Evaluation Factors	Evaluation Criteria	Option 1 – Sidewalks, on-road bike lanes	Option 2 – Sidewalks, protected bike lanes on both sides of the road	Option 3 – Sidewalk on one side of the road and multi-use pathway (accommodating two directions of travel) on the other side of the road	Option 4 – Multi-use pathways on both sides of the road	Option 5 – Sidewalk on one side of the road, multi-use pathway on the other side of the road and on-road bike lanes on both sides of the road
Traffic Operations	Improves existing traffic operations	Impact on traffic operations would be roughly equal across all the options On-street bike lanes will result in a wider roadway width, which potentially encourages drivers to travel above the speed limit	Impact on traffic operations would be roughly equal across all the options	Impact on traffic operations would be roughly equal across all the options	Impact on traffic operations would be roughly equal across all the options	Impact on traffic operations would be roughly equal across all the options

Evaluation Factors	Evaluation Criteria	Option 1 – Sidewalks, on-road bike lanes	Option 2 – Sidewalks, protected bike lanes on both sides of the road	Option 3 – Sidewalk on one side of the road and multi-use pathway (accommodating two directions of travel) on the other side of the road	Option 4 – Multi-use pathways on both sides of the road	Option 5 – Sidewalk on one side of the road, multi-use pathway on the other side of the road and on-road bike lanes on both sides of the road
Technical/ Engineering	Impacts on municipal services/ utilities	All options will require at least a portion of existing overhead utilities be relocated There is an option to bury overhead hydro as part of the relocation. Burying overhead hydro vs. relocating poles is approximately five times greater	All options will require at least a portion of existing overhead utilities be relocated There is an option to bury overhead hydro as part of the relocation. Burying overhead hydro vs. relocating poles is approximately five times greater	All options will require at least a portion of existing overhead utilities be relocated There is an option to bury overhead hydro as part of the relocation. Burying overhead hydro vs. relocating poles is approximately five times greater	All options will require at least a portion of existing overhead utilities be relocated There is an option to bury overhead hydro as part of the relocation. Burying overhead hydro vs. relocating poles is approximately five times greater	Option has the widest cross-section All options will require at least a portion of existing overhead utilities be relocated There is an option to bury overhead hydro as part of the relocation. Burying overhead hydro vs. relocating poles is approximately five times greater

Evaluation Factors	Evaluation Criteria	Option 1 – Sidewalks, on-road bike lanes	Option 2 – Sidewalks, protected bike lanes on both sides of the road	Option 3 – Sidewalk on one side of the road and multi-use pathway (accommodating two directions of travel) on the other side of the road	Option 4 – Multi-use pathways on both sides of the road	Option 5 – Sidewalk on one side of the road, multi-use pathway on the other side of the road and on-road bike lanes on both sides of the road
Land Use	Is the alternative consistent with City policy documents? Impacts on adjacent lands	Option is consistent with Cycling Master Plan	Option is different than Cycling Master Plan, however is a similar approach in that pedestrians and cyclists are separated Option has a wider cross-section compared to Options 1, 3 and 4, however can be accommodated within the existing right-of way	Option is different than the Cycling Master Plan, and provides cycling facilities on one side of the roadway only (however does provide for two directions of travel) Option has narrowest cross-section, allowing some flexibility in siting sidewalk and pathway between existing trees to minimize impacts Multi-use pathway crossing multiple driveway entrances introduces conflict points	Option is different than Cycling Master Plan, however does provide cycling facilities on both sides of the roadway Multi-use pathway crossing multiple driveway entrances introduces conflict points. Option has more conflict points than Option 3 since pathway is on both side of the roadway	Option is consistent with the Cycling Master Plan Option has the widest cross-section, having the greatest impact on adjacent properties

Evaluation Factors	Evaluation Criteria	Option 1 – Sidewalks, on-road bike lanes	Option 2 – Sidewalks, protected bike lanes on both sides of the road	Option 3 – Sidewalk on one side of the road and multi-use pathway (accommodating two directions of travel) on the other side of the road	Option 4 – Multi-use pathways on both sides of the road	Option 5 – Sidewalk on one side of the road, multi-use pathway on the other side of the road and on-road bike lanes on both sides of the road
Recreational user experience	Provides a positive user experience for area residents, promoting an active lifestyle Provides facilities for users and various levels of ability	Least preferred option as it does not provide a space for cyclists who are not comfortable using on-road cycling lanes	Less preferred option compared to Options 3, 4 and 5 for cyclists who are not comfortable with cycling close to traffic	Accommodates leisure and family cycling however does not provide designated facilities for utilitarian cyclists	Accommodates leisure and family cycling however does not provide designated facilities for utilitarian cyclists	Provides the greatest variety for user experiences as it accommodates utilitarian and confident cyclists by providing uninterrupted bike lanes along the entire length of the Road; leisure and family cycling by providing a multi-use pathway; and pedestrians by providing sidewalks and a multi-use pathway

Evaluation Factors	Evaluation Criteria	Option 1 – Sidewalks, on-road bike lanes	Option 2 – Sidewalks, protected bike lanes on both sides of the road	Option 3 – Sidewalk on one side of the road and multi-use pathway (accommodating two directions of travel) on the other side of the road	Option 4 – Multi-use pathways on both sides of the road	Option 5 – Sidewalk on one side of the road, multi-use pathway on the other side of the road and on-road bike lanes on both sides of the road
Natural Environment	Impacts on existing mature trees	Options 1, 2 and 5 have wide cross-sections and would require removal of a number of mature trees	Options 1, 2 and 5 have wide cross-sections and would require removal of a number of mature trees	Option has the greatest flexibility in siting sidewalk and pathway between existing trees to minimize impacts. Sidewalk on the west side can be designed to minimize impacts to mature trees as much as possible	Option has the potential to impact more mature trees than Option 3 as multi-use pathway is wider than sidewalk	Options 1, 2 and 5 have wide cross-sections and would require removal of a number of mature trees
Supportive of Public Input	Alternative is supportive of the public input received to date	Option is not supportive of public input – public preference for off-road cycling lanes	Options 2, 3, 4 and 5 are supportive of public input	Options 2, 3, 4 and 5 are supportive of public input	Options 2, 3, 4 and 5 are supportive of public input	Options 2, 3, 4 and 5 are supportive of public input

Evaluation Factors	Evaluation Criteria	Option 1 – Sidewalks, on-road bike lanes	Option 2 – Sidewalks, protected bike lanes on both sides of the road	Option 3 – Sidewalk on one side of the road and multi-use pathway (accommodating two directions of travel) on the other side of the road	Option 4 – Multi-use pathways on both sides of the road	Option 5 – Sidewalk on one side of the road, multi-use pathway on the other side of the road and on-road bike lanes on both sides of the road
Cultural Heritage	What is the impact to archaeological resources? What is the impact to heritage resources?	No discernable difference between Options. Options with wider footprint have some potential to impact cemetery at Garner Road East	No discernable difference between Options. Options with wider footprint have some potential to impact cemetery at Garner Road East	No discernable difference between Options. Options with wider footprint have some potential to impact cemetery at Garner Road East	No discernable difference between Options. Options with wider footprint have some potential to impact cemetery at Garner Road East	No discernable difference between Options. Options with wider footprint have some potential to impact cemetery at Garner Road East

Evaluation Factors	Evaluation Criteria	Option 1 – Sidewalks, on-road bike lanes	Option 2 – Sidewalks, protected bike lanes on both sides of the road	Option 3 – Sidewalk on one side of the road and multi-use pathway (accommodating two directions of travel) on the other side of the road	Option 4 – Multi-use pathways on both sides of the road	Option 5 – Sidewalk on one side of the road, multi-use pathway on the other side of the road and on-road bike lanes on both sides of the road
Economic/ Financial	Relative cost (order of magnitude) Costs for utility relocations	Options 1 to 4 would have similar costs as amount of new infrastructure is similar There is an option to bury overhead hydro as part of the relocation. Burying overhead hydro vs. relocating poles is approximately five times greater. The cost is similar for all of the alternatives	Options 1 to 4 would have similar costs as amount of new infrastructure is similar There is an option to bury overhead hydro as part of the relocation. Burying overhead hydro vs. relocating poles is approximately five times greater. The cost is similar for all of the alternatives	Options 1 to 4 would have similar costs as amount of new infrastructure is similar There is an option to bury overhead hydro as part of the relocation. Burying overhead hydro vs. relocating poles is approximately five times greater. The cost is similar for all of the alternatives	Options 1 to 4 would have similar costs as amount of new infrastructure is similar There is an option to bury overhead hydro as part of the relocation. Burying overhead hydro vs. relocating poles is approximately five times greater. The cost is similar for all of the alternatives	Highest relative cost due to the greatest amount of new infrastructure in the corridor There is an option to bury overhead hydro as part of the relocation. Burying overhead hydro vs. relocating poles is approximately five times greater. The cost is similar for all of the alternatives
Preferred Option				**Preferred Option**		