

RELIEF LINE



**Relief Line Project Assessment Phase 3
Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)
Meeting #2**

**Tuesday, June 9, 2015 | 6:00 pm – 9:00 pm
Metropolitan United Church | 56 Queen St. East**

Meeting Summary - DRAFT

Participants

Craig Nichol	Advisory Committee on Accessible Transit
Carlos Benzecy	Bloor-East Neighbourhood Association
Linda Brett	Bloor-East Neighbourhood Association
Briar de Lange	Bloor-Yorkville BIA
Amin Ali	City Youth Council of Toronto
Cameron MacLeod	CodeRedTO
Ole Calderone	Corktown Residents and Business Association
Stephen Wickens	Danforth East Community Association
Berni Campbell	Degrassi/Wardell Neighbourhood Group
Lana MacInnes	Degrassi/Wardell Neighbourhood Group
Evan M. Weinberg	Financial District BIA
Bennet MacNeil	First Gulf
Keith Viera	Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association
Nicole Beayni	Greater Toronto Civic Action Alliance
Marcus Bowman	Metrolinx
Gilles Durot	The Pocket
Nic de Salaberry	Ryerson University
Al Smith	St. Lawrence Market Neighbourhood BIA
Laurie Naylor	St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Marion Wingson	St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Jessica Mustachi	Toronto Women's City Alliance
Karl Junkin	Transport Action Ontario
Mario Silva	Toronto District School Board
Suhail Barot	TTC Riders
Ryan Kichler	Yonge-Dundas Square
Taylor Rath	Yonge-Dundas Square

Project Staff

Tim Läspä	Director, Transportation Planning
Paul Millett	Chief Project Engineer, Engineering, Construction and Expansion Section, TTC
Stella Gustavson	Program Manager, Transit Implementation Unit
David Cooper	Transit Implementation Unit
Michael Hain	Transit Implementation Unit
Charissa Iogna	Transit Implementation Unit
Kate Kusiak	Transit Implementation Unit
Mike Logan	Transit Implementation Unit
Hans Riekkö	Transit Implementation Unit

Project Consultant Team

Natalia Banoub	Argyle Communications
Jim Fought	LURA Consulting
Andrew O'Connor	HDR Inc.
Nick Shaw	HDR Inc.
Brodie Vissers	LURA Consulting
Leah Winter	LURA Consulting
Mary Zajac	Argyle Communications

Also Invited (Meeting minutes will be circulated)

519 Church Street Community Centre	Kempton Howard Community Association
BILD GTA	Leslieville BIA
Cabbagetown South Residents' Association	Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
Cadillac Fairview	Oxford Properties
Church of the Holy Trinity	Pembina Institute
Confederation of Resident and Ratepayer Associations in Toronto	Regent Park Community Health Centre
Danforth Mosaic BIA	Riverside District BIA
Distillery Historic District	Social Planning Toronto
Downtown Yonge BIA	South Riverdale Community Health Centre
Eastview Community Centre	The Danforth BIA
Evergreen	Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas
Garden District Residents' Association	Toronto Catholic District School Board
George Brown College	Toronto Centre for Active Transportation
Gerrard East Community Organization	Toronto Region Board of Trade
Gerrard India Bazaar BIA	Urban Land Institute - Toronto
Gerrard Square	Woodgreen Community Services
Greek Community of Toronto	Yonge-Bloor-Bay Business Association
GreekTown on the Danforth BIA	

1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction

Stella Gustavson, Program Manager, Transportation Planning, City of Toronto welcomed participants to the second Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting for the Relief Line Project Assessment. The purpose of the meeting was to report on the results of the potential station area evaluation and seek input on potential corridors. Mike Logan, Senior Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the meeting agenda and facilitated a round of introductions. David Cooper, Senior Transportation Planner, provided an overview of transit planning initiatives and a recap of the study to date. Andrew O'Connor, HDR Inc., presented the results of the potential station area evaluation and potential corridors. Participants had the opportunity to ask questions of clarification as well as provide feedback through a small group discussion and mapping exercise. Approximately 24 participants attended the meeting representing a variety of stakeholder groups.

2. Questions of Clarification

A summary of the Question and Answer period following the presentation is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**. Answers were provided by Stella Gustavson, Tim Läspä (Director, Transportation Planning, City of Toronto) and Paul Millett (Chief Project Engineer, Engineering, Construction and Expansion Section, TTC).

Questions of Clarification on Station Locations:

- Q. What was the methodology used for defining the station area?**
- A.** We used a 500 m radius to define existing and future population and employment. A station could impact a larger area; we take that into consideration in different ways for different criteria.
- Q. At the last SAG meeting we talked about potential routing further north near Dundas and Gerrard which could serve important destinations such as Ryerson and the Eaton's Centre. Why are you only proposing options that are further south?**
- A.** The study area has been focused on the southern part of the downtown core near the financial district which is the centre of highest employment density. The intention is to provide the greatest relief function, and part of that is to build the Relief Line closest to the destination of most riders. The centre of employment density and trip generation is in the area from Queen to Union.
- Q. Is it the intention to take Bloor/Danforth riders and bring them downtown via another corridor? Broadview station during peak hours is very crowded. Putting another line there would be confusing. The relief is needed east of Broadview.**
- A.** Ridership modelling is still being finalized. The modelling results will be a significant factor in determining the preferred corridor.
- C. Routing at Broadview station would also provide relief to the surface streetcar network.**
- Q. One of the concerns in my community is that you can't get on the trains in the morning at Woodbine and Coxwell. Broadview is too far west to provide significant relief. Why was the Donlands area not further considered?**

- A. As shown in the evaluation tables, Donlands has some issues. We want to restrict construction to existing rights-of-way as much as possible to avoid impacts to private property. Donlands Ave. ends at Danforth in a "T" intersection so there would be property impacts south of Danforth as the tunnel realigns onto a public right-of-way. There is also landfill in the Donlands area. When doing tunnel boring we have to be cautious of geotechnical constraints and the potential for gases originating from the landfill.
- Q. **Has the evaluation framework been updated since the Feeling Congested exercise in the Official Plan update? There were never any follow up meetings to discuss how the public input was considered. I am concerned that the evaluation framework was used as a starting point because there are a lot issues with the framework itself, especially with respect to Social Equity.**
- A. The evaluation framework was developed through the Official Plan review process and it is not within the scope of the Relief Line project to revisit it. The evaluation criteria presented and consulted on in Phase 2 were developed specifically for this project based on a broad array of technical considerations and stakeholder input, using the Feeling Congested framework as a starting place. Social and gender equity issues are addressed very broadly, not just within the "social equity" set of criteria. The evaluation criteria developed for the Relief Line Project Assessment are considered final for this project.

Questions of Clarification on Potential Corridors:

- Q. **You mentioned corridor A is the shortest route. What are the distances of the potential corridors?**
- A. The corridor areas are quite broad. Depending on the alignment that is identified, the distances would vary.

The following distances were provided after the meeting

Corridor	Approximate Length (from Danforth Terminus to University Avenue)
A	4.6 – 5.1 km
B	5.7 – 6.6 km
C	5.5 km
D	5.8 – 6.6 km

- Q. **Some of the potential corridors overlap with the Queen Street and King Street streetcar network. Is the implication that streetcars will be eliminated as a result of a new line?**
- A. There is no intent to eliminate any streetcar service as part of the Relief Line project.
- C. **The overlap with existing streetcar routes has not been framed as an advantage or disadvantage in the routing evaluation. It seems redundant to overlap the Relief Line with existing streetcar routes, but it could be an opportunity to somewhat reduce the need for service on some streetcar lines and deploy some of the streetcars to other lines that are in need across the city.**
- Q. **Are the network impacts during and after construction considered in this corridor selection process?**

- A. In the assessment we have considered the potential for impacts to surface transit and traffic during construction. Depending on the construction methods that are most appropriate, as well as the preferred alignment that is identified, there may be more or less impact at street level.
- Q. There are some proposed projects that would be competing for the same ridership. How do you protect the service for the users who are already there?**
- A. Network impacts will continue to be incorporated and we will be providing more detail in the next phase of the project as the modelling results become available. In terms of the network, we will be looking at how the corridors impact other lines and proposed projects and how service areas could overlap.
- Q. How do these corridors relate to the debate about the Gardiner East? We don't know the result of the decision yet, but the decision could result in significant new developments and potential for construction overlap.**
- A. The evaluation did take into account the impact of future transit lines and improvements, but we did not look at how the Relief Line may impact use on the Gardiner. From a strategic perspective, there is a potential for changing modal split. That is being considered at a broad and strategic level in the Gardiner study.
- Q. If the Gardiner East is replaced and there is more development along the existing corridor, which potential corridor would best serve those new developments?**
- A. While the corridors that connect to King/Wellington would probably be better than the ones that connect to Queen/Richmond, there is a difference between corridors and alignments. At this stage, we are introducing corridors which are broad bands connecting the Danforth to downtown. Within each corridor, the potential for the various potential alignments and stations to serve existing and future development opportunities will need to be considered.

3. Facilitated Small Group Discussion and Mapping Exercise

Participants engaged in small group facilitated discussions on the potential corridors. Each group was asked to come to a consensus on a preferred corridor. Participants were then given large maps of the preferred corridor and invited to discuss and illustrate possible alignments and station locations within that corridor. A summary of key feedback by participants is provided below:

Preferred Corridors:

- Overall, most groups had preference for either Corridor B (Pape to Queen/Richmond) or Corridor D (Pape to King/Wellington via Queen Street). Both of these corridors include a station at Pape/Danforth which facilitates a potential northern expansion and provides an efficient link with the public right-of-way.
- One group table showed a preference for Corridor A (Broadview to Queen/Richmond) and one table showed a preference for Corridor C (Broadview to King/Wellington).

Preferred Stations:

- Some participants were in support of having two downtown stations that connect to both the Yonge and University lines while others felt that one centrally located downtown station with multiple access points would be sufficient.

- There was consistent support for a station at Gerrard Square, providing a connection to SmartTrack, streetcar, and future development opportunities.
- There was consistent support for stations at Sherbourne and Cherry/Sumach.
- There was some support for a station at the Unilever site.

Top Considerations in Corridor Discussions:

- Providing greatest relief to the transit network
- Access to employment areas
- Connections to other transit routes
- Train operations (speed, curve radius)
- Access to key destinations
- Serving areas with development potential

Additional Feedback from Small Group Discussion on Potential Corridors and Potential Stations:

Corridor A:

- Alignment on Adelaide was suggested to provide better access to both the financial employment district and destinations further north.
- Adelaide alignment would also reduce impacts to existing surface transit.
- Stations on Adelaide at both Yonge and University were suggested.
- A station at Sherbourne/Adelaide was suggested, serving George Brown College and St. Lawrence Market.
- A station near Sumach/Richmond was suggested.
- A station at Sumach/Dundas was suggested to serve the Regent Park community.
- An elevated crossing over the Don River was suggested.

Corridor B:

- A station on Queen at Bay (or between Bay and Yonge) was suggested, with underground connections to the Yonge and University lines.
- Alignment along Queen was preferred to increase access to destinations further north (Ryerson, Eaton's Centre, hospital, City Hall) while still providing access to the King employment areas.
- A station at Sherbourne/Queen was suggested which would serve George Brown College.
- A station near Regent Park was suggested (near Parliament or Sumach).
- A station at the Unilever site was suggested, in addition to extension of the Broadview streetcar to the site, to create an interconnected transit hub.
- A station at Queen/Broadview was suggested providing connection to the Queen and Broadview streetcars.
- There was consistent support for a station at Gerrard Square due to potential connection to Smart Track.

Corridor C:

- A station at Bay/Wellington was suggested to provide access to key destinations such as Union Station, UPX, the financial district, Rogers Centre, etc.
- Alignment of corridor C has the potential to serve future development south of Front St. and along the waterfront.
- Stations at Queen/Broadview, Front/Cherry, and Front/Sherbourne were suggested.

- A station at Broadview/Gerrard would allow streetcar connection opportunities to Ryerson, hospitals, Gerrard Square, etc.

Corridor D:

- A station between Yonge and Bay on King was suggested.
- A station between Yonge and Bay on Wellington was suggested.
- A station between University and John was suggested.
- A station at King/Sherbourne was supported. It was suggested that the station be located between King and Front, providing pedestrian access from both King and Front.
- A station at Front/Cherry was supported, providing better access to the Distillery District.
- A station at the Unilever site was supported to connect with future employment and development opportunities, however there were concerns with flooding. Shifting the station to Eastern Ave was also suggested.
- Some participants showed support for a station at Queen/Carlaw while others showed support for Queen/Pape.
- A station at Gerrard Square was supported due to potential connection to Smart Track.

4. Wrap Up and Next Steps

The potential corridors presented at the meeting will be evaluated using the evaluation criteria. SAG and public feedback obtained during the upcoming eight public meetings will inform the evaluation process. Once a preferred corridor is determined, the project team will be identifying potential alignments for public review comment in the fall of 2015.