

Evaluation of Alternative Designs (Phase 3)

The Municipal Class Environment Assessment for Rymal Road evaluated three (3) alternative designs using thirty (30) distinct assessment criteria. The complete analysis is included in the Environmental Study Report, Section 5.0. The following is a summary of key criteria used.

	SUMMARY OF EVALUATION COMMENTS		
Category	Option 1: Dual Multi-Use Paths	Option 2: North Side Multi-Use Path & South Side Sidewalk (Preferred Design Concept)	Option 3: Dual Cycle Tracks
<b>Transportation</b>	Compatible with vehicle travel improvements and transit; moderate for potential conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians. Does not provide continuity with adjacent sections.	Compatible with vehicle travel improvements and transit; most potential for conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians. This configuration provides continuity with adjacent sections.	Compatible with vehicle travel improvements and transit; lowest potential for conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists. Does not provide continuity with adjacent sections.
<b>Natural Environment</b>	Significant impact on existing trees/vegetation; provides significant area for naturalized stormwater quality treatment.	Minimal impact to existing trees/vegetation; provides the most area in the boulevard to implement both naturalized stormwater quality treatment and improved drainage.	Large impact on existing trees/vegetation; provides limited area for naturalized stormwater quality treatment.
<b>Community</b>	Compatible with existing facilities, trails and local residential communities. Provides significant areas for decorative landscaping and plantings	Compatible with existing facilities, trails and local residential communities. Provides the most opportunity for decorative landscaping and plantings.	Compatible with existing facilities, trails and local residential communities. Provides limited locations for decorative landscaping and plantings
<b>Cultural Heritage/Archaeology</b>	No impact on existing heritage features/property is necessary.	No impact on existing heritage features/property is necessary.	Encroachment onto one identified historic property is required with this option.
<b>Cost</b>	High capital cost including impact to utilities, additional lands; allows for maintenance efficiency.	Lowest capital cost, minimal impact on utilities and lands; lowest maintenance effort/cost of all options.	High capital cost including large impact on utilities and additional lands; allows maintenance efficiency but is highest maintenance effort/cost of all options.