

Summary of Relief Line Corridor Options Scoring					
Pape-Queen Alignments					
February 2016					
Major Group	Category	Pape to Queen Route		Pape to King Route	
		Via Queen	Via Lever	Via Queen	Via Lever
Choice					
	Connectivity to Surface Transit Routes				
	Qualitative	4	4	4	4
	Quantitative	4	4	4	4
	Connectivity to Walking & Cycling	3	4	3	4
	Connectivity to Higher Order Transit Services	4	4	4	4
	Supporting Transportation Infrastructure	2	3	2	3
	Directness of Transfer to BD & YUS	4	4	4	4
	Compatability with PATH	3	3	4	4
	Ability to reduce passenger crowding at existing stations	4	4	3	3
	Downtown Pedestrian Impacts	3	3	2	2
	Service Area	3	2	2	2
	<i>Total</i>	34	35	32	34
	<i>Average</i>	0.85	0.88	0.80	0.85
	<b>Summary</b>	4	4	3	3
<b>Experience</b>	Proximity to Key Destinations	4	4	2	2
	Relief to Danforth Subway	4	4	4	4
	Relief to Downtown Subway	3	3	4	4
	Danforth Interchange Design	4	4	4	4
	Downtown Interchange Design	4	4	4	4
	Proximity to Key Destinations for future Northern Xtn	4	4	4	4
	Proximity to Key Destinations for future Western Xtn	2	4	2	4
	Travel Time	4	1	4	3
	Relief to Yonge Subway Line	4	4	4	4
	Relief to B-Y Station	4	3	4	4
	Relief to Union Station	1	1	2	2
	Relief to Surface Routes	4	4	4	4
	Relief Line Ridership	3	3	4	4
	Total Transit Ridership	2	3	3	4
	<i>Total</i>	47	46	49	51
	<i>Average</i>	0.84	0.82	0.88	0.91
	<b>Summary</b>	3	3	4	4
<b>Social Equity</b>	Improving Service to Neighbourhood Improvement Areas	3	3	2	2
	Support Equity	3	3	2	2
	<i>Total</i>	6	6	4	4
	<i>Average</i>	0.75	0.75	0.50	0.50
	<b>Summary</b>	3	3	2	2
<b>Shaping the City</b>	Serving Areas of Existing Population	4	4	4	4
	Serving Areas of Planned Growth	4	4	3	3
	Compatibility with Planning Policies	2	3	3	4
	Existing Physical Barriers	4	3	3	2

	Support City Building Opportunities	3	4	3	4
	Partnership Opportunities for Transit Oriented Development	2	3	3	4
	<i>Total</i>	19	21	19	21
	<i>Average</i>	0.79	0.88	0.79	0.88
	<b>Summary</b>	3	3	3	4
<b>Healthy Neighbourhoods</b>	Compatibility with Existing Neighbourhoods	3	3	3	3
	Opportunities for sensitive integration of stations	2	2	2	3
	Improving Access to Community Facilities	4	4	3	3
	<i>Total</i>	9	9	8	9
	<i>Average</i>	0.75	0.75	0.67	0.75
	<b>Summary</b>	3	3	3	3
<b>Public Health &amp; Environment</b>	Impacts and Compatibility with Natural Environment	4	4	4	4
	Ability to mitigate natural impacts	4	3	4	3
	Compatibility with parks and public spaces	3	3	3	3
	Encouraging people to use transit more and drive less	2	2	2	2
	<i>Total</i>	13	12	13	12
	<i>Average</i>	0.81	0.75	0.81	0.75
	<b>Summary</b>	4	3	4	3
<b>Affordability</b>	Engineering Feasibility	3	1	2	1
	Construction Impacts	3	3	1	2
	Construction Cost	3	2	3	2
	Minimize Property Acquisition Cost	3	2	3	2
	Ease of Providing Storage Facility Connection	4	4	4	4
	Ease of Construction of Future Northern Extension	4	4	4	4
	Ease of Construction of Future Western Extension	4	4	4	4
	Operating/Mtce Cost	3	2	3	2
	<i>Total</i>	27	22	24	21
	<i>Average</i>	0.84	0.69	0.75	0.66
	<b>Summary</b>	4	2	3	2
<b>Supports Growth</b>	Serving Areas of Existing Employment	2	2	4	4
	Serving Areas of Planned Growth in Employment	2	2	3	4
	<i>Total</i>	4	4	7	8
	<i>Average</i>	0.50	0.50	0.88	1.00
	<b>Summary</b>	2	2	3	4
<b>Sum by Category</b>		159	155	156	160
<b>Average by Category</b>		0.81	0.79	0.80	0.82
<b>Sum by Major Group</b>		6.14	6.01	6.07	6.29
<b>Average by Major Group</b>		0.77	0.75	0.76	0.79
<b>Technical Summary</b>		3	3	3	3
<b>Public Comments</b>		3	3	3	3