LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation					
Actual	D	E	D	E	D
SCENARIO:	SPR & 142 St Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)				
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector				
MODE					
Type	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	B	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	E	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 makings 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	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)
	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	36 - 55	F	Greater than 80
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)	-	-	-
	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 presentation					
Actual	D	E	C	E	D
SCENARIO:	SPR & 142 St Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)				
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector				
MODE					
Type	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	B	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	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 makings 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	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)
	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	21 - 35	F	Greater than 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	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 presentation

Actual	D	F	C	B	B
SCENARIO:	*SPR & 149 St Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)*				
Area Type:	*Neighbourhood 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	D	F	C	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)?	No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings 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	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)
	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	-	-
	106 -120	106 - 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	Greater than 3	Greater than 3			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	D	E	C	B	B
SCENARIO:	*SPR & 149 St Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)*				
Area Type:	*Neighbourhood 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	D	E	C	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)?	No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings 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	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)
	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	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	Greater than 3	Greater than 3			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation					
Actual	C	C	C	E	C
SCENARIO:	SPR & 156 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 R12 Rapidbus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	C	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 makings 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	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	-	-
	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			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation					
Actual	C	C	C	D	B
SCENARIO:	SPR & 156 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 R12 Rapidbus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	C	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)?	No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings 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	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	11 - 20	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	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	C	C	D	D	D
SCENARIO:	***SPR & 158 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	C	D	D	D

Active Transportation Design Check	
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?	No
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?	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	Less than 10%
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	-	-
	61 - 75	61 - 75	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation					
Actual	C	C	D	D	D
SCENARIO:	***SPR & 158 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	C	D	D	D

Active Transportation Design Check	
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?	No
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?	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	Less than 10%
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	-	-
	61 - 75	61 - 75	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	E	E	F	F	D
SCENARIO:	*SPR & 163 St Post-Development AM (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	163 St District Connector	R12 Rapid Bus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	E	E	F	F	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 makings 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	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)
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	Greater than 80	F	Greater than 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	E		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	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 presentation

Actual	D	D	E	E	C
SCENARIO:	*SPR & 163 St Post-Development PM (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	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	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 makings 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	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)
	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	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	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 presentation

Actual	C	C	C	E	C
SCENARIO:	*95 Ave & 156 St Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)*				
Area Type:	*Urban Boulevard*				
MODE					
Type	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	C	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	C	C	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 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	0.76 - 1	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	1.1 - 1.5			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	C	C	C	E	C
SCENARIO:	*95 Ave & 156 St Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)*				
Area Type:	*Urban Boulevard*				
MODE					
Type	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	C	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	C	C	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 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	0.76 - 1	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	1.1 - 1.5			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation					
Actual	D	E	C	D	C
SCENARIO:	87 Ave & Meadowlark Rd Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)				
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector				
MODE					
Type	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	B	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	D	E	C	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 makings 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	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)
	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	-	-
	106 -120	106 - 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 3.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation					
Actual	D	E	C	D	C
SCENARIO:	87 Ave & Meadowlark Rd Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)				
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector				
MODE					
Type	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	B	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	D	E	C	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 makings 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	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)
	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	-	-
	106 -120	106 - 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 3.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation					
Actual	C	D	D	D	B
SCENARIO:	82 Ave & 109 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		Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	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)?	No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings 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	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)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0				

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	C	D	D	E	C
SCENARIO:	*82 Ave & 109 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		Future BRT - B1/B2		
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 makings 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	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	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	Greater than 3			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	A	A	B	C	A
SCENARIO:	*83 Ave & 109 St AM (Sole Scenario)*				
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	83 Ave District Connector	Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	A	A	B	C	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	> 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)
	Less than 9	Less than 9	0 - 10	A	0 - 10
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	61 - 75	61 - 75	B		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.0	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	A	A	B	C	A
SCENARIO:	*83 Ave & 109 St PM (Sole Scenario)*				
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	83 Ave District Connector	Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	A	A	B	C	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	> 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)
	Less than 9	Less than 9	0 - 10	A	0 - 10
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	61 - 75	61 - 75	B		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.0	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	D	D	B	C	D
SCENARIO:	*86 Ave & 109 St Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)*				
Area Type:	*Urban Main Street*				
MODE					
Type	UNSIGNALIZED 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		Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	D	B	C	D

Active Transportation Design Check

Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?	No
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 makings 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?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

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	-
	Less than 50% of movements	Greater than 85%	D	A	
Measure 3	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	-	-	-
	Less than 9	Less than 9			
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	D	D	B	C	D
SCENARIO:	*86 Ave & 109 St Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)*				
Area Type:	*Urban Main Street*				
MODE					
Type	UNSIGNALIZED 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		Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	D	B	C	D

Active Transportation Design Check

Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?	No
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 makings 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?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

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	-
	Less than 50% of movements	Greater than 85%	D	A	
Measure 3	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	-	-	-
	Less than 9	Less than 9			
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation					
Actual	C	D	C	E	B
SCENARIO:	***87 Ave & 109 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		Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	D	C	E	B

Active Transportation Design Check	
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?	No
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 makings 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
	0.26 - 0.5	0	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)
	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	-	-
	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			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	D	D	D	E	B
SCENARIO:	*87 Ave & 109 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		Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	D	D	E	B

Active Transportation Design Check

Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?	No
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 makings 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
	0.26 - 0.5	0	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)
	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)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	Greater than 3			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation					
Actual	B	B	D	D	B
SCENARIO:	*88 Ave/109 St/Walterdale Hill/Saskatchewan Drive Post-Development AM (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	District Connector Confluence	Future BRT - B1		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	B	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 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
	> 1	0.76 - 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	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)
	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	21 - 35	C	21 - 35
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	B		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.0	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	B	C	D	D	C
SCENARIO:	*88 Ave/109 St/Walterdale Hill/Saskatchewan Drive Post-Development PM (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	District Connector Confluence	Future BRT - B1		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	B	C	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)?	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
	> 1	0.76 - 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	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)
	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 -120	106 - 120	B		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.0	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation					
Actual	D	E	C	C	B
SCENARIO:	82 Ave/University Ave & 114 St Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)				
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector				
MODE					
Type	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	C	C	B	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	E	C	C	B

Active Transportation Design Check	
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?	No
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 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	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)
	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	-	-
	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			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	D	E	D	D	C
SCENARIO:	*82 Ave/University Ave & 114 St Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)*				
Area Type:	*Neighbourhood Connector*				
MODE					
Type	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	C	C	B	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	E	D	D	C

Active Transportation Design Check

Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?	No
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 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	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)
	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	-	-
	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			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation

Actual	D	D	E	D	C
SCENARIO:	*87 Ave & 114 St Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)*				
Area Type:	*Urban Boulevard*				
MODE					
Type	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	C		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	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 makings 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	0	No transit priority measures at any 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	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	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 presentation

Actual	E	E	F	E	D
SCENARIO:	***87 Ave & 114 St Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)***				
Area Type:	***Urban Boulevard***				
MODE					
Type	**SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS**				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	C		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 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?	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	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	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)
	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	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	E		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	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 presentation

Actual	C	D	D	D	B
SCENARIO:	*82 Ave & 112 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	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)?	No
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings 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	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	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	C		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	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 presentation

Actual	C	D	D	E	C
SCENARIO:	*82 Ave & 112 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 makings 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	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	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)	-	-	-
	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 presentation					
Actual	B	B	C	C	B
SCENARIO:	87 Ave & 110 St Post-Development AM (Without Improvements)				
Area Type:	Urban Boulevard				
MODE					
Type	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	C		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		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	B	B	C	C	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
	> 1	> 1	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	0 - 10	A	0 - 10
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	91 -105	91 - 105	B		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.1 - 1.5	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you know and for detailed or summary results presentation					
Actual	B	B	C	D	C
SCENARIO:	*87 Ave & 110 St Post-Development PM (Without Improvements)*				
Area Type:	*Urban Boulevard*				
MODE					
Type	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	C		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		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	B	B	C	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)?	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
	> 1	> 1	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	11 - 20	B	11 - 20
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	106 -120	106 - 120	B		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.1 - 1.5	1.0			