>1	> 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	10 - 34%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	Less than 9	Less than 9	11 - 20	В	11 - 20
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	В		
	Number of Description	Number of Uncontrolled			
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-		-