G

Appendix G
Existing Corridor MMLOS

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

Actual	C		D	D	D
SCENARIO:	*109 Street (Wihkwêntôwin)*				
Area Type:	*Urban Main Street*				
MODE					
Type	SEGMENTS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C		D	D	D

Active Transportation Design Check	
Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	Greater than 3.0		Mixed traffic with > 1 lane per direction	3.4 - 3.6	0.70 - 0.79
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	1.0 - 1.2		Low presence of passenger amenities such as shelters, seating, shade trees, etc.	D	9+
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	201 - 230		C		
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

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

Actual	B		C	E	D
SCENARIO:	***124 Street***				
Area Type:	***Urban Main Street***				
MODE					
Type	**SEGMENTS**				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	B		C	E	D

Active Transportation Design Check	
Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	2.6 - 3.0		Mixed traffic with > 1 lane per direction	Less than 3.4	0.60 - 0.69
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	1.3 - 1.5		Moderate presence of passenger amenities such as shelters, seating, shade trees, etc.	D	9+
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	200		B		
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

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

Actual	C		B	E	D
SCENARIO:	***104 Avenue***				
Area Type:	***Urban Main Street***				
MODE					
Type	**SEGMENTS**				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)			LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C		B	E	D

Active Transportation Design Check	
Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	2.1 - 2.5		Dedicated lanes	Less than 3.4	0.70 - 0.79
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	1.3 - 1.5		Abundance of passenger amenities such as shelters, seating, shade trees, etc.	D	9+
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	200		C		
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

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

Actual	B		C	E	D
SCENARIO:	***Jasper Avenue***				
Area Type:	***Urban Main Street***				
MODE					
Type	**SEGMENTS**				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	B		C	E	D

Active Transportation Design Check	
Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	2.1 - 2.5		Mixed traffic with > 1 lane per direction	Less than 3.4	0.80 - 0.89
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	Greater than 2.5		Moderate presence of passenger amenities such as shelters, seating, shade trees, etc.	D	7-8
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	200		B		
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

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

Actual	B	D			D
SCENARIO:	***100 Avenue***				
Area Type:	***Urban Boulevard***				
MODE					
Type	**SEGMENTS**				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	B	D		E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	B	D			D

Active Transportation Design Check

Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	Yes

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	2.1 - 2.5	1.6 - 1.8			0.90 - 1.00
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	Greater than 2.5	Has physical measures AND buffer width is 0.5 - 1			5-6
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	200	One "moderate" conflict indicator and one "high" conflict indicator			
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

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

Actual	D	B	B	D	C
SCENARIO:	*Stony Plain Road (with LRT)*				
Area Type:	*Urban Main Street*				
MODE					
Type	SEGMENTS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)			LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	B	B	D	C

Active Transportation Design Check	
Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	2.1 - 2.5	1.6 - 1.8	Dedicated lanes	Less than 3.4	0.80 - 0.89
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	1.3 - 1.5	Has physical measures AND buffer width > 1	Abundance of passenger amenities such as shelters, seating, shade trees, etc.	C	3-4
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	Greater than 320	Two "low" conflict indicators	D		
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

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

Actual	E	F	D	C	D
SCENARIO:	*Stony Plain Road (without LRT)*				
Area Type:	*Urban Main Street*				
MODE					
Type	SEGMENTS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)			LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	E	F	D	C	D

Active Transportation Design Check	
Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	1.8 - 2.0	Less than 1.2	Mixed traffic with > 1 lane per direction	3.4 - 3.6	0.70 - 0.79
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	Less than 1.0		Low presence of passenger amenities such as shelters, seating, shade trees, etc.	C	9+
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	Greater than 320	Two "high" conflict indicators	E		
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

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

Actual	D	F	B	D	B
SCENARIO:	*156 Street / Meadowlark Road*				
Area Type:	*Urban Main Street*				
MODE					
Type	SEGMENTS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)			LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	F	B	D	B

Active Transportation Design Check	
Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	2.1 - 2.5	Less than 1.2	Dedicated lanes	Less than 3.4	0.60 - 0.69
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	1.3 - 1.5		Abundance of passenger amenities such as shelters, seating, shade trees, etc.	B	3-4
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	Greater than 320	Two "high" conflict indicators	D		
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

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

Actual	C	C	C	D	D
SCENARIO:	*109 Street (Garneau)*				
Area Type:	*Urban Main Street*				
MODE					
Type	SEGMENTS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)			B1 and B2 Routes		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	C	C	D	D

Active Transportation Design Check	
Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	2.1 - 2.5	1.6 - 1.8	Mixed traffic with > 1 lane per direction	3.4 - 3.6	0.80 - 0.89
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	1.0 - 1.2	Has physical measures and buffer width is 0.3 - 0.5 OR	Moderate presence of passenger amenities such as shelters, seating, shade trees, etc.	E	7-8
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	201 - 230	Two "low" conflict indicators	C		
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

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

Actual	D	B	B	C	B
SCENARIO:	***114 Street***				
Area Type:	***Urban Main Street***				
MODE					
Type	**SEGMENTS**				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)			LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	B	B	C	B

Active Transportation Design Check	
Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	2.1 - 2.5	1.6 - 1.8	Dedicated lanes	3.4 - 3.6	0.60 - 0.69
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	Less than 1.0	Has physical measures AND buffer width > 1	Abundance of passenger amenities such as shelters, seating, shade trees, etc.	B	3-4
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	201 - 230	Two "low" conflict indicators	D		
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

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

Actual	D	F	C	E	D
SCENARIO:	***82 Avenue***				
Area Type:	***Urban Main Street***				
MODE					
Type	**SEGMENTS**				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	F	C	E	D

Active Transportation Design Check	
Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	1.8 - 2.0	Less than 1.2	Mixed traffic with > 1 lane per direction	Less than 3.4	0.60 - 0.69
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	Less than 1.0		Abundance of passenger amenities such as shelters, seating, shade trees, etc.	D	9+
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	200	Two "high" conflict indicators	D		
Measure 4		-	-	-	-

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

Actual	C	F	C	D	C
SCENARIO:	*87 Avenue*				
Area Type:	*Urban Main Street*				
MODE					
Type	SEGMENTS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	B	C	C	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	F	C	D	C

Active Transportation Design Check	
Do the pedestrian facilities provide direct access to all properties along the segment? (Direct access can be provided by an adjacent facility or designated crossing to the property in question)	
Does the bicycle facility selected correspond with the minimum appropriate facility type identified in the context appropriate nomograph (Figure 6.1, 6.2)?	No

MMLOS Evaluation

Measure 1	Pedestrian Facility Width (m)	Bike Facility Width per Direction (m)	Transit Facility Type	Width of Curb Lane (m)	Mid-block V/C Ratio
	1.8 - 2.0	Less than 1.2	Mixed traffic with > 1 lane per direction	Less than 3.4	0.70 - 0.79
Measure 2	Pedestrian Buffer Width (m)	Bike Buffer Width (m)	Transit Passenger Amenities	Car Level of Service	Curb Lane Conflicts
	1.6 - 2.0		Abundance of passenger amenities such as shelters, seating, shade trees, etc.	C	5-6
Measure 3	Max Distance Between Controlled Crossings (m)	Conflicts with Other Modes (in-lane conflicts and cross point conflicts)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
	200	Two "high" conflict indicators	C		
Measure 4		-	-	-	-