

	Criteria	Active Transportation User Experience	Traffic Safety	Environmental Benefit	Constructability and Cost	Total	Rank
	Weighting	40	10	10	40	100	
	Objectives	- minimizes exposure to traffic - minimize conflicts between all users - provides generous amount of operating space - provides exposure to nature/trees	- improve safety at intersections - support traffic calming and reduced collision severity	- maximizes capture of stormwater runoff - contributes to a strong, healthy environment	- cost of construction - future operating costs (ex. Snow removal) - design and construction risks (ex. Utilities)		
CONTEXT 1 - LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL	Alternative 1: Multi-use pathway behind ditch (rural cross section, shift crown)	2 Very comfortable buffer from traffic. Cyclists and pedestrians are mixed which may lead to more conflicts, particularly with faster cyclists. Frequent utility poles require MUP to split and create a hazard. Pedestrians only have facility on one side.	3 Narrowed 6.6m road width will contribute to slower travel speeds. MUP remains offset 5+m from vehicle lanes which helps with sightlines at driveways and side street crossings. Bidirectional user volumes more challenging for safety as motorists don't expect cyclists travelling in counterflow direction.	3 Provides 6.5m total width of LID in the cross section	3 Maintains rural cross section. Requires shift in centreline and roadway crown. May require relocating many utility poles to avoid splitting MUP. MUP built to edge of ROW adds risk of conflicts with private yards, trees, etc.	260	3
	Alternative 2: Buffered paved shoulders (rural cross section) & sidewalk east side	2 Comfortable buffer from traffic for cyclists if physical separation is added, but still adjacent to traffic. Without separation, motorists may park in the paved shoulders. In winter, separation may have to be removed for maintenance. Pedestrians have dedicated sidewalk space, which weaves and narrows at some points to avoid utility poles. Pedestrians only have facility on one side	2 Improved predictability at intersections as cyclists travel in same direction as traffic. Cyclists are not set back from vehicles at intersections which may lead to more collisions.	2 Provides 5.6m total width of LID in the cross section (lowest of all options)	2 Maintains rural cross section and existing crown/centreline. Some utility poles may be relocated to maintain 2m desired sidewalk width. Sidewalk built to edge of ROW adds risk of conflicts with private yards, trees, etc. Requires physical separation - either flexible bollards or permanent solution, increasing maintenance costs.	200	4
	Alternative 3: Multi-use pathway behind east ditch, sidewalk behind west ditch (semi-urban cross section)	2 Very comfortable buffer from traffic. Pedestrians have a facility on both sides of the street. Cyclists and pedestrians are mixed which may lead to more conflicts, particularly with faster cyclists. Frequent utility poles require MUP to split and create a hazard. Trees adjacent to MUP improve comfort and enjoyment.	3 Narrowed 6.6m road width will contribute to slower travel speeds, especially with curb on one side. MUP remains offset 3+m from vehicle lanes which helps with sightlines at driveways and side street crossings. Bidirectional user volumes more challenging for safety as motorists don't expect cyclists travelling in counterflow direction.	4 Provides 6.6m total width of LID in the cross section plus potential for larger tree plantings in bioswales	2 Increased cost to urbanize one side of roadway but maintains existing crown/centreline. May require relocating many utility poles to avoid splitting MUP. MUP built to edge of ROW adds risk of conflicts with private yards, trees, etc.	230	1
	Alternative 4: Sidewalks and unidirectional cycle tracks both sides (urban cross section)	4 Very comfortable buffers from traffic with trees for cyclists and pedestrians. Facilities on both sides maximizes connectivity and comfort for users. Fully separated walking and cycling facilities supports reduced conflicts between users.	4 Narrowed 6.6m road width plus trees along road will contribute to slower vehicle travel speeds. Cyclists riding in flow of traffic improves predictability at intersections.	3 Provides 3.2m of LID in the cross section (bioswale) plus planting strip on west side with potential for tree planting on both sides of roadway. Lowest LID potential of all options but partially offset with potential for trees.	1 Full urbanization of roadway carries significantly more cost compared to maintaining rural cross section. Some utility poles may be relocated to maintain 2m desired sidewalk width. Sidewalk built to edge of ROW adds risk of conflicts with private yards, trees, etc.	270	2
CONTEXT 2 - GREEN SPACE	Alternative 1: Multi-use pathway behind ditch (rural, shift crown)	4 Very comfortable buffer from traffic. Cyclists and pedestrians are mixed which is not of concern in low pedestrian activity area. Very few utility poles in conflict. MUP users travel adjacent to trees beyond ROW, contributing to comfort and enjoyment.	4 Very minimal number of driveways and side streets results in nearly conflict-free MUP user experience. Existing traffic environment is maintained, which is of less concern with vulnerable road users accommodated via the MUP.	3 Provides 6.5m total width of LID in the cross section. No new trees provided in ROW	2 Requires shift in crown/centreline. May require adjustments to a small number of local service utility poles. MUP built to edge of ROW adds risk of conflicts with trees.	310	3
	Alternative 2: Buffered paved shoulders (rural cross section)	3 Comfortable buffer from traffic for cyclists if physical separation is added, especially given low traffic volumes. Minimal risk of parking in paved shoulders due to undeveloped context. Pedestrians share shoulders, which is of less concern in low pedestrian activity area.	2 Very wide paved width may contribute to increased vehicle travel speeds.	3 Provides 6.4m total width of LID in the cross section. No new trees provided in ROW	4 Maintains rural cross section and existing crown/centreline. No impacts anticipated to utility poles. Flexibility towards edge of ROW allows minimal impact to adjacent properties, trees, etc.	330	2
	Alternative 3: Multi-use pathway behind ditch (rural, maintain existing crown)	4 Very comfortable buffer from traffic. Cyclists and pedestrians are mixed which is not of concern in low pedestrian activity area. Very few utility poles in conflict. MUP users travel adjacent to trees beyond ROW, contributing to comfort and enjoyment.	4 Very minimal number of driveways and side streets results in nearly conflict-free MUP user experience. Existing traffic environment is maintained, which is of less concern with vulnerable road users accommodated via the MUP.	3 Provides 6.5m total width of LID in the cross section. No new trees provided in ROW	3 Avoids shift in crown/centreline. May require adjustments to a small number of local service utility poles. MUP built to edge of ROW adds risk of conflicts with trees.	350	1
CONTEXT 3 - DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL	Alternative 1: Raised, bi-directional cycle track (urban cross section) & sidewalks on both sides	4 Very comfortable buffer from traffic and cyclists and pedestrians are separated. Generous pedestrian realm provided for furniture, patios, trees, etc. Several utility poles in conflict resulting in narrowing/weaving sidewalk. Street trees possible both sides, contributing to comfort and enjoyment.	2 Narrow road width contributes to slower travel speeds. Minimal driveways results in less conflicts with traffic. Extra attention needed at commercial driveway and Lockhart intersection to ensure bidirectional cycle track conflicts are managed.	3 Provides up to 7.8m of boulevard space for landscaping, street trees, etc. Infiltration chambers provided to minimize storm surges and support landscaped area.	2 Requires full road reconstruction and urbanization. Adjustments likely to many/most utility poles. Small buffers to edge of ROW allow some flexibility in transitions.	290	1
	Alternative 2: Unidirectional cycle tracks (urban cross section) & sidewalks on both sides	4 Very comfortable buffer from traffic and cyclists and pedestrians are separated. Some pedestrian realm provided for furniture, patios, trees, etc. Several utility poles in conflict resulting in narrowing/weaving sidewalk. Street trees possible on one side, contributing to comfort and enjoyment.	4 Narrow road width and parking lane bulb-outs contribute to slower travel speeds. Minimal driveways results in less conflicts with traffic. One-way bicycle traffic results in less conflicts and more predictable traffic patterns.	2 Provides up to 2.4m of boulevard space for landscaping, street trees, etc. Infiltration chambers provided to minimize storm surges and support landscaped area. Provision of on-street parking reduces area for landscaping.	2 Requires full road reconstruction and urbanization. Adjustments likely to many/most utility poles. Small buffers to edge of ROW allow some flexibility in transitions.	300	2