LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation			
Actual	С	E	В	E	D
SCENARIO:	SPR & 142 St Post-Developm	ent AM (With Improvements)			
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector	•			
MODE	×	র্ণত	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	С	Е	В	Е	D
	-	Active Transportatio			
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent wi	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
ls 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 the	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		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Weasure 1	>1	0	Transit priority measures at 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)
iviedsure z	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	21 - 35	F	Greater than 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)	-	-	-
incusure 4					

Actual		resentation			
	C	E	В	E	D
SCENARIO:	SPR & 142 St Post-Developm	ent PM (With Improvements)			
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector				
MODE	× 1	র্নত	1		
уре			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	С	Е	В	Е	D
		Active Transportatio			
	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
ls a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Is a continuo Does the intersection design provi					No Yes
	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility		
	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for a etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) an	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d?		Yes
Does the intersection design provi	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for etc)? etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and rds (if applicable) been considered	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d?		Yes
	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for a etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) an ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d? aluation	space, protected intersection,	Yes Yes % of Movements with
Does the intersection design provi	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for o etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) at ds (if applicable) been considere <u>MMLOS Eva</u> Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d? aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at all	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Does the intersection design provi	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	e intended turn movements for e etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) an rds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius	eyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d? aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at all approaches for transit	Space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 13 - 14	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84%
Does the intersection design provi	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for e etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) an ds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing ad municipal accessibility d? aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at all approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	space, protected intersection, 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 provi	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 13.0 - 14.9	e intended turn movements for e etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and ds (if applicable) been considered MIMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 13.0 - 14.9	eyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d? aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at all approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 21 - 35	space, protected intersection, Space, protected intersection, 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) Greater than 80
Does the intersection design provi	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 13.0 - 14.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	e intended turn movements for e etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) and rds (if applicable) been considered MIMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 13.0 - 14.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	eyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d? aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at all approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 21 - 35 Pedestrian Level of Service	space, protected intersection, Space, protected intersection, 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) Greater than 80

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation			
Actual	В	E	С	E	В
SCENARIO:	SPR & 149 St Post-Developm	ent AM (With Improvements)			
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Main Street	•			
MODE	*	র্ণত	1		
Туре			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		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	В		С	Е	В
	_	Active Transportatio			
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent wi	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
ls a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ited for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for c etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar 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
inicasure 1	>1	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)
IVICASULE Z	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	D	36 - 55
Maar	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)	-	-	
ivicasul e 4	1.1 - 1.5	Greater than 3			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation			
Actual	В	D	С	E	В
SCENARIO:	SPR & 149 St Post-Developm	ent PM (With Improvements)			
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Main Street	-			
MODE	│	র্নত	1		
Туре			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		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	В	D	С	Е	В
		Active Transportatio			
	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
ls 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 the	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		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
inicasure 1	> 1	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)
IVICASULE Z	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	D	36 - 55
Maar	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	91 -105	91 - 105	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
weasule 4	1.1 - 1.5	Greater than 3			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results	presentation	Ī		
Actual	В	С	С	E	С
SCENARIO:		ent AM (With Improvements			
Area Type:	Urban Main Street	•			
MODE	*	్	1		
Туре			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	В	C	С	E	С
		Active Transportatio	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
ls a continuo	is 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	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a 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%
Maar	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	36 - 55
M2	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)	-	-	-
incusure 4	1.1 - 1.5	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	I know and for detailed or summary results	presentation	Ī		
Actual	В		С	E	С
SCENARIO:	SPR & 156 St Post-Developm	ent PM (With Improvements)		
Area Type:	Urban Main Street				
MODE	×	র্নত	1		
Туре			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	В	С	С	E	С
		Active Transportatio	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 wi	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
ls 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 the	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and the set of the set			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
weasure 1	> 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
Mosture 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
Maga	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)	-	-	-
	1.1 - 1.5	1.0			

	_				
Actual	В	С	С	D	D
SCENARIO:	SPR & 158 St Post-Developm Urban Main Street	ent AM (With Improvements)		
Area Type:	•		0		
MODE	★	్	1 ■		
[uno			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)					
Actual	В	С	С	D	D
		Active Transportation	-		_
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	aching 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)?	Yes
ls a continuc	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes
Is a continuo Does the intersection design prov					Yes Yes
	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s		
	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility 2d?		Yes
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility 2d?		Yes
	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considerd MMLOS Ev	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation	space, protected intersection,	Yes Yes % of Movements with
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considerd <u>MMLOS Ev</u> Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd 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 prov	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been consider MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10%
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been consider MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	Space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s)
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considered MIMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 11 - 20	Space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s)
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9 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) 9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 11 - 20 Pedestrian Level of Service	Space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s)

Actual	В	С	C	D	D
SCENARIO:	SPR & 158 St Post-Developm	ent PM (With Improvements)		
Area Type:	Urban Main Street	•			
MODE	× 1	్	1		
уре			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)					
Actual	В	С	С	D	D
	_	Active Transportation	-	-	_
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	aching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike	acility 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		nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes
Is a continuo Does the intersection design provi	us amount of space and accompa				Yes
	us amount of space and accompa de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s		
	us amount of space and accompa de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility 2d?		Yes
Does the intersection design provi	us amount of space and accompa de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility 2d?		Yes
	us amount of space and accompa de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Ev	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation	space, protected intersection,	Yes Yes % of Movements with
Does the intersection design provi	us amount of space and accompa de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considered <u>MMLOS Ev</u> Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd 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	us amount of space and accompa de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	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	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10%
Does the intersection design provi	us amount of space and accompa de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	Space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s)
Does the intersection design provi	us amount of space and accompand de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considered MIMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 11 - 20	Space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s)
Does the intersection design provi	us amount of space and accompand de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9 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) 9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 11 - 20 Pedestrian Level of Service	Space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s)

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation			
Actual	В	В	С	E	С
SCENARIO:		ent AM (With Improvements)			
Area Type:	Urban Main Street				
MODE	×	র্জত	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	163 St District Connector	R12 Rapid Bus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	В	В	С	E	С
		Active Transportatio	-	-	<u> </u>
	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	ction (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ted for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for c etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar 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
inicasul e 1	> 1	> 1	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)
ivicasul e z	Less than 9	Less than 9	36 - 55	E	56 - 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
incusuie 5	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	В		
Measure 4	Greater than 120 Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Greater than 120 Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	B -	-	-

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation			
Actual	В	В	С	E	С
SCENARIO:	SPR & 163 St Post-Developm	ent PM (With Improvements)			
Area Type:	Urban Main Street				
MODE	×	র্জত	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	163 St District Connector	R12 Rapid Bus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	В	В	С	Е	С
	0	Active Transportatio	-	-	C
	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	ited for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for c etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar 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
ivicasule 1	>1	> 1	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)
WEUGUIE Z	Less than 9	Less than 9	21 - 35	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Niedsure 5					
	106 -120	106 - 120	В		
Measure 4	106 -120 Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	106 - 120 Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	- -	-	

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	I know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation			
Actual	В	В	С	E	С
SCENARIO:	95 Ave & 156 St Post-Develo	oment AM (With Improveme	nts)		
Area Type:	Urban Boulevard				
MODE	×	র্জত	1 		
Туре			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	В	В	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 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 o etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar 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
ivicasul e 1	>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)
wicasule 2		0.0 10.0	21 - 35	D	
	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21-33		36 - 55
Moorura 2	9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	36 - 55 -
Measure 3				-	36 - 55
Measure 3 Measure 4	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	36 - 55 - -

Actual	В	В	С	E	С
SCENARIO:	95 Ave & 156 St Post-Develo	pment PM (With Improvemer	its)		
Area Type:	Urban Boulevard	•			
MODE	★	র্নত	1 F		
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	В	В	С	Е	С
		Active Transportation	-	-	
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike	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 inte	rsection?	Yes
Is a continuo Does the intersection design provi	· · ·				Yes Yes
	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility		
	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for a etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) au	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d?		Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian	e intended turn movements for a etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) an rds (if applicable) been considere	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d?		Yes
	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for a etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) an rds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d? aluation	space, protected intersection,	Yes Yes % of Movements with
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for or etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and rds (if applicable) been considere <u>MIMLOS Eva</u> Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d? 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 % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	e intended turn movements for o etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) an rds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d? aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 35 - 59%
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for o etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) an rds (if applicable) been considere <u>MMLOS Eva</u> Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	cyclists (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)	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 35 - 59% Intersection Delay (s)
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	e intended turn movements for e etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and rds (if applicable) been considered MIMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	cyclists (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) 21 - 35	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 35 - 59% Intersection Delay (s)
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	e intended turn movements for or etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) and rds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	cyclists (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) 21 - 35 Pedestrian Level of Service	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 35 - 59% Intersection Delay (s)

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ا know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation			
Actual	D	С	С	D	С
SCENARIO:	87 Ave & Meadowlark Rd Po	st-Development AM (With Im	provements)		
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector				
MODE	Ŕ	র্ণত	1 		
Туре			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)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	С	С	D	С
		Active Transportatio	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 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	ited for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar 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
inicasul e 1	0.76 - 1	0.76 - 1	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	13 - 14	60 - 84%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	
	(m)	(,			Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	(m) 13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	21 - 35	E	Intersection Delay (s)
			21 - 35 Pedestrian Level of Service	E	
Measure 2 Measure 3	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9		E -	
	13.0 - 14.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	13.0 - 14.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	E - -	

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation					
Actual	D	С	С	E	D		
SCENARIO:		st-Development PM (With Im	provements)				
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector						
MODE	×	র্ণত	1 				
Туре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	Target (Custom if necessary) D B D						
Adjustment for Planning Direction	djustment for Planning Direction Upwards None None None						
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				None		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None		
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)							
Actual	D	С	С	Е	D		
	_	Active Transportatio	-	_			
	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	ited for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes		
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes		
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar 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		
Weasure 1	0.76 - 1	0.76 - 1	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			Transit Movement Delay (s) 21 - 35	Car Level of Service			
	(m)	(m)			Intersection Delay (s)		
Measure 2 Measure 3	(m) 13.0 - 14.9	(m) 13.0 - 14.9	21 - 35		Intersection Delay (s)		
	(m) 13.0 - 14.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	(m) 13.0 - 14.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	21 - 35 Pedestrian Level of Service		Intersection Delay (s)		

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation						
Actual	В	D	С	E	С			
SCENARIO:	82 Ave & 109 St Post-Develop	oment AM (With Improveme	nts)					
Area Type:	Urban Main Street	•						
MODE	大	র্ণত	1					
Туре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D			
Adjustment for Planning Direction	djustment for Planning Direction Upwards None Upwards None							
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)								
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None			
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)								
Actual	В		С	Е	С			
	_	Active Transportatio						
	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			
ls 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 the	e intended turn movements for a etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes			
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) an ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes			
		MMLOS Eva	aluation					
Manuar 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	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	Less than 9	Less than 9	21 - 35	D	36 - 55			
Marca	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)	-	-				
Wicasule 4	1.6 - 2.0	Greater than 3						

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation						
Actual	В	D	С	F	D			
SCENARIO:	82 Ave & 109 St Post-Develop	oment PM (With Improvemer	nts)					
Area Type:	Urban Main Street	-						
MODE	☆	র্ণত	1					
Туре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D			
Adjustment for Planning Direction	djustment for Planning Direction Upwards None Upwards None							
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)								
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None			
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)								
Actual	В		С	F	D			
		Active Transportatio						
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes			
Does the approaching bike f	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 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 the	e intended turn movements for a etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes			
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) aı 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			
incasure 1	>1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%			
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)			
IVICASULE 2	Less than 9	Less than 9	36 - 55	F	Greater than 80			
Marcal	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-			
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	В					
	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-			
Measure 4								

	u know and for detailed or summary results p								
Actual	A	Α	В	С	Α				
SCENARIO:	83 Ave & 109 St AM (Sole Sce	enario)							
Area Type:	Urban Main Street								
MODE	×	র্জত	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	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	А				
	N	Active Transportation		U	A				
	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	ction (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes				
ls a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ted for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes				
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for c etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes				
			Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?						
					Yes				
		MMLOS Eva			Yes				
Moosuro 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	MMLOS Eva		Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes				
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures		luation		% of Movements with				
		Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Iuation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all	(m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes				
Measure 1 Measure 2	0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	Iluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	(m) Less than 11	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100%				
Measure 2	0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Iluation Transit Priority Measures 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	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100% Intersection Delay (s)				
	0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	Iluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 0 - 10	(m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100% Intersection Delay (s)				
Measure 2	0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	Iluation 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	(m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100% Intersection Delay (s)				

Actual	Α						
		Α	В	С	Α		
SCENARIO:	83 Ave & 109 St PM (Sole Sce	enario)					
Area Type:	Urban Main Street						
MODE	×	র্জত	1				
Гуре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С	D	D		
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Ijustment for Planning Direction Upwards Upwards None None						
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	83 Ave District Connector	Future BRT - B1/B2		None		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None		
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)							
Actual	Α	Α	В	С	Α		
		Active Transportatio					
	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	ction (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes		
ls a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ted for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes		
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for c etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes		
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontaria		d municipal accessibility	space, protected intersection,	Yes		
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontaria	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar	id municipal accessibility d?	space, protected intersection,			
	Have Accessibility for Ontaria	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere	id municipal accessibility d?	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m)			
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva	d municipal accessibility d? Iluation	Average Effective Turning Radius	Yes % of Movements with		
Measure 1	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar rds (if applicable) been considere <u>MMLOS Eva</u> Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	d municipal accessibility d? Iluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes		
	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar rds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	Id municipal accessibility d? Iluation 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 % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100%		
Measure 1 Measure 2	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar rds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	d municipal accessibility d? Iluation 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 % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100% Intersection Delay (s)		
Measure 1	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar rds (if applicable) been considered MIMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	d municipal accessibility d? Iluation 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 % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100% Intersection Delay (s)		
Measure 1 Measure 2	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar rds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	d 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 % of 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	resentation						
Actual	С		В	E	D			
SCENARIO:		oment AM (With Improvemer	nts)					
Area Type:	Urban Main Street							
MODE	×	র্ণত	1					
Туре		l	INSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION	IS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D			
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Adjustment for Planning Direction Upwards None Upwards None							
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)								
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None			
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)								
Actual	С		В	Е	D			
	<u> </u>	Active Transportatio		-				
	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			
ls a continuou	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ited for cyclists through the inter	rsection?	No			
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for c etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	No			
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes			
		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)			
incusule 1	Greater than 11	No bike facility	0 - 10	Less than 11	0 - 10			
Maga: 2	Marked Crossings	Requirement to stop	Pedestrian Level of Service	Car Level of Service	-			
Measure 2	100% of movements	Greater than 85%	D	D				
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	-	-				
Measure 3	Less than 9	Less than 9						
Mar		-	-	-				
Measure 4								

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation						
Actual	С	D	В	D	D			
SCENARIO:		oment PM (With Improvemen	its)					
Area Type:	Urban Main Street	-						
MODE	★	র্ণত	1					
Туре		ι	JNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION	s				
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D			
Adjustment for Planning Direction	djustment for Planning Direction Upwards None Upwards None							
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)								
Adjustment for Strategic Policy								
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					None			
Actual	С	D	В	D	D			
		Active Transportatio		-				
	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	ited for cyclists through the inter	section?	No			
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for c etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	No			
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes			
		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)			
incusure 1	Greater than 11	No bike facility	0 - 10	Less than 11	0 - 10			
Moorting 2	Marked Crossings	Requirement to stop	Pedestrian Level of Service	Car Level of Service	-			
Measure 2	100% of movements	Greater than 85%	D	С				
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	-	-				
Measure 3	Less than 9	Less than 9						
Magazine				-				
Measure 4								

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation						
Actual	В	D	С	F	С			
SCENARIO:	87 Ave & 109 St Post-Develop	oment AM (With Improvemen	nts)					
Area Type:	Urban Main Street							
MODE	★	র্নত	1 					
Гуре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D			
Adjustment for Planning Direction	djustment for Planning Direction Upwards None Upwards 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	В		С	F	С			
	•	Active Transportatio	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 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					
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes			
ivieasul e 1	> 1	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)			
Measure 2								
	Less than 9	Less than 9	21 - 35	F	Greater than 80			
	Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	21 - 35 Pedestrian Level of Service	F -	Greater than 80			
Measure 3								
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service					

Actual		resentation						
Actual	B	D	С	F	С			
SCENARIO:	87 Ave & 109 St Post-Develop	oment PM (With Improvemer	nts)					
Area Type:	Urban Main Street							
MODE	×	র্নত	1					
Гуре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D			
Adjustment for Planning Direction	djustment for Planning Direction Upwards None Upwards None							
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B1/B2		None			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None			
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)								
Actual	В	D	С	F	С			
		Active Transportatio	on Design Check					
	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 interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No			
ls 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 a etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes			
	Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered?							
	standar	ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes			
	standaı	ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva	d?		Yes			
Maanura 1	standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures		d?	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes			
Measure 1		MMLOS Eva	d? aluation		% of Movements with			
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	MMLOS Eva	d? aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all	(m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes			
Measure 1 Measure 2	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius	d? aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	(m) Less than 11	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100%			
Measure 2	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	d? aluation Transit Priority Measures 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	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100% Intersection Delay (s)			
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	MMLOS Eve Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	d? aluation Transit Priority Measures 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 F	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100% Intersection Delay (s) Greater than 80			
Measure 2	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	d? 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	(m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service F	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100% Intersection Delay (s) Greater than 80			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results	presentation					
Actual	В	В	С	E	С		
SCENARIO:	88 Ave/109 St/Walterdale H	ill/Saskatchewan Drive Post-	Development AM (With Impr	ovements)			
Area Type:	Urban Main Street						
MODE	A I	S	↑ ■				
	Λ	0.0		0	1		
			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
ype Target (Custom if necessary)							
					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	С	Е	С		
		Active Transportation	on Design Check				
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes		
Door the approaching hike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interes	action (crosswalk or such odge of	intersecting readway)?	Vec		
Does the approaching blke is	acility continue at a consistent w	iath 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 provi	de features which facilitate all th	a intended turn movements for	nuclists (o.g. biko boyos, guquing	space protected intersection			
Does the intersection design provide	de leatures which facilitate all th	etc)?	yenses (e.g. bike boxes, queung	space, protected intersection,	Yes		
	Have Accessibility for Ontariar	ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	nd municipal accessibility				
	standar	ds (if applicable) been considere	d?		Yes		
		MMLOS Eva	aluation				
				Average Effective Turning Radius	% of Movements with		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	(m)	Dedicated Turn Lanes		
ivieasure 1	>1	>1	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all	11 - 12	60 - 84%		
		· *	approaches for transit	**	00 01/0		
	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	E	56 - 80		
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-		
Measure 3	01 105	01 105	n.				
	91 -105	91 - 105	В				
	Number of Uncontrolled	Number of Uncontrolled	-	_	_		
Measure 4	Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Conflicts (conflicts/approach)					
	1.0	1.0					

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what yo	u know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	В	В	С	D	В
CENARIO:		ill/Saskatchewan Drive Post-	Development PM (With Impr	ovements)	
rea Type:	Urban Main Street				
MODE	I K	్	↑ →		
		0.0		-00-	
/pe			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None
Poscons for adjustment (if applicable)		District Connector	Future BRT - B1		
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	Confluence			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	P	P.			
Actual	В	B Active Transportatio	C Decign Check	D	В
	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	nving navement makings deline:	ated for cyclists through the inte	rsection?	Yes
15 4 60111140		nying poverient makings demet	accuror cyclists through the lifte		165
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
		,			
	Have Accessibility for Ontaria	ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	nd municipal accessibility		
	standar	ds (if applicable) been considere	ed?		Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Darks in the			Average Effective Turning Radius	% of Movements with
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	(m)	Dedicated Turn Lanes
	> 1	> 1	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all	11 - 12	60 - 84%
			approaches for transit		
	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 12.0	11.0 12.0	21 25	D	24.25
	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	21 - 35	U	21 - 35
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	
Measure 3					
	106 -120	106 - 120	В		
	Number of Encentrelled	Number of Linearitzellar			
Maaa	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
Measure 4	1.0	1.0			
	1.0	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation					
Actual	С	E	С	С	В		
SCENARIO:		St Post-Development AM (W	ith Improvements)				
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector						
MODE	×	র্ণত	1 				
Туре							
Target (Custom if necessary)	arget (Custom if necessary) C C B D						
Adjustment for Planning Direction							
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)							
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	Upwards	None	None	None	None		
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	None	None	None	None		
Actual	С	F	С	С	В		
	L C	Active Transportatio		C C			
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa			Yes		
	Are marked pedestnan crossing	s provided to connect an approa	ening percestinan racintics:		165		
Does the approaching bike f	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	nying pavement makings delinea	ted for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes		
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for c etc)?	yclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes		
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes		
		MMLOS Eva	luation		<u></u>		
	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	15 - 16	85 - 100%		
Manuar 2	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	15.0 - 17.9	11 - 20	D	36 - 55		
Mooruro 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-		
Measure 3	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	С				
		l					
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-		

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation					
Actual	С	E	С	С	В		
SCENARIO:	82 Ave/University Ave & 114	St Post-Development PM (W	ith Improvements)				
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector						
MODE	†	র্ণত	1 				
Туре							
Target (Custom if necessary)	Farget (Custom if necessary) C C B D						
Adjustment for Planning Direction							
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	Current Cycling Corridor			None		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	Upwards	None	None	None	None		
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	None	None	None	None		
Actual	С	F	С	С	В		
	L C	Active Transportatio		<u> </u>			
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa			Yes		
Does the approaching bike f	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	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes		
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	yclists (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	>1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	15 - 16	85 - 100%		
Maarura 2	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	21 - 35	D	36 - 55		
Mossure 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-		
Measure 3	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	С				
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-			
	1.1 - 1.5	1.6 - 2.0					

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results	presentation	Ī					
Actual	В	D	С	E	D			
ICENARIO: 87 Ave & 114 St Post-Development AM (With Improvements) Urban Boulevard Urban Boulevard								
Area Type:	Orban Boulevara							
MODE	l K	్	•					
	Λ	00		0 0				
Туре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS					
Target (Custom if necessary)								
Adjustment for Planning Direction	_	None	Upwards	None	E None			
	Future BRT - R2							
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		920X Rapidbus					
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None			
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)								
Actual	В	D	С	E	D			
		Active Transportatio	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			
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 provi	de features which facilitate all th		cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes			
		etc)?			165			
		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			Transit priority measures at a					
	> 1	0	minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	11 - 12	35 - 59%			
	Average Effective Turning Radius	Average Effective Turning Radius	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)			
Measure 2	(m)	(m)	Hansie Wovement Delay (5)	Car Lever Of Service	intersection Delay (5)			
	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	36 - 55	F	Greater than 80			
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-			
Measure 3								
	91 -105	91 - 105	В					
	Number of Uncontrolled	Number of Uncontrolled						
Measure 4	Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-			
	1.1 - 1.5	2.6 - 3.0						

Ashivel		presentation	-				
Actual	В	E	С	E	D		
CENARIO: 87 Ave & 114 St Post-Development PM (With Improvements) rea Type: Urban Boulevard							
Area Type:	orban Boulevara						
MODE		റ്റ	† E				
		00	<u>~</u>	0 0			
Гуре							
Target (Custom if necessary)	essary) B B C						
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None		
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Future BRT - B2						
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None		
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)							
Actual	В	E	С	Е	D		
		Active Transportatio	on Design Check				
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes		
Does the approaching bike	Yes						
ls a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline:	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No		
Is a continuo Does the intersection design provi					No Yes		
	de features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontariai	e intended turn movements for	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility				
	de features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontariai	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d?		Yes		
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontariai	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d?		Yes		
	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for e etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d? aluation	space, protected intersection,	Yes Yes % of Movements with		
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for e etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility d? 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 % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes		
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	e intended turn movements for e etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere <u>MMLOS Eva</u> Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 11 - 12	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84%		
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures >1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for e etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd municipal accessibility aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	space, protected intersection, 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	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 11.0 - 12.9	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 11.0 - 12.9	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) 56 - 80	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 11 - 12 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s) Greater than 80		
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 11.0 - 12.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Evr Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 11.0 - 12.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing nd 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) 56 - 80 Pedestrian Level of Service	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 11 - 12 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s) Greater than 80		

Actual		resentation					
	В	В	D	D	В		
CENARIO: 82 Ave & 112 St Post-Development AM (With Improvements)							
Area Type:	Urban Main Street						
MODE	×	র্জত	1 				
Гуре							
Target (Custom if necessary)	Target (Custom if necessary) B C D D						
Adjustment for Planning Direction	ustment for Planning Direction Upwards None None None						
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)							
Adjustment for Strategic Policy							
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					None		
Actual	В	В	D	D	В		
	_	Active Transportation	_		_		
	Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities?						
Does the approaching bike f	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 continuou	Yes						
				section?	Tes		
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for etc)?			Yes		
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontaria		cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing : nd municipal accessibility				
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontaria	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility ed?		Yes		
	Have Accessibility for Ontaria	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility ed?		Yes		
Does the intersection design provid	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Ev	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation	space, protected intersection,	Yes Yes % of Movements with		
Measure 1	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd 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		
	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84%		
Measure 1 Measure 2	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s)		
Measure 1	Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) a dds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing sont municipal accessibility ed?	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 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 >1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 21 - 35 Pedestrian Level of Service	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s)		

Actual							
	В	В	D	E	С		
SCENARIO:	82 Ave & 112 St Post-Develop	oment PM (With Improveme	nts)				
Area Type:	Urban Main Street						
MODE	*	র্জত					
Туре							
Target (Custom if necessary)	arget (Custom if necessary) B C D D						
Adjustment for Planning Direction	ustment for Planning Direction Upwards None None None						
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)							
Adjustment for Strategic Policy							
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)							
Actual	В	В	D	E	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	Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?						
ls a continuor	Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?						
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing :	space, protected intersection,	Yes		
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontariar		nd municipal accessibility	space, protected intersection,	Yes Yes		
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontariar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	nd municipal accessibility ed?	space, protected intersection,			
	Have Accessibility for Ontariar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere	nd municipal accessibility ed?	space, protected intersection,			
Does the intersection design provid	Have Accessibility for Ontariar standar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Ev	nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation	Average Effective Turning Radius	Yes % of Movements with		
Measure 1	Have Accessibility for Ontariar standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle 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 Ontarian standar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	nd municipal accessibility ed? 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 Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	nd municipal accessibility 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 Ontarian standar	etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) a dds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 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) 36 - 55	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 Ontarian standar	etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 36 - 55 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		presentation						
	В	В	С	С	В			
CENARIO: 87 Ave & 110 St Post-Development AM (With Improvements) vea Type: Urban Boulevard								
neu rype.		^	. A	_				
MODE		^ি	1 					
уре								
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С		E			
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None			
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	ns for adjustment (if applicable) Pedestrian Priority Area 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 Transportation	on Design Check					
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	aching pedestrian facilities?		Yes			
Does the approaching bike	acility 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?	Yes			
Is a continuo Does the intersection design provi					Yes			
	de features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontariai	e intended turn movements for	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s					
	de features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontariai	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility ed?		Yes			
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontariai	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility ed?		Yes			
	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Ev	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s nd municipal accessibility ad? aluation	space, protected intersection,	Yes Yes % of Movements with			
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considerd <u>MMLOS Ev</u> Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility ad? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any	space, protected intersection,	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes			
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considered <u>MMLOS Ev</u> Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility ad? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 10 - 34%			
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing : nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 10 - 34% Intersection Delay (s)			
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a dds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility ad? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 0 - 10	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 10 - 34% Intersection Delay (s)			
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	e intended turn movements for etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) a dds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s and municipal accessibility ad? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 0 - 10 Pedestrian Level of Service	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 10 - 34% Intersection Delay (s)			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	I know and for detailed or summary results	presentation						
Actual	В	В	С	D	С			
SCENARIO:	ENARIO: 87 Ave & 110 St Post-Development PM (With Improvements) ea Type: Urban Boulevard							
Area Type.	*	<u>۸</u>	.					
MODE	次	ୖୄ	1 					
Type	e SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS Target (Custom if necessary) B B C C							
				Nono	E None			
	stment for Planning Direction Upwards None Upwards None Interview 110 St Neighbourhood Extension Direction Extension Direction Extension Direction							
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	ns for adjustment (if applicable) Pedestrian Priority Area Route Future BRT - B2							
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None			
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable) Actual	В	В	С	D	С			
100001		Active Transportation		0	C			
	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)?	Yes			
ls a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes			
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,				
		etc)?			Yes			
	User Assessibility for Ostavia							
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere			Yes			
		MMLOS Ev	aluation					
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius	% of Movements with			
Measure 1				(m)	Dedicated Turn Lanes			
	> 1	> 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	10 - 34%			
	Average Effective Turning Radius	Average Effective Turning Radius	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)			
Measure 2	(m)	(m)						
	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	orbital of the neulistical	orbitat of ote relieve (a)						
	106 -120	106 - 120	В					
	Number of Uncontrolled	Number of Uncontrolled						
Measure 4	Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-			
	1.1 - 1.5	1.0						
	1							