

**St. Clair Avenue West Improvements Class Environmental Assessment Study  
Summary of Phase 2 Community Workshop #1.**

**Date: Monday, January 26, 2004, 6:00p.m. – 9:00p.m.**

**Location: Timothy Eaton Memorial Church, 230 St. Clair Avenue West,  
Room 107 – East Assembly Hall (Main Floor)**

---

**Staff**

**Affiliation**

Gough, Jim	Marshall Macklin Monaghan (MMM)
Mcp hail, Rod	City of Toronto, UDS Transportation Planning
Musters, Joanna	City of Toronto, UDS Transportation Planning
Sinikas, Jim	Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) Service Planning
Stambler, Mitch	TTC Service Planning

**Lead Facilitator**

Rose, Marc	Hardy Stevenson and Associates
------------	--------------------------------

**Assistant Facilitators**

Corazzola, Gene	City of Toronto, UDS Transportation Planning
Karczmarzyk, Beatrice	Hardy Stevenson and Associates
Mccormick, Jeff	City of Toronto, WES Public Consultation and Community Outreach
Schlenvogt, Becky	MMM
Palmer, Penelope	City of Toronto, WES Transportation Services
White, Jacqueline	City of Toronto, WES Transportation Services
Yacoumidis, James	City of Toronto, WES Public Consultation and Community Outreach
Zion Burton, Liora	City of Toronto, WES Public Consultation and Community Outreach

**Participants**

Forty-seven individuals attended representing the following Community/Stakeholder Groups:

- 1) Corso Italia BIA
- 2) Hillcrest Village BIA
- 3) Humewood Neighbourhood Ratepayers' Association
- 4) MyStClair
- 5) Regal Heights Residents' Association
- 6) Rocket Riders
- 7) Save Our St.Clair (SOS)
- 8) SCRIPT
- 9) St.Clair West Revitalization Committee (SWRC)
- 10) St.Clair Gardens BIA
- 11) St.Clair West BIA
- 12) Toronto Cycling Committee
- 13) Toronto Pedestrian Committee

- 14) Wychwood Heights BIA
- 15) Wychwood Park Ratepayers' Association
- 16) Rawlinson Ratepayers' Association
- 17) South Hill District Homeowners' Association
- 18) Rosemount Earls court Residents' Association
- 19) Deer Park Ratepayers' Group

## **Notes of Workshop**

---

### **Introduction**

The meeting commenced at 6:10 p.m. **Rod Mcphail** welcomed everyone and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to get involved in Phase 2 of the Study. He added that study team had met with the Mayor and Ward Councillors in December. They recommended that the study team adjust the schedule to provide additional opportunities for public input. The study team has made adjustments to lengthen the schedule and added two workshops (including this one) and an additional public meeting.

**Rod Mcphail** introduced **Marc Rose** as the facilitator for the evening. Marc reminded the participants that Phase 2 of the Study involved identifying and evaluating alternatives based on the comments provided by businesses, resident groups, and other interested parties. He emphasized that the study team would also be sharing information about possible alternative solutions, but that participants would not be choosing an alternative solution at the workshop.

Marc reviewed the workshop agenda and format of the workshop.

### **Presentation on the Study Process and Evaluation Criteria and Measures**

**Jim Gough** provided an overview of the study process and described a sample of a decision-making process. He then reviewed the proposed criteria and measures to be used in the evaluation of alternatives for the St. Clair West Transit Improvements Study.

Workshop participants raised the following questions and concerns:

**Q1a:** The Problem Statement seems to be conclusive. Will there be an opportunity for public input to revise the Problem Statement?

**A1a:** We could revise the problem statement further, but we believe that the effort would be better spent on moving ahead with the analysis. The problem statement should be viewed more as the 'spark' for the study, rather than a definitive all-inclusive statement. During Phase I of this study, the study team met with community groups to discuss and revise the problem statement to reflect their concerns; those changes are reflected. We will continue to meet with the community in Phase II of the study to address any additional concerns.

**Q1b:** How will you evaluate the criteria and identify the preferred alternative based on the various interests of the St. Clair community?

- A1b:** The study team will average the ranking of criteria to reflect all perspectives along St. Clair Avenue.
- Q2:** Could we see quantitative data, such as the number of trips now and in the future, to help us choose the preferred solution?
- A2:** That information will be provided when complete. City and TTC staff are here tonight to address any specific questions. Generally speaking, traffic volumes are projected to increase in the St. Clair West area over the next 20 years.
- Q3a:** Is the study data of economic activity along Spadina available to the public?
- A3a:** This base information is available through the Planning Department. If completed on time, the interviews with business representatives along Spadina will be presented to the public at the next public meeting.
- Q3b:** How did you measure the demands of traffic flow?
- A3b:** The demands of traffic flow are measured based on the intersection capacity analysis and a complex computer simulation model.
- Q4:** Could you provide us with detailed information on how many trips TTC riders take along Queen Street, College Street and Dundas Street?
- A4:** We do not have all this data available with us tonight, but TTC staff here tonight can make this information available for St. Clair and any other streetcar route.
- Q5:** Will various alternatives and utility costs associated with this project be available to the public? How are the utility costs being assessed?
- A5:** Yes. The information will be provided. The utility costs are based on unit costs for each component.
- A5:** Yes. The information will be derived from the economic analysis.

### **Exercise #1: Discussion of Criteria**

**Marc Rose** explained that the purpose of the first exercise was to think about whether the study team should be examining any other criteria as part of their evaluation of alternatives.

After a lengthy discussion in small groups, workshop participants reported back their suggestions for additional criteria. A summary of the table discussions can be found in Appendix A.

### **Presentation and Discussion of Alternative Solutions**

**Jim Gough** presented nine alternative solutions for the current Phase of the study design. He emphasised that the alternative solutions are considered during Phase 2 but there are no specific alternative designs shown. The following were the alternative solutions presented:

- **Alternative #1:** Do nothing – No improvements beyond street track replacement and platform improvements;
- **Alternative #2:** Minor Transportation Improvements (such as signal timing changes for all vehicles, road improvements, turn restrictions);
- **Alternative #3:** Transit Priority Improvements – to give transit a time advance over other vehicles (signals and/or geometric design);
- **Alternative #4:** Other Transportation System Strategies (transportation demand management, transportation system management, high occupancy vehicle lanes);
- **Alternative #5:** Major Transit Improvements (on other east-west streets);
- **Alternative #6:** Exclusive Transit Lanes on St. Clair Avenue: (design for the transit and vehicle lanes would be defined if this alternative is selected);
- **Alternative #7:** Change Technology – for example to bus service or articulated streetcars;
- **Alternative #8:** Road Widening – St. Clair or parallel roads.
- **Alternative #9:** A combination of more than one of the alternatives above.

Note: The Powerpoint presentation material is available on the project website.

**Jim Gough** provided answers to the following questions:

Q1: Could you estimate the cost of each alternative?

A1: The cost for alternatives will be evaluated in the next few months.

**Alternative #1.**

*Do nothing – No improvements beyond street track replacement and platform improvements.*

Q2: How will the old tracks be improved?

A2: The old tracks have a wood-based platform and will be replaced with tracks embedded in a rubber boot supported on a concrete base, which minimizes vibration and noise.

**Alternative #3.**

*Transit Priority Improvements – to give transit a time advance over other vehicles (signals and/or geometric design).*

In response to a question about whether this alternative has already been implemented, **Jim Gough** stated that it has already been implemented in some areas of St. Clair, but further enhancements are possible.

**Alternative #6.**

*Exclusive Transit Lanes on St. Clair Avenue: (design for the transit and vehicle lanes would be defined in detail if this alternative is selected).*

There was a question regarding how well the current *Exclusive Transit Lanes* system was working on King Street. **Jim Sinikas** responded that exclusive lanes are currently in place on King Street between Dufferin and Parliament (except a small section through the downtown core) Due to lack of enforcement of the exclusive lane, the streetcar operation is not meeting the design's expectations.

### **Alternative #7.**

*Change Technology – for example to bus service or articulated streetcars.*

One of the participants suggested that the TTC should consider real alternatives that currently do not exist along the street, including a subway. He added that the alternatives that have been considered to date already exist along St. Clair, and are therefore not real alternatives. **Jim Gough** noted that some alternatives, such as subway, are not realistic for St. Clair, due to funding limitations and the level of existing and projected demand.

### **Alternative #8.**

*Road Widening – St. Clair or parallel roads*

There was a question regarding how compatible the options presented in Alternative #7 would be with the parking on St. Clair Avenue, and whether widening St. Clair Avenue would leave enough space for sidewalks. **Jim Gough** responded that these two considerations were of significant concern, and they would factor into the analysis.

## **Conclusion and Next Steps**

**Marc Rose** explained the purpose and instructions for Exercise #2, Weighting of Criteria Categories, and Exercise #3, Rating of Evaluation Criteria. He indicated that the additional criteria identified at the workshop, which was necessary for completing Exercise #3, would be posted on the project web site ([www.toronto.ca/planningstudies](http://www.toronto.ca/planningstudies)).

One of the participants suggested it was difficult to assign a percentage to each of the categories as they often overlap. She suggested that the study team should reconsider whether, and how, they weight the criteria categories. **Marc** suggested that participants who feel that the categories should not be weighted should indicate as such on the worksheet for Exercise #2.

**Joanna Musters** concluded the workshop with the following announcements:

- The study team will be preparing a workshop summary report that will describe the feedback received from Workshop #1.
- The next Public Meetings will be held on February 17 & 19, 2004, at Brown Community Centre (**IMPORTANT: location subsequently changed to Holy Rosary Parish Centre**) and J.J. Piccinnini Community Centre, respectively
- Workshop #2 will take place in March 2004 to discuss results of alternatives. The exact date has not yet been determined. The Workshop will take place before the Spring Break. The study team is open to suggestions for a preferred date.

A participant asked whether there would be any workshops taking place during Phase 3 of the study. **Joanna** responded that the study team is open to considering other workshops if the community feels that they are worthwhile. She asked participants to indicate whether other workshops would be desirable on the evaluation form.

James Yacoumidis asked the participants for the following submissions:

- Worksheet #1 – Evaluation Criteria to be submitted by January 30, 2004;
- Worksheet #2 – Criteria and Measures to be submitted by February 6, 2004 using the pre-paid self-addressed envelope provided;
- Workshop Evaluation Form (pink sheet) to be submitted at their earliest convenience.

**Appendix A: Suggestions for Additional Evaluation Criteria from Workshop Participants**

**TABLE 1**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Additional Criteria / Measures</b>
<b>Transit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Travel and time savings (measure – maximum waiting time – analysis should be for the full day, not just peak hours)</li> <li>▪ Flexibility and adaptability               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Can be changed</li> <li>○ Upgraded easily</li> <li>○ Incremental development</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Transportation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall safety               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Emergency vehicles (measure is access and time to respond)</li> <li>○ Pedestrians (exposure of pedestrians to exhaust – proximity of cars to waiting pedestrians)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Community / Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Traffic flow – very important criteria to residents’ associations; redevelopment concerns are also important</li> <li>▪ Congestion – economic effects on businesses (impacts of alternatives on drivers from outside area)</li> <li>▪ Culture – add street festivals to 4<sup>th</sup> bullet</li> <li>▪ Community cohesion (north side and south side)</li> <li>▪ Look at planning objectives that are broader than the OP (i.e., Smart Growth, Provincial Policy Statement objectives) - measure would be how well alternatives meet those policy goals</li> <li>▪ Pride in the community – measure by sidewalks and displays and terraces</li> <li>▪ Effects on parking should include bike parking availability as a measure</li> <li>▪ Illegal parking on private property on residential streets should be a criteria</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Environment is not confined to St. Clair W. (measure CO<sub>2</sub>, emissions)</li> <li>▪ Compare to other fuels (i.e., fuel cells vs. hydroelectric)</li> <li>▪ Add NOISE to environment category</li> <li>▪ Qualitative effects on shade (heat island effects, trees)</li> </ul>

<b>Category</b>	<b>Additional Criteria / Measures</b>
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Long-term costs have to be considered (17 year horizon)</li> <li>▪ Costs to human health</li> <li>▪ Full costs need to be shown and defined</li> <li>▪ Costs of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (which alternative is more expensive in this regard)</li> <li>▪ Value of vegetation on street</li> </ul>
<b>General Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Criteria in different categories are related and should be integrated into a single criteria (e.g., safety should be one criteria within its own category rather than being dispersed across categories)</li> <li>▪ Evaluation should be done on a holistic basis rather than by individual criterion (i.e., don't evaluate each criterion and come up with a score for the alternative by simply adding up each criterion score)</li> <li>▪ Criteria in the COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS category are more important than the COSTS category, and most important of all the categories</li> <li>▪ Request accidents data from Spadina study</li> </ul>

**TABLE 2**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Additional Criteria / Measures</b>
<b>Transit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quality of experience</li> <li>▪ More transit vehicles</li> <li>▪ Affordable transit service</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Per person delay (as opposed or in addition to vehicular delay)</li> <li>▪ Effects on motorists' route planning (i.e., cut through neighbourhoods)</li> <li>▪ Reduction in capacity for vehicles</li> <li>▪ Clarity for motorists (i.e., lane consistency)</li> </ul>
<b>Community / Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Loss of tax dollars in the community</li> <li>▪ Overall degradation of quality of life of surrounding neighbourhood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Public safety</li> <li>○ Decline of property values</li> <li>○ Effect on community services</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Curb cuts that affect onstreet parking (driveways)</li> <li>▪ Opportunity to increase the numbers of customers for existing businesses on St. Clair</li> <li>▪ Opportunity to attract better businesses (or businesses that serve the area) to the neighbourhood</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b>	
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Social costs (sustainable development)</li> </ul>
<b>General Comment</b>	

**TABLE 3**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Additional Criteria / Measures</b>
<b>Transit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Safety should be a measure for each criteria</li> <li>▪ GO Rail is not a priority, and should not be a criterion. The focus should be streetcar tracks and safety</li> <li>▪ Accessibility for disabled (not only consideration) as a measure should also consider functionality and safety</li> <li>▪ Effects on vehicles</li> <li>▪ Comfort not just in the waiting facilities but on board cars; need adequate space</li> <li>▪ Size of streetcars not mentioned (small vs. big)</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Look at A.M. and P.M. peak hours in the same way</li> <li>▪ Look at off-peak period effects on businesses</li> <li>▪ Pedestrian safety effects away from St. Clair (study blocks north and south)</li> <li>▪ Under overall safety, includes vehicular / pedestrian, vehicle / vehicle, vehicle / cyclists</li> <li>▪ Travel per person (measure suggested)</li> </ul>
<b>Community / Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ First four criteria appear to be what city employees want, rather than the St. Clair community (move to cost)</li> <li>▪ Effect on quality of life / human health</li> <li>▪ Safety</li> <li>▪ People effects on businesses (not just vehicles, cyclists, mothers with children, different people)</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Trees, lawns, gardens, local urban environment should be considered</li> <li>▪ Not just stormwater effects; returning hydrological cycle</li> <li>▪ Effect on urban temperatures</li> </ul>
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Money for revitalization</li> <li>▪ Externalities (compensation for impacts)</li> <li>▪ Enforcement costs, if required</li> </ul>
<b>General Comment</b>	

**TABLE 4**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Additional Criteria / Measures</b>
<b>Transit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Adaptability to technological change</li></ul>
<b>Transportation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Maximize person capacity of the road</li><li>▪ Ensure clarity of distinction in separate road functions</li></ul>
<b>Community / Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Visual quality</li><li>▪ Emergency vehicle access</li><li>▪ Effects on number of on-street parking spaces for residents</li></ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b>	
<b>Costs</b>	
<b>General Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Transit and transportation should be combined into one category (or added as a separate category) to reflect the compound effect of travel time savings per person trip on a transit vehicle, as opposed to per vehicle trip (personal or transit vehicle)</li><li>▪ The categories in general should be removed (or at least the weighting of categories) to provide a holistic solution</li></ul>

**TABLE 5**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Additional Criteria / Measures</b>
<b>Transit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Economic considerations:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Make transit more viable and attract riders</li> <li>○ Include on and off options for multiple destinations and short stops</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Parking – park and ride lots to attract ridership</li> <li>▪ Long-term viability – fuel cell vehicle option may be cheaper in 20-30 year horizon</li> <li>▪ Travel time savings per commuter</li> <li>▪ Route management</li> <li>▪ Quality of trip experience</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Accommodation of future transportation technologies (i.e., Segway)</li> </ul>
<b>Community / Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Design supports immediate local business / community needs (based on diverse conditions of street), recognizing that vast majority of community are commuters</li> <li>▪ Will design “bury” hydro and telephone poles</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b>	
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cost effectiveness for cars</li> </ul>
<b>General Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Safety should be its own category and include the following criteria:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pedestrian safety, especially related to island design / width</li> <li>○ Minimize injuries and fatalities for pedestrians / cyclists / transit riders / motorists / passengers</li> <li>○ Costs should also factor in the costs of injuries</li> <li>○ Accessibility, especially for wheelchairs</li> <li>○ Mitigate road rage – protect community from additional “cut-through”</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ On-off short stop at mid-route (e.g., tokens and/or transfers available from business owners to make transit more attractive ... ties in to Economic considerations mentioned in Transit) – SUGGESTION TO TTC</li> </ul>

**TABLE 6**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Additional Criteria / Measures</b>
<b>Transit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Measure: marginal change in AVERAGE travel time</li> <li>▪ Measure: Look at the maximum delays expected</li> <li>▪ Measure of attractiveness to riders should include which types of vehicles are attractive</li> <li>▪ Criterion: Safety of passenger platforms</li> <li>▪ Measure of access for disabled should include looking at how capacity of transit vehicles affects disabled passengers</li> <li>▪ Safety of vehicles and pedestrians as related to transit</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Person / person measures rather than person / vehicle</li> <li>▪ Look at motor vehicle / cyclist safety</li> <li>▪ Measure of Pedestrian Safety should look at the # of lanes to cross with or without median</li> <li>▪ Sidewalk safety measure: width reduction “tipping point” of 2m unobstructed</li> <li>▪ Safety of pedestrians islands</li> <li>▪ Criterion: Safety / efficiency for emergency vehicles</li> <li>▪ Criterion: Easy pickup of garbage and recyclables</li> <li>▪ Criterion: Keeping road in winter or inclement weather safe and non-slippery</li> </ul>
<b>Community / Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Effects of parking in residential areas / side streets</li> <li>▪ Double parking</li> <li>▪ Parking on sidewalks</li> <li>▪ Need enough parking for viable businesses</li> <li>▪ Effect on local traffic</li> <li>▪ Criterion: Potential revenue loss due to construction</li> <li>▪ Measure of effect on local roads: whether it will increase traffic <u>above designation of what constitutes a “local road”</u></li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Criterion: Effect on human health</li> <li>▪ Measure of air quality should include measures of pollution from TTC, not only cars</li> <li>▪ Measure of air quality: change in vehicle delays and speed per person</li> </ul>
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Include hidden subsidy of \$0.15/km for cars</li> <li>▪ Health care costs from air pollution should be included in full cost accounting</li> <li>▪ Durability -&gt; look at costs in the long run due to how much maintenance will be required (includes vehicles and tracks)</li> <li>▪ Include in costs the effect of damage by other vehicles on tracks</li> <li>▪ Look at TTC fares (raise)</li> </ul>
<b>General Comment</b>	

**TABLE 7**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Additional Criteria / Measures</b>
<b>Transit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capacity</li> <li>▪ Flexibility for expansion / change in technology</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergency Services – ease of vehicle access</li> </ul>
<b>Community / Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Commercial assessment value</li> <li>▪ Community planning should include cultural festivals</li> <li>▪ “Effects during construction” should be expanded to address residential vs. business effects separately</li> <li>▪ Opportunities for mitigation / relief measures</li> <li>▪ Emergency Services – changes to response times</li> <li>▪ Maintenance / safety in winter design considerations</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b>	
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property compensation (during construction)</li> </ul>
<b>General Comment</b>	