Evaluation of Alternatives: Transportation

	Good/Preferred – A solution that has a positive impact in regard to the evaluation criteria
	Moderate - solution that has a moderate impact in regard to the evaluation criteria.
	Poor - A solution that has a negative impact in regard to the evaluation criteria
	No change to or effect on existing.

	Lakeshore Blvd Alignment		
	1. Status quo	**2. LSB moved half-way 'up'**	**3. LSB moved all the way 'up'**
Natural Environment			
Terrestrial Habitat	No change. Habitat remains fragmented.	**Releases useable parkland for potential ecological community establishment. Tree loss will require compensation plantings.**	**Releases maximum useable parkland for potential ecological community establishment. Tree loss will require compensation plantings.**
Aquatic Habitat, Shoreline	No change.	**Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline**	**Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline**
Air Quality, SWM, Soils and Groundwater	No change.	**No noticeable change.**	**Existing SWM pond would need to be relocated for habitat and water quality purposes. There will be no noticeable change to stormwater runoff, air quality, soil,**
Social, Cultural and Economic			
Recreation and Tourism	No change. Does not meet the goals of the project.	**Moving the Lakeshore increases park space; the areas available for community recreational activity; the ability to link different functional areas within the park; and to enhance the overall quality of parks and recreational amenities – all of which are an improvement over the status quo.**	**Moving the Lakeshore increases park space; the areas available for community recreational activity; the ability to link different functional areas within the park; and to enhance the overall quality of parks and recreational amenities – all of which are an improvement over the status quo.** **From a recreational perspective, the more parkland that is reclaimed, the better. This suggests a preference for alternative #3.**
Employment, Cultural Heritage, Existing Buildings	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**
Noise and Vibration	No change.	**Improved slightly.**	**Improved.**
Technical Feasibility and Cost	Feasible. No cost aside from maintenance costs.	**Feasible.** **Lower construction cost compared with Alternative 3.**	**Feasible.** **Most expensive alternative.**
Transportation			
Road and Pedestrian Safety	No change.	**No noticeable change.**	**No noticeable change.**
Pedestrian / Cycling / Transit	No change.	**Pedestrian conditions improved due to smaller distance between neighbourhoods and park.** **Transit can be accommodated.** **Cycling – No change.**	**Pedestrian conditions improved significantly due to smaller distance between neighbourhoods and park.** **Transit can be accommodated.** **Cycling – No change.**
Network Efficiency (e.g., Travel Demand and Delay)	No change.	**No change**	**No change.**
Future Capacity (i.e., Utility and Function of LSB)	No change.	**Utility and function are maintained.**	**Utility and function are maintained.**
RECOMMENDED SOLUTION	Not Preferred ✘	**Preferred** ✓	**Preferred** ✓

	Lakeshore Character				
	1. Status quo	**2. LSB as a boulevard**	3. LSB as a "great street"	4. LSB with grade separations	**5. LSB as a four-lane "main street"**
Natural Environment					
Terrestrial Habitat	No change.	**No effect on terrestrial habitat.**	No effect on terrestrial habitat.	Provides a greater potential for land bridges, which would allow for greater vegetation diversity and potential wildlife corridors	**No effect on terrestrial habitat.**
Aquatic Habitat, Shoreline	No change.	**Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline.**	Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline.	Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline.	**Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline.**
Air Quality, SWM, Soils and Groundwater	No change.	**No noticeable change.**	No noticeable change.	No noticeable change.	**No noticeable change.**
Social, Cultural and Economic					
Recreation and Tourism	No change. Current character is not appealing from a tourism perspective.	**Cycle and pedestrian crossings would be improved.** **Opportunity to create a tourist destination.**	Cycle and pedestrian crossings would be improved. Opportunity to create a tourist destination.	Would allow for pedestrian crossings over LSB. Opportunity to create a tourist destination.	**Cycle and pedestrian environment, including crossings, would be greatly improved.** **Opportunity to create a tourist destination.**
Employment, Cultural Heritage, Existing Buildings	No change.	**No noticeable change.**	No noticeable change.	No noticeable change.	**No noticeable change.**
Noise and Vibration	No change.	**No noticeable change.**	No noticeable change.	No noticeable change.	**Significantly Improved.**
Technical Feasibility and Cost	No change.	**Feasible.** **Cost is moderate in comparison to other alternatives.**	Feasible. Cost is moderate in comparison to other alternatives.	Feasible. May be more expensive in comparison to other alternatives because of grade separation.	**Feasible.** **May be more expensive in comparison to other alternatives because lost traffic capacity would have to be added somewhere else.**
Transportation					
Road and Pedestrian Safety	No change.	**No material change.**	No material change.	Pedestrian safety improved at grade separated intersections. Road Safety – No material change.	**Safer for pedestrians due to slower speed of traffic and reduced crossing width.**
Pedestrian / Cycling / Transit	No change.	**Transit can be accommodated.**	Transit can be accommodated.	Transit can be accommodated.	**Transit can be accommodated.** **Much improved cycling and pedestrian environment.**
Network Efficiency (e.g., Travel Demand and Delay)	No change.	**No noticeable change.**	No noticeable change.	Increased capacity (through unimpeded traffic at Parkdale Drive).	**Less capacity on LSB. Potential improvements to mitigate capacity deficiency include pedestrian / cyclist / transit improvements and / or increased capacity on Gardiner Expressway (i.e. more lanes).**
Future Capacity (i.e., Utility and Function of LSB)	No change.	**Utility and function** are **maintained.**	Utility and function are maintained.	Utility and function are maintained.	**Capacity is reduced.**
RECOMMENDED SOLUTION	Not Preferred ✘	**Preferred** ✓	Not Preferred ✘	Not Preferred ✘	**Preferred** ✓

	North/South Connections			
	1. Status quo	2. Close Dowling and Colborne Lodge	3. Improve existing connections	4. Build new bridges
Natural Environment				
Terrestrial Habitat	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	**Land bridges provide the greatest potential for wildlife movement, including insects, birds, mammals and amphibians.**
Aquatic Habitat, Shoreline	No change.	**Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline.**	**Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline.**	**Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline.**
Air Quality, SWM, Soils and Groundwater	No change.	**No noticeable change.**	**No noticeable change.**	**No noticeable change.**
Social, Cultural and Economic				
Recreation and Tourism	No change.	**All alternatives would improve north-south connections relative to the status quo.**	**All alternatives would improve north-south connections relative to the status quo.**	**All alternatives would improve north-south connections relative to the status quo, however new bridges would maximize these opportunities.**
Employment, Cultural Heritage, Existing Buildings	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	**No change.**
Noise and Vibration	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	**No change.**
Technical Feasibility and Cost	No change.	**Feasible, especially in the short term.** **Minor costs as compared to Alternative #3 and #4.**	**Feasible, especially in the longer term.** **Moderate costs as compared to Alternative #4.**	**Feasible, especially in the longer term.** **Most expensive alternative.**
Transportation				
Road and Pedestrian Safety	No change.	**Improved safety for pedestrians at Dowling, because of the removal of vehicular traffic and installation of signal, and at Colborne Lodge Drive because of the removal of vehicular traffic.** **Road Safety - No noticeable change.**	**Improved safety for pedestrians because of improvement to intersections / signals, etc..** **Road Safety - No noticeable change.**	**Improved safety for pedestrians because of increased connections and less conflict points with vehicles.** **Road Safety - No noticeable change.**
Pedestrian / Cycling / Transit	No change.	**Improved cycling and pedestrian connections to waterfront.** **Transit connection opportunities.**	**Improved cycling and pedestrian connections to waterfront.** **Transit - No material change.**	**Improved cycling and pedestrian connections to waterfront.** **Transit - No material change.**
Network Efficiency (e.g., Travel Demand and Delay)	No change.	**Overall network efficiency will not be affected.** **Slight increase in delay for existing Dowling / Colborne Lodge Drive users.**	**No change.**	**No change.**
Future Capacity (i.e., Utility and Function of LSB)	No change.	**Utlility and function are maintained.**	**Utlility and function are maintained.**	**Utlility and function are maintained.**
RECOMMENDED SOLUTION	Not Preferred ✘	**Preferred** ✓	**Preferred** ✓	**Preferred** ✓

	MGT + Boardwalk			
	1. Status quo	2. Consolidated MGT + Boardwalk along water	**3. MGT south of LSB with Boardwalk along water**	4. MGT north of LSB with Boardwalk along water
Natural Environment				
Terrestrial Habitat	No change.	Parkland will not be as fragmented.	**Same as status quo. Parkland will be fragmented.**	Parkland will not be as fragmented.
Aquatic Habitat, Shoreline	No change.	Assumed there is no or minor change to shoreline.	**Assumed there is no or minor change to shoreline.**	Assumed there is no or minor change to shoreline.
Air Quality, SWM, Soils and Groundwater	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Social, Cultural and Economic				
Recreation and Tourism	No change.	Recreational opportunities would be improved.	**Recreational opportunities would be improved.**	Recreational opportunities would be improved.
Employment, Cultural Heritage, Existing Buildings	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Noise and Vibration	No change.	Increased distance between LSB and paths results in slightly less noise and vibration for MGT and Boardwalk users.	**Slightly less noise and vibration for Boardwalk users. No material change for MGT users.**	Increased noise for MGT users because of proximity to roadway (LSB and Gardiner Expressway).
Technical Feasibility and Cost	No change.	All alternatives are equally feasible and have comparable costs.	**All alternatives are equally feasible and have comparable costs.**	All alternatives are equally feasible and have comparable costs.
Transportation				
Road and Pedestrian Safety	No change.	Pedestrian safety is affected due to consolidation of high speed (cyclists) and low speed (walkers). Road Safety – No change.	**Pedestrian safety increased due to separation of Boardwalk and MGT.** **Road Safety – No change**	Pedestrian safety increased due to separation of Boardwalk and MGT. Road Safety - No noticeable change.
Pedestrian / Cycling / Transit	No change.	Slightly improved, but not a significant change.	**Slightly improved, but not a significant change.**	May be more appealing to commuter cyclists.
Network Efficiency (e.g., Travel Demand and Delay)	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	Slightly longer delays for vehicles due to increased N-S pedestrian activity.
Future Capacity (i.e., Utility and Function of LSB)	No change.	Utility and function are maintained.	**Utility and function are maintained.**	Utility and function are maintained.
RECOMMENDED SOLUTION	Not Preferred ✘	Not Preferred ✘	**Preferred** ✓	Not Preferred ✘

	Parking			
	1. Status quo	**2. Consolidated lots south of LSB**	**3. Consolidated lots north of LSB**	4. Consolidated lots with on-street parking at non-peak times.
Natural Environment				
Terrestrial Habitat	No change.	**No change.**	**Less fragmentation of parkland provides potential for ecological community creation.**	Less fragmentation of parkland provides potential for ecological community creation.
Aquatic Habitat, Shoreline	No change.	**Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline.**	**Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline.**	Assumed there is no resulting change to shoreline, due to distance of road works from shoreline.
Air Quality, SWM, Soils and Groundwater	No change.	**Need to consider the runoff from proposed parking facilities regardless of location (i.e., permeable paving, rain gardens, SWM ponds).**	**Need to consider the runoff from proposed parking facilities regardless of location (i.e., permeable paving, rain gardens, SWM ponds).**	Need to consider the runoff from proposed parking facilities regardless of location (i.e., permeable paving, rain gardens, SWM ponds).
Social, Cultural and Economic				
Recreation and Tourism	No change.	**Vehicular access will continue to be important but the location and configuration of the lots would not have a major impact on recreational use.**	**Vehicular access will continue to be important but the location and configuration of the lots would not have a major impact on recreational use. Parkland south of LSB would be freed up for recreational activity.**	Vehicular access will continue to be important but the location of the lots would not have a major impact on recreational use. Parkland south of LSB would be freed up for recreational activity.
Employment, Cultural Heritage, Existing Buildings	No change.	**No change. Existing private buildings will continue to have parking.**	**No change. Existing private buildings will continue to have parking.**	No change. Existing private buildings will continue to have parking.
Noise and Vibration	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.
Technical Feasibility and Cost	No change.	**Feasible.** **Costs would be associated with relocation of lots and would be similar to other alternatives.**	**Feasible.** **Cost is expensive compared to other alternatives.**	Feasible. Costs would be associated with relocation of lots. May be less expensive than Alternative #2 and #3 because it would be part of road development / reconstruction.
Transportation				
Road and Pedestrian Safety	No change.	**Safer for pedestrians due to fewer crossing points of E-W transportation infrastructure.** **Road Safety – No noticeable change.**	**Not as safe for pedestrians due to required crossing of E-W transportation infrastructure.** **Provided that vehicle sightlines are acceptable, there should be no noticeable change for road safety.**	Pedestrian and road safety is decreased.
Pedestrian / Cycling / Transit	No change.	**Existing parking capacity maintained.** **No influence on transit, cycling.**	**Existing parking capacity maintained.** **No influence on transit, cycling.**	Existing parking capacity maintained. No influence on transit, cycling.
Network Efficiency (e.g., Travel Demand and Delay)	No change.	**Improved way finding.**	**Improved way finding.**	Improved way finding. Overall network efficiency may decrease during off-peak times.
Future Capacity (i.e., Utility and Function of LSB)	No change.	**Utility and function are maintained.**	**Utility and function are maintained.**	Utility and function are likely decreased.
RECOMMENDED SOLUTION	Not Preferred ✘	**Not Preferred** ✘	**Preferred** ✓	Not Preferred ✘

Evaluation of Alternatives: Shoreline Protection

	Good/Preferred – A solution that has a positive impact in regard to the evaluation criteria
	Moderate - solution that has a moderate impact in regard to the evaluation criteria.
	Poor - A solution that has a negative impact in regard to the evaluation criteria
	No change to or effect on existing.

	Shoreline Protection				
	1. Status quo	**2. Reconstructed breakwater**	**3. Beach nourishment**	4. Extended watercourse to 1300m, reconstructed breakwater to Sunnyside, dynamic beaches west of Sunnyside	5. Extended watercourse to 2300m, dynamic beaches west of Sunnyside
Natural Environment					
Terrestrial Habitat	No change.	**No change.**	**Vegetation compensation may be required.** **The terrestrial species diversity may be reduced as a result of this alternative because of beach nourishment.**	No change.	No change.
Aquatic Habitat, Shoreline	No change.	**Gaps in breakwater allows scarification** **Varying sand with cobble/boulder provides good fish habitat.** **Enhancement of fish habitat along breakwater would be beneficial in this option.** **Water quality issues associated with the breakwater** **During construction, there would be some impacts on water quality, however silt curtains could be used to mitigate impacts.** **Minor erosion at present, maintains existing level of protection.**	**Would reduce fish habitat slightly** **It is assumed that beach nourishment extends inland, not into water, however run-off may occur. Use silt curtain during construction.** **Beach provides some improvement to minor erosion.**	Fish habitat could be created with the groins, utilizing cobbles and boulders Extended watercourse (this replaces existing breakwater). Water quality at east end of site, where watercourse extension would be, is better than at west end of site near Humber River, impact of watercourse on water quality therefore less significant. Also, watercourse is not overtopped, does not have gaps to allow plume in, however still porous. Extended watercourse also provides high level of shore protection and flat water, and minimizes erosion. Retained beach at west end – improved shoreline quality, improved shore protection, provides dynamic beach that responds to waves.	Fish habitat could be created with the groins, utilizing cobbles and boulders Extended watercourse (this replaces existing breakwater). Water quality at east end of site, where watercourse extension would be, is better than at west end of site near Humber River, impact of watercourse on water quality therefore less significant. Also, watercourse is not overtopped, does not have gaps to allow plume in, however still porous. Extended watercourse also provides high level of shore protection and flat water, and minimizes erosion. Retained beach at west end – improved shoreline quality, improved shore protection, provides dynamic beach that responds to waves.
Air Quality, SWM, Soils and Groundwater	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	No change.
Social, Cultural and Economic					
Recreation and Tourism	No change.	**All alternatives are an improvement over the status quo in terms of beach quality and areas available for water based recreation.**	**All alternatives are an improvement over the status quo in terms of beach quality and areas available for water based recreation.**	All alternatives are an improvement over the status quo in terms of beach quality and areas available for water based recreation. Recreation would be improved because of extended watercourse.	All alternatives are an improvement over the status quo in terms of beach quality and areas available for water based recreation. This alternative may maximize these opportunities because of extended watercourse.
Employment, Cultural Heritage, Existing Buildings	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	Extended watercourse could attract competitions which would positively impact business in the area and in the City.
Noise and Vibration	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	No change.

	Shoreline Protection				
	1. Status quo	**2. Reconstructed breakwater**	**3. Beach nourishment**	4. Extended watercourse to 1300m, reconstructed breakwater to Sunnyside, dynamic beaches west of Sunnyside	5. Extended watercourse to 2300m, dynamic beaches west of Sunnyside
Technical Feasibility and Cost	No change. However, as breakwall deteriorates, some work will be required to remove breakwall, address safety and navigation issues, as the breakwall deteriorates. No short term costs associated with this alternative. Will likely need to be reconstructed in the next few years.	**Feasible to construct.** **More affordable of all alternatives.**	**Feasible to construct.** **Assume $20-$30 per tonne placed depending on material (sand or pea gravel).**	Feasible to construct. Very expensive alternative.	Feasible to construct. Very expensive alternative.
Transportation					
Road and Pedestrian Safety	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	No change.
Pedestrian / Cyclist / Transit	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	No change.
Network Efficiency (e.g., Travel Demand and Delay)	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	No change.
Future Capacity (i.e., Allows for Growth, Improves Service Levels)	No change.	**Allows for future recreational capacity.**	**Allows for future recreational capacity**	Allows for future recreational capacity	Allows for future recreational capacity
RECOMMENDED SOLUTION	Not Preferred ✘	**Preferred** ✓	**Preferred** ✓	Not Preferred ✘	Not Preferred ✘

	Water Quality				
	1. Status quo	**2. Beach curtain**	**3. Waterfront curtain**	4. Deflector arm	**5. Deflector islands**
Natural Environment					
Terrestrial Habitat	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	**Potential to create new terrestrial habitat.**
Aquatic Habitat, Shoreline	No change.	**Will improve over status quo.** **Water quality issues not actually addressed but allows more swimming in a localized area** **Maintains existing level of shoreline protection, replaces deteriorating structures.**	**Will improve over status quo.** **Water quality issues not actually addressed but allows more swimming over a larger area.** **Maintains existing level of shoreline protection, replaces deteriorating structures.**	Will improve over status quo. Water quality issues not actually addressed but allows more swimming over a larger area. Provides some level of protection for waves from west, southwest.	**Will improve over status quo.** **Will likely provide additional aquatic habitat opportunities.** **Water quality issues not actually addressed but allows more swimming over a larger area, provided it is designed to ensure plume does not penetrate islands and reach shore.** **Provides some level of protection for waves from west, southwest..**
Air Quality, SWM, Soils and Groundwater	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	**No change however, could allow for additional SWM facilities**
Social, Cultural and Economic					
Recreation and Tourism	No change.	**All alternatives are an improvement over the status quo.**	**All alternatives are an improvement over the status quo.**	All alternatives are an improvement over the status quo.	**All alternatives are an improvement over the status quo. This alternative, however, has the added potential to create new parkland for recreational use.**
Employment, Cultural Heritage, Existing Buildings	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	**No change.**
Noise and Vibration	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	**No change.**
Technical Feasibility and Cost	No change. If breakwall to deteriorates, some work will be required to remove breakwall, address safety and navigation issues, as the breakwall deteriorates. No short term cost.	**Feasible to construct but some issues to resolve through design.** **Less expensive than Alternatives 3, 4 and 5.**	**Feasible to construct but some issues to resolve through design. Could be combined with breakwater reconstruction.** **Less expensive than Alternative 4 and 5.**	Feasible to construct but there is a large amount of armourstone and fill required. It must have non-porous core which requires significant additional work for design. Shoreline still requires protection. Significantly more expensive than Alternative 2 and 3.	**Feasible to construct but large amount of fill required. Significant additional work required for island design so that plume cannot penetrate gaps (i.e. sills between islands).** **Shoreline still requires protection.** **Most expensive alternative.**
Transportation					
Road and Pedestrian Safety	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	**No change.**
Pedestrian / Cyclist / Transit	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	**Additional pedestrian infrastructure possible.**
Network Efficiency (e.g., Travel Demand and Delay)	No change.	**No change.**	**No change.**	No change.	**No change.**
Future Capacity (i.e., Allows for Growth, Improves Service Levels)	Does not improve the existing situation.	**Allows for future beach use.**	**Allows for future beach use.**	Allows for future beach use.	**Allows for future beach use – and parkland use.**
RECOMMENDED SOLUTION	Not Preferred ✘	**Preferred** ✓	**Preferred** ✓	Not Preferred ✘	**Preferred** ✓

Evaluation of Alternatives: Servicing and Stormwater Management

	Good/Preferred – A solution that has a positive impact in regard to the evaluation criteria
	Moderate - solution that has a moderate impact in regard to the evaluation criteria.
	Poor - A solution that has a negative impact in regard to the evaluation criteria
	No change to or effect on existing.

	Stormwater Management				
	1. Status quo	2. Reconstruct/rehabilitate/adapt existing storm sewers/SWM ponds	3. Construct new storm sewers/SWM ponds to service new development	**4. Install enhanced stormwater treatment using non-mechanical systems (i.e., oil and grit separators)**	5. Install enhanced stormwater treatment using mechanical systems (i.e., ultra violet disinfection facilities)
Natural Environment					
Terrestrial Habitat	No change. Provides vegetative/community diversity and wildlife habitat.	No change to status quo, other than the adaptability to a preferred design option.	Provides vegetative/ community diversity and wildlife habitat.	**Provides vegetative/ community diversity and wildlife habitat**	Provides vegetative/ community diversity and wildlife habitat
Aquatic Habitat, Shoreline	No change.	Would slightly improve shoreline aquatic habitat.	Improved water quality entering Lake Ontario.	**Improved water quality entering Lake Ontario.**	Improved water quality entering Lake Ontario.
Air Quality, SWM, Soils and Groundwater	No change.	Improved SWM over current conditions but no expansion.	Improved SWM over current conditions. Increased capacity for water infiltration	**Improved SWM over current conditions.**	Improved SWM over current conditions.
Social, Cultural and Economic					
Recreation and Tourism	No change.	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Employment, Cultural Heritage, Existing Buildings	No change.	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Noise and Vibration	No change.	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Technical Feasibility and Cost	No change	Feasible – minor improvements. Lowest cost.	Feasible – especially if other construction projects are occurring on site. Moderate Cost.	**Feasible.** **More expensive.**	Feasible. Most expensive.
Transportation					
Road and Pedestrian Safety	No change.	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Pedestrian / Cycling / Transit	No change.	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Network Efficiency (e.g., Travel Demand and Delay)	No change.	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Future Capacity (i.e., Allows for Growth, Improves Service Levels)	No change. May not meet future needs	Can meet the needs of the short term future.	Can meet the needs of future developments (longer term needs are met).	**Can meet the needs of long term development / SWM requirements in the area.**	Can meet the needs of long term development / SWM requirements in the area.
RECOMMENDED SOLUTION	Not Preferred ✖	Not Preferred ✖	Not Preferred ✖	**Preferred** ✓	Not Preferred ✖

	Servicing (Water)			
	1. Status quo (depending on capacity review of proposed initiatives)	2. Rehabilitate existing water facilities (no expansion)	**3. Reconstruct and enlarge existing water facilities to create additional capacity**	4. Construct new water facilities (extend existing facilities)
Natural Environment				
Terrestrial Habitat	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Aquatic Habitat, Shoreline	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Air Quality, SWM, Soils and Groundwater	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Social, Cultural and Economic				
Recreation and Tourism	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Employment, Cultural Heritage, Existing Buildings	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Noise and Vibration	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Technical Feasibility and Cost	No change.	Feasible Dependent on servicing requirements. Least expensive.	**Feasible** **Dependent on servicing requirements.** **Moderately expensive.**	Feasible Dependent on servicing requirements. Most expensive.
Transportation				
Road and Pedestrian Safety	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Pedestrian / Cycling / Transit	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Network Efficiency (e.g., Travel Demand and Delay)	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.
Future Capacity (i.e., Allows for Growth, Improves Service Levels)	No change to existing. May not meet future needs.	Can meet the needs of the short term future.	**Will meet the needs of future developments (longer term needs are met).**	Will meet the needs of long term development / water requirements in the area.
RECOMMENDED SOLUTION	Not Preferred ✖	Not Preferred ✖	**Preferred** ✓	Not Preferred ✖

	Servicing (Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers)				
	1. Status quo	2. Rehabilitate existing services (no expansion)	**3. Implement alternative sanitary facilities that conform to green design practices**	4. Connect some facilities without expansion of existing services (i.e., 'beachside' City of Toronto-run facilities)	5. Construct new sanitary sewers to expand existing service (connect all buildings)
Natural Environment					
Terrestrial Habitat	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.	No change.
Aquatic Habitat, Shoreline	No change.	If sewers are combined, then impacts to aquatic habitat and water quality could occur during large rain events. To eliminate combined sewers, some expansion of existing sanitary facilities will be required.	**No change.**	No change.	No change. New sanitary sewers would not be combined.
Air Quality, SWM, Soils and Groundwater	No change.	No change.	**Additional SWM may be required.**	Additional SWM may be required.	Additional SWM may be required.
Social, Cultural and Economic					
Recreation and Tourism	No change.	Does not improve water quality or improve potential swimability in this area because combined sewers remain in use.	**No change.**	No change.	No change
Employment, Cultural Heritage, Existing Buildings	No change.	No change	**No change.**	No change.	No change
Noise and Vibration	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.	No change.
Technical Feasibility and Cost	No change. No cost, however, costs may be incurred in the future.	Least expensive.	**Moderately expensive.**	Moderately expensive	Most expensive
Transportation					
Road and Pedestrian Safety	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.	No change.
Pedestrian / Cycling / Transit	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.	No change.
Network Efficiency (e.g., Travel Demand and Delay)	No change.	No change.	**No change.**	No change.	No change.
Future Capacity (i.e., Allows for Growth, Improves Service Levels)	No change.	Rehabilitation would provide equal capacity as the status quo.	**This could be expanded in the future.**	This could be expanded in the future.	Provides the most flexibility for future growth.
RECOMMENDED SOLUTION	Not Preferred ✘	Not Preferred ✘	**Preferred** ✓	Not Preferred ✘	Not Preferred ✘