

| Factor/Criteria | Team Average Weighting | Descriptions/Proposed Measures | Alternative 1 Widen For All Traffic | Alternative 2 Widen For HOV Lanes | Alternative 3 Widen For Dedicated Transit In Curb Lanes | Alternative 4 Widen For Dedicated Transit In The Median |
|--|------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| TRANSPORTATION | | | | | | |
| Transit Operations & Capacity | | | | | | |
| Total Transit Travel Time & Delay | 10.4% | - Travel time through BRT corridor for transit vehicles | 2.86 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 3.75 |
| Transit Capacity | 8.5% | - Ability to meet current and anticipated transit user demands - Potential to attract users | 1.31 | 2.09 | 3.22 | 3.97 |
| Transit System Continuity | 7.4% | - Consistency of bus operations along the Highway 2 corridor | 3.00 | 3.06 | 3.44 | 1.25 |
| Transit Service Reliability | 8.4% | - Traffic congestion and/or delays affecting transit vehicles | 1.06 | 2.06 | 3.25 | 3.31 |
| Transit Vehicle Conflict Points | 5.8% | - Interaction with general purpose traffic - Conflicts with turning vehicles - Weaving between curb and median lanes | 1.31 | 2.47 | 3.50 | 2.09 |
| General Purpose Traffic Operations & Capacity | | | | | | |
| Travel Time & Delay | 8.1% | - Total travel time through study section for non-transit vehicles | 3.43 | 3.91 | 3.91 | 2.31 |
| Traffic Capacity | 8.6% | - Impact on Highway 2 non-transit vehicle capacity | 3.84 | 3.03 | 1.81 | 1.09 |
| Infiltration | 6.7% | - Potential for increased traffic infiltration onto adjacent streets (due to restricted left turns or loss of capacity on Highway 2) - % increase in vehicle km travelled on local roadways (vehicles diverting from Highway 2) - % increase in vehicle km travelled on alternate arterial / collector roadways (i.e., number of vehicles diverting from Highway 2) | 2.65 | 2.58 | 2.50 | 1.57 |
| Mid-block Turning Movements | 5.5% | - Ability of vehicles to make turns from unsignalized cross streets and/or mid-block driveways - Potential increase in U-turns - Number of locations | 3.44 | 3.44 | 3.69 | 1.13 |
| Enforcement of Unauthorized Vehicle Use | 3.6% | - Ability of motorists to distinguish dedicated transit lane from mixed use lane - Ease of enforcement | 3.63 | 1.75 | 2.44 | 2.97 |
| Overall Transportation System | | | | | | |
| Corridor Capacity | 7.7% | - Overall person throughput | 1.62 | 1.74 | 1.62 | 1.43 |
| Safety | 10.6% | - Change in safety characteristics of corridor due to alternative in terms of: - Pedestrians - Cyclists - General traffic - Transit vehicles | 2.63 | 2.56 | 3.31 | 2.94 |
| Fire and/or Emergency Medical Service (EMS) | 4.1% | - Impacts on emergency service response time - Potential for emergency access issues - Impact on emergency detour route (EDR) performance (ability to accommodate increased traffic volumes in the case of Highway 401 closure, natural/man-made disasters, etc.) | 2.22 | 3.06 | 3.44 | 2.28 |
| Accessibility | 4.6% | - Impacts on accessibility for persons with disabilities (i.e. provision of dropped curbs, tactile pavement, audible signal crossings) | 2.69 | 2.56 | 3.38 | 2.69 |
| TRANSPORTATION WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 251.97 | 278.82 | 312.19 | 241.26 |
| SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | |
| Provincial and/or Municipal Planning Guidelines and Policies | 25.5% | - Compatibility with the general intent of provincial / municipal planning goals and objectives including: - Ability to provide for alternative modes of transportation - Ability to improve Highway 2 corridor as a higher order transit and intensification corridor - Regard for the "top transit priority" and transit spine designation along the corridor - Regard for the long term vision of light rail transit along the corridor - Establish a transportation system that compliments and supports the future urban structure and land use pattern | 1.00 | 2.06 | 3.56 | 3.63 |
| Property Owner Use Impacts | 25.4% | - Potential Impacts to the use of the property | 3.56 | 3.25 | 3.31 | 1.63 |
| Business impacts | 30.2% | - Impacts to business viability/access - Public view interference - Disruption impacts during construction period | 3.13 | 3.03 | 3.13 | 1.31 |
| Air Quality | 6.8% | - Potential impacts to air quality and/or greenhouse gas emissions | 2.38 | 2.75 | 3.19 | 2.94 |
| Aesthetics / Streetscaping | 12.2% | - Roadside obstacles - Impacted landscaped areas - Opportunity for enhancing streetscaping | 2.59 | 2.72 | 3.28 | 3.25 |
| SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 257.89 | 278.27 | 330.73 | 232.77 |
| ENGINEERING | | | | | | |
| Implementation Risks | 29.3% | - Ability to implement alternative within the Provincial Quick Win funding allocation/schedule (i.e., March 2016 completion) - Ability to implement if property acquisition delayed | 2.44 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 1.25 |
| Snow Storage and/or Removal | 13.1% | - Complexity of snow storage/removal on corridor (stations, barriers, etc.) - Boulevard space needed / available for snow storage | 3.69 | 3.75 | 3.63 | 1.44 |
| Phasing Ability | 17.3% | - Ease of transition to ultimate transit vision for the Region (i.e. LRT) - Conversion costs - Traffic impacts during conversion - Maintenance of transit service delivery during construction of ultimate vision | 2.06 | 2.63 | 3.09 | 2.69 |
| Costs | | | | | | |
| Capital | 18.6% | - Total capital cost | 1.75 | 1.75 | 1.75 | 1.00 |
| Property | 14.7% | - Property requirement | 2.74 | 2.74 | 2.74 | 1.00 |
| Operations and Maintenance | 6.9% | - Operations and Maintenance costs | 3.63 | 3.44 | 3.44 | 2.06 |
| ENGINEERING WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 253.53 | 279.26 | 300.37 | 149.62 |
| TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 253.79 | 278.80 | 313.51 | 215.25 |
| RECOMMENDATION | | | | | RECOMMENDED | |

| Factor/Criteria | Team Average Weighting | Descriptions/Proposed Measures | Alternative 1 Widen For All Traffic | Alternative 2 Widen For HOV Lanes | Alternative 3 Widen For Dedicated Transit In Curb Lanes | Alternative 4 Widen For Dedicated Transit In The Median |
|--|------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| TRANSPORTATION | | | | | | |
| Transit Operations & Capacity | | | | | | |
| Total Transit Travel Time & Delay | 10.1% | - Travel time through BRT corridor for transit vehicles | 4.00 | 3.43 | 3.90 | 3.00 |
| Transit Capacity | 8.2% | - Ability to meet current and anticipated transit user demands - Potential to attract users | 1.31 | 2.13 | 3.22 | 3.97 |
| Transit System Continuity | 7.4% | - Consistency of bus operations along the Highway 2 corridor | 3.00 | 3.06 | 3.44 | 1.25 |
| Transit Service Reliability | 8.4% | - Traffic congestion and/or delays affecting transit vehicles | 1.06 | 2.06 | 3.25 | 3.31 |
| Transit Vehicle Conflict Points | 5.8% | - Interaction with general purpose traffic - Conflicts with turning vehicles - Weaving between curb and median lanes | 1.31 | 2.47 | 3.50 | 2.09 |
| General Purpose Traffic Operations & Capacity | | | | | | |
| Travel Time & Delay | 8.1% | - Total travel time through study section for non-transit vehicles | 3.96 | 3.30 | 3.74 | 3.52 |
| Traffic Capacity | 8.6% | - Impact on Highway 2 non-transit vehicle capacity | 3.88 | 3.06 | 1.81 | 1.09 |
| Infiltration | 6.7% | - Potential for increased traffic infiltration onto adjacent streets (due to restricted left turns or loss of capacity on Highway 2) - % increase in vehicle km travelled on local roadways (vehicles diverting from Highway 2) - % increase in vehicle km travelled on alternate arterial / collector roadways (i.e., number of vehicles diverting from Highway 2) | 2.77 | 2.64 | 2.50 | 1.72 |
| Mid-block Turning Movements | 6.1% | - Ability of vehicles to make turns from unsignalized cross streets and/or mid-block driveways - Potential increase in U-turns - Number of locations | 3.44 | 3.44 | 3.69 | 1.06 |
| Enforcement of Unauthorized Vehicle Use | 3.6% | - Ability of motorists to distinguish dedicated transit lane from mixed use lane - Ease of enforcement | 3.44 | 1.75 | 2.44 | 2.97 |
| Overall Transportation System | | | | | | |
| Corridor Capacity | 7.7% | - Overall person throughput - Maximum feasible throughput | 1.81 | 1.82 | 1.56 | 1.49 |
| Safety | 10.6% | - Change in safety characteristics of corridor due to alternative in terms of: - Pedestrians - Cyclists - General traffic - Transit vehicles | 2.63 | 2.56 | 3.31 | 2.94 |
| Fire and/or Emergency Medical Service (EMS) | 4.1% | - Impacts on emergency service response time - Potential for emergency access issues - Impact on emergency detour route (EDR) performance (ability to accommodate increased traffic volumes in the case of Highway 401 closure, natural/man-made disasters, etc.) | 2.22 | 3.06 | 3.44 | 2.28 |
| Accessibility | 4.6% | - Impacts on accessibility for persons with disabilities (i.e. provision of dropped curbs, tactile pavement, audible signal crossings) | 2.69 | 2.56 | 3.38 | 2.69 |
| TRANSPORTATION WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 270.44 | 269.91 | 309.39 | 242.90 |
| SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | |
| Provincial and/or Municipal Planning Guidelines and Policies | 24.9% | - Compatibility with the general intent of provincial / municipal planning goals and objectives including: - Ability to provide for alternative modes of transportation - Ability to improve Highway 2 corridor as a higher order transit and intensification corridor - Regard for the "top transit priority" and transit spine designation along the corridor - Regard for the long term vision of light rail transit along the corridor - Establish a transportation system that compliments and supports the future urban structure and land use pattern | 1.00 | 2.06 | 3.56 | 3.63 |
| Property Owner Use Impacts | 24.2% | - Potential Impacts to the use of the property | 3.44 | 3.19 | 3.25 | 1.63 |
| Business impacts | 30.6% | - Impacts to business viability/access - Public view interference - Disruption impacts during construction period | 3.13 | 3.03 | 3.19 | 1.38 |
| Air Quality | 6.2% | - Potential impacts to air quality and/or greenhouse gas emissions | 2.38 | 2.75 | 3.19 | 2.94 |
| Aesthetics / Streetscaping | 14.1% | - Roadside obstacles - Impacted landscaped areas - Opportunity for enhancing streetscaping | 2.66 | 2.78 | 3.34 | 3.38 |
| SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 255.93 | 277.53 | 331.80 | 237.42 |
| ENGINEERING | | | | | | |
| Implementation Risks | 29.3% | - Ability to implement alternative within the Provincial Quick Win funding allocation/schedule (i.e., March 2016 completion) - Ability to implement if property acquisition delayed | 2.38 | 2.94 | 3.50 | 1.25 |
| Snow Storage and/or Removal | 13.4% | - Complexity of snow storage/removal on corridor (stations, barriers, etc.) - Boulevard space needed / available for snow storage | 3.69 | 3.75 | 3.63 | 1.44 |
| Phasing Ability | 17.4% | - Ease of transition to ultimate transit vision for the Region (i.e. LRT) - Conversion costs - Traffic impacts during conversion - Maintenance of transit service delivery during construction of ultimate vision | 2.00 | 2.63 | 3.16 | 2.69 |
| Costs | | | | | | |
| Capital | 18.6% | - Total capital cost | 1.90 | 1.90 | 1.90 | 1.00 |
| Property | 14.4% | - Property requirement | 3.05 | 3.05 | 3.05 | 1.00 |
| Operations and Maintenance | 6.9% | - Operations and Maintenance costs | 3.63 | 3.44 | 3.44 | 2.06 |
| ENGINEERING WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 258.17 | 285.03 | 309.05 | 149.85 |
| TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 263.61 | 275.64 | 315.17 | 218.47 |
| RECOMMENDATION | | | | | RECOMMENDED | |

| Factor/Criteria | Team Average Weighting | Descriptions/Proposed Measures | Alternative 1 Widen For All Traffic | Alternative 2 Widen For HOV Lanes | Alternative 3 Widen For Dedicated Transit In Curb Lanes | Alternative 4 Widen For Dedicated Transit In The Median |
|--|------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| TRANSPORTATION | | | | | | |
| Transit Operations & Capacity | | | | | | |
| Total Transit Travel Time & Delay | 10.4% | - Travel time through BRT corridor for transit vehicles | 2.50 | 3.97 | 4.00 | 3.97 |
| Transit Capacity | 8.5% | - Ability to meet current and anticipated transit user demands - Potential to attract users | 1.31 | 2.13 | 3.22 | 3.97 |
| Transit System Continuity | 7.4% | - Consistency of bus operations along the Highway 2 corridor | 2.94 | 3.06 | 3.44 | 1.31 |
| Transit Service Reliability | 8.4% | - Traffic congestion and/or delays affecting transit vehicles | 1.06 | 2.06 | 3.25 | 3.31 |
| Transit Vehicle Conflict Points | 5.8% | - Interaction with general purpose traffic - Conflicts with turning vehicles - Weaving between curb and median lanes | 1.31 | 2.47 | 3.50 | 2.09 |
| General Purpose Traffic Operations & Capacity | | | | | | |
| Travel Time & Delay | 8.1% | - Total travel time through study section for non-transit vehicles | 3.67 | 3.38 | 2.93 | 1.00 |
| Traffic Capacity | 8.6% | - Impact on Highway 2 non-transit vehicle capacity | 3.88 | 3.06 | 1.81 | 1.09 |
| Infiltration | 6.7% | - Potential for increased traffic infiltration onto adjacent streets (due to restricted left turns or loss of capacity on Highway 2) - % increase in vehicle km travelled on local roadways (vehicles diverting from Highway 2) - % increase in vehicle km travelled on alternate arterial / collector roadways (i.e., number of vehicles diverting from Highway 2) | 3.18 | 2.94 | 2.50 | 2.26 |
| Mid-block Turning Movements | 5.5% | - Ability of vehicles to make turns from unsignalized cross streets and/or mid-block driveways - Potential increase in U-turns - Number of locations | 3.44 | 3.44 | 3.69 | 1.25 |
| Enforcement of Unauthorized Vehicle Use | 3.6% | - Ability of motorists to distinguish dedicated transit lane from mixed use lane - Ease of enforcement | 3.44 | 1.75 | 2.44 | 2.97 |
| Overall Transportation System | | | | | | |
| Corridor Capacity | 7.7% | - Overall person throughput - Maximum feasible throughput | 3.29 | 3.43 | 2.31 | 2.21 |
| Safety | 10.6% | - Change in safety characteristics of corridor due to alternative in terms of: - Pedestrians - Cyclists - General traffic - Transit vehicles | 2.63 | 2.56 | 3.31 | 2.94 |
| Fire and/or Emergency Medical Service (EMS) | 4.1% | - Impacts on emergency service response time - Potential for emergency access issues - Impact on emergency detour route (EDR) performance (ability to accommodate increased traffic volumes in the case of Highway 401 closure, natural/man-made disasters, etc.) | 2.22 | 3.06 | 3.44 | 2.28 |
| Accessibility | 4.6% | - Impacts on accessibility for persons with disabilities (i.e. provision of dropped curbs, tactile pavement, audible signal crossings) | 2.69 | 2.56 | 3.38 | 2.69 |
| TRANSPORTATION WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 265.72 | 290.20 | 309.60 | 244.78 |
| SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | |
| Provincial and/or Municipal Planning Guidelines and Policies | 25.5% | - Compatibility with the general intent of provincial / municipal planning goals and objectives including: - Ability to provide for alternative modes of transportation - Ability to improve Highway 2 corridor as a higher order transit and intensification corridor - Regard for the "top transit priority" and transit spine designation along the corridor - Regard for the long term vision of light rail transit along the corridor - Establish a transportation system that compliments and supports the future urban structure and land use pattern | 1.00 | 2.06 | 3.56 | 3.69 |
| Property Owner Use Impacts | 24.8% | - Potential Impacts to the use of the property | 3.63 | 3.31 | 3.38 | 1.81 |
| Business impacts | 30.2% | - Impacts to business viability/access - Public view interference - Disruption impacts during construction period | 3.06 | 2.97 | 3.13 | 1.31 |
| Air Quality | 6.8% | - Potential impacts to air quality and/or greenhouse gas emissions | 2.38 | 2.75 | 3.19 | 2.94 |
| Aesthetics / Streetscaping | 12.8% | - Roadside obstacles - Impacted landscaped areas - Opportunity for enhancing streetscaping | 2.72 | 2.84 | 3.41 | 3.38 |
| SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 258.59 | 279.22 | 333.86 | 241.57 |
| ENGINEERING | | | | | | |
| Implementation Risks | 29.3% | - Ability to implement alternative within the Provincial Quick Win funding allocation/schedule (i.e., March 2016 completion) - Ability to implement if property acquisition delayed | 2.44 | 2.88 | 3.50 | 1.38 |
| Snow Storage and/or Removal | 13.1% | - Complexity of snow storage/removal on corridor (stations, barriers, etc.) - Boulevard space needed / available for snow storage | 3.69 | 3.75 | 3.63 | 1.50 |
| Phasing Ability | 17.3% | - Ease of transition to ultimate transit vision for the Region (i.e. LRT) - Conversion costs - Traffic impacts during conversion - Maintenance of transit service delivery during construction of ultimate vision | 2.00 | 2.59 | 3.16 | 2.75 |
| Costs | | | | | | |
| Capital | 18.6% | - Total capital cost | 2.05 | 2.05 | 2.05 | 1.00 |
| Property | 14.7% | - Property requirement | 1.78 | 1.78 | 1.78 | 1.00 |
| Operations and Maintenance | 6.9% | - Operations and Maintenance costs | 3.63 | 3.44 | 3.44 | 2.06 |
| ENGINEERING WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 243.93 | 266.53 | 292.93 | 155.18 |
| TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE | | | 258.38 | 281.43 | 311.33 | 221.06 |
| RECOMMENDATION | | | RECOMMENDED | | | |

Sensitivity Testing - Whites Road Segment

| Criteria | Weights | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Original | Transp. High | Transp. Low | Social High | Social Low | Eng. High | Eng. Low |
| TRANSPORTATION | 50.0% | 70.0% | 30.0% | 39.4% | 59.1% | 44.0% | 57.6% |
| SOCIO-ECONOMIC | 23.8% | 14.3% | 33.4% | 40.0% | 10.0% | 21.0% | 27.4% |
| ENGINEERING | 26.2% | 15.7% | 36.6% | 20.6% | 30.9% | 35.0% | 15.0% |
| TOTAL | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

| | Recommendation | | | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Original | Transp. High | Transp. Low | Social High | Social Low | Eng. High | Eng. Low |
| Alternative 1 | 253.8 | 253.1 | 254.5 | 254.6 | 253.0 | 253.8 | 253.9 |
| Alternative 2 | 278.8 | 278.8 | 278.8 | 278.6 | 278.8 | 278.9 | 278.8 |
| Alternative 3 | 313.5 | 313.0 | 314.0 | 317.1 | 310.3 | 312.0 | 315.6 |
| Alternative 4 | 215.2 | 225.7 | 204.8 | 218.9 | 212.0 | 207.5 | 225.2 |

Alternative 3 is recommended in all scenarios regardless of weight distribution.

Sensitivity Testing - Liverpool Road / Brock Road Segment

| Criteria | Weights | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Original | Transp. High | Transp. Low | Social High | Social Low | Eng. High | Eng. Low |
| TRANSPORTATION | 49.1% | 70.0% | 30.0% | 36.6% | 59.9% | 42.4% | 58.7% |
| SOCIO-ECONOMIC | 26.2% | 15.4% | 36.0% | 45.0% | 10.0% | 22.6% | 31.3% |
| ENGINEERING | 24.7% | 14.6% | 34.0% | 18.4% | 30.1% | 35.0% | 10.0% |
| TOTAL | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

| | Recommendation | | | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Original | Transp. High | Transp. Low | Social High | Social Low | Eng. High | Eng. Low |
| Alternative 1 | 263.6 | 266.4 | 261.0 | 261.7 | 265.4 | 262.9 | 264.7 |
| Alternative 2 | 275.6 | 273.3 | 277.7 | 276.2 | 275.3 | 276.9 | 273.8 |
| Alternative 3 | 315.2 | 312.8 | 317.3 | 319.5 | 311.6 | 314.3 | 316.3 |
| Alternative 4 | 218.5 | 228.5 | 209.2 | 223.3 | 214.4 | 209.1 | 231.9 |

Alternative 3 is recommended in all scenarios regardless of weight distribution.

Sensitivity Testing - Westney Road / Harwood Avenue / Salem Road Segment

| Criteria | Weights | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Original | Transp. High | Transp. Low | Social High | Social Low | Eng. High | Eng. Low |
| TRANSPORTATION | 49.7% | 70.0% | 30.0% | 39.6% | 59.4% | 43.4% | 56.8% |
| SOCIO-ECONOMIC | 24.7% | 14.7% | 34.4% | 40.0% | 10.0% | 21.6% | 28.2% |
| ENGINEERING | 25.6% | 15.3% | 35.6% | 20.4% | 30.6% | 35.0% | 15.0% |
| TOTAL | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

| | Recommendation | | | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Original | Transp. High | Transp. Low | Social High | Social Low | Eng. High | Eng. Low |
| Alternative 1 | 258.4 | 261.3 | 255.5 | 258.4 | 258.3 | 256.6 | 260.5 |
| Alternative 2 | 281.4 | 285.0 | 278.0 | 281.0 | 281.8 | 279.6 | 283.6 |
| Alternative 3 | 311.3 | 310.6 | 312.0 | 315.9 | 306.9 | 309.0 | 314.0 |
| Alternative 4 | 221.1 | 230.6 | 211.7 | 225.2 | 217.0 | 212.8 | 230.5 |

Alternative 3 is recommended in all scenarios regardless of weight distribution.