












ALTERNATIVE 1 - DO NOTHING (RECONSTRUCT TRACKS)

Legend ⊖ Negative impact or low benefit ○ Marginal impact or benefit ⊕ Positive impact or high benefit			
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE		SUMMARY OF TEAM'S ASSESSMENT	
<p>The streetcar tracks on St. Clair Avenue could be replaced, and the roadway could be reconstructed the way it is now. Passenger platforms could be reconstructed as they are now.</p>		<p>The do-nothing option would not provide the reliable, consistent service needed to maximize person-carrying capacity on St. Clair Avenue. It would not allow accommodation of the projected growth in travel demand. It would not contribute to municipal goals regarding making transit more attractive. There would be no effect on community objectives. There would be no effect on access, parking, loading for business. It would have no effect on the natural environment (in terms of air quality, storm water runoff, or street trees). It would attract few new transit riders.</p>	
TRANSPORTATION (38%)		COMMUNITY & BUSINESS (38%)	
Project Team Ranking: ⊖	Workshop Ranking: ⊖	Project Team Ranking: ○	Workshop Ranking: ⊖
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The do-nothing option could not provide the reliable, consistent service needed to increase person-carrying capacity St. Clair Avenue. It would not help accommodate projected growth in travel demand. •No effect on travel time savings. Over time, transit and auto travel time would worsen as travel demand grows. •Over time, streetcars would experience declining quality of service, speed, and reliability. •Safety could worsen for all road users over time as traffic volumes increase. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Something more needs to be done • Doesn't take away from existing automobile transportation on St. Clair • Agree that it is bad (poor) alternative • Will negatively affect the streetcar in the long run 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Does not support transit service or priority improvement, reduced auto dependence, and Avenues goals of the Official Plan. •No effect on neighbourhood traffic volumes or permitted turns. •Some disruption to businesses during construction. •No effect on access, parking, loading for businesses. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about impact on parking? • Leaves sidewalks at existing width and leaves existing trees in place •Decline in service will affect communities • Does not address safety of schools/parent concerns and congestion •Continued decline
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT (14%)		COSTS (10%)	
Project Team Ranking: ○	Workshop Ranking: ⊖	Project Team Ranking: ○	Workshop Ranking: ⊖
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •No effect. Over time, air quality would worsen due to decrease in vehicle speeds and increased delay. •No change to local natural environment 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative over time • Not considering future effects on air pollution etc. - leaving the problem to the future • More cars = more pollution 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Construction cost for replacement has been budgeted. •Operating costs would increase over time due to declining efficiency of service, caused by traffic congestion. •Few new riders attracted. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •30 years of status quo

ALTERNATIVE 2 - MINOR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

Legend ⊖ Negative impact or low benefit ○ Marginal impact or benefit ⊕ Positive impact or high benefit			
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE		SUMMARY OF TEAM'S ASSESSMENT	
<p>Minor changes to the roadway or to traffic operations strategies at specific locations, to improve the flow of all vehicles. This would include traffic signal timing improvements (to better facilitate traffic flow), selected exclusive left turn/right turn lanes, and addition of more turn restrictions (either at all times, or during peak periods). This may involve restricting on-street parking in selected locations during peak periods and/or removing selected on-street parking spaces. This option includes track replacement.</p>		<p>Not seen as an adequate comprehensive transportation solution for the street as a whole, as it would have only limited benefit for Official Plan transit goals. It would have a marginally negative effect on community objectives (due to added roadway width/decreased sidewalk, decreased peak period parking). Possible small negative effect on parking, loading for businesses. No benefit to natural environment (in terms of air quality or street trees). Low benefit relative to cost.</p>	
TRANSPORTATION (38%)		COMMUNITY & BUSINESS (38%)	
Project Team Ranking: ⊖	Workshop Ranking: ⊖	Project Team Ranking: ○	Workshop Ranking: ○
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Not seen as an adequate comprehensive solution for the street as a whole, as it would have only limited benefit for transit and traffic. •Slight improvement to overall traffic flow, until growing traffic congestion offsets these improvements. •Limited improvement in travel time from Gunns Road to Yonge Street, relative to existing streetcar service. Travel time would worsen as traffic volumes increase. •Reliability of service would not improve; would worsen in future due to traffic congestion. •Quality of service would not improve; would worsen in future. •Person-carrying capacity would improve marginally at first, but worsen over time as travel demand increases. •Safety would worsen over time, as traffic volumes increase. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we know about attractiveness of service? • Debatable as to whether supports Official Plan and Smart Growth policies • Not enough improvements to achieve reliable transit service • We already have this solution which is not working • Increase safety by widening pedestrian islands • Increase in volumes will negate any improvements 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Very limited support of transit service improvement and reduced auto dependence goals of the Official Plan, and of provincial Smart Growth policies. •Marginal negative effect on streetscape enhancement, sidewalks. •If peak period parking prohibited, access would decrease in selected areas. •Could have a negative effect on delivery and loading access for business. •Disruption to businesses during construction similar to “Do Nothing” option. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking restrictions are an issue • Decrease of on-street parking and sidewalks is negative for business community •Remove TTC lane restrictions
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT (14%)		COSTS (10%)	
Project Team Ranking: ⊖	Workshop Ranking: ⊖	Project Team Ranking: ○	Workshop Ranking: ○
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Air quality would worsen over time due to increase in traffic volumes, offset slightly by improved traffic flow. •No change to local natural environment. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased enforcement may increase revenue 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Slightly higher cost than basic track replacement (depends on number of intersections affected). •Operating costs would increase in longer term as traffic volumes continue to grow. •Enforcement costs would increase due to added turn restrictions and parking limits. •Benefit in terms of new riders relative to added cost would be low (transit service only marginally more attractive). 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased enforcement may increase revenue












ALTERNATIVE 3 - TRANSIT PRIORITY IMPROVEMENTS

Legend			
	Negative impact or low benefit		Marginal impact or benefit
			Positive impact or high benefit
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE		SUMMARY OF TEAM'S ASSESSMENT	
<p>This would involve implementation of signaling and road design changes to give transit vehicles a time advantage over other vehicles. Design changes would include establishing exclusive streetcar lanes only at selected intersections, to allow streetcars to bypass left turn vehicle line-ups.</p> <p>NOTE: Transit priority has already been implemented along much of St. Clair Ave, and thus only marginal further improvements in transit signal priority can be obtained. Exclusive lanes for streetcars have been implemented from Vaughan Road east at most signalized intersections during peak periods. Therefore, new exclusive transit lanes at intersections would be mostly west from Vaughan Road to Gunns Road.</p>		<p>Limited benefit in terms of transit operations, traffic operations, and meeting City goals for transit support or intensification. Little or no effect on community objectives. No effect on business access, loading or parking. No effect on natural environment (in terms of air quality or street trees). Few new riders attracted.</p>	
TRANSPORTATION (38%)		COMMUNITY & BUSINESS (38%)	
Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 	Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited benefit in terms of transit operations • Marginal improvement in travel time, relative to existing streetcar service. • Reliability of trip would improve slightly but still affected by collision-related delays. • Service would be marginally more attractive to potential riders. • Collision incidents could increase, due to the added complexity of traffic operations. Safety would not improve. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority signal at intersection not enough • If already have transit signals, isn't this a do nothing? • Exclusive lanes at intersections are confusing, cause congestion and collisions, disruption to traffic • Better management of TTC, timing (signals) and traffic signal timing would improve service • Exclusive lanes at intersections create bottlenecks - don't help traffic flow • Only use intersection right of ways at problem intersections • Bathurst EB priority signal needed 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited support of transit service improvement and reduction of auto dependence goals of the Official Plan, and of provincial Smart Growth policies. • Little or no effect on streetscape, sidewalks. • Parking availability: marginal effect due to potential loss of some spaces in selected areas. • No significant effect on traffic volumes on neighbourhood streets. • Disruption to businesses during construction similar to "Do Nothing" option. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p>
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT (14%)		COSTS (10%)	
Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 	Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality would decline over time due to increase in traffic volumes and delays. • No change to local natural environment. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No benefit to natural environment 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slightly higher cost, relative to basic track replacement (depends on number of intersections affected). • Transit operating costs would be reduced initially, but would worsen over time as traffic volumes continue to grow. • Few new riders attracted. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p>

ALTERNATIVE 4 - OTHER TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM STRATEGIES

Legend			
Negative impact or low benefit		Marginal impact or benefit	
		Positive impact or high benefit	
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE		SUMMARY OF TEAM'S ASSESSMENT	
<p>Implementation of policies, programs and infrastructure to improve the efficiency of the area transportation network. Programs would include: Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures (to reduce car dependency and congestion, such as parking pricing, congestion pricing, vehicle restrictions, cycling, walking, promotion of transit). Transportation System Management (TSM) measures such as accident/incident management programs or improved traveller information; High occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes for vehicles carrying three or more persons in the streetcar lanes.</p> <p>NOTE: it is important to understand that TDM has been shown to have a very limited effect without high-quality transit service - in the range of less than 5% on an ongoing basis. TSM would have a minimal effect on travel demand; it would marginally increase capacity. Therefore, this option focuses on the HOV lanes for streetcars plus other vehicles with three or more occupants.</p>		<p>Introduction of HOV lanes would increase person-carrying capacity, but centre HOV lanes would be an unusual (unique) operational strategy, which could be confusing for drivers and would cause complex traffic operations. Little or no effect on community objectives. No benefit to natural environment (in terms of air quality or street trees). HOV lanes would need to be implemented on a network basis to be effective; not seen as being of value on St. Clair alone.</p> <p>TDM and TSM would not provide the capacity needed to meet future demands, and would have little benefit in terms of business and community objectives, or natural environment. (The City is committed to these programs, but they play only a supporting role in the overall transportation service objectives of the Official Plan)</p>	
TRANSPORTATION (38%)		COMMUNITY & BUSINESS (38%)	
Project Team Ranking:	Workshop Ranking:	Project Team Ranking:	Workshop Ranking:
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Introduction of HOV lanes would increase person-carrying capacity, but would be an unusual operational strategy, which could be confusing for drivers. •TDM and TSM would not provide the capacity needed to meet future demands. •HOV lanes: Transit travel time would improve during peak periods, but would be affected by left turn queues. Savings would decrease over time as traffic grows. •HOV: Reliability of service would improve during peak periods only (not during off-peaks or weekends) affected by collision-related delays and turns from HOV lanes. Reliability/quality would decline over time due to increasing traffic congestion. •HOV: delay to non-high occupancy vehicles. Reduced delay for travellers in HOV lanes. •Collision incidents could likely increase, due to the added complexity of traffic operations. Safety would not improve. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has potential to improve service in combination with other things • HOV is positive - needs better enforcement • HOV doesn't belong or work on St. Clair- it's a highway solution • Who will monitor them? • Was not effective on King Street and will not work here • HOV in median shared with streetcars does not solve problem of streetcars delaying left turns by public traffic • HOV lane could be an incentive for HOV to drive through St Clair •HOV not enforceable 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •TDM/TSM: limited support of transit priority improvement goals of Official Plan. City-wide policies necessary to have desired effect over long term. •HOV: some support for transit priority goals of Official Plan. •Personal safety could be affected by complexity of traffic operations under HOV option. •HOV: some change in ease of access to businesses due to added traffic demand in centre (left-turn) lane. •Some disruption to businesses during construction. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p>
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT (14%)		COSTS (10%)	
Project Team Ranking:	Workshop Ranking:	Project Team Ranking:	Workshop Ranking:
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •No change to local natural environment. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p>	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Capital costs would be slightly higher than for basic track replacement (signage, pavement markings). Transit operating costs would increase over time due to increasing traffic congestion. •Enforcement costs would increase due to added restrictions and parking limits. •Few new riders attracted. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p>

ALTERNATIVE 5 - TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS ON OTHER EAST-WEST STREETS

Legend			
	Negative impact or low benefit		Marginal impact or benefit
	Positive impact or high benefit		
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE		SUMMARY OF TEAM'S ASSESSMENT	
<p>This would involve increasing the level of transit service on other parallel routes such as Eglinton Avenue, Rogers Road, Davenport Road, or Dupont Street by using measures such as operating more service, signal priority, queue jump lanes, or HOV/reserved bus lanes. (Eglinton Avenue already has HOV lanes.). This option includes track replacement on St. Clair.</p>		<p>Transit needs to be within a short walking distance to be successful, and ideally, it should service a medium to high-density mixed-use corridor to attract all-day ridership. None of these streets are a viable alternative to service improvements on St. Clair. Eglinton Ave already has HOV lanes and high frequency transit, and is too far away from the primary study area. Rogers Rd is not continuous throughout the study area, and would provide only a very partial improvement in service. Dupont Street is also too far from St. Clair to service the demand (particularly considering the grade differential between the two streets); Dupont is also better served by the Bloor Subway.</p> <p>Most of these roads would not connect transit service to the Yonge Subway. Rogers and Davenport are not mixed-use streets conducive to all-day transit ridership. Local St. Clair destinations and operations would not be served by these corridors. This alternative would still leave an inefficient, unreliable service on St. Clair. Improvements on these parallel routes would have no effect on the business, residential or natural environments along St. Clair. Not likely to be cost-effective, given lower ridership potential on Davenport, Rogers, Dupont. However, this alternative would contribute to City-building by improving transit service across a wide area.</p>	
TRANSPORTATION (38%)		COMMUNITY & BUSINESS (38%)	
Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 	Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •None of these other streets is a viable alternative to transit service improvement on St. Clair. Eglinton Avenue already has HOV lanes and high frequency transit, and is too far away to service demand in the primary study area. Rogers Road is not continuous throughout the study area, and would provide only a very partial improvement in service. •To implement significant transit improvements on Davenport Road, bike lanes could need to be eliminated, causing a degradation of the City's cycling network. •Dupont Street is too far from St. Clair to serve the demand (particularly considering the grade differential between the two streets); Dupont is also better served by the Bloor Subway. •No change to overall traffic operations on St. Clair Avenue •Reliability/quality would improve on routes parallel to St. Clair, but not on St. Clair. •Would not attract riders to St. Clair service. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Better from safety point of view - won't force traffic on to side streets •TTC passengers wouldn't walk to another road to take transit - not attractive to local transit users •Want to travel on St Clair not go to other routes •High speed rapid transit on CP Rail corridor could carry a large volume between Bloor and St. Clair •This is just shifting the problem elsewhere •Won't use other streets like Dupont or Eglinton •St. Clair needs to be the priority •Pushes traffic to other areas 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Limited support of transit service improvement goals; does not support OP goal for St. Clair. •No change in ease of access to businesses on St. Clair; some access reduction could occur on other parallel streets where transit features are introduced. •No change in parking on St. Clair; reductions could occur on other parallel streets where transit is increased. •Disruption to businesses during construction similar to "Do Nothing". 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Does not benefit St. Clair - neutral •Takes potential business customers away from St Clair
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT (14%)		COSTS (10%)	
Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 	Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Air quality would decline on St. Clair over time due to increases in traffic volumes, marginal improvement over the secondary study area. •No change to local natural environment. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Can this be afforded? 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •High cost for purchase of additional buses and supporting infrastructure (signal systems, etc). •Transit operating costs would increase significantly, due to need for more vehicles to increase service levels. •Benefit in terms of new riders relative to added cost would be low (particularly on St. Clair). 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Can this be afforded?












ALTERNATIVE 6 - EXCLUSIVE TRANSIT LANES ON ST. CLAIR AVENUE

Legend			
	Negative impact or low benefit		Marginal impact or benefit
	Positive impact or high benefit		
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE		SUMMARY OF TEAM'S ASSESSMENT	
<p>Creating exclusive lanes for transit vehicles on all or a portion of St. Clair Avenue. This can be done in many ways, including: a) Signing, pavement markings, and enforcement; and b) Physical separation of transit vehicles from other traffic (using a raised or flush curb, bollards/posts, a landscaped strip, different coloured or textured pavement, etc). A number of design options could be considered for this alternative.</p>		<p>This alternative is most closely aligned with the goals of the Official Plan. It provides more-reliable, higher-quality transit service with the potential for capacity expansion needed to address growth in a sustainable manner, which does not degrade the natural environment. The cost-effectiveness of this alternative is higher than other options. This alternative would have community and/or business effects in relation to changes to auto access and peak period parking availability in some sections. This alternative is not expected to have significant effects on community planning initiatives or festivals. It is expected to improve pedestrian access. This alternative provides the opportunity to improve the streetscape through design (to be further defined in Phase 3). The physically separate design would have significantly higher positive effects on safety, transit reliability, and urban design than the option of signing the transit lanes.</p> <p>Operation of "peak period only" exclusive lanes is not seen as viable. This would be confusing to drivers, in terms of where they should be on the road to make a left turn at the various times of day. (The alternative would be to prohibit all left turns, which is not seen as appropriate.) This confusion is evident on St. Clair east of Spadina Road, based on the higher collision incidence. This would reduce the safety of St. Clair Avenue for all users (transit riders, auto occupants, cyclists).</p>	
TRANSPORTATION (38%)		COMMUNITY & BUSINESS (38%)	
Project Team Ranking:	Workshop Ranking:	Project Team Ranking:	Workshop Ranking:
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •It provides higher-quality more-reliable transit service with the potential for capacity expansion needed to address growth in a sustainable manner. •Improvement in transit travel time projected, relative to existing streetcar service. This applies to existing and future conditions. •Efficiency would improve due to decrease in traffic delay and collisions affecting streetcars. Future growth would not significantly affect efficiency. •Reliability/quality could improve significantly due to reduction in delay and collisions. Reliability/quality would not be significantly affected by traffic increases. •High quality service of this alternative could attract more riders and could accommodate future growth in demand. •Some increase in delay to vehicles using rest of road. This could grow over time as demand increases, but vehicular demand could be moderated by improved transit service. •There would be a reduction in auto capacity or peak period parking availability •Person-carrying capacity could improve to the greatest degree of the alternatives being considered. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More reliable • More attractive to new riders • Clearly improves transportation • Pavement marking will not work-(look at King Street W) • Cars need to make left hand turns after streetcar passes • Will result in reliable service/less delay • Decrease of short-turns • Will increase road logic (urban design aspects of street and traffic flow will improve) • Creates access problems to side streets • Will create need for special left turn signals • This is the highest congestion volume of our alternatives • Not conducive to emergency vehicles • Greater safety for pedestrians and transit users • Will reduce traffic collisions • Safer and better for a growing senior population • A (physically separated) streetcar ROW (in the entire corridor) is not flexible to possible change, and cannot be removed (without added cost and disruption) , if negative impacts to traffic and business occur as a result • No mention of bike lane • Show where parking lots will be and develop at the same time at ROW • Problems for cars and trucks more traffic in fewer lanes left over • Pedestrian friendly, cleaner, better quality • Must include more off-Street parking lots • Less cars = less business 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In direct conformity with the transit priority improvement, reduced auto dependence and 'Avenues' goals of the Official Plan. •Support of provincial Smart Growth policies. •Provides opportunity for streetscape enhancement. •Art features could be incorporated into design. •Some decrease in business access due to turn restrictions. •Loading and delivery space on-street is not projected to change significantly; times available may change. •May be some decrease in on-street parking supply during weekday peak periods. •Volume on some neighbourhood streets would likely increase, others could decrease. •Disruption to businesses during construction similar to "Do Nothing". 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will have serious effects on business and could result in closings • Decreased property values • Decreased safety (EMS response) • Want width of sidewalk maintained • Improved transit service can improve businesses in some areas • Disagree - this solution will hurt businesses as 70%-90% of business comes from outside of area- not supported by area • Impacts on residents because of inability to make left turns from side streets • Property values will decrease • Not everyone can take TTC, such as commuters • Must include adding parking • ROW is coming - work with it to improve businesses • Would situation for increase cut through traffic in adjacent neighbourhoods along St. Clair • Safety - increased traffic speed and road rage • Creates separation of North and South side of St. Clair • Reduces delivery options for businesses • Narrowing of sidewalks loss of trees etc. • On-street delivery • Not conducive to increased business • Opportunity for stronger urban design and public art • Negative impact on businesses- loss of 630 spots • Shoppers and delivery need parking • Neighbourhood safety issues • Limits access to cemetery- 5 heritage features in the cemetery, statues of Italian immigrants •Implement neighbourhood traffic calming measures
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT (14%)		COSTS (10%)	
Project Team Ranking:	Workshop Ranking:	Project Team Ranking:	Workshop Ranking:
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Air quality would likely remain the same could improve if higher percentage of trips made by transit. •Could be increased street trees as part of median and/or curb extensions. •Storm water management could be improved slightly by increased permeability of planted median elements and/or curb extensions. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gridlocked traffic won't improve air quality • More pollution with reduced traffic lanes • Streetcars in exclusive lanes will cause increased congestion in single lane therefore increased pollution •Increased congestion will cause pollution 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Somewhat higher cost than track replacement cost (depends on design). •Transit operating costs could decrease due to increased efficiency. •Benefit in terms of new riders relative to added cost could be high. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p>

ALTERNATIVE 7 - CHANGE TRANSIT TECHNOLOGY

Legend ⊖ Negative impact or low benefit ○ Marginal impact or benefit ⊕ Positive impact or high benefit			
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE		SUMMARY OF TEAM'S ASSESSMENT	
<p>This alternative includes replacing the existing streetcars with other types of transit vehicles. Sub-options include: Buses operating in High Occupancy Vehicle lanes (HOV lanes are needed because buses in mixed traffic would not provide sufficient capacity to meet existing or future demands); or Supplementing the current streetcar (light rail vehicles) with a higher capacity articulated light rail vehicle like the Queen streetcars.</p>		<p>This alternative would not provide a high benefit in terms of the quality or capacity of transit service on St. Clair, particularly when considered relative to the cost. Investment would not result in increased ridership; it could decrease attractiveness. The option of buses would have negative effects on air quality, noise, traffic congestion and the availability of on-street parking. The option of articulated streetcars would not represent a cost-effective investment or have significant benefit in terms of ridership growth. Changing to articulated streetcars or buses would not be cost-effective, due to requirement for new vehicles and storage/maintenance facilities.</p>	
TRANSPORTATION (38%)		COMMUNITY & BUSINESS (38%)	
Project Team Ranking: ⊖	Workshop Ranking: ⊖	Project Team Ranking: ○	Workshop Ranking: ⊖
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •This alternative would not provide a high benefit in terms of the quality or capacity of transit service on St. Clair. •It would not result in increased ridership; it could in fact decrease attractiveness. •Some improvement in transit travel time projected, relative to existing streetcar service, for buses in HOV. Could be degradation in transit time as traffic demand grows. •Buses: Efficiency would decrease now and in future, as this would require more vehicles. •Buses would degrade attractiveness, and accommodating future growth would be difficult. •Access would not improve; comfort could decrease. •Buses can be regarded as more adaptable to technological change. •There would be a reduction in auto capacity or peak period parking availability. •Person-carrying capacity would decrease over time due to congestion. •Pedestrian access from sidewalk to buses would improve. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Hybrid bus technology not commercially viable •Buses are negative as much less attractive •Buses are a promising option •Hydrogen buses/ new technology- look into this •Customers prefer streetcars •What about alternative fuel technology buses? •Some people prefer streetcars to buses •Buses are bumpy •Buses are seen as low class 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Contrary to OP goals for St. Clair in terms of transit priority and intensification. Also contrary to broader provincial Smart Growth policies. •Marginally negative effect on employment, land use, building permits (perception of degradation of transit service). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bus stopping areas would interfere with on-street loading areas; negative effect. •Marginal decrease in on-street parking, to accommodate bus stops. •Noise levels would worsen due to addition of buses at the curbside. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Option might impact parking •Streetcars are more attractive
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT (14%)		COSTS (10%)	
Project Team Ranking: ⊖	Workshop Ranking: ⊖	Project Team Ranking: ⊖	Workshop Ranking: ⊖
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Air quality would decline due to increase in bus and traffic volumes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No change to local natural environment. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison of pollution associated with streetcars vs. pollution from alternative fuel technology vehicles • No matter what type of bus you are in it will create pollution • No overhead wire is visual improvement •Overhead wires are eyesore 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High cost for purchase of additional buses and supporting infrastructure (signal systems, bus storage facility, etc). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transit operating costs could increase, due to need for more vehicles and maintenance. ▪ Not cost-effective, due to requirement for new vehicles and garage. Investment would not result in increased ridership. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p>

ALTERNATIVE 8 - ROAD WIDENING: ST.CLAIR AVE. OR NEARBY PARALLEL ROADS

Legend			
	Negative impact or low benefit		Marginal impact or benefit
	Positive impact or high benefit		
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE		SUMMARY OF TEAM'S ASSESSMENT	
<p>Widening of St. Clair Avenue or other parallel roads such as Eglinton Avenue, Rogers Road, Davenport Road, or Dupont Street to increase capacity. Widening might occur on one or both sides of the street, depending on the roadway and land use features. A sub-option could be widening by removing on-street parking.</p>		<p>Physical widening is impractical within the constrictions on right-of-way. Removal of on-street parking would increase traffic capacity, but with a negative effect on the business and residential communities. It is contrary to Official Plan goals, and does not contribute to City-building; it is anti-urban. The option of using a widening for HOV/RBL is not seen as appropriate. Such a sub-option requires application on a network basis to succeed, and that network is not present or planned. There would be significant disruption due to the removal of on-street parking. The streetscape would be degraded, which (together with the parking loss) would likely have a negative effect on the business and residential communities. The cost-effectiveness of this alternative would be very low, given that it would not support higher transit use.</p>	
TRANSPORTATION (38%)		COMMUNITY & BUSINESS (38%)	
Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 	Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Traffic would grow to use the available road space, countering any initial improvement. •Efficiency would decrease. •Reliability/quality of transit would decrease with growth in traffic and increasing complexity of traffic operations. •Increase in vehicular capacity would not attract more riders; would detract from attractiveness as traffic increases. •Collision incidents would likely increase on St. Clair, due to increasing congestion. Decreased safety for cyclists and pedestrians 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •"Consensus" that not a favourable option •Negative in every way •Not a serious alternative •CNR underpass •Turn Dupont and Davenport into parallel opposing one way street •Widen the railroad bridge 	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Goes against OP goals for St. Clair in terms of transit priority and intensification. •Contrary to broader provincial Smart Growth policies. •Degrades opportunity for streetscape enhancement, sidewalk expansion/improvement, creation of public spaces for cultural/art features. •Possible decrease in ease of business access due to loss of on-street parking. •Possible loss of on-street parking along much of the street. •Volume on neighbourhood streets could increase with growth in traffic volumes. •Noise levels would increase due to growth in traffic. •Significant disruption to businesses during construction. 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Businesses need to display goods on sidewalk •Street character will be destroyed
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT (14%)		COSTS (10%)	
Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 	Project Team Ranking: 	Workshop Ranking: 
<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Air quality would decline significantly due to increase in traffic volumes. •Loss of some street trees expected. •Stormwater management would be degraded somewhat due to reduced permeability (increased hard surface). 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p>	<p>Project Team Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •High cost for widening due to construction and property costs. •Transit operating costs would increase. •Not cost effective in dealing with transportation demand increases (high capital cost combined with low ridership increase). 	<p>Workshop Comments:</p>