



Toronto Transit Commission Transit City Open Houses



Eglinton Crosstown LRT Transit Project Assessment November 23, 2009 to January 14, 2010 Summary Report

Prepared by Lura Consulting
January 2010

This draft summary report was prepared by Lura Consulting. Lura is providing third-party consultation management services as part of the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) and the City of Toronto Transit City projects. This summary captures the key comments submitted during the noted Public Open Houses. It is not intended as a verbatim transcript. If you have any questions or comments regarding the summary, please contact:

Stephanie Rice

Environmental Assessment Project Manager
TTC -Transit City Department
Phone: 416-393-2198
stephanie.rice@ttc.ca

David Veights

Senior Project Coordinator
TTC -Transit City Department
Phone: 416-393-7929
david.veights@ttc.ca

Lisa Josephson

Project Manager
Lura Consulting
Phone: 416-410-3888 x 4
ljosephson@lura.ca



Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Public Notification | 2 |
| 2.1. TTC Mailings / Notification | 2 |
| 2.2. Canada Post Drops and Newspaper Ads (led by the City of Toronto) | 2 |
| 2.3. Communication between City of Toronto and First Nations | 3 |
| 3. Comment Summary | 3 |
| 3.1. Top Comments and Concerns | 3 |
| 4. Comments Received since Second Round of Open Houses | 4 |
| 4.1. Support / Opposition for the Plan | 4 |
| 4.2. Network Design Considerations | 6 |
| 4.2.1. Stop/Station Spacing | 6 |
| 4.2.2. Parallel Bus Service | 7 |
| 4.2.3. Inter-Regional Transit Connections | 7 |
| 4.2.4. LRT route to the Airport | 8 |
| 4.3. LRT Line Design Suggestions | 9 |
| 4.3.1. Underground LRT | 9 |
| 4.3.2. Elevated LRT | 10 |
| 4.3.3. Side of Road Alignment | 10 |
| 4.4. Traffic Management | 11 |
| 4.4.1. U-Turns and Re-routed Left Turns: General | 11 |
| 4.4.2. U-Turns | 12 |
| 4.4.3. Re-routed Left Turns | 13 |
| 4.4.4. Transit Signal Priority | 14 |
| 4.4.5. Other | 14 |
| 4.5. Construction | 14 |
| 4.5.1. Construction Impacts | 14 |
| 4.5.2. Construction Methods | 15 |
| 4.5.3. Construction Schedule | 16 |
| 4.6. Nuisance Concerns (Noise, Vibration and Dust) | 16 |
| 4.7. Parking | 16 |
| 4.8. Pedestrian Impacts | 16 |
| 4.9. Bike Lanes | 17 |
| 4.10. Surrounding Environmental Conditions | 18 |
| 4.10.1. Air Quality | 18 |
| 4.10.2. Watercourses | 18 |
| 4.10.3. Green Space | 18 |
| 4.11. Service | 19 |
| 4.11.1. Reliability and Travel Time | 19 |
| 4.11.2. Safety and Security | 19 |
| 4.11.3. Project Cost/ Funding | 19 |
| 4.12. Neighbourhood Impacts | 20 |
| 4.13. Consultation Events | 20 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| 5. | Design Issues | 21 |
| 5.1. | LRT Vehicles and Runningway (Tracks)..... | 21 |
| 5.2. | Stations..... | 22 |
| 5.3. | Community..... | 23 |
| 6. | Stop/Station Specific Comments | 23 |
| 6.1. | Commerce | 23 |
| 6.2. | Rangoon..... | 24 |
| 6.3. | Martin Grove | 24 |
| 6.4. | Kipling..... | 26 |
| 6.5. | Wincott/Bemersyde..... | 27 |
| 6.6. | Islington..... | 27 |
| 6.7. | Mulham..... | 27 |
| 6.8. | Scarlett..... | 27 |
| 6.9. | Jane | 28 |
| 6.10. | Weston | 28 |
| 6.11. | Keele..... | 29 |
| 6.12. | Caledonia | 29 |
| 6.13. | Dufferin | 29 |
| 6.14. | Eglinton West..... | 30 |
| 6.15. | Eglinton | 30 |
| 6.16. | Avenue | 31 |
| 6.17. | Mount Pleasant..... | 31 |
| 6.18. | Bayview | 31 |
| 6.19. | Laird | 31 |
| 6.20. | Leslie..... | 32 |
| 6.21. | Don Mills..... | 32 |
| 6.22. | Wynford..... | 33 |
| 6.23. | Victoria Park | 34 |
| 6.24. | Birchmount | 34 |
| 6.25. | Kennedy..... | 35 |
| 7. | Appendices | 35 |
| A. | Summary of the meeting hosted by Councillor Frances Nunziata and the Mount Dennis Community Association – Dec 14, 2009..... | 35 |
| B. | Public Notifications | 35 |
| C. | Letters submitted by Stakeholders | 35 |

1. Introduction

The Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) and the City of Toronto are planning a new light rail transit route along Eglinton Avenue from Kennedy Subway Station in the east to Pearson International Airport in the west. The LRT will link to the Yonge Subway at Eglinton Station and the Spadina Subway at Eglinton West Station.

In accordance with the requirements of the Transit Projects Regulation (231/08) of the *Environmental Assessment Act*, following the November 13, 2009 Notice of Commencement for the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Transit Project Assessment, the TTC and the City of Toronto undertook extensive public consultation across the study corridor in November and December 2009. Seven public open houses were conducted. These meetings were in addition to previous consultations undertaken during the preliminary planning stage in August and September 2008 and from June to September in 2009.

At the November and December 2009 consultations, TTC and the City of Toronto presented the preferred design for both the underground and street level sections of the line. Passenger stop locations and traffic management strategies to ensure fast and reliable transit service in the surface section of the line were displayed. The Open Houses exhibited the identified environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures as well as the proposed methods of construction.

As a follow-up initiative following the TTC's open houses as part of the Transit Project Assessment process, Councillor Frances Nunziata and the Mount Dennis Community Association hosted a meeting on December 14, 2009. This meeting focused on the concerns of the Mount Dennis Community, specifically related to LRT plans at Weston Road (See Appendix A for a summary of this meeting). On Thursday, January 14, 2010, an additional open house was hosted by Councillor Denzil Minnan Wong at the Latvian Canadian Cultural Centre.¹

This report summarizes the comments received through the open houses and other communication channels up to and including January 14, 2009. The following table displays the dates and locations of the Eglinton Crosstown LRT open houses, as well as the number of attendees (signed in) and comment forms received.

| Date | Location | Number of Attendees (signed in) | Number of Comment forms received |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| November 23, 2009 | York Memorial CI | 112 | 14 |
| November 24, 2009 | Etobicoke Olympium | 125 | 11 |
| November 25, 2009 | Northern SS | 161 | 19 |
| November 26, 2009 | Richview CI | 206 | 34 |
| December 2, 2009 | CNIB | 122 | 34 |
| December 8, 2009 | Don Montgomery Community Recreation Centre | 63 | 14 |
| December 10, 2009 | Beth Shalom | 71 | 13 |
| Total | -- | 860 | 139 |

¹ Note: Ongoing consultation is planned with the Latvian Canadian Cultural Centre and Councillor Minnan-Wong's office to follow-up on comments from the January 14th meeting, specifically regarding the Swift/Credit Union area.

Each open house presented 66 detailed panels, 5 panels presenting information about Metrolinx, a Frequently Asked Questions handout (available for download on the project web page at http://www.toronto.ca/involved/projects/eglinton_crosstown_lrt/index.htm), an audio-visual (AV) PowerPoint presentation with voice over, a PowerPoint presentation with video representing re-routed left turns, and an open invitation to ask questions and discuss the plan with the TTC, City and Consultant project team members present.

During the open houses, participants were invited to write down their ideas and opinions on comment forms and submit them at the registration table. In addition to the comment forms, project team members and Lura staff recorded participant comments as they arose during discussions.

A total of 860 (signed in) participants attended the seven Eglinton Crosstown LRT open houses and 139 comment forms were submitted. In addition, approximately 70 participants attended the meeting hosted by Councillor Frances Nunziata and the Mount Dennis Community Association, while 144 participants signed in at the open house held at the Latvian Canadian Cultural Centre, submitting 30 comment forms. The public was also able to provide comments online or via telephone. Between November 23, 2009 and January 14, 2010, TTC received 88 comments via email and telephone, many of which were questions, comments and/or requests to be added to the mailing list.

2. Public Notification

The following section lists the methods used to notify stakeholders and the public about the Eglinton Crosstown LRT project. The Notice of Commencement, newspaper ad/flyer, along with sample letters and emails are provided at the end of the document in Appendix B.

2.1. TTC Mailings / Notification

- Letter with a copy of the ad/flyer was faxed and mailed out to MP/MPPs, Minister of Transportation, CEO of Metrolinx (November 19, 2009).
- Letter with a copy of the ad/flyer sent to BIAs (November 11, 2009).
- Notification letters sent to all private property owners affected for which full (44) or partial (45) property acquisition requirements have been identified.
- Email to Agencies, Ministries, Stakeholders (November 13, 2009).
- 11 x 17 laminated ad/flyer posted at the following stations: Kennedy, Eglinton, Eglinton West, and Kipling from November 16 – 20, 2009.

2.2. Canada Post Drops and Newspaper Ads (led by the City of Toronto)

Notices:

- Between November 10 and November 12, 2009:
 - 67, 155 notices were sent to properties within approximately 300 meters of the study corridor.
 - 2814 property owners within 60m of the corridor were sent notices (in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08, “Transit Projects and Greater Toronto Transportation Authority Undertakings”).
 - 1890 e-mails and/or mail were sent to the established project contact list.

Newspaper Ads:

- Toronto Star (November 13 and November 18)
- Metro (November 13)
- City Centre Mirror, North York Mirror, East York Mirror, Scarborough Mirror, and Etobicoke Guardian (all on November 13)

2.3. Communication between City of Toronto and First Nations

- November 12, 2009: Letter (Appendix B - sample to Alderville First Nation) sent to all Williams Treaty Bands with the notice of commencement.
- November 12, 2009: The Mississaugas of the New Credit were contacted via e-mail (their preferred method)
- November 12, 2009: Notices were sent to Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) Specific Claims, INAC Litigation Management and Resolution Branch, and INAC Comprehensive Claims and the Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs.

3. Comment Summary



From left to right: Eglinton Crosstown open houses at CNIB (Dec. 2, 2009); Don Montgomery Community Recreation Centre (Dec. 8, 2009); and Northern SS (Nov. 25, 2009)

A summary of the key issues and comments raised between November 23, 2009 and January 14, 2010 are presented below, with detailed comments provided in Section 4, future work that TTC will undertake during detailed design in Section 5, and station specific comments provided in Section 6. In general, they include expressions of both support and opposition to the LRT line and are listed in order of topic.

3.1. Top Comments and Concerns

- Support for the plan.
- Request for parallel bus service for the underground LRT section (Laird Drive to Keele St.).
- Consideration/support for bike lanes and safety for cyclists within LRT design.
- Concern that distances between surface stops and underground stations is too far.
- Request that the entire route should be underground from Kennedy to Pearson International Airport.
- Ensure that the underground section is convertible to subway technology.
- Concern regarding increased traffic levels due to construction of the line and the implementation of U-turns at above ground sections once the line is in operation.
- Less negative reaction to prohibitions of U-turns and re-routed left turns (compared to PIC #2).
- Ensure that the LRT provides pedestrian friendly connections to other transit lines/routes.
- Opposition and concern regarding the removal of the Credit Union Dr. / Swift Dr. stop.

4. Comments Received since Second Round of Open Houses



From left to right: Eglinton Crosstown open houses at York Memorial CI (Nov. 23, 2009); Beth Shalom Synagogue (Dec. 10, 2009); and Don Montgomery Community Recreation Centre (Dec. 8, 2009)

A summary of all comments received from the public since the second round of open houses is presented below, beginning November 25, 2009 and ending January 14, 2010. They are grouped by topic and type of comment. An asterisk (*) is used to illustrate comments mentioned more than once.

4.1. Support / Opposition for the Plan

Support for the project*:

- You have my **full support**. The sooner it gets built, the better.*
- **Support the recommendations** that have come out since round two of open houses.*
- “**Thank you** for having these sessions and community consultations. Having attended them from nearly the beginning I noticed you seem to have listened, learned and where it was practical you incorporated more than 90% of the suggestions you received. This is truly remarkable and is going to make this project a great success. Congratulations and thank you.”
- The Eglinton Crosstown LRT has the potential to be an **important** part of Toronto’s transit network. Station spacing and design are well thought out.
- Changes are either **improvements** (e.g. Laird stop, twin tunnels) or make no difference.*
- Hope that the **work schedule proposed will not get altered**. This project (along with others proposed in transit city and the Big Move) is a huge and needed undertaking for Toronto. The more it’s delayed, the less benefit for people due to changed future conditions (e.g. population growth).
- Hoping that **commitment** to improved and coordinated Transit City efforts will continue, regardless of political change at any level of government.
- Transportation **to and from the airport** in a megacity like Toronto is essential.*
- **Satisfied** with the current layout at the Weston Rd., Black Creek Dr., Jane St., Laird Dr., Don Mills Rd., and Wynford Dr. intersections.

- This solution may be the best. **LRT** should always have **priority over automobiles**.
- There should be a **good public education campaign**.
- **Learn from St. Clair**: under promise and over deliver.*
- **Minimize delays** such as NIMBYism to stay on schedule.
- Changes need to be made in order for trains/LRT to run **efficiently**.

Objection to the plan*:

- Still **not satisfactory**. Traffic volume has already increased on La Rose, as has the speed. These proposals only guarantee a further increase. Service to the airport would be better served using dedicated buses.
- **No benefit** for Eglinton and Yonge area. The project will lead to more congestion at Eglinton subway station.
- This project will result in an **unacceptable amount of traffic**.
- **Remove the Eglinton LRT plan** and allocate the funds and resources to improve other areas of Transit City and other Public Transit projects. (i.e., Subway to York U, updating subway stations, other LRT projects, etc.).
- The four billion **dollars** that will be spent could be better **used in different projects** such as building community centres along Eglinton.
- Money should be put into creating **affordable closed community** spaces like community centres where senior and young people could benefit from health and educational opportunities.
- The project is **not feasible and not needed**; only the connection to the Airport is really needed, or make the extension at the other end (e.g. at Kipling).
- It's **excessive** to have an east-west line along Bloor St., St. Clair and Eglinton. **Lawrence** would have provided a better long term solution.

Questions

- How are **objections to the plan measured** by TTC?
- What is **TTC's willingness to change or alter plans** to accommodate such objections?

4.2. Network Design Considerations

4.2.1. Stop/Station Spacing

- Concern that **distances between stops and stations** is too far (e.g. for the elderly, people with disabilities, young mothers, walking in the winter, etc.).*
 - Especially **between the following stations**: Dufferin and Caledonia, Brentcliffe and Bayview.*
 - **Concern** that the proposed **Swift/Credit Union Stop** has been **eliminated from the initial plan** and from the recent public Display Panels of June 29th and September 2nd. (See Appendix C for detailed letter). Believe the elimination of Swift/Credit Union station is contrary to the LRT standard of spacing stations at approximately 500m (vs. almost proposed 1km between Bermondsey and Wynford).*
- Comment made regarding the elimination of the **Swift/Credit Union Stop** at the January 14th open house, hosted by Councillor Denzil Minnan Wong at the Latvian Canadian Cultural Centre:
 - **Elimination** of this station will make it difficult for residents and visitors to the area. Would like to have more of the “challenges” at this location addressed.*
 - A transit stop is required at Credit Union because there are **residential and industrial employment sites** to the north and cultural employment sites to the south.
 - The **slope** to Credit Union makes the area difficult to navigate/walk.
 - Problems associated with the **steep hill** in the area could be eliminated by clever engineering. This could reduce the **cost** of building a stop at this location.*
 - The **distance between the two stops** on either side of the eliminated stop (Credit Union) is greater than the distance between other stops on the line.*
 - **Future area redevelopment** would require a transit stop at Credit Union.
 - **Senior citizens** will find it difficult to get to public transit without the Swift drive transit stop (distance and slope).*
 - **Safety** concerns for **female riders** on the TTC walking from the Bermondsey transit stop instead of from the Swift Drive transit stop during the night.*
 - The **Latvian Canadian Culture Centre** is a **destination** and would be difficult to get to without a stop at Credit Union.*

- The **Latvian Community Centre** houses about 500 pensioners, some who are **handicapped** and will be forced to use other transportation if this transit stop is removed from this area.*
- The **Latvian Cultural Centre** is the only Latvian Centre in Toronto and has over 8,000 members. More than 70% are over the age of 70 years. This centre **provides Heritage Language Classes, ESL for new immigrants, senior events and other cultural gatherings**. Removing the transit stop at Swift/Credit Union Drive will make it difficult for the older generation who depend on public transportation to continue to participate in activities at the centre.
- Children and teenagers attend school at the **Latvian Canadian Cultural Centre** Friday night and Saturday. A close transit stop is important for **safety**.*
- Would like the **name of the stop** Credit Union Drive changed to Swift Dr. or Latvian Centre.
- **Support** for removing stop at Swift Drive.
- **Keep all** current stops.

4.2.2. Parallel Bus Service

- Stations are **far apart** and you will still require limited bus service.*
 - **Between the following stations:** Dufferin and Caledonia, Laird to Bayview.
 - **Don't compare** this to Bloor/Danforth subway line – Yonge line has surface buses.
 - Consider **limited bus service** (similar to Yonge St) at least above the underground section because station spacing is too far for this dense area and may undermine overall support for the project.*
 - Major cities (e.g. London, England) have bus routes that **duplicate the underground subway** system. This should be considered despite the cost.

Question

- Currently **buses make extra stops** at night for **women**. How will this occur with LRT?

4.2.3. Inter-Regional Transit Connections

- The **Bloor-Danforth Subway line should connect with the Eglinton Crosstown LRT line** (from Bloor Street, up Keele St. to the airport and return along Eglinton, east towards Yonge Street and same for Eglinton line going west).
- **Don't do the Eglinton LRT west of Scarlett Road**. There is no industry, no demand and it won't pay for itself. The airport is already being served by **Regional Rail via Weston**. Duplicating via Eglinton is costly and unnecessary.

- Consider **better connections with GO Transit** as these will become an important part of the transit network by the time this line opens.
- Interest in the **regional-scale transit infrastructure** being planned in the vicinity of the Renforth/Eglinton intersection to better understand when this area may attain its planned status as a Gateway Transit Hub upon completion of the BRT (expected to be completed by March/2013), the Eglinton Crosstown LRT, and the rumoured third transit initiative linking the Renforth/Eglinton area to the Kipling Subway Station.
- To **improve the connection with the Mississauga BRT station** at Commerce, build two branches west of Martin Grove. One would follow the proposed alignment to Commerce to connect with the BRT station. The other could follow Highway 27 and Dixon Road into the airport.
- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* Staff have not evaluated the option with **Mississauga Transitway BRT using a grade-separated loop terminal** around Willowridge and Eglinton. There are issues surrounding a grade-separated loop terminal for BRT, and the relationship to the Etobicoke-Finch West LRT in capital expense as well as the maintenance and operating costs as a network of both lines together have not been adequately addressed.
 - The **Commerce Blvd terminal** setup for BRT to connect with Eglinton Crosstown LRT forces passengers to cross lanes of traffic. This issue is addressed in the **Martin Grove** grade-separated loop terminal concept. With BRT extending further east along Eglinton/401 (BRT line proposed will come close to Willowridge) using the 427 to reach **Kipling Station**. This line would go as far east as the East Mall where the 427 off-ramp is located at Eglinton. Significant capital **cost savings** could occur by not building a large facility in the **Commerce-Renforth** area and using that funding for the **Martin Grove** area (running the LRT up Highway 27 to avoid duplicating infrastructure).

Question

- Is an **additional transit project** being considered by Metrolinx/GO, linking Mississauga's BRT system to the Kipling Subway Station via a new transit route that would run along Hwy 427? If so, please provide details for the route, including timing for the project.

4.2.4. LRT route to the Airport

- Build the **airport to Kipling portion** of the LRT to take advantage of the **new water main**, connecting the Martin Grove reservoir. This would be an excellent introduction to the City for visitors.
- Concerns about the **routing to the airport**. This would make more sense for the Eglinton Crosstown to connect with the BRT than to connect at Commerce. The stops at Commerce and Black Creek will increase the travel time.

- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* Council passed a request to have **Etobicoke-Finch West LRT extension to Pearson International and Eglinton Crosstown LRT west of Martin Grove to be evaluated as a network** rather than isolated lines. Preferred option west of Martin Grove will need to be revisited during the EA. Public consultations in September showed strong support for alignment running up Highway 27 and across Dixon Rd instead of running up Silver Dart. The Airport Master Plan and Airport Precinct Plan are not completed yet but should be completed before decisions are made for transit in this area.

Questions

- Is there a proposed **high speed rail line through Weston to the airport**? If the link is at Black Creek, no need for anything beyond Weston on Eglinton.
- Is there a **need for the extension** of the LRT to the airport? Have alternative routes linking Pearson to the GO terminal been considered? What will be the impact of developing a high-speed rail system across the Golden Horseshoe on European lines?
- Has the city looked into a **bullet/express train** to the airport? Would this be a feasible option?
- Models presented at the open house justify an above ground LRT based on traffic projecting extending out to 2031. **Will the usage of the airport increase beyond 2031**, creating a greater need (e.g. subway technology) for transit along Eglinton?

4.3. LRT Line Design Suggestions

4.3.1. Underground LRT

- The **entire route should be underground** and should **protect for future conversion to subway technology**.*
 - As soon as it goes above ground, the **traffic affects** the LRT, making it **run slower**. The people at the city core (e.g. Yonge/Eglinton) will be reluctant to use it in the surface sections
 - Anything other than an underground model will make Eglinton a much more **problematic route**, serving to intensify activity and complete traffic flow to a street plagued with traffic at present.*
 - **Not subject to** weather, traffic and pedestrian delays, and does not affect the aesthetics of existing neighbourhoods.
 - A **dedicated subway** should be running from the airport to the downtown tourist and business area.
 - Build it right the first time: allow for **future conversion to subway**, allow for future DRL connection at Don Mills and maybe at Weston Road.
 - This would **avoid the re-routed left turn lanes** and the doubling of traffic signals between Scarlett and Martin Grove.

- In the event that plans remain as they have been proposed, **do not build any additional traffic signals** between Scarlett and Martin Grove. Use the existing traffic lights and allow longer left turn signals (which should be used on a 24 hour basis) to clear the intersection.
- Should **build the line below grade** from Black Creek Drive to Jane St. Eglinton is very narrow in this section and the property affects and impact on the community will be very negative. Questions regarding **impacts to traffic** where the LRT will run above ground.
- The route should be **underground** from Scarlett Rd. to Renforth.
- The section at **Weston Road** should be **underground**.
- Place LRT **underground from Keele St.** westward to avoid any re-routing of left turns in Etobicoke.
- To **avoid property acquisitions**, recommend placing the LRT **underground** from Weston Rd. to Jane St.

Question

- Can the tunnels be easily **converted to allow for a subway** in the future?

4.3.2. Elevated LRT

- The section between Renforth and Highway 401 (the Commerce stop / BRT interchange) **should be elevated**. This will eliminate the need for transit signals at three intersections. The gentler curve will reduce wear on the wheels and rails and increase vehicle speed through the curve. As a result, operation and maintenance costs will be reduced, resulting in savings that will more than offset the higher construction costs.
- The **surface option** is the best way to go. Elevate the system.

4.3.3. Side of Road Alignment

- **Side-of-the-road** not practical where driveways for parking access enter main road by crossing right of way. However, Eglinton has two significant stretches that should be taken advantage of:
 - **South side from Don Mills** west to the eastern portal of the underground section. In this section, there are no driveways. There's a ramp accessed driveway that's easily avoided by shifting alignment approximately 100 metres south.
 - **North side west from Jane Street** makes use of land that was originally reserved for the new expressway. Presence of side-of-road LRT right-of-way can dictate development plans to reflect parking access via secondary roads.

- **Side-of-the-road has the advantage** of being less costly to build since ballasted tie construction can be used. This would have added benefits in the eastern section if future needs dictate running longer trains in tunnel that aren't practical in a median right-of-way, operation can extend as far east as Don Mills. This would require new underpass at railway east of Leslie, but lower cost of ballasted tie construction for 2 km section should balance out.
- **One advantage of side-of-road right-of-way** is less interference with traffic. It benefits the LRT and lessens impact due to changes to automobile traffic arrangements such as left turns. LRT crossings of side streets can have railway-type crossing signals and gates interlocked to traffic signals at intersection.
- Consider having the **LRT tracks on the south side** of Eglinton between Brentcliffe portal, past Leslie and to Don Mills Station. Then **move to centre road tracks** east of Don Mills.*
- Great to have the **ROW in the grass strip on the north side** of Eglinton, west of Royal York, but maybe the City hopes to develop that land.
- Alignment **between Black Creek Drive and Martin Grove Road** should be at the **north side** of the road.
- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* If alignment **between Brentcliffe Rd and Don Mills Rd were along south side** of Eglinton this would allow for shorter bored tunnels but would be offset by retaining walls. This could protect the area for a future open-air station, starting at the new road intersecting with Eglinton east of Brentcliffe and extending to the start of the bored tunnels about 150m west. Grade east of Don Valley ROW portal is over 4% at the east portal. If located on the south side of Eglinton Ave the grades should not exceed 3.5% up to Don Mills. Quality of service could be improved by running LRT along the south side of road between Don Mills Rd and Brentcliffe Rd. Intersections along this stretch all lead to the north, except the Celestrica ramp, the LRT could by-pass traffic signals through this area.
 - The **Celestrica ramp could be removed and replaced** with a signalized intersection for road traffic, creating a continuous exclusive ROW from Ferrand Dr stop to the Black Creek Dr stop.

Question

- Why will the LRT will be located in the **middle of the road** on the surface sections, rather than on the north or south side of the street?

4.4. Traffic Management

4.4.1. U-Turns and Re-routed Left Turns: General

- **Support** for re-routed left and u-turns.*
 - It should improve the **flow of traffic**.
 - It is great idea if it is **safer** for pedestrians and **saves car and LRT travel time**.

- **Happy about the change** regarding left-turns aligned along the length of Eglinton Ave., rather than the u-turns on the north-south axes. Improvement from last round of consultation
- They are **inconvenient but acceptable**.
- Public needs to be **educated** because it can be confusing.
- I **prefer the current option** as it would not confuse drivers and would still be able to assist the flow of the LRT.
- Include **signals for bicycles** at u-turns/re-routed left turns.
- **Opposed** to re-routed left and u-turns.*
 - Left-turn restrictions will **force traffic onto side streets**.
 - It will **increase congestion and accidents** with cars and streetcars.
 - The u-turns seem **odd** and the comparisons to other cities are not reassuring as it's not clear these are on LRT lines.

4.4.2. *U-Turns*

- **Better idea** than previous plan.*
 - The Michigan lefts are a **huge improvement** over the earlier plan.*
 - Overall picture of u-turns is **good for autos** during morning or evening rush hour. Prefer transit signals, as on the Queensway line between High Park and Humber River.
 - Seems complicated but support the line if it will **run faster than Spadina**.
 - Royal York Road, Islington Ave., Kipling Ave., etc.: **one u-turn** placed between two north and south intersections about halfway could serve better and speed up east and west run on Eglinton, instead of two u-turns as proposed.
 - Have you considered a “**demi-turn**” as seen in Quebec City?
 - What's been proposed is a **better solution**, but would not be required if sections of the LRT between Black Creek and the airport were **underground**.
- **Concern** regarding u-turns.*
 - Concern regarding u-turns by **transport trucks**. This type of vehicle is too long for the proposed u-turns (not sufficient radius) and will therefore infiltrate communities/side streets as ways to avoid u-turns.*
 - They seem **confusing**.*

- U-turns for Kipling, Islington, Royal York and Scarlett Rd seem to be **designed for commuters**, not for residents north and south of Eglinton. Making a left turn from westbound Eglinton will triple time to go south on anyone of these roads.*
- Concerned regarding the **length of time and safety** required to make the right hand turn at a busy intersection only to go the designated u-turn area to turn left.*
- Significant concerns regarding the **ability to turn left**, on a timely basis, at Jane/Royal York/Islington/Kipling/Martin Grove.
- The proposed u-turns seem like a **long way to make a left** turn into your driveway.
- Concerned that **back-ups from the u-turn** lanes may clog traffic if those lanes are not long enough. This is a more significant problem than a regular left turn lane that is too short because overflow from a u-turn lane that is too short will block traffic that otherwise should be moving, which would be a major impediment to traffic flow.
- Ensure that **u-turn lanes are long enough** to hold substantial number of cars so that they do not interfere with cars going straight and not making the turn.

Questions

- Would the **staging** of the project allow **one or two to be built and evaluated** before committing the rest of the line? *
- Could **traffic signals** use light-up “U”s instead of the normal lights with a sign?
- How will **bikes** make the u-turns?
- Is it possible to provide some of the **travel times/delays** for u-turn intersections at Kipling?
- **Where else** have they been used?
- How will these u-turns work when **vehicles aren't moving** along Eglinton?
- Will **u-turns** divert more traffic into **residential side streets** and will they result in more **accidents**?
- How will it be **efficient** with all the long transport trucks, dump trucks, cement trucks, service trucks, etc. to make the u-turns along Eglinton along with daily traffic?

4.4.3. Re-routed Left Turns

- **Support** for re-routed left turns.*
- **Concern** regarding re-routed left turns.*

- This will significantly **increase traffic on parallel routes**, partial only on the north side of Eglinton.*
- More **dangerous** than conventional left turns.

4.4.4. Transit Signal Priority

- Leave a left-hand turn lane, but **give Light Rail Vehicles priority at intersections** by using priority signalling. Let the LRT get a green before anyone else. (x2)
- Along Spadina, above College, there is an advanced left and a separate streetcar lane. An LRT train will not always be present at each light. The **light should sense** when a train is there and adjust the light accordingly.
- Pay more attention to **signal priority** as the current implementations of Spadina to St. Clair R.O.W. are not as efficient as they could be.

4.4.5. Other

- The LRT will force **more cars into the neighbourhood** and inconvenience the ability to drive in and out of the community.
- When Eglinton has two lanes of traffic in both directions and a bike lane, the widening of the street to accommodate all of these lanes makes too big of a division between the sides of the street and becomes **too divisive of the neighbourhood**.

Questions

- Will an approximate **doubling of the number of stop lights** between 427 & Scarlett Road slow down vehicular traffic?
- What happens when an **LRT vehicle stalls**? How will it affect other vehicles behind it?

4.5. Construction

4.5.1. Construction Impacts

- **Minimize disruption during the winter**, especially when walking to the bus/station where cut-and-cover is used.*
- Concerns regarding construction **impacts**.*
- Make sure that **construction minimizes the impacts on business** particularly those at busy intersections between Leslie and Avenue Rd. Those shops and businesses are critical to the neighbours.*
- During construction, please ensure **adequate pest control** for raccoons and rats during construction.
- Please consider **opening the streets to two way traffic** during construction (Eglinton and Allen) so residents can access their homes.

- **Limit construction hours/noise** after 7pm, according to applicable by-laws. In addition, develop and communicate noise abatement strategies.
- Great opportunity to provide good **construction jobs**.

Questions

- **Access to TTC** during construction will be **difficult**. What are the ways TTC plans on mitigating disruptions to the subway lines connected to the Eglinton LRT route?
- During **construction** on Eglinton, will an **extended transfer** be issued like during construction on St. Clair?
- When the **four tunnelling machines** meet at the centre of the line, how will they be removed?
- Will **subway service on the Yonge and Spadina lines be interrupted** while the LRT tunnel, between Yonge Street and Allen Road, is being constructed? If so, how will this be handled?

4.5.2. Construction Methods

- **Ducts** should be installed within the bottom segment of the tunnel, prior to pouring the concrete, so that they are available for TTC control and power cable; and for rental to other utilities (for their cables), thus providing continuing supplementary revenue to the TTC.
- **Single bore tunnelling** is more cost efficient than twin tunnel and has been used successfully in Europe
- **Stations** should be **shallow**, with direct access from the surface to each platform. Have **access for east bound vehicles** available only from the south side of the street and **access to west bound vehicles** available from the north side of the street.
- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* **Tunnels should be aligned** to allow for additional stations to be constructed at a future date without extensive tunnel realignments. Provisions for **protecting the addition of stations** around Banff Rd and Ronald Ave should be incorporated into the vertical alignment. Substantial savings would occur in the future by avoiding extensive disruption. Changing vertical alignment of the bored tunnel should have a negligible cost impact, unless this conflicts with large utilities.

Questions

- Could **tunnel boring machines** for the Eglinton LRT and Spadina stations be refurbished for the Yonge Subway extension and be staged in order to allow the **reuse** of some of the tunnel boring machines?

- If the **gasketed concrete tunnel liners** will be used for the Eglinton LRT tunnels, will they have a multi-decade proven "track record" better than the performance of the leaky Yonge Subway tunnel north of Eglinton Avenue? If not, it might be more economical, in the long run, to use cast iron tunnel liners as found in the University Avenue Subway tunnels.

4.5.3. Construction Schedule

- Concerns regarding **time/duration of work**.
- Considerations should be given to adjusting the schedule to provide a **stage-one opening from Pearson Airport to Allen Rd.** in time for the Pan-Am Games.
- For phasing of the line, start at Yonge and work out to **maximize benefit in 2016**.
- Commit to **working in phases**, without having to disrupt the entire route.
- **Mitigate delays** that might result from contractors, community, etc.

Questions

- Will construction of the line occur **sequentially or at different locations**? How many sites will be under construction at a given time?
- **When** will construction begin in the different areas and **how long** it will take?

4.6. Nuisance Concerns (Noise, Vibration and Dust)

- Make sure that **vibration and noise are minimized, particularly in surface sections** during construction and once the LRT is operational.*
- Comment to provide **more information about vibration and noise levels** of the LRT for homes located close to the underground section of the LRT when LRT is operational.*

Question

- What will the **noise level** be after the project is completed and the LRT is in **operation**?*

4.7. Parking

- **Parking** should be available in different areas so that cars could be parked and drivers could use the LRT as per Kipling, Islington and Bloor.
- Concerned for **loss of parking** at major cross streets (e.g. Jane and Scarlett, Royal York/Islington/Kipling/Martin Grove/Renforth).

4.8. Pedestrian Impacts

- Currently, most **walking paths** at Martin Grove, Islington, Kipling, and Royal York are too close to the street.

- **Traffic lights and crosswalks** should be coordinated to allow pedestrians to reach the platforms before the LRT arrives. This should help alleviate running to the platforms as the LRT arrives, just as the light is changing.
- Concerned about current **safety/existing conditions** of Allen Rd. crossing at Eglinton.

Questions

- **Intersections with stops are very wide.** How will people cross the street? *
- How will **pedestrians get over the transit rails?**

4.9. Bike Lanes

- **Keep bike lanes** where present and build **more**.*
 - **Proposed bike lanes do not protect the cyclists** from traffic and do not encourage cyclists to ride and park at the nearest LRT stop and get onto the LRT.
 - Provide **safe crossings at cross streets** since left turns vary throughout the stretch.
- The plan needs to **include realistic options for bicyclists** making turns to and from the bike lanes without using the cross walks.
- Be sure to **keep the bike lanes**. They were promised on Sheppard Subway project but were never built.
- Consider implementing **surface bike lanes on underground portion**.
- Bike lanes should **continue across Eglinton** West and Black Creek because bike traffic will continue past the lanes onto Eglinton.
- Request for a **single, bi-directional bike way** on one side of the street, separated from traffic by a protective barrier, such as a raised curb. This mirrors the success of the Martin Goodman Trail and provides a safe bike way.
- **Happy** that bike lanes are being considered for the section between Jane and Keele. They are needed in this area as it is a very busy area with no parallel side roads one can take due to the obstacles such as a rail line, creek and expressway.
- Bike lanes **need to be extended another 500 metres east to Bicknell Ave**. Once cyclists get to Bicknell, they can get on several quiet residential roads. Please keep this in mind when widening the bridge over Black Creek.
- **Project maps** should show **interaction with planned and actual bike path infrastructure** (bike lanes, recreation trails) as well as roads and how they will be linked to the LRT.
- Need **real bike lanes**, not lines painted on pavement shared with cars.

- Show bike lanes at the **cross section at Swift Drive** intersection.
- **Do not build/keep bike lanes.**
- Providing **cycle tracks everywhere is contra-indicated with rapid transit.** Cyclists on Eglinton are seasonal and rare. By implementing cycle paths, the impact on green space will be increased.

Questions

- Will **elevators** on the underground section be large enough to accommodate bikes?
- Will the **diamond lanes remain?** These are not good for bicycles as the traffic travels faster in them and they are not wide enough for bikes and traffic together. Bike lanes on the surface sections should be separated from motorized traffic by a grass median.
- How will bikes make **re-routed left-hand turns** (e.g. Birchmount)?
- Will the recent **cycle paths and walkways** created along Eglinton in the Etobicoke area around the creek be demolished?
- How will **instructions to cyclists** be displayed regarding the **use of re-routed left hand turns/u-turns?** It is not reasonable to expect cyclists to pedal an additional 400 metres to make vehicular left turns.

4.10. Surrounding Environmental Conditions

4.10.1. Air Quality

- Question regarding whether consideration been given to the amount of **pollution and gas wasted by cars** exiting the shopping centres and having to go out of their way to get around no-left turns onto Eglinton.

4.10.2. Watercourses

- Don't ruin any **waterways.**
- Question regarding whether the **natural waterways** will be driven even further underground so that only the very rich will enjoy some semblance of nature in their homes.

4.10.3. Green Space

- Concerned with **tree removal** and replanting with new, weak trees.
- Increase the **green spaces.**
- Concern regarding the **environmental impacts** on existing old growth forests.

4.11. Service

4.11.1. *Reliability and Travel Time*

- Comments regarding the need for **consistent service**.
- The central section of the line, where LRT will be built underground, is much **better serviced** by the TTC compared to the west end.*

Question

- During rush hour, **buses are empty** on Eglinton and Islington. Does this warrant an LRT west of Weston Road?

4.11.2. *Safety and Security*

- Concerned with the **security and possible loitering** on the platforms. What is being done about security?
- **Vehicular speed limit on elevated sections** should be reduced to 50km/hr to enhance cyclist and pedestrian comfort and safety.
- If more people are to be attracted to use the LRT, the city should consider safety (pedestrians and riders) walking to the LRT. **Lights**, especially at night and on north-south arterial roads intersecting Eglinton Avenue. Also, **overgrown trees** cause safety issue.
- What are the plans for security at each station to **prevent drug trafficking and crime** moving into the area?
- **Safety** concerns about the **width of the sidewalk** in the Credit Union area need to be addressed to protect pedestrians from cars speeding along Eglinton.

Question

- How will **suicide prevention** be worked into the plan at the portal sites and in the underground section?

4.11.3. *Project Cost/ Funding*

- Problem is **funding**, especially from the Federal Government.
- Question regarding the **capital cost** difference between LRT and subway.
- Negotiate with the city a **reduction in business tax** for those whose businesses are interrupted by construction of TTC lines.
- **Funding** will run out long before completion of the St. Clair and Sheppard projects. The Eglinton subway is proof.

Question

- Going underground is **very expensive**. How will these costs be contained?

4.12. Neighbourhood Impacts

- Concern regarding **private property expropriations**. Less concerned about commercial/industrial property expropriation.
- Mitigate all impacts to **cultural heritage sites**.

Question

- Why not a **tunnel from Black Creek to east of Jane**? This would save the expropriation of 26 properties.

4.13. Consultation Events

- **The staff at the open house explained the project** very well.*
- **Great presentation**.*
- The open house was **very well laid out and informative**.
- Noticed that TTC has listened, learned and where it was practical you incorporated more than 90% of the suggestions you received. This is **truly remarkable** and is going to make this project a great success.
- The community engagement and responsiveness to their input is **very impressive**.
- Appreciation for providing **panels** on-line.
- **Appreciation** for continued emails and updates regarding the project and open houses.
- Request for more **information about the project**.*
- All contracts must be subject to **public tender**.
- Please have **long term display of boards** in civic buildings.
 - Provide a **second story board** for the underground portion of the LRT.
- Perhaps future open house will have a **speaker to express current project timelines** and highlight all updated **changes** since the previous open house.
- Lack of ‘arms length’ relationship between the City and the TTC **demands outside consultation**. St. Clair streetcar planning could not show any major difference between the current design and the ROW streetcar lane with restricted left for TTC.
- Please **update website with latest details and designs**. Open Houses and public forums are appreciated but people may not always be available to attend them.
- Provide **projected population growth** of the different areas in future meetings.
- Would like the option to pick up a **handout** of the slides to make notes on.

- Would like **diagram of Bathurst Station** showing the location and plans such as the entrances, length, etc.
- Comment regarding request for individual board showing design at Leslie/Eglinton.
- Disappointed by the one **video presentation** that needed to be re-set a number of times.
- Need for **better interaction** and information from the project staff at the open houses.
- **Frustration** regarding **lack of support and help** at open houses to address concerns.
- Information written on notice was too **vague**.
- The evening's **presentation format** is not conducive to true dialogue and full understanding of popular views.*
 - The presentation should have been in the format of an **open forum**, where questions could be asked, not in the format of a “do it yourself tour”.*
- Need for **direct (e.g. person to person) consultations** with businesses and homes located along Eglinton. Please include this in the future.

5. Design Issues

The following are comments related to future work that TTC will undertake during detailed design. The comments are grouped into three categories: LRT Vehicles and Tracks, Stations and Community.

5.1. LRT Vehicles and Runningway (Tracks)

- Consider **ergonomics and the human factor** when designing the vehicles.*
- Look around at **what other cities are doing**.
- Car design is critical to **accommodate airport service**. The Canada Line in Vancouver is fantastic for movement of luggage, etc.
- Don't want to hear **intercom voices** at platforms and bells as doors close.
- **Side-poles** will work better than centre poles. Using side-poles will allow the ROW to be narrower, as well as give emergency vehicles a better chance of successfully negotiating the ROW should they need to use it. Plus, side-poles give the ROW a cleaner and clearer appearance.
- Consider the pros and cons of using **rubber tires and not tracks**, similar to Montreal subway.
- Comments regarding the **design of the light rail vehicles**, the need for low-level entrances and exits to the cars and the need for space to store items, such as luggage.
- Make sure that there are **frequent crossover tracks** to allow for turn backs in case a track is blocked.

- It is a mistake that Metrolinx has decided to use **standard gauge on Transit City tracks**. Even though there are physical reasons that city cars cannot travel on Transit City routes, and vice versa, at least using the same gauge will allow sharing of Transit City car houses (which can have loops for the city cars).
- It should be possible to **lay the track essentially straight**. Too many curves in the track will make for an uncomfortable ride.

Question

- Currently TTC buses are overloaded with strollers that stay near the front doors and block entry and waste a lot of time. How will **strollers be accommodated** in the new vehicles?

5.2. Stations

- Stations should have **two elevators** so that disabled passengers will not have to travel to the next station.*
 - **One elevator per station is insufficient**. If the escalator breaks down, those that can will take the stairs, while those that can't will take the elevator. If the elevator breaks down, those who cannot take stairs or the escalator are stuck. Malfunctions and maintenance are always ongoing. Stations must have a second elevator for when one is out of commission.
- Include **art to beautify the stops and stations**, reflecting the character of the neighbourhoods as the LRT goes by.*
- Platforms and vehicles must be **accessible**.*
- Consider **lighting** and **safety** in the underground stations.*
- Just **one escalator** from street to concourse level seems like an unwise cost-cutting step. TTC escalators are frequently out of service for long periods of time and it's unrealistic to expect everyone to take the stairs or squeeze into the elevator. The minimum should be **two escalators** between each level.*
- Spend time on designing the **pedestrian/public realm**.*
- Since there will not be any surface buses, the **underground stations should be as shallow** as possible. Re-route the utilities around the stations, and put the tracks/trains immediately under the road.
- The present grade of Islington vs. Eglinton is dangerous in icy conditions. It is the perfect opportunity to **pass Eglinton over Islington** with the station at one side.
- Space to **drop off and pick up** TTC riders at all subway stops is required.
- Will the TTC allow **retail at the stations**? What about variety store or coffee shop?
- **Unique station names** should be used at all Stations to avoid confusion between subway stations on the other lines (e.g. Bathurst North, Bathurst-Eglinton, Forest Hill).

- Make sure that platform design makes for **easy access to/from car** with luggage.
- I would recommend that the **Kennedy Station** for both Eglinton and Scarborough Malvern LRT be made underground to make transfer to Bloor-Danforth Subway easy and convenient.
- *Comments made by Councillor Michael Thompson:* **Supports changes made** in station entrance/exit arrangements since previous open houses. Additional opportunities (Dufferin, Oakwood and Young) exist where full property acquisitions have been identified but are currently for the purpose of fire vents. Important to consider from a customer service point of view.

Questions

- How will people in **wheelchairs** exit through the **emergency exit buildings**? Where there are EEBs, how will people in wheelchairs get off the train quickly during an emergency?

5.3. Community

- Please do your best to **preserve the heritage buildings**. Heritage preservation should take priority over consistency and uniformity along the line.
- Recommend **burying all hydro-lines and all other overhead wires** throughout the entire route, which will require cooperation among TTC, Ontario Hydro and other parties involved.*
- Need plan for **parking on Eglinton** so businesses can survive.
- Would like to see **revitalization at street level**, even in areas where the line is underground.
- **Consider communities and people's homes** when going forward with the project.

6. Stop/Station Specific Comments



The following are comments related to specific stops or stations along the Eglinton Crosstown LRT line. The comments are organized by stops or stations, beginning in the west end. Comments were not received for all stops or stations along the line.

6.1. Commerce

- Request for a **commuter parking** near Commerce for BRT/LRT stop.*

Question

- Could the Commerce stop have a **better connection between Mississauga’s future busway?**

6.2. Rangoon

- Concerns regarding **traffic, noise, dust and pollution impacts** of using Eglinton as opposed to the highway.*
 - Request to build a **wall** fronting onto Eglinton from properties close to the street.
- Ensure that **station lighting is screened** so that no light trespasses into residential properties on south the side of Eglinton.
- **Shifting the centre line slightly to the north** will help avoid property acquisition.
- Worried about the **potential environmental impacts** that may arise both during construction and during operation of the LRT.
- Concern regarding **increased traffic, noise and pollution** on Eglinton – particularly near Rangoon – and effects on surrounding properties. Concern that the LRT will increase the traffic noise, dirt, debris and pollution affecting properties. The noise assessment representative said that the area is below standards for a retaining wall (noise barrier) regardless of resident’s needs to alleviate problem. Request for a noise barrier/wall across Eglinton Avenue at the Rangoon stop.
- Does not appear that the concerns raised during PIC #2 have been considered.
- Concern about **noise and vibration** during construction at Rangoon.

6.3. Martin Grove

- The **re-routed left turn solution for Martin Grove** and Eglinton is a good one.*
 - Need **more left turn lanes** at Lloyd Manor Rd. Cars back up on this road.*
- Much **improved** from the previous design.
- The **re-routed left hand turn on Martin Grove**, north off Eglinton on the east side of the street, will cross the current parking lot for the **soccer fields**.
- Concern for **traffic infiltration** at Winterton Dr. (south of Eglinton, off Martin Grove).
- The **re-routed left turn** at Martin Grove is **not necessary**. All that is required is a proper advance green light.
- The proposed **re-routing**, at least at Martin Grove and Eglinton, deposits an enormous volume of **traffic** in front of two public schools. Glad to see that part changed.
- Place the route **underground** at Martin Grove.

- Concern with **EBR and EBL turns** on new road at Martin Grove and Eglinton. EBR turn storage length is a concern as well. Should make EBR turn channelized so that they are forced to turn right. Also, EBL should be dual left turn.
- Concerned with **illegal crossing** across the new road to access the northeast corner parking lot for the Richview Park. A barrier of some sort is needed to prevent this from occurring.
- **Shifting** 1-block south the 1 kilometre-long line of left-turning traffic from Eglinton Eastbound onto Martin Grove Northbound, continues to place this congestion directly in front of Martin Grove Collegiate high school where large volumes of pedestrian traffic already exist from the schools (Martin Grove Collegiate and to some extent Princess Margaret Junior School).
- **Opposition to the plan** for the Martin Grove - Eglinton intersection.
 - Proposed re-routed left hand turns will create **bedlam**.
 - **Too many lights** exist on Eglinton within a short distance and the addition of another light will increase traffic.
 - An earlier proposal for a Michigan U-turn south of Eglinton won't work either because of the **confusion** at the school crosswalk at NHG and the need to accommodate turns for 53 foot truck trailers.
 - A change of the exit off Eglinton to parallel the Hydro corridor south to NHG would accommodate the new light without interference to the northbound left turns and allow larger vehicles 90 degree turns.
 - For left turns to go south on Martin Grove from westbound Eglinton, the latest proposal **cuts through an area for drop-off or parking** related to the soccer pitches at Richview Reservoir. This will require Parks & Recreation to create safer and more formal parking elsewhere to avoid unsafe pedestrian crossing on the exit lane.*
- **Drivers already frustrated at the congestion** of this area often elect to drive at high speed through the surrounding neighbourhoods to the southeast of this intersection to shorten their driving time. This is particularly evident along Winterton Drive, Longfield Road and Lloyd Manor Road where the safety implications of a lethal combination of winding roads and public school pedestrian traffic will worsen significantly as the increased number of these vehicles further jeopardizes the school children in this vicinity.
- The NE and SW quadrants where proposed **rerouted left turn** traffic will be diverted could increase the risk of traffic accidents as well as accidents involving pedestrians and cyclists. The left turn diversion lanes will **impede the cycling traffic**.
 - Convert the intersection into a **full intersection allowing left turns** from Eglinton eastbound.

- **Allowing left turns** at this intersection will relieve some of the demand to make left turns from Eglinton eastbound to Martin Grove northbound allowing for full access to Highways 401, 427 and 27.
- Instead of using **left turn diversion lanes** allow **U-turns**.
- The U-turn for Eglinton westbound to Martin Grove southbound can be incorporated into a full intersection. The U-turn for Eglinton eastbound to Martin Grove northbound could be incorporated as per the other U-turn intersections (about 200m east of intersection).
- These recommendations should **cost less** than introducing the diversion lanes and could improve the level of service for LRT and vehicle traffic.

Questions

- Will **walking access** to Martin Grove CI remain? Also, will the extra traffic near Martin Grove CI stop the traffic flow on Martin Grove? *
- Regarding the **re-routed left hand turn on Martin Grove**, north off Eglinton on the east side of the street, which will cross the current parking lot for the **soccer fields**: Will a crosswalk be put in? Will more parking be added for the fields?
- Has the **speed change** at the proposed light going south on Martin Grove and Eglinton been considered?
- Will **additional traffic** on Martin Grove affect the **noise level inside the school**?
- New turn lane at Martin Grove crosses the existing **bicycle/pedestrian trail**. What **safety considerations** will be made for cyclists crossing this lane? A crossing signal is a bare minimum, but could be problematic. Better would be a form of grade-separation, such as a small tunnel for the trail underneath or a bridge over the turning lane.
- How does the **traffic flow study currently underway** at Martin Grove CI fit into the proposed design?
- Half of the students from Martin Grove CI walk from the north side of Eglinton to the south side. How will the **pedestrian crossing** occur at Eglinton and Martin Grove?

6.4. Kipling

- Completely **disagree with the proposed u-turns** at this stop. This will create congestion, re-routing of through traffic onto residential side streets and increase noise and vibration, decreasing property values.

6.5. Wincott/Bemersyde

- Westbound traffic will not use the u-turn configuration between Islington and Bemersyde and traffic will take a shortcut traveling **through the community** along Princess Margaret Blvd. **Large trucks** that cannot be accommodated by Islington u-turn will continue on Bemersyde and turn left to Islington southbound **through the community**. Police presence or signage will not deter large trucks from travelling this route.

6.6. Islington

- There is more room to build the LRT on the **south side of Eglinton** than on the north side, between Russell Road and Islington. It appears that the south could be used without causing an increase in the “bending” of the LRT line.*
- Richview CI’s **back fence has a gap** near the turning lane. Anticipate **many children** will use this to run across the street to get to the mall.
- Concerned that **westbound traffic** will use the left turn signal at Russell Road rather than the u-turn, just east of Islington. Will the signal at the two locations be such so that traffic will choose the u-turn?
- Post a **sign that indicates "Local Traffic Only"** on Russell Road.
- Completely **disagree with the proposed u-turns** at this stop. This will create congestion, re-routing of through traffic onto residential side streets and increase noise and vibration, decreasing property values.
- Examine a **traffic signal north of Eglinton** at Waterford and Wincott at the plaza entrance.

Question

- Will TTC be responsible in the **maintenance of the driveway** access to the Christian Science Church at the northeast corner of Eglinton and Islington?

6.7. Mulham

- **Change the name** from "Mulham" stop to “Richview” or “Plant World”. Few people in the area have heard of the name Mulham. It will be more recognizable with one of the latter names.
- Question regarding **reasons for adding an intersection** at the Mulham Place stop to serve Plant World.

6.8. Scarlett

- Concern regarding **wait times, confusion and time** it will take to make a **right hand turn** from south Scarlett Rd. at Eglinton in order to go eastbound on Eglinton.

6.9. Jane

- **Like all changes**; however, I would recommend that at Jane Station, a proper walkway be made as a means of safely connecting commuters to the Jane LRT (especially if Jane LRT is going to be underground at this location).
- Request for **information** at Trethewey Dr. and Yore Rd. to understand how project in this location will impact daily life (noise, traffic, etc.).

Questions

- Can **Emmett Avenue become a U-turn intersection** and drop the two to the west and east of it?
- Question regarding **reasons for eliminating** the Emmett intersection with its left turns, leaving only right turns.
- Where are the provisions for **pedestrian crossings** into Eglinton Flats Park?

6.10. Weston

- The above ground LRT through Mount Dennis (Eglinton and Weston) community will kill our community. It **needs to be underground**, thereby eliminating the purchase of 22 houses and the steep incline to the top of Weston Rd. Also, it would decrease impact to the residents and businesses.*
- Concerns about **widening plan** for Eglinton at Weston Rd.
- **Strongly support an elevated LRT system**. This would simplify things.
- Strongly support the **LRT on the north side** of the road rather than in the middle. This would lead to less congestion and less confusion.
- Concern regarding **property acquisition**
 - Current **proposed location of surface LRT** at Weston Road is **not acceptable**. It must be underground through the Weston Road community. Buying and knocking down homes would not be considered in Forest Hill.
- Weston Road should be treated the way Don Mills is being treated: a **short underground stretch** with station. That would allow a station to be located further east, and **closer to the future GO station**. **Network connectivity** is the key to building transit in this City as a viable choice for more people.
- The **intersection** at Weston Rd. is **too big**. It would make it difficult for the elderly and handicapped to cross.
- You may also want to consider **underground walkway** from Weston Station to the proposed new GO Station.

- Stop at Weston Rd. Should be **east of Weston road and west of the rail corridor** to help reduce distance that people would travel to the connecting GO train station.
- Does not agree with **locating the stop east of Weston Road** considering the current stop between Weston Road and Jane Street are very busy in both directions. If the stop is located west of Weston Rd. it decreases the burden for riders in the neighbourhood impacted by the eliminated stop.

Questions

- Why is **property expropriation** being considered in Weston Road area?
- Question regarding how **decisions** (e.g. options chosen) will be made at the Weston Stop.
- Could the LRT be **built on fill as it passes underneath the railway bridge** to help reduce the grade at the stop?

6.11. Keele

- Put an **entrance** to the LRT at the **southwest corner of Keele** and Eglinton to shorten the walking distance for passengers on the southbound Keele buses. Make it as convenient as possible for TTC riders to use the system.
- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* **Additional entrance/exit located at northwest corner** of Keele St. (not Trethewey Dr) and Eglinton Ave would allow improved pedestrian access to bus terminal at Yore Rd for buses operating through the southeast portion of the terminal. The main entrance/exit serves only northwest portion of terminal directly, requiring passengers to use southeast portion to cross terminal busway. Additional exit would eliminate need for passengers to make that crossing and would provide more direct access to south east portion of terminal.

6.12. Caledonia

- Concern that the **distance between Caledonia station and Dufferin station is too great**. Suggestion that a parallel bus route along Castlefield Ave. would reduce the walking distance for people that live in this area.
- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* One instance of a **grade 5% between Keele and Caledonia stations** exists making conversion to HRT subway impossible. The grade should not exceed 3.5%. Keele St. Station could be raised, discussions with architect suggested this could be possible. Or an alternative would be to lower Caledonia Station. Raising Keele St. could reduce costs and would be a better option; however, raising Caledonia would increase the cost of Caledonia Station due to increased depth.

6.13. Dufferin

- Request for a **stop at Harvie Ave.**

6.14. Eglinton West

- **Entrances** to the LRT should be built on the north-east and north-west sides of the Allen. It's impossible to cross over the Allen with car traffic and short pedestrian lights. If pedestrian lights are longer, car traffic will be backed up.*
- Would like to see **two additional underground walk ways**, connecting the east and west sides of Eglinton Station to the peripheral blocks.*
- **City's realignment** of the intersection should be coordinated with the Allen Rd. station (Eglinton West) so **excavation/construction** is done at the same time.
- **Coordinate with the City** of Toronto regarding the reconfiguration of the intersection at Eglinton Avenue and Allen Rd.
- Concern regarding car **access on and off the Allen** Expressway during construction.
- **Shifting the LRT station to the north** would allow for direct access to the subway platforms and could reduce the amount of earth moving necessary during construction because the existing Eglinton West infrastructure could be used.
- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* Eglinton W subway (allen station) requires **closed fare-paid area** because of subway connection. Entrances/exits would be best located on outer sides of Allen Expressway in areas currently owned by TTC for commuter parking. This would allow riders to cross the Allen intersection to reach LRT (or by extension the subway). **Emergency exit in west lot** should be a regular entrance for easier public access. East emergency exit would better serve riders if it was located in the east lot as a regular entrance/exit. This increased cost would allow improved customer convenience, transformation of Eglinton to a transit-oriented corridor (by decreasing walking distances and auto-dependency). Existing subway entrance could become obsolete if the recommended setup was implemented.

Questions

- How will **traffic entering and exiting the Allen** be monitored as construction at Eglinton West station occurs?
- Could the **location of the station** at Allen Rd be **moved slightly north** to exist with the Eglinton West subway station?

6.15. Eglinton

- The **intensification** at Yonge and Eglinton is a mistake. The area is equidistant from any major highway, therefore creating gridlock in the area. Only way to improve the system is to take the pressure off the Yonge line.
- Concern from residents of a nearby condominium **during construction** of the line (see letter regarding potential impact on 2 Edith Drive in Appendix C):
 - Damage to our foundation and underground parking during construction;

- Potential for flooding;
- Ongoing disturbance to residents and damage to the structure because of vibration from the LRT vehicles.
- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* **Exit could be added to the old bus terminal lands** close to Duplex Ave. This potential entrance/exit should be protected for future implementation.

6.16. Avenue

- Avenue Station should be **named Avenue Road Station**.

6.17. Mount Pleasant

- Would appreciate the **retention of the former bank building** on the north-west corner of Eglinton at Mt. Pleasant. This heritage building is the only structure that has any character at this otherwise ugly intersection.
- Consider having an **entrance** on the south side of Eglinton for the block bordered by Mt. Pleasant and Bayview. This block is densely populated and will benefit from access at this location.
- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* Eglinton Junior Public School currently used for two **fire vent locations** (one Eglinton Ave and one on Brownlow Ave). Eglinton Ave fire vent location could be additional exit in future, and should be protected.

Question

- Has a decision been made about the **specific locations** of the Mt. Pleasant station **entrances/exits**?

6.18. Bayview

- Interested in the **construction and timelines** at the Bayview stop.
- Concern regarding **impact on a hidden river** at Bayview.
- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* In combination with a **shift in the station box eastward, additional entrance/exit at east end** of Sunnybrook Plaza would benefit more people northeast of the station than at the west end of Sunnybrook Plaza lot because of the irregular street layout. Why would the green strip between the existing McDonald's property and sidewalk not be used? This would bring the distance between the northbound bus and LRT secondary entrance as close as that between the southbound bus and main entrance. The **Howard Talbot Park secondary entrance** would also serve more people if it was moved as far east as the station box will allow because people could cut across the park from neighbourhoods to the southeast.

6.19. Laird

- **Looks good.** Like the Laird station.*

- **Laird stop preferred** over Brentcliffe/Agree with the move to Laird from Brentcliffe.*
- **Don't agree** that the station at Brentcliffe was moved to Laird. There are plans for two high rise condominium towers east of Brentcliffe.*
- **Main and secondary entrances seem appropriate**, provided no loss of parking spaces at the following locations: the Metro (main entrances), TD Bank (secondary entrance on the northwest side) or Sunnybrook Place (secondary entrance on the southeast side).
- Concerned with the **four health facilities** close to Brentcliffe.
- Perhaps a compromise can be made by extending or repositioning the eastern **secondary entrance** further eastward, closer toward Don Avon Drive. This would make the station more accessible for those living further east from Laird.
- If an **emergency exit is needed at Rumsey** and Eglinton it appears there is insufficient room at the North West corner. The City should consider **acquiring these properties** on this corner, one of which is currently up for sale.
- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* Support for Laird station over Brentcliffe Rd but suggests that **Brentcliffe could act as a future station** as development increases.
 - Additional opportunities could exist if the **station was shifted 60m to the west**. All existing entrances/exits would remain, but an additional exit would be possible through 814 Eglinton Ave E. Depending on the existing structure, some form of access to the high-rise across the street from 814 could also be incorporated into the design.

Questions

- Where the station and **entrances/exits** be located at Laird?*
- Why was **Brentcliffe station** moved to Laird?

6.20. Leslie

- Concern regarding **traffic** at Eglinton and Leslie.
- Concern about **reducing the left turn capacity** to just one lane at Eglinton and Leslie, causing increased traffic.
- Suggestion to **accommodate two left turn lanes** to Leslie.
- Concern that the **grade differences** eastbound Eglinton at Leslie is steep enough to cause problems for a fully loaded LRT (two or three cars) to start from stop during a snowstorm.

6.21. Don Mills

- Don Mills station needs to be fully **above ground** and not partially.
- Support for Don Mills station being **underground**.

- The **grade separation** between the two LRT lines is good.
- Consider **incorporating Flemington 100 bus** through a proposed intersection at Gervais Drive at Eglinton.
- **North - South passage for pedestrians and cyclists** are hindered at Gervais Drive and Eglinton. A four-way signalized intersection would benefit these groups.
- **Connect the Don Mills LRT and Eglinton Crosstown LRT.***
- Don't agree with the various points given of how the Don Mills LRT and Eglinton LRT should be separated at the intersection. This would be a missed opportunity to not have both routes pass underground at the intersection. **Detailed interchange work** for both lines should be done well in advance.
- The lack of a connection from the **Don Mills LRT platform** to the underground station is troubling. This intersection already has heavy foot traffic and new LRT lines will only increase this. An off-street connection is warranted, and there is space.
- Release to the public a detailed view of the **passenger interchange** at Don Mills and Eglinton, covering BOTH lines.

6.22. Wynford

- Concerned that **traffic will increase** because of the associated new development in the area. **Noise and vibration** from buses are high.*
- **Re-routing of Wynford** means a stop-sign or traffic lights is required at St. Dennis/Wynford intersection.
- Pleased to see that attention has been paid to **accessibility** at Wynford Dr. Hopeful the green space at Wynford and Eglinton will remain as is and not be redeveloped with yet another high rise condo building.
- Insure that **noise assessment** in Wynford area is ongoing and updated since the area between Don Mills station and Wynford is mainly residential. Also, ensure that access to the platform at Wynford takes into account the number of seniors living in the Wynford condos and the new seniors rental residence at the Crown Plaza site.
- Concerned about **traffic operations** at new signalized intersection at this stop.
- Concerned about **environmental and traffic impacts** at this intersection.
- *Comments by Councillor Michael Thompson:* **Supports current configuration** for Wynford/Eglinton - Option selected for Wynford/Eglinton intersection is close to DVP interchange and Bala railway subdivision crossing, creating a complicated pedestrian and cycling environment. With LRT and changes to the road network, pedestrians would probably make up small portion of traffic along Eglinton Ave to/from Wynford area. Additional traffic signal would slow both LRT and road traffic unnecessarily.

- On south side of Eglinton Ave, only way to go on Wynford Dr/St.Denis St is west of Wynford/Eglinton interchange. North side Wynford Dr is mostly north but meanders towards the west. Until reaching the intersection at Wynford Heights Crescent, nothing is on east side of Wynford Dr. Pedestrians only require access to west side of Wynford Dr. from station.
- Access to the west side can be done using vertical transportation or ramps from the centre platform in the existing interchange. This would increase safety for pedestrians by creating a segregated route from the traffic on Eglinton.
- The cycling route should be diverted to Wynford Dr and/or St Denis St to avoid DVP and Wynford interchanges to increase safety for cyclists.

Questions

- What will happen to the land created by **re-routing the roadways at St. Dennis/Wynford Drive**? Do not want any more high rises constructed.
- Request to **leave the underpass at Wynford Drive** open for local residents as it provides access/egress to the adjacent condo at Wynford Drive. Can the underpass and surface intersection be blended so that both needs are met?
- There has to be a **better solution to pedestrian access**. On Bloor St., before the Bloor-Danforth subway, streetcar passengers accessed the Yonge subway via station platforms in the middle of Bloor St. Could a similar arrangement work at Wynford, with graded ramps and optional stairs?

6.23. Victoria Park

- The re-directed left turn at Eglinton and Victoria Park is a **vast improvement** from the Jonesville Crescent left turn continuation.
- At **Victoria Park and Pharmacy**, traffic is currently terrible, due to a combination of several traffic lights in a small area, poor light coordination and inconsiderate Toronto drivers. This mess needs to be fixed and this is a good opportunity to do it.
- **Noise concerns** at Eglinton and Sloane Ave.

Question

- Why not move the **westbound left turn** from Victoria Park to a right turn at Jonesville? This would decrease delays in the southbound lanes of Victoria Park.

6.24. Birchmount

- **Noise concerns** at Eglinton and Rosemount Drive.

Question

- Why is the LRT stop at Birchmount **located before the intersection** when most of the other stops along the LRT are located after the intersection?

6.25. Kennedy

- Would like to be on a **separate mailing list** for the Kennedy Station Study.
- Redevelopment of the station and vicinity is a **great idea**. Look forward to seeing more plans.
- I would recommend that the Kennedy Station for both Eglinton and Scarborough Malvern LRT be made **underground** to make transfer to Bloor-Danforth Subway easy and convenient.
- Request for **more information** about the project, particularly near Kennedy Station.

Questions

- Instead of tunnelling into Kennedy station, could the station roadways and underpass, combined with the current access road from the Kiss and Ride to Kennedy, be used to **eliminate left turns** at Kennedy and Eglinton? Would this make traffic flow move quickly through the intersection?

7. Appendices

A. Summary of the meeting hosted by Councillor Frances Nunziata and the Mount Dennis Community Association – Dec 14, 2009

B. Public Notifications

- Eglinton Crosstown LRT Ad/flyer
- Eglinton Crosstown LRT Notice of Commencement
- Letter with a copy of the ad/flyer was faxed and mailed out to MP/MPPs
- Letter with a copy of the ad/flyer sent to BIAs
- Sample Letter of a ‘partial property acquisition’
- Sample Letter of ‘full property acquisition’
- Email to Agencies, Ministries, Stakeholders
- Letter to all Williams Treaty Bands

C. Letters submitted by Stakeholders

- Letter submitted by the Latvian Canadian Cultural Centre
- Letter submitted regarding potential impact on 2 Edith Drive
- Letter submitted by Cycle 26
- Letter submitted by Bell Canada
- Comments received from Councillor Michael Thompson