



4. Public Consultation

This section describes the public consultation undertaken as part of the EA Modification process. The integration of the input received into the process and assessment of routes is reflected in the following sections addressing the various steps of the EA Modification process.

4.1 Overview of the Public Participation Process

The EA modification process outlined in Chapter 11 of the WWLRT IEA for major modifications requires a consultative process at key decision-making steps along the way. Public involvement has been an integral part of this study. This extensive consultation program with stakeholders and community groups was undertaken in parallel with the technical/planning work in order to facilitate meaningful two-way dialogue between the Project Team and affected parties. Public consultation activities included the creation of a Community Advisory Group (CAG) and a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), consultation with various stakeholders, including the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, three Public Information Centres (PICs), the use of a project website and direct contact with stakeholders in response to comments received.

4.2 Project Commencement Notification

A notice of study commencement and of the first PIC was mailed on Tuesday, November 14, 2006, to 125 individuals on the established project stakeholder list.

On Thursday, November 15, 2006, a one page flyer notification of study commencement and the first PIC was distributed by Canada Post to 24,989 residents and businesses in the Study Area.

A media release was issued on Monday, November 20, 2006 and public notification was also placed in Now Magazine on November 23, 2006.

In all cases, the notice included a description of the Exhibition Place to Dufferin Street EA modification study and the Dufferin Street to Roncesvalles Avenue Class EA, including the process being followed and the objectives of the study. The notice provided information on the time, date, and location of the first round of PICs as well as a key map of both Study Areas.



4.3 Community Advisory Group: First Meeting July 25, 2007

The CAG was formed at the outset of the project to provide a forum for members of the local community to feed directly into the decision-making process. The purpose was to ensure that local community knowledge and feedback was obtained at each step along the way.

The CAG functioned for both the EA Modification study (Strachan Avenue to Dufferin Street) and the Waterfront West Streetcar Class EA (Dufferin Street to Roncesvalles Avenue). Since the two projects were following the same schedule and are related to one another, it was decided that a broader perspective would be advantageous. Therefore, the CAG members were representative of the larger community in both Study Areas.

The first CAG meeting was held on July 25, 2007 in advance of the first PIC. The purpose of the meeting was to: 1) ensure that the PIC presentation material was clear so that meaningful feedback could be obtained from the community at the PIC; 2) allow leaders of community groups to share information with their members in advance of the PIC; and 3) provide an opportunity for community representatives to ask questions and raise potential concerns to the project team.

Eleven people attended the first meeting. From the project team, the following members participated:

- Chris Bishop, TTC
- Adrienne Long, Earth Tech
- David Nagler - Public Consultation Unit, City of Toronto
- Karl van Kessel, Gartner Lee Limited
- Nigel Tahair, Transportation Planning, City of Toronto

The CAG Members included:

- Roger Brook – Parkdale Residents Association/Parkdale-High Park Residents Waterfront Group
- Megan Edmonds – Roncesvalles Macdonell Residents Association
- Michael Craig – Sunnyside Community Association
- Jeffery Hanning – Sunnyside Community Association/Western Waterfront Steering Committee/Roncesvalles Village BIA
- David White – Waterfront Action
- Devin Horne – Parkdale Village BIA



4.3.1 Notification

On Wednesday, July 11th 2007, invitations were mailed to people on the initial CAG member list. Follow-up e-mails were sent on Tuesday, July 17th 2007. The following community representatives received invitations and were asked to invite another member of their organization if they could not attend.

- Craig Peskett – Parkdale Residents Association
- Roger Brook – Parkdale Residents Association/Parkdale-High Park Residents Waterfront Group
- Peter Elson/Clarence Seunarine – Roncesvalles-Macdonell Residents Association
- Meghan Edmonds – Roncesvalles Macdonell Residents Association
- Michael Craig – Sunnyside Community Association
- Jeffery Hanning – Sunnyside Community Association/Western Waterfront Steering Committee/Roncesvalles Village BIA
- David White – Waterfront Action
- Joseph Norkus – High Park Residents Association
- David Cronin – St. Francis Table, Capuchin Outreach to the Poor: Parkdale
- Devin Horne – Parkdale Village BIA
- Lynn Clay – Liberty Village BIA

4.3.2 Handout Package

A handout package was provided that consisted of a colour map of the proposed routes, as well as a description of the key differences between the routes.

4.3.3 Questions/ Comments Received

The following summarizes the questions, comments, and answers from the meeting that specifically concerned the TTC EA Modification study (Strachan Avenue to Dufferin Street segment only).

- Heritage evaluation should include railway engineering structures including the bridges over the Gardiner at Dufferin. Any elevation changes to any bridge must not block views of the waterfront from Parkdale. Any effect to heritage bridges as well as visual impacts can be evaluated.
- CAG member asked if the numbers on the map (1, 2, 3) ranked the routes between Exhibition to Dufferin Street, or if they were simply the names assigned. Response was that the number referred to the names assigned to the routes and not to their ranking.



- A CAG member asked what the main purpose of this meeting was. Team member replied that the purpose is threefold. First, to ensure that the presentation material is clear so that meaningful feedback can be obtained from the community at the larger public meeting. This meeting will allow the project team to improve the presentation. Secondly, the meeting is intended to allow leaders of community groups to share information with their members in advance of the larger public meeting. Thirdly, if there are any preliminary questions or concerns the CAG can identify them for the project team.
- Public meeting to be held on August 15 is not the best date because some of the public is on vacation and it is hard for people to get to the meetings. Team member responded that the initial public meeting was scheduled in May, but it was later pushed to this date for various reasons. The summer date was discussed with the local Councillors who did not have concern. Comments collected in these meetings will be collected and compiled by September to be incorporated in the evaluation.
- CAG member asked whether new streetcars would be able to push up an 8% grade as has been indicated during the Waterfront East study. Team member said yes, but it would be preferable to keep streetcar route grades below 8% to reduce strain on the vehicles.
- CAG member asked if the TTC would construct a fence on the north side of a new streetcar route between Dufferin and Roncesvalles if it is placed on the north of the Gardiner. The answer was yes.
- CAG member asked what the timeline is for this project? Team member responded that timelines have been put forward (a table was displayed during the course of the meeting). He also added that the money is already there and this project can proceed once approved. If everything proceeds on approval the extension to Dufferin could be completed in 3 yrs.
- CAG member said residents in the eastern waterfront were concerned about the negative visual impact of streetcar portals on the Queens Quay and visual impacts should be evaluated for this study. Any portal must have high quality urban design.
- Future public meeting could be held at 20 West Lodge in the May Robinson Building. Team member would look into that location for a future public meeting.
- CAG member asked what the cost difference between the proposed routes was? Team member responded that no specific cost details are available at this time.
- There should be pedestrian and cycling improvements at all existing bridges.
- Difficult to understand some of the graphics. More streets should be referenced on the maps, bridges should be highlighted along with other key landmarks.



- Public presentation should confront the issue of cost. She further suggested that many people would consider cost as an important factor when choosing for an appropriate route.
- Suggestion was made as to whether it was possible to have images refined before public consultation (preferably a week before the first public consultation session). Brief descriptions of where routes would run, designated stops and where routes are above grade or below grade would also be useful information for public consultation.
- City should check the heritage status of the Dufferin bridge. He stressed the importance of the railway heritage in the Study Area. Team member was not aware of a heritage designation for the Dufferin bridge but will confirm.
- Preferable to replace the Dufferin bridge with another structure if it would benefit the community, particularly cyclists and pedestrians.
- Public needs a better understanding of what a turn-around or terminal facility at Dufferin would look like as well as any impacts on the railway structure (bridge). CAG member said the current rail bridge would not support streetcars. In addition, the City's plan to extend Dufferin to Lake Shore Blvd. suggests the bridge would have to be widened to accommodate streetcars, two lanes of traffic each way, bicycle lanes and wide sidewalks.
- CAG member asked if studies have been done to ascertain that there is a significant number of people in south Etobicoke that will be using the proposed LRT. Team member responded that the City is using a forecasting model that studied ridership not only from south Etobicoke but also passenger demand along the entire route.
- CAG member asked if there will be any improved linkages to other TTC lines for example the Lansdowne Bus? Team member noted that this is to be evaluated.
- CAG member asked that ridership projections from south Etobicoke, current ridership in the area, and the projected future growth of ridership area available at a future meeting.
- At future consultations, Project team should illustrate the time it takes to get from Exhibition to Union Station on the new line versus the time it would take to get to Union on the King Street Line from Dufferin. Each proposed route should show how long it would take to arrive at different stops and the distance between designated stops should also be shown.



4.4 Community Advisory Group: Second Meeting January 9, 2008

The CAG meeting for the Waterfront West Streetcars EA was held on January 9, 2008. The purpose of the meeting was:

- a) To give CAG representatives an opportunity to comment on the draft presentation materials for the second PIC to help ensure that the presentation material is clear so that meaningful feedback could be obtained from the community.
- b) To allow community representatives to share information with their members in advance of the PIC so that residents would be well informed and therefore comment more effectively.
- c) To allow community representatives to ask questions and identify key issues directly to the Project Team.

The following representatives from the Project Team and the CAG participated:

City of Toronto/TTC Project Team

- Councillor Gord Perks
- Councillor Adam Giambrone
- Chris Bishop, TTC
- Richard Nusink, TTC
- Mary-Ann George, TTC
- Sameh Ghaly, TTC
- David Nagler - Public Consultation Unit, City of Toronto
- Adrienne Long, Earth Tech
- Nigel Tahair, Transportation Planning, City of Toronto
- Karl van Kessel, Gartner Lee Limited
- Terry Wallace, LEA

Community Advisory Group Members

- Roger Brook – Parkdale Residents Association/Parkdale-High Park Residents Waterfront Group
- Lynn Clay, Liberty Village BIA
- Jeffery Hanning – Sunnyside Community Association/Western Waterfront Steering Committee/Roncesvalles Village BIA
- David White – Waterfront Action, Parkdale Residents Association
- Sandy Wong (Springhurst resident)
- Shant Poladian (Springhurst resident)
- Clarence Seunarine – Roncesvalles Macdonnell Residents Association



A handout package was distributed that consisted of colour maps of the proposed routes between Dufferin and Strachan as well as a description of the route options.

4.4.1 Questions and Discussion

The following summarizes main concerns and answers pertaining to the Exhibition Place to Dufferin Street section.

- The definition of the word 'natural' as used in the presentation was requested and it was answered that it refers to anything referring to environmental effects, for example trees and groundwater.
- CAG member asked if a 'round robin' display method for the evaluation methodology was considered, answered that the currently used 'trade-off method', ensured that comparisons could be made between the routes
- CAG member asked for clarification as to whether there would be a need to go across the bridge at Dufferin in the short term, reply that this would become an implementation issue and would depend on the alignment and timing of the implementation of Dufferin to Roncesvalles segment.
- CAG member suggested that even if the TTC does not need a re-constructed bridge at Dufferin Street to support streetcar travel, there are people at the City level who may be interested in rebuilding the Dufferin bridge; reply that the City is in the process of assessing the need to rebuild the Dufferin bridge.
- CAG member asked how much clearance for the bridge would be needed to meet standards, reply that clearance envelopes is at least two to three feet.
- CAG member asked if the bridge has historic significance, reply that it depends on what needs to happen to the bridge. It would be looked at in terms of age and uniqueness.
- CAG member asked why there has been no discussion on the cost issue evaluating 3A and 3B; reply that display boards at the PICs will be more comprehensive.
- CAG member asked why GO Transit does not put more stops up; reply that GO Transit exists to serve long distance commuter traffic; lines will not serve as many people as existing and future streetcar lines.

4.5 Technical Advisory Committee

As part of the project, a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was formed to provide an opportunity to share information and obtain input for both studies prior to presenting information to the public. An invitation to join the TAC was sent via mail.



The first TAC Meeting was held on Thursday, November 23, 2006 with City of Toronto and TTC representatives attending, in addition to the regular Project Team members (TTC & City staff, Consultants). Chris Bishop (TTC) provided a summary of discussions with GO Transit and CN Rail, and reviewed options for the extension of the streetcar route. Options on the north and south side of the CN and Gardiner corridor would protect for a future Front Street Extension. City and TTC representatives mutually concluded that the options should include scenarios with and without protection for a future Front Street Extension. Other issues identified included: integration of the GO and TTC stations at the north end of Exhibition place and how crowds would be accommodated; whether service would be extended along Dufferin Street to Bloor; and whether the Dufferin Street bridges would be replaced.

Because the TAC consisted of only a few City and TTC staff in addition to the Project Team members, the TAC was represented on a regular basis through the normal, bi-weekly Project Team meetings, with City and TTC staff in attendance at the Project Team meetings ensuring that other City and TTC staff were updated on the progress of the study on a regular basis.

The Project Team Meetings were established with the following Project Team/TAC members:

- Richard Nusink, Project Manager, TTC
- Chris Bishop, Project Engineer, TTC
- Mary-Ann George, Service Planning, TTC
- David Nagler, Public Consultation Unit, City of Toronto
- Nigel Tahair, Transportation Planning, City of Toronto
- John Kelly, Transportation Services, City of Toronto
- Terry Wallace, Consultant Project Manager, LEA
- Karl van Kessel, Consultant Project Planner, Gartner Lee Limited
- Adrienne Long, Consultant Project Engineer, Earth Tech

These meetings were convened to ensure that the views and comments from the TAC members could be readily incorporated into the process. The TAC reviewed materials and provided comment before presentation to the CAG or the public/agencies. When necessary as issues arose, additional expertise was sought from other individuals/stakeholders and invitations were extended to attend the appropriate TAC meetings.

At one regularly held project team meeting, John Bryson of City Structural Department and Doug Webb of UMA attended to discuss the City's plans to refurbish the Dufferin Bridge, and to discuss the project's impact on the other bridges in the proposed streetcar corridor. The minutes of this meeting can be found in **Appendix F**.

4.6 Stakeholder Consultation

Key stakeholders that may be directly affected by the proposed project were consulted during the study. These stakeholders included the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA), the



City of Toronto Deputy Mayor, the Canadian National Railway (CN Rail), GO Transit, the Canadian National Exhibition (CNE), the organizers of the Toronto Grand Prix (part of the Indy Racing League), Exhibition Place, and Ontario Place representatives.

4.6.1 The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) responded to the Notice of Commencement and Public Information Centre in writing on December 18, 2006 with background information and the identification of potential environmental concerns with the project. As TRCA representatives were unable to attend the first round of public information centres, the agency was provided with meeting materials as requested. The TRCA's response letter can be found in **Appendix F**.

4.6.2 Meeting with Deputy Mayor Pantalone

On January 14, 2007, a meeting was held at Toronto City Hall offices with Deputy Mayor Pantalone to discuss issues related to impacts through the north side of Exhibition Place due to the streetcar extension. Discussion also took place with regard to options to increase the usable width of Manitoba; options for streetcar connections across the Dufferin Bridge; and options for loading at the Food Building. Minutes from this meeting can be found in **Appendix F**.

4.6.3 GO Transit and Canadian National Railway Consultation

The Project Team met with representatives from GO Transit and CN Rail on a number of occasions, and provided drawings and information for their review and comment. Letters and minutes from meeting with GO/CN can be found in **Appendix F**.

An initial meeting was held on November 23, 2006 with Mike Wolczyk and Dan Francey from GO Transit and John MacTaggart from CN Rail. GO/CN advised of their plans to potentially provide additional track and platforms through the corridor for more frequent service. Preliminary route alternatives were presented to GO/CN for their consideration. The Project Team advised GO/CN that they would be kept informed of the study progress.

A second meeting was held with GO Transit (Dan Francey and Adam Snow) on March 27, 2007 to discuss further details on the design for a streetcar alignment north of the GO/CN corridor, in the future Front Street Extension (local street) alignment. Some modifications would be required to the long term plans for GO's platforms, and the tunnel and pedestrian access. GO Transit expressed concerns with the lack of R.O.W. available to accommodate the project and their own expansion plans, and agreed to have their consultant review the plans in detail, for further comment.



Correspondence was received from CN and GO Transit in May 2007. CN provided written comments on May 17, 2007 and advised that they had no concerns regarding the project alternatives, provided that the future expansion of the CN corridor to 6 tracks is protected for, and that there would be no financial or operational impacts on CN. GO Transit responded with a detailed letter on May 30, 2007, indicating that the impacts of Route #1 were limited to access and interaction issues at the GO tunnel and platforms, but that Route #2 (then identified as Route #4) along the north side of the CN corridor appeared to be cost prohibitive and potentially not feasible, as there would be a need to relocate existing signal appliances. Further, they explained that with Route 2 there were significant issues that could impact the future expansion of their transit service, but Route 1 did not contain any issues that could be significant to GO Transit.

4.6.4 Canadian National Exhibition (CNE) Consultation

A meeting with CNE representatives occurred on September 14, 2006 at the CNE offices. Attendees included Virginia Ludy and David Bednar of CNE, Chris Bishop of TTC and Terry Wallace of LEA Consulting. The meeting was held to discuss potential alignment options and receive comments from the CNE representatives, including information concerning the Food Building such as drawings and schedules, to determine potential effects of the proposed project.

4.6.5 Toronto Grand Prix Consultation

A meeting with Toronto Grand Prix organizers, including Karen Hardinge and Jim Tario, was held on September 29, 2006 at the Grand Prix offices. Chris Bishop of TTC and Terry Wallace of LEA Consulting were also present. The purpose of this introductory meeting was to understand the requirements for the car race and to brief these key stakeholders on potential alignment options and their associated effects.

4.6.6 Exhibition Place/Ontario Place Consultation

A meeting with Exhibition Place and Ontario Place was held on October 23, 2006, as an introductory meeting to discuss potential alignment options and receive stakeholder feedback on issues, concerns and interests. In attendance were Dianne Young, Mark Shortill and Mark Gross of Exhibition Place, Glenn Dobbin and Keith Brown of Ontario Place, and Chris Bishop (TTC) and Terry Wallace (LEA).

4.7 First Nations Consultation

First Nations consultation was undertaken directly with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nations Director Margaret Sault and Chief Brian Laforme. Following notification, a meeting in Hagersville, Ontario was held on Wednesday, January 10, 2007.



Chief Laforme and Ms. Sault indicated the following:

- Their intention with EAs in Toronto is not to stop development. However, in the case that any First Nations archaeological material is found, they wish to be contacted immediately and for any construction to be halted temporarily until a mutually acceptable agreement is reached on how to proceed.
- The City of Toronto and TTC need to be aware that there are groups/individuals that may claim to be representative of the First Nation but they do not represent the Mississaugas. Communications should always be between the City and the Mississaugas of New Credit. If there are cultural heritage or archaeological issues the Mississaugas of New Credit will be contacted by the City.
- Ms Sault and Chief Laforme indicated they would like to receive notices for each stage of the EA and all EAs that Toronto and/or the TTC are undertaking

Officials at Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) – Litigation Management, Specific Claims, and Comprehensive Claims as well the former Ontario Secretariat of Aboriginal Affairs (OSSA) – Mr. Surinder Singh Gill were also consulted.

4.8 Project Website

The project website www.toronto.ca/involved was launched on Monday, November 6, 2006 and a link was provided from the TTC's main website at www.ttc.ca on Friday, November 10, 2006. All project-related information circulated to the public contained the project website address. Attendees at the PICs were made aware of the site's address.

4.9 Public Information Centre #1

The first Public information Centre (PIC) was held jointly for the WWLRT EA Modification (Exhibition Place to Dufferin Street) and the Waterfront West Streetcars Class EA Study (Dufferin Street to Roncesvalles Avenue). Two locations were selected for the PIC, one in each Study Area: Parkdale and Exhibition Place.

The purpose of the PIC was to introduce the two studies, present the work completed to date, identify the project schedule and next steps, and provide an opportunity for public feedback directly with the Project Team members.



4.9.1 Notification

Notification of the PIC was mailed to 125 individuals on the established project stakeholder list on Tuesday, November 14, 2006. The same day, 24,989 notices were distributed to Canada Post for delivery to residents and businesses in the Study Area. A media release was issued on November 20, 2006 and Public notification was also placed in the NOW on November 23, 2006.

4.9.2 Parkdale Location

The Parkdale PIC took place on November 27, 2006 at the Church of the Holy Family, 1372 King Street West. The PIC commenced at 6:30 pm with a presentation starting at 7:30 pm, followed by questions and answers.

The following representatives from the City of Toronto, and the Project Team were in attendance at the PIC:

- Gordon Perks, Councillor, City of Toronto
- Richard Nusink, TTC
- Chris Bishop, TTC
- Sameh Ghaly, TTC
- Wieslaw Chojnacki, TTC
- John Kelly, City of Toronto
- Heather Inglis-Baron, City of Toronto
- David Nagler, City of Toronto
- Terry Wallace, LEA Consulting Ltd.
- Karl van Kessel, Gartner Lee Limited
- Leslie Martin, Earth Tech

Thirty-three people attended the November 27th PIC.

4.9.2.1 Questions and Discussion

The comments from this meeting focussed mainly on the EA process. While many representatives suggested expanding the scope of the study, others were anxious to get something built. It was suggested to the study team that greater focus be placed on advising the diverse ethnic groups living in the area (it was suggested that this was the reason for lower attendance). It was agreed that translation of the notices would be provided for distribution by the area's City social worker.

A representative (Mr. David White) who had served on the Waterfront East community liaison committee suggested that a similar process –including a Community Liaison Committee- be used in the west end. A request was also made to extend the deadline for providing comments on the terms of reference. It was agreed that the date for submission of comments would be extended to January 15/07.



Some suggested that they were quite supportive of enhanced transit but tying into the Harbourfront service would not result in a quick, efficient route, and suggested that connecting to a future Front Street or Bremner Boulevard streetcar service would be more efficient. One person suggested that the Terms of Reference be expanded to look at improving service between Exhibition Place and Union Station.

The CNE representative (Knox Henry) provided comments for their organization suggesting that routing of the line to the north side of the Gardiner/CN corridor would eliminate any impacts on their facilities. The current preliminary alignment work for the south side suggests that the Food Building will be affected if allowance is made for the current Front Street design. The Food Building is an important element of the CNE and the impact of reducing its size could drastically affect the attractiveness of the building and its CNE tenants.

Additional indicators/evaluation criteria were suggested to account for the potential attractive view of Lake Ontario for an Ontario Place alignment. Some emphasized the importance of connecting the line to the Waterfront.

Numerous comments related to the present congestion at Roncesvalles/Queen/King intersection and that improvements would be needed if the connection between Dufferin to Roncesvalles was to be effective.

4.9.3 Exhibition Place Location

The Exhibition Place PIC was held on Tuesday, November 28th 2006 at the Direct Energy Centre (formerly National Trade Centre) on the Exhibition Place grounds (100 Princes' Boulevard). The PIC followed the same schedule as the Parkdale location, commencing at 6:30 pm with a presentation at 7:30 pm, followed by questions and answers. 20 members of the public signed-in at the meeting and approximately 26 attended.

The following representatives from the City of Toronto, and the Project Team were at the PIC:

- Deputy Mayor Joe Pantalone
- Chris Bishop, TTC
- Richard Nusink, TTC
- Sameh Ghaly, TTC
- Wieslaw Chojnacki, TTC
- David Nagler, City of Toronto
- Nigel Tahair, City of Toronto
- Terry Wallace, Lea Consulting Ltd.
- Karl van Kessel, Gartner Lee Limited
- Leslie Martin, Earth Tech



4.9.3.1 Questions and Discussion

The comments at this meeting focussed more on the current poor streetcar service along King Street and potential solutions such as the addition of express bus service from Roncesvalles to downtown. Also, questions were asked regarding how the alignment would work through the Roncesvalles/King intersection.

The Liberty Village BIA suggested that a north alignment would best serve the large residential and employment population (approx. 6,000 residents and 6,000 employees) that is located there. Their Executive Director advised that a service on the south side of the Gardiner/CN corridor would not be well received due to the walk across the corridor.

Deputy Mayor Pantalone raised the issue of available space for an alignment on the north side based on previous comments of GO Transit regarding their intention to add an additional track on the north side of the corridor and the impact of this alignment on the Front Street design. In addition, it was suggested that if the Front Street alignment was pushed north it would affect the existing Canada Bread facility. He also provided comments regarding the fact that the restricted street system and road capacity west of Bathurst Street is the basic reason for traffic congestion between Roncesvalles and Bathurst on Queen, King and Lake Shore.

A question was asked of the impacts associated with either of the south corridors (i.e., through north end of Exhibition Place or along Lakeshore). The impacts were described, being the potential impacts on the food building and kids village (re: CNE) and loss of parking at Ontario Place and additional cost (Lakeshore route).

A representative from the Exhibition Place Board of Governors advised the Board was in favour of maintaining TTC service through Exhibition Place and requested that an extended line be situated as far north and as close to the Gardiner Expressway, as possible – if the south side of the Gardiner was selected as the preferred option.

Comments were made about overall transportation planning in the area and suggestions were made to alleviate streetcar delays. A question arose about the ability to use GO service to reach the area and it was agreed that we would review the situation with GO.

Concern was also registered regarding potential noise and vibration effects that an alignment could generate using the existing streetcar technology. This affect will be addressed in the evaluation.

4.9.4 Comment Sheets

A handout was provided at both PIC locations to attendees that consisted of a comment sheet and a postage paid return envelope for attendees to provide feedback. Comment sheets that were returned are summarized in **Appendix E**.



4.10 Public Information Centre #2

The second PIC was also held jointly for the WWLRT EA Modification (Exhibition Place to Dufferin Street) and the Waterfront West Streetcars Class EA Study (Dufferin Street to Roncesvalles Avenue). Once again, two locations were selected for the PIC, one in each Study Area: Parkdale and Exhibition Place.

The purpose of the PIC was to update the public on the work completed to date, identify the project schedule and next steps, and provide an opportunity for public feedback directly with the Project Team members.

4.10.1 Notification

Notification of the PIC was mailed to 280 individuals on the established project stakeholder list on Thursday, July 26, 2007. The same day, 24,989 notices were distributed to Canada Post for delivery to residents and businesses in the Study Area. Public notification was also placed in the Parkdale Liberty on Wednesday, August 1, 2007 and NOW Magazine on Thursday, August 2, 2007 and Thursday, August 9, 2007.

4.10.2 Exhibition Place Location

PIC #2 was held on August 13, 2007 at the Presentation Theatre in the Direct Energy Centre, Exhibition Place. The PIC commenced at 6:30 pm with a presentation at 7:30 pm, followed by questions and answers.

The following representatives from the City of Toronto, and the Project Team were at the PIC:

- Chris Bishop, TTC
- John Kelly, Transportation Services, City of Toronto
- David Nagler, Public Consultation Unit, City of Toronto
- Terry Wallace, LEA
- Vivian Leung, LEA
- Karl van Kessel, Gartner Lee Limited
- Adrienne Long, Earth Tech

Thirty-five people attended the PIC.



4.10.2.1 Questions and Discussion

All the questions and responses from PIC #2 are contained in a comment summary table in **Appendix E**. Some of the main issues raised or comments provided have been listed below:

- Stakeholders voiced financial concerns, such as the effect on City budget cuts in the project, and the ability to fund the new LRT vehicles;
- Concern with effects on the cultural landscape, especially the Dufferin Gate, was expressed, as was a recommendation to include cultural landscape/urban design in criteria;
- Many stakeholders requested more information and further studies of transit routes, need for the study such as ridership forecast, traffic effects, and other technical issues;
- A comment concerning transit servicing of Ontario Place, which is a large area currently underserved, was received;
- A stakeholder questioned whether the effects on the Food Building has been resolved or mitigated; and
- A concern with reduced service from the King and Queen streetcar lines was expressed

4.10.3 Parkdale Location

PIC #2 was held on August 15, 2007 at the Bonar Parkdale Presbyterian Church, 250 Dunn Avenue. The PIC commenced at 6:30 pm with a presentation at 7:30 pm, followed by questions and answers.

The following representatives from the City of Toronto, and the Project Team were at the PIC:

- Chris Bishop, TTC
- David Nagler, Public Consultation Unit, City of Toronto
- Saikat Basak, Transportation Planning, City of Toronto
- Terry Wallace, LEA
- Vivian Leung, LEA
- Karl van Kessel, Gartner Lee Limited
- Adrienne Long, Earth Tech

Thirty-four people attended the PIC.



4.10.3.1 Questions and Discussion

All the questions and responses from PIC #2 are contained in a comment summary table in **Appendix E**. Some main issues raised or comments provided have been listed below:

- Impact on Dufferin bridge, and proposed design;
- Would northern route preclude a future southern route along waterfront? What does northern route do for waterfront access?
- How do we as a community see these processes working together so that the concerns of homeowners, tenants are taken into account?
- Is there a cost benefit analysis?
- Is route to benefit people in local, regional area?
- Want to make sure none of the potential crossings to the lake are closed for pedestrian access and TTC and consultants should consider probable places for new access.

4.10.4 Comment Sheets

A handout was provided at both PIC locations to attendees that consisted of:

- Comment Sheet and a postage paid return envelope
- Diagram – Exhibition Place to Dufferin Street: Alternative Routes
- Diagram – Individual EA Alternative Routes
- Table – Description of Route Options and Detailed Description of Routes

Comment sheets that were returned are summarized in **Appendix E**.

4.11 Public Information Centre #3

The third and final PIC for this project was also held jointly for the WWLRT EA Modification (Exhibition Place to Dufferin Street) and the Waterfront West Streetcars Class EA Study (Dufferin Street to Roncesvalles Avenue). Once again, two locations were selected for the PIC, one in each Study Area: Parkdale and Exhibition Place.

The purpose of the PIC was to update the public on the work completed to date (including the recommended alternative route), identify the project schedule and next steps, and provide an opportunity for public feedback directly with the Project Team members.



4.11.1 Notification

On December 20, 2007, notices were mailed and/or e-mailed to the project mailing list (312 total) On January 7, 2008, 24,989 notices were distributed via Canada Post to all properties in the Study Areas for the Waterfront West Streetcars and Union Station to Exhibition Place EAs. Public notification was also placed in NOW magazine on January 10 and January 17, 2008.

4.11.2 Parkdale Location

PIC #3 took place on January 23, 2008 at the Bonar-Parkdale Presbyterian Church, located at 250 Dunn Avenue. The PIC was held from 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm, with a presentation at 7:30 pm, followed by questions and answers.

The following representatives from the City of Toronto, and the Project Team were at the PIC:

- Adam Giambrone, City Councillor, TTC Chair
- Chris Bishop, TTC
- Richard Nusink, TTC
- Mary-Ann George, TTC
- Jim Sinikas, TTC
- Nigel Tahair, Transportation Planning, City of Toronto
- David Nagler- Public Consultation Unit, City of Toronto
- John Kelly – Transportation Services, City of Toronto
- Terry Wallace, LEA
- Vivian Leung, LEA
- Karl van Kessel, Gartner Lee Limited
- Adrienne Long, Earth Tech
- John Emeljanow - Valcoustics

Fifty-five individuals signed-in (an additional 10 individuals declined to sign in for a total attendance of 65) over the course of the event.

4.11.2.1 Questions and Discussion

All the questions and responses from PIC #3 are contained in a comment summary table in **Appendix E**. Some of the main issues raised or comments provided have been listed below:

- One stakeholder did not feel safe, as a woman, using a stop at the Exhibition grounds at night. She prefers a transit stop north of the rail corridor, closer to Liberty Village;
- Potential effects on the Dufferin Bridge was once again raised as a concern; also effects on the park and kiddie land within Exhibition Place;
- One stakeholder asked how many new riders were predicted from the project;



- The consideration of GO trains or a different technology was requested;
- It was stated that the project is not ambitious enough in terms of trying to get people out of their cars: while this may cause inconvenience for Parkdale residents, it would reduce traffic in the neighbourhood;
- It was asked whether a six-month to one year pilot project has been considered to gauge community effects, as opposed to spending money on a longer term investment.

4.11.3 Exhibition Place Location

PIC #3 was held on January 24, 2008 at the Fountain Room of the Queen Elizabeth Building at Exhibition Place. The PIC was held from 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm, with a presentation at 7:30 pm followed by questions and answers.

The following representatives from the City of Toronto, and the Project Team were at the PIC:

- Deputy Mayor Joe Pantalone, City of Toronto
- Councillor Gord Perks, City of Toronto
- Nigel Tahair, Transportation Planning, City of Toronto
- David Nagler- Public Consultation Unit, City of Toronto
- John Kelly – Transportation Services, City of Toronto
- Chris Bishop, TTC
- Richard Nusink, TTC
- Mary-Ann George, TTC
- Jim Sinikas, TTC
- Terry Wallace, LEA
- Vivian Leung, LEA
- Karl van Kessel, Gartner Lee Limited
- Adrienne Long, Earth Tech

Forty-one individuals signed-in (an additional 4 individuals declined to sign in for a total attendance of 45) over the course of the event.

4.11.3.1 Questions and Discussion

All the questions and responses from this PIC are contained in a comment summary table in **Appendix E**. Some of the main issues raised or comments provided have been listed below:

- A stakeholder asked why road widening is being considered in evaluations when the city is aiming to reduce carbon emissions by 80%, and other transit projects are getting rid of roads;



- The Dufferin Gate was once again raised in discussion, concerning effects on the bridge from the project and the funding of restoration;
- A stakeholder requested cost information for the alternative routes- he/she wondered why this was absent from evaluation;
- Another stakeholder asked if a temporary right of way has been looked at versus a permanent right of way for the streetcar; and
- Will the project have the capacity to provide both express and local service (stating that New York City transit has a third line)?

4.11.4 Comment Sheets

A handout package was provided to attendees that included colour maps of the proposed routes, a list of Frequently Asked Questions, a description of the route options and a comment sheet with a postage paid return envelope.

The comments received after the third round of PICs to the completion of this report have been included in **Appendix E**.