



KINGSTON ROAD

TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS

Environmental Assessment: **Terms Of Reference**

Supporting Documents

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

KINGSTON ROAD TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT TERMS OF REFERENCE

OFFICIAL PLAN BACKGROUND REPORTS LISTING

SUPPLEMENTAL DESCRIPTION OF TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

TRAVEL DEMAND ANALYSIS

TABLES

Table SD-1: Existing & Future Conditions - Data Sources

Table SD-2: Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for Assessing Alternatives

Table SD-3: Potential Environmental Effects

PUBLIC CONSULTATION PLAN AND COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

TERMS OF REFERENCE CONSULTATION RECORD

PRELIMINARY PROJECT SCHEDULE

OFFICIAL PLAN
BACKGROUND REPORTS
LISTING

CITY OF TORONTO OFFICIAL PLAN

City Council at its meeting on October 29, 30 and 31, 2002 approved the Draft Official Plan dated May 2002 subject to a number of modifications. The Official Plan was adopted by City Council at its meeting on November 28, 2002. The Plan can be viewed at:

- www.toronto.ca/planning/official_plan/introduction.htm

The Official Plan is a long-term policy document, strategic and high level in its approach to future development, but clear in its vision. The vision of the Plan is about creating an attractive and safe city that evokes pride, passion and a sense of belonging- a city where everybody cares about quality of life. A major achievement of the new Plan has been to capture this growth strategy for the City in eight general land use designations.

BACKGROUND REPORTS

The following is a select listing of Background reports to the Official Plan providing the basis for the transportation policies and objectives included in the Toronto Official Plan Document (adopted by City Council November 2002, approved in part, with modifications by the Ontario Municipal Board June 2006). The 3 core documents forming the basis of the primary transportation-related policies are indicated in Bolded text. Further pages provide a brief description of each.

- Regeneration in the Kings: Directions and Emerging Trends (November 2002)
- Scarborough Centre Secondary Plan Directions Report: Towards a New Direction (June 2002)
- Flashforward: Projecting Population and Employment to 2031 in a Mature Urban Area (June 2002)
- **Transportation Building Blocks for the Official Plan** (June 2002)
- Where do we Grow from Here? (May 2002)
- From Home to Work: A look at Commuting Patterns (April 2002)
- Historical Profile of Centres 1991– 2000 (April 2002)
- Development and Rapid Transit Stations (March 2002)
- Forever Young: A Vision for Urban Planning in Toronto (December 2001)
- Transit Corridors and Land Use (September 2001)
- Transit Priority for the 504 King Streetcar Route (June 2001)
- Railway Corridor Use in the City of Toronto (December 2000)
- **Reducing Car Dependence: Transportation Options for the City of Toronto** (March 2001)
- The Avenues (February 2001/October 2000)
- **A Transportation Vision for the City of Toronto Official Plan** (April 2000)
- Toronto at the Crossroads: Shaping Our Future (June 2000)
- The Future of Downtown Toronto (June 2000)
- Building a Vision for Toronto (November 1999)

DESCRIPTIONS

Regeneration in the Kings: Directions and Emerging Trends (November 2002)

This report highlights the changing character of the King-Spadina and King-Parliament Reinvestment Areas. These two districts have emerged as highly desirable urban lifestyle communities close to Toronto's Downtown Core and have also seen considerable new business development since 1996.

Scarborough Centre Secondary Plan Directions Report: Towards a New Direction (June 2002)

The report outlines five key initiatives to create a vibrant mixed use area in Scarborough Centre.

Flashforward: Projecting Population and Employment to 2031 in a Mature Urban Area (June 2002)

Where will we live? Where will we work? How many of us will there be? The challenge of forecasting the city's future is to make reasonable projections about where people will live and work over the next thirty years, given the city's growth and change and the prospects for the GTA. Flashforward discusses the models and methodologies used to forecast population and project employment for the city and for smaller areas within the city. Flashforward Addendum: Projecting Housing Demand by Tenure to 2031 - July 2006

Transportation Building Blocks for the Official Plan (June 2002)

The report deals with improving the attractiveness of public transportation in ways that are cost effective, affordable and consistent with accommodating urban growth in a more compact and sustainable form. The key approaches include improving transit accessibility in poorly served areas and increasing the connectivity of the transit system so that transit becomes more competitive with the private automobile for a wider variety of trip purposes. Much of the analysis draws on earlier reports including,

A Transportation Vision for the City of Toronto (April 2000)

The report, proposes a vision that suggests several ways to reduce automobile dependency however, to achieve this vision and associated principles, there must be a willingness to make significant changes in the approach to planning and operations.

Reducing Car Dependence: Options for the City of Toronto (March 2001)

Released in March 2001, Reducing Car Dependence: Transportation Options for the City of Toronto proposes several transportation options. These options are based on a vision in the report "Toronto at the Crossroads: Shaping our Future", which was the first milestone report for a new Official Plan. The main thrust of this vision is to reduce car dependence and improve the competitiveness of transit. The range of options are shown on the map below including, subway/RT extensions, new rail lines, busways, and transitway, as well as new connections between GO/TTC.

Where do we Grow from Here? (May 2002)

Toronto at the Crossroads identified in a general manner the geographic areas of the City where future residential growth will be directed, but few details were provided. The growth management and land use strategy has since been further developed through research and public consultation. This report provides the details by attempting to answer the question of where and by how much Toronto can grow in terms of population and jobs.

From Home to Work: A Look at Commuting Patterns (April 2002)

Understanding commuting patterns to the clusters of employment is important to mesh transportation policy with our vision of employment growth. This report will reveal through mapping the degree to which people try to locate close to their place of work, given the appropriate range of housing opportunities to do so. This will give us a better understanding of the live/work relationships for key employment locations in the City.

Historical Profile of Centres 1991– 2000 (April 2002)

The dynamics of recent change (1991-2000) in jobs and establishments in the Downtown, North York, Scarborough, Etobicoke and Yonge-Eglinton/Yonge–St. Clair centres is the focus of this report. The report documents our ability to accommodate at least 500,000 new jobs over the long term.

Development and Rapid Transit Stations (March 2002)

Finding ways to encourage and promote development in the vicinity of rapid transit stations is an important element of the City's growth strategy. This type of strategy promotes re-urbanization and reinvestment in municipal infrastructure; makes better use of existing transportation infrastructure; results in a more compact urban form and reduces dependence on the private automobile. This study, produced by City of Toronto staff, examines development potential around TTC subway and RT stations and identifies a number of transportation planning policies and goals to guide future developments at and in the vicinity of rapid transit stations in Toronto..

Forever Young: A Vision for Urban Planning in Toronto (December 2001)

The report is the culmination of consultation conducted by the Toronto Youth Cabinet to assist in obtaining the views of Toronto's youth in response to the report, "Toronto at the Crossroads".

Transit Corridors and Land Use (September 2001)

The new Official Plan's Avenues concept recognizes the opportunity to accommodate growth and promote city living by revitalizing many of the main streets and arterial corridors in Toronto. The Avenues are also key transit corridors. This report, produced by David Crowley of the Consult Group Ltd., reviews the transit and land use experience in Toronto and other jurisdictions to identify the land use characteristics and other factors that have contributed to the success of cost effective surface transit routes. Recognizing the identified transit "success factors", land use and transportation policies are proposed to support the increased use of transit and guide new development along the Avenues and major surface transit corridors.

Transit Priority for the 504 King Streetcar Route (June 2001)

One of the goals of the new Official Plan is to reduce auto dependence through a number of strategies that enhance the competitiveness of public transit relative to the private automobile. One of the strategies being considered is the application of more aggressive transit priority measures to improve transit's competitiveness. This study, prepared by Professors Baher Abdulhai and Amer Shallaby of the University of Toronto, examines the impacts of adopting a more aggressive transit priority strategy along Toronto's busiest streetcar route - the King 504 Streetcar.

Railway Corridor Use in the City of Toronto (December 2000)

One of the challenges to improving transit use in the City of Toronto is finding ways to increase the level of transit services within existing rail corridors as well as implementing services within new corridors. This report, prepared by Harvey Romoff, a leading expert in Canadian railway economics, assesses the likelihood of freight rail corridors in the City becoming available for passenger transportation purposes.

The Avenues

Civic staff together with a consulting team and advisory panels of area residents carried out a pilot study to examine four areas along the City's major streets, identified as "Avenues". The study areas are The Queensway, Finch-Weston, Bloor-Landsdowne, and **Kingston Road**. These areas were chosen for two reasons. First, they represent areas that are suitable for incremental but substantial new growth, especially new housing, without negative impact on nearby stable areas. Second, in comparison to other, less distressed Avenues, all four study areas are in need of special attention if their potential is to be realized.

- The Queensway – February 2001
- Finch-Weston – February 2001
- Bloor-Landsdowne – October 2000
- Kingston Road – February 2001

Toronto at the Crossroads: Shaping Our Future (June 2000)

For over a year City staff conducted research into the state of the City and region and listened to Torontonians at public open houses, workshops, through letters, faxes and e-mail. In our report, Toronto at the Crossroads, we share what we have learned about the challenges facing Toronto and recommend directions our City can take to meet them. This is the first milestone report for the new Official Plan.

The Future of Downtown Toronto (June 2000)

The Future of Downtown Toronto: Overview Report analyses trends in key activity areas and shows how a healthy downtown core is key to keeping the Greater Toronto Area competitive. The report proposes strategic directions for the future of downtown Toronto and provides a framework for action. More detailed information can be found in the report, The Future of Downtown Toronto: Background Studies.

Building a Vision for Toronto (November 1999)

Building a Vision for Toronto reports on the key themes and directions from a series of nine workshops held with community and business leaders in November 1999. The participants were invited to participate in the process of defining a new Vision for the City of Toronto. This was one part of an on-going series of public consultations we did for the "Toronto at the Crossroads" report.

SUPPLEMENTAL DESCRIPTION
OF TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

ROAD NETWORK

Toronto's grid of major streets serves as main arteries for movement, drawing together various parts of the City, providing links within Toronto and to the Greater Toronto Area. Many of these early roads have provided the City with the opportunity to develop a comprehensive network of bus and streetcar lines, which will be key to meeting the goals of reducing the city's reliance on the automobile for mobility and growth.


For much of its length, Kingston Road runs roughly parallel to the shore of Lake Ontario and forms many oblique crossings with the north-south and east-west grid of arterial and local roads. In this way it is similar to nearby Danforth Road, another major arterial road in the study area.

Kingston Road is a six lane arterial road in a 36 m right of way east of Birchmount Road. It has a raised concrete median with street lighting. In some locations the median has landscaping or decorative features such as tree planters and flag poles. Generally, the commercial buildings along Kingston Road are set back from the street and parking is provided in the space between. The residential uses are higher density and have service roads or other limited access points.

West of Birchmount Road, the character of Kingston Road is very different. The right-of-way is only 20 m and buildings are generally close to the street. There are four travel lanes available. On-street parking is common along the commercial strips, and some sections have laneways behind the fronting properties.

Figure SD-1 illustrates the construction history and the five year reconstruction/rehabilitation plan for arterial roads within the study area.

Figure SD-1: Construction History & Five Year Reconstruction/Rehabilitation Plan



TTC SERVICES

A number of the major bus and streetcar routes in Toronto are reaching their practical limit with respect to what can be achieved in terms of reliability, capacity and ability to attract new riders along growth corridors as a result of operating in mixed traffic. As congestion increases, it is expected that these problems will persist and worsen on more and more of the major surface routes in the TTC system.

TTC bus and streetcar services across the City suffer from reduced efficiency because they operate in mixed traffic, under congested conditions. Retaining existing transit passengers essentially means dealing with sources of delay, overcrowding, congestion on heavily used routes and reducing waiting times.

There is no continuous transit service along Kingston Road through the study area. Streetcar service is provided on Kingston Road by the 502 Downtowner and 503 Kingston routes, which end at the Bingham Loop (west of Victoria Park Avenue). Along Kingston Road, east of Victoria Park Avenue, service is provided by the following bus routes:

- 12 Kingston Rd;
- 102 Markham Rd;
- 69 Warden South; and
- 9 Bellamy.

The Bloor-Danforth subway lies to the north and has stations at Main Street, Victoria Park Avenue, Warden Avenue and Kennedy Road (at Eglinton Avenue) to serve the study area. Apart from Main Street, these stations serve many feeder bus routes. The trains are very frequent throughout the TTC's service hours.

Kingston Road Transit Services

Kingston Road is served by a number of different TTC services along its length within the Study Area. At the western portion of the study area, Kingston Road is served by the 502 (Downtowner) and 503 (Kingston) streetcar services which terminate at the Bingham Loop, just north of Kingston Road along Victoria Park Avenue. East of Victoria Park Avenue, originating at the Victoria Park subway station, the 12 (Kingston) provides bus services that leave Kingston Road at Midland Avenue or Brimley Avenue. The 69 (Warden) route provides service along Kingston Road between Warden Avenue and Birchmount Road.

East of Brimley Avenue, the 102 (Markham) route provides bus services along Kingston Road as far as Markham Road. Between Markham Road and Eglinton Avenue, Kingston Road is served by a peak period service extension off of Eglinton Avenue, an extension of the 34 (Eglinton). East of Eglinton Avenue, Kingston Road is served by the 86 (Scarborough East) and 116 (Morningside) bus services.

Major passenger transfer points occur along Kingston Road at Eglinton Avenue, St. Clair Avenue and Victoria Park Avenue.

Eglinton Avenue Transit Services

The 34 (Eglinton) bus service is the primary service on Eglinton Avenue and has its eastern terminus at Kingston Road. Other bus services originating on Eglinton Avenue (at Kennedy Station) connect to Kingston Road and serve neighbourhoods east of the Study Area on two major routes, the 86 (Scarborough East) and 116 (Morningside). The 102 (Markham) service connects

between Eglinton Avenue and Kingston Road in the Study Area. The Kingston/Eglinton intersection is a major transfer/terminal point for bus services in the Study Area.

The Ridership Growth Strategy report identifies Eglinton Avenue between Kennedy Station and Guildwood GO Station as a high priority for surface rapid transit. This section of Eglinton Avenue currently has High Occupancy Vehicle lanes to provide some priority for transit vehicles operating along this route. However, it is expected that TTC will pursue a study of surface rapid transit on Eglinton Avenue (and possibly on Kingston Road east of Eglinton Avenue to Guildwood GO Station) in the near future. In the interim, the demand for services on Eglinton Avenue connecting to Kingston Road as well as transfer/terminal facilities at this major intersection will need to be assessed as part of this EA.

GO TRANSIT

GO Transit runs two commuter train services in the CN rail corridor north of Kingston Road. The Stouffville GO line serves passengers from Markham, Stouffville and north eastern Scarborough with a stop at Kennedy subway station. The Lakeshore East train line services passengers from Durham Region (Pickering, Ajax, Whitby, and Oshawa) and south and east Scarborough. The Lakeshore East GO line has stops at the Danforth, Scarborough, Eglinton GO Stations, which are all located within the study area. Although GO transit does provide a direct transit route to downtown, the service provided tends to focus more on a regional scale, serving longer distance trips. Both Scarborough and Eglinton GO stations have commuter parking lots with free parking for riders; 635 and 838 spaces respectively.

GO Transit is currently constructing a third track on the south side of its corridor from the Scarborough Station into Union Station, along with an improved signal system. Once this project is completed, higher frequency train service will be possible.

The potential and need to provide connections to the GO Stations within the study area will be assessed as part of the EA study.

TRAVEL DEMAND ANALYSIS

1 Introduction

This document provides a preliminary assessment of travel patterns along the Kingston Road corridor between Woodbine Avenue and Eglinton Avenue as background information and support for the proposed Kingston Road Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment.

1.1 Study Area Definition

Exhibit 1 shows the study area considered for this analysis. The study area covers the area between Woodbine Avenue and Scarborough Golf Club Road. The northern boundaries are St. Clair Avenue, Eglinton Avenue and Lawrence Avenue and the southern boundary is the lake.

2 Travel Patterns

Travel patterns in the study area were analyzed using 2001 Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) data for the AM peak period (6:00 – 9:00) to assess the transit and overall transportation needs in the section of Kingston Road from Woodbine Avenue to Eglinton Avenue. Exhibits 2 – 5 show the origins and destinations (OD) by mode (transit and auto).

2.1 Base Year Travel Patterns (2001)

Exhibit 2 shows that the majority of transit trips originating in the study area are generally destined to the Downtown Core and to the zones containing the highest concentration of schools located within or just outside the study area. However, transit trips destined to areas within the study area are mostly internal trips (trips also originating from within the study area), as shown in Exhibit 3.

Most auto driver trips originating in the study area are destined to the employment areas located on the west side of Birchmount Road from Danforth Avenue to Highway 401, and to zones within the study area. These patterns are illustrated in Exhibit 4. Auto driver trips destined to the study area are coming mainly from areas within or adjacent to the study area, as shown in Exhibit 5.

2.1.1 Mode Split

The share of trips made by different modes of transportation (mode split or modal split) for the study area is shown in Table 1.

The majority of the study area internal trips (trips starting and ending at locations within the study area) are made by car (auto driver 41% and auto passenger 15%), 26% are walking trips and 15% of these trips are made by transit.

Of trips originating in the study area, 36% are by transit and 49% auto, whereas, trips destined to the study area are predominantly by auto, 63% drivers and 13% auto passengers.

GO Transit trips only account for about 1% of originating trips from the study area.

Table 2 shows the mode split generated by the GTA Model 2001 AM peak period (3-hr) Simulation. The mode split generated by the GTA Model is very close to the mode split extracted from TTS. Therefore, the GTA model generates reasonable modal splits, and can be used to forecast future mode split.

Table 1: Study Area Mode Split (AM Peak Period)

Mode	Internal Trips		From Study Area (Excluding Internal)		To Study Area (Excluding Internal)		Total	
	Trips	%	Trips	%	Trips	%	Trips	%
Transit	3,885	15%	25,481	36%	5,781	20%	35,147	28%
GO Rail Only	0	0%	788	1%	90	0%	878	0.5%
Total Transit	3,885	15%	26,269	37%	5,871	20%	36,025	29%
Auto Driver	10,273	41%	34,747	49%	18,036	63%	63,056	51%
Auto Passenger	3,837	15%	7,284	10%	3,610	13%	14,731	12%
Cycle	230	1%	580	1%	64	0%	874	0.5%
Walk	6,564	26%	1,162	2%	712	2%	8,438	7%
Other	550	2%	589	1%	539	2%	1,678	1%
Total Walk/Cycle/Other	7,344	29%	2,331	4%	1,315	4%	10,990	8.5%
TOTAL	25,339	100%	70,631	100%	28,832	100%	124,802	100%
TOTAL (%)	20%		57%		23%		100%	

Source: 2001 Transportation Tomorrow Survey (6:00 – 9:00 AM)

Table 2: GTA Model Mode Split (AM Peak Period)

Mode	Internal Trips		From Study Area (Excluding Internal)		To Study Area (Excluding Internal)		Total	
	Trips	%	Trips	%	Trips	%	Trips	%
Total Transit	4,432	19%	27,456	40%	8,530	26%	40,418	32%
Auto Driver	8,933	39%	33,222	48%	18,955	58%	61,109	49%
Auto Passenger	2,813	12%	5,926	9%	3,481	11%	12,220	10%
Total Walk/Cycle/Other	6,748	29%	2,359	3%	1,879	6%	10,986	9%
TOTAL	22,926	100%	68,962	100%	32,845	100%	124,733	100%
TOTAL (%)	19%		55%		26%		100%	

Source: GTA Model – 2001 AM Peak Period (3hr) Simulation

2.1.2 Trip Purpose

Table 3 shows trip purpose by mode for internal trips. The majority of total internal trips are school trips (45%) and 66% of internal transit trips are also school trips. Most of the internal auto driver trips are home-based other (63%).

Table 3: Trip Purpose by Mode – Internal Trips (AM Peak Period)

	Home-Based Work	Home-Based School	Home-Based Other	Non Home-Based	Total
Transit	976 (25%)	2,572 (66%)	258 (7%)	79 (2%)	3,885 (100%)
School Bus	0 (0%)	485 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	485 (100%)
Auto Driver	2,476 (24%)	212 (2%)	6,454 (63%)	1,130 (11%)	10,272 (100%)
Auto Passenger	680 (18%)	2,233 (58%)	721 (19%)	204 (5%)	3,838 (100%)
Walk	753 (11%)	5,731 (87%)	66 (1%)	13 (0%)	6,563 (100%)
Cycle	85 (37%)	144 (63%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	229 (100%)
Other	39 (60%)	13 (20%)	13 (20%)	0 (0%)	65 (100%)
Total	5,009 (20%)	11,390 (45%)	7,512 (30%)	1426 (6%)	25,337 (100%)

Source: 2001 Transportation Tomorrow Survey (6:00 – 9:00 AM)

Table 4 shows trip purpose to and from the study area. Almost 70% of transit trips and auto driver trips originating from the study area and destined to locations outside the study area are work trips.

Table 4: Trip Purpose by Mode – From/To Study Area (AM Peak Period)

	From Study Area to External					From External to Study Area				
	Home-Based Work	Home-Based School	Home-Based Other	Non Home-Based	Total	Home-Based Work	Home-Based School	Home-Based Other	Non Home-Based	Total
Transit	18,217 (69%)	6,653 (25%)	907 (3%)	493 (2%)	26,270 (100%)	2,545 (43%)	2,856 (49%)	373 (6%)	96 (2%)	5,870 (100%)
School Bus	0 (0%)	329 (92%)	0 (0%)	29 (8%)	358 (100%)	0 (0%)	511 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	511 (100%)
Auto Driver	23,897 (69%)	826 (2%)	5,957 (17%)	4,067 (12%)	34,747 (100%)	10,419 (58%)	565 (3%)	4,667 (26%)	2,388 (13%)	18,039 (100%)
Auto Passenger	4,335 (60%)	1,751 (24%)	729 (10%)	468 (6%)	7,283 (100%)	1,427 (40%)	1,389 (38%)	427 (12%)	365 (10%)	3,608 (100%)
Walk	174 (15%)	938 (81%)	22 (2%)	28 (2%)	1,162 (100%)	190 (27%)	524 (73%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	714 (100%)
Cycle	497 (86%)	60 (10%)	0 (0%)	21 (4%)	578 (100%)	43 (67%)	0 (0%)	21 (33%)	0 (0%)	64 (100%)
Other	140 (60%)	26 (11%)	51 (22%)	17 (7%)	234 (100%)	13 (46%)	0 (0%)	15 (54%)	0 (0%)	28 (100%)
Total	47,260 (67%)	10,583 (15%)	7,666 (11%)	5,123 (7%)	70,632 (100%)	14,637 (51%)	5,845 (20%)	5,503 (19%)	2,849 (10%)	28,834 (100%)

Source: 2001 Transportation Tomorrow Survey (6:00 – 9:00 AM)

2.1.3 Select Link Analysis

A select link analysis was done for Kingston Road within the study area using 2001 TTS 1-hour auto driver trips assigned to the base 2001 EMME/2 network. A select link analysis shows how many auto trips use a section of Kingston Road within the study area for at least

part of the total trips. It identifies if these trips are passing through the study area, internal trips, or trips starting or ending in the study area. The results are shown in Table 5 and illustrated in Exhibits 6 and 7. Assignment results show that 31% of auto trips travelling on Kingston Road consist of through trips, meaning that their origins and destinations fall outside the study area. Thirteen percent of auto trips on Kingston Road are from internal trips. The remaining 56% of the trips on Kingston Road either start or end in the study area.

Of the auto trips originating in the study area and travelling on Kingston Road, most are destined to areas within the study area (27%), Downtown (26%) and the east part of Scarborough (7%) as illustrated in Exhibit 6. Exhibit 7 shows that the majority of external trips on Kingston Road travelling through the study area are coming from the east part of Scarborough (28%) and Durham Region (38%). The main destination for these trips is downtown Toronto (56%) and areas around the study area (24%).

Table 5: Kingston Road – Select Link Analysis (AM Peak Hour)

Origins	Destinations			Percentage		
	External	Study Area	Total	External	Study Area	Total
External	2,817	1,717	4,534	31%	19%	50%
Study Area	3,278	1,194	4,472	37%	13%	50%
Total	6,095	2,911	9,006	68%	32%	100%

Source: 2001 TTS AM peak hour auto assignment

2.1.4 Select Line Analysis

A select line analysis was done for the TTC 34 Eglinton bus route using 2001 TTS 3-hour transit trips assigned to the 2001 EMME/2 transit network. A select line analysis indicates how many transit trips use the 34 Eglinton route for at least part of the total trips. It identifies if any of these trips are internal trips or trips starting or ending in the study area. External trips do not necessarily pass through the study area, since the select line analysis was done for the entire 34 Eglinton route, which includes sections outside the study area.

Results show that the majority of passengers on the Eglinton route (71%) are either passing through the study area or travelling outside the study area, as shown in Table 6. Only 3% of passengers using the Eglinton route are internal trips. The remaining 26% of the transit trips on the Eglinton route either start or end in the study area, with the majority (22%) originating in the study area.

Table 6: TTC 34 Eglinton Line – Select Line Analysis (AM Peak Period)

Origins	Destinations			Percentage		
	External	Study Area	Total	External	Study Area	Total
External	4,715	231	4,946	71%	4%	75%
Study Area	1,451	230	1,680	22%	3%	25%
Total	6,166	2,911	6,626	93%	7%	100%

Source: 2001 TTS AM peak period (3-hr) transit assignment

A select line analysis was also done for the GO Rail Lake Shore East and Stouffville lines. There are four GO stations within the study area, Danforth Station, Scarborough Station, and Kennedy Station on the Lake Shore East line and the Eglinton Station on the Stouffville line. Table 7 shows 16% of the passengers on both GO train lines in the AM peak period are either originating from (15%) or destined to the study area.

Table 7: GO Rail Lake Shore East and Stouffville Lines – Select Line

From/To	Trips			Percentage		
	External	Study Area	Total	External	Study Area	Total
External	18,332	273	18,604	84%	1%	85%
Study Area	3,194	-	3,194	15%	-	15%
Total	21,525	273	21,798	99%	1%	100%

Source: 2001 TTS AM peak period (3-hr) transit assignment

3 Screenline Analysis

Screenline analysis examines the total number of trips on roads crossing a defined linear boundary, referred to as a screenline.

Screenlines used for analysis were:

- (1) west of Scarborough Golf Club Road (CN Tracks to Hill Cr.)
- (2) west of Kennedy Road (Eglinton Avenue to Kingston Road)
- (3) west of Victoria Park Avenue (Eglinton Avenue to Queen Street)
- (4) west of Woodbine Avenue (O'Connor Drive to Lake Shore Boulevard)
- (5) south of Danforth Avenue (Birchmount to Woodbine)

Table 8 shows the comparison between base year (2001) model simulated auto volumes (GTA Model) and 2001 observed auto volumes (from turning movement counts and 24-hr traffic counts) as well as 2001 TTS volumes crossing the screenlines.

In the westbound direction, GTA Model auto driver volumes are within +/- 17% of observed counts crossing the screenlines. However, in the eastbound (off-peak) direction the GTA Model is under-simulating auto volumes significantly by -15% to -49%. The GTA Model is under-simulating auto volumes crossing the screenline in the northbound (off-peak) direction by -32% and over-simulating by +14% in the southbound direction. Therefore, the model is performing well in the peak direction.

Since the GTA model has been calibrated to 2001 TTS data, when comparing 2001 simulated to a 2001 TTS assignment crossing the screenlines, the difference is within +11% in the westbound direction, +14% in the eastbound direction, +5% in the northbound direction and +12% in the southbound direction. Therefore, based on this analysis, the model is calibrated (adjusted for accuracy) within expected tolerances for analysis at a screenline level.

Table 8: Auto Travel Screenlines Analysis – (AM Peak Hour)

Screenline	Location	2001 Observed AM Peak Hour ¹	2001 TTS ²	GTA Model ³	2001 Observed AM Peak Hour ¹	2001 TTS ²	GTA Model ³
		Westbound			Eastbound		
West of Scarborough Golf Club Rd							
	Kingston Rd.	3,270	2,597	2,730	1,091	857	829
	Total	3,270	2,597	2,730	1,085	857	829
2001 Simulated/2001 Counts				0.83			
2001 Simulated/TTS				1.05	0.76		
West of Markham Rd							
	Lawrence Ave. E	1,652	1,911	2,001	510	208	232
	Eglinton Ave.	1,715	1,401	1,404	574	364	431
	Kingston Rd.	2,785	1,845	2,102	966	539	512
	Total	6,572	5,157	5,507	2,325	1,111	1,175
2001 Simulated/2001 Counts				0.87	0.51		
2001 Simulated/TTS				1.07	1.06		
West of Kennedy Rd							
	Eglinton Ave.	2,266	1,642	1,656	907	444	474
	St. Clair Ave. E	1,690	1,374	1,492	762	409	427
	Danforth Rd.	951	1,335	1,519	555	638	778
	Highview Ave.		45	228		6	7
	Danforth Ave.	1,198	798	869	369	225	172
	Kingston Rd.	1,270	1,320	1,388	547	436	491
	Total	7,375	6,514	7,152	2,140	2,158	2,349
2001 Simulated/2001 Counts				0.97	0.75		
2001 Simulated/TTS				1.10	1.09		
West of Victoria Park Ave.							
	Eglinton Ave.	1,932	1,780	1,823	1,785	810	929
	O'Connor Dr.	956	1,060	1,292	595	897	877
	Sunrise Ave.	96	62	152	118	41	56
	St. Clair Ave. E	1,588	999	1,113	712	765	747
	Dawes Rd.	605	105	192	405	148	204
	Danforth Rd.	900	1,513	1,631	521	695	818
	Gerrard. St.	1,031	903	996	945	190	218
	Kingston Rd.	1,521	1,310	1,233	746	541	652
	Queen St. E	478	636	805	389	247	151
	Total	9,637	8,368	9,238	6,717	4,334	4,652
2001 Simulated/2001 Counts				0.96	0.69		
2001 Simulated/TTS				1.10	1.07		
West of Woodbine Ave.							
	O'Connor Dr.	1,551	1,282	1,382	800	716	714
	Cosburn Ave.	549	360	371	245	14	13
	Lumsden Ave.	690	646	694	250	95	42
	Danforth Ave.	1,294	1,277	1,326	613	697	754
	Gerrard. St.	832	903	841	282	39	119

Screenline	Location	2001 Observed AM Peak Hour ¹	2001 TTS ²	GTA Model ³	2001 Observed AM Peak Hour ¹	2001 TTS ²	GTA Model ³
		Westbound			Eastbound		
	Kingston Rd.	1,197	1,518	1,271	498	457	582
	Queen St. E	677	893	1,030	274	14	27
	Lake Shore Blvd	1,716	1,552	1,546	479	173	262
	Total	8,655	8,431	8,395	3,550	2,205	2,513
2001 Simulated/2001 Counts				0.98	0.71		
2001 Simulated/TTS				1.00	1.14		
		Northbound			Southbound		
South of Danforth Ave. (Birchmount to Woodbine)							
	Woodbine Ave.	618	454	672	613	1,235	1,198
	Main St.	576	489	477	464	482	537
	Victoria Park Ave.	585	443	487	545	557	668
	Warden Ave./Hollis Ave.	805	371	329	858	689	876
	Birchmount Rd.	350	426	303	268	341	270
	Total	3,346	2,183	2,268	3,120	3,307	3,549
2001 Simulated/2001 Counts				0.68	1.14		
2001 Simulated/TTS				1.04	1.07		

Notes: ¹ City of Toronto Turning Movement Counts and 24-HR Counts - Auto Only (1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002)

² 2001 TTS AM Peak hour Auto Driver Trips

³ GTA Model - 2001 Simulated AM Peak Hour Roads that are not included in the GTA model are hidden in the table but are included in the Totals.

Table 9 summarizes person travel crossing the screenlines.

Table 9: Person Travel Screenline Analysis (AM Peak Hour)

Screenline	Mode	Westbound	Percent	Eastbound	Percent
West of Scarborough Golf Club Road					
	Auto ¹	3,221	30%	978	64%
	TTC ²	3,341	32%	521	34%
	GO Rail/Bus ²	4,015	38%	36	2%
	Total	6,562	100%	1,499	100%
West of Markham Road					
	Auto ¹	6,498	43%	1,387	66%
	TTC ²	4,501	30%	675	32%
	GO Rail/Bus ²	4,015	27%	36	2%
	Total	15,014	100%	2,098	100%
West of Kennedy Road					
	Auto ¹	8,439	53%	2,772	77%
	TTC ²	2,053	13%	746	21%
	GO Rail/Bus ²	5,526	34%	78	2%
	Total	16,018	100%	3,596	100%
West of Victoria Park Avenue					
	Auto ¹	10,901	32%	5,489	55%
	TTC ²	17,339	52%	4,337	44%

	GO Rail/Bus ²	5,526	16%	78	1%
	Total	33,766	100%	9,904	100%
West of Woodbine Avenue					
	Auto ¹	9,984	28%	2,965	42%
	TTC ²	20,644	57%	3,974	57%
	GO Rail/Bus ²	5,323	15%	82	1%
	Total	35,951	100%	7,021	100%
		Northbound	Percent	Southbound	Percent
South of Danforth Avenue (Birchmount to Woodbine)					
	Auto ¹	2,676	69%	4,188	85%
	TTC ²	1,187	31%	763	15%
	GO Rail/Bus ²	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	3,863	100%	5,226	100%

Notes: ¹ – GTA Model – 2001 Simulated AM Peak Hour (Auto driver and auto passenger)

² – GTA Model – 2001 Simulated AM Peak Hour

4 Land Use

Traffic zone level 2001 population and employment are illustrated in Exhibits 6 and 7 respectively. Table 10 shows existing and predicted population and employment for the study area.

Table 10: Study Area Population and Employment (based on projections developed for the City of Toronto Official Plan)

	Study Area Population	Study Area Employment	Toronto Population	Toronto Employment
2001	201,400 (8%)*	48,230 (3%)*	2,450,700	1,453,600
2021	222,700 (8%)*	56,830 (2%)*	2,827,700	1,753,900
Growth	21,300 (10%)	8,600 (18%)	377,000 (15%)	300,300 (21%)

Source: City of Toronto. Flashforward: Projecting Population and Employment to 2031 in a Mature Urban Area, June 2002, Official Plan, City Planning

Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation Land Use Forecast

* Percentage of City of Toronto Total Population and Employment

5 Screenline Forecasts

2021 land use and planned road and transit network changes were used for the GTA Model 2021 simulation. The critical screenlines are west of Scarborough Golf Club Road and west of Woodbine Avenue in the westbound direction. All numbers represent AM peak hour auto and person trip volumes.

Table 11: Auto Travel Screenlines Analysis

Screenline	Location	Capacity	2001 ¹	v/c	2021 ¹	v/c	2001 ¹	v/c	2021 ¹	v/c
			Westbound				Eastbound			
West of Scarborough Golf Club Rd										
	Kingston Rd.	2,400	2,730	1.14	3,040	1.27	829	0.35	1,304	0.54
	Total	2,400	2,730	1.14	3,040	1.27	829	0.35	1,304	0.54
West of Markham Rd										
	Lawrence Ave. E	2,400	2,001	0.83	2,300	0.96	232	0.10	253	0.11
	Eglinton Ave.	2,400	1,404	0.59	1,713	0.71	431	0.18	633	0.26
	Kingston Rd.	2,400	2,102	0.88	2,342	0.98	512	0.21	734	0.31
	Total	7,200	5,507	0.76	6,355	0.88	1,175	0.16	1,620	0.23
West of Kennedy Rd										
	Eglinton Ave.	2,400	1,656	0.69	1,829	0.76	474	0.20	646	0.27
	St. Clair Ave. E	1,600	1,492	0.93	1,605	1.00	427	0.27	475	0.30
	Danforth Rd.	1,400	1,519	1.09	1,693	1.21	778	0.56	900	0.64
	Highview Ave.	1,000	228	0.23	675	0.68	7	0.01	7	0.01
	Danforth Ave.	1,400	869	0.54	996	0.71	172	0.12	252	0.18
	Kingston Rd.	1,600	1,388	0.87	1,296	0.81	491	0.31	769	0.48
	Total	9,400	7,152	0.76	8,094	0.86	2,349	0.25	3,049	0.32
West of Victoria Park Ave.										
	Eglinton Ave.	2,400	1,823	0.76	2,041	0.85	929	0.39	920	0.38
	O'Connor Dr.	1,400	1,292	0.92	1,337	0.96	877	0.63	948	0.68
	Sunrise Ave.	1,000	152	0.15	196	0.20	56	0.06	69	0.07
	St. Clair Ave. E	1,000	1,113	1.11	1,178	1.18	747	0.75	774	0.77
	Dawes Rd.	500	192	0.38	256	0.51	204	0.41	233	0.47
	Danforth Rd.	1,000	1,631	1.63	1,825	1.83	818	0.82	965	0.97
	Gerrard St.	1,000	996	1.00	1,206	1.21	218	0.22	347	0.35
	Kingston Rd.	1,000	1,233	1.23	1,400	1.40	652	0.65	845	0.85
	Queen St. E	1,000	805	0.81	884	0.88	151	0.15	160	0.16
	Total	10,800	9,238	0.75	10,364	0.84	4,652	0.38	5,261	0.42
West of Woodbine Ave.										
	O'Connor Dr.	1,400	1,382	0.99	1,451	1.04	714	0.51	762	0.54

Screenline	Location	Capacity	2001 ¹	v/c	2021 ¹	v/c	2001 ¹	v/c	2021 ¹	v/c
			Westbound				Eastbound			
	Cosburn Ave.	500	371	0.74	431	0.86	13	0.03	29	0.06
	Lumsden Ave.	1,000	694	0.69	832	0.83	42	0.04	67	0.07
	Danforth Ave.	1,400	1,326	0.95	1,601	1.14	754	0.54	821	0.59
	Gerrard St.	1,000	841	0.84	954	0.95	119	0.12	146	0.15
	Kingston Rd.	1,000	1,271	1.27	1,379	1.38	582	0.58	628	0.63
	Queen St. E	1,000	1,030	1.03	1,098	1.10	27	0.03	84	0.08
	Lake Shore Blvd	1,600	1,546	0.97	1,752	1.10	262	0.16	575	0.36
	Total	7,300	8,461	0.95	9,498	1.07	2,513	0.34	3,112	0.35
			Northbound				Southbound			
South of Danforth Ave. (Birchmount Woodbine)										
	Woodbine Ave.	1,400	672	0.48	839	0.60	1,198	0.86	1,292	0.92
	Main St.	1,000	477	0.48	566	0.57	537	0.54	622	0.62
	Victoria Park Ave.	1,000	487	0.49	542	0.54	668	0.67	775	0.78
	Warden Ave./Hollis Ave.	1,200	329	0.27	484	0.40	876	0.73	1,108	0.92
	Birchmount Rd.	1,400	303	0.22	322	0.23	270	0.19	484	0.35
	Total	6,000	2,268	0.40	2,753	0.48	3,549	0.62	4,281	0.75

Notes: ¹ GTA Model - 2001 and 2021 Simulated AM Peak Hour

Roads that are not part of the GTA model network are hidden in the table but are included in the Totals

Table 12: Person Travel Screenline Analysis

2021 Person Travel					
Screenline	Mode	Westbound	Percent	Eastbound	Percent
West of Scarborough Golf Club Road					
	Auto ¹	3,587	19%	1,539	70%
	TTC ²	3,930	21%	609	28%
	GO Rail/Bus ²	11,295	60%	51	2%
	Total	18,812	100%	2,148	100%
West of Markham Road					
	Auto ¹	7,499	31%	1,912	69%
	TTC ²	5,218	22%	798	29%
	GO Rail/Bus ²	11,295	47%	51	2%
	Total	24,012	100%	2,761	100%
West of Kennedy Road					
	Auto ¹	9,551	36%	3,598	79%
	TTC ²	2,315	9%	873	19%
	GO Rail/Bus ²	14,499	55%	95	2%
	Total	26,365	100%	4,566	100%
West of Victoria Park Avenue					
	Auto ¹	12,230	26%	6,208	55%
	TTC ²	20,027	43%	4,897	44%
	GO Rail/Bus ²	14,499	31%	95	1%
	Total	46,756	100%	11,200	100%
West of Woodbine Avenue					
	Auto ¹	11,208	23%	3,672	43%
	TTC ²	24,049	49%	4,843	56%
	GO Rail/Bus ²	13,998	28%	107	1%
	Total	49,255	100%	8,622	100%
		Northbound	Percent	Southbound	Percent
South of Danforth Avenue (Birchmount to Woodbine)					
	Auto ¹	3,249	73%	5,052	86%
	TTC ²	1,213	27%	824	14%
	GO Rail/Bus ²	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	4,462	100%	5,876	100%

Notes: ¹ Auto person trips - 2001 Simulated auto driver trips x 1.18 (AM Peak Hour)


² GTA Model – 2001 Simulated AM Peak Period (3hrs) * 0.5 to convert to peak hour


Table 13 shows the anticipated person travel growth crossing the screenlines from 2001 to 2021. Major growth is expected west of Markham Road and west of Kennedy Road. Significant growth is expected in the central part of the corridor that cannot be accommodated by auto travel. Therefore, a shift to transit and other modes of travel are needed.

Table 13: Person Travel Screenline Growth (2001 to 2021)

		Westbound		Eastbound	
Screenline	Mode	Growth	Growth%	Growth	Growth%
West of Scarborough Golf Club Rd					
	Auto	366	11%	561	57%
	TTC	589	18%	88	17%
	GO Rail/Bus	7,280	181%	15	42%
	Total	8,235	78%	664	43%
West of Markham Rd					
	Auto	1,001	15%	525	38%
	TTC	717	16%	123	18%
	GO Rail/Bus	7,280	181%	15	42%
	Total	8,998	60%	663	32%
West of Kennedy Rd					
	Auto	1,112	13%	826	30%
	TTC	262	13%	127	17%
	GO Rail/Bus	8,973	162%	17	22%
	Total	10,347	65%	970	27%
West of Victoria Park Ave.					
	Auto	1,329	12%	719	13%
	TTC	2,688	16%	560	13%
	GO Rail/Bus	8,973	162%	17	22%
	Total	12,990	38%	1,296	13%
West of Woodbine Ave.					
	Auto	1,224	12%	707	24%
	TTC	3,405	16%	869	22%
	GO Rail/Bus	8,675	163%	25	30%
	Total	13,304	37%	1,601	23%
		Northbound		Southbound	
South of Danforth Ave. (Birchmount to Woodbine)					
	Auto	573	21%	864	21%
	TTC	26	2%	61	8%
	GO Rail/Bus	-	-	-	-
	Total	599	16%	925	19%


Source: GTA Model – 2001 Simulated AM Peak Period (3hrs)





Source: 2001 Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS)
AM Peak Period - 6:00 to 9:00





Study Area (SA)
 TTS Traffic Zone (TZ)

Trips from TZ Destined to SA (9,700)

- 1 to 100
- 100 to 250
- 250 to 500

1%

1%

2%

25%

7%


9.0%

11%

40%


3%

1%



Source: 2001 Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS)
 AM Peak Period - 6:00 to 9:00






Study Area (SA)
 TTS Traffic Zone (TZ)

Trips from TZ Destined to SA (28,300)


	1 to 100
	100 to 250
	250 to 500
	500 to 750
	750 to 1,000






Source: 2001 TTS Auto Assignment - AM Peak Hour (Trips using Kingston Road within Study Area)






Source: 2001 TTS Auto Assignment - AM Peak Hour (Trips using Kingston Road within Study Area)





Source: City of Toronto. Flashforward: Projecting Population and Employment to 2031 in a Mature Urban Area, June 2002, Official Plan, City Planning






Study Area

Employment

- 1 to 1,000
- 1,000 to 5,000
- 5,000 to 10,000
- 10,000 to 20,000
- 20,000 to 30,000
- 40,000 to 50,000


Source: City of Toronto. Flashforward: Projecting Population and Employment to 2031 in a Mature Urban Area, June 2002, Official Plan, City Planning





Source: City of Toronto. Flashforward: Projecting Population and Employment to 2031 in a Mature Urban Area, June 2002, Official Plan, City Planning
 Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation Land Use Forecast





Source: City of Toronto. Flashforward: Projecting Population and Employment to 2031 in a Mature Urban Area, June 2002, Official Plan, City Planning
 Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation Land Use Forecast



TABLES

Table SD-1: Existing & Future Conditions - Data Sources

Table SD-2: Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for Assessing Alternatives

Table SD-3: Potential Environmental Effects

Table SD-1: Existing & Future Conditions – Data Sources*

CATEGORY	DATA	SOURCE
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory of existing transit routes, operating characteristics, peak hour headways, and passenger demand Projected future service levels and demand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) GO Transit
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory existing road network (volumes, collisions #'s, signal timings) Projected travel demand forecasts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Toronto
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other planned road and transit projects in the study area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Toronto TTC Ministry of Transportation
Planning and Policy Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Toronto and TTC policy documents (OP, TTC Ridership Growth Strategy, Building a Transit City) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Toronto TTC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inter-regional transit initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Transportation GO Transit
Socio-Economic/Cultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify socio-economic characteristics of communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Toronto
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory of community facilities (Schools, places of worship, parks arenas, community centers, and libraries) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Toronto
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing and future land use and development patterns Land use policies and pattern 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Toronto Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC) Other landowners
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory of historical and architectural features 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Toronto Ministry of Culture TRCA ORC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory of archaeological sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto & Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) Ministry of Culture ORC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory of existing noise and vibration receptors Baseline noise and vibration levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of the Environment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory of utilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Toronto Utility Companies

Table SD-1: Existing & Future Conditions – Data Sources*

CATEGORY	DATA	SOURCE
Natural Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory aquatic habitats and species • Inventory wildlife habitats • Inventory of species at risk, endangered and threatened species • Inventory of oil and gas hazards or petroleum resource operations • Geographic extent, composition, structure and function of vegetation communities • Inventory of fill regulated areas, fill extension areas, ravine protected areas, and valley corridors • Inventory of ESA's, Wetlands, and ANSI's • Inventory of watercourses • Inventory of regional storm flood plains, and stream corridors • Water and air quality measurements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toronto & Region Conservation Authority • Ministry of Natural Resources • City of Toronto • Ministry of the Environment • Environment Canada (i.e., web based range maps for species at risk)

Note: * Listed data sources exclude actual field surveys and inventories to be carried out as required by the Proponents

Table SD-2: Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for Assessing Alternatives

CATEGORY	CRITERION	MEASURES (The potential, or degree to which the alternative...)
Transportation (Transit)	Ability to accommodate demand and attract new riders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets existing and forecast transit demands to 2021 • Maximizes share of trips by transit (i.e. new transit riders)
	Reliability/ quality of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximizes uniformity of spacing between vehicles • Provides consistency in day-to-day trip times • Minimizes number of transfers for majority of travelers
	Transit accessibility and passenger comfort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for adequate/safe passenger waiting facilities • Minimizes walking distances to access stop locations • Maximizes population and employment within 500 m of transit service
	Vehicle Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optimizes number of vehicles required to address demand • Optimizes number of passengers/vehicle
	Transit accessibility for the disabled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for barrier access/design
	Transit service integration/ Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for expansion and staging of transit services • Provides potential connections with other planned services • Provides potential high quality and attractive service connections (e.g. continuity of service to Downtown, availability for express routes, number of transfers, etc.)
	Flexibility and adaptability of transit service to technological change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for future upgrades and/or replacement/conversion
Transportation	Overall person carrying capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximizes number of persons carried per segment of corridor (both transit and automobile – key segments within primary study area)
	Traffic/intersection operations (existing and future demands)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains or improves overall level of service (on road segments and at key intersections) • Minimizes additional delays to traffic in study area (average and/or overall delay) • Maximizes non-auto use (transit, cycling, pedestrian) for trips to and within the study area • Minimizes number of major intersections operating with critical movements (e.g. less than 10 percent of capacity unused) • Maintains connections to adjacent

Table SD-2: Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for Assessing Alternatives

CATEGORY	CRITERION	MEASURES (The potential, or degree to which the alternative...)
		areas/transportation facilities at boundaries of study area
	Corridor traffic operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes adverse effects on overall level of service on parallel routes

Table SD-2: Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for Assessing Alternatives

CATEGORY	CRITERION	MEASURES (The potential, or degree to which the alternative...)
Transportation	Overall person carrying capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximizes number of persons carried per segment of corridor (both transit and automobile – key segments within primary study area)
	Traffic/intersection operations (existing and future demands)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains or improves overall level of service (on road segments and at key intersections) Minimizes additional delays to traffic in primary study area (average and/or overall delay) Maximizes non-auto use (transit, cycling, pedestrian) for trips to and within the study area Minimizes number of major intersections operating with critical movements (e.g. less than 10 percent of capacity unused) Maintains connections to adjacent areas/transportation facilities at boundaries of study area
	Corridor traffic operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimizes adverse effects on overall level of service on parallel routes
	Effects on neighbourhood traffic volumes and access (existing and future demands)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides for local road access (residents, businesses, visitors) Minimizes adverse effects of traffic volumes in the corridor, and on local streets (compared to existing conditions and expected future conditions with 'do nothing') Minimizes through auto travel on local roads Maximizes number of full-moves accesses into and out of neighbourhoods Minimizes traffic activity patterns in sensitive areas (schools, daycares, seniors residences)
	Emergency vehicle operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimizes delays in emergency vehicle access into neighbourhoods Minimizes delays to emergency vehicle access on primary routes
	Safety (conflicts between vehicles, passengers, pedestrians, cyclists)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximizes opportunities for safety measures to minimize collisions and potential conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists
	Pedestrian accessibility, comfort, safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximize locations to provides minimum acceptable sidewalk widths Minimizes changes in intersection crossing times Minimizes changes in intersection waiting times Minimizes changes to cross-street access at non-signalized intersections Minimize adverse effects on cross-street access (grade differences at stop locations)

Table SD-2: Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for Assessing Alternatives

CATEGORY	CRITERION	MEASURES (The potential, or degree to which the alternative...)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimize adverse effects on transit accessibility (median islands, stop locations)

Table SD-2: Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for Assessing Alternatives

CATEGORY	CRITERION	MEASURES (The potential, or degree to which the alternative...)
Transportation	Cyclist accessibility, comfort, safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximizes opportunities to improve existing situation (ability to provide for bike lanes) • Provides for enhanced bike lane/path crossings • Provides opportunities to provide cycling storage
	Construction feasibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximizes construction feasibility (minimizes construction constraints, complexity)
	Ability to maintain transportation facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides ease of maintenance (snow removal, minor repairs)
Planning and Policy Context	Support of Official Plan and other government policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the Official Plan policies regarding transportation/land use, enhanced public realm, protection of the natural environment and natural heritage system • Is consistent with Waterfront Transit plans • Supports City and TTC standards/specifications for transportation facility planning and design • Consistent with applicable provincial legislation and guidelines
	Effects on redevelopment potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximizes development potential and opportunities relative to baseline scenario, up to 2021 horizon
	Support of community planning initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximizes potential to improve public spaces • Maximizes potential to improve personal safety
	Ability to meet Urban Design objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides potential for sidewalk enhancement/improvements, including sustainable landscaping/tree planting opportunities • Provides potential for new or enhanced public spaces and public art opportunities
Socio-Economic	Effects on property and business access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes physical effects on residential and commercial property • Maximizes community access (for residents, and businesses) • Maintains existing on-street parking and loading (where permitted) • Maintains permitted turning movements on access routes • Maximizes delivery and loading access (# of businesses affected)
	Parking availability in commercial/retail areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affects net change in number of on-street parking spaces, by section • Affects opportunity to create off-street parking by section

Table SD-2: Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for Assessing Alternatives

CATEGORY	CRITERION	MEASURES (The potential, or degree to which the alternative...)
Socio-Economic	Economic effects on adjacent businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports existing and potential business activity (where permitted) and employment based on changes to vehicular access parking supply, left turn access, loading access) • Supports sidewalk commercial activities (where applicable) • Maximizes business attractiveness due to improved streetscape
	Economic effects on residential property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affects assessment value (limited by data availability) comparing short, medium and long-term timeframes
	Noise impacts (after construction)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes adverse effects on ambient noise levels (after construction) as per MOE criteria
	Access to community services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximizes access of existing public institutional, cultural and recreational facilities and services (e.g. Community Centre. Parks and Open Spaces)
	Effects during construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes noise, dust and vibration levels
	Effect on built heritage, cultural and archeological features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes number of heritage features affected (i.e. level of irreversibility, severity and duration of effect) • Provides opportunities to enhance built heritage and cultural features
Natural Environment	Air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes adverse effects on air quality • Minimizes potential vehicle exhaust emissions and the relative impact of the emissions that contribute to climate change • Maximizes opportunities to reduce harmful emissions
	Natural habitats (plants & animals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes adverse effects on local natural environment (vegetation, terrestrial and aquatic habitat) • Maximize enhancement/restoration of habitats or opportunities for stewardship and natural environment improvements
	Stormwater management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximizes potential for stormwater management facilities • Minimizes adverse effects to existing stormwater facilities • Maximizes ability of soil to allow for stormwater infiltration
Costs	Effects on City/TTC budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizes construction costs and costs for vehicle acquisition and vehicle maintenance facilities • Minimizes capital and operating and costs over a 20 year lifecycle • Minimizes additional utility costs (upgrading,

Table SD-2: Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for Assessing Alternatives

CATEGORY	CRITERION	MEASURES (The potential, or degree to which the alternative...)
		relocation, etc.)
	Cost effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minimizes increase in operating costs from existing• Minimizes cost per new rider

Table SD-3: Potential Environmental Effects

AREA OF CONCERN	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
Impacts during Operation and Maintenance	
Built Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical impact of alignment and stations on existing land uses • Property requirements outside of ROW • Conflicts with utilities
Visual (streetscape)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes brought on about construction of the undertaking can either enhance or impair the visual setting (Streetscape) of the community
Community Cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on stable residential neighbourhoods
Heritage and Archaeological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disturbance of heritage and archaeological resources
Natural Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct or indirect impacts (intrusion, noise, vibration, sediments, and contaminates) on vegetation, wetlands and wetland functions • Impacts on watercourse crossings, erosion, sedimentation, drainage patterns, and water quality • Changes to hydraulic characteristics of watercourses, such as flooding • Potential impacts on geology and soils • Potential erosion of exposed slopes • Potential impacts on ecosystem functions/ lost ecosystem functions • Potential impacts of the introduction of invasive species • Direct or indirect impacts on species at risk • Direct or indirect impacts on wildlife habitat • Direct or indirect impacts on endangered and threatened species • Direct or indirect impact on wildlife travel corridors • Impacts on migratory birds
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impact of undertaking using commuter facilities
Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impact of undertaking using commuter facilities
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Localized impacts due to vehicles using commuter facilities • Reduced auto vehicles use and greenhouse gases through potential reduction in auto traffic and increased transit use
Construction Impacts	
Road Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disruption of traffic operation (transit, private automobile, and delivery trucks) due to road and lane closures and temporary detours • Impacts to emergency vehicle response routes and times
Pedestrian Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on pedestrian access, circulation and safety
Building Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential vibration and settlement impacts on structures due to construction activities
Noise and Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise and vibrations due to the operation of construction equipment
Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentials damage and/or disruption due to construction activities

AREA OF CONCERN	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dust emissions due to construction activities• Vehicle exhaust emissions• Emissions from asphalt batching and paving
Natural Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All applicable potential impacts from list above, Overall Impacts – Natural Environment)
Business Disruptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Modified vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation patterns• Reduce on –street parking• Temporary inconvenience patrons due to construction, debris, noise and dust

PUBLIC CONSULTATION PLAN
AND COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

KINGSTON ROAD TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PUBLIC CONSULTATION PLAN & COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

Introduction

The Public Consultation Plan is an overview of the consultation goals, process, and requirements to effectively gather and report on broad stakeholder input concerning improvements to transit services along Kingston Road. This plan also includes a comprehensive Communications strategy to realize these Consultation goals.

Background

The City of Toronto and the TTC are initiating an individual Environmental Assessment (EA) to study transit improvements on Kingston Road between Victoria Park Avenue and Eglinton Avenue to support existing and future transportation demands. Ultimately, the EA will identify a preferred approach to providing reliable and efficient transit service to serve the communities along the corridor. This section of Kingston Road is identified on Map 4 of the City's Official Plan as a "Higher Order Transit Corridor", Map 5 as a Surface Transit Priority Network, and is also identified as part of the City/TTC Building a Transit City strategy.

Various projects are being undertaken to improve the connectivity of the transit network/system across the entire City. The aim is to form a continuous transit network linking various parts of the City together. This improved network will provide links and connections to both local transit (TTC) routes and GO Transit's regional system. A key component of this EA will be the integration of services and a direct connection to the downtown core.

Overview of Consultation and Communications Plan

The Consultation Plan is built upon five core values:

- **Personal** - Establish and maintain valuable contact with individuals (e.g. residential and business surveys solicit individual input; sharing this data with the community; tailoring outreach and streamlining information to cater to specific interests of individuals)
- **Pro-active** - Seeking public feedback well in advance of the project will help identify potential problems early on in the process and build trust with the community (e.g. by means of surveys, public meetings, workshop committees, timely and informative newsletters)
- **Focused on Message** - It is very important to stress *why* transit needs to be addressed and what the benefits of transit could be, particularly in the Terms of Reference (ToR) process

- **Focused on Benefits** - Community economic development; overall City commercial growth strategy; improved public transit; service accessibility; environmental/health benefits; consistent with the transit ridership growth policies; better GTA integration
- **Big picture** - It is also very important to stress how this transit EA fits into the broader transit, environmental, economic and development goals of the City, and Province. This serves several purposes:
 - (1) the big picture clarifies for people how their communities have been thoughtfully integrated into a larger planning framework – in this way they don't feel negatively targeted (if they disapprove of the project) and they also gain an appreciation for City-wide planning;
 - (2) an appeal to higher authorities and policy documents also demonstrates and educates people on structures of governance and policy implementation. For example, we will explain how the study must comply with the Provincial Policy Statement, Places to Grow Act, and the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) Growth Plan.

Goals of the Consultation Process

Terms of Reference (ToR) Stage

- Introduce the public and stakeholders to the proposed EA process and ToR for the Environmental Assessment,
- Obtain public and stakeholder input on the ToR, including any recommendations or refinements, and
- Receive feedback from the public and stakeholders on their preferences for being kept informed and involved with the EA process.

Environmental Assessment Stage

- Fulfill public consultation requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act
- Offer flexible and appropriate consultation mechanisms that meet the needs of the different stakeholder groups
- To encourage meaningful and timely public involvement during each phase of the study through the use of appropriate public consultation methods and activities, and
- To ensure opportunities for the public and stakeholders to voice concerns, questions and comments through a variety of methods.

Throughout the process

- Convey the City's desire to improve transit accessibility, convenience and reliability in the Kingston Road corridor.

Implementation: Consultation/Communication Activities

Key Components

1. Maintain strong internal communication

To improve the public relations component of the project, Consultation, Communications and Transportation Planning staff will keep each other informed of project progress and meet regularly to stay updated. Meetings with Councillors in all wards affected by this Transit EA have been organized and their Offices will be kept updated on the project and consultation activities. A Technical Advisory Committee has also been organized and will meet at regular intervals to provide technical guidance and advice, and to ensure coordination of project elements and issues with other planning and infrastructure projects in the City.

2. Frequent updates to City of Toronto Website

- Post project information, status reports, newsletters and meeting notices; incorporate an embedded Comment link, provide links to other related Webpages;
- Linked to a description of the broader City transportation planning picture (map)
- Linked to the City Planning, Transportation Planning, Toronto Official Plan and Mayor's Office webpages on the City's internet site
- The website is already live at:
www.toronto.ca/involved/projects/kingston_road_ea/index.htm
- Project email address: kingstonroadEA@toronto.ca

3. Newsletters

It is anticipated that there will be four Study Newsletters prepared during the EA:

1. Study Initiation – Terms of Reference (prior to PIC #1)
2. Problems and Opportunities and Planning Alternatives (prior to PIC #2)
3. Design Alternatives and Evaluation (prior to PIC #3)
4. Study Completion/Recommendations

The newsletters are expected to give brief highlights of study findings and information on upcoming meetings. They will be mailed out to our mailing list, and posted (in PDF format) on the Project Website. Selected newsletters may also be delivered to households and businesses by postal delivery. Our first newsletter will also include an invitation for anyone to have their names added to the study mailing list.

4. Three Public Open House/Public Information Centres (PICs):

The initial Notice of Study Commencement will be done in April 2007 in combination with the notification of Public Open Houses for the Terms of Reference. The notice will be placed in local newspapers and, possibly, the Toronto Star. This notice is mandatory under the requirements of the EA Act.

Each round of PICs is expected to be held at three locations within the study area on different evenings and in the same week. Notices will be placed in the local newspapers in advance of the meetings as well as on the Project Website. The schedule of the meetings will also be placed on the City's website under the "Public Meetings" and "Get Involved with your city" links.

At each round of PICs, the consultant will prepare a handout package for those in attendance that will contain much of the material on display. The consultant will also prepare a summary of the meeting, from notes compiled by consultant and City/TTC staff attending, after each meeting. This meeting summary will be posted on the Project Website and will be distributed to the mailing list.

5. Advance Information Packages

Information packages will be prepared in advance of each public newspaper notice. These packages will be sent at a minimum to Agency Stakeholders, Councillors, the Strategic Transportation Planning Group (STPG), and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members. The packages will contain a:

- Copy of newspaper notice
- Schedule of ads
- Current Newsletter

The package to STPG and/or Executive Directors/General Managers may also contain a briefing note if significant issues need to be described in more detail.

Special Note: A regular item may be added to the STPG monthly meeting agenda for this project. Project status reports will be prepared and submitted by Rod McPhail, Director of Transportation Planning to these meetings. Display boards or presentation slides to be shown at PICs may also be shown to this group in advance.

6. Community Workshops

In addition to PICs, which provide an opportunity to provide information to a larger community audience, the Project Team also plan to meet with ratepayer and business representatives in a smaller, more focused forum by holding several community workshops. These workshops will provide the opportunity to present and receive input from the community on specific study components or issues, such as the study approach, alternatives, evaluation criteria, and specific design elements like urban design/streetscaping.

The workshops provide for roundtable discussions, and open group dialogue to identify community opinions, preferences and concerns to be considered by the Project Team in the EA. These workshops will occur a few weeks in advance of the PICs in order to allow changes to be made which incorporates input received at the community workshops, before presenting it to the larger community audience.

7. Outreach

Examples of community outreach include:

- Ads in community newspapers: e.g. Scarborough Mirror, Bluffs Monitor;
- Briefing and responding to enquiries by media groups :contextualize issue for reporters BEFORE project implementation
- Make documentation available at local libraries

Additional elements will be identified and developed as the ToR process proceeds.

Stakeholders

These various Stakeholders and agencies can be broken down by interest into smaller sub-groups, as well. These subgroups with particular interests can be consulted separately in workshop meetings.

Internal stakeholders

- City Council
- Mayor Miller
- Local Area Councillors:
 - Councillor Ashton,
 - Councillor Bussin,
 - Councillor Heaps,
 - Councillor Davis,
 - Councillor Ainslie,
 - Councillor De Baeremaeker, and
 - Councillor Thompson
- Strategic Transportation Planning Group (STPG)

External Stakeholders

External Stakeholders can be broken down by interest into smaller sub-groups, as well. These subgroups with particular interests can be consulted separately in workshop meetings.

Business

Residents

Commuters

Transit Advocacy Groups

Environmental agencies/organizations

Other Special Interest Groups

Jurisdiction/Authority	Agency
Federal Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) • Transport Canada • Fisheries and Oceans Canada • Environment Canada • Health Canada • Public Works and Government Service • Indian and Native Affairs Canada
Provincial Ministries & Agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Natural Resources • Ministry of Municipal Affairs • Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal • Ministry of Culture • Ministry of Tourism and Recreation • Ministry of Education • Ministry of Health • Greater Toronto Transportation Authority (GTTA) • Ontario Realty Corporation • Ontario Secretariat of Aboriginal Affairs (and individual First Nations groups)
Other Public Agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toronto District School Board • Toronto Catholic District School Board
Railways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canadian National
Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toronto Hydro • Bell Canada • Enbridge Gas • Rogers Cable Systems • Shaw Communications • Hydro One Networks

KEY TASKS DURING THE TERMS OF REFERENCE STAGE		
Website Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website on “Get Involved” City of Toronto site • Post map and summary of EA from ToR intro 	
Project Email Address	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create email address for correspondence with the public: KingstonRoadEA@toronto.ca Mail to be checked regularly by the Public Consultation Coordinator 	
Notice of Open House Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gets word out as broadly as possible about the EA; • Provides an opportunity for previously unknown stakeholders to identify themselves for the project mailing list; • Provides an opportunity for stakeholders to begin to identify their concerns (through the 24-hour comment line and the public consultation e-mail address provided on the notice). • Meets legislative requirements 	Mid-March 2007

KEY TASKS DURING THE TERMS OF REFERENCE STAGE		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advertisement in major newspapers, local community newspapers • Direct mailing to stakeholders • Web site page on the City's "Get Involved" section to provide background information • Materials delivered to libraries 	
Newsletter 1	Study Initiation – Terms of Reference	April 2007
Public Consultation Training and Information Sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives staff (and Councillors, if they so desire) an opportunity to become familiar with the material and provide knowledgeable answers and feedback to the public prior to Open House or Workshops 	Mid-Late-April 2007
Open Houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides an overview of the Terms of Reference approach and study scope • Provides an opportunity for the public to ask questions, voice concerns, and provide input on the recommended site through comment sheets (distributed at meetings with postage-paid envelopes), e-mails to the public consultation e-mail address, telephone messages to the 24-hour comment line, and through any personal contact between staff and members of the public. • Open House session: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thursday April 19th 2007 - Scarborough Village Arena, 3600 Kingston Rd. - Wednesday April 25th 2007 - Birch Cliff Public School, 1650 Kingston Rd. - Thursday April 26th - Qssis Banquet Hall, 3474 Kingston Road 	Mid-May 2007
Public Consultation Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarises, organises and interprets public input; • Highlights any opportunities to respond to public concerns 	Late Summer/Early Fall 2007

Prepared by: Shiri Pasternak
Public Consultation Coordinator Public Consultation Unit
Policy, Planning, Finance & Administration
(416) 392-6900
spaster2@toronto.ca
www.toronto.ca/involved

Date: May 2007

TERMS OF REFERENCE
CONSULTATION RECORD

**Kingston Road Environmental Assessment
Public Consultation Report on the Draft Terms of Reference
May 2007**

1. Description of Consultation and Communication Activities

The following table provides a description of the consultation and communication activities during the Terms of Reference (ToR) stage of the Study.

TERMS OF REFERENCE STAGE		Timing
January to May 2007		
Website Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website on "Get Involved" City of Toronto site Post map and summary of EA from ToR intro 	Live January 2007
Project Email Address	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create email address for correspondence with the public: KingstonRoadEA@toronto.ca Mail to be checked regularly by the Public Consultation Coordinator (SP) 	Live January 2007
Notice of Public Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gets word out as broadly as possible about the EA; Provides an opportunity for previously unknown stakeholders to identify themselves for the project mailing list; Provides an opportunity for stakeholders to begin to identify their concerns (through the 24-hour comment line and the public consultation e-mail address provided on the notice). Meets legislative requirements 	April 2007
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertisement in local community newspapers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bluffs Monitor and Scarborough Mirror (south section) Beaches Mirror 	April 1st, 2007 April 13th, 2007
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct mailing to stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Around 300 newsletters were sent directly to stakeholders 	Early April 2007
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newsletter drop in study area (57,000) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Canada Post hand-delivered newsletters to all businesses, apartment buildings and houses in the study area 	Early April 2007
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Web site page on the City's "Get Involved" section to provide background information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about the Open Houses posted to site Public Consultation materials posted to site, including a copy of the display boards and comment sheet Copy of the newspaper ad posted to site 	April 2007
Open Houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides an overview of the Terms of Reference approach and study scope; Provides an opportunity for the public to ask questions, voice concerns, and provide input on the recommended site through comment sheets (distributed at meetings with postage-paid envelopes), e-mails to the public consultation e-mail address, telephone messages to the 24-hour comment line, and through any personal contact between staff and members of the public. 	<p>Thurs. April 19th Scarborough Village Arena 6pm – 9pm 3600 Kingston Rd.</p> <p>Wed. April 25th Birch Cliff P.S. 6pm-9pm 1650 Kingston Rd.</p> <p>Thurs. April 26th Ossis Banquet Hall 6pm-9pm 3474 Kingston Road</p>

TERMS OF REFERENCE STAGE		Timing
Public Consultation Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarises, organises and interprets public input; Highlights any opportunities to respond to public concerns; 	Mid-May 2007

2. Summary of Open Houses

In April 2007, three public consultation events were held in Scarborough. The first consultation was held on Thursday, April 19th at the Scarborough Village Arena at 3600 Kingston Rd. The second consultation was held on Wednesday, April 25th at Birch Cliff P.S. at 1650 Kingston Rd. The third consultation was held on Thursday, April 26th at QSSIS Banquet Hall at 3474 Kingston Road. One-hundred-thirty-six people attended the Open Houses in total. As well, an email address and dedicated phone lines were set up so that people could voice their opinions 24-hours a day. Email and phone messages were checked daily and inquiries were responded to within 24-72 hours of receipt, depending on the nature of the comment and the extent of follow-up time that was required.

To inform people about the Kingston Road Transit Improvement EA and the consultations, approximately 57,000 newsletters were delivered through Canada Post to homes, apartments and businesses in the study area. Over 300 newsletters were also mailed directly, addressed personally to Business Improvement Associations (BIAs), Residents' Associations (RAs), and other identified stakeholders. Newspaper ads ran in the Bluffs Monitor (April 1st, 2007), and in the Scarborough Mirror (south section), Beach Metro News (April 11th), and the Beaches Mirror (April 13th) advertising the public consultations.

The format of the public meetings was an Open House, which consisted of having Staff circulating with the public, providing explanations of the display boards, and answering questions. The display boards summarized the Environmental Assessment process, contextualized the project within major municipal and provincial policy documents, and graphically presented the Draft Terms of Reference. The Open Houses were staffed by members of TTC, City Planning Division (Transportation Planning, Community Planning), Transportation Services and Public Consultation. Materials provided at the consultations included a Comment form (see attached), copy of the display boards (see attached), and postage-paid envelopes to return the Comment sheets to the City.

3. Key Issues Raised by Public and Stakeholders

Subject	Summary of Comments	Response
1) Scarborough deserves & desires transit improvements	a) Scarborough has been neglected in terms of public transit for years; many trips are simply impossible to take on public transit; b) An evening and late-night service plan is needed; many people work late, including women and young teenagers, and it is dangerous for them to walk long distances alone in the dark late at night	a) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study b) Comments will be forwarded to TTC and carried forward to EA Study
2) Vehicle Technology	a) A majority of people expressed support for a Streetcar Right-of-Way along Kingston Road; however, some of these same people also felt that certain sections of Kingston Road (west of Birch Cliff) are too narrow for Streetcar Right-of-Ways and that there is a great deal of congestion in these areas already; b) Some people expressed support for buses because (i) they pull into the curb when stopping, therefore they do not take lanes away from car traffic like	a) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study b) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study c) Subway is not an alternative that will be examined during this EA d) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study e) Comments will be carried

Subject	Summary of Comments	Response
	<p>Streetcar Right-of-Ways do; (ii) buses are quieter than streetcars;</p> <p>c) Some people expressed support for building a subway along Kingston Road;</p> <p>d) Some residents expressed support for trolley buses;</p> <p>e) Some people were negative about buses due to pollution;</p> <p>f) Support was expressed for the introduction of new streetcars based on new technologies</p>	<p>forward to EA Study</p> <p>f) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p>
3) Transfer Points	<p>a) As things currently stand, substantial travel-time delays are caused by the need for multiple transit transfers when travelling on Kingston Road;</p> <p>b) Connect with existing bus routes;</p> <p>c) Connect with existing subway routes;</p> <p>d) Connect with GO Station;</p> <p>e) Connect St. Clair and Kingston Road;</p> <p>f) Connect Kingston Road at main Danforth hub;</p> <p>g) Connect at Summerville;</p> <p>h) Connect St. Clair and Kennedy;</p> <p>i) Create "gateway" at Eglinton and Kingston routing streetcars underground to mitigate traffic congestion; design park on surface;</p> <p>j) Service should be provided to schools, Bluffer's Park, Scarborough town.</p>	<p>a) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>b) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>c) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>d) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>e) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>f) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>g) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>h) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>i) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>j) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p>
4) Routing Options	<p>a) A majority of people expressed support for providing a continuous route on Kingston Road, with a connection in the west to the Victoria Park streetcar and to a subway station or GO transit in the east;</p> <p>b) Provide reliable, quick service from Birch Cliff to the zoo;</p> <p>c) Route should mirror existing major arteries;</p> <p>d) Link to Beaches;</p> <p>e) Need to look at extending service beyond Eglinton;</p> <p>f) Streetcar service is needed between Morningside or Port Union, running along Kingston Road to Old City Hall</p>	<p>a) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>b) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>c) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>d) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>e) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>f) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p>
5) Climate Change	<p>a) Vehicle technology should be chosen by virtue of producing fewest emissions;</p> <p>b) Public transit along this corridor would significantly reduce carbon emissions, encouraging people to leave their cars at home and commute using mass transit</p>	<p>a) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p> <p>b) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p>
6) Other Transit Options	<p>a) There were numerous references to continuous bicycle paths and pedestrian walkways as important transit options that must be integrated into the Kingston Road transit improvement plan;</p> <p>b) Specific suggestions for bike lanes included making use of back laneways on the north side of Kingston Road behind the businesses and along the waterfront</p>	<p>a) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study – ToR contains discussion of pedestrian and bike amenities as part of evaluation process</p> <p>b) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study</p>

Subject	Summary of Comments	Response
	in the Cliffside area	
7) Impacts of Construction	Small business owners will suffer from the construction disruptions and loss of on-street parking.	Comments will be carried forward to EA Study
8) Natural Environment	a) Construction on Kingston Road must not harm the Scarborough Bluffs; b) Do not destroy tree plantings in the median running along Kingston Road	a) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study b) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study
9) Evaluation Categories	a) Transit service was considered the most important criteria, while cost considerations were considered the least important; b) Transportation services more generally ranked high, along with community, which were considered important evaluation categories.	a) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study b) Comments will be carried forward to EA Study

4. Summary of Public Response: Questionnaires

A total of 26 questionnaires were returned to the project team.

4.1. *Are there any important considerations that were not mentioned in the Kingston Road study plan?*

Some suggestions of factors to consider in the study plan are: to incorporate geological studies of the Scarborough Bluffs, to incorporate wheelchair accessibility into the study plan, to include considerations of parking along Kingston Road, to incorporate streetscaping improvements, to incorporate safe routes for bikes, and to take into account the changing demographics of Kingston Road, for example, an aging population, when choosing forms of transit.

4.2. *What transportation and/or transit issue(s) are of most concern to you when travelling in the study area?*

Predictability of service and speed of arriving at destinations were mentioned most frequently. Other transit issues of concern to people were convenience and safety for female passengers, over-crowded buses, loss of on-street parking, the provision of pedestrian and bicycle walkways, congestion, and the need for rapid cross-town service.

4.3. *What do you think is important in choosing a preferred mode of transit (e.g. streetcar, bus)?*

Factors identified as most important included noise level, frequency and predictability of service, long term affordability, and ecological considerations. Other factors identified as important included accessibility to the curb (for buses), impacts on traffic flow, community and social environmental sensitivities and available space for operations. There were also suggestions that the types of vehicles chosen could be varied according to ridership throughout the day, for example, having the streetcar size vary to respond to the difference in commuter volumes from morning to night.

4.4. *What do you think is important in choosing a preferred physical configuration (e.g. mixed traffic, reserved transit lanes)?*


Reserved transit lanes were chosen by the greatest number of people as their preferred transit option. People qualified this choice in a variety of ways, for example, believing that it is the most efficient use of space or stipulating that this would only be impossible west of the Birchcliff area, due to the narrowing of the road. The only other preference expressed was for mixed traffic.

4.5. What do you think is most important in choosing a preferred route?

The factors that were identified as most important in choosing a preferred route were convenience; “speedy” access to subways; the least amount of transfer points; maximum number of riders accommodated; speed at arriving at destination; least impact on natural environment near Kingston Road; effectiveness of the route at moving people; ability to move people downtown; and best connections to the subway stations. Connections that people felt were most important were to the subway stations and GO stations.

4.6. Please rank the connection points identified in the order that is important to you. (1 = most important, 4 = least important)

Summary of results: Connections to Main Street and Kingston Road were considered the most important connection points. Eglinton ranked fairly high in importance for some, yet it was also ranked the least important for others by a wide margin. Victoria Park may represent the average in terms of preference.



4.6.b. Can you think of any other connection points that should be considered (e.g. subway or GO station)?


- Provide continuous route on Kingston Road
- Connect with GO Transit
 - “Especially if service increases... to every 15 minutes, I would take this [train] downtown [instead of] B/D subway”
 - “Guildwood GO should be considered eastern terminus for both Kingston Road Eglinton Ave Light Rail/Bus Routes”
 - “Guildwood provides easy access to VIA, GO Trains going east and gives Durham residents access to Scarborough”
 - “Extend east from Eglinton to Guildwood GO Station, even it’s only a rush-hour extension”
- Connect with existing subway routes
 - Fastest route to Kennedy or Warden

- Victoria Park and Main Station are not important connections; Victoria Park and Main Station are too overcrowded already
- Expansion needed for Main and Victoria Park Stations
- Warden and Woodbine → Expansion for Eglinton
- Extend subway line from Sheppard Avenue in both directions to Markham and Islington Avenue to the west, loop back into existing subway system to complete the circle
- Connect with existing bus routes
 - 1b and 2b
 - 502/503 to Victoria Park Station with a branch from Victoria Park
 - Bus route 1b could be linked to Waterfront LRT
 - Bus integration opportunities exist for routes 1 and 1a and 2a
 - Bus connection to Eglinton GO via Kingston Road
- Link to Beaches
- Route should mirror existing major arteries
- St. Clair and Kingston Road
- Main Danforth hub
- Summerville
- St. Clair and Kennedy

Other suggestions in this category included the introduction of an integrated fare system and support for enabling existing connection points (Main St., Victoria Park, TTC) to store bikes, cars, scooters, rollerblade, and walking shoes.

4.7. Please rank the major Evaluation Categories in the order that is important to you. (1 = most important, 6 = least important)

Summary of results: Transit service was considered the most important criteria, while cost considerations were considered the least important. Transportation services more generally ranked high, along with community, which were considered important evaluation categories.



4.8. Please identify any specific criteria that you think should be considered.

Transit Service

- People generally felt that the more convenient the service provided, the more people will use it, and the fewer cars will be on the road. People emphasized that the importance of transit service should not solely be placed on people's ability to commute downtown, but also along Kingston Road within the area.

Transportation Service

- People emphasized the need to reduce people's reliance on cars, for example, proposing the introduction of tolls for people commuting into Toronto.

Natural Environment

- People expressed their preference for the cleanest vehicle operation, with the lowest carbon emissions, to be selected to run on Kingston Road. They were concerned that no negative impacts are felt at the Scarborough Bluffs due to construction. One person was concerned that some green or open space be retained at Kingston Road and Eglinton Avenue.

Community

- People generally felt that consideration needed to be paid to integrating commercial and residential interests on Kingston Road. Noise levels of the transit service should remain low because of the nature of the partially residential corridor. During construction, particular

attention should be paid to the needs of the merchant community based on Kingston Road. The integration of community needs was also proposed in the form of pedestrian-friendly walkways, bike routes and streetscaping.

Economic

- People seem to agree that this project must contribute to the revitalization on Kingston Road, thereby outweighing the inconveniences of construction. Building renewal and transit not exclusively serviced for rush hour were mentioned as examples of good economic development.

Costs


- Opinions varied around costs. Several people felt that this investment will pay off in the long-term, so the City should not “cut corners.” Others felt that the costs must always be kept as low as possible, to maximize the overall value of a new transit system. One person mentioned that it is vital that Toronto secure long-term, on-going funding for this project.

4.9. *Do you have any additional comments?*

Additional comments varied from suggestions about making use of the Lake as a transit option to building a subway corridor along Kingston Road. One person supported the sale of City land for condo development around subway stations and transfer points in order to raise money and increase ridership. Comments were generally very positive about the consultation process and about the prospect of improved transit in Scarborough.

PRELIMINARY
PROJECT SCHEDULE

KINGSTON ROAD TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT - PRELIMINARY SCHEDULE



Project: Project plan Kingston EA 2006
Date: Mon 05/28/07

Task		Progress		Summary		External Tasks		Deadline	
Split		Milestone		Project Summary		External Milestone			