Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Measures	Descriptions	By	SRT	Midland	Brimley	McCowan	SRT	Midland	Brimley	McCowan	Notes
					Analysis				Evaluation				
A. Serving People													
1. Experience – capacity to ease crowding and congestion; reduce travel times; make travel more reliable, safe and enjoyable	A.1.1. Speed, reliability and comfort of subway from Kennedy Station to Scarborough Centre	A.1.1.1. Travel time from Kennedy Station to Scarborough Centre	Estimated travel time (min.), lower number is preferred	Civil	8.6 mins	7.5 mins	7.9 mins	7.5 mins					The Midland, Brimley and McCowan corridors are equally preferred as they result in similar travel time from Kennedy Station to Scarborough Centre. The SRT is the least preferred as it results in longer travel time relative to the other corridors.
		A.1.1.2. Comfort for subway passengers Note: larger radii = smoother ride Shorter length = more preferred	Length of curves with radii less than 457 m (radius and length)	Civil	1157m	870m	1123m	428m					The McCowan corridor is the most preferred as it results in the least curves with radii less than 457 m (smoothest ride relative to other corridors). The Midland corridor is less preferred relative to the McCowan corridor as it results in more curves. Both the SRT and Brimley corridors are the least preferred as they result in the most curves.
	Summary for Experience												**The McCowan corridor is the most preferred as it results in fast travel time and the most comfort for passengers. The Midland and the Brimley corridors are less preferred relative to the McCowan corridor as they result in more curves. The SRT corridor is the least preferred as it results in longer travel time and the most curves.**
2. Choice – develop an integrated network that connects different modes to provide for more travel options	A.2.1. Locate and design subway stations in a manner that mitigates the impacts to existing users of Line 3	A.2.1.1. Is the route located to provide service to Scarborough Centre?	Proximity to geographic centre of Scarborough Centre (Secondary Plan), lower number is preferred	Civil	189m	189m	193m	151m					The McCowan corridor is the most preferred as it is located in close proximity to the centroid of Scarborough Centre Secondary plan boundaries. The SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors are equally less preferred relative to the McCowan corridor as they are located a bit further away from the centroid of Scarborough Centre Secondary plan boundaries.
		A.1.2.1. Impacts to service for existing Line 3 riders	Number of years without Line 3 service during construction of the subway (#, lower number is preferred)	TTC	approx. 6	approx. 6	approx. 6	0					The McCowan corridor is the most preferred as it does not require the shut down of SRT during construction. The SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors require shutting down SRT for approximately six years during construction. As such, they are not preferred.
		Summary for A.2.1											The McCowan corridor station is located in the closest proximity to the centroid of Scarborough Centre Secondary plan boundaries relative to the other corridors and it does not require the shut down of SRT during construction, whereas all the other corridors require shutting down SRT for approximately six years during construction. As such, the McCowan corridor is the most preferred and all the other corridors are less preferred.
	A.2.3. Locate and design subway stations in a manner that promotes seamless pedestrian connections through subway station location and design (including below-ground, at surface, and/or above ground pedestrian connections)	A.2.3.1. Opportunities to provide bus terminals at station	Qualitative assessment of opportunity to use existing or accommodate new bus terminal location	Civil	Opportunity to provide bus terminal to the South of shopping centre (current bus terminal location). Existing bus terminal location can be utilized with additional expansion for bays to the east and west.	Opportunity to provide bus terminal to the South of shopping centre (current bus terminal location). Existing bus terminal location can be utilized with additional expansion for bays to the east and west.	Opportunity to provide bus terminal to the South of shopping centre (current bus terminal location). Existing bus terminal location can be utilized with additional expansion for bays to the east and west.	Opportunity to provide new bus terminal at the South east corner of shopping centre. New bus terminal required as existing is considerably far from the proposed platform location.					The SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors are equally preferred as the existing bus terminal location can be utilized with additional expansion for bays to the east and west. The McCowan is less preferred as a new bus terminal will be required (the existing terminal is considerably far from the proposed platform location).
		A.2.3.4. Opportunities for others to provide commuter parking	Qualitative assessment of opportunity to use existing or accommodate new location	Arch	Opportunity to provide parking at west side of shopping centre	Opportunity to provide parking at west side of shopping centre	Opportunity to provide parking at west side of shopping centre	Opportunity to provide parking at east side of shopping centre; where shopping centre expansion is anticipated.					The SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors are equally preferred as they result in opportunity to provide parking at west side of shopping centre whereas the McCowan corridor provides parking at east side of shopping centre where expansion is anticipated. As such, the McCowan corridor is less preferred.
		Summary for A.2.3.											The SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors are equally preferred as the existing bus terminal location can be utilized with additional expansion for bays to the east and west and they provide parking at the west side of shopping centre where expansion is not anticipated. As such, the McCowan is not preferred.
	A.2.5. Qualitative assessment of opportunities to split bus terminal between initial and future station(s) within the Centre	A.2.5.1. Opportunities to split bus terminal between initial and future station(s) within the Centre	Qualitative assessment	Arch	East-west station orientation allows expansion of current bus terminal at both ends of station; opportunity to provide bus terminal at future station at Progress/west of Highland Creek.	East-west station orientation allows expansion of current bus terminal at both ends of station; opportunity to provide bus terminal at future station at Progress/west of Highland Creek.	East-west station orientation allows expansion of current bus terminal at both ends of station; opportunity to provide bus terminal at future station at Progress/west of Highland Creek.	This corridor does not allow for future station.					The SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors are equally preferred as they allow expansion of current bus terminal at both ends of station and can provide bus terminal at future additional stations within SC. The McCowan corridor does not allow for future additional stations within SC, as such it is not preferred.
	A.2.6. Qualitative assessment of opportunities for others to provide parking at future station(s) within the Centre	A.2.6.1. Opportunities for others to provide parking at future station(s) within the Centre	Qualitative assessment	Arch	Opportunity to provide parking at future station at Progress/west of Highland Creek.	Opportunity to provide parking at future station at Progress/west of Highland Creek.	Opportunity to provide parking at future station at Progress/west of Highland Creek.	This corridor does not allow for future station.					The SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors are equally preferred. They all provide opportunity for parking at future additional stations within SC. The McCowan corridor does not allow for future additional stations within SC, as such it is not preferred.
	Summary for Choice												**The McCowan corridor does not require the shut down of SRT during construction. As such, it is the most preferred from a Choice perspective. Although the SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors utilize the existing bus terminal location, they are less preferred relative to the McCowan corridors as they require shutting down SRT for approximately six years during construction.**
B. Strengthening Places													
2. Healthy Neighbourhoods – changes in the transportation network should strengthen and enhance existing neighbourhoods; promote safe walking and cycling within and between neighbourhoods	B.2.3. Mitigate impact to existing neighbourhoods associated with the construction	B.2.3.1. Impacts on existing stable neighbourhoods	% of residential properties above and adjacent to the corridor and stations, lower number is preferred (lower length of residential preferred)	Civil	65%	72%	78%	70%					The SRT corridor has the smallest percentage of residential properties above and adjacent to the corridor and station. The Midland and McCowan corridors result in higher percentage of residential properties above and adjacent to the corridor and station. The Brimley corridor results in the highest percentage of residential properties relative to all other corridors above and adjacent to the corridor and station. This criteria is considered not decision relevant as impacts associated with residential properties are better captured in B.2.4.1.
	B.2.4. Mitigate property impacts associated with the construction	B.2.4.1. Property impacts brought about by the construction of stations, tunnels, etc.	Number of properties directly affected, lower number is preferred	Civil	Total: 92 Number of Single Family Homes Impacted (Below Surface Impacts): - Partial/sliver <2m: 3 - Partial/sliver >2m: 17 - Complete: 29 Number of Residential Buildings/complexes Impacted (Below Surface Impacts): - Partial/sliver <2m: 0 - Partial/sliver >2m: 0 - Complete: 0 Business & Developable properties Impacted: Surface Impacts - Partial/sliver <2m: 0 - Partial/sliver >2m: 29 (3.11Ha) - Complete: 0 Below Surface Impacts - Partial/sliver <2m: 0 - Partial/sliver >2m: 11 (3.36Ha) - Complete: 1 (0.16Ha) - Total: 6.47 Ha	Total: 33 Number of Single Family Homes Impacted (Below Surface Impacts): - Partial/sliver <2m: 1 - Partial/sliver >2m: 5 - Complete: 4 Number of Residential Buildings/complexes Impacted (Below Surface Impacts): - Partial/sliver <2m: 0 - Partial/sliver >2m: 0 - Complete: 0 Business & Developable properties Impacted: Surface Impacts - Partial/sliver <2m: 0 - Partial/sliver >2m: 7 (1.58Ha) - Complete: 0 Below Surface Impacts - Partial/sliver <2m: 0 - Partial/sliver >2m: 14 (2.60Ha) - Complete: 1 (0.16Ha) - Total: 4.34 Ha	Total: 49 Number of Single Family Homes Impacted: (Below Surface Impacts): - Partial/sliver <2m: 4 - Partial/sliver >2m: 10 - Complete: 7 Number of Residential Buildings/complexes Impacted (Below Surface Impacts): - Partial/sliver <2m: 0 - Partial/sliver >2m: 1 - Complete: 0 Business & Developable properties Impacted: Surface Impacts - Partial/sliver <2m: 0 - Partial/sliver >2m: 7 (2.22Ha) - Complete: 0 Below Surface Impacts - Partial/sliver <2m: 1 (0.0036 Ha) - Partial/sliver >2m: 19 (1.80Ha) - Complete: 0 - Total: 4.03 Ha	Total: 91 Number of Single Family Homes Impacted: (Below Surface Impacts): - Partial/sliver <2m: 42 - Partial/sliver >2m: 21 - Complete: 5 Number of Residential Buildings/complexes Impacted: (Below Surface Impacts): - Partial/sliver <2m: 1 - Partial/sliver >2m: 3 - Complete: 0 Business & Developable properties Impacted: Surface Impacts - Partial/sliver <2m: 0 - Partial/sliver >2m: 4 (1.36Ha) - Complete: 0 Below Surface Impacts - Partial/sliver <2m: 7 (0.05 Ha) - Partial/sliver >2m: 8 (1.91Ha) - Complete: 0 - Total: 3.31 Ha					The Midland corridor is the most preferred. The Brimley and McCowan corridors are less preferred relative to the Midland corridor. The SRT corridor is the least preferred. *based on twin tunnel, impacts are anticipated to be reduced with 10.7m (single bore)
	Summary for Healthy Neighbourhoods												**The percentage of residential properties above and adjacent to the corridor and station serves as an indicator to the potential impact to existing stable neighbourhoods only. The summary for Healthy Neighbourhoods will focus on the actual impact to private properties (B.2.4.1.). The Midland corridor is the most preferred. The Brimley and McCowan corridors are less preferred relative to the Midland corridor. The SRT corridor is the least preferred.**
C. Supporting Prosperity													
	C.1.1. Ability to integrate subway stations with existing land uses	C.1.1.1. The extent to which the station location and orientation create opportunities for integration with existing land uses	Qualitative assessment based on proposed station location and orientation relative to existing land uses (high, medium, low potential)	TPP	The East-West station has four entrances. There is approximately 275m of separation between the western-most entrance (on Triton south of the mall) and the two eastern entrances (west side of Borough), with another entrance in between. This provides more geographical coverage and a greater degree of access to adjacent lands than the North-South station, assuming at-grade pedestrian connections can be made. In particular, the western-most entrance can provide ready access to the mall and two residential towers, and is about 150m from the Scarborough Civic Centre, a distinct difference to the North-South station.			The North-South station has two entrances, in the same general location (either side of Borough). Compared to the East-West station, it provides fewer access points to adjacent lands.					The two options are within the Civic Precinct/Mall area, and thus have high potential for integration with the existing institutional, employment, commercial and residential uses based on proximity alone. However, the criteria of integration with existing land uses is highly dependent on the location of pedestrian entrances to the station, as ultimately, transit users walk at the beginning and end of their trips. Both station options locate entrances in what is today an unfriendly pedestrian environment. Further, even assuming a significantly upgraded pedestrian environment, surrounding buildings tend to present unanimated frontages towards this area, characterized by blank walls, service entrances, or vehicular spaces. In this regard, the specific entrance locations of both stations can be considered in the low to moderate range in terms of their potential integration with existing uses. Retrofit of existing buildings could help to mitigate this, as would direct pedestrian linkages (such as to the mall or to the Civic Precinct). Of the two station options, the East-West option (associated with the SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors) is superior to the North-South option (associated with the McCowan corridor) for integration.
		C.1.2.1. Qualitative assessment of the positive and negative impacts to parcels with intensification potential within 500 m of station location	Qualitative assessment	TPP	The East-West station's wide entrance spacing will bring more lands within a 500m walking radius than the North-South station. This includes numerous large soft sites west of the Mall and along Brimley Road. The East-West station captures all of the lands that are within 500m of the North-South station, in addition to the sites west of the Mall. The East-West station's underground infrastructure (bus and subway), which is located further west than the North-South option, will partially and moderately reduce the development potential of a few sites west of the mall.			The North-South station's underground infrastructure (bus and subway), which is located further east than the East-West option, will partially and moderately reduce the development potential of a few sites east of the mall (to a greater degree than the East-West option)					The construction of a subway is a likely catalyst for intensification within 500m. Both options encompass soft sites with intensification potential within 500m of station entrances. These sites are within the Civic Centre/mall precinct and the McCowan Precinct, some of which are parking lots or vacant, and some of which are dependent on redevelopment within the McCowan Precinct Plan. The underground infrastructure of both stations (bus terminal and subway) will have a modest restrictive effect on a few soft sites in their immediate vicinity, depending on final alignment, by reducing available space for underground parking, utilities and foundations. Of the two station options, the East-West option is superior to the North-South option in that it encompasses far more lands with intensification potential within a 500m walking radius.
		C.1.2.2. Existing employment density within 500 m of subway stations	Existing employment density within a 500 m radius of subway stations (jobs/ha)	TPP	Both stations have similar existing employment density within a 500 m radius of subway stations								All corridors are equally preferred.

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Measures	Descriptions	By	SRT	Midland	Brimley	McCowan	SRT	Midland	Brimley	McCowan	Notes
					Analysis				Evaluation				
1. Supports Growth - investment in public transportation should support economic development; allow workers to get to jobs more easily; allow goods to get to markets more efficiently	C.1.2. Opportunity to improve transit service to employment areas	C.1.2.3. Qualitative assessment of the positive and negative impacts to parcels with intensification potential in the vicinity of potential future station location(s)	Qualitative assessment	TPP	Option 1: This potential station location is more central than Option 2 to the McCowan Precinct as a whole, and therefore provides better access and shorter walks to the surrounding proposed development blocks. It is integrated with the proposed road network of the McCowan Precinct. It would be better integrated from a land use perspective. In this respect, it *may* catalyze higher density intensification of the McCowan Precinct overall than Option 2. Option 2: This potential station location is at the periphery of the McCowan Precinct. It is not well integrated with the proposed street network, and its principal adjacencies are a large park (to the north) and the rear of industrial buildings (to the south), making walking to the proposed development blocks longer than Option 1. It is less well integrated from a land use perspective.			Not applicable. Does not allow for future extension to the McCowan Precinct to the east.	●	●	●	○	The North-South station cannot be extended eastward into the McCowan Precinct, and therefore this criteria does not apply to it. Commentary under the East-West Precinct is provided for two options for extending the subway into the McCowan Precinct with a station location either 1) under Progress Road west of Highland Creek, or 2) within the existing SRT right of way west of Highland Creek and east of the yard.
		A.2.1.3. Qualitative description of potential for the alignment to be extended and support future additional stations within SC at the urban stop spacing (e.g. 700-900 m)	Qualitative assessment	Civil	Approx. Distance from Scarborough Centre Official plan centroid to Scarborough Centre Official plan limits along alignment 1150m - High Potential	Approx. Distance from Scarborough Centre Official plan centroid to Scarborough Centre Official plan limits along alignment 1150m - High Potential	Approx. Distance from Scarborough Centre Official plan centroid to Scarborough Centre Official plan limits along alignment 1100m - High Potential	Approx. Distance from Scarborough Centre Official plan centroid to Scarborough Centre Official plan limits along alignment 500m - No Potential	●	●	●	○	The SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors are equally preferred as they all provide high potential for the alignment to be extended and support future additional stations within Scarborough Centre. The McCowan corridor is the least preferred as it does not support future additional stations within Scarborough Centre.
		Summary for C.1.2.							●	●	●	◑	The SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors are equally preferred. The McCowan corridor is the least preferred as its station encompasses less lands with intensification potential within a 500m walking radius relative to the station concept associated with other corridors and does not support future additional stations within Scarborough Centre.
	Summary for Supports Growth								●	●	●	◑	**The SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors are equally preferred.** **The McCowan corridor is not preferred as it provides fewer access points to adjacent lands, encompasses less lands with intensification potential within a 500m walking radius relative to the other corridors and does not support future additional stations within Scarborough Centre.**
2. Affordable – improvements to the transportation system should be affordable to build, maintain and operate	C.2.1. Optimize cost effectiveness in terms of both capital and operating costs	C.2.1.1. Capital cost	$ (lower cost is preferred)	TTC					◑	◕	◕	●	The Midland and Brimley corridors are equally preferred. The McCowan corridor is slightly less preferred relative to the Midland and Brimley corridors. The SRT corridor is the least preferred.
		C.2.1.4. Potential impact to large scale infrastructure (i.e. major gravity systems crossing corridor, hydro towers / corridors, major water feeder line > 750 mm, etc.)	Qualitative assessment	Civil - Watermain	Approximate length of WM ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 23m	Approximate length of WM ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 1850m	Approximate length of WM ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 30m	Approximate length of WM ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 60m	●	◔	●	●	The SRT, Brimley and McCowan corridors are equally preferred as they result in similar length crossing WM≥750MM. The Midland corridor is the least preferred as it results in significantly longer length crossing WM≥750MM.
				Civil - Storm	Approximate length of STM Sewer ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 1440m	Approximate length of STM Sewer ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 2680m	Approximate length of STM Sewer ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 2720m	Approximate length of STM Sewer ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 1592m	●	◑	◑	●	The SRT and McCowan corridors are more preferred relative to the Midland and Briley corridors.
				Civil- Sewer	Approximate length of SAN Sewer ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 90m	Approximate length of SAN Sewer ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 285m	Approximate length of SAN Sewer ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 120m	Approximate length of SAN Sewer ≥ 750MM crossing corridor 90m	●	◑	◕	●	The SRT and McCowan corridors are the most preferred. The Brimley corridor is more referred relative to the Midland corridor. The Midland corridor is the least preferred.
				Civil - Impacts on Hydro Towers	Approximate length of crossing of Hydro corridor 320m	Approximate length of crossing of Hydro corridor 160m	Approximate length of crossing of Hydro corridor 215m	Approximate length of crossing of Hydro corridor 220m	◑	●	◕	◕	The Midland corridor is the most preferred. The Brimley and McCowan corridors are slightly less preferred relative to the Midland corridor. The SRT corridor is the least preferred.
			Summary for C.2.1.4						●	◑	◕	●	
		C.2.1.5. Constructability issues that may increase construction cost (i.e. available space for tunnel construction, proximity to multi-storey buildings, option to pass over Hwy 401, flexibility to shift station to mitigate impacts to arterial roads, etc.)	Qualitative assessment	Civil-Available space for tunnel construction	Land adjacent to station area for tunnel launch shaft is currently existing TTC Bus terminal, constrained area	Land adjacent to station area for tunnel launch shaft is currently existing TTC Bus terminal, constrained area	Land adjacent to station area for tunnel launch shaft is currently existing TTC Bus terminal, constrained area	Land adjacent to station area for tunnel launch shaft is currently existing surface parking, relatively unconstrained	◑	◑	◑	●	The McCowan corridor is the most preferred as land adjacent to station area for tunnel launch shaft is currently existing surface parking, relatively unconstrained. The SRT, Midland and Brimley corridors is less preferred relative to the McCowan corridor as land adjacent to station area for tunnel launch shaft is currently existing TTC Bus terminal, constrained area.
				Civil-Proximity to multi-storey buildings	10	14	5	13	◕	◕	●	◕	The Brimley corridor is the most preferred as it has the least multi-storey buildings located in proximity to the corridor. The SRT, Midland and McCowan corridors are equally less preferred relative to the Brimley corridor.
			Summary for C.2.1.5						◑	◑	◕	●	
	Summary for Affordable								◑	◕	◕	●	**The McCowan corridor is the most preferred.**