Appendix A to Report PED25111 Page 1 of 1

Candidate Evaluation for funding as Municipal Betterments	(Enhancements and/or Additions)				
Initiative BETTERMENT CANDIDATE					
COUNCIL PRIORITY	DESIRED OUTCOME	MEASURE			
COUNCIL PRIORITY	DESIRED GOTCOIVIE				
Sustainable Economic and Ecological Development	Facilitate Growth of Key Sectors Enhances City's reputation as a centre of: Accelerate our response to Climate Change	Culture	Yes	□ No	
		Sport	Yes	No	
		Tourism	Yes	☐ No	
		Climate Resilience	Yes	☐ No	
		Climate Readiness	Yes	☐ No	
	Protect Green Spaces and Waterways	Green Spaces	Yes	No	
		Waterways	Yes	□ No	
Safe and Thriving Neighbourhoods	Ensure people can safely move about by foot, bike, transit and car	Accessibility	Yes	□ No	
		Mobility	Yes	No	
		Road Safety	Yes	No	
		Pedestrian	Yes	No	
		Cyclists	□Yes	No	
		Transit Customers	☐ Yes	No	
		Vehicles and Goods Movement	Yes	No	
	Provide vibrant parks and public spaces	Vibrant Parks	Yes	□ No	
		Vibrant Public Spaces	Yes	□ No	
Responsiveness	Modernize City Systems	Implementation of the City's Digital Strategy	Yes	□ No	
ADDITIONAL CRITERIA DELIVERY OPTION					
Burden on Residential Taxpayers is best mitigated when delivered:		With LRT Construction (inclusive of ancillary project charges)	Yes	No	
		By the City, after or Coordinated around LRT Construction*	Yes	No	
		Generally Neutral	Yes	No	
		With LRT Construction	Yes	No	
Disruption to the Neighbourhood is best mitigated when delivered:		By the City, after or Coordinated around LRT Construction*	Yes	No	
		Generally Neutral	Yes	☐ No	
With LRT Construction Disruption to Transportation Network and LRT operations are best mitigated when delivered: By the City, after or Coordinated around LRT Construction*			Yes	No	
			Yes	☐ No	
		Generally Neutral	Yes	No	
	<u> </u>	Significant	Yes	□No	
Increases to LRT Construction durations from the inclusion o	of the initiative are:	Minor	Yes	□ No	
	7	Negligible	Yes	□ No	
		e footprint in the corridor for the future installation(s). The understanding sho			
reserved then the initiative would also not have been able to be delivered with LRT Construction.					
ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA					
Betterment is located on municipal lands			Yes	☐ No	
Betterment is an enhancement of City Infrastructure included the Base Scope			Yes	No	
(City funds incremental costs for the enhancement only)			Lies		
Betterment is an addition of City Infrastructure beyond the Base Scope (City fully funds the Betterment)				No	
Betterment is an enhancement of Non-municipal Infrastructure included the Base Scope				П.	
(City funds incremental costs for the enhancement only)			Yes	□ No	
Development Charges would be applicable to the Betterment				☐ No	
Initiative was developed with consideration of Indiusion, Diversity, Equity, Accessibility, Climate Justice and/or removes barriers to users of the LRT corridor.			Yes	No	
Could the City advance the initative on adjacent streets and/or parallel roadways.			Yes	No	
Would the City advancing the initative on adjacent streets and/or parallel roadways be cost effective.				□No	
BUDGET					
	Capital construction Costs			\$0.00	
Cost	Future Capital Costs of Including Initiative			\$0.00	
Cost				\$0.00	
	Projected Operation Costs			\$0.00	
ANALYSIS OF INITIATIVE AND RECOMMENDATION					
Initiative	BETTERMENT CANDIDATE				
Do staff recommend the initiative be funded, and that the City enter into a Municipal Infrastructure Agreement with Metrolinx for its inclusion in the LRT project.				□NO	
Do staff recommend the initiative be funded, and that the City enter into a Municipal Infrastructure Agreement with Metrolinx for its inclusion in the LRT project. ves					