OBJECTIVE A: To Improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable, and efficient rapid transit service

|            |  |   |   |                                     | RH2   |
|------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|
|            | Goals  | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals                             | Unit of measure   | Information Source                  | Yonge Street  |
| <b>A</b> 1 | Increase attractiveness of rapid transit service | Projected travel time along each alternative  | Travel time   | IBI                                 | 9.4 minutes   |
|            |  | Passenger volume at the peak load point   | AM peak hour passenger volume in 2031                       | York Region Travel<br>Demand Model  | 5,100   |
|            |  | Transit Boardings   |   | York Region Travel<br>Demand Model  | 5,000   |
|            |  | Route features with potential to reduce service reliability                               | Constraints/# of intersections & operation in mixed traffic | Plan                                | signalized intersections<br>6.3 km of dedicated transitway                                |
| A2         | Maximize transit connectivity                    | Connections to inter-regional services  | No. of crossing services (i.e. GO etc.)                     | Build on Preliminary<br>Screening   | GO Bus stop at King Rd<br>Continuation to the South Yonge Street<br>rapid transit system. |
| А3         | Alignment geometry that maximizes speed and ride | % of route > 3% grade   | %   | Profile                             | 2.5%  |
|            | comfort and minimizes safety risks and           | No. of running way sections > 3.5%  | #   | Profile                             | 4 (320m, 470m, 390m, 350m)  |
|            | maintenance costs                                | No. of curves < 100 metres  | #   | Plan                                | 0   |
|            |  | No. of curves > 100 metres and < 300 metres   | #   | Plan                                | 0   |
| A4         | Convenient service connections to                | Length of service connections   | Relative measure  | Plan                                |   |
| A5         | Station locations that maximize ridership        | Existing and future residents or residences within 500 m walking distance of station      | No. of residents in 2013                                    | Land use forecasts, GIS<br>Analysis | 2,400   |
|            |  | Existing and future employment within a 500 m walking distance of a station               | No. of employees in 2031                                    | Land use forecasts, GIS<br>Analysis | 450   |
|            |  | Major traffic generators or attractors within 500 m walking distance of proposed stations | #   | Plan                                | Oak Ridges core area, Library, Oak<br>Ridges Recreation Centre                            |

OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor

|    |   |   |  |                                     | RH2   |
|----|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|
|    | Goals   | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals   | Unit of measure  | Information Source                  | Yonge Street                                |
| B1 | Minimize adverse effects on and maximize benefits for communities in corridor | Potential for displacement/disruption of unique and distinctive community features  | No. of unique & distinctive community features disrupted | Plan, Heritage (Unterman); Land use | No substantial impact on community features |
|    |   | Number and type of industrial uses displaced or disrupted   | No. of industrial properties                             | Plan                                | None  |
|    |   | Length of route with potential for an increase or decrease in business activity   | Length (m)   | Plan                                | 1.8 km (through Oak Ridges core)            |
|    |   | Number and type of retail, office and service commercial businesses displaced or affected   | No. of affected retail, office or service commercial     | Plan                                | 20  |
|    |   | Number of residential properties displaced or disrupted by location   | No. of residential properties                            | Plan                                | None  |
|    |   | Barrier impact – potential for division of communities by the facility right-of-way   | Qualitative  | Plan, Land use                      | Low: route follows existing Yonge St        |
|    |   | Number and type of community features/services affected   | No. of community features                                | Plan                                | None  |
|    |   | Construction effects  | Length of new construction                               | Plan                                | 6.3 km on existing major roadway            |
| B2 | Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation                   | Number of intersections with restricted access  | No. of intersections                                     | Plan                                | 10  |
|    |   | Number of driveways with restricted access due to the alignment   | No. of driveways   | Plan                                | 70  |
|    |   | Potential for infiltration of neighbourhoods by diverted traffic  | Qualitative  | Plan, Projected LOS along route     | Minor potential                             |
|    |   | Loss of residential street parking  | Length of residential street parking loss                | Plan                                | No existing residential street parking      |
|    |   | Change in convenience of pedestrian crossing movements  | Qualitative  | Plan                                | Operation in dedicated ROW                  |
|    |   | Number of instances where primary access routes to social or community institutions are made more indirect or otherwise disrupted | #  | Plan                                | None  |
|    |   | Number of stations with the potential to increase traffic and parking on local streets  | No. of stations  | IBI                                 | 5 stations                                  |

OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor

|  |   |   |   |  | RH2  |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
|  | Goals   | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals   | Unit of measure   | Information Source                       | Yonge Street   |
| B3 Maintain a high level of public safety and security in corridor |   | Locations with potential to decrease public safety  | Qualitative   | Plan                                     | Motorists unfamiliar with u-turns across transitway.   |
|  | ,   | Effect of transitway insertion on emergency vehicle circulation   |   | Plan, emergency agencies, municipalities | May use transitway but some median crossing restriction on Yonge St.   |
| B4   | Minimize adverse noise and vibration effects        | Approximate number of noise-sensitive receptors that may potentially experience an increase in ambient sound levels based on the proximity of the route alternative to existing and/or future receptors                           | No. of receptors  |  | Existing noise levels are generally high through Richmond Hill. Residential subdivisions are generally set back from Yonge St. |
|  |   | Approximate number of residences or<br>Vibration–sensitive buildings that may potentially<br>experience an increase in vibration levels based on<br>the proximity of the route alternative to existing and/or<br>future receptors | No. of residences/buildings                                 | Plan, Vibration consultant (Senes)       | Low to none  |
|  |   | Construction effects  | Qualitative/ Noise Level/<br>Mitigation during construction | Plan, Noise consultant (Senes)           | Moderate. Route has a range of low to high existing ambient noise conditions.  |
| B5   | Minimize adverse effects on<br>cultural resources   | Significance of built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes   | Significance of building & type of disruption               | Plan, Heritage consultant (Unterman)     | Low impact   |
|  |   | Number of archaeological resources displaced or disrupted   | No. of resources  | Plan, Archaeological consultant (ASI)    | 12 Sites   |
|  |   | Significance of archaeological resources displaced or disrupted   | Type of disruption  | Plan, Archaeological consultant (ASI)    | Medium-High Impact (score of 59)   |
| В6   | Minimize disruption of community vistas and adverse | Visual impact on people living and working in and visiting the community  | Qualitative   | Plan                                     | Median transitway including stations with streetscaping.   |
|  | effects on street and<br>neighbourhood aesthetics   |   |   |  |  |

OBJECTIVE C: To promote a sustainable environment by protecting and enhancing the natural environment in the corridor

|    |  |  |   |  | RH2  |  |
|----|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|    | Goals  | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals  | Unit of measure   | Information Source                                       | Yonge Street   |  |
| C1 | Minimize adverse effects on<br>Aquatic Ecology   | Number of watercourse crossings  | No. of watercourse crossings  | Plan, Environmental                                      | watercourse crossing (perpendicular crossing of East Humber River)   |  |
|    |  | Type of watercourse crossing to be affected  | Type and significance of watercourse crossing   | Plan, Environmental                                      | Watercourse crossing has permanent flow and natural channel.   |  |
|    |  | Type and significance of fish habitat to be affected   | Type and significance of fish habitat   | Plan, Environmental                                      | Type II fish habitat present and cattail marsh (east side), therefore mitigation required at the crossing if widening required.              |  |
| C2 | Minimize adverse effects on<br>Terrestrial Ecology   | Number and status of any species at risk   | No. & status of terrestrial ecosystems (ELC vegetation communities)                                     | Plan, Environmental                                      | 30 ELC vegetation communities (affect not substantial since majority of widening to be done in existing ROW)                                 |  |
|    |  | Area, type and significance of wildlife habitat/vegetation communities to be affected  | Type, occurrence and significance of terrestrial ecosystems (wetlands, forests, thickets, fields, etc.) | Plan, Environmental                                      | 70% of the area is represented by<br>cultural meadow, sultural thicket and<br>cultural woodland.   |  |
| C3 | Improve regional air quality and minimize adverse local effects                              | Predicted change in air quality  | Qualitative   | Air Consultant   | Low. Route is already largely developed as an urban environment.   |  |
|    |  | Number of residential units potentially affected by local air quality degradation  | No. of residential units affected   | Air Consultant   | Residential subdivisions are generally set back from Yonge St. Residences on Yonge St are located in mixed use areas.                        |  |
|    |  | Construction effects   | Effects   | Air Consultant   | Dust control measures will be adopted.<br>Multiple interfaces with commercial and<br>residential developments.                               |  |
| C4 | Minimize adverse effects on corridor hydrogeological, geological and hydrological conditions | Minimization of total recharge area affected.  | recharge areas with moderate to higher permeable soils  | Geologic Survey of Canada<br>Surficial Geology map, Plan | Approx. 3.2 km of route over permeable moraine and glacial river deposits.  Negligable decrease in recharge expected.                        |  |
|    |  | Change in potential for flooding by removal of storage capacity  |   | Geologic Survey of Canada<br>Surficial Geology map, Plan | Construction through aquifers, if any, may require special construction measures to eliminate or minimize changes to groundwater conditions. |  |
|    |  | Potential for adverse effects on surface water quality/quantity. Preference for minimizing proximity to watercourses    Rating of watercourse   Plan, Environmental (Jagg crossings and length of span (km) in floodplain deposits |   |  |  |  |
|    |  | Number of sites with contaminants  | No. of contaminated sites   | Contaminated sites consultant                            | 11 High Risk; 2 Medium-Risk; 14 Low-Risk   |  |

OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor

|    |   |  |                 |                          | RH2  |
|----|---|--|-----------------|--------------------------|--|
|    | Goals   | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals  | Unit of measure | Information Source       | Yonge Street   |
| D1 | Support Regional and<br>Municipal Planning Policies<br>and approved urban structure | Conformity with, and support for, policies of official plans and urban structures of Region, internal and adjacent municipalities, including GTA | Qualitative     | 1                        | Route recommended in TMP for rapid transit.  |
|    |   | Conformity with land use designations, including compatibility with existing development   | Qualitative     | Plan, Land Use, OP's     | Route traverses existing commercial and residential developments.  |
|    |   | Service to planned centres, major and minor  | Qualitative     |                          | Direct access to the Oak Ridges core area.   |
| D2 | Provide convenient access to social and community facilities in corridor            | Proximity to hospitals, educational institutions, community centres, local government offices etc.   | Qualitative     | on Preliminary Screening | Direct access to Oak Ridges Public<br>Library, Charles Connor Room.<br>Reasonable access to Oak Ridges<br>Recreation Centre. |
| D3 | Protect provisions for goods movement in corridor                                   | Inventory of major truck routes, delivery and loading areas, manufacturing operations affected by transitway insertion                           | Qualitative     |                          | Numerous businesses along Yonge St requiring deliveries. Median transitway may cause trucks to modify access routes.         |
| D4 | Promote transit-oriented development  | Opportunities for re-development   | Qualitative     | Plan                     | High potential   |
|    |   | Potential opportunities for development and higher order uses, at stations, termini, and along the corridor                                      | Qualitative     |                          | Good potential for transit-oriented devleopments along route.  |

OBJECTIVE E: To maximize the cost-effectiveness of the rapid transit system

|    |  |   |   |                              | RH2   |
|----|--|---|---|------------------------------|---|
|    | Goals  | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals   | Unit of measure   | Information Source           | Yonge Street  |
| E1 | Minimize capital cost of vehicles, facilities and systems required | Estimate of cost of capital works including: elevated, at-grade, cut and cover, tunnelled or open cut running way, stations, systems and major utility relocation works | <b>``</b>   | Plan, Profile, cross section | Estimate (higher staging costs due to length of dedicated transitway) |
|    |  | Estimated vehicle fleet cost  | Estimate (No. of fleet to be required, Frequency of the service, Length of service) | Plan                         | Estimate  |
| E2 | Minimize property acquisition cost to implement facilities         | Estimated value of residential units to be acquired   | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Land Use               | None  |
|    |  | Estimated value of industrial units to be acquired  | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Land Use               | None  |
|    |  | Estimated value of commercial units to be acquired  | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Land Use               | Minor takings from Yonge St frontage                                  |
|    |  | Potential remediation costs for known or potentially contaminated sites   | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Golder                 | 27 sites  |
| E3 | Minimize adverse effects of alignment characteristics on           | Influence of route length on O & M costs  | Route length  | Plan, YC Program Office      | 6.3 km  |
|    | operating and maintenance costs                                    | Influence of alignment characteristics on O & M costs   | No. of stations, effect of alignment on maintenance costs                           | Plan, YC Program Office      | 5 stations  |
|    |  | Influence of route location on O & M costs  | No. of stations, ease of access of maintenance vehicles                             | Plan, YC Program Office      | Not applicable  |

### **AURORA EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES**

OBJECTIVE A: To Improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable, and efficient rapid transit service

|   |  |   |   |                                     |   | Aur2   |                     | Aur3  |   | Aur4   |
|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|---------------------|---|---|--|
|   | Typical indicators massyring route's chility to          |   |   |                                     |   |  | Yonge Street/       | Yonge Street/   |   |  |
|   | Goals  | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to   | Unit of measure   | Information Source                  |   | Yonge Street   | Industrial Parkway/ |   |   | Industrial Parkway/  |
|   |  | achieve goals   |   | information source                  |   |  |                     | St. John's Sideroad   | а | djacent to GO Bradford ROW   |
| A | Increase attractiveness of rapid transit service         | Projected travel time along each alternative  | Travel time   | IBI                                 | • | 12.1 minutes   | •                   | 13.4 minutes  | • | 11.4 minutes   |
|   |  | Passenger volume at s. of Wellington  | AM peak hour<br>passenger volume in<br>2031                 | York Region Travel<br>Demand Model  | • | 2,400  | •                   | 2,700   | • | 1,500  |
|   |  | Transit Boardings   | AM peak period boardings (NB and SB)                        | York Region Travel<br>Demand Model  | • | 3500-4000  | •                   | 3000-3500   | • | 2500-3000  |
|   |  | Route features with potential to reduce service reliability                               | Constraints/# of intersections & operatior in mixed traffic | Plan<br>1                           | • | 12 signalized intersections Approx. 3 km operation in mixed high volume traffic on Yonge St and 3.2 km of dedicated transitway | •                   | 6 signalized intersections Approx. 6 km operation in mixed moderate traffic volume on Industrial Pkwy and St.John's Sdrd and 2 km of dedicated transitway on Yonge St | • | 3 signalized intersections Approx. 2.5 km operation in mixed moderate traffic volume on Industrial Pkwy and 2 km of dedicated transitway on Yonge St |
|   |  | Overall A1 Rating   |   |                                     | 0 |  | •                   |   |   | •  |
| A | Maximize transit connectivity                            | Connections to inter-regional services  | No. of crossing services (i.e. GO, etc.)                    | Build on Preliminary<br>Screening   | O | GO Bus stop at Murray Drive  | •                   | Reasonable connection to GO Rail services at Aurora GO Station  | • | Good connection to GO Rail services at Aurora GO Station   |
|   |  | Overall A   | 2 Rating  |                                     |   | •  |                     | 0   |   | •  |
| A | Alignment geometry that maximizes speed and ride         | % of route > 3% grade   | %   | Profile                             | • | 40%  | •                   | 40%   | • | 30%  |
|   | comfort and minimizes safety risks and maintenance costs | No. of running way sections > 3.5%  | #   | Profile                             | • | 5 (560m, 290m, 215m, 95m, 120m)  | •                   | 13 (560m, 235m, 145m, 270m, 155m, 90m, 180m, 80m, 120m, 130m, 170m, 110m, 60m)  | • | 5 (560m, 235m, 145m, 270m, 165m)   |
|   |  | No. of curves with radius < 100 metre   | #   | Plan                                | • | 0 Curves   | •                   | Industrial Parkway - 5 Curves   | • | Industrial Parkway - 5 Curves<br>New ROW - 0 Curves  |
|   |  | No. of curves with radius ≥ 100 metres and < 300 metres                                   | #   | Plan                                | • | 0 Curves   | •                   | Industrial Parkway - 7 Curves   | • | Industrial Parkway - 7 Curves<br>New ROW - 2 Curves  |
|   |  | Overall A   | 3 Rating  |                                     |   | •  |                     | O   |   | •  |
| A | Convenient service connections to                        | Length of service connections   | Relative measure  | Plan                                |   | Not Applicable   |                     | Not Applicable  |   | Not Applicable   |
|   | maintenance facility and storage yard                    | Overall A   | 4 Rating  |                                     |   |  |                     |   |   |  |
| A |  | Existing and future residents or residences within 500 m walking distance of station      | No. of residents in 2013                                    | Land use forecasts, GIS<br>Analysis | • | 9,100  | •                   | 6,600   | O | 5,900  |
|   |  | Existing and future employment within a 500 m walking distance of a station               | No. of employees in 2031                                    | Land use forecasts, GIS<br>Analysis | • | 4,200  | •                   | 4,200   | • | 2,800  |
|   |  | Major traffic generators or attractors within 500 m walking distance of proposed stations | #   | Plan                                | • | Aurora Historic Core, Library, and commercial areas  | •                   | Aurora Leisure Complex  | • | Aurora Leisure Complex   |
|   |  | Overall A   | 5 Rating  |                                     |   | •  |                     | 0   |   | •  |

LEGEND: Least Responsive



|  |   |  |  |              | Aur2  |   | Aur3   |   | Aur4   |
|--|---|--|--|--------------|---|---|--|---|--|
|  |   | _  |  |              |   |   | Yonge Street/  |   | Yonge Street/  |
| Goals  | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to   | Unit of measure  | Information Source                       | Yonge Street |   |   | Industrial Parkway/  |   | Industrial Parkway/  |
| Goals  | achieve goals   | Offic of fileasure                                       | mormation Source                         |              |   |   | St. John's Sideroad  | ; | adjacent to GO Bradford ROW  |
| B1 Minimize adverse effects on<br>and maximize benefits for<br>communities in corridor | Potential for displacement/disruption of unique and distinctive community features  | No. of unique & distinctive community features disrupted | Plan, Heritage (Unterman); Land use      | •            | No substantial impact on community features   | • | No substantial impact on community features  | • | No substantial impact on community features  |
|  | Number and type of industrial uses displaced or disrupted   | No. of industrial properties                             | Plan                                     | •            | None  | • | None   | 0 | 20 along new ROW, adjacent to existing GO Bradford ROW   |
|  | Length of route with potential for an increase or decrease in business activity   | Length (m)   | Plan                                     | •            | 3.3 km Henderson to development south of St.John's Sdrd.  | • | Lower potential due to land use primarily industrial   | • | Lower potential due to land use primarily industrial   |
|  | Number and type of retail, office and service commercial businesses displaced or affected   | No. of affected retail, office or service commercial     | Plan                                     | •            | None  | • | None   | • | 2 along new ROW, adjacent to existing GO Bradford ROW  |
|  | Number of residential properties displaced or disrupted by location   | No. of residential properties                            | Plan, Land use                           | •            | None  | • | None   | • | None   |
|  | Barrier impact – potential for division of communities by the facility right-of-way   | Qualitative  | Plan                                     | •            | Low: route follows existing Yonge St  | • | Low: route follows existing roadways   | • | Low: route follows existing roadways and rail ROW's  |
|  | Number and type of community features/services affected   | No. of community features                                | Plan, Land use                           | •            | None  | • | None   | • | None   |
|  | Construction effects  | Length of new construction                               | Plan (major vs minor roadway)            | •            | 4.2 km on existing major roadway  | • | 2.0 km on existing major roadway (Yonge St)  | • | 2.0 km on existing major roadway (Yonge St)  |
|  |   | all B1 Rating  |  |              | •   |   | •  |   | O  |
| B2 Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation                         | Number of intersections with restricted access  | No. of intersections                                     | Plan                                     | •            | 5 intersections Operation in mixed traffic in Aurora Historic Core  | • | 3 intersections on Yonge St<br>Operation in mixed traffic on Ind Pkwy and<br>St. John's Sdrd                             | • | 3 intersections on Yonge St Operation in mixed traffic on Ind Pkwy   |
|  | Number of driveways with restricted access due to the alignment   | No. of driveways   | Plan                                     | •            | 54 driveways along Yonge St (does not include between Golf Links Rd and Aurora Heights since operation is in mixed traffic) | • | 23 driveways along Yonge St<br>0 on Industrial Pkwy and St.John's since<br>operation is in mixed traffic                 | • | 23 driveways along Yonge St<br>0 on Industrial Pkwy and St.John's since<br>operation is in mixed traffic                           |
|  | Potential for infiltration of neighbourhoods by diverted traffic  | Qualitative  | Plan, Projected LOS along route          | •            | Moderate to High in downtown core area  | • | Little to none   | • | Little to none   |
|  | Loss of residential street parking  | Length of residential street parking loss                | Plan                                     | •            | None. Assumes parking prohibited in Historic Core in peak hour.   | • | No existing residential street parking   | • | No existing residential street parking   |
|  | Change in convenience of pedestrian crossing movements  | Qualitative  | Plan                                     | •            | Transitway on longer route length. Operation in dedicated ROW.  | • | Transitway on shorter route length.  Operation in mixed traffic has no effect.   | • | Transitway on shorter route length.  Operation in mixed traffic has no effect.   |
|  | Number of instances where primary access routes to social or community institutions are made more indirect or otherwise disrupted |  | Plan                                     | •            | 1 (Aurora Cemetery)   | • | 1 (Aurora Cemetery)  | • | 1 (Aurora Cemetery)  |
|  | Number of stations with the potential to increase traffic and parking on local streets  | No. of stations  | IBI                                      | O            | 6 stations  | • | 5 stations   | • | 4 stations   |
|  | Overa   | all B2 Rating  |  |              | •   |   | •  |   | •  |
| B3 Maintain a high level of public safety and security in corridor                     | Locations with potential to decrease public safety  | Qualitative  | Plan                                     | •            | Motorists unfamiliar with u-turns across transitway.  | • | Motorists unfamiliar with u-turns across transitway (Yonge St portion).  | • | Motorists unfamiliar with u-turns across transitway (Yonge St portion). Stations adjacent to GO rail line may be a safety concern. |
|  | Effect of transitway insertion on emergency vehicle circulation   | Qualitative  | Plan, emergency agencies, municipalities | •            | May use transitway but some median crossing restriction.  | • | May use transitway but some median crossing restriction on Yonge St. Otherwise operation in mixed traffic and no effect. | • | No effect when adjacent to rail ROW.   |
|  | Overa   | all B3 Rating  |  |              | •   |   | •  |   | 0  |

### **AURORA EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES** OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor

|   |   |  |                                       |   | Aur2   | Aur3  | Aur4   |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Goals   | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals   | Unit of measure  | Information Source                    |   | Yonge Street   | Yonge Street/<br>Industrial Parkway/<br>St. John's Sideroad   | Yonge Street/<br>Industrial Parkway/<br>adjacent to GO Bradford ROW  |
| B4 Minimize adverse noise and vibration effects   | Approximate number of noise-sensitive receptors that may potentially experience an increase in ambient sound levels based on the proximity of the route alternative to existing and/or future receptors                           | No. of receptors   | Plan, Noise consultant (Senes)        | • | Residential pockets close to Yonge St exposed to high existing sound levels. Larger numbers of residences closer to Yonge St and therefore likely to be impacted by transit noise. | Low potential. Route is highly industrial so existing sound levels are expected to be high.  Closest residences are generally further from this route than residences in the vicinity of A2 and A4. | Low potential.   |
|   | Approximate number of residences or<br>Vibration—sensitive buildings that may potentially<br>experience an increase in vibration levels based on<br>the proximity of the route alternative to existing and/or<br>future receptors | Qualitative  | Plan, Vibration consultant (Senes)    | • | Low to none  | Low to none   | Moderate   |
|   | Construction effects  | Qualitative/ Noise Level/<br>Mitigation during<br>construction | Plan, Noise consultant (Senes)        | • | Low Route has high existing ambient noise levels.  | Moderate  | High Route has low existing ambient noise levels.  |
|   | Overa   | III B4 Rating  |                                       |   | •  | •   | •  |
| B5 Minimize adverse effects on<br>cultural resources  | Significance of built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes   | Significance of building 8 type of disruption                  | Plan, Heritage consultant (Unterman)  | • | Minimal impact   | No impact   | No impact  |
|   | Number of archaeological resources displaced or disrupted   | No. of resources   | Plan, Archaeological consultant (ASI) | • | 3 sites  | 0 sites   | 0 sites  |
|   | Significance of archaeological resources displaced or disrupted   | Type of disruption   | Plan, Archaeological consultant (ASI) | • | Medium Impact (score of 38)  | Medium Impact (score of 25)   | Medium Impact (score of 25)  |
|   | Overa   | III B5 Rating  |                                       |   | •  | •   | •  |
| B6 Minimize disruption of community vistas and adverse effects on street and neighbourhood aesthetics | Visual impact on people living and working in and visiting the community  | Qualitative  | Plan                                  | • | Median transitway including stations with streetscaping.   | Limited Median transitway along Yonge Street  | Median transitway along Yonge St including stations with streetscaping. Separate transitway running alongside existing GO rail line. |
|   | Overa   | III B6 Rating  |                                       |   | •  | •   | •  |

LEGEND: Least Responsive







### AURORA EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES

OBJECTIVE C: To promote a sustainable environment by protecting and enhancing the natural environment in the corridor

|   |  |   |  |   | Aur2   |   | Aur3   |   | Aur4   |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| Goals   | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals  | Unit of measure   | Information Source                                       |   | Yonge Street   |   | Yonge Street/<br>Industrial Parkway/<br>St. John's Sideroad  | а | Yonge Street/<br>Industrial Parkway/<br>Idjacent to GO Bradford ROW  |
| C1 Minimize adverse effects on<br>Aquatic Ecology   | Number of watercourse crossings  | No. of watercourse crossings  | Plan, Environmental                                      | • | 5 watercourse crossings (3 perpendicular and 2 parallel of Tannery Creek)  | • | 2 watercourse crossings (2 perpendicular of tributary of Tannery Creek)  | • | 2 watercourse crossings (2 perpendicular of tributary of Tannery Creek)  |
|   | Type of watercourse crossing to be affected  | Type and significance of watercourse crossing   | Plan, Environmental                                      | • | Operation in mixed traffic at the crossing locations.  | • | None. Operation in mixed traffic along Industrial Pkwy where the crossings are located.  | • | None. Operation in mixed traffic along Industrial Pkwy where the crossings are located.  |
|   | Type and significance of fish habitat to be affected   | Type and significance of fish habitat   | Plan, Environmental                                      | • | None since no widening in the locations of the crossings.  | • | None   | • | None   |
|   | Ove  | erall C1 Rating   |  |   | •  |   | •  |   | •  |
| C2 Minimize adverse effects on<br>Terrestrial Ecology   | Number and status of any species at risk   | No. & status of terrestrial ecosystems (ELC vegetation communities)                                     | Plan, Environmental                                      | • | 22 Ecological Land Classification vegetation communities along route. Low potential for impact due to limited widening and mixed traffic operation.          | • | 25 Ecological Land Classification vegetation communities along route. Low potential for impact due to limited widening on Yonge St and mixed traffic operation on Industrial Pkwy. | • | 24 Ecological Land Classification vegetation communities along route. Low potential for impact due to limited widening on Yonge St and mixed traffic operation on Industrial Pkwy. None affected by new row. |
|   | Type and significance of wildlife habitat/vegetation communities to be affected                                      | Type, occurrence and significance of terrestrial ecosystems (wetlands, forests, thickets, fields, etc.) | Plan, Environmental                                      | • | All areas are relatively small providing minimal wildlife habitat for small mammals and birds.   | • | Minimal significance on Yonge St.<br>No widening on Industrial Pkwy or<br>St.John's Sdrd, therefore no affect to<br>habitat/vegetation communities.                                | • | Minimal significance on Yonge St.<br>No widening on Industrial Pkwy, therefore<br>no affect to habitat/vegetation<br>communities.  |
|   | Ove  | erall C2 Rating   |  |   | •  |   | •  |   | •  |
| C3 Improve regional air quality and minimize adverse local effects                              | Predicted change in air quality  | Qualitative   | Air Consultant (Senes)                                   | • | Minimal. Route is already largely developed as an urban environment.   | • | Minimal. Route is already largely developed mostly as an industrial, urban environment.  | • | Minimal. Route is already largely developed mostly as an industrial, urban environment.  |
|   | Number of residential units potentially affected by local air quality degradation                                    | No. of residential units affected   | Air Consultant (Senes)                                   | • | Residential pockets close to Yonge St are exposed to existing vehicle emissions.   | • | Closest residences are generally further away from this route than those in the vicinity of A2 and A4.   | • | Residences on south end of route are separated from the alternative by the GO line and industry.   |
|   | Construction effects   | Effects   | Air Consultant (Senes)                                   | • | Dust control measures will be adopted.  Multiple interfaces with commercial and residential developments.  | • | Dust control measures will be adopted.  Multiple interfaces with industrial developments.  | • | Dust control measures will be adopted.<br>Multiple interfaces with residential and<br>industrial developments.   |
|   | Ove  | erall C3 Rating   | ,  |   | •  |   | •  |   | •  |
| C4 Minimize adverse effects on corridor hydrogeological, geological and hydrological conditions |  | Length of alignment (km) over<br>recharge areas with moderate<br>to higher permeable soils              |  | • | Approx. 1.7 km of route over permeable moraine deposits. Negligable decrease in recharge expected.  No affect in area where mixed traffic operation assumed. | • | Approx. 1.7 km of route along Yonge St over permeable moraine deposits.  Negligable decrease in recharge expected.  No affect in area where mixed traffic operation assumed.       | • | Approx. 1.7 km of route along Yonge St over permeable moraine deposits.  Negligable decrease in recharge expected.  No affect in area where mixed traffic operation assumed.                                 |
|   | Change in potential for flooding by removal of storage capacity  | Qualitative   | Geologic Survey of Canada<br>Surficial Geology map, Plan | • | Construction through aquifers, if any, may require special construction measures to eliminate or minimize changes to groundwater conditions.                 | • | Construction through aquifers, if any, may require special construction measures to eliminate or minimize changes to groundwater conditions.                                       | • | Construction through aquifers, if any, may require special construction measures to eliminate or minimize changes to groundwater conditions.   |
|   | Potential for adverse effects on surface water quality/quantity. Preference for minimizing proximity to watercourses | Rating of watercourse crossings and length of span (km) in floodplain deposits                          | Plan, Environmental (Jagger<br>Hims)                     | • | Low to moderate. Route closer to watercourses.   | • | Low to moderate. Route not as close to watercourses.   | • | Low. Least span in proximity to watercourses.  |
|   | Number of sites with contaminants  | No. of contaminated sites   | Contaminated sites consultant                            | • | 12 High Risk; 9 Medium Risk; 19 Low<br>Risk  | O | 12 High Risk;11 Medium Risk; 18 Low<br>Risk  | • | 8 High Risk; 2 Medium Risk; 13 Low Risk  |
|   | Ove  | erall C4 Rating   |  |   | •  |   | •  |   | •  |

LEGEND: Least Responsive



0



•

# AURORA EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor

|    | Aur2  |  | Aur2            |  | Aur3 | Aur4  |   |  |    |  |
|----|---|--|-----------------|--|------|---|---|--|----|--|
|    | Goals   | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals  | Unit of measure | Information Source   |      | Yonge Street  |   | Yonge Street/<br>Industrial Parkway/<br>St. John's Sideroad  | ac | Yonge Street/<br>Industrial Parkway/<br>Ijacent to GO Bradford ROW   |
| D. | 1 Support Regional and<br>Municipal Planning Policies<br>and approved urban structure | Conformity with, and support for, policies of official plans and urban structures of Region, internal and adjacent municipalities, including GTA | Qualitative     | Plan, Reports, Land Use                                    | •    | Matches corridor recommended in TMP for rapid transit and conforms well with policies   | • | Generally within TMP corridor but less supportive of policies  | •  | Generally within TMP corridor but less supportive of policies.   |
|    |   | Conformity with land use designations, including compatibility with existing development   | Qualitative     | Plan, Land Use, OP's                                       | •    | Route traverses existing commercial land use with higher density residential developments in proximity.   | • | Route traverses existing industrial development.   | •  | Route traverses existing industrial and residential development.   |
|    |   | Service to planned centres, major and minor  | Qualitative     | Plan, TMP, OP's, Reports                                   | •    | Direct access to Aurora business district.  | 0 | Bypasses Aurora business district.   | 0  | Bypasses Aurora business district.   |
|    |   | Overall D  | 1 Rating        |  |      | •   |   | •  |    | •  |
| D: | Provide convenient access to social and community facilities in corridor              | Proximity to hospitals, educational institutions, community centres, local government offices etc.   | Qualitative     | Plan, Reports, Land Use, Build<br>on Preliminary Screening | •    | Direct access to Aurora Public Library,<br>Community Centre, Dr.S.W. Williams<br>High School, Aurora Museum,<br>St.Andrews College, Recreation<br>Centres, School Board Headquarters. | 0 | Direct access to Aurora Leisure<br>Complex, Aurora Montessori School,<br>Foundations Private School, Royal<br>Canadian Legion Ontario head office,<br>Sheppartds Bush Conservation Area. | •  | Direct access to Aurora Montessori<br>School.<br>Reasonable access to Aurora Leisure<br>Complex, Foundations Private School,<br>Royal Canadian Legion Ontario head<br>office, Sheppards Bush Conservation<br>Area. |
|    |   | Overall D  | 2 Rating        |  |      | •   |   | •  |    | •  |
| D: | Protect provisions for goods movement in corridor                                     | Inventory of major truck routes, delivery and loading areas, manufacturing operations affected by transitway insertion                           | Qualitative     | Plan   | •    | Numerous businesses along Yonge St requiring deliveries. Median transitway may cause trucks to modify access routes.  | • | Major route for trucks accessing the numerous industrial businesses along Industrial Pkwy.  Low impact since transit operation is in low volume mixed traffic.                           | •  | Major route for trucks accessing the numerous industrial businesses along Industrial Parkway. Transitway adjacent to existing GO rail ROW, therefore operations not affected.                                      |
|    |   | Overall D  | 3 Rating        |  |      | •   |   | •  |    | •  |
| D  | Promote transit-oriented development  | Opportunities for re-development   | Qualitative     | Plan   | •    | High potential outside heritage district.   | • | Minimal opportunity.   | •  | Minimal opportunity.   |
|    |   | Potential opportunities for development and higher order uses, at stations, termini, and along the corridor                                      | Qualitative     | Plan   | •    | Good potential for transit-oriented developments along route.   | • | Low potential  | •  | Low potential  |
|    |   | Overall D  | 4 Rating        | ,  |      | •   |   | O  |    | •  |

LEGEND: Least Responsive







### **AURORA EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES**

OBJECTIVE E: To maximize the cost-effectiveness of the rapid transit system

|    |  |   |   |                              | Aur2         |   | Aur3                                       |  | Aur4   |   |
|----|--|---|---|------------------------------|--------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| _  |  |   | T   | T                            | 4            | Yonge Street  |  | Yonge Street/  |  | Yonge Street/   |
|    | Goals  | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals   | Unit of measure   | Information Source           | Tonge Street |   | Industrial Parkway/<br>St. John's Sideroad |  | Industrial Parkway/<br>adjacent to GO Bradford ROW |   |
| E1 | required   | Estimate of cost of capital works including: elevated, at-grade, cut and cover, tunnelled or open cut running way, stations, systems and major utility relocation works |   | Plan, Profile, cross section | •            | Estimate \$105 million range (higher staging costs, shorter length) | •  | Estimate \$80 million range (mixed traffic on Industrial Pkwy and St. John's Sdrd) | •  | Estimate \$90-100 million range (brand new ROW)                             |
|    |  | Estimated vehicle fleet cost  | Estimate (No. of fleet to be required, Frequency of the service, Length of service) | Plan                         | •            | Shortest route length contributes to lower fleet cost.              | O  | Longest route increases round-trip time potentially requiring more vehicles.       | •  | Longer route increases round-trip time potentially requiring move vehicles. |
|    |  | Ov  | verall E1 Rating  |                              |              | •   |  | 0  |  | •   |
| E2 | Minimize property acquisition cost to implement facilities | Estimated value of residential units to be acquired   | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Land Use               | •            | Minor takings from Yonge St. frontage.                              | •  | Minimal takings  | •  | None  |
|    |  | Estimated value of industrial units to be acquired  | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Land Use               | •            | None  | •  | None   | 0  | Significant acquisition of new ROW adjacent to GO Rail.                     |
|    |  | Estimated value of commercial units to be acquired  | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Land Use               | •            | Minor takings from Yonge St. frontage.                              | •  | Minimal takings  | 0  | Significant acquisition of new ROW adjacent to GO Rail.                     |
|    |  | Potential remediation costs for known or potentially contaminated sites   | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Golder                 | O            | 40 sites  | •  | 41 sites   | •  | 23 sites  |
|    |  | 0\  | verall E2 Rating  |                              |              | 0   |  | •  |  | •   |
| E3 | Minimize adverse effects of alignment characteristics on   | Influence of route length on O & M costs  | Route length  | Plan, YC Program Office      | •            | 6.2 km  | •  | 8.0 km   | •  | 6.7 km  |
|    | operating and maintenance costs                            | Influence of alignment characteristics on O & M costs   | No. of stations, effect of alignment on maintenance costs                           | Plan, YC Program Office      | •            | 6 stations<br>No sharp curves                                       | •  | 5 stations<br>Curves are tighter on Industrial Pkwy                                | •  | 4 stations<br>Curves are tighter on Industrial Pkwy                         |
|    |  | Influence of route location on O & M costs  | No. of stations, ease of access of maintenance vehicles                             | Plan, YC Program Office      |              | Not applicable  |  | Not applicable   |  | Not applicable  |
|    |  | 0\  | verall E3 Rating  |                              |              | 0   |  | O  |  | 0   |

LEGEND: Least Responsive







### NEWMARKET/EAST GWILLIMBURY EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES

OBJECTIVE A: To Improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable, and efficient rapid transit service

|  |   |   |                                     | NE2   | NE3  | NE5   | NE6  | NE7  | NE8   |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| Goals  | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals                             | Unit of measure   | Information Source                  | Yonge Street/<br>Green Lane   | adjacent to GO Bradford ROW  | Yonge Street/Eagle Street<br>West/Newmarket GO Bus<br>Terminal  | Yonge Street/Davis Drive/Main<br>Street/Green Lane   | Yonge Street/Davis Drive to<br>Leslie Street   | Yonge Street/Davis<br>Drive/Bayview Parkway/Green<br>Lane   |
| A1 Increase attractiveness of<br>rapid transit service | Projected travel time along each alternative  | Travel time   | IBI                                 | 14.2 minutes  | 7 minutes  | 8.5 minutes   | 16.6 minutes   | O 17 minutes   | O 16.2 minutes  |
|  | Passenger volume at the peak load point   | AM peak hour passenger volume in 2031                       | York Region Travel<br>Demand Model  | <b>1</b> ,000   | 900  | <b>o</b> 900  | 1,300  | <b>•</b> 1,300   | <b>a</b> 1,300  |
|  | Transit Boardings   | AM peak period boardings (NE and SB)                        | York Region Travel<br>Demand Model  | 3,000   | <b>1</b> 2,100   | 2,800   | 3,400  | 3,600  | 4,000   |
|  | Route features with potential to reduce service reliability                               | Constraints/# of intersections & operation in mixed traffic | Plan                                | 17 signalized intersections 8.5 km of dedicated transitway on Yonge Street and Green Lane | 5 intersections 7.0 km of new ROW  | 7 signalized intersections Approx. 1.4 km operation in moderate mixed traffic volume or Eagle St and 3.1 km of dedicated transitway on Yonge St |  | 19 signalized intersections Approx. 4.1 km operation in heavy mixed traffic on Davis Dr and 4.2 km of dedicated transitway on Yonge St | 16 signalized intersections Approx. 2.5 km operation in heavy mixed traffic on Davis Dr and Green Lane, 1.9 km in light mixed traffic on Bayview Parkway, 400 m on new ROW and 4.2 km of dedicated transitway on Yonge St |
|  | Overa   | II A1 Rating  |                                     | 0   | O  | •   | •  | •  | •   |
| A2 Maximize transit connectivity                       | Connections to inter-regional services  | No. of crossing services (i.e. GO, etc.)                    | Build on Preliminary<br>Screening   | Connects to GO Rail services at East Gwillimbury GO Station                               | Connects to GO Rail services at Newmarket and East Gwillimbury GO Stations     | Connects to GO Bus services   | Connects to GO Rail services at<br>East Gwillimbury Station &<br>reasonable access to Newmarket<br>Station | Connects to GO Rail services at Newmarket GO Station   | Connects to GO Rail services at Newmarket and East Gwillimbury GO Stations  |
|  | Overa   | II A2 Rating  |                                     | •   | •  | •   | •  | •  | •   |
| A3 Alignment geometry that<br>maximizes speed and ride | % of route > 3% grade   | %   | Profile                             | O 30%   | <b>3</b> 20%   | <b>O</b> 30%  | <b>O</b> 33%   | O 33%  | <b>o</b> 25%  |
| comfort and minimizes safety risks and                 | No. of running way sections > 3.5%  | #   | Profile                             | 4 (820m, 300m, 190m, 180m)  | 7 (250m, 220m, 145m, 75m, 100m, 40m, 110m)                                     | 1 (820m)  | 8 (820m, 250m, 240m, 50m, 80m, 40m, 180m, 180m)  | 7 (820m, 250m, 220m, 200m, 165m, 380m, 175m)   | 5 (820m, 250m, 110m, 190m, 180m)  |
| maintenance costs                                      | No. of curves with radius < 100 metre   | #   | Plan                                | 1 Curve   | 0 Curves   | 1 Curve   | 3 Curves   | 1 Curve  | 3 Curves  |
|  | No. of curves with radius ≥ 100 metres and < 300 metres                                   | #   | Plan                                | O Curves  | 2 Curves   | Eagle St - 1 Curve  | Main St - 3 Curves   | • 0 Curves   | Bayview Pkwy - 2 Curves   |
|  | Overa   | II A3 Rating  |                                     | •   | 0  | •   | •  | •  | •   |
| A4 Convenient service connections to                   | Proximity to nearest MSF  | Non-revenue distance to end of service                      | Plan                                | ① 2.9 km  | ① 2.9 km   | ● 2.4 km  | ① 2.9 km   | • 6.0 km   | ① 2.9 km  |
| maintenance facility and<br>storage yard (MSF)         | Overa   | II A4 Rating  |                                     | •   | •  | •   | 0  | •  | 0   |
| A5 Station locations that<br>maximize ridership        | Existing and future residents or residences within 500 m walking distance of station      | No. of residents in 2013                                    | Land use forecasts, GIS<br>Analysis | <b>1</b> 3,850  | <b>9</b> 8,800   | <b>9</b> ,400   | • 17,000   | <b>1</b> 6,000   | • 17,100  |
| potential of rapid transit service                     | Existing and future employment within a 500 m walking distance of a station               | No. of employees in 2031                                    | Land use forecasts, GIS<br>Analysis | <b>o</b> 6,250  | 3,250  | <b>9</b> 4,450  | 6,800  | • 8,600  | 7,500   |
|  | Major traffic generators or attractors within 500 m walking distance of proposed stations | #   | Plan                                | Upper Canada Mall, commercial developments/big box stores, York Regional Centre           | Pickering College, Southlake Regional Health Centre, Newmarket Historical area | Upper Canada Mall, York<br>Regional Centre.   | Upper Canada Mall, York Regional Centre, Southlake Regional Health Centre, Newmarket Historical area       | Upper Canada Mall, York Regional Centre, Southlake Regional Health Centre, Newmarket Historical area                                   | Upper Canada Mall, York Regional Centre, Southlake Regional Health Centre, Newmarket Historical area  |
|  | Overa   | II A5 Rating  |                                     | •   | •  | •   | •  | •  | •   |

LEGEND: Least Responsive O 🐧 🛈 Most Responsive

# NEWMARKET/EAST GWILLIMBURY EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor

|  |   |  |  |   | NE2   |        | NE3   |    | NE5  |    | NE6  |   | NE7  |   | NE8  |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|--------|---|----|--|----|--|---|--|---|--|
| Goals  | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals   | Unit of measure  | Information Source                       |   | Yonge Street/<br>Green Lane   | adjace | ent to GO Bradford<br>ROW                                       | Ea | Yonge Street/<br>agle Street West/<br>wmarket GO Bus<br>Terminal   | Da | Yonge Street/<br>avis Drive/Main<br>reet/Green Lane  |   | nge Street/Davis<br>e to Leslie Street   | I | nge Street/Davis<br>Drive/Bayview<br>kway/Green Lane   |
| B1 Minimize adverse effects on and maximize benefits for communities in corridor | Potential for displacement/disruption of unique and distinctive community features  | No. of unique & distinctive community features disrupted | Plan, Heritage (Unterman); Landuse       | • | No substantial impact on community features   | •      | Holland River valley lands                                      | •  | No substantial impact on community features  | •  | No substantial impact on community features  | • | No substantial impact on community features  | • | No substantial impact on community features  |
| communities in corruor   | Number and type of industrial uses displaced or disrupted   | No. of industrial properties                             | Plan                                     | • | None  | 0      | 9   | •  | None   | •  | None   | • | None   | • | None   |
|  | Number and type of retail, office and service commercial businesses displaced or affected   | No. of affected retail, office or service commercial     | Plan                                     | O | 10  | •      | 6   | •  | 8  | •  | 10   | • | 10   | O | 10   |
|  | Number of residential properties displaced or disrupted by location   | No. of residential properties                            | Plan, Land use                           | • | 1   | •      | 25  | •  | 1  | •  | 1  | • | 1  | • | 1  |
|  | Barrier impact – potential for division of communities by the facility right-of-way   | Qualitative  | Plan                                     | • | Low: route follows existing roadways  | •      | Low: route follows existing rail ROW                            | •  | Low: route follows existing roadways   | •  | Low: route follows existing roadways   | • | Low: route follows existing roadways   | • | Low: route follows existing roadways   |
|  | Number and type of community features/services affected   | No. of community features                                | Plan, Land use                           | • | None  | •      | Golf Course, East<br>Holland River                              | •  | None   | •  | None   | • | None   | • | None   |
|  | Construction effects  | Length of new construction                               | Plan (major vs minor roadway)            | • | 8.5 km on existing<br>major roadway (Yonge<br>St and Green Ln)  | •      | 7.0 km on new ROW   | •  | 3.1 km on existing major roadway (Yonge St)  | •  | 4.2 km on existing major roadway (Yongo St)  | • | 4.2 km on existing<br>major roadway (Yonge<br>St)  | • | 4.2 km on existing<br>major roadway (Yonge<br>St) and .4 km new<br>ROW   |
|  | Ove   | erall B1 Rating  | •  |   | •   |        | O   |    | •  |    | •  |   | 0  |   | •  |
| B2 Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian                               | Number of intersections with restricted access  | No. of intersections                                     | Plan                                     | • | None  | •      | None  | •  | None   | •  | None   | • | None   | • | None   |
| circulation  | Number of driveways with restricted access due to the alignment   | No. of driveways   | Plan                                     | 0 | 51 driveways along<br>Yonge St (does not<br>include Green Ln<br>since operation is in<br>mixed traffic) | •      | None  | •  | 23 driveways along<br>Yonge St (does not<br>include Eagle St due<br>to mixed traffic<br>operation)                       | •  | 34 driveways along<br>Yonge St (does not<br>include Davis Dr, Mair<br>St or Green Ln due to<br>mixed traffic<br>operation) |   | 34 driveways along<br>Yonge St (does not<br>include Davis Dr due<br>to mixed traffic<br>operation)                       | • | 34 driveways along<br>Yonge St (does not<br>include Davis Dr,<br>Bayview Pkwy or<br>Green Lane due to<br>mixed traffic<br>operation) |
|  | Potential for infiltration of neighbourhoods by diverted traffic  | Qualitative  | Plan, Projected LOS along route          | • | Some potential south of Davis Dr  | •      | Little to none  | •  | Some potential south of Davis Dr   | •  | Moderate potential   | • | Some potential south of Davis Dr   | • | Moderate potential   |
|  | Loss of residential street parking  | Length of residential street parking loss                | Plan                                     | • | No existing residential street parking  | •      | No existing residential street parking                          | •  | No existing residential street parking   | •  | No existing residential street parking   | • | No existing residential street parking   | • | Assume current parking remains   |
|  | Change in convenience of pedestrian crossing movements  | Qualitative  | Plan                                     | 0 | Low to moderate   | •      | Low to moderate   | •  | Low to moderate  | •  | Low to moderate  | • | Low to moderate  | • | Low to moderate  |
|  | Number of instances where primary access routes to social or community institutions are made more indirect or otherwise disrupted |  | Plan                                     | • | Newmarket Cemetery,<br>Quaker House,  | •      | None  | •  | Newmarket Cemetery,<br>Quaker House,   | •  | Newmarket Cemetery<br>Quaker House,  | • | Newmarket Cemetery,<br>Quaker House,   | • | Newmarket Cemetery,<br>Quaker House,   |
|  | Number of stations with the potential to increase traffic and parking on local streets  | No. of stations  | IBI                                      | O | 7 stations  | •      | 5 stations  | •  | 4 stations   | O  | 8 stations   | • | 6 stations   | • | 8 stations   |
|  | Ov  | erall B2 Rating  |  |   | •   |        | •   |    | •  |    | •  |   | •  |   | •  |
| B3 Maintain a high level of public safety and security in corridor               | Locations with potential to decrease public safety  | Qualitative  | Plan                                     | • | Motorists unfamiliar with u-turns across transitway.  | O      | Stations adjacent to<br>GO rail line may be a<br>safety concern | •  | Motorists unfamiliar with u-turns across transitway (Yonge St portion).  | •  | Motorists unfamiliar with u-turns across transitway (Yonge St portion).  | • | Motorists unfamiliar with u-turns across transitway (Yonge St portion).  | 0 | Motorists unfamiliar with u-turns across transitway (Yonge St portion).  |
|  | Effect of transitway insertion on emergency vehicle circulation   | Qualitative  | Plan, emergency agencies, municipalities | • | May use transitway but some median crossing restriction on Yonge St.                                    | •      | No effect.  | •  | May use transitway but some median crossing restriction on Yonge St. Otherwise operation in mixed traffic and no effect. | •  | May use transitway but some median crossing restriction on Yonge St. Otherwise operation in mixed traffic and no effect.   | • | May use transitway but some median crossing restriction on Yonge St. Otherwise operation in mixed traffic and no effect. | • | May use transitway but some median crossing restriction on Yonge St. Otherwise operation in mixed traffic and no effect.             |
|  | Ove   | erall B3 Rating  |  |   | •   |        | •   |    | •  |    | •  |   | •  | _ | •  |

# NEWMARKET/EAST GWILLIMBURY EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor

|   |   |  |                                       |   | NE2   | 1      | NE3  | ĺ   | NE5   |    | NE6  |   | NE7   | i | NE8  |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|--------|--|-----|---|----|--|---|---|---|--|
| Goals   | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals   | Unit of measure  | Information Source                    |   | Yonge Street/<br>Green Lane   | adjace | ent to GO Bradford<br>ROW  | Ea  | Yonge Street/<br>agle Street West/<br>wmarket GO Bus<br>Terminal                                  | Da | Yonge Street/<br>avis Drive/Main<br>reet/Green Lane  |   | nge Street/Davis<br>ve to Leslie Street   | [ | nge Street/Davis<br>Drive/Bayview<br>kway/Green Lane   |
|   | Approximate number of noise-sensitive receptors that may potentially experience an increase in ambient sound levels based on the proximity of the route alternative to existing and/or future receptors               | t No. of receptors   | Plan, Noise consultant (Senes)        | • | Most receptors are set<br>back from Green<br>Lane, except for a few<br>pockets. | •      | High potential since<br>there are several<br>residential<br>subdivisions along the<br>route. | •   | Medium potential to residences close to Eagle St. Low potential in area of higher ambient levels. | •  | Low potential in area of higher ambient levels close to Main St. Since there are numerous residences close to the route, there is potential for impact in areas with low existing background noise levels. | • | Low potential since<br>most of the route is<br>already exposed to<br>elevated noise levels. | • | High potential on residences close to Bayview Pkwy currently experiencing low background noise levels. |
|   | Approximate number of residences or Vibration—sensitive buildings that may potentially experience an increase in vibration levels based on the proximity of the route alternative to existing and/of tuture receptors | No. of residences/buildings                                | Plan, Vibration consultant (Senes)    | • | Low to none   | •      | Moderate   | •   | Moderate along Eagle<br>St  | •  | Moderate along Main<br>St  | • | Low to moderate   | • | Moderate along<br>Bayview Pkwy   |
|   | Construction effects  | Qualitative/Noise Level/<br>Mitigation during construction | Plan, Noise consultant (Senes)        | • | Low<br>Route has high<br>existing ambient noise<br>levels.                      | •      | Moderate<br>Route has low existing<br>ambient noise levels.                                  | •   | Moderate<br>Route on Eagle St has<br>low existing ambient<br>noise levels.                        | •  | Moderate<br>Route on Main St has<br>low existing ambient<br>noise levels.  | • | Low Route has high existing ambient noise levels.   | • | Moderate Route on Bayview Pkwy has low existing ambient noise levels.                                  |
|   | Ov  | verall B4 Rating   |                                       |   | •   |        | •  |     | •   |    | •  |   | •   |   | •  |
| B5 Minimize adverse effects on cultural resources   | Significance of built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes   | Significance of building & type of disruption              | Plan, Heritage consultant (Unterman)  | 0 | Moderate impact   | •      | No impact  | •   | Moderate to high impact   | •  | Moderate to high impact  | O | Moderate to high impact   | • | Moderate to high impact  |
|   | Number of archaeological resources displaced or disrupted   | No. of resources   | Plan, Archaeological consultant (ASI) | • | 10 sites  | •      | 5 sites  | •   | 9 sites (1 on Eagle St)   | •  | 10 sites (minimal on Main St)  | • | 8 sites (none on Davis Dr)  | • | 10 sites (minimal on Bayview Pkwy)   |
|   | Significance of archaeological resources displaced or disrupted   | Type of disruption   | Plan, Archaeological consultant (ASI) | • | Medium Impact (score of 35)   | •      | Medium-High Impact (score of 50)   | 0   | Medium Impact (score of 35)   | •  | Medium Impact (score of 45)  | • | Medium Impact (score of 32)   | • | Medium Impact (score of 45)  |
|   | Ov  | verall B5 Rating   |                                       |   | •   |        | •  |     | •   |    | •  |   | •   | i | •  |
| B6 Minimize disruption of community vistas and adverse effects on street and neighbourhood aesthetics | Visual impact on people living and working in and visiting the community  | Qualitative  | Plan                                  | • | Median transitway including stations with streetscaping.                        | •      | Separate transitway running adjacent to existing GO rail line.                               | •   | Median transitway along Yonge St including stations with streetscaping.                           | •  | Median transitway along Yonge St including stations with streetscaping.  | • | Median transitway along Yonge St including stations with streetscaping.                     | • | Median transitway along Yonge St including stations with streetscaping.                                |
|   | Ov  | verall B6 Rating   | 1                                     |   | •   | i      | •  | l . | •   |    | •  |   | <b>a</b>  | ı |  |

LEGEND: Least Responsive







### NEWMARKET/EAST GWILLIMBURY EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES

OBJECTIVE C: To promote a sustainable environment by protecting and enhancing the natural environment in the corridor

|  |   |  |                     |   | NE2  |        | NE3  |       | NE5  |   | NE6  |   | NE7  |   | NE8   |
|--|---|--|---------------------|---|--|--------|--|-------|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| Goals  | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals                         | Unit of measure  | Information Source  |   | Yonge Street/<br>Green Lane  | adjace | ent to GO Bradford<br>ROW  | Stree | nge Street/Eagle<br>et West/Newmarket<br>O Bus Terminal  |   | onge Street/Davis<br>e/Main Street/Green<br>Lane   |   | e Street/Davis Drive<br>o Leslie Street  |   | nge Street/Davis<br>Drive/Bayview<br>kway/Green Lane  |
| C1 Minimize adverse effects on Aquatic Ecology     | Number of watercourse crossings   | No. of watercourse crossings   | Plan, Environmental | • | 4 watercourse<br>crossings (1<br>perpendicular each of:<br>Tannery Creek,<br>Western Creek, small<br>tributaries of East<br>Holland River)           | O      | 8 watercourse<br>crossings (3<br>perpendicular and 5<br>parallel of East<br>Holland River, 1<br>perpendicular of<br>Western Creek)       | •     | 2 watercourse<br>crossings (1<br>perpendicular each of:<br>Tannery Creek and<br>Western Creek)   | • | 4 watercourse<br>crossings (1<br>perpendicular of:<br>Tannery Creek, and 3<br>of Western Creek)  | • | 5 watercourse<br>crossings (1<br>perpendicular of:<br>Tannery Creek, and 4<br>of Western Creek)  | • | 6 watercourse<br>crossings (all<br>perpendicular: 1 of<br>Tannery Creek, 2 of<br>Western Creek, 3 of<br>small feeder creeks of<br>the East Humber<br>River) |
|  | Type of watercourse crossing to be affected   | Type and significance of watercourse crossing  | Plan, Environmental | • | All crossings have<br>permanent flow.<br>Mitigation would be<br>required in these<br>areas if affected.  | 0      | All crossings have<br>permanent flow.<br>Mitigation would be<br>required in these<br>areas if affected.                                  | •     | All crossings have<br>permanent flow.<br>Western Creek<br>crossing on Eagle St<br>where operation in<br>mixed traffic, therefore<br>no affect.       | • | All crossings have permanent flow. 2 Western Creek crossings on Davis Dr where operation in mixed traffic, therefore no affect.                        | • | All crossings have<br>permanent flow. 3<br>Western Creek<br>crossings on Davis Dr<br>where operation in<br>mixed traffic, therefore<br>no affect.    | • | All crossings have permanent flow. 1 crossing on Davis Dr and 3 on Bayview Pkwy where operation in mixed traffic, therefore no affect.                      |
|  | Type and significance of fish habitat to be affected                                  | Type and significance of fish habitat  | Plan, Environmental | O | Type II (important) present in Tannery Creek, and Type III (marginal) present in other three.  | 0      | Numerous areas of concern.   | •     | Type II (important) present in Tannery Creek.  | • | Type II (important) present in Tannery Creek.  | O | Type II (important)<br>present in Tannery<br>Creek.  | • | Type II (important)<br>present in Tannery<br>Creek.   |
|  | Ov  | verall C1 Rating   |                     |   | •  |        | 0  |       | •  |   | •  |   | •  |   | •   |
| C2 Minimize adverse effects on Terrestrial Ecology | Number and status of any species at risk  | No. & status of terrestrial ecosystems (ELC vegetation communities)                                    | Plan, Environmental | • | 3 Ecological Land<br>Classification<br>vegetation<br>communities along<br>route. Low potential<br>for affect due to limited<br>widening on Yonge St. | O      | 16 Ecological Land Classification vegetation communities along route. Moderate potential due to locations in close proximity to new row. | •     | 3 Ecological Land<br>Classification<br>vegetation<br>communities along<br>route. Low potential<br>for affect due to limited<br>widening on Yonge St. | • | 10 Ecological Land<br>Classification<br>vegetation<br>communities along<br>route. Low potential<br>for affect due to<br>operation in mixed<br>traffic. | • | 3 Ecological Land<br>Classification<br>vegetation<br>communities along<br>route. Low potential<br>for affect due to limited<br>widening on Yonge St. | • | 9 Ecological Land<br>Classification<br>vegetation<br>communities along<br>route. Low potential<br>for affect due to<br>operation in mixed<br>traffic.       |
|  | Area, type and significance of wildlife habitat/vegetation communities to be affected | Type, occurrence and significance of terrestrial ecosystems (wetlands, forests thickets, fields, etc.) | Plan, Environmental | • | Community types represented contain minimal habitat and no concern is evident.   | 0      | Significant concerns<br>due to areas that<br>provide good wildlife<br>habitat and travel<br>corridors.                                   | •     | Community types represented contain minimal habitat and no concern is evident.   | • | Community types represented contain minimal habitat and no concern is evident.   | • | Community types represented contain minimal habitat and no concern is evident.   | • | Community types represented contain minimal habitat and no concern is evident.  |
|  | 0,  | verall C2 Rating   |                     |   | •  |        | •  |       | •  |   | •  |   | •  | _ | •   |

### NEWMARKET/EAST GWILLIMBURY EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES

OBJECTIVE C: To promote a sustainable environment by protecting and enhancing the natural environment in the corridor

|   |  |  |  |   | NE2  |        | NE3  |       | NE5  |   | NE6  |   | NE7  |   | NE8  |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--------|--|-------|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| Goals   | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals  | Unit of measure  | Information Source                                       | - | Yonge Street/<br>Green Lane  | adjace | ent to GO Bradford<br>ROW  | Stree | onge Street/Eagle<br>et West/Newmarket<br>iO Bus Terminal  |   | onge Street/Davis<br>e/Main Street/Green<br>Lane   | _ | e Street/Davis Drive<br>o Leslie Street  |   | onge Street/Davis<br>Drive/Bayview<br>rkway/Green Lane   |
|   | Predicted change in air quality  Number of residential units potentially affected by local air quality degradation   | Qualitative  No. of residential units affected   | Air Consultant Air Consultant                            | • | Minimal. Route is already largely developed as an urban environment.  Mainly commercial zoning along Yonge                                   | •      | Minimal. Route is already largely developed as an urban environment.  Several residential subdivisions located                               | •     | Minimal. Route is already largely developed as an urban environment.  Mainly commercial zoning along Yonge   | • | Minimal. Route is already largely developed as an urban environment.  Mainly commercial zoning along Yonge Si  | • | Minimal. Route is already largely developed as an urban environment.  Mainly commercial zoning along Davis Dr.   | • | Minimal. Route is already largely developed as an urban environment.  Mainly commercial zoning along Yonge St  |
|   |  |  |  | • | St. Residences are generally set-back from Green Lane.   | •      | along the route.<br>Industrial uses.   | •     | St. Potential affect to residences located adjacent to Eagle St.   | • | and Davis Dr. Potential affect to residences located adjacent to Main St.  | • | ŭ ŭ  | • | and Davis Dr. Potential affect to residences located adjacent to Bayview Pkwy.   |
|   | Construction effects   | Effects  | Air Consultant   | • | Dust control measures will be adopted. Multiple interfaces with commercial and residential developments.                                     | •      | Dust control measures will be adopted. Multiple interfaces with industrial and residential developments.                                     | •     | Dust control measures will be adopted. Multiple interfaces with commercial and residential developments.   | • | Dust control measures will be adopted. Multiple interfaces with commercial and residential developments.   | • | Dust control measures will be adopted. Multiple interfaces with commercial and residential developments.   | • | Dust control measures will be adopted. Multiple interfaces with commercial and residential developments.   |
|   | Overall C3 Rating  |  |  |   | •  |        | •  |       | •  |   | •  |   | •  |   | •  |
| C4 Minimize adverse effects on corridor hydrogeological, geological and hydrological conditions | Minimization of total recharge area affected.  | Length of alignment (km) over<br>recharge areas with moderate<br>to higher permeable soils | Geologic Survey of Canada<br>Surficial Geology map, Plan | • | Approx. 2.0 km of route over permeable Newmarket Till deposits. Negligable decrease in recharge expected.                                    | •      | No portion of route<br>over permeable<br>Newmarket Till<br>deposits. Negligable<br>decrease in recharge<br>expected.                         | •     | Approx. 0.4 km of route over permeable Newmarket Till deposits. Negligable decrease in recharge expected. No affect in area where mixed traffic operation assumed. | • | Approx. 2.4 km of route over permeable Newmarket Till deposits. Negligable decrease in recharge expected. No affect in area where mixed traffic operation assumed. | • | Approx. 0.4 km of route over permeable Newmarket Till deposits. Negligable decrease in recharge expected. No affect in area where mixed traffic operation assumed. | • | Approx. 1.8 km of route over permeable Newmarket Till deposits. Negligable decrease in recharge expected. No affect in area where mixed traffic operation assumed. |
|   | Change in potential for flooding by removal of storage capacity  | Qualitative  | Geologic Survey of Canada<br>Surficial Geology map, Plan | • | Construction through aquifers, if any, may require special construction measures to eliminate or minimize changes to groundwater conditions. | •      | Construction through aquifers, if any, may require special construction measures to eliminate or minimize changes to groundwater conditions. | •     | Construction through aquifers, if any, may require special construction measures to eliminate or minimize changes to groundwater conditions.                       | • | Construction through aquifers, if any, may require special construction measures to eliminate or minimize changes to groundwater conditions.                       | • | Construction through aquifers, if any, may require special construction measures to eliminate or minimize changes to groundwater conditions.                       | • | Construction through aquifers, if any, may require special construction measures to eliminate or minimize changes to groundwater conditions.                       |
|   | Potential for adverse effects on surface water quality/quantity. Preference for minimizing proximity to watercourses | Rating of watercourse<br>crossings and length of span<br>(km) in floodplain deposits       | Plan, Environmental (Jagger<br>Hims)                     | • | Moderate. Minor span in proximity to watercourses.   | O      | High. Closer to watercourses.  | •     | Low to moderate.<br>Minor span in<br>proximity to<br>watercourses.   | • | Moderate. Moderate span in proximity to watercourses.  | • | Moderate. Minor span in proximity to watercourses.   | • | Highest. Longer poirtions are closer to watercourses.  |
|   | Number of sites with contaminants  | No. of contaminated sites  | Contaminated sites consultant                            | • | 14 High Risk; 5<br>Medium Risk: 14 Low<br>Risk   | •      | 7 High Risk; 5 Medium<br>Risk: 16 Low Risk   | •     | 7 High Risk; 5 Medium<br>Risk: 6 Low Risk  | • | 17 High Risk; 5<br>Medium Risk: 14 Low<br>Risk   | 0 | 28 High Risk; 7<br>Medium Risk: 29 Low<br>Risk   | 0 | 20 High Risk; 5<br>Medium Risk: 24 Low<br>Risk   |
|   | Ove  | erall C4 Rating  |  |   | •  |        | •  |       | •  |   | •  |   | •  |   | •  |

LEGEND: Least Responsive



•

# NEWMARKET/EAST GWILLIMBURY EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor

|  |  |                  |  | NE2  | NE3   | NE5   | NE6   | NE7   | NE8   |
|--|--|------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goals  | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals  | Unit of measure  | Information Source   | Yonge Street/<br>Green Lane  | adjacent to GO Bradford ROW   | Yonge Street/Eagle Street<br>West/Newmarket GO Bus<br>Terminal  | Yonge Street/Davis Drive/Main<br>Street/Green Lane  | Yonge Street/Davis Drive to<br>Leslie Street  | Yonge Street/Davis<br>Drive/Bayview Parkway/Green<br>Lane   |
| D1 Support Regional and<br>Municipal Planning Policies and<br>approved urban structure | Conformity with, and support for, policies of official diplans and urban structures of Region, internal and adjacent municipalities, including GTA | Qualitative      | Plan, Reports, Land Use                                    | Entire route recommended in TMP for rapid transit. Supports Newmarket OP in providing access to Yonge St Regional Centre.  | Not consistant  | Yonge St is recommended in TMP for rapid transit.   | Recommended in TMP south of Davis Dr. Supports Newmarket OP in providing access to all Centres in Newmarket: Yonge St, Regional Healthcare and Historic Downtown. | Recommended in TMP south of Davis Dr. Supports Newmarket OP in providing access to both Yonge St and Regional Healthcare Centres.   | Not consistent with TMP north of Davis Dr. Supports Newmarket OP in providing access to both Yonge St and Regional Healthcare Centres.  |
|  | Conformity with land use designations, including compatibility with existing development   | Qualitative      | Plan, Land Use, OP's                                       | Route traverses existing commercial and residential developments. Higher density residential developments in proximity to route.   | Route traverses existing industrial and residential developments.   | Route traverses existing commercial and residential developments.   | Route traverses existing commercial and residential developments. Higher density residential developments in proximity to route.                                  | Route traverses existing commercial and residential developments. Higher density residential developments in proximity to route.  | Route traverses existing commercial and residential developments. Higher density residential developments in proximity to route.  |
|  | Service to planned centres, major and minor  | Qualitative      | Plan, TMP, OP's, Reports                                   | Direct access to York Regional Centre and urban centre along Yonge St.   | None  | Reasonable access to York Regional Centre.  | Direct access to York Regional Centre and urban centre along Yonge St, and Historic Downtown on Main St.  | Direct access to York Regional Centre and urban centre along Yonge St, Southlake Regional Centre and Historic Downtown on Main St.  | Direct access to York Regional Centre and urban centre along Yonge St, Southlake Regional Centre and Historic Downtown on Main St.  |
|  | Ov   | rerall D1 Rating |  | •  | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   |
| D2 Provide convenient access to social and community facilities in corridor            | Proximity to hospitals, educational institutions, community centres, local government offices etc.   | Qualitative      | Plan, Reports, Land Use, Build<br>on Preliminary Screening | Direct access to York Regional Centre, York Regional Headquarters, Upper Canada Mall, Seneca College. Bypasses Newmarket historical area on Main St. and Southlake Regional Health Centre. | Direct access to Newmarket historical area on Main St, Tannery Centre and Bayview park. Reasonable access to Southlake Regional Health Centre. Bypasses York Regional Centre, Upper Canada Mall and designated urban centre along Yonge St. | Direct access to York Regional Centre, York Regional Headquarters, and Upper Canada Mall, Bypasses Newmarket historicarea on Main St. and Southlak Regional Health Centre.                                    | Centre, York Regional<br>Headquarters, Upper Canada<br>Mall, Seneca College,<br>designated urban zone along   | Direct access to York Regional Centre, York Regional Headquarters, Upper Canada Mall, Seneca College, Hollingsworth Arena, Tannery Centre, designated urban zone along Yonge St, Southlake Regional Health Centre and Newmarket historical area on Main St. | Direct access to York Regional Centre, York Regional Headquarters, Upper Canada Mall, Seneca College, designated urban zone along Yonge St, Southlake Regional Health Centre, Newmarket historical area on Main St, Tannery Centre, Bayview Park, and Mabel Davis Conservation Area.  |
|  | Ov   | rerall D2 Rating | •  | •  | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   |
| D3 Protect provisions for goods movement in corridor                                   | Inventory of major truck routes, delivery and loading areas, manufacturing operations affected by transitway insertion                             | Qualitative      | Plan   | Yonge St. has numerous commercial developments that use the corridor as a desirable delivery route. May create challenge for trucks utilizing uturns due to median transitway.             | Transitway adjacent to existing GO rail ROW, therefore operations not affected.   | Eagle St not a major truck route. Yonge St. has numerous commercial developments tha use the corridor as a desirable delivery route. May create challenge for trucks utilizing uturns due to median transitwa | challenge for trucks utilizing u-<br>turns due to median transitway.  Main Street not a major truck   | Yonge St. has numerous commercial developments that use the corridor as a desirable delivery route. May create challenge for trucks utilizing uturns due to median transitway. Moderate impact since transitway in high volume mixed traffic (Davis Dr).    | Yonge St. has numerous commercial developments that use the corridor as a desirable delivery route. May create challenge for trucks utilizing uturns due to median transitway. Bayview Pkwy not a major truck route. Moderate impact since transitway operation in high volume mixed traffic (Davis Dr) and in low volume mixed traffic (Bayview Pkwy). |
|  | Ov   | rerall D3 Rating |  | •  | •   | 0   | 0   | •   | 0   |
|  | Opportunities for re-development   | Qualitative      | Plan   | High potential for re-   | Minimal opportunity.  | High potential along Yonge St   | . High potential for redevelopment around Davis Dr  | High potential for redevelopment around Davis Dr  | High potential for redevelopment around Davis Dr  |
| D4 Promote transit-oriented development  | Potential opportunities for development and higher order uses, at stations, termini, and along the corridor  | Qualitative      | Plan   | development around Davis Dr intersection.  Good potential for transitoriented developments along route.  | Moderate transit-oriented development potential at GO stations on Davis Dr and Greer Ln.  | Moderate transit-oriented development potential at Newmarket GO bus terminal.   | intersection.  Moderate transit-oriented development potential at GO station on Green Ln.   | intersection.  Moderate transit-oriented development potential at GO station on Davis Dr.   | intersection.  Moderate transit-oriented development potential at GO stations on Davis Dr and Green Ln.   |

LEGEND: Least Responsive







○ • • Most Responsive

### NEWMARKET/EAST GWILLIMBURY EVALUATION OF ROUTE ALTERNATIVES OBJECTIVE E: To maximize the cost-effectiveness of the rapid transit system

|    |  |  |   |                              |   | NE2  |       | NE3   |      | NE5   |   | NE6  |   | NE7  |   | NE8  |
|----|--|--|---|------------------------------|---|--|-------|---|------|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|
|    | Goals  | Typical indicators measuring route's ability to achieve goals  | Unit of measure   | Information Source           |   | Yonge Street/<br>Green Lane  | adjac | ent to GO Bradford<br>ROW                   | Stre | onge Street/Eagle<br>et West/Newmarket<br>GO Bus Terminal |   | nge Street/Davis<br>/Main Street/Green<br>Lane                         | _ | e Street/Davis Drive<br>o Leslie Street                  |   | onge Street/Davis<br>Drive/Bayview<br>rkway/Green Lane                     |
| E1 | vehicles, facilities and systems required                  | Estimate of cost of capital works including: elevated,<br>at-grade, cut and cover, tunnelled or open cut running<br>way, stations, systems and major utility relocation<br>works | Estimate (qualitative assessment from plan)   | Plan, Profile, cross section | • | Estimate \$200 million range (higher staging costs, longer route length) | •     | Estimate \$185 million range (brand nw ROW) | •    | Estimate \$85 million range (mixed traffic on Eagle St)   | • | Estimate \$155 million range (mixed traffic on Davis Dr, and Main St ) |   | Estimate \$160 million range (mixed traffic on Davis Dr) | • | Estimate \$170 million range (mixed traffic on Davis Dr, and Bayview Pkwy) |
|    |  | Estimated vehicle fleet cost   | Estimate (No. of fleet to be required, Frequency of the service, Length of service) | Plan                         | • | Longer route length  | O     | Longer route length                         | •    | Shortest route  | • | Longer route length  | • | Longer route length                                      | • | Longest route length   |
|    |  | Ov   | erall E1 Rating   |                              |   | •  |       | •   |      | •   |   | •  |   | •  |   | •  |
| E2 | Minimize property acquisition cost to implement facilities | Estimated value of residential units to be acquired  | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Land Use               | • | 1  | O     | 35  | •    | 1   | • | 1  | • | 1  | • | 1  |
|    | ·  | Estimated value of industrial units to be acquired   | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Land Use               | • | None   | O     | 9   | •    | None  | • | None   | • | None   | • | None   |
|    |  | Estimated value of commercial units to be acquired   | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Land Use               | • | 10   | •     | 6   | •    | 9   | O | 10   | • | 10   | • | 10   |
|    |  | Potential remediation costs for known or potentially contaminated sites  | Qualitative assessment from plan  | Plan, Golder                 | • | 33 sites   | •     | 28 sites                                    | •    | 18 sites  | • | 36 sites   | 0 | 64 sites   | • | 49 sites   |
|    |  | Ov   | erall E2 Rating   |                              |   | •  |       | •   |      | •   |   | •  |   | •  |   | •  |
| E3 | Minimize adverse effects of alignment characteristics on   | Influence of route length on O & M costs   | Route length  | Plan                         | O | 8.5 km   | •     | 7.0 km                                      | •    | 4.5 km  | O | 8.3 km   | • | 8.3 km   | O | 9.0 km   |
|    | operating and maintenance costs                            | Influence of alignment characteristics on O & M costs  | No. of stations, effect of alignment on maintenance costs                           | Plan                         | • | 7 stations<br>Moderate influence   | •     | 5 stations<br>Low influence                 | •    | 4 stations<br>Low influence                               | O | 8 stations<br>Moderate influence                                       | O | 8 stations<br>moderate influence                         | • | 8 stations<br>Moderate influence   |
|    |  | Ov   | erall E3 Rating   |                              |   | •  |       | •   |      | •   |   | •  |   | •  |   | •  |

LEGEND: Least Responsive O 🔿 🛈 •





