yongeTOmorrow Environmental Study Report October 2021

Appendix I – yongeTOmorrow Detailed Evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts



City of Toronto

				DE	TAILED DESIGN EVA	LUATION				DO NOT Future baseline (or exis unavaila	ting situation where		ALTERNATIV Most Pe	E DESIGN CO edestrian Pri					ALTERNA Pedestrian Prior	TIVE DESIGN ty with Two					Ped	ALTERNATIV estrian Priority with On				cks	
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID INI	DICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR OUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do	ative to Score oncepts Conce			Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do Re	Relative to S Concepts C	Score vs Crite Concepts Sumr	
			M1.1 along Yong	clearway area e St between and Queen St	Quantitative	square metres	Larger values preferred	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	Day/No Programming: 9,375 m ² Night/Active Programming: 9,375 m ²	High pedestrian volumes lead to crowding.	Day/No Programming: 18,205 m ² + 9% relative to Do Nothing Night/Active Programming: 13,060 m ² + 39% relative to Do Nothing	Greatest increase in pedestrian clearway space.	-		•••		Day/No Programming: 16,555 m ² + 77% relative to Do Nothing Night/Active Programming: 12,795 m + 36% relative to Do Nothing	increased in pedestrian clearway space.	÷		••0			Day/No Programming: 15,775 m ² + 68% relative to Do Nothing Night/Active Programming: 11,970 m ² + 28% relative to Do Nothing	Increased in pedestrian clearway space. Reduced relative to Concept 4B due to presence of segregated cycle tracks north of Gerrard St.	+		•00		
М1	Pedestrian Movement	Provides the opportunity to significantly improve pedestrian movement by adding space for movement both along and across Yonge Street to street to growing growing	each categ Pedestrian (PCL) along between C M1.2 Queen St. Note: relat Comfort Le	ollege St and ive Pedestrian vel categories on Transport for	Quantitative	metres	Larger values preferred in the following order: 1) Comfortable 2) Acceptable 3) At Risk 4) Unacceptable		Proposed Design	Comfortable: 0 m Acceptable: 236 m At Risk: 346 m Unacceptable: 1,292 m College to Gerrard W - Acceptable E - Unacceptable E - At Risk Walton to Elm W - Unacceptable E - At Risk Elm to Gould W - Unacceptable E - At Risk Elm to Gould W - Unacceptable E - At Risk Edward to Dundas E - At Risk Edward to Dundas W - Unacceptable E - Unacceptable E - Unacceptable Dundas to Dundas W - Unacceptable E - Unacceptable Dundas to Dundas Sturter Dundas St W - Unacceptable E - At Sisk E - A Risk Edward to Dundas Sturter Dundas St W - Unacceptable E - At Sisk Shuter to Queen W - Unacceptable E - At Sisk	Narrow sidewalks fail to comfortably accommodate high volumes of pedestrians along the length of the corridor.	Comfortable: 444 m Acceptable: 624 m At Risk: 403 m Unacceptable: 403 m College to Gerard V - Comfortable E - Acceptable Gerard to Walton W/E - Acceptable (pedestrian priority zone) Elm to Gould VW - Inacceptable E - At Risk Gould to Gdward W/E - Acceptable (pedestrian priority zone) Edward to Dundas W/E - Acceptable (pedestrian priority zone) Edward to Dundas W/E - Acceptable (ped strian priority zone) Dundas to Shutter W - Unacceptable (ped strian priority zone) Dundas to Shutter W - Unacceptable E - At Risk Shutter to Queen W - At Risk E - Unacceptable	Greatest improvement in pedestrian comfort along the corridor. Comfortable: + 444m Acceptable: + 388m At Risk: + 57m Unacceptable: -889m	•	•	••••	and improv that contrib positive s experience planting,	trian Edward to Lundas son W/E - Comfortable gide (predestrian priority sone) which (W/E - Acceptable Undas Sq to Shuter Undas Sq to Shuter Shuter to Queen W - Ar Risk Shuter to Queen W - Ar Risk	Improved pedestrian comfort along the corrido Comfortable: + 453m Acceptable: + 302m 4. Risk: + 57m Unacceptable: -812m	*	+	••0	•00	Concept 4B has two pedestrian priority zone: and is serviced by two- way driving access and the most curbside activity areas. This provides the least support for walking and improvements that contribute to a positive street experience.	Comfortable: 217 m Acceptable: 538 m At Risk 639 m Unacceptable: 480 m College to Gerrard: W - Acceptable E - At Risk Gerrard to Walton W - Unacceptable E - Comfortable Walton to Elm Wy(E - Acceptable E - At Risk Gould to Edvard W - Unacceptable E - At Risk Comfortable Edward to Dundas W/E - Acceptable Edward to Dundas W/E - Acceptable (pedestrian priority zone) Dundas to Dundas Sq W/E - Acceptable E - At Risk Shuter to Queen W - At Risk E - Unacceptable	Improved pedestrian comfort along the corridor Comfortable: + 217m Acceptable: + 202m A tisk: + 232m Unacceptable: -812m Reduced pedestrian comfort level relative to Concept 48 due to presence of separated ocycle tracks north of Gerrard St.	+	•	•00	Concept 4 pedestriar zones serviced way drivi and fewer activity an provide traffic volu good sup walkin provide traffic volu good sup walkin provide traffic volu good sup walkin provide traffic volu good sup walkin positive experi Pedestriar	In priority and is I by one- ng access r curbside reas. This is lower umes and pport for ng and neents that ute to a e street ience. n comfort
		pedestrian volumes.	M1.3 to pedestri one-way tr way traffic	idewalk adjacent an priority area; affic; and two- along Yonge St ollege St and	Quantitative	metres	Larger values preferred in the following order: 1) Pedestrian priority areas 2) one-way traffic 3) two-way traffic	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	Day Pedestrian priority: 0 m One-way traffic: 0 m Two-way traffic: 1874 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	All sidewalks adjacent to wo-way traffic (curbs only).	Day Pedestrian priority: 596 m One-way traffic: 348 m Two-way traffic: 930 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	30% adjacent to pedestrian priority (biggest gain); 20% adjacent to one-way traffic; 50% remains adjacent to two-way traffic.	+			seating, program		24% adjacent to pedestria priority; 19% adjacent to one-way 58% remains adjacent to two-way traffic (least improved).	n +		•00			Day Pedestrian priority: 442 m One-way traffic: 616 m Two-way traffic: 816 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	24% adjacent to pedestriar priority; 33% adjacent to one-way traffic (biggest gain); 44% remains adjacent to two-way traffic (lowest exposure).	+		••0	is reduced to Conc north of G due to inc separate trac	cept 4B Gerrard St clusion of ed cycle
			M1.4 blocks with priority are traffic and along Yong	pedestrians in , pedestrian a; one-way a; one-way the wor-way traffic e S to between S to between S to due on S t	Quantitative	pedestrians	Larger values preferred in the following order: 1) Pedestrian priority areas 2) one-way traffic 3) two-way traffic		Proposed Design	Pedestrian priority: 0 pedestrians/hr One-way traffic: 0 pedestrians/hr Two-way traffic: 103,470 pedestrians/hr	All pedestrian flows adjacent to two-way traffic.	Pedestrian priority: 65,942 pedestrians/hr One-way traffic: 7,665 pedestrians/hr Two-way traffic: 29,863 pedestrians/hr	Vast majority of pedestrian flows accommodated within pedestrian priority zones. Higher flows adjacent to two-way traffic relative to Concept 4C due to differences in local access arrangements between Elm and Edward.	•		••••		Pedestrian priority: 42,038 pedestrians/hr One-way traffic: 7,665 pedestrians/hr Two-way traffic: 53,767 pedestrians/hr	Majority of pedestrian flows remain adjacent to two-way traffic.	•		•00			Pedestrian priority: 42,038 pedestrians/hr One-way traffic: 45,613 pedestrians/hr Two-way traffic: 15,819 pedestrians/hr	Majority of pedestrian flows accommodated within pedestrian priority zones and in sections adjacent to I-way traffic. Lowest volume of pedestrian flows adjacent to two-way traffic of the three concepts.	+		••0		

				DET	AILED DESIGN EVA	LUATION				DO NOT Future baseline (or exis unavaila	ting situation where		ALTERNATIVE Most Pe	DESIGN CC						ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priorit						Pec	ALTERNATIV estrian Priority with On				ks
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID INDICA	ATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to S Concepts Co	Score vs Soncepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	telative to S Concepts C	core vs Criteria oncepts Summary
			Number of con pedestrian cros M1.5 (signalised/PO) Yonge St betwe St and Queen S	ssings X) across een College	Quantitative	number	Larger values preferred; unless need for crossing eliminated (e.g. becomes pedestrian priority area)		Proposed Design	Total: 11 1 College/Carlton 2 Gerrard 2 Gould 2 Dundas 1 Eaton Centre 2 Shuter 1 Queen	No crossing at McGill / College Park desire line.	TOTAL: 10 1 College/Carlton 1 McGill 2 Gerrard 0 Gould 2 Dundas 1 Eaton Centre 2 Shuter 1 Queen	New crossing at McGill (all concepts); Crossings at Gould becomes unsignalized. Greatest improvement relative to Do Nothing.	+					Total: 12 1 College/Carlton 1 McGill 2 Gerard 2 Gould 2 Dundas 1 Eaton Centre 2 Shuter 1 Queen	New crossing at McGill (all concepts). Improved relative to Do Nothing.	·		•••			TOTAL: 12 1 College/Carlton 1 McGill 2 Gerard 2 Gould 2 Dundas 1 Eaton Centre 2 Shuter 1 Queen	New crossing at McGill (all concepts). Improved relative to Do Nothing.	+		••••	
			Maximum dista between succe pedestrian cros Yonge St	essive	Quantitative	metres	Smaller values preferred		Proposed Design	235m College to Gerrard	Maximum distance betwe	165m Shuter to Queen	Maximum space between crossings reduced by 30%. Same for all alternatives.	•					165m Shuter to Queen	Maximum space between crossings reduced by 30%. Same for all alternatives.	+		•••			165m Shuter to Queen	Maximum space between crossings reduced by 30%. Same for all alternatives.	·		••••	
М1	Pedestrian Movement	Provides the opportunity to significantly improve pedestrian movement by adding space for movement both along and across Yonge Street to accommodate	Crossing distan pedestrian cros Yonge St betwe St and Queen S	ssing across een College	Quantitative	metres	Smaller values preferred		Proposed Design	College/Carlton S: 15.5 m McGill V: 15.8 m; S: 13.4 m Gould N: 13.7 m; S: 13.1 m Dundas N: 12.9 m; S: 13.2 m Eaton Centre M: 12.8 m; S: 13.0 m Queen N: 13.8 m; S: 13.0 m	Average crossing distance of 14 m.	College/Carlton S: 8.5 m McGill M: 6.6 m Gerrard N: 6.8 m; S: 6.8 m Gould - Dundas - Dundas - Dundas - Dundas - Dundas - Dundas - Dundas - S: 6.6 m; S: 6.6 m; S: 6.6 m; S: 6.6 m; S: 6.6 m; S: 6.7 m Shuter N: 6.7 m; S: 7.1 m Queen N: 6.7 m; S: 7.1 m Super- - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Average crossing distance of 6.9 m; -51% relative to Do Nothing. Greatest improvement.	+	÷		a ••••	Concept 4A has th most pedestrian priority zones and fewer curbside ctrivity areas while allows it to provid the most space to support walking and improvement hat contribute to positive street experience such a planting, cafés,	College/Carlton S: 8.5 m McGill M: 6.6 m Gerard N: 10.2 m; S: 8.3 m Gould N: 7.4 m; S: 6.6 m Durdas R: 6.6 m; S: 6.6 m Eaton Centre M: 6.7 m Shuter N: 6.7 m; S: 7.1 m Queen N: 9.8 m	Average crossing distance of 7.6 m; -46% relative to Do Nothing.	+	+	••0	•00	improvements that	College/Carlton 5:12.3 m McGill M:11.6 m Gerard N:11.9 m; 5:6.8 m Gould N:7.4 m; 5:6.6 m Dundas N:6.6 m; 5:6.6 m Eaton Centre M:6.7 m Shuter N:6.9 m; 5:7.1 m Queen N:6.7 m	Average crossing distance of 8.1 m; -42% relative to Do Nothing. Wider crossings north of Gould due to cycling facilities (relative to Concepts A + C)	÷		•00	 Concept 4C has two pedestrian priority zones and is serviced by one-way driving access and fewer curbside activity areas. This provides lower traffic volumes and good support for walking and improvements that contribute to a positive street experience. Pedestrian comfort
		growing pedestrian volumes.	Alignment of m M1.8 pedestrian cros Yonge St with c	ssings across	Qualitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		Proposed Design	Medium	No mid-block crossing at College Park - McGill Street desire line, however other desire lines served by existing crossings	High	New mid-block crossing at McGill/College Park addresses unmet desire line (same for all concepts).	+		••••		seating, and programming	High	New mid-block crossing at McGill/College Park addresses unmet desire line (same for all concepts)	+		•••			High	New mid-block crossing at McGill/College Park addresses unmet desire line (same for all concepts).	+		••••	is reduced relative to Concept 4B north of Gerrard St due to inclusion of separated cycle tracks.
			Number of turr movements pe across each pe crossing at sign intersections	ermitted destrian	Quantitative	number	Smaller values preferred		Proposed Design	College/Carlton 4: NBR, EBR, SBR, WBR Gould 4: NBR, SBL, SBR, WBR Gould 4: NBR, SBL, WBL, WBR Dundas turns not permitted Shuter 4: NBR, SBL, WBL, WBR Queen turns not permitted	17 movements permitted across signalized pedestrian crossings. Restrictions at Dundas and Queen	College/Carlton 4: NBR, EBR, SBR, WBR Gerrard Distance Gould Dundas turns not permitted Shuter 2: NBR, WBR Queen turns not permitted	9 movements permitted across signalized pedestrian crossings. Greatest improvement (approx. haf eliminated) relative to Do Nothing. Potential for conflicts reduced at Cerrard, Gould, and Shuter	•					College/Carlton 4: NBR, EBR, SBR, WBR Gerrard 6: NBL, NBR, EBR, SBL, SBR, WBR Gould not signalized Dundas turns not permitted Shuter S: NBL, NBR, EBR, WBL, WBR Queen turns not permitted	15 movements permitted across signalized pedestrian crossings. Number of conflicting vehicle movements reduced at Gould. Additional movements permitted at Gerard and Shuter relative to Do Nothing.	÷		● 00			College/Carlton 4: NBR, EBR, SBR, WBR Gerrard 4: NBL, NBR, SBL, WBR Gould 1: WBL Dundas turns not permitted Shuter 4: NBL, NBR, EBR, WBR Queen turns not permitted	13 movements permitted across signalized pedestrian crossings. Number of conflicting vehicle movements reduced at Gerard and (most significantiy) at Gould.	÷		•••	

				D	ETAILED DESIGN EV	LUATION				DO NOTI Future baseline (or exist unavaila	ting situation where		ALTERNATIVI Most Pe	E DESIGN CO edestrian Pri					ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priorit						Ped	ALTERNATI\ estrian Priority with O			Cycle Tracks	
ID CRIT	ERIA DESC	CRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	, DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	ve to Score vs epts Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do R	elative to Score vs Concepts Concepts	Criteria Summary
M1 Pede Move	oppo sign im pec addi for m both acro: Str accor gr gro	vides the prtunity to inficantly prove destrian ement by ing space novement along and ss Yonge reet to mmodate rowing destrian plumes.	M1.10a	Motorized traffic flows making turning movement: acrossing at signalized intersections: AM Peak Motorized traffic flows making turning movement: across each pedestrian rorssing at signalized intersections: PM Peak	Both Both	vehicles (48) / relative level (4A, 4C) vehicles (48) / relative level (4A, 4C)	preferred	AM Peak PM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design Aimsun / Proposed Design	TOTAL: 802 vehicles College/Cariton: 120 vehicles NBR: 6, EBR: 2, SBR: 32, WBR: 90 Geraral: 902 vehicles I19, WBR: 21, BBR: 45, SBR: 64, SBL: 53, SBR: 119, WBR: 21 Gould: 80 vehicles NBR: 24, SBL: 14, WBL: 17, WBR: 28 Dunds: 0 Uurns not permitted Shuter: 300 vehicles NBR: 147, SBL: 48, WBL: 63, WBR: 42 Queen: 0 Uurns not permitted TOTAL: 760 vehicles NBR: 9, EBR: 14, SBR: 24, SBR: 35, SBR: 9, WBR: 10 Gould: 93 vehicles NBR: 9, SBL: 7, WBL: 33, WBR: 44, Dunds: 0 vehicles	Overall the number of movements across pedestrian crossings estimated for the Do Nothing scenario are relatively similar to to the alternative design concepts. However, the location of turning movements are redistributed with fewer movements anticipated at the College/Carton and more turning movements at Gerrard X3. Feative to the alternative design concepts.	At the aggregate level, the number of turning movements across predistrian crossings are anticipated to be moderately lower than the Do Nothing scenario, and lower than those estimated for Concept 4C.	Concept 4A introduces the greatest number of restrictions to permissible vehicle movements and is anticipated to result in the lowest traffic volumes along the Yonge St study area of the three alternative design concepts. The potential for conflict between turning vehicles and pedestrians is anticipated to be lower relatative to the Do Nothing scenario, and the three alternative desing concepts.	•				At the aggregate level, the number of turning movements across pedestrian crossing as an anticipated to be similar to the Do Nothing scenario, and moderately higher than those estimated for Concept 4C.	Concept 4B is most similar to the Do Nothing scenario with similar vehicle access arrangements. The potential for conflict between turning vehicles and pedestrians is anticipated to be similar to the Do Nothing scenario, and greatest overall amongst the three alternative desing concepts.	-		•00	•00		TOTAL: 725 vehicles College/Carlton: 284 vehicles NBR:0, EBR:0, 588: 163, WBR: 121 Geraraf: 91 vehicles NBL:0, NBR:0, 58L:47, WBR:44 Gould: 104 vehicles WBL:104 Dundas: 0 Shuter: 246 vehicles NBL:0, NBR:150, EBR: 96, WBR:1 Queen: 0 turns not permitted TOTAL: 809 vehicles College/Carlton: 293 vehicles NBR:0, SBR:0, SBL:36, WBR:49 Gould: 160 vehicles WBL:160 Dundas: 0 vehicles	Overall, a similar number of traffic movements are estimated across pedestrian crossing along the length of Yonge St within the study area relative, to the Do Nothin scenario. A reconfiguration of permissible vehicle movements along the corridor result in changer to traffic patterns. The most notable changes include an increase in urning movements at th intersection of Yonge St and College/Cariton, and relative decrease at Yong St and Gerrard St.		•	••••	Concept 4C has two pedestrian priority zones and is serviced by one- way driving access and fewer curbside activity areas. This provides lower traffic volumes and good support for walking and improvements that contribute to a positive street experience. Pedestrian comfort is reduced relative to Concept 4C
		-	M1.11	Level of physical separation between pedestrians and the roadway along Yonge S between College St and Queen St	n Qualitative	high / međium / low level	Preference order fo qualitative ranking 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		Proposed Design	turns not permitted Shuter: 272 vehicles NBR: 97, 58L: 114, WBL: 16, WBR: 45 Queen: 0 vehicles turns not permitted Low	Typically curbs only, providing little buffer between pedestrians and vehicle traffic along the liength of the corridor.	High	Extensive landscape buffer provision (typically 2.7m wide) reduces traffic exposure along much of corridor.	+	••	•		Medium	Landscape buffer provision (typically 2.7m wide) reduces traffic exposure along portions of the corridor relative to Do Nothing.	+		•00			tums not permitted Shuter: 271 vehicles NBL: 0, NBL: 28, BBL: 141, WBR 2 Queen: 0 vehicles tums not permitted High	Extensive landscape buffe provision (typically 2.7m wide) and cycle tracks north of Gerard reduce traffic exposure along much of corridor	+		•••	due to inclusion of separated cycle tracks.

				DE	TAILED DESIGN EVA	LUATION				DO NOT Future baseline (or exis unavail	sting situation where		ALTERNATIV Most Pe	E DESIGN CO edestrian Pr					ALTERNATI\ Pedestrian Priority						Pet	ALTERNATIVI estrian Priority with On				
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR OUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	, DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do	tive to Score v cepts Concep		Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Score vs Concepts Concepts	Criteria Summary
			M2.1	Length of Yonge St between College St and Queen St with mixed pedestrians and cyclists	Quantitative	linear length (metres)	Smaller values preferred	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	Day: 0 m Night: 0 m	No shared pedestrian/cyclist space.	Day: 290 m Gerara - Eim; Gould - Dundas; Dundas - Dundas Sq Night: 0 m	Largest pedestrian / cyclist mixing zone amongst concepts (all increased relative to Do Nothing). Potential for conflict mitigated somewhat with provision of major north- south cycling link on University Ave.	-	•	•0		Day: 205 m Walton - Elm; Edward - Dundas; Dundas - Dundas Sq Night: 0 m	New cyclist mixing zones, fragmented relative to Concept 4A (further reducing utility as cyclist through route, reducing potential for conflict with pedestrians). Potential for conflict mitigated somewhat with provision of major north- south cycling link on University Ave.	-					Day: 205 m Walton - Eim; Edward - Dundas; Dundas - Dundas Sq Night: 0 m	New cyclist mixing zones, fragmented relative to Concept A4 (further reducing utility as cyclist through route, reducing potential for conflict with pedestrians). Potential for conflict mitigated somewhat with rowision of major north- south cycling link on University Ave.				
M2	Cycling	Provides a major north- south connection through downtown and improved experience for cyclists on Yonge Street.	M2.2a J	Length of Yonge St between College St and Queen St with mixed motorised whicles (two-way) and cyclists	Quantitative	linear length (metres)	Smaller values preferred (must be consider alongside M2.2b)	daytime / night- d time	Proposed Design	Day: 935 m Night: 935 m	Entire length (no dedicated cycling facilities).	Day: 465 m Night: 935 m	Potential for conflict reduced during daytime; - 50% relative to Do Nothing. Cyclists share roadway with mixed traffic along entire length during night time periods, though streetscape changes anticipated to reduce travel speeds and potentia for conflicts.	+	•	•0	three concepts This concept provides more pedestrian prior areas of people cycling and redu traffic volumes one-way drivin access blocks, b	es n 3 it	Potential for conflict reduced during daytime;- 41% relative to Do Nothing Cyclists share roadway with mixed traffic along entrice length during night time periods, though streetszape changes anticipated to reduce travel speeds and potential for conflicts.	·	÷	•00	8 ₩ •00	Concept 4B performs poorest, and has the pratest amount of two- yard driving access that is shared with people cycling and does not include cycle tracks on Yonge St. Concept 4b outperforms to Do Nothing Scenario.	Day: 165 m Night: 700 m	Greatest potential for conflict reduction during daytime due to provision of separated cycling facilities (College/Cariton to Gerrard): 42% relative to Do Nothing. Cyclists share roadway with mixed traffic south of Gerrard St during night time periods, though streetscape changes anticipated to reduce travel speeds and potential for conflicts.	+	+		Concept 4C performs best and is the only concept that provides cycle tracks on part of Yonge St. Pedestrian priority areas and three blocks of one-way local-access segments limit traffic volumes on the corridor where cyclists share the road with vehicles, reducing the
			M2.2b	Length of Yonge St between College St and Queen St with mixed motorised weihides (one-way) and cyclists	Quantitative	linear length (metres)	Smaller values preferred (must be consider alongside M2.2a)	daytime / night- ed time	Proposed Design	Day: 0 m Night: 0 m	None	Day: 180 m Night: 0 m	Some exposure to one-way mixed traffic; Cyclists share entire length of roadway with two-way traffic during night time periods.	+ (relative to existing 2- way)	•		does not includ cycle tracks or Yonge St.	Day: 180 m Night: 0 m	Some exposure to one-way mixed traffic; Cyclists share entire length of roadway with two-way traffic during night time periods.	+ (relative to existing 2- way)		•••	L		Day: 330 m Night: 0 m	Greater exposure to one- way traffic relative to other options, but lowest mixed- traffic exposure (one-way + two-way). Cyclists share the roadway with two-way traffic south of Gerrard St during night time periods.	+ (relative to existing 2- way)		••0	potential for conflicts. This concept minimizes the amount of cycling that is shared with two- way traffic.
			M2.3	Length of Yonge St between College St and Queen St with separated facilities for cyclists	Quantitative	linear length (metres)	Larger values preferred		Proposed Design	0	None	0m	No separated cyclist facilities	=		•0		0m	No separated cyclist facilities	=		••0			235m	Only concept with separated facilities	=		•••	
			M2.4	Number of bike turn boxes on Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	number	Larger values preferred		Proposed Design	o	None	Total: 5 Gerrard (4 - all) Shuter (1 - WBL)	Introduction of bike turn boxes improves cyclist comfort and increases visibility to drivers. Improved relative to Do Nothing (same for all concepts).	+	•	•••		Total: 5 Gerrard (4 - all) Shuter (1 - WBL)	Introduction of bike turn boxes improves cyclist comfort and increases visibility to drivers. Improved relative to Do Nothing (same for all concepts).	+		••••			Total: 5 Gerrard (4 - all) Shuter (1 - WBL)	Introduction of bike turn boxes improves cyclist comfort and increases visibility to drivers. Improved relative to Do Nothing (same for all concepts).	+			

				D	ETAILED DESIGN EV	ALUATION				DO NOT Future baseline (or exis unavaila	ting situation where		ALTERNATIVI Most Pe	E DESIGN CON edestrian Prio					ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priori	IVE DESIGN CONC y with Two-Way [SS		Pi	ALTERNATIVE edestrian Priority with On				:ks
ID C	RITERIA	DESCRIPTION	I ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR OUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	/ DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments		Score vs Do Nothing	telative to Score v Concepts Concept		Value	Comments	Relative to Sco Do vs D Nothing Noth	re Relative ing Conce	to Score vs ts Concept	Criteria s Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	o Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Criteria Concepts Summary
			M2.5a	Average (motorized) traffic speed along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Qualitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order foo qualitative rankings 1) Low 2) Medium 3) High	r : AM Peak	Proposed Design	High	Vehicles on the corridor move at relatively high speed as a result of vehicle-oriented design	Low	Moderate reduction in traffic speed anticipated relative to the Do Nothing Scenario as a result of reduced opportunities for through traffic and introduction of turning movement restrictions.	÷				Medium	Moderate reduction in traffic speed anticipated relative to the Do Nothin Scenario as a result of reduced opportunities fo through traffic. Highest average motorize		•••			Low	Moderate reduction in traffic speed anticipated relative to the Do Nothing Scenario as result of reduced opportunities for through traffic and introduction of turning movement restrictions.	·			
		Provides a	M2.5b	Average (motorized) traffic speed along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	: Qualitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order foo qualitative rankings 1) Low 2) Medium 3) High	r : PM Peak	Proposed Design		with few vehicle turning movement restrictions relative to the alternative design concepts.		Lowest average motorized traffic speed on Yonge St between College St and Queen St of the three alternative design concepts, anticipates to be similar to those estimated for Concept 4C.				Concept 4. performs sec best among	nd	traffic speed on Yonge St between College St and Queen St of the three alternative design concepts, anticipated to b greater than those estimated for Concept 4C				Concept 4B performs		Lowest anticipated average motorized traffic speed on Yonge St between College St and Queen St of the three alternative design concepts, similar to Concept 4A.				Concept 4C performs best and is the only concep that provides cycl tracks on part of Yonge St. Pedestrian priorit
M2	Cycling d	major north- south connection through downtown and improved experience for	M2.6a d	Average (motorized) traffic flow along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	: Both	vehicles (4B) / relativ level (4A, 4C)	e Smaller values preferred	AM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB: 587 vehicles/hr SB: 481 vehicles/hr	Traffic volumes in the Do Nothing scenario are greater than those	Traffic volumes are expected to be most significantly reduced relative to Do Nothing and	Lowest average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge St between College St and Queen St.	+		•••	three concep This concep provides mo pedestrian pri areas of peo cycling and reo traffic volume	t re vrity vle uces	Highest average motorize traffic volumes on Yonge 5 between College St and Queen St.	+ +	•00	•00	poorest, and has the greatest amount of two way driving access that i shared with people cycling and does not include cycle tracks on Yonge St.	9 NB: 68 vehicles/hr 58: 31 vehicles/hr	Average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge St between College St and Queen St sits in the middle.	+	÷	••0	areas and three blocks of one-way local-access segments limit traffic volumes or the corridor where cyclists share the road with vehicles
		cyclists on Yonge Street.	M2.6b	Average (motorized) traffic flow along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	: Both	vehicles (4B) / relativ level (4A, 4C)	e Smaller values preferred	PM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB: 422 vehicles/hr SB: 232 vehicles/hr	anticipated for all three of the alternative design concepts.	moderately lower than those estimated for Concept 4C.	Moderate reduction relative to the Do nothing Scenario.	•			one-way driv access blocks, does not incl cycle tracks Yonge St.	but de	Reduced relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	÷	•00		Concept 4b outperform the Do Nothing Scenaric	s NB: 53 vehicles/hr SB: 40 vehicles/hr	Moderate reduction relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	+		••0	reducing the potential for conflicts. This concept minimize the amount of cycling that is shared with two-
			M2.7	Level of strategic contribution to the overall cycling network	Qualitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order fo qualitative rankings 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low	r 2	Proposed Design	Low	No cycling facilities on Yonge St for local access / broader network connections.	High	Improved local cycling access on Yonge St, connects with existing and planned facilities on Shuter, reduces potential for conflicts with vehicles relative to Do Nothing, and provides broader north- south network-level connection on University.	•				High	Improved local cycling access on Yonge St, connects with existing and planned facilities on Shuter, reduces potential for conflicts with vehicles relative to Do Nothing, an provides broader north- south network-level connection on University.	•	•••			High	Improved local cycling access on Yonge St, connects with existing and planned facilities on Shuter, reduces potential for conflicts with vehicles relative to Do Nothing, and provides broader north- south network-level connection on University.	÷		•••	way traffic.

				DE	TAILED DESIGN EVA	ALUATION				DO NOTH Future baseline (or exist unavaila	ting situation where		ALTERNATIVE Most Pe	DESIGN CO destrian Prio		1				ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priorit						Ped	ALTERNATIV estrian Priority with Or			Cycle Tracks	
ID CR	ITERIA DE	ESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Sco Concepts Cor		Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	elative to Sco Concepts Con	re vs Criteria cepts Summary
			M3.1a	Change in surface transit journey time delay on University Ave: AM peak	Both	seconds (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	NB / SB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB +3 sec SB +129 sec						•00							•••			NB +5 sec SB +361 sec		-		•••	
			M3.1b	Change in surface transit journey time delay on University Ave: PM Peak	Both	seconds (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	NB / SB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB -3 sec SB no change						•00					-		•••			NB +30 sec SB +7 sec		-		••0	
			M3.2a	Change in surface transit journey time delay on Bay St: AM peak	Both	seconds (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	NB / SB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB +10 sec SB +13 sec	1					•00					-		•••			NB +23 sec SB +117 sec		-		••0	
			M3.2b	Change in surface transit journey time delay on Bay St: PM Peak	Both	seconds (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	NB / SB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB +53 sec SB +16 sec		Surface transit journey times are anticipated to be longer than				•00			Surface transit journey times are anticipated to be longer than		-		•••			NB +59 sec SB +52 sec	Surface transit journey time impacts vary by route but in general more routes	e, - S		••0	
			M3.3a	Change in surface transit journey time delay on College/Carlton St: AM neak	Both	seconds (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +147 sec WB + 219 sec	The Do Nothing Scenario	those estimated for the Do Nothing Scenario.	will have increases in journey times relative to the Do Nothing.			•00			those estimated for the Do Nothing Scenario.	will have increases in journey times relative to the Do Nothing.	-		•••			EB +141 sec WB + 273 sec	will have increases in journey times relative to the Do Nothing.	-		••0	
			M3.3b	Change in surface transit journey time delay on College/Carlton St: PM Peak	Both	seconds (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +288 sec WB +280 sec	outperforms all three concepts.	Journey times are expected to be similar for all three alternative design concepts, though performance of Concept 4A is	Journey time impacts are likely to be similar across all three concepts, but may	-		•00			ourney times are expected to be similar for all three alternative design concepts, though performance of Concept 4B is	Journey time impacts are likely to be similar across all three concepts, but may	-		•••			EB +127 sec WB +286 sec	Journey time impacts are likely to be similar across all three concepts, though the performance of	+		••0	
			M3.4a	Change in surface transit journey time delay on Dundas St: AM peak	Both	seconds (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +57 sec WB -6 sec	1	expected to be marginally worse than Concept 4C and Concept 4B.	be marginally worse in this concept than in Concept 4C.			•00		e th	expected to be marginally better nan Concept 4C and Concept 4A.	be marginally better in this concept than in Concept 4C.			•••			EB +40 sec WB -43 sec	Concept 4C is expected to fall between Concept 4A and Concept 4B.	+		••0	
			M3.4b	Change in surface transit journey time delay on Dundas St: PM Peak	Both	seconds (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +183 sec WB +24 sec						•00					-		•••			EB +184 sec WB +66 sec		+		••0	
			M3.5a	Change in surface transit journey time delay on Queen St: AM peak	Both	seconds (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +4 sec WB +1 sec						•00					-		•••			EB -33 sec WB +108 sec		-		••0	
	o	Supports efficient peration of	M3.5b	Change in surface transit journey time delay on Queen St: PM Peak	Both	seconds (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB -60 sec WB +239 sec						•00	inci tir	Concept 4A creases journey times on some					•••		Concept 4B increases	EB -33 sec WB +175 sec		+		••0	Concept 4C increases journey times on some
мз т	id ansit T di st	bus and streetcar routes dentified by TC to meet ridership lemand and allows ttreetscape	M3.6	Number of bus stops on Yonge Street between College Street and Queen Street	Quantitative	number	Larger values preferred		Proposed Design	14	Several closely spaced bus stops along length of corridor provide local access daytime bus service (97B).	8	Daytime local service discontinued in consultation with TTC. Night bus service maintained with wider stop spacing to align with subway station spacing.	-	-	•••	•00 Not cor the day	insit routes, and see impacts may be marginally ater than for the er two concepts. Botably, all three oncepts include e elimination of hytime local bus		Daytime local service discontinued in consultation with TTC. Night bus service maintained with wider stop spacing to align with subway station spacing.	-	-	••0	••••	Iransit routes, and these impacts may be marginally less than for the other two concepts. Notably, all three concepts include the elimination of daytime local bus service on Yonge St from	8	Daytime local service discontinued in consultation with TTC. Night bus service maintained with wider stop spacing to align with subway station spacing.	-		•••	 transit routes, and these impacts are likely to fall between 4A and 4B. Notably, all three concepts include the elimination of daytime local bus
	s	nprovement to surface ransit stops nd transfers.	M3.7	Maximum spacing of bus stops on Yonge Street between College Street and Queen Street	Quantitative	metres	Smaller values preferred		Proposed Design	280 m Shuter to Dundas (NB)	Stops spaced closely for daytime local service (97B).	455 m Queen to Dundas (NB)	Wider stop spacing reflects change in service function (night bus is equivalent to subway service).	-		•••	Coll	vice on Yonge St from llege/Carlton to Queen St. Q	55 m uueen to Dundas (NB)	Wider stop spacing reflects change in service function (night bus is equivalent to subway service).	-		••0		College/Carlton to Queen St.	455 m Queen to Dundas (NB)	Wider stop spacing reflect: change in service function (night bus is equivalent to subway service).	-		••0	service on Yonge St from College/Carlton to Queen St.
			M3.8	Change in distance between Yonge Street bus stops and east-west transit stops at each intersection	Quantitative	metres	Smaller values preferred		Proposed Design	N/A	Yonge bus stops are located adjacent to each intersection with east- west transit routes.	Yonge / College: Net:-3 m Max:+2 m Avg:-1 m Yonge / Queen: Net:-3 m Max:+1 m Max:+1 m Avg:-1 m relative to Do Nothing transfer distances	Minimal change in transfer distances between Yonge St bus service and Streetars service on College and Queen relative to Do Nothing.	•		•••		N A' N A'	onge / College: et:-3 m tax+2 m vg:-1 m onge / Queen: et:-0 m tax:+1m vg: 0 m slative to Do Nothing transfer istances	Minimal change in transfer distances between Yonge St bus service and streetcar service on College and Queen relative to Do Nothing	+		•••0			Yonge / College: Net: +52 m Max: +26 m Avg: +13 m Yonge / Queen: Net: -3 m Max: +1 m Avg: -1 m relative to Do Nothing transfer distances	Increased transfer distance (max + 26m between 320 NB bus stop on Yonge to 306 EB and 306 WB streetcar stops on College/Carthon between Yonge St bus service and streetcar service on Colleg to accommodate separated cycling facilities north of Gerrard St. Winimal change in transfe distances between Yonge St bus service and streetca service on Queen relative to Do Nothing.	2 2 7		•00	

				DI	ETAILED DESIGN EVA					DO NOT Future baseline (or exis unavail:	sting situation where		ALTERNATIV Most Pe	E DESIGN CO edestrian Pric						ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priorit						Pe	ALTERNATIV destrian Priority with Or				5
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTIO	N ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing		core vs incepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	o Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Sco Concepts Con	ore vs Criteria ncepts Summary
		Supports efficient operation o bus and streetcar routes identified by	M3.9 f	Change in crossing distance between subway exits and east-west routes	Quantitative	metres	Smaller values preferred		Proposed Design	N/A	Any interchange between subway exits and east- west routes that involves crossing Yonge require crossing four traffic lanes.	-35m	Similar overall reduction in transfer distances between Subway exits and east-west transit services on College/Carlton, Dundas, and Queen for all concepts	+			t t o	Concept 4A increases journey times on some transit routes, and these impacts may be marginally greater than for the sther two concepts.	-32m	Similar overall reduction in transfer distances between Subway exits and east-wees Transit services on College/Carlton, Dundas, and Queen for all concepts	+		••0		Concept 48 increases journey times on some transit routes, and these impacts may be marginally less than for the other two concepts.	-31m	Similar overall reduction in transfer distances between Subway exits and east-wee Transit services on College/Carlton, Dundas, and Queen for all concept	t +		•00	Concept 4C increases journey times on some transit routes, and these impacts are likely to fall between 4A and 4B.
МЗ		TTC to meet ridership demand and allows streetscape improvemen to surface transit stops and transfer	d M3.10 s	Presence of daytime bus service along Yonge Street between College Street and Queen Street	Binary	yes / no	YES preferred		ттс	Yes	Route 97B provides a limited and infrequent daytime service along Yonge. Subway is preferred by the vast majority of transit travellers.	No	Daytime local service discontinued in consultation with TTC.	-	-	••0	1 S	Notably, all three concepts include the elimination of daytime local bus service on Yonge St from College/Carlton to Queen St.	No	Daytime local service discontinued in consultation with TTC.	-		••0	•••	Notably, all three concepts include the elimination of daytime local bus service on Yonge St from College/Carlton to Queen St.	No	Daytime local service discontinued in consultation with TTC.	-		•••	 O Notably, all three concepts include the elimination of daytime local bus service on Yonge St from College/Cariton to Queen St.
			M3.11	Presence of night-time bus service along Yonge Street between College Street and Queen Street	Binary	yes / no	YES preferred		ттс	Yes	Route 320 is present on Yonge.	Yes	Route 320 is present on Yonge. No change from Do Nothing.	=		•••			Yes	Route 320 is present on Yonge. No change from Do Nothing.	=		•••			Yes	Route 320 is present on Yonge. No change from Do Nothing.	=		•••	

				DI	ETAILED DESIGN EVA	ALUATION				DO NOTH Future baseline (or exist unavaila	ting situation where		ALTERNATIV Most P	E DESIGN C edestrian Pi						ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priorit						Ped	ALTERNATIN estrian Priority with O				:ks
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	I ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	o Score vs Do Nothing	elative to Score Concepts Conce	vs Cri pts Sum		Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do	Relative to Se Concepts Co	Score vs Criteria Concepts Summary
		Provides suitable vehicle access to support	M4.1a M4.1b M4.2a M4.2b M4.2a M4.3a M4.3a M4.4a M4.4a M4.4b M4.5a	Aue AM eask Change in traffic journey time delay on University Ave: PM Peak Change in traffic journey time delay on Yonge St: AM peak Change in traffic journey time delay on Yonge St: PM Peak Change in traffic journey time delay on Bay St: AM peak Change in traffic journey time delay on Bay St: PM Peak Change in traffic journey time delay on College/Cariton St: AM peak Change in traffic journey time delay on Dundas St: AM peak Change in traffic journey time delay on Dundas St: AM peak	Both Both Both	LEVELS (FOR LOUALITATIVE seconds (AC) / relative level (4A, 4B) seconds (AC) / relative level (4A, 4B)	preferred Smaller values preferred	DIRECTIONS NB / SB EB / WB EB / WB EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB +10 sec SB +23 sec NB +01 sec SB +29 sec NB -23 sec SB -19 sec SB +19 sec SB +17 sec NB +54 sec SB +27 sec EB +41 sec WB +97 sec EB +20 sec WB +157 sec EB +20 sec WB +105 sec EB +79 sec WB +105 sec EB +254 sec WB +156 sec	The Do Nothing Scenario outperforms all three options with respect to traffic delays. increased travel times are anticipated on most corridors in the future case relative to the baseline scenario.	Traffic journey times are anticipated to be similar across all alternative design concepts, and in general are exected to bo moderately longer (more delayed) than the Do Nothing scenario. It is expected that journey times will be marginally longer in Concept 4A relative to Concept 4C, resulting in moderately wors performance.	Traffic journey time impacts vary by street, but in general more streets wi have increased journey times relative to the Do Nothing scenario. Journey time impacts are likely to be similar across all three concepts, but may be marginally worse in thi	Nothing		Concepts Concepts • 000 • • 000 • • 000 • • 000 • • 000 • • 000 • • 000 • • 000 • • 000 • • 000 • • 000 • • 000 • • 000 • • 000 •	Conc perform with t impact	Traffic j anticipated all alternati and in gener moderal delayed) It is expecte will be m Concept 44 4C, result better pt 4A poorstt e most	tely longer (more han the Do Nothing scenario. ed that journey times harginally faster in	Traffic journey time impacts vary by street, but in general more streets will have increased journey times relative to the Do Nothing scenario. Journey time impacts are likely to be similar across all three concepts, but may be marginally better in this concept relative to Concept 4C.	-	Nothing	•••• •••• •••• •••• •••• •••• •••• •••• •••• •••• ••••		Concept 48 performs best and is least impactful to the existing traffic patterns and access arrangements.	NB +40 sec SB +70 sec SB +108 sec SB +108 sec SB +120 sec SB +131 sec SB +135 sec EB +108 sec WB +135 sec EB +106 sec WB +135 sec	Journey time impacts var by street, but in general more streets will have increased ourney times relative to the Do Nothin, scenario. Journey time impacts are likely to be similar across all three concepts, but ma fall between impacts in 44 and 48. The introduction of pedestrian priority zones on Yonge St eliminates potential for through traffic along the full lengt of the corridor, and thus n change in travel time can be reported.		Nothing	Concepts Concepts	Concept 4C provides a level of impacts that sits between those of Concept 4A (mast impactful) and Concept 4B (least impactful). This concept provides a
м4	Driving	business operation, tourism and servicing of the neighbourhoo d.	M4.6a M4.6b	Change in traffic journey time delay on Queen St: AN peak Change in traffic journey time delay on Queen St: PN Peak		seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B) seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +124 sec WB +85 sec EB +123 sec WB +168 sec				-		•00	change existin	s to the traffic nd access ements he study			-	-	•••	•••	The creation of pedestrian priority areas on Yonge St and changes to local access arrangements and on- street parking restrictions reduce the overall traffic performance relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	EB +134 sec WB +131 sec EB +127 sec WB +285 sec	-	-		••0	 more balanced level of local vehicle access along Yonge St, providing moderate pedestrian realm improvements while mitigating the worst of the negative
			м4.7	Number of directions to and from Yonge St each minor side street is accessible from (Walon St Elm St, Gould St, Edward St Dundas SQ, Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade, Shuter St)	Quantitative	number	Larger values preferred	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	towards N and S Edward: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S	are accessible both to and from Yonge in both directions. Exceptions are the Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade (not accessible either to / from Yonge) and Dundas Sq (only accessible from Yonge).	Walton: 0/4 - No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge Elm: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards Gould: 2/4 - Access from Yonge towards N Edward: 0/4 - No access from Yonge Tom S; access to Yonge towards Yonge; no access to Yonge Dundas Sq: 1/4 - Access from Yonge from S; no access to Yong Shuter: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards N Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 0/ - No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge	S Do Nothing. Access from Yonge maintained in one direction at most minor side streets (Elm, Gould, Dundas Sq, and Shuter). Access to Yonge direction at some minor direction at some minor	- t		•00		from N; acce N Elm: 2/4 - Ac from S; accet Gould: 4/4 - from N and S towards N at Edward: 2/4 from N; acce N Dundas Q; Yonge from Shuter: 3/4 from S; accet N and S	- Access from Yonge ess to Yonge towards	Marginal reduction in access to/from Yonge relative to Do Nothing. Access to/from Yonge maintained in one or more directions at all minor side streets with the exception of Dundas Sq (no access to Yonge).			•••			Walton: 1/4 - No access from Yonge; access to Yonge towards N Elm: 1/4 - No access from Yonge access to Yonge towards S Gould: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N; access to Yonge toward: S Edward: 1/4 - Access from Yonge from N; no access to Yonge Dundas Sq: 1/4 - Access from Yonge from S; no access to Yonge Shuter: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards N N Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 2/ - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards S	Yonge relative to Do Nothing. Access from Yonge maintained in one direction at most minor side streets with the exception of Walton and Elm.			••0	redistributive traffic impacts associated with Concept 4A.

				DET	FAILED DESIGN EVA	LUATION				DO NOT Future baseline (or exis unavail:	ting situation where		ALTERNATIVE Most Pe	DESIGN CO destrian Pr		A				ALTERNATI Pedestrian Priorit						Pec	ALTERNATIV estrian Priority with On				
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID II	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	, DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do	Relative to Score vs Concepts Concepts	
				in total traffic in ea; AM Peak	Both	vehicle-km (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Larger values preferred	AM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	+4,974 vehicles	The Do Nothing scenario results in the greatest	Overall Concept 4A is anticipated to result in reduced traffic relative to Do Nothing.	Road network changes that minimze through traffic on Yonge St result in lower traffic volumes relative to the Do Nothing scenario.			•00			Overall Concept 4A is anticipated to result in reduced traffic relative to Do Nothing.	Road network changes that reduce through traffic on Yonge St result in lower traffic volumes relative to the Do Nothing scenario.			•••			+4,452 vehicles	Overall reduction in traffic volume relative to Do			•••	
				in total traffic in ea; PM Peak	Both	vehicle-km (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Larger values preferred	PM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	+ 5,181 vehicles	increase in traffic within the study area.	Total traffic volumes are expected to be marginally lower than in Concept 4C.	Marginally lower expected traffic volumes results in modertately lower performance relative to Concept 4C.			•00			Total traffic volumes are expected to be marginally lower than in Concept 4C.	Marginally higher expected traffic volumes results in modertately better performance relative to Concept 4C.			•••			+4,632 vehicles	Nothing, reduction likely to fall between 4A and 4B.			•••	
		Provides		in average vehicle a study area; AM	Both	km/h (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Positive values preferred	AM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	-1.0 km/hr on average within study area	Minor reduction in	Average travel speeds are expected to be similar across all three alternative design concept at the study area level, with	Greatest reduction in	-		•••			Average travel speeds are expected to be similar across all three alternative design concepts at the study area level, with	s Lowest reduction in	+		•00		Concept 4B performs best and is least impactful to the existing	-1.6 km/hr on average within study area	Moderate reduction in average travel speed	+		••0	Concept 4C provides a level of impacts that sits between those of Concept 4A (most impactful) and
M4	Driving	suitable vehicle access to support business operation, tourism and servicing of		in average vehicle h study area; PM	Both	km/h (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Positive values preferred	PM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	-1.2 km/hr on average within study area	 average vehicle speed within the study area. 	marginally lower speeds in Concept 4A relative to Concept 4C	average vehicle speed within the study area.	-	-	•••	•00	Concept 4A performs poorest with the most impactful level of changes to the existing traffic atterns and access arrangements	marginally lower speeds in Concept 4A relative to Concept 4C	average travel speed within the study area.	+	-	•00	•••	traffic patterns and access arrangements. The creation of pedestrian priority areas on Yonge St and changes to local access arrangements and on-	-1.6 km/hr on average within study area	within the study area (sits between Concept 4A and Concept 4B)	÷	-	•••	Concept 4B (least impactful). This concept provides a more balanced level of local vehicle access along Yonge St, providing moderate
		the neighbourhoo d.	M4.10 each maj along Yo	r of banned turns at ijor intersection nge St between St and Carlton St	Quantitative	number	Smaller values preferred		Proposed Design	Major Intersections: 23 College/Carlton: 4 NBL, EBL, SBL, WBL Gerrard: 3 NBL, EBL, WBL Dundas St: 8 no turns permitted Queen: 8 no turns permitted	Do Nothing scenario maintains the existing turn ban configuration at major intersections.	Major Intersections: 24 College/Carlton: 3 NBL, EBL, WBL Gerrard: 5 NBL, NBR, EBL, EBR, WBL Dundas St: 8 no turns permitted Queen: 8 no turns permitted	Additional turn movement restrictions implemented at major intersections relative to Do Nothing (Gerrard); reduced restrictions at College/Carlton.			•00		within the study area.	Major Intersections: 21 College/Carlton: 3 NBL, EBL, WBL Gerrard: 2 EBL, WBL Dundas St: 8 no turns permitted Queen: 8 no turns permitted	Reduction in turn movement restrictions at major intersections relative to Do Nothing (Gerrard and College/Cariton).			•••		street parking restrictions reduce the overall traffic performance relative to the Do Nothing Scenario	Major Intersections: 23 College/Cartton: 3 NBL, EBL, WBL Gerrard: 4 EBL, EBR, SBR, WBL Dundas SE: 8 no turns permitted Queen: 8 no turns permitted	No net change in total number of turn movement restrictions at major intersections relative to Dc Nothing (changes at College/Cariton and Gerrard).	=		••0	pedestrian realm improvements while mitigating the worst of the negative redistributive traffic impacts associated with Concept 4A.

			DE	TAILED DESIGN EVA	ALUATION				DO NOTH Future baseline (or exist unavaila	ing situation where		ALTERNATIV Most P	E DESIGN CO edestrian Pr						ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priori						Pe	ALTERNATIVE lestrian Priority with One				cks
ID CRITER	A DESCRIPTIO	N ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DATA DIRECTIONS	A SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do Re	elative to Scor Concepts Conc		Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	elative to Concepts	Score vs Criteria Concepts Summary
11		L1.1	Area of street available for pedestrian activity on Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	square metres	Larger values preferred	Proposed	l Design	Day 9,375 m² Night 9,375 m²	Sidewalk space only. No flex / programmable space available outside of pedestrian clearway.	Day 18,205 m ² +94% relative to Do Nothing Night 16,240 m ² +73% relative to Do Nothing	Greatest gain of pedestriar opportunity/street activity and programming space relative to Do Nothing.	+		•••			Day 16,555 m ² 47% relative to Do Nothing Night 15,050 m ² 461% relative to Do Nothing	Moderate gain of pedestrian opportunity/street activit space relative to Do Nothing.	· +		••0			Day 15,775 m ² +65% relative to Do Nothing Night 14,360 m ² +53% relative to Do Nothing	Moderate gain of pedestrian opportunity/street activity space relative to Do Nothing. Reduced relative to Concept 4B primarily due to inclusion of segregated cycling facilities north of Gerrard.	+		•00	
	Provides the opportunity improve the pedestrian experience	:0 L1.2	Length of boulevard strip potentially available for pedestrian amenities along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values preferred	Proposed	l Design	0	Narrow sidewalks means that there is little opportunity to provide pedestrian amenities.	1,085m	Greatest potential for pedestrian amenities on boulevard strip.	+		•••	gre fo	Concept 4A provides the eatest potential or an improved pedestrian perience with the	775m	Good potential for pedestrian amenities on boulevard strip; approximately 70% of bes case (Concept 4A).	+		•00		Concept 4B provides an improved pedestrian experience relative to Dc Nothing with a similar level of pedestrian space	920m	Moderate potential for pedestrian amenities on boulevard strip; approximately 80% of best case (Concept 4A).	+		••0	Concept 4C offers the second greatest potential for an improved pedestrian experience with improved potential for amenities
Pedestri Experien	in with a unifie	g L1.3	Maximum spacing between adjacent boulevard strips potentially available for pedestrian amenities along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values preferred	Proposed I	l Design	n/a (no boulevard strips)	Narrow sidewalk means that there is little opportunity to provide pedestrian amenities.	265m Gould to Ed Mirvish (east side)	Smallest gap. This gap is located to provide more space for pedestrian movement where pedestrian flows are highest.	N/A	+	•00	hig po st ind bo	ghest allocation of space for redestrians and treet activities, acluding flexible	310m Elm to Ed Mirvish (east side)	Largest gap. This gap is located to provide more space for pedestrian movement where pedestrian flows ar highest.	N/A P	+	•••	•00	as Concept 4C, but a higher proportion of through traffic and a lower potential for pedestrian amenities within the boulevard zone.	290m Gould to Ed Mirvish (east side)	Marginally larger gap than Concept 4A. Gap is located to provide more space for pedestrian movement where pedestrian flows are highest.	N/A	÷	••0	 Tor amentices Tor amen
		L1.4	Quality of space, as measured by quality of finishes and opportunity to provide a unified streetspace	Qualitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low	Proposed	l Design	Low	No special treatments used along corridor with the exception of Yonge and Dundas Square.	High	Concept 4Allows for high quality materials to create a unified streetscape. Specific materials and treatments to be determined through detailed design.	+					нigh	Concept 4Allows for high quality materials to create a unified streetscape. Specific materials and treatments to be determined through detailed design.	+					High	Concept 4Allows for high quality materials to create a unified streetscape. Specific materials and treatments to be determined through detailed design.	+		••••	

			DI	ETAILED DESIGN EVA	LUATION				DO NOT Future baseline (or exist unavaila	ting situation where		ALTERNATIV Most Pe	E DESIGN C edestrian Pi						ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priorit						P	ALTERNATIV edestrian Priority with Or			ycle Tracks	5
ID CRITE	RIA DESCRIPTI	DN ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	, DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	telative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments		vs Do	ative to Sco ncepts Cor	ore vs Criteria ncepts Summary
12		L2.1	Length of pedestrian priority areas on Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values preferred		Proposed Design	Day: 0 m Night: 0 m		Day: 275m Night: Om	Provides the greatest amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+		•••			Day: 190m Night: 0m	Provides moderate amoun of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+		••0			Day: 190m Night: Om	Provides moderate amoun of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	t +	•	•••	
	Supports Yonge Stree	L2.2 t's	Amount of programmable space available (excluding space required for pedestrian movement)	Quantitative	square metres	Larger values preferred		Proposed Design	Day: 0 m ² Night: 0 m ²	No dedicated programmable space.	Day: 5,145m ² Night: Om ²	Greatest amount of dedicated programmable space	·			е	Concept 4A provides the greatest opportunity for vents and festivals with the most	Day: 3,760m ² Night: 0m ²	Moderate allocation of programmable space; least of all concepts.	·		•00		Concept 4B provides moderate opportunities	Day: 3,900m ² Night: Om ²	Moderate allocation of programmable space; 74% relative to concept 44 marginally exceeds space provided in Concept 4B.	*		••0	Concept 4C provides moderate opportunities for events and
Events, Fe & Para	role as culto corridor by improving t streets abil stivals to provide	nral he ty ce ons	Clear width along Yonge St between College St and Queen St able to accommodate parade / event vehicles	Binary	yes / no	YES preferred		Proposed Design	Yes; 12.7m	Existing roadway clear width accommodates two travel lanes per direction along the length of Yonge St, accommodating parade / event vehicles. Limited sidewalk-space presents challenges for crowding and circulation during events, requiring temporary use of traffic lanes to accommodate large event crowds.	Yes; 6.6m	All options provide adequate space to accommodate parades and event vehicles.	=	+	••0	а	amount of dedicated programmable space and space and reas. This concept equires the lowest level of intervention to achieve a fully car- free scenario to achieve a full car- free scenario to achi	Yes; 6.6m	All options provide adequate space to accommodate parades and event vehicles.	=	÷	••0	•00	for events and festivals, at a level similar to Concept 4C. This concept requires the greatest level of intervention of the three concepts to achieve a livyl car-free scenario to accommodate large scale events along the corridor, such as parades.	Yes; 6.6m	All options provide adequate space to accommodate parades an event vehicles.	5 =	•	••••	festivais, at a level similar to Concept 48. This concept requires a moderate level of intervention to achieve a fully car- free scenario to accommodate large scale events along the corridor, such as parades.
		L2.4	Curb radii able to accommodate event / parade vehicles	Binary	yes / no	YES preferred	By intersection	Proposed Design	Yes	Accommodates turning movements of event / parade vehicles	Yes	Design maintains ability to accommodate design vehicle turning movements.	=		•••			Yes	Design maintains ability to accommodate design vehicle turning movements.	=		•••			Yes	Design maintains ability to accommodate design vehicle turning movements.	=	•	•••	

			DE	TAILED DESIGN EVA	LUATION				DO NOTH Future baseline (or exist unavaila	ting situation where		ALTERNATIV Most P	E DESIGN CC edestrian Pri						ALTERNATI Pedestrian Priority						Ped	ALTERNATIV				cks
ID CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	N ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	/ DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do Rel	elative to Scor oncepts Conc		Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Criteria Concepts Summary
		M1.9	Duplicate indicator: Number of turning vehicle movements permitted across each pedestrian crossing at signalized intersections	Quantitative	number	Smaller values preferred		Proposed Design	College/Carlton 4: NBR, EBR, SBR, WBR Gerard Gould 4: NBR, SBL, VBL, WBR Dundas turns not permitted Shuter 4: NBR, SBL, WBL, WBR Queen turns not permitted	17 movements permittee across signalized pedestrian crossings. Restrictions at Dundas and Queen	College/Carlton 4: NBR, EBR, SBR, WBR Gerrard 3: SBL, SBR, WBR Gould not signalized Dundas turns not permitted Shuter 2: NBR, WBR Queen turns not permitted	9 movements permitted across signalized pedestrian crossings. Greatest improvement (approx. half eliminated) relative to Do Nothing. Potential for conflicts reduced at Gerard, Gould, and Shuter	*				1	College/Carlton 4: NBR, EBR, SBR, WBR Gerrard 6: NBL, NBR, EBR, SBL, SBR, WBR Gould not signalized Dundas turns not permitted Shuter 5: NBL, NBR, EBR, WBL, WBR Queen turns not permitted	15 movements permitted across signalized pedestrian crossings. Number of conflicting vehicle movements reduced at Gould. Additional movements permitted at Gerard and Shuter relative to Do Nothing.	+		•00			College/Carlton 4: NBR, EBR, SBR, WBR Gerrard 0: NBR, NBR, SBL, WBR Gould 1: WBL Dundas turns not permitted Shuter 4: NBL, NBR, EBR, WBR Queen turns not permitted	13 movements permitted across signalized pedestrian crossings. Number of conflicting vehicle movements reduced at Gerard and (most significantly) at Gould.	+		••0	
	Prioritizes th safety of pedestrians and cyclists reducing vehicle speec	м1.10 е в	Duplicate indicator: Motorized traffic flows making turning movements across each pedestrian crossing at signalized intersections: AM Peak	Both	vehicles (48) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	AM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	TOTAL: 802 vehicles College/Carlton: 120 vehicles NBR: 6, ERR: 2, SRR: 2, WBR: 80 Gerard: 302 vehicles NBR: 45, EBR: 64, SBL: 53, SBR: 119, WBR: 21 Gould: 80 vehicles NBR: 24, SBL: 11, WBL: 17, WBR: 28 Dundas: 0 turns not permitted NBR: 147, SBL: 48, WBL: 63, WBR: 42 Queen: 0 turns not permitted	turning movements are redistributed with fewer movements anticipated at the College/Carlton	At the aggregate level, the number of turning movements across pedestrian crossings are anticipated to be moderately lower than the Do Nothing scenario, and lower than those estimated for Concept 4C.	Concept 4A introduces the greatest number of restrictions to permissible vehicle movements and is anticipated to result in the lowest traffic volumes along the Yonge S tstudy area of the three alternative design concepts.	+		•••		 	At the aggregate level, the number of turning movements across pedestrian crossings are anticipated to be similar to the Do Nothing scenario, and moderately higher than those estimated for Concept 4C.	Concept 4B is most similar to the Do Nothing scenario with similar vehicle access arrangements. The potential for conflict between turning vehicles and pedestrians is anticipated to be similar to the Do Nothing scenario and greatest overall amongst the three alternative desing concepts.			•00			TOTAL: 725 vehicles College/Cariton: 284 vehicles NBR: 0, EBR: 0, 587: 163, WBR: 121 Gerrard: 91 vehicles Ould: 104 vehicles WBI: 104 Dundas: 0 tums not permitted Shuter: 246 vehicles NBL: 0, NBR: 150, EBR: 96, WBR: 1 Queen: 0 turns not permitted	permissible vehicle movements along the corridor result in changes to traffic patterns. The most notable changes	-		••0	Concept 4C
L3 Public Safe	y and mode conflicts and by providing space for lighting, sigh lines and emergency	d 3 t L3.1	Ability of design to be aligned with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles	Qualitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order for qualitative rankings 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low	r 52	Proposed Design	Medium	Opportunities to apply CPTED principles to improve safety.	High	CPTED principles applied to high level design concepts, can be carried through detailed design	+		•••	pro	oncept 4A rovides the atest level of rovements to	High	CPTED principles applied to high level design concepts, can be carried through detailed design	÷		•••		Concept 4B offers the fewest public safety benefits.	High	CPTED principles applied to high level design concepts, can be carried through detailed design	+		•••	provides moderate improvements to public safety by providing extensive pedestrian priority space and is the only concept to
	services.	L3.2	Ease of emergency service vehicle access to the street, measured by length of street accessible to emergency services and at least 7.5m clear width between College St and Queen St	Qualitative	metres	Full Corridor preferred	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	Full corridor	Accommodated within existing design.	Full corridor	Accommodated within all design concepts	-	•		provia e pedes space traffic restri acc pedes	blic safety by ding the most extensive strian priority e, minimizing volumes, and iciting vehicle cess where strian volumes re greatest.	Full corridor	Accommodated within all design concepts	-	÷		•••	Introduction of sedestrian priority zones and access restrictions that reduce traffic volumes reduce the potential for conflicts relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	Full corridor	Accommodated within all design concepts	-	+		 include segregated cycling facilities along part of the Yonge St corridor. Exposure to two- way traffic is also minimized. Vehicle access restrictions and local-access one-way traffic loops further
		L3.3	Number of barriers/bollards emergency vehicles need to circumvent	Quantitative	number	Smaller values preferred	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	Day: 0 Night: 0	No pedestrian priority areas requiring gates.	Day: 6 Night: 0	Pedestrian priority zones designed with gated barriers that are sufficiently wide to discourage general traffic, but which still allow passage of emergency service vehicles and cyclists.	-		•••			Day: 6 Night: 0	Pedestrian priority zones designed with gated barriers that are sufficiently wide to discourage general traffic, but which still allow passage of emergency service vehicles and cyclists.	-		•••			Day: 6 Night: 0	Pedestrian priority zones designed with gated barriers that are sufficiently wide to discourage general traffic, but which still allow passage of emergency service vehicles and cyclists.	-		••0	reduce the potential for conflict.
		M2.3	Duplicate indicator: Length of Yonge St between College St and Queen St with separated facilities for cyclists	Quantitative	linear length (metres)	Larger values preferred		Proposed Design		None	0m	No separated cyclist facilities	=		••0		c	0m	No separated cyclist facilities	=		••0			235m	Only concept with separated facilities	=			
		M2.5	Duplicate indicator: Average (motorized) traffic speed along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Qualitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order for qualitative rankings 1) Low 2) Medium 3) High	r :: AM Peak	Proposed Design	High	Vehicles on the corridor move at relatively high speed as a result of vehicle-oriented design movement restrictions relative to the alternative design concepts.	Low e	Moderate reduction in traffic speed anticipated relative to the Do Nothing Scenario as a result of reduced opportunities for through traffic and introduction of turning movement restrictions. Lowest average motorized traffic speed on Yonge St between College St and Queen St of the three alternative design concepts, anticipates to be similar to those estimated for Concept 4C.	+					Medium	Moderate reduction in traffic speed anticipated relative to the Do Nothing Scenario as a result of reduced opportunities for through traffic. Highest average motorized traffic speed on Yonge St between College St and Queen St of the three alternative design concepts, anticipated to be greater than those estimated for Concept 4C.	•		••0			Low	Moderate reduction in traffic speed anticipated relative to the Do Nothing Scenario as a result of reduced opportunities for through traffic and introduction of turning movement restrictions. Lowest anticipated average motorized traffic speed on Yonge S between College St and Queen St of the three alternative design concepts, similar to Concept 4A.	+	•	•••	

				DI	TAILED DESIGN EV	ALUATION				DO NOT Future baseline (or exis unavail	sting situation where		ALTERNATIV Most P	E DESIGN C edestrian P					ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priori	IVE DESIGN ty with Two-					Ped	ALTERNATIVI estrian Priority with On				cks
ID O	RITERIA C	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS DIRECTIONS	/ DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do Concen	to Score vs ts Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Criteria Concepts Summary
			M2.6	Duplicate indicator: Average (motorized) traffic flow along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Both	vehicles (48) / relative level (4A, 4C)	e Smaller values preferred	AM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB: 587 vehicles/hr SB: 481 vehicles/hr	Traffic volumes in the Do Nothing scenario are greater than those anticipated for all three of the alternative design concepts.	Traffic volumes are expected to be most significantly reduced relative to Do Nothing and moderately lower than those estimated for Concept 4C.	Lowest average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge S between College St and Queen St. Moderate reduction relative to the Do nothing Scenario.	t +					Highest average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge 5 between College 5t and Queen 5t. Reduced relative to the Dc Nothing Scenario.	t +		•00			NB: 68 vehicles/hr SB: 31 vehicles/hr	Average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge St between College St and Queen St sits in the middle. Moderate reduction relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	·		••0	
L3 Pu	a vi blic Safety	Prioritizes the safety of pedestrians and cyclists by reducing rehicle speeds and mode conflicts and by providing space for	M1.3	Duplicate indicator: Length of sidewalk adjacent to pedestrian priority area; one-way traffic; and two-way traffic along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values preferred in the following order: 1) Pedestrian priority areas 2) one-way traffic 3) two-way traffic	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	Day Pedestrian griority: 0 m One-way traffic: 0 m Two-way traffic: 1874 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	All sidewalks adjacent to two-way traffic (curbs only).	Day Pedestrian priority: 596 m One-way traffic: 348 m Two-way traffic: 930 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	30% adjacent to pedestria priority (biggest gain); 20% adjacent to one-way traffic; 50% remains adjacent to two-way traffic.	n +	•••		Concept 4A	Day Pedestrian priority: 442 m One-way traffic: 348 m Two-way traffic: 1084 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	24% adjacent to pedestria priority; 19% adjacent to one-way; 58% remains adjacent to two-way traffic (least improved).	n +		•00			Day Pedestrian priority: 442 m One-way traffic: 616 m Two-way traffic: 816 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	24% adjacent to pedestrian priority; 33% adjacent to one-way traffic (biggest gain); 44% remains adjacent to two-way traffic (lowest exposure).	÷		••0	Concept 4C provides moderate improvements to public safety by providing extensive
		ighting, sight lines and emergency services.	L3.4	Speed limit	Quantitative	km/hr	Smaller values preferred		Proposed Design	40 km/hr	40km/hr posted speed limit along length of corridor	20 km/hr zones (local access): Dundas Sq to Shuter 30 km/hr zones: College to Gerrard; Shuter to Queen	Greatest speed reductions and traffic free areas most significantly limit opportunities for vehicle conflicts.	*	•••	••••	provides the greatest level of improvements to public safety by providing the mos extensive pedestrian priority space, minimizing traffic volumes, an restricting vehicle access where	20 km/hr zones (local access): Dundas Sq to Shuter 30 km/hr zones: College to Walton; Shuter to Queen	Moderate speed reductions and traffic-free areas reduce opportunitie for conflicts involving vehicles.	s +		•00		Concept 4B offers the fewest public safety benefits. Introduction of pedestrian priority zone and access restrictions that reduce traffic volumes reduce the potential for conflicts relative to the Do	20 km/hr zones (local access): Gerrard to Walton; Elm to Edward; Dundas Sq to Shuter 30 km/hr zones: College to Gerrard; Shuter to Queen	Moderate speed reductions and traffic-free areas reduce opportunities for conflicts involving vehicles.	+		••0	 pedestrian priority space and is the only concept to include segregated cycling facilities along part of the Yonge St corridor. Exposure to two- way traffic is also minimized. Vehicle access restrictions
			L3.5	Potential to improve roadway and pedestrian lighting levels	Qualitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order for qualitative rankings 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low	r -	Proposed Design	Medium	Lighting fixtures and ownership/maintenance responsibilities carry along the length of the corridor. Opportunity to improve roadway and pedestrian lighting levels and to create a unified lighting experience along the length of the corridor with investment.	High	All options provide opportunity to improve pedestrian lighting levels and to create a unified lighting experience along the length of the corridor	*			pedestrian volume are greatest.	s High	All options provide opportunity to improve pedestrian lighting levels and to create a unified lighting experience along the length of the corridor	÷		•••		Nothing Scenario.	High	All options provide opportunity to improve pedestrian lighting levels and to create a unified lighting experience along the length of the corridor	÷			and local-access one-way traffic loops further reduce the potential for conflict.
			M4.9	Duplicate indicator: Change in average vehicle speed in study area; AM Peak	Both	km/h (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Positive values preferred	AM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	-1.0 km/hr on average within study area	Minor reduction in average vehicle speed within the study area.	Average travel speeds are expected to be similar across all three alternative design concep at the study area level, with marginally lower speeds in Concept 4A relative to Concept 4C	is Greatest reduction in average vehicle speed within the study area.	-				Average travel speeds are expected to be similar across at three alternative design concep at the study area level, with marginally lower speeds in Concept 4A relative to Concept 4C	ts Lowest reduction in average travel speed	·		•00			-1.6 km/hr on average within study area	Moderate reduction in average travel speed within the study area (sits between Concept AA and Concept 48)	÷		••0	

				DE	TAILED DESIGN EVA	LUATION				DO NOTI Future baseline (or exis unavaila	ting situation where			E DESIGN CONCEP edestrian Priority	r 4A				ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priorit						Pec	ALTERNATIV			& Cycle Tracl	ĸ
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	N ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Scor Do vs D Nothing Nothi	Relative			Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	telative to Si Concepts Co	core vs Criteria oncepts Summary
		Support's Yonge Street's	L2.1	Duplicate indicator: Length of pedestrian priority areas on Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values preferred			Day: 0 m Night: 0 m	No pedestrian priority areas	Day: 275m Night: Om	Provides the greatest amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+	•••		Concept 4A	Day: 190m Night: Om	Provides moderate amoun of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	t. +		••0			Day: 190m Night: Om	Provides moderate amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+		•0	Concept 4C
P1	r F S	role as a priority retail street by adding space for patios and vending and providing a		Area available for potential patios, store frontages and street vendors at all times on Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	square metres	Larger values preferred		Proposed Design	0 m ²	No space for expanded retail/dining.	3,180 m ²	Greatest potential for expanded retail/dining within expanded sidewalks and pedestrianized areas		•••	•	provides the greatest potential for expanded retai and dining, including wider sidewalks and the largest amount of dedicated	l 2,255 m ²	Good potential for expanded retail/dining within expanded sidewalk:	+	÷	•00	•00	Concept 4B provides the least potential for expanded retail and dining, with wider sidewalks on some street segments and areas of dedicated pedestrian	2,485 m ²	Good potential for expanded retail/dining within expanded sidewalks and pedestrianized areas	+	÷	••0	 provides good potential for expanded retail and dining, including wider sidewalks on many street segments and the large areas
	s V F S S	streetscape which provides a pleasant experience to shop, dine and explore.	0 d P1.2	Level of support for Yonge St focused tour operators (both level and suitability of location of curbside provision)	Quantitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order fo qualitative rankings 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		Proposed Design	High	Tour bus stop located NB on Yonge St north of Dundas Sq (lane)	Medium	Tour bus access to Yonge- Dundas square retained, stop relocated from Yonge St to Dundas Sq (lane). Note that location of existing tour bus stop is more prominent and thus performs better than all concepts from operator perspective.		••0		pedestrian priority space for events and programming	Medium	Tour bus access to Yonge- Dundas square retained, stop relocated from Yonge St to Dundas Sq (lane). Note that location of existing tour bus stop is more prominent and thus performs better than all concepts from operator perspective.	-		••0		deolated peoestnam priority space that permit events and programming.	Medium	Tour bus access to Yonge- Dundas square retained, stop relocated from Yonge St to Dundas Sq (lane). Note that location of existing tour bus stop is more prominent and thus performs better than all concepts from operator perspective.	-		••0	of dedicated pedestrian priority space that also permits events and programming.

				DI	TAILED DESIGN EVAI	UATION				DO NOT Future baseline (or exis unavaila	ting situation where			E DESIGN CONC edestrian Priorit					ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priorit						Ped	ALTERNATIN estrian Priority with O			Cycle Track	s
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Si Do vi Nothing No	core s Do othing	Relative to Score vs Concepts Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do Re	elative to So Concepts Co	ore vs Criteria ncepts Summary
		Improves		Capital cost of design option (ranked lowest to highest)	Quantitative / qualitative	Lowest to highest	Lowest is preferred		Proposed Design	Approximately \$14 million	The two watermains that run along the length of Yonge Street will require replacement.	Concepts relatively equal; approximately five times greater than Do Nothing	Complete frontage to frontage rebuild in high quality materials results in minor cost variation across options.	-		•••	Concept 4A performs poorest due to higher operations and maintenance-	Concepts relatively equal; approximately five times greater than Do Nothing	Complete frontage to frontage rebuild in high quality materials results in minor cost variation across options.	-		••0		Concept 4B (and Concept 4C) perform best due to lower	Concepts relatively equal; approximately five times greater than Do Nothing	Complete frontage to frontage rebuild in high quality materials results in minor cost variation acros options.	-		••0	Concept 4C (and Concept 4B) perform best due to lower operations and maintenance-
Ρ2	Cost Effectiveness	Improves Yonge Street in a cost effective manner [note that this is considered from the Short List Selection onwards].		Operating cost of design options (ranked lowest to highest)	Qualitative	Lowest to highest	Lowest is preferred		Proposed Design	Lowest	Operating and maintenance costs anticipated to remain lower than proposed concept designs due to limited opportunities for amenities, street furniture, plantings, etc.	Highest	Highest operating and maintenance costs are anticipated due to larger pedestrian priority areas and greater space for amenities, street furniture, vegetation, etc relative to the other concepts.	-	-	•00	related costs that are associated with increased space fo programming, planning, cafes, and furnishings relative to Concep 4B and Concept 4C Capital costs are expected to be similar for all options.	Middle	Lower operating and maintenance costs are anticipated (similar to Concept 4G) due to smaller pedestrian priority areas and limited space for amenities, street fumiture, vegetation, etc relative to the other concepts.		-	••0		operations and maintenance-related costs that are associated with reduced space for programming, plantings, cafes, and furnishings relative to Concept 4A. Capital costs are expected to be similar for all concepts.	Middle	Lower operating and maintenance costs are anticipated (similar to Concept 48) ueto somalle pedestrian priority areas and limited space for amenities, street furniture vegetation, etc relative to the other concepts.	-		•••0	related costs that are associated with reduced space for programming.

				DE	TAILED DESIGN EVA	LUATION				DO NOTH Future baseline (or exist unavaila	ting situation where			E DESIGN CONCEP edestrian Priority	Г 4А			ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priorit	IVE DESIGN ty with Two-					Ped	ALTERNATIV estrian Priority with On				acks
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	data source	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Scor Do vs Do Nothing Nothi	Relative to Score vs Concepts Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Criteria Concepts Summary
			P3.1	Total length of curbside activity areas available on Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values are preferred	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	Day: 16m Night: 16m	Limited space dedicated for commercial loading/delivery access		Provides some dedicated space for commercial loading/delivery access.		•00		Day: 305 m; +289 m relative to Do Nothing Night: 340 m; +324 m relative to Do Nothing	Provides greatest level of dedicated space for commercial loading/delivery access	+					Day: 154 m; +138 m relative to Do Nothing Night: 189 m; +173m relative to Do Nothing	Provides moderate level of dedicated space for commercial loading/delivery access	+		••0	
			P3.2	Total length of commercial loading areas available on Vonge Street between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values are preferred	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	Total: 50 m Walton St 0 m Elm St 0 m Gould St 0 m Edward St 0 m Dundas Sq 50 m Shuter St 0	Limited space dedicated to commercial loading/deliveries on adjacent side streets (Dundas Sq).	Total: 50 m Walton St 0 m Elm St 25 m Gould St 0 m Edward St 0 m Dundas Sq 25 m Shuter St 0	Total space dedicated to commercial loading/ deliveries maintained on adjacent side streets (shifted from Jundas Sq to Dundas Sq and Elm).		•••		Total: 75 m Walton St 0 m Elm St 25 m Gould St 0 m Edward St 25 m Dundas Sq 25 m Shuter St 0 m	Increased space dedicated to commercial loading/ deliveries on adjacent side streets (Elm, Edward, and Dundas Sq). +50% relative to Do Nothing.	+		••••			Total: 75 m Walton St 0 m Elm St 25 m Gould St 0 m Edward St 25 m Dundas Sq 25 m Shuter St 0 m	Increased space dedicated to commercial loading/ ellewreis on adjacent side streets (Elm, Edward, and Dundas Sq). +50% relative to Do Nothing.	+		••••	
		Supports appropriate access and	P3.3	Total length of ride hail areas available on Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values are preferred	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	0	No dedicated space for ride hailing passenger drop-off/pick-up	0	No dedicated space for ride hailing passenger drog off/pick-up	D- =	•00		0	No dedicated space for ride hailing passenger drop off/pick-up)- =		•00			0	No dedicated space for ride hailing passenger drop off/pick-up	=		•00	
Р3		level of service for ride hailing, goods movement and municipal services to support business and	P3.4	Total length of ride hail areas available on side streets adjacent to Yonge Street between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values are preferred	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	Day/Night 0 m	No dedicated space for ride hailing passenger drop-off/pick-up on adjacent side streets	Day/Night 25 m	Designated space for ride hailing passenger drop- off/pick-up on adjacent side streets. Same for all concepts.	+			Day/Night 25 m	Designated space for ride hailing passenger drop- off/pick-up on adjacent side streets. Same for all concepts.	+		•••		Concept 4B provides the	Day/Night 25 m	Designated space for ride hailing passenger drop- off/pick-up on adjacent side streets. Same for all concepts.	+		•••	
		uusines anu tourism.	M4.7	Duplicate indicator: Number of directions to and from Yonge St each minor side street is accessible from (Walton St, Ein St, Gould St, Edward St, Dundas Sq, Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade, Shuter St)	Quantitative	number	Larger values preferred	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	Walton: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and 5; access to Yonge towards N and 5 Elm: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and 5; access to Yonge towards N and 5 Gould: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from A and 5; access to Yonge towards N and 5 Edward: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from A and 5; access to Yonge towards N and 5 Dundas Sq: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N and 5; no access to Yonge Shuter: 4/4 - Access from Yonge towards N and 5 Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 0/4 No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge	are accessible both to and from Yonge in both directions. Exceptions are the Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade (not accessible either to / from Yonge) and Dundas Sq (only accessible from Yonge).	Walton: 0/4 - No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge Elm: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from 5; access to Yonge toward: Gould: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from 4; access to Yonge toward N Edward: 0/4 - No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge / Dundas 5q: 1/4 - Access from Yonge from 5; no access to Yonge from 5; access to Yonge toward: N Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 0) No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge	S Do Nothing. Access from Yonge maintained in one direction at most minor side streets (Elm, Gould, Dundas Sq, and Shuter). Access to Yonge direction at some minor side streets (Elm, Gould, and Shuter). No access to/from Yonge a Walton, Edward and Eator Center Yonge Parkade.	-	•00	Concept 4A includes the greatest level of vehicle access restrictions and smallest gain in dedicated commercial loading/delive to Nothing.		Marginal reduction in access to/from Yonge relative to Do Nothing. Access to/from Yonge maintained in one or more directions at all minor side streets with the exception of Dundas Sq (no access to Yonge). 4		+			gratest level of access for goods movement, ride halling, and municipal servicing, with the greatest increase in space dedicated to commercial loading/deliveries, and the lowest level of restrictions to turning movements on to and off of the corridor.	Walton: 1/4 - No access from Yonge; access to Yonge towards N Elm: 1/4 - No access from Yonge access to Yonge towards 5 Gould: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N; access to Yonge toward S Edward: 1/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards Oundas Sq: 1/4 - Access from Yonge from 5; no access to Yonge Shuter: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards N Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 2/ Access from Yonge from 5; acces to Yonge towards 5	A constraints of the second of		÷	•••0	 Oncept 4C performs similarly to Concept 48 with respect to provision of dedicated space for deliveries and commercial loading, but with additional vehicle access restrictions onto and off Yonge.
	urbside ctivity	Supports appropriate access and level of service for ride hailing, goods movement and municipal services to support business and tourism.	P3.5	Change in length of curbside parking available on side streets (between College St and Queen St)	Quantitative	metres	Larger values are preferred	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	N/A	N/A	Total: -50 m Walton St 0 m Elm St -25 m Gould St 0 m Edward St 0 m Dundas Sq -25 m Shuter St 0 m	Removal of 50m of dedicated curbisdie parkin on adjacent side streets to accommodate new dedicated commercial loading/delivery zones.		•••		Total: -75 m Walton St 0 m Elim St -25 m Gould St 0 m Edward St -25 m Dundas Sq -25 m Shuter St 0 m	Removal of 75m of dedicated curbisde parkin on adjacent side streets to accommodate new dedicated commercial loading/delivery zones.			•00			Total: -75 m Walton St Om Elm St -25 m Gould St Om Edward St -25 m Dundas Sq -25 m Shuter St O m	Removal of 75m of dedicated curbisde parking on adjacent side streets to accommodate new dedicated commercial loading/delivery zones.	-		•00	

			DE	TAILED DESIGN EVA	LUATION				DO NOT Future baseline (or exis unavaila	ting situation where		ALTERNATIV Most Pe	E DESIGN CC edestrian Pr					ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priori	IVE DESIGN ty with Two					Ped	ALTERNATIVE lestrian Priority with On			ycle Traci	ks
ID CRITE	IA DESCRIPT	PTION II	D INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	tive to Score cepts Conce	rs Criteria ts Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do		icore vs Criteria oncepts Summary
		51	Size of potential landscape 1.1 zone on Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	square metres	Larger values are preferred		Proposed Design	0 m2	No space for landscaping.	3,180 m2	Largest potential landscape zone.	+	•	••		2,255 m2	Smallest potential landscape zone.	+		•00			2,485 m2	Second largest potential landscape zone; marginal increase relative to Concept 4B.	+		•••	
		51	Ability to support 1.2 reductions in air quality impact	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low	r	Proposed Design	Low	Do Nothing maintains existing traffic volumes, resulting in similar local air quality.	Medium	Local air quality is anticipated to improve relative to the Do Nothing Scenario in line with reduced traffic. Performance is likely to be similar to Concept 4C.	·		•0		Low	Local air quality is anticipated to improve relative to the Do Nothing Scenario in line with reduced traffic. Performance may be marginally lower than Concept 4A and Concept 4C.	·		•00			Medium	Local air quality along Yonge St is anticipated to improve moderately in line with reduced vehicle traffic. Performance is likely to be similar to Concept 4A.	÷		••0	
		51	Ability to support 1.3 reductions in traffic noise impact	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low	r C	Proposed Design	Low	Do Nothing maintains existing traffic volumes, resulting in similar local noise levels.	Medium	Local traffic noise impacts are anticipated to decrease relative to the Do Nothing Scenario in line with reduced traffic. Performance is anticipated to be similar to Concept 4C.	*	•	•0	Concept 4A provides the greatest poten to support healthier and m resilient streetscapes including the	ial Low ore	Local traffic noise impacts are anticipated to decreas relative to the Do Nothing Scenario in line with reduced traffic. Performance may be marginally worse than Concept 4A and Concept 4C.	e +		•00		Concept 4B provides less	Medium	Local traffic noise impacts are anticipated to decrease relative to the Do Nothing Scenario in line with reduced traffic. Performance is anticipated to be similar to Concept 4A.	+		••0	Concept 4C performs similarly to Concept 4A, with the second greatest potential for
ra Natur	Supports a healthier a more resil	a and ilient	Ability to support reductions in volume of 1.4 runoff, as measured by change in permeable surfaces	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low	r 2	Proposed Design	N/A	All surfaces impermeable; all precipitation channelled to stormwater management system.	Low	Landscaped features and street trees offer potential to reduce stormwater runoff.	+	•	•0	largest potentia landscaping a street trees wit the buffer zone addition to potential use surface treatme that reduce ti urban heat isla	d in Low f tts	Landscaped features and street trees offer potentia to reduce stormwater runoff.	+	+	••0	•00	potential for landscaping and street trees relative to Concept 4A and Concept 4C, though with moderate improvement relative to the Do Nothing Scenario. All concepts provide	Low	Landscaped features and street trees offer potential to reduce stormwater runoff.	+	+	••0	 landscaping and street trees, potential use of surface treatments that reduce the urban heat island effect. All concepts
S1 Environr		nities	Ability to support potential sustainable lighting improvements	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low	r 2	Proposed Design	Medium	Potential for retrofit of existing light fixtures to make use of more efficient technology	High	Design will accommodate use of low-power/energy efficient light fixtures.	+	•	••	effect. All concepts provide opportunities use of energ efficient lighti	High or g	Design will accommodate use of low-power/energy efficient light fixtures.	+		•••		opportunities for use of energy efficient lighting and application of Low Impact Development principles to reduce the burden on stormwater management	High	Design will accommodate use of low-power/energy efficient light fixtures.	+		•••	provide opportunities for use of energy efficient lighting and application of Low Impact Development
		51	Level of opportunity to provide for sustainable 1.6 stornwater management through Low Impact Development (LID)	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low	r 2	Proposed Design	Low	Conventional stormwater management design	High	High-level potential for integration of more sustainable stormwater management system as part of detailed design process	·	•	••	and application Low Impact Developmen principles to rec the burden o stormwater managemen infrastructure	uce High	High-level potential for integration of more sustainable stormwater management system as part of detailed design process	·		•••		infrastructure.	High	High-level potential for integration of more sustainable stormwater management system as part of detailed design process	+		•••	principles to reduce the burden on stormwater management infrastructure.
		51	Level of opportunity to use materials that reduce temperatures and minimise the urban heat island effect	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		Proposed Design	Low	Baseline surface treatments have relatively low albedo, contributing to urban heat island effect	Medium	Potential for use of specialized pares or surface material with increased albedo relative to baseline concrete/asphalt treatments to reduce contribution to urban heat island effect. Material selection limited to some extent to ensure materials are appropriate for vehicle loading (including local access and night bus sections) Materials to be determined through	•		•0		Low	Potential for use of specialized pavers or surface material with increased albedo relative to baseline contribution to urban hea island effect. Material selection likely to be more limited due to structural / durability requirements for increase traffic loading. Materials to be determined through detailed design process.	=		•00			Medium	Potential for use of specialized pavers or surface material with increased albedo relative to baseline concrete/asphalt treatments to reduce contribution to urban heat island effect. Material selection limited to some extent to ensure materials are appropriate for vehicle loading (including local access and night bus sections) Materials to be determined through detailed design process	•		••0	

				DI	TAILED DESIGN EV	ALUATION				DO NOT Future baseline (or exis unavail:	sting situation where		ALTERNATIV Most P	E DESIGN Co edestrian Pr		A				ALTERNATI Pedestrian Priority						Pec	ALTERNATIVI estrian Priority with On				:ks
ID	RITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do		Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Criteria Concepts Summary
			52.1	Ease of altering operation in the future to reflect long term changing pattern of use on Yonge ST, without requiring agginicant investment in further construction	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		Proposed Design	LOW	Current roadway layout permits changes/fickibility of traffic patterns on Yonge St for vehicles, but infrastructure changes required to accommodate changing use of other users.	High	Consistent 6.6m clearway designed for vehicle loading allows for flexibility in response to changing movement pattems.	·					Medium	Consistent 6.6m clearway designed for vehicle loading allows for flexibility in response to changing movement patterns. Flexibility is reduced somewhat by infrastructure needed to accommodating higher traffic volumes	+		••0			нigh	Consistent 6.6m clearway designed for vehicle loading allows for flexibility in response to changing movement patterns. Reduced somewhat relative to Concept 4A due to presence of cycle lanes on northern section	+			
		Provides lexible and	52.2	Ease of altering physical elements along Yonge St between College St and Queen St on regular and short term basis - short terms ops	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		Proposed Design	LOW	Short term operational changes are required to accommodate events, festivals, and temporary infrastructure and operational interventions to divert traffic off the corridor.	High	Greatest level of pedestrianization offers greatest level of short- term flexibility to accommodate events, festivals, and temporary uses as fewer short-term vehicle diversions required.	·		•••		Concept 4A provides the greatest level of short-term	Low	This concept offers limited flexibility increases for short term uses, festivals, and events relative to Do Nothing. Moderately less flexible than A and B due to increased traffic accommodated along the length of the corridor requiring temporary diversion infrastructure/staffing.	-		•00		Concept 48 performs poorest with respect to short term flexibility. Though pedestrianized areas are similar in size to Concept 42, offering	Medium	Pedestrianized sections and limited, local-access traffic only provides high level of flexibility to accommodate events, festivals, and temporary uses as fewer short-term vehicle diversions are required relative to Concept 48.	÷		••0	Concept 4C performs second best with similar levels of short-term operational flexibility to
	exibility & t inovation r	idaptable itreet design hat can espond to	\$1.1	Duplicate indicator: Size of potential landscape zone on Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	square metres	Larger values are preferred		Proposed Design	0 m2	No space for landscaping	3,180 m2	Largest potential landscape zone.	+	+	•••		lexibility, potentia for landscaping, and the long-term design can accommodate	2,255 m2	Smallest potential landscape zone.	+	=	•00	•00	improved flexibility relative to the Do Nothing Scenario, short- term flexibility is reduced relative to	2,485 m2	Second largest potential landscape zone; marginal increase relative to Concept 4B.	+	+	••0	 Concept 4A, and offers good potential for landscaping and pedestrianized
	r	hanging lemands and needs.	L2.1	Duplicate indicator: Length of pedestrian priority areas on Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values preferred		Proposed Design	Day: 0 m Night: 0 m	No pedestrian priority areas	Day: 275m Night: Om	Provides the greatest amount of flexible space for street activities, events and festivals.	, +		••••	,	different novement pattern in the future.	Day: 190m Night: Om	Provides moderate amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+		••0		Concept 4A and C due to higher traffic volumes that would need to be diverted for larger scale events.	Day: 190m Night: Om	Provides moderate amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	•		••0	areas. The long- term design can accommodate different movement patterns in the future.
			M2.6	Duplicate indicator: Average (motorized) traffic flow along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Both	vehicles (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	e Smaller values preferred	AM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB: 587 vehicles/hr 58: 481 vehicles/hr	Traffic volumes in the Do Nothing scenario are greater than those anticipated for all three of the alternative design concepts.	Traffic volumes are expected to be most significantly reduced relative to Do Nothing and moderately lower than those estimated for Concept 4C.	Lowest average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge S between College St and Queen St. Moderate reduction relative to the Do nothing Scenario.	t +		••••				Highest average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge St between College St and Queen St. Reduced relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	+		•00			NB: 68 vehicles/hr SB: 31 vehicles/hr	Average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge St between College St and Queen St sits in the middle. Moderate reduction relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	•		••0	
			S2.3	Flexibility to cater for utility requirements	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		Proposed Design	Low	Replacement of aging infrastructure required	High	Utility requirements captured and accommodated	+		•••			High	Utility requirements captured and accommodated	+		••••			High	Utility requirements captured and accommodated	+			

				DE	TAILED DESIGN EVAI		_			DO NOTI Future baseline (or exis unavaila	ting situation where			E DESIGN CONC edestrian Priorit		N			ALTERNAT Pedestrian Priorit					Per	ALTERNATIV lestrian Priority with On			Cycle Track	ks
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALTIATIVE	UNITS (FOR QUANTITATIVE MEASURES) / LEVELS (FOR QUALITATIVE	SCORING PREFERENCE	TIME PERIODS / DIRECTIONS	DATA SOURCE	Value	Comments	Value	Comments	Do v	Score rs Do othing	Relative to Score vs Concepts Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Score vs Concepts Concepts	Criteria Summary	Value	Comments	Relative to Do Nothing	vs Do Re	lative to Sc oncepts Co	core vs Criteria oncepts Summary
				Duplicate indicator: Length of sidewalk adjacent to pedestrian priority area; one-way trafitic; and two-way trafitic along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values preferred in the following order: 1) Pedestrian priority areas 2) one-way traffic 3) two-way traffic	daytime / night- time	Proposed Design	Day Pedestrian priority: 0 m One-way traffic: 0 m Two-way traffic: 1874 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	All sidewalks adjacent to two-way traffic (curbs only).	Day Pedestrian priority: 596 m One-way traffic: 348 m Two-way traffic: 930 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	30% adjacent to pedestriar priority (biggest gain); 20% adjacent to one-way traffic; 50% remains adjacent to two-way traffic.	+		••••		Day Pedestrian priority: 442 m One-way traffic: 348 m Two-way traffic: 1084 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	24% adjacent to pedestriar priority; 19% adjacent to one-way; 58% remains adjacent to two-way traffic (least improved).	1 +		•00		Day Pedestrian priority: 442 m One-way traffic: 616 m Two-way traffic: 816 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	24% adjacent to pedestrian priority; 33% adjacent to one-way traffic (biggest gain); 44% remains adjacent to two-way traffic (lowest exposure).	+		••0	
		Encourages walking, cycling and transit use for	M2.3	Duplicate indicator: Length of Yonge St between College St and Queen St with separated facilities for cyclists	Quantitative	linear length (metres)	Larger values preferred		Proposed Design	-	None	0m	No separated cyclist facilities	=		••0	Concept 4A provides the greatest level of improvements to health and wellbeing for all	0m	No separated cyclist facilities	=		••0	Concept 4B performs poorest, and retains th	235m	Only concept with separated facilities	=		••••	Concept 4C provides segregated cycling facilities north of
53		all ages and abilities by providing safe, convenient and attractive facilities.	S3.1	Level of consideration for accessibility for all ages and abilities	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order fo qualitative ranking 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		Proposed Design	Medium	Improvements required to achieve accessibility for all ages and abilities	High	Designed with consideration of accessibility to all ages and abilities. Design meets or exceeds current standards.	+	+		users by reducing exposure to through traffic and dedicating the greatest amount of space to pedestrians.	High	Designed with consideration of accessibility to all ages and abilities. Design meets or exceeds current standards.	+	+	•••	highest level of exposur to two-way traffic.	e High	Designed with consideration of accessibility to all ages and abilities. Design meets or exceeds current standards.	+	+	••••	 Gerrard, with greatest increase in pedestrian priority space and reduced traffic exposure.
			L1.2	Duplicate indicator: Length of boulevard strip potentially available for pedestrian amenities along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values preferred		Proposed Design	-	Narrow sidewalks means that there is little opportunity to provide pedestrian amenities.	1,085m	Greatest potential for pedestrian amenities on boulevard strip.	+		••••		775m	Good potential for pedestrian amenities on boulevard strip: approximately 70% of best case (Concept 4A).	+		•00		920m	Moderate potential for pedestrian amenities on boulevard strip; approximately 80% of best case (Concept 4A).	+		••0	

Relative to Do Nothing Relative to Other Concepts

+	better	•••	Best
=	equal	••0	Better
-	worse	•00	Good

13