

PHASE 2 PUBLIC MEETINGS – EVALUATION CRITERIA AND ALTERNATIVES

We are interested in your input on the alternatives (options) under consideration for the St. Clair Transit Improvements Class EA study, and the criteria to be used for evaluating the alternatives (options).

Please complete this form and return to us in the postage paid envelope by February 27, 2004. You can also fax the completed form to 416-392-2974 or email your responses to stclairwestea@toronto.ca

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Please review the following list of proposed criteria and measures to be used in the evaluation of the alternatives (options) for the St. Clair Ave. West Class EA study.

What are criteria and how do we measure them?

Criteria are factors that must be assessed when evaluating each alternative. The measure for each criterion describes how each alternative's impact on that item will be measured, meaning the extent of the impact. For example, when considering which car to purchase, one criterion would be fuel efficiency. The measure of fuel efficiency is kilometres per litre.

CATEGORY	#	CRITERION	MEASURE (S)
Transportation	A1	Person travel time savings and delay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginal change in travel time from Gunns Road to Yonge Street, relative to existing service (average and overall delay) * • Marginal change in delay to transit passengers (average delay) *
	A2	Efficiency (vehicle utilization)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of vehicles required to address demand *
	A3	Reliability/quality of service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginal change in number of short turns projected * • Uniformity of spacing between vehicles * • Consistency in day-to-day trip times*
	A4	Ability to attract riders/ accommodate demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competitiveness with other modes (travel time, trip cost) • Measure comfort of trip (no. of passengers/vehicle)
	A5	Ability to connect with potential GO Rail station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative assessment of feasibility (access, available space, integration with east-west transit service)
	A6	Accessibility for the disabled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative assessment; width of platforms; access from sidewalk
	A7	Improves passenger accessibility, comfort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of adequate/safe passenger waiting facilities • Number of passengers per vehicle
	A8	Vehicle travel time and delays (existing and future demands)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginal change in travel time for transit vehicles and automobiles from Gunns Road to Yonge Street, relative to existing service (average and overall delay) * • Marginal change in delay to transit vehicles and automobiles in primary study area (average and/or overall delay) *
	A9	Flexibility and adaptability of transit service to technological change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative assessment of future upgrades, replacement, and/or development time
	A10	Overall person carrying capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of persons carried per segment of roadway (both transit and automobile).
	A11	Intersection operations (existing and future demands)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in overall level of service (at key intersections)* • Number of major intersections with critical movements (e.g. less than 10 percent of capacity unused) *
	A12	Corridor traffic operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in overall level of service on parallel routes *
	A13	Emergency vehicle operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in emergency vehicle time response time • Changes in emergency vehicle access
	A14	Safety (vehicle, passenger, pedestrians, cyclists)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projected change in collisions: vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists, and transit vehicles
	A15	Pedestrian accessibility, comfort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Net change in sidewalk-width (# of metres by BIA or road section) • Change in intersection crossing times • Changes in intersection waiting times • Changes to cross-street access at non-signalized intersections • Effect on cross-street access (provision of median islands, differential in grades for ROW)

CONTINUES ON BACK OF THIS PAGE

CATEGORY	#	CRITERION	MEASURE (S)
Transportation (continued)	A16	Cyclist accessibility, comfort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change relative to existing situation; ability to provide reserved or shared bike lanes Ability to enhance crossings of St.Clair Ave. Ability to provide cycling storage
	A17	Construction feasibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative assessment of construction feasibility
	A18	Ability to maintain road and related facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ease of maintenance (snow removal, minor repairs)
Community and Business	B1	Support of Official Plan and other policy objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative assessment of how well the alternative meets the Official Plan goals for Avenues (supporting mixed-use, transit-oriented development, quality pedestrian environments, enhanced street amenities, etc.) Evaluation of alternative meeting broader planning policy guidelines (e.g. Provincial Policy Statement, Smart Growth etc)
	B2	Effects on redevelopment potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected change in development potential relative to baseline, up to horizon of 2021
	B3	Support of community planning initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to improve public spaces Potential to improve personal safety
	B4	Ability to meet Urban Design objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for streetscape enhancement Potential for sidewalk expansion/improvement Opportunity to create public spaces Opportunity to create areas for cultural/art features (festivals, special events, and street festivals) Opportunity to promote community cohesion (north and south sides of St. Clair)
	B5	Economic effects on adjacent businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected change in employment, land use, building permits Projected change in retail activity based on changes to vehicular access (addressing parking supply, left turn access, loading access) Projected change in sidewalk commercial activities Projected change in business attractiveness due to improved streetscape (qualitative) Estimation of broad economic gains/losses for the short term (1-2 years after construction), medium term (5-10 years) and long term (15-20 years)
	B6	Economic effects on residential property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment value (limited by data availability) comparing broad Spadina situation to St. Clair. Short, medium and long-term timeframes to be assessed
	B7	Effects on property and business access for employees, customers and deliveries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to hours during which on-street parking and loading are permitted Changes to permitted turning movements on access routes (consideration for absolute number of route alternatives) Changes to delivery and loading access (# of businesses affected)
	B8	Parking availability in commercial/retail areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-street: net change in number of spaces, by section (e.g. BIA boundaries) Off-street: opportunity to create off-street parking by section (e.g. BIA boundaries)
	B9	Effects on neighbourhood traffic volumes and access (existing and future demands)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected change in volume, by section of the corridor, and on local streets (compared to existing conditions and expected future conditions with 'do nothing') Change in number of full-moves accesses into and out of specific neighbourhoods of concern Change in parking spaces on residential streets (i.e. permit parking) Changes to Emergency vehicle access to primary routes Changes in activity patterns in sensitive areas (schools, daycares, seniors residences)
	B10	Access to community services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in the access of existing public institutional, cultural and recreational facilities and services (e.g. Piccininni Community Centre)
	B11	Noise impacts (after construction)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marginal change in noise levels as per MOE criteria
	B12	Effects during construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duration and extent of construction relative to baseline (replacement of tracks only) (noise/vibration)
	B13	Effect on heritage features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of heritage features affected (i.e. level of irreversibility, severity and duration of effect)
Natural Environment	C1	Air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative effect on air quality due to changes in vehicle delays/speeds
	C2	Natural habitats (plants & animals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative effect on local natural environment (terrestrial and aquatic habitat, vegetation such as street trees)
	C3	Stormwater management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirement for stormwater management facilities Effect on existing stormwater facilities Ability of soil to allow for (storm)water infiltration
Costs	D1	Effects on City/TTC budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction cost Capital and operating costs over a 20 year lifecycle Utilities (relocation, upgrading, etc.)
	D2	Cost effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in operating costs from existing Cost per new rider

* The traffic and transit analyses will address weekday and weekend conditions. The focus in the detailed operational modelling will be on the p.m. peak hour as a representative indication of peak conditions.

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

- 1a. There are four broad categories in the list of criteria presented on pages 1 and 2 (Transportation, Business and Community, Natural Environment, and Cost).

Which categories do you consider the most important in evaluating the alternatives (options) for the study?

Instructions:

- 1) Please review the categories in the table below
- 2) Think about which categories you consider most important in the evaluation process for the study
- 3) Weight the categories out of 100%, For example, if you consider "costs" the most important category, you would give "costs" a higher weight, e.g., 40%, that would leave 60% to distribute to the other four categories
- 4) Write in your % weight for each category

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION	RELATIVE VALUE WEIGHT (% OF 100%)
Transportation	Shows the ability of the alternatives to satisfy transportation needs, operations and safety for other road users, including pedestrians, automobiles, cyclists and delivery vehicles. Shows the ability of the alternatives to improve reliability, efficiency and safety of transit service, in order to serve existing and future needs.	
Community and Business	Shows the ability of the alternatives to meet community planning and Official Plan objectives, effects on business operations and economy, and effects on neighbourhoods and community facilities.	
Natural Environment	Shows the potential effects of the alternatives on the natural environment including air quality and any sensitive natural habitats.	
Costs	Shows the financial implication of the alternatives including construction, capital, operating and maintenance costs.	
TOTAL		100 %

- 1b. From the list of criteria presented on pages 1 and 2, which five criteria do you consider the most important? Please list your criteria in order of importance from #1 to #5.

- #1) _____
- #2) _____
- #3) _____
- #4) _____
- #5) _____

PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE

PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE NEXT PAGE

2. There are nine alternatives (options) under consideration in the St.Clair Ave. West Transit Improvements Class EA study.

The nine alternatives are as follows:

Alternative 1 – Do Nothing

The streetcar tracks will be replaced, and some passenger platforms will be improved to a two-metre width standard, where warranted by higher passenger use.

Alternative 2 – Minor Transportation Improvements

This includes changes to signal timing at intersections (to better facilitate traffic flow), road improvements (such as installing left turn lanes), turn restrictions (such as restricting left or right turns during peak periods or at all times), and restricting on-street parking during peak periods.

Alternative 3 – Transit Priority Improvements

This would give transit a time advantage over other vehicles and includes: installing transit signals and/or creating queue jump lanes, and moving near-side passenger platforms to the far-side of intersections.

Alternative 4 – Other Transportation System Strategies

Examples of this include travel demand management (such as parking pricing or employer paid transit passes), transportation system management (such as improved travel information, e.g., changeable message signs), and high occupancy vehicle lanes.

Alternative 5 – Major Transit Improvements on other East-West Streets

This would involve increasing the level of transit service on other parallel routes such as Eglinton Ave., Rogers Rd., Davenport Rd., or Dupont St. by using signal priority, queue jump lanes, or HOV or reserved bus lanes.

Alternative 6 – Exclusive Transit Lanes on St. Clair Avenue

Creating exclusive lanes for transit use on all or a portion of St. Clair. This can be done with signs and pavement markings, or with some form of physical separation (such as a curb, bollards, landscaped strip, textured pavement, etc.). A number of design options would be considered for this alternative.

Alternative 7 – Change Transit Technology

This alternative includes replacing the streetcars with buses that would operate in mixed traffic, using buses in reserved lanes (either at the curb or in the median), or supplementing the currently used fleet of light rail vehicles with a higher capacity articulated light rail vehicle.

Alternative 8 – Road Widening: St. Clair or Parallel Roads

A road could be widened to increase capacity for private vehicles only, or for HOV or reserved bus lanes. Widening might occur on one or both sides of the street, depending on the right-of-way. A sub-option could be to first remove on-street parking.

Alternative 9 – Combination of Some of the Above Options

Many of the alternatives can be combined by section, to reflect the needs, opportunities, and constraints of the distinct communities along St. Clair.

Do you have any comments or concerns about any of the alternatives? Do you have suggestions for additional alternatives that should be considered? *Please comment*

PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE

