

Appendix I – yongeTOmorrow Detailed Evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks											
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary	
M1	Pedestrian Movement	Provides the opportunity to significantly improve pedestrian movement both along and across Yonge Street to accommodate growing pedestrian volumes.	M1.1	Pedestrian clearway area along Yonge St between College St 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 + 94% 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 ² + 36% relative to Do Nothing	Increased in pedestrian clearway space.	+		●●○			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.	+		●○○			
			M1.2	Length of sidewalk with each category of peak hour Pedestrian Comfort Level (PCL) along Yonge St between College St and Queen St. Note: relative Pedestrian Comfort Level categories are based on Transport for London guidance.	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 Gerrard to Walton W - Unacceptable E - At Risk Walton to Elm W - Unacceptable E - At Risk Elm to Gould W - Unacceptable E - Unacceptable Gould to Edward W - Unacceptable E - At Risk Edward to Dundas W - Unacceptable E - Unacceptable Dundas to Dundas Sq W - Unacceptable E - Unacceptable Dundas Sq to Shuter W - Unacceptable E - At Risk Shuter to Queen W - Unacceptable E - Unacceptable	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 Gerrard W - Comfortable E - Acceptable Gerrard to Walton W/E - Comfortable (pedestrian priority zone) Walton to Elm W/E - Acceptable (pedestrian priority zone) Elm to Gould W - Unacceptable E - At Risk Gould to Edward W/E - Acceptable (pedestrian priority zone) Edward to Dundas W/E - Comfortable (ped priority zone) Dundas to Dundas Sq W/E - Acceptable (pedestrian priority zone) Dundas Sq to Shuter W - Unacceptable E - At Risk Shuter to Queen W - At Risk E - Unacceptable	Greatest improvement in pedestrian comfort along the corridor. Comfortable: + 444m Acceptable: + 388m At Risk: + 57m Unacceptable: -89m	+		●●●		Concept 4A has the most pedestrian priority zones and fewer curbside activity areas which allows it to provide the most space to support walking and improvements that contribute to a positive street experience such as planting, cafes, seating, and programming.	+		●●○		Concept 4B has the most pedestrian priority zones 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.	+		●○○		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 4B due to inclusion of separated cycle tracks.	+		●○○		
			M1.3	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 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: 595 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.	+		●●●			Day Pedestrian priority: 442 m One-way traffic: 348 m Two-way traffic: 1084 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	24% adjacent to pedestrian priority; 19% adjacent to one-way; 58% remains adjacent to two-way traffic (least improved).	+		●○○			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).	+		●○○			
			M1.4	Number of pedestrians in blocks with pedestrian priority area; one-way traffic and two-way traffic along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	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.	+		●○○			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 1-way traffic. Lowest volume of pedestrian flows adjacent to two-way traffic of the three concepts.	+		●○○			

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION									DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks																		
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary							
M1	Pedestrian Movement	Provides the opportunity to significantly improve pedestrian movement by adding space for movement both along and across Yonge Street to accommodate growing pedestrian volumes.	M1.5	Number of controlled pedestrian crossings (signalised/PDX) across Yonge St between College St and Queen St	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 unsignalised. Greatest improvement relative to Do Nothing.	+		●●●				Total: 12 1 College/Carlton 1 McGill 2 Gerrard 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 Gerrard 2 Gould 2 Dundas 1 Eaton Centre 2 Shuter 1 Queen	New crossing at McGill (all concepts). Improved relative to Do Nothing.	+		●●●							
			M1.6	Maximum distance between successive pedestrian crossings across Yonge St	Quantitative	metres	Smaller values preferred		Proposed Design	235m College to Gerrard	Maximum distance between crossings reduced by 30%.	165m Shuter to Queen	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.	+		●●●							
			M1.7	Crossing distances at each pedestrian crossing across Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Smaller values preferred		Proposed Design	College/Carlton S: 19.5 m McGill M: 6.6 m Gerrard N: 6.8 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 Shuter N: 12.8 m; S: 13.0 m Queen N: 13.8 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 N: 13.7 m; S: 6.6 m Dundas N: 6.6 m; S: 6.6 m Eaton Centre M: 6.7 m Shuter N: 6.9 m; S: 7.1 m Queen N: 6.7 m	Average crossing distance of 6.9 m; -51% relative to Do Nothing. Greatest improvement.	+		●●●			+	●●●	Concept 4A has the most pedestrian priority zones and fewer curbside activity areas which allows it to provide the most space to support walking and improvements that contribute to a positive street experience such as planting, cafes, seating, and programming	College/Carlton S: 10.2 m; S: 8.3 m McGill M: 6.6 m Gerrard N: 10.2 m; S: 8.3 m Gould N: 7.4 m; S: 6.6 m Dundas N: 6.6 m; S: 6.6 m Eaton Centre M: 6.7 m Shuter N: 6.9 m; S: 7.1 m Queen N: 9.8 m	Average crossing distance of 7.6 m; -46% relative to Do Nothing.	+		●●○		+	●●○	Concept 4B has two pedestrian priority zones 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.	College/Carlton S: 12.3 m McGill M: 11.6 m Gerrard N: 11.9 m; S: 6.8 m Gould N: 7.4 m; S: 6.6 m Dundas N: 6.6 m; S: 6.6 m Eaton Centre M: 6.7 m Shuter N: 6.9 m; S: 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)	+		●●○		+	●●○	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.
			M1.8	Alignment of mid-block pedestrian crossings across Yonge St with desire lines	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).	+		●●●				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).	+		●●●								
			M1.9	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 Gerrard 5: NBR, EBR, 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 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 Gerrard, Gould, and Shuter	+		●●●				+	●●○	Additional movements permitted at Gerrard and Shuter relative to Do Nothing.	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 Gerrard and Shuter relative to Do Nothing.	+		●●○			+	●●○	Number of conflicting vehicle movements reduced at Gerrard and (most significantly) at Gould.							

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority						ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access						ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks								
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary
M1	Pedestrian Movement	Provides the opportunity to significantly improve pedestrian movement by adding space for movement both along and across Yonge Street to accommodate growing pedestrian volumes.	M1.10a	Motorized traffic flows making turning movements across each pedestrian crossing at signalized intersections: AM Peak	Both	vehicles (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	AM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	TOTAL: 802 vehicles College/Carlton: 120 vehicles NBR: 6, EBR: 2, SBR: 32, WBR: 80 Gerrard: 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 Shuter: 300 vehicles NBR: 147, SBL: 48, WBL: 63, WBR: 42 Queen: 0 turns not permitted	Overall the number of movements across pedestrian crossings estimated for the Do Nothing scenario are relatively similar to the alternative design concepts. However, the location of turning movements are redistributed with fewer movements anticipated at the College/Carlton and more turning movements at Gerrard St, relative to the alternative design concepts.		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.	+		●●●	●●●			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 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 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 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 4B due to inclusion of separated cycle tracks.	
			M1.10b	Motorized traffic flows making turning movements across each pedestrian crossing at signalized intersections: PM Peak	Both	vehicles (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	PM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	TOTAL: 760 vehicles College/Carlton: 160 vehicles NBR: 9, EBR: 14, SBR: 62, WBR: 75 Gerrard: 235 vehicles NBR: 109, EBR: 44, SBL: 33, SBR: 39, WBR: 10 Gould: 93 vehicles NBR: 9, SBL: 7, WBL: 33, WBR: 44 Dundas: 0 vehicles turns not permitted Shuter: 272 vehicles NBR: 97, SBL: 114, WBL: 16, WBR: 45 Queen: 0 vehicles turns not permitted		The potential for conflict between turning vehicles and pedestrians is anticipated to be lower relative to the Do Nothing scenario, and the lowest overall amongst 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 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.		
			M1.11	Level of physical separation between pedestrians and the roadway along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Qualitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		Proposed Design	Low		Typically curbs only, providing little buffer between pedestrians and vehicle traffic along the length 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.	+		●○○	●●●		High	Extensive landscape buffer provision (typically 2.7m wide) and cycle tracks north of Gerrard reduce traffic exposure along much of corridor	+		●●●	●●●

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks										
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary
M2	Cycling	Provides a major north-south connection through downtown and improved experience for cyclists on Yonge Street.	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 Gerrard - Elm; 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.	-	●●●	●●●			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 - 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.	-	●●●	●●●		
			M2.2a	Length of Yonge St between College St and Queen St with mixed motorised vehicles (two-way) and cyclists	Quantitative	linear length (metres)	Smaller values preferred (must be considered alongside M2.2b)	daytime / night-time	Proposed Design	Day: 935 m Night: 935 m	Entire length (no dedicated cycling facilities).	Day: 465 m Night: 935 m	Cyclists share roadway with mixed traffic along entire length during night time periods, though streetscape changes anticipated to reduce travel speeds and potential for conflicts.	+	●●●	●●●	Concept 4A performs second best among the three concepts. This concept provides more pedestrian priority areas of people cycling and reduces traffic volumes on one-way driving access blocks, but does not include cycle tracks on Yonge St.	+	●●●	●●●	Day: 550 m Night: 935 m	Cyclists share roadway with mixed traffic along entire length during night time periods, though streetscape changes anticipated to reduce travel speeds and potential for conflicts.	+	●●●	●●●	Concept 4B performs poorest, and has the greatest amount of two-way driving access that is shared with people cycling and does not include cycle tracks on Yonge St. Concept 4b outperforms the Do Nothing Scenario.	Day: 165 m Night: 700 m	Greatest potential for conflict reduction during daytime due to provision of separated cycling facilities (College/Carlton to Gerrard); -82% 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.	+	●●●	●●●	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 potential for conflicts. This concept minimizes the amount of cycling that is shared with two-way traffic.
			M2.2b	Length of Yonge St between College St and Queen St with mixed motorised vehicles (one-way) and cyclists	Quantitative	linear length (metres)	Smaller values preferred (must be considered alongside M2.2a)	daytime / night-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) ●●●	●●●		+	(relative to existing 2-way) ●●●	●●●	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) ●●●	●●●		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) ●●●	●●●	
			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	=	●●●	●●●		=	●●●	●●●	0m	No separated cyclist facilities	=	●●●	●●●		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	0	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).	+	●●●	●●●	

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks										
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary
M2	Cycling	Provides a major north-south connection through downtown and improved experience for cyclists on Yonge Street.	M2.5a	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	AM Peak	Proposed Design	High	Vehicles on the corridor move at relatively high speed as a result of vehicle-oriented design with few vehicle turning movement restrictions relative to the alternative design concepts.	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.	+	●●●	●●●	●●●	Concept 4A performs second best among the three concepts.	Medium	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.	+	●●●	●●●	●●●	Concept 4B performs poorest, and has the greatest amount of two-way driving access that is shared with people cycling and does not include cycle tracks on Yonge St.	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.	+	●●●	●●●	●●●	Concept 4C performs best and is the only concept that provides cycle tracks on part of Yonge St.
			M2.5b	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	PM Peak	Proposed Design																							
			M2.6a	Average (motorized) traffic flow along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Both	vehicles (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	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 St between College St and Queen St.	Highest average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge St between College St and Queen St.	Average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge St between College St and Queen St sits in the middle.																	
			M2.6b	Average (motorized) traffic flow along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Both	vehicles (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	PM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB: 422 vehicles/hr SB: 232 vehicles/hr			Moderate reduction relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	Reduced relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	Moderate reduction relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.																	
			M2.7	Level of strategic contribution to the overall cycling network	Qualitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		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, 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, 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, and provides broader north-south network-level connection on University.	+	●●●	●●●	●●●	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 potential for conflicts. This concept minimizes the amount of cycling that is shared with two-way traffic.

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks													
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary			
M3	Transit	Supports efficient operation of bus and streetcar routes identified by TTC to meet ridership demand and allows streetscape improvements to surface transit stops and transfers.	M3.9	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.	+	●●●	●●●	●●●	Concept 4A increases journey times on some transit routes, and these impacts may be marginally greater than for the other two concepts.	-32m	Similar overall reduction in transfer distances between Subway exits and east-west transit services on College/Carlton, Dundas, and Queen for all concepts.	+	●●○	●●○	●●○	●●○	Concept 4B 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-west transit services on College/Carlton, Dundas, and Queen for all concepts.	+	●●○	●●○	●●○	●●○	Concept 4C increases journey times on some transit routes, and these impacts are likely to fall between 4A and 4B.	
			M3.10	Presence of daytime bus service along Yonge Street between College Street and Queen Street	Binary	yes / no	YES preferred		TTC	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.	-	●●○	●●○	●●○	●●○	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.	-	●●○	●●○	●●○	●●○	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.	-	●●○	●●○	●●○	●●○	Notably, all three concepts include the elimination of daytime local bus service on Yonge St from College/Carlton 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		TTC	Yes	Route 320 is present on Yonge.	Yes	Route 320 is present on Yonge. No change from Do Nothing.	=	●●●	●●●	●●●	●●●	Route 320 is present on Yonge. No change from Do Nothing.	Yes	Route 320 is present on Yonge. No change from Do Nothing.	=	●●●	●●●	●●●	●●●	Route 320 is present on Yonge. No change from Do Nothing.	Yes	Route 320 is present on Yonge. No change from Do Nothing.	=	●●●	●●●	●●●	●●●	Route 320 is present on Yonge. No change from Do Nothing.

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)	ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks														
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary			
M4	Driving	Provides suitable vehicle access to support business operation, tourism and servicing of the neighbourhood.	M4.1a	Change in traffic journey time delay on University Ave: AM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	NB / SB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB +10 sec SB +23 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. It is expected that journey times will be marginally longer in Concept 4A relative to Concept 4C, resulting in moderately worse performance.	Traffic journey times are anticipated to be similar across all alternative design concepts, and in general are expected to be moderately longer (more delayed) than the Do Nothing scenario. Journey time impacts are likely to be similar across all three concepts, but may be marginally worse in this concept relative to Concept 4C.	Traffic journey time impacts vary by street, but in general more streets will have increased journey times relative to the Do Nothing scenario.	-	-	●○○	●○○	Concept 4A performs poorest with the most impactful level of changes to the existing traffic patterns and access arrangements within the study area.	Traffic journey times are anticipated to be similar across all alternative design concepts, and in general are expected to be moderately longer (more delayed) than 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.	Traffic journey time impacts vary by street, but in general more streets will have increased journey times relative to the Do Nothing scenario.	-	-	●●●	●●●	Concept 4B performs best and is least impactful to the existing traffic patterns and access arrangements. 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.	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 fall between impacts in 4A and 4B. The introduction of pedestrian priority zones on Yonge St eliminates potential for through traffic along the full length of the corridor, and thus no change in travel time can be reported.	-	-	●●●	●●●	Concept 4C provides a level of impacts that sits between those of Concept 4A (most impactful) and Concept 4B (least impactful). This concept provides a more balanced level of local vehicle access along Yonge St, providing moderate pedestrian realm improvements while mitigating the worst of the negative redistributive traffic impacts associated with Concept 4A.	-	-	●●●	●●●
			M4.1b	Change in traffic journey time delay on University Ave: PM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	NB / SB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB +01 sec SB +29 sec				-	-	●○○	●○○				-	-	●●●	●●●			-	-	●●●	●●●					
			M4.2a	Change in traffic journey time delay on Yonge St: AM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	NB / SB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB -23 sec SB -01 sec				-	-	●○○	●○○				-	-	●●●	●●●			-	-	●●●	●●●					
			M4.2b	Change in traffic journey time delay on Yonge St: PM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	NB / SB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB +19 sec SB +17 sec				-	-	●○○	●○○				-	-	●●●	●●●			-	-	●●●	●●●					
			M4.3a	Change in traffic journey time delay on Bay St: AM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	NB / SB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB +54 sec SB +38 sec				-	-	●○○	●○○				-	-	●●●	●●●			-	-	●●●	●●●					
			M4.3b	Change in traffic journey time delay on Bay St: PM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	NB / SB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	NB +75 sec SB +27 sec				-	-	●○○	●○○				-	-	●●●	●●●			-	-	●●●	●●●					
			M4.4a	Change in traffic journey time delay on College/Carlton St: AM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +41 sec WB +97 sec				-	-	●○○	●○○				-	-	●●●	●●●			-	-	●●●	●●●					
			M4.4b	Change in traffic journey time delay on College/Carlton St: PM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +120 sec WB +157 sec				-	-	●○○	●○○				-	-	●●●	●●●			-	-	●●●	●●●					
			M4.5a	Change in traffic journey time delay on Dundas St: AM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +79 sec WB +106 sec				-	-	●○○	●○○				-	-	●●●	●●●			-	-	●●●	●●●					
			M4.5b	Change in traffic journey time delay on Dundas St: PM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +254 sec WB +156 sec				-	-	●○○	●○○				-	-	●●●	●●●			-	-	●●●	●●●					
			M4.6a	Change in traffic journey time delay on Queen St: AM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +124 sec WB +85 sec				-	-	●○○	●○○				-	-	●●●	●●●			-	-	●●●	●●●					
M4.6b	Change in traffic journey time delay on Queen St: PM Peak	Both	seconds (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Smaller values preferred	EB / WB	Aimsun / Proposed Design	EB +123 sec WB +168 sec	-	-	●○○	●○○	-	-	●●●	●●●	-	-	●●●	●●●																
M4.7	Number of directions to and from Yonge St each minor side street is accessible from (Walton 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	<p>Walton: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S</p> <p>Elm: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S</p> <p>Gould: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S</p> <p>Edward: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S</p> <p>Dundas Sq: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; no access to Yonge</p> <p>Shuter: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S</p> <p>Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 0/4 - No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge</p>	<p>Most minor side streets are accessible both to and from Yonge in both directions.</p> <p>Exceptions are the Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade (not accessible either to / from Yonge) and Dundas Sq (only accessible from Yonge).</p>	<p>Walton: 0/4 - No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge</p> <p>Elm: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards S</p> <p>Gould: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N; access to Yonge towards N</p> <p>Edward: 0/4 - No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge</p> <p>Dundas Sq: 1/4 - Access from Yonge from S; no access to Yonge</p> <p>Shuter: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards N</p> <p>Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 0/4 - No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge</p>	<p>Largest reduction in access to/from Yonge relative to Do Nothing.</p> <p>Access from Yonge maintained in one direction at most minor side streets (Elm, Gould, Dundas Sq, and Shuter).</p> <p>Access to Yonge maintained on one direction at some minor side streets (Elm, Gould, and Shuter).</p> <p>No access to/from Yonge at Walton, Edward and Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade.</p>	-	-	●○○	●○○	<p>Walton: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N; access to Yonge towards N</p> <p>Elm: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards S</p> <p>Gould: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S</p> <p>Edward: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N; access to Yonge towards N</p> <p>Dundas Sq: 1/4 - Access from Yonge from S; no access to Yonge</p> <p>Shuter: 3/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards N and S</p> <p>Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards S</p>	<p>Marginal reduction in access to/from Yonge relative to Do Nothing.</p> <p>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).</p>	-	-	●●●	●●●	<p>Walton: 1/4 - No access from Yonge; access to Yonge towards N</p> <p>Elm: 1/4 - No access from Yonge; access to Yonge towards S</p> <p>Gould: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N; access to Yonge towards S</p> <p>Edward: 1/4 - Access from Yonge from N; no access to Yonge</p> <p>Dundas Sq: 1/4 - Access from Yonge from S; no access to Yonge</p> <p>Shuter: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards N</p> <p>Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards S</p>	<p>Reduced access to/from Yonge relative to Do Nothing.</p> <p>Access from Yonge maintained in one direction at most minor side streets with the exception of Walton and Elm.</p> <p>Access to Yonge maintained in one direction at most minor side streets with the exception of Edward and Dundas Sq.</p>	-	-	●●●	●●●									

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks																
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary						
M4	Driving	Provides suitable vehicle access to support business operation, tourism and servicing of the neighbourhood.	M4.8a	Change in total traffic in study area; 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 increase in traffic within the study area.	Overall Concept 4A is anticipated to result in reduced traffic relative to Do Nothing.	Road network changes that minimize through traffic on Yonge St result in lower traffic volumes relative to the Do Nothing scenario.			●○○			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 Nothing, reduction likely to fall between 4A and 4B.			●●○								
			M4.8b	Change in total traffic in study area; PM Peak	Both	vehicle-km (4C) / relative level (4A, 4B)	Larger values preferred	PM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	+5,181 vehicles		Total traffic volumes are expected to be marginally lower than in Concept 4C.	Total traffic volumes are expected to be marginally lower than in Concept 4C.	Marginally lower expected traffic volumes results in moderately lower performance relative to Concept 4C.			●○○			Total traffic volumes are expected to be marginally lower than in Concept 4C.	Marginally higher expected traffic volumes results in moderately better performance relative to Concept 4C.			●●●			+4,632 vehicles			●●○								
			M4.9a	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		Average travel speeds are expected to be similar across all three alternative design concepts at the study area level, with marginally lower speeds in Concept 4A relative to Concept 4C.	Average travel speeds are expected to be similar across all three alternative design concepts at the study area level, with marginally lower speeds in Concept 4A relative to Concept 4C.	Greatest reduction in average vehicle speed within the study area.			●●●			Average travel speeds are expected to be similar across all three alternative design concepts at the study area level, with marginally lower speeds in Concept 4A relative to Concept 4C.	Lowest reduction in average travel speed within the study area.			+		●○○			-1.6 km/hr on average within study area	Moderate reduction in average travel speed within the study area (sits between Concept 4A and Concept 4B)			+		●●○			
			M4.9b	Change in average vehicle speed in study area; PM Peak	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								●●●	●○○							+		●○○	●●●									
			M4.10	Number of banned turns at each major intersection along Yonge St between College 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.			●○○			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/Carlton).			+		●●●			Major Intersections: 23 College/Carlton: 3 NBL, EBL, WBL Gerrard: 4 EBL, EBR, SBR, WBL Dundas St: 8 no turns permitted Queen: 8 no turns permitted	No net change in total number of turn movement restrictions at major intersections relative to Do Nothing (changes at College/Carlton and Gerrard).			=		●●○		

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks													
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary			
L1	Pedestrian Experience	Provides the opportunity to improve the pedestrian experience with a unified streetscape and public realm while not impacting pedestrian movement.	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 Design	Day 9,375 m ² Night 9,375 m ²	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 pedestrian opportunity/street activity and programming space relative to Do Nothing.	+		●●●	●●●		Day 16,555 m ² +77% relative to Do Nothing Night 15,050 m ² +61% relative to Do Nothing	Moderate gain of pedestrian opportunity/street activity space relative to Do Nothing.	+		●●○	●●●		Day 15,775 m ² +68% 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.	+		●○○	●●●				
			L1.2	Length of boulevard strip potentially available along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Quantitative	metres	Larger values preferred		Proposed Design	0	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).	+		●○○	●●●		920m	Moderate potential for pedestrian amenities on boulevard strip; approximately 80% of best case (Concept 4A).	+		●●○	●●●				
			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 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		+	●○○	●●●		310m Eim to Ed Mirvish (east side)	Largest gap. This gap is located to provide more space for pedestrian movement where pedestrian flows are highest.	N/A		+	●●●	●●●		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		+	●●○	●●●	
			L1.4	Quality of space, as measured by quality of finishes and opportunity to provide a unified streetscape	Qualitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		Proposed 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.	+		●●●	●●●		High	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.	+		●●●	●●●				

Concept 4C offers the second greatest potential for an improved pedestrian experience with improved potential for amenities within the boulevard zone, and similar levels of dedicated pedestrian space as Concept 4B but with lower traffic volumes along the corridor.

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks										
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary
L2	Events, Festivals & Parades	Supports Yonge Street's role as cultural corridor by improving the streets ability to provide flexible space and operations for new and existing events, festivals and parades.	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	No pedestrian priority areas	Day: 275m Night: 0m	Provides the greatest amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+		●●●			Day: 190m Night: 0m	Provides moderate amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+		●●○			Day: 190m Night: 0m	Provides moderate amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+		●●○		
			L2.2	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: 0m ²	Greatest amount of dedicated programmable space	+		●●●			Day: 3,760m ² Night: 0m ²	Moderate allocation of programmable space; least of all concepts.	+		●○○			Day: 3,900m ² Night: 0m ²	Moderate allocation of programmable space; 74% relative to concept 4A, marginally exceeds space provided in Concept 4B.	+		●●○		
			L2.3	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.	=	+	●○○	●●●		Yes; 6.6m	All options provide adequate space to accommodate parades and event vehicles.	=	+	●○○	●○○		Yes; 6.6m	All options provide adequate space to accommodate parades and event vehicles.	=	+	●○○	●●○	
			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.	=		●●●		
												Concept 4A provides the greatest opportunity for events and festivals with the most amount of dedicated programmable space and pedestrian priority areas. This concept requires the lowest level of intervention to achieve a fully car-free scenario to accommodate large scale events along the corridor, such as parades.					Concept 4B provides moderate opportunities 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 fully car-free scenario to accommodate large scale events along the corridor, such as parades.					Concept 4C provides moderate opportunities for events and festivals, at a level similar to Concept 4B. 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.										

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks												
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary		
L3	Public Safety	Prioritizes the safety of pedestrians and cyclists by reducing vehicle speeds and mode conflicts and by providing space for lighting, sight lines and emergency services.	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 Gerrard 5: NBR, EBR, 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 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 Gerrard, 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 5: NBR, 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 Gerrard and Shuter relative to Do Nothing.	+		●●○			College/Carlton 4: NBR, EBR, SBR, WBR Gerrard 4: NBL, NBR, SBL, WBR Gould 1: WBL Dundas turns not permitted Shuter 4: NBR, NBR, EBR, WBR Queen turns not permitted	13 movements permitted across signalized pedestrian crossings. Number of conflicting vehicle movements reduced at Gerrard and (most significantly) at Gould.	+		●●○				
			M1.10	Duplicate indicator: Motorized traffic flows making turning movements across each pedestrian crossing at signalized intersections: AM Peak	Both	vehicles (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	Smaller values preferred	AM Peak	Aimsun / Proposed Design	TOTAL: 802 vehicles College/Carlton: 120 vehicles NBR: 6, EBR: 2, SBR: 32, WBR: 80 Gerrard: 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 Shuter: 300 vehicles NBR: 147, SBL: 48, WBL: 63, WBR: 42 Queen: 0 turns not permitted	Overall the number of movements across pedestrian crossings estimated for the Do Nothing scenario are relatively similar to the alternative design concepts. However, the location of turning movements are redistributed with fewer movements anticipated at the College/Carlton and more turning movements at Gerrard St, relative to the alternative design concepts.	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. The potential for conflict between turning vehicles and pedestrians is anticipated to be lower relative to the Do Nothing scenario, and the lowest overall amongst 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. 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 design concepts.	=		●●○			TOTAL: 725 vehicles College/Carlton: 284 vehicles NBR: 0, EBR: 0, SBR: 163, WBR: 121 Gerrard: 91 vehicles NBL: 0, NBR: 0, SBL: 47, WBR: 44 Gould: 104 vehicles WBL: 104 Dundas: 0 turns not permitted Shuter: 246 vehicles NBL: 0, NBR: 150, EBR: 96, WBR: 0 Queen: 0 turns not permitted	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 Nothing scenario. A reconfiguration of permissible vehicle movements along the corridor result in changes to traffic patterns. The most notable changes include an increase in turning movements at the intersection of Yonge St and College/Carlton, and a relative decrease at Yonge St and Gerrard St.	=		●●○						
			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		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	+		●●●			Concept 4A provides the greatest level of improvements to public safety by providing the most extensive pedestrian priority space, minimizing traffic volumes, and restricting vehicle access where pedestrian volumes are greatest.	High	CPTED principles applied to high level design concepts, can be carried through detailed design	+		●●●			Concept 4B offers the fewest public safety benefits. Introduction of pedestrian priority zones and access restrictions that reduce traffic volumes reduce the potential for conflicts relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	High	CPTED principles applied to high level design concepts, can be carried through detailed design	+		●●●		
			L3.2	Ease of emergency service vehicle access to the street, measured by length of street accessible to emergency services and at least 7.6m 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	=		●●●				Full corridor	Accommodated within all design concepts	=		●●●				Full corridor	Accommodated within all design concepts	=		●●●		
			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.	-		●●○			
			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	=		●●○				0m	No separated cyclist facilities	=		●●○				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	AM Peak	Proposed Design	High	Vehicles on the corridor move at relatively high speed as a result of vehicle-oriented design with few vehicle turning movement restrictions relative to the alternative design concepts.	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 average motorized traffic speed on Yonge St between College St and Queen St of the three alternative design concepts, anticipated 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.	+		●●○			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 St between College St and Queen St of the three alternative design concepts, similar to Concept 4A.	+		●●●						

Concept 4C provides moderate improvements to public safety by providing extensive 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 and local-access one-way traffic loops further reduce the potential for conflict.

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks										
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary
L3	Public Safety	Prioritizes the safety of pedestrians and cyclists by reducing vehicle speeds and mode conflicts and by providing space for lighting, sight lines and emergency services.	M2.6	Duplicate indicator: Average (motorized) traffic flow along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Both	vehicles (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	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.	+		***				Highest average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge St between College St and Queen St.	+	•••				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.	+		•••		
			M1.3	Duplicate indicator: Length of sidewalk adjacent to pedestrian priority area; one-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 priority: 0 m One-way traffic: 1874 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 pedestrian 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 pedestrian priority; 19% adjacent to one-way; 58% remains adjacent to two-way traffic (least improved).	+		•••		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).	+		•••			
			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.	+		•••	•••	Concept 4A provides the greatest level of improvements to public safety by providing the most extensive pedestrian priority space, minimizing traffic volumes, and restricting vehicle access where pedestrian volumes are greatest.	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 opportunities for conflicts involving vehicles.	+		•••	•••	Concept 4B offers the fewest public safety benefits. Introduction of pedestrian priority zones and access restrictions that reduce traffic volumes reduce the potential for conflicts relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	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.	+		•••	•••	
			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		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	+		•••			High	All options provide opportunity to improve pedestrian lighting levels and to create a unified lighting experience along the length of the corridor	+		•••			High	All options provide opportunity to improve pedestrian lighting levels and to create a unified lighting experience along the length of the corridor	+		•••		
			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 concepts at the study area level, with marginally lower speeds in Concept 4A relative to Concept 4C.		Greatest reduction in average vehicle speed within the study area.	-		•••			Average travel speeds are expected to be similar across all three alternative design concepts at the study area level, with marginally lower speeds in Concept 4A relative to Concept 4C.	Lowest reduction in average travel speed within the study area.	+		•••		-1.6 km/hr on average within study area	Moderate reduction in average travel speed within the study area (sits between Concept 4A and Concept 4B)	+		•••	

Concept 4C provides moderate improvements to public safety by providing extensive 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 and local-access one-way traffic loops further reduce the potential for conflict.

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks										
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary
P1	Retail & Tourism	Support's Yonge Street's role as a priority retail street by adding space for patios and vending and providing a streetscape which provides a pleasant experience to shop, dine and explore.	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: 0m	Provides the greatest amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+		●●●	●●●		Day: 190m Night: 0m	Provides moderate amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+		●●○	●●○		Day: 190m Night: 0m	Provides moderate amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+		●●○	●●○	
			P1.1	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	+	+	●●●	●●●		2,255 m ²	Good potential for expanded retail/dining within expanded sidewalks	+	+	●●○	●●○		2,485 m ²	Good potential for expanded retail/dining within expanded sidewalks and pedestrianized areas	+	+	●●○	●●○	
			P1.2	Level of support for Yonge St focussed tour operators (both level and suitability of location of curbside provision)	Quantitative	high / medium / low level	Preference order for 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.	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.	-		●●○	●●○		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.	-		●●○	●●○		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.	-		●●○

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks										
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary
P2	Cost Effectiveness	Improves Yonge Street in a cost effective manner [note that this is considered from the Short List Selection onwards].	P2.1	Capital cost of design option (ranked lowest to highest)	Quantitative / qualitative	Lowest to highest	Lowest is preferred		Proposed Design	Approximately \$14 million	The two water mains 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-related costs that are associated with increased space for programming, planning, cafes, and furnishings relative to Concept 4B and Concept 4C. Capital costs are expected to be similar for all options.	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 4B (and Concept 4C) perform best due to lower 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.	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 4C (and Concept 4B) perform best due to lower 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.
			P2.2	Operating cost of design options (ranked lowest to highest)	Qualitative	Lowest to highest	Lowest is preferred		Proposed Design	Lowest	Highest	Operating and maintenance costs anticipated to remain lower than proposed concept designs due to limited opportunities for amenities, street furniture, plantings, etc.	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.	-	-	●○○	●●○	Capital costs are expected to be similar for all options.	Middle	Lower operating and maintenance costs are anticipated (similar to Concept 4C) due to smaller pedestrian priority areas and limited space for amenities, street furniture, vegetation, etc relative to the other concepts.	-	-	●●○	●●○	Capital costs are expected to be similar for all concepts.	Middle	Lower operating and maintenance costs are anticipated (similar to Concept 4B) due to smaller pedestrian priority areas and limited space for amenities, street furniture, vegetation, etc relative to the other concepts.	-	-	●●○	●●○	Capital costs are expected to be similar for all concepts.

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION									DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks											
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary
P3	Curbside Activity	Supports appropriate access and level of service for ride hailing, goods movement and municipal services to support business and tourism.	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	Day: 80 m; +64 m relative to Do Nothing Night: 95 m; +79 m relative to Do Nothing	Provides some dedicated space for commercial loading/delivery access.	+		●○○			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	+		●●○		
			P3.2	Total length of commercial loading 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	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 m	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 m	Total space dedicated to commercial loading/deliveries maintained on adjacent side streets (shifted from Dundas 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/deliveries on adjacent side streets (Elm, Edward, and Dundas Sq). +50% relative to Do Nothing.	+		●●●		
			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 drop-off/pick-up	=		●○○				0	No dedicated space for ride hailing passenger drop-off/pick-up	=		●○○			0	No dedicated space for ride hailing passenger drop-off/pick-up	=		●○○	
			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.	+		●●●			Day/Night 25 m	Designated space for ride hailing passenger drop-off/pick-up on adjacent side streets. Same for all concepts.	+		●●●		
			M4.7	Duplicate indicator: Number of directions to and from Yonge St each minor side street is accessible from (Walton 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	Walton: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S Elm: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S Gould: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S Edward: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S Dundas Sq: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; no access to Yonge Shuter: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 0/4 No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge	Most minor side streets 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 S Gould: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N; access to Yonge towards N Edward: 0/4 - No access from Yonge; 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 Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 0/4 No access from Yonge; no access to Yonge	Largest reduction in access to/from Yonge relative to Do Nothing. Access from Yonge maintained in one direction at most minor side streets (Elm, Gould, Dundas Sq, and Shuter). Access to Yonge maintained from one direction at some minor side streets (Elm, Gould, and Shuter). No access to/from Yonge at Walton, Edward and Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade.	=		●○○			Walton: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N; access to Yonge towards N Elm: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards S Gould: 4/4 - Access from Yonge from N and S; access to Yonge towards N and S Edward: 2/4 - Access from Yonge from N; access to Yonge towards N Dundas Sq: 1/4 - Access from Yonge from S; no access to Yonge Shuter: 3/4 - Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards N and S Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 2/4 Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards S	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 towards 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 Eaton Centre Yonge Parkade: 2/4 Access from Yonge from S; access to Yonge towards S	Reduced access to/from Yonge relative to Do Nothing. Access from Yonge maintained in one direction at most minor side streets with the exception of Walton and Elm. Access to Yonge maintained in one direction at most minor side streets with the exception of Edward and Dundas Sq.	+		●●○		
P3	Curbside Activity	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 curbside parking on adjacent side streets to accommodate new dedicated commercial loading/delivery zones.	-		●●○		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	Removal of 75m of dedicated curbside parking on adjacent side streets to accommodate new dedicated commercial loading/delivery zones.	-		●○○		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	Removal of 75m of dedicated curbside parking on adjacent side streets to accommodate new dedicated commercial loading/delivery zones.	-		●○○				

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks										
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary
S1	Natural Environment	Supports a healthier and more resilient streetscape by providing opportunities for tree planting.	S1.1	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.	+		●●●			2,255 m2	Smallest potential landscape zone.	+		●○○			2,485 m2	Second largest potential landscape zone, marginal increase relative to Concept 4B.	+		●●○		
			S1.2	Ability to support reductions in air quality impact	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		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.	+		●●○			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.	+		●○○		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.	+		●●○			
			S1.3	Ability to support reductions in traffic noise impact	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		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.	+		●●○			Low	Local traffic noise impacts are anticipated to decrease relative to the Do Nothing Scenario in line with reduced traffic. Performance may be marginally worse than Concept 4A and Concept 4C.	+		●○○		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.	+		●●○			
			S1.4	Ability to support reductions in volume of runoff, as measured by change in permeable surfaces	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		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.	+		●●○			Low	Landscaped features and street trees offer potential to reduce stormwater runoff.	+		●●○			Low	Landscaped features and street trees offer potential to reduce stormwater runoff.	+		●●○		
			S1.5	Ability to support potential sustainable lighting improvements	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		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.	+		●●●			High	Design will accommodate use of low-power/energy efficient light fixtures.	+		●●●			High	Design will accommodate use of low-power/energy efficient light fixtures.	+		●●●		
			S1.6	Level of opportunity to provide for sustainable stormwater management through Low Impact Development (LID)	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 1) High 2) Medium 3) Low		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	+		●●●			High	High-level potential for integration of more sustainable stormwater management system as part of detailed design process	+		●●●			High	High-level potential for integration of more sustainable stormwater management system as part of detailed design process	+		●●●		
			S1.7	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 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.	+		●●○			Low	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 likely to be more limited due to structural / durability requirements for increased traffic loading. Materials to be determined through detailed design process.	=		●○○		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.	+		●●○			

Concept 4C performs similarly to Concept 4A, with the second greatest potential for landscaping and street trees, potential use of surface treatments that reduce the urban heat island effect.

All concepts provide opportunities for use of energy efficient lighting and application of Low Impact Development principles to reduce the burden on stormwater management infrastructure.

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks														
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary				
S2	Flexibility & Innovation	Provides flexible and adaptable street design that can respond to changing demands and needs.	S2.1	Ease of altering operation in the future to reflect long-term changing pattern of use on Yonge St, without requiring significant 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/flexibility 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 patterns.	+		●●●			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 accommodate higher traffic volumes.	+			●●○			High	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.	+			●●●				
			S2.2	Ease of altering physical elements along Yonge St between College St and Queen St on regular and short term basis - short term 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 uses, including 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.	+		●●●			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.	=			●○○			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 4B.	+			●●○				
			S1.1	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.	+	+	●●●	●●●			2,255 m2	Smallest potential landscape zone.	+	=			●○○	●○○			2,485 m2	Second largest potential landscape zone; marginal increase relative to Concept 4B.	+	+	●●○	●●○	
			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: 0m	Provides the greatest amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+		●●●				Day: 190m Night: 0m	Provides moderate amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+				●●○			Day: 190m Night: 0m	Provides moderate amount of flexible space for street activities, events, and festivals.	+			●●○		
			M2.6	Duplicate indicator: Average (motorized) traffic flow along Yonge St between College St and Queen St	Both	vehicles (4B) / relative level (4A, 4C)	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 St between College St and Queen St. Moderate reduction relative to the Do nothing Scenario.	+		●●●						Highest average motorized traffic volumes on Yonge St between College St and Queen St. Reduced relative to the Do Nothing Scenario.	+			●○○			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.	+			●●○		
			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	+				●●●		High	Utility requirements captured and accommodated	+			●●●		

Concept 4C performs second best with similar levels of short-term operational flexibility to Concept 4A, and offers good potential for landscaping and pedestrianized areas. The long-term design can accommodate different movement patterns in the future.

DETAILED DESIGN EVALUATION										DO NOTHING Future baseline (or existing situation where unavailable)		ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4A Most Pedestrian Priority					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4B Pedestrian Priority with Two-Way Driving Access					ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 4C Pedestrian Priority with One-Way Driving Access & Cycle Tracks										
ID	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	ID	INDICATOR	QUANTITATIVE / QUALITATIVE	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	Score vs Do Nothing	Relative to Concepts	Score vs Concepts	Criteria Summary
53	Health & Wellbeing	Encourages walking, cycling and transit use for all ages and abilities by providing safe, convenient and attractive facilities.	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 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 pedestrian priority (biggest gain); 20% adjacent to one-way traffic; 50% remains adjacent to two-way traffic.	+		●●●	●●●	Concept 4A provides the greatest level of improvements to health and wellbeing for all users by reducing exposure to through traffic and dedicating the greatest amount of space to pedestrians.	Day Pedestrian priority: 442 m One-way traffic: 348 m Two-way traffic: 1084 m Night Two-way traffic: 1874 m	24% adjacent to pedestrian priority; 19% adjacent to one-way; 58% remains adjacent to two-way traffic (least improved).	+		●●○	●●○	Concept 4B performs poorest, and retains the highest level of exposure to two-way traffic.	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).	+		●●○	●●○	Concept 4C provides segregated cycling facilities north of Gerrard, with greatest increase in pedestrian priority space and reduced traffic exposure.
			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	=		●●○	●●○		0m	No separated cyclist facilities	=		●●○	●●○		235m	Only concept with separated facilities	=		●●●	●●○	
			S3.1	Level of consideration for accessibility for all ages and abilities	Qualitative	high / medium / low	Preference order for qualitative rankings: 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.	+		●●●	●●●		High	Designed with consideration of accessibility to all ages and abilities. Design meets or exceeds current standards.	+		●●●	●●●		High	Designed with consideration of accessibility to all ages and abilities. Design meets or exceeds current standards.	+		●●●	●●●	
			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).	+		●●○	●●○		920m	Moderate potential for pedestrian amenities on boulevard strip; approximately 80% of best case (Concept 4A).	+		●●○	●●○	

Relative to Do Nothing
 + better
 = equal
 - worse

Relative to Other Concepts
 ●●● Best
 ●●○ Better
 ●○● Good