

Options under consideration

Four options:

- 1. Six lanes with HOV/Transit opportunities (4 general purpose lanes + 2 HOV/Transit)
- 2. Four general purpose lanes
- 3. Four general purpose lanes with reduced centre median
- 4. Resurfacing of existing pavement only

Not considered – added lane for single occupancy vehicles/general use

All options include:

- Boulevard multi-use path on both sides
- Cross-rides (cycle crossing) at intersections
- Signal optimization
- Reduced lane widths (to moderate motor vehicle speed)
- As much streetscaping as geometrically possible
- Widening of existing or adding new structures to include for MUP for option 1-3



Option 1@ midblock: Six lanes (4 GP + 2 HOV)



OPPORTUNITIES

- 1. Less traffic congestion and infiltration to road network
- Encourages move to multiple occupancy with HOV lanes to connect to highway and carpool lot
- 3. Promotes more efficient Transit service.
- 4. Aligns with EA and current traffic reassessment work
- 5. Provides the most people moving capacity
- 6. Allows for traffic capacity during nearby construction projects and future road diets

ISSUES

- 1. Highest capital cost
- 2. Limited opportunities for landscaping along large areas of the corridor
- 3. HOV lanes do not extend to Williams Parkway on 410 at this time
- 4. No City policy regarding HOV lanes
- 5. Transit is not considering this corridor as a future Zum or BRT route
- 6. Reduced perceived safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- 7. Less aesthetic public realm with less street trees, more hard surfaces, wide road width



Option 2 (Four GP lanes) @ midblock:



- 1. More opportunities for landscaping along the corridor with shrubs and trees
- 2. Least initial capital cost for construction
- 3. More pleasing aesthetic public realm with less street trees, less hard surfaces
- 4. More perceived safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- 5. Does not change current road cross section
- 6. Less utility relocation costs

- 1. Increase traffic on balance of road network
- 2. Slower transit service and fewer opportunities to encourage mode shift away from single occupancy vehicle
- 3. Does not align with EA or traffic reassessment work
- 4. Noise wall would not have been required
- 5. Increased costs for landscape maintenance for shrubs
- 6. Redesign required, delay to construction start



Option 3 (Four GP Lanes & Reduced Centre Median) @ mid-block



OPPORTUNITIES

- ISSUES
- 1. The most opportunities for landscaping along the corridor with shrubs and double staggered trees
- 2. Moderate initial capital cost for construction
- 3. Results in the most aesthetic public realm with more street trees, less hard surfaces
- 4. The highest perceived safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- 5. The least amount of pavement width

- 1. Increase traffic on balance of road network
- 2. Slower transit service and fewer opportunity to encourage mode shift away from single occupancy vehicle
- 3. Does not align with EA or traffic reassessment work
- 4. Noise wall would not have been required
- 5. Complete redesign; delay to construction start
- 6. Increased costs for landscape maintenance



Preliminary Cost Estimates and Life expectancy

Options	DC Funding (Million)	Tax Funding (Million)	Total Cost (Million)	Recovery From Region (Million)	End Of Life Cycle (Years)	Maintenance Life Cycle / Estimated Current Cost
Option 1 – Six lanes (4 GP + 2 HOV/Transit)	\$54	\$6	\$60	\$1.5	30	Resurfacing every 15 years / \$6 million
Option 2 – Four GP lanes	\$6	\$21	\$27	\$1.5	30	Resurfacing every 15 years / \$5 million
Option 3 – Four GP Lanes with reduced centre median	\$6	\$32	\$38	\$1.5	30	Resurfacing every 15 years / \$5 million
Option 4 – Partial depth 90mm pavement reconstruction (resurfacing)	\$0	\$5	\$5	\$0	15	Full depth reconstruction end of life cycle / \$15 million