

# RELIEF LINE



## Relief Line Project Assessment Phase 4 Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting #4

Monday, May 30, 2016 | 6:00 – 8:00 pm  
Church of the Holy Trinity | 19 Trinity Square

### Meeting Summary

#### Participants

John Burt	Bloor East Neighbourhood Association
Beth Baskin	Church of the Holy Trinity
Tricia Wood	CodeRedTO
Ole Calderone	Corktown Residents and Business Association
Berni Campbell	Degrassi/Wardell Neighbourhood Group
Evan M. Weinberg	Financial District BIA
Derek Goring	First Gulf
Michael Brewer	Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association
Marcus Bowman	Metrolinx
Lindsay Wiginton	Pembina Institute
Al Smith	St. Lawrence Market Neighbourhood BIA
Gilles Durot	The Pocket
Karl Junkin	Transport Action Ontario
John Wilson	West Don lands Committee

#### Project Staff

Stella Gustavson	Program Manager, Transit Implementation Unit
Paul Millett	Chief Project Engineer, Engineering, Construction and Expansion Section, TTC
Hans Riekkö	Transit Implementation Unit
Charissa Iogna	Transit Implementation Unit
Michael Hain	Transit Implementation Unit
Kristin Olson	Transit Implementation Unit
David Cooper	Transit Implementation Unit
Nishanthan Balasubramaniam	Transit Implementation Unit

#### Project Consultant Team

Sheldon Frankel	HDR
Nick Shaw	HDR
Jean-Pierre Veilleux	Argyle
Jim Faight	LURA
Leah Winter	LURA

**Also Invited (Meeting minutes will be circulated)**

519 Church Street Community Centre  
Advisory Committee on Accessible Transit  
BILD GTA  
Bloor-Yorkville BIA  
Cabbagetown South Residents' Association  
Cadillac Fairview  
Church of the Holy Trinity  
Confederation of Resident and Ratepayer Associations in Toronto  
The Danforth BIA  
Danforth East Community Association  
Danforth Mosaic BIA  
Distillery Historic District  
Downtown Yonge BIA  
Eastview Community Centre  
Evergreen  
Garden District Residents' Association  
Gerrard East Community Organization  
Gerrard India Bazaar BIA  
Gerrard Square  
Greater Toronto Civic Action Alliance  
Greek Community of Toronto  
GreekTown on the Danforth BIA  
Kempton Howard Community Association

Leslieville BIA  
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change  
Oxford Properties  
Regent Park Community Health Centre  
Riverside District BIA  
Ryerson University  
Social Planning Toronto  
South Riverdale Community Health Centre  
St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association  
Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas  
Toronto Catholic District School Board  
Toronto Centre for Active Transportation  
Toronto Region Board of Trade  
Toronto Relief Line Alliance  
Toronto Women's City Alliance  
TTC Riders  
Transport Action Ontario  
Urban Land Institute - Toronto  
Woodgreen Community Services  
Yonge-Bloor-Bay Business Association  
Yonge Dundas Square

## 1. Opening Remarks and Meeting Format

Stella Gustavson, Program Manager, Transit Implementation Unit, City of Toronto, welcomed participants to the Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting for the Relief Line Project Assessment. The purpose of the meeting was to: provide a brief update on the City's current transit planning initiatives; present the results of the evaluation of Relief Line alignment options and the emerging preferred alignment; and present the proposed locations for Relief Line station entrances along the emerging preferred alignment. Ms. Gustavson provided an overview of the meeting agenda and delivered the overview presentation. Participants had the opportunity to ask questions of clarification as well as provide feedback through a full group discussion following the presentation. Participants were also able to view large maps showing the emerging preferred alignment and proposed station locations for the Relief Line and mark comments on the maps. Approximately 15 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**.

### **Questions of Clarification:**

**Q. Can you share more information on the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP)? What is the timeframe and does it focus on only one recommended alignment?**

**A.** The TPAP will focus on the preferred alignment once it is approved by City Council. It is a six month review process. An Environmental Project Report will be prepared and submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change for approval. The process was established to streamline the environmental assessment process to expedite the approval for transit projects.

**Q. Does this process mean that we don't have to worry about the next political cycle and the changes that might come with it?**

**A.** We can't say for sure. We are trying to get to a point where the planning approvals are in place for the Relief Line. But the Relief Line is not a funded project. City staff have been asked to bring forward business cases for each of the transit projects to assist City Council make decisions about transit approval priorities.

**Q. The recommended alignment presented tonight is not what was recommended and discussed at my table at the previous SAG meeting. Why was this alignment chosen? Based on the information presented, it is the longest and slowest alignment, it has the highest number of stations, and would be the most expensive to construct. Do you have a comparison of travel times for each alignment?**

**A.** The decisions were made in consideration of all the approved evaluation criteria based on the "Feeling Congested?" framework. It was a comprehensive analysis of many factors. We are also doing a business case analysis which will take into consideration the economic benefits and costs. The emerging preferred alignment has a higher potential for adding the most new net transit riders to the system. The difference in cost is not as significant at this level of analysis.

**Q. I looked at the metrics. When you compare to the EQ alignment to the AQ alignment there is less diversion from Yonge St. I think there may be something wrong with the model.**

**A.** We are continuing to work on the modelling to understand the potential ridership benefits of the Relief Line. We are expecting the report to be available in the next month as part of the report to Council.

**Q. With respect to new ridership, how much are you attributing to the Unilever site? Are you considering new growth or ridership from existing areas?**

**A.** We are looking at the network effects using a base future network that takes into consideration general growth. The overall potential for growth on the Unilever site is higher than the growth we assumed in the model. The developers have their sights set on more development than what we have included in our base case. This is still being worked on.

**Q. Are the results of the vibration assessment study available online?**

**A.** We have not yet conducted a noise and vibration study. This will be part of the future work once a preferred alignment has been approved. General information on noise and vibration is provided on one of the display boards.

**Q. Could you elaborate on the social equity metrics used in the evaluation? Why did alignment EQ rank the best?**

**A.** The social equity aspect of the evaluation consists of four criteria. We looked at the Neighbourhood Equity Scores which capture populations in social need. We did a demographic analysis which looks at

children, seniors, low income residents, recent immigrants, among others. We also looked at some more qualitative factors such as opportunities to develop social infrastructure. As an example, the King-Sumach Station provides the opportunity to connect the north and south sides of the land severed by the overpasses. We also consulted with our colleagues in Social Development and Economic Development.

**Q. I have a few questions: (1) With respect to alignment ER, where will the station be located that will pick up riders on the 501 and 504 streetcars to feed them into the downtown core? Will the station be east or west of the Don River? (2) Will building a subway along Queen Street create delays and difficulties like we are seeing with the Eglinton LRT, compared to building on Richmond even if the entrances are on Queen Street? (3) What are the development opportunities at Queen and Sherbourne given the fact that it is highly concentrated with social housing? Density on Richmond Street can be built higher.**

**A.** (1) The proposed station at Queen and Pape would help offload the Queen streetcar and the proposed station at King and Sumach station would help offload the King streetcar. (2) The Richmond alignments have more technical issues than the Queen alignments. They do not travel in a straight line and this would affect travel time and constructability. (3) Queen and Sherbourne is an important node. There is a proposal for an expanded community sports and recreation complex at Moss Park. We have met with the team looking at this proposal and they have the technical information to protect for a connection to a station as part of their planning. It is important to be serve the area with higher order transit. There is also a development proposal for a large-scale redevelopment at Queen and Sherbourne.

**Q. Where will the subway trains be kept at night?**

**A.** The trains would be maintained and stored at TTCs Greenwood Yard. Because there are capacity constraints now at the Greenwood Yard, enough track would need to be built to store a portion of the trains on the line.

**C. There is an important development at Moss Park. They are not going to be taking out any of the park; they will be improving the parkland and facilities. It is important to the LGBTQ community. It will become more of a hub. I am happy with the chosen alignment and the Queen-Sherbourne station.**

**A.** Yes, we are familiar with this proposal. We met with the project team last year to share information.

**Q. Why are all the main station entrances for the intermediary stations located at the same end of the platform? From an operations perspective, it doesn't make sense to always be loading passengers at the same end of the train.**

**A.** We are only presenting conceptual station locations and entrances at this time. We will be working to refine them as we progress through the study. We are required to have ventilation at either end of the platform. What we have presented is the configuration with the least impact at surface level. Also, with the new trains in service there shouldn't be issues with where people get on the train.

**C. I like seeing the direct interchange connection with Line 1 at Yonge Street. I also like the fact that you have added more stations. The line will not be as fast to get downtown, but I think the Relief Line needs a name change. It should serve more areas in the city. I like the station spacing that is reflected in the recommendation.**

**Q. Why are both downtown stations entrances located within the U of Line 1? Why not put the Yonge-Queen station further east?**

A. We are constrained by the foundations of adjacent buildings. With the station west of Yonge, there will be connectivity with the Bay St. bus. The locations are based on standard TTC requirements for station boxes and tunnel design. We may have the opportunity to shift the stations as we get into more detailed design.

**C. Do you intend for people connecting to the 501 streetcar to offload at surface level?**

A. It is premature to be able to pinpoint the interchange with streetcar lines. At this stage we intend to keep streetcar services as they are.

**C. Have you thought about changing the name of the line to the Eastern Distributor?**

A. This is more appropriate to consider once there is an actual approved alignment.

### 3. Additional Feedback Submitted

Participants engaged in small group discussions on the emerging preferred alignment and proposed station locations using large aerial maps. A summary of additional written feedback by participants is provided below:

- Consider underground connections to King Street to increase sub-level access and service the King corridor.
- Need connections to the PATH system (from Yonge to Market to Relief Line).
- Strongly prefer more direct interchanges to Line 1 at Yonge and University as opposed to one connection at Bay St.
- Queen-Yonge station should be located east of Yonge Street with a potential connection to St. Michael's hospital. City Hall could be connected at University-Queen.
- Support for emerging preferred alignment (EQ). Developers will be focusing on Queen St. East and the Port Lands. There are lots of development opportunities.
- Regarding King-Sumach station entrances: it seems illogical to build two new surface entrances separate from the station when the overpass already acts as a roof. Move one or more entrances to be under the overpass itself. A long mezzanine could work even more effectively to link neighbourhoods north and south. Stretch walkways to Sackville Street all the way to Underpass Park.
- Zoning upgrades must be made to allow high-density redevelopment along the Queen Street corridor and area surrounding connections at Yonge.
- Additional considerations submitted by the Toronto Financial District BIA include:
  - Coordination of transit connections with proposed Waterfront Transit "Reset" Phase One projects, especially potential routing near Bay Street.
  - Pedestrian planning and congestion management, i.e., How new stations will connect into the below-ground PATH network and exit onto street via surface-level entrances. Of particular concern are heritage contexts at Queen/Yonge and Queen/University that may limit opportunities.
  - Identify ways to mitigate the longer travel time from Danforth Ave. to downtown and improve diversion potential at Yonge-Bloor.

Written feedback was also received after the meeting. A summary is provided below:

- St. Lawrence Market BIA noted the following considerations submitted by the BIA were not captured in the minutes for the February 22 meeting:
  - Consider the possibility of an underground connection running to the south from Queen/Sherbourne station to provide an access point at King Street. The King Street corridor is heavily travelled and experiencing commercial and residential growth. An underground connection would benefit workers, residents and tourists.
  - Consider the possible future of the PATH network. There may be a connection from Yonge to Market Street in the future. The redeveloped North Market building could eventually include an underground connection to the PATH, which could then provide a direct underground connection to the Queen/Sherbourne station.

#### **4. Wrap Up and Next Steps**

Public and stakeholder consultations on the emerging preferred alignment and proposed station locations for the Relief Line will be ongoing throughout May and June 2016. A report will be presented to the Executive Committee and Council in June/July 2016. Pending Council approval, the project team will undertake the following: refine the station locations and prepare station concept plans; develop conceptual design for the preferred alignment; determine potential impacts and mitigation measures; and prepare an Environmental Project Report. The formal TPAP is anticipated to launch in Fall 2016, including public and stakeholder consultation. Ms. Gustavson thanked SAG members for their continued interest and input on the project.