Alternatives Criteria	Do Nothing	Reduced Lane Widths with Paved Shoulders and Rumble Strips	Reduced Lane Widths, Sidewalks and On-Street Buffered Bike Lanes	Reduced Lane Widths, Sidewalk on East Side and Multi-use Path on West Side	Reduced Lane Widths and Multi-Use Paths		
	Not Preferred	Neutral	Preferred	Preferred	Preferred		
Transportation	No change to traffic operations	Acceptable traffic operations with reduced lane widths to encourage slower traffic speeds, which in turn may encourage truck diversion	Acceptable traffic operations with reduced lane widths to encourage slower traffic speeds, which in turn may encourage truck diversion	 Acceptable traffic operations with reduced lane widths to encourage slower traffic speeds, which in turn may encourage truck diversion 	Acceptable traffic operations with reduced lane widths to encourage slower traffic speeds, which in turn may encourage truck diversion		
	No change to road alignment Neutral	No change to road alignment Preferred	Improvements to road geometry Not Preferred	Improvements to road geometry Not Preferred	Improvements to road geometry Not Preferred		
Natural Environment	Avoids negative impacts on natural heritage features and wildlife and wildlife habitat	Minimal impacts to natural heritage features	Encroaches into locally significant wetlands and minimum protection zones; May result in a direct loss of an unevaluated wetland community Moderate tree removal Minor extension to culvert	Encroaches into locally significant wetlands and minimum protection zones; May result in a direct loss of an unevaluated wetland community Moderate tree removal Minor extension to culvert	Encroaches into locally significant wetlands and minimum protection zones; May result in a direct loss of an unevaluated wetland community Moderate tree removal Minor extension to culvert		
	No opportunity to enhance natural heritage features and wildlife and wildlife habitat	Does not increase potential for vehicle-wildlife conflicts	No opportunity to enhance natural heritage features and wildlife and wildlife habitat	No opportunity to enhance natural heritage features and wildlife and wildlife habitat	No opportunity to enhance natural heritage features and wildlife and wildlife habitat		
	No opportunity to reduce risk for natural hazards	Generally similar impervious area contributing to stormwater runoff No change to treatment (existing ditches) for stormwater runoff	Generally similar impervious area contributing to stormwater runoff as existing condition Opportunity to treat stormwater runoff	 Generally similar impervious area contributing to stormwater runoff as existing condition Opportunity to treat stormwater runoff 	Generally similar impervious area contributing to stormwater runoff as existing condition Opportunity to treat stormwater runoff		
	No opportunity to adapt to or mitigate the	Potential for low impact development	Potential for low impact development may be restricted in wellhead	Potential for low impact development may be restricted in wellhead			
	effects of climate change		protection areas	protection areas	protection areas		
	Not Preferred	Not Preferred	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral		
Healthy Communities	Sidewalk gap between Cranston Drive and Hilltop Drive	Does not fill sidewalk gap between Cranston Drive and Hilltop Drive	Fills sidewalk gap between Cranston Drive and south of Hilltop Drive; Provides active transportation link between Mono Road community and Caledon East	Fills sidewalk gap between Cranston Drive and south of Hilltop Drive; Provides active transportation link between Mono Road community and Caledon East	Fills sidewalk gap between Cranston Drive and south of Hilltop Drive; Provides active transportation link between Mono Road community and Caledon East		
		Improved surface conditions for cycling and walking	 Improved cycling facility; Possibly more desirable than multi-use path(s) for utilitarian cyclists (e.g., long-distance or commuter cyclists) and less for recreational cyclists 	 Improved cycling facility; Possibly more desirable than bike lanes for recreational cyclists and less desirable than bike lanes for utilitarian cyclists 	 Improved cycling facility; Possibly more desirable than bike lanes for recreational cyclists and less desirable than bike lanes for utilitarian cyclists 		
	No opportunity to promote healthy (active) environments	Continuous cycling facilities between paved shoulder in rural area and urban area	Continuous cycling facilities between paved shoulder in rural area and bike lane in urban area	Non-continuous pedestrian and cycling facilities between paved shoulder in rural area and sidewalk or multi-use path in urban area	Non-continuous pedestrian and cycling facilities between paved shoulder in rural area and multi-use path in urban area		
		No separation between pedestrians and cyclists Buffer (separation) between pedestrians and roadway; Rumble strips	Separated walking and cycling facility Less physical separation between pedestrians (sidewalk) and	Shared walking and cycling facility More physical separation between pedestrians or cyclists (multi-use	Shared walking and cycling facility More physical separation between pedestrians or cyclists (multi-use		
		 deter vehicles from crossing over to shoulder Paved shoulders improve surface accessibility compared to granular 	roadway than alternatives with multi-use path(s); Cycling facility is designated on-road Less comfort for recreational cyclists than alternatives with multi-use	path) and the roadway than alternatives with bike lanes; Cycling facility is off-road Less overall cyclist comfort than alternatives with bike lanes;	paths) with the roadway than alternatives with bike lanes; Cycling facility is off-road Less overall cyclist comfort than alternatives with bike lanes; Provides		
		shoulders	path(s); Little to no separation between cyclists and motorized traffic; Potential buffer between bike lane and travel lane is less than separation in alternatives with multi-use path(s)	Provides wide separation between cyclists and motorized traffic with no separation between cyclists and pedestrians	wide separation between cyclists and motorized traffic with no separation between cyclists and pedestrians		
		Limited potential for tree planting in rural cross-section	Number of trees within urban area will increase to extent possible, with consideration to provide shade for active transportation infrastructure	 Number of trees within urban area will increase to extent possible, with consideration to provide shade for active transportation infrastructure 	Number of trees within urban area will increase to extent possible, with consideration to provide shade for active transportation infrastructure		
	Not improved to standards of Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act	Paved shoulders may not be comfortable for all pedestrians and cyclists	 Designed to standards of Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act 	 Designed to standards of Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act 	 Designed to standards of Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act 		
	Neutral	Preferred in Rural Area	Not Preferred	Not Preferred	Preferred in Urban Area		
Social, Cultural and Economic Environment	 No impact on existing and planned future land uses 	Rural cross-sections are generally upgraded to urban within settlement areas, however the settlement area of Mono Road is outside the development area and will remain within a rural area	Urban cross-section is compatible with existing and planned future land uses between south of Cranston Drive to south of Hilltop Drive	 Urban cross-section is compatible with existing and planned future land uses between south of Cranston Drive to south of Hilltop Drive 	Urban cross-section is compatible with existing and planned future land uses between south of Cranston Drive to south of Hilltop Drive		
	Avoids negative impacts on cultural heritage features	Impacts to cultural heritage features can be avoided or mitigated					
	No opportunity to improve streetscape and aesthetics	Limited potential for tree planting in rural cross-section	Potential for improvements to streetscape and aesthetics, with potential to maintain or enhance treelined corridor to balance street form and function	Potential for improvements to streetscape and aesthetics, with potential to maintain or enhance treelined corridor to balance street form and function	Potential for improvements to streetscape and aesthetics, with potential to maintain or enhance treelined corridor to balance street form and function		
	South of Cranston Drive to Hilltop Drive is located within Prime Agricultural Area	Accommodates for farm vehicles	Designing for farm vehicles not ideal in urban area with raised curbs; Potential for farm vehicles to encroach onto bike lane	Designing for farm vehicles not ideal in urban area with raised curbs	Designing for farm vehicles not ideal in urban area with raised curbs		
	No conflict with utilities and municipal infrastructure	No conflict with utilities and municipal infrastructure	Minor utility and municipal infrastructure to be relocated or impacted	Minor utility and municipal infrastructure to be relocated	Utility and municipal infrastructure to be relocated		
	No construction staging	Minor temporary traffic impact due to construction staging	Moderate temporary traffic impact due to staging of storm sewers	Moderate temporary traffic impact due to staging of storm sewers	Moderate temporary traffic impact due to staging of storm sewers		
		Minor boulevard construction and grading improvements	Full boulevard reconstruction and potential drainage modification	Full boulevard reconstruction and potential drainage modification	Full boulevard reconstruction and potential drainage modification		
	No construction cost	Low cost to construct due to less drainage, street lighting and material costs compared to other alternatives	High cost to construct due to full boulevard reconstruction with higher drainage, street lighting and material costs than other alternatives	 Moderate cost to construct due to full boulevard reconstruction with moderate drainage, street lighting and material costs compared to other alternatives 	 Moderate cost to construct due to full boulevard reconstruction with moderate drainage, street lighting and material costs compared to other alternatives 		

Alternati Criteria	ves Do Nothing	Reduced Lane Widths with Paved Shoulders and Rumble Strips	Reduced Lane Widths, Sidewalks and On-Street Buffered Bike Lanes	Reduced Lane Widths, Sidewalk on East Side and Multi-use Path on West Side	Reduced Lane Widths and Multi-Use Paths
	No change to operations and maintenance co	Low operations and maintenance cost	Moderate cost to operate and maintain	Moderate ongoing cost to operate and maintain	Moderate ongoing cost to operate and maintain
Summary	Not Carried Forward	Preferred in EA for the rural section between Olde Base Line Road and Cranston Drive	Not Preferred in EA due to less separation between bike lane and travel lane	Not Preferred in EA due to less separation between bike and travel lanes on east side	Preferred in EA for the urban section between Cranston Drive and south of Hilltop Drive
	Does not address problem and opportunity (included for comparison)	Provides a functional cycling and walking facility adjacent to predominately agricultural land uses between Olde Base Line Road and Cranston Drive (provides improved conditions for cycling and walking in rural area compared to existing). Low cost to construct compared to other alternatives.		Semi-continuous pedestrian and cycling facilities between rural and urban area, and fills sidewalk gap between Cranston Drive and south of Hilltop Drive. More desirable than bike lanes for recreational cyclists with wide separation between cyclists and motorized traffic. Less cost to construct than bike lanes with moderate operations and maintenance costs compared to other alternatives. Less preferred than multi-use path on both sides due to less separation between bike and travel lanes on east side.	Non-continuous pedestrian and cycling facilities between rural and urban area, however fills sidewalk gap between Cranston Drive and south of Hilltop Drive. More desirable than bike lanes for recreational cyclists with wide separation between cyclists and motorized traffic. Less cost to construct than bike lanes with moderate operations and maintenance costs compared to other urban alternatives.

September 17, 2020