

**Greenwood Station Second Exit
Local Working Group (LWG) Meeting #7
March 21, 2018
St. David's Church – Basement 6:30 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.**

Meeting Purpose & Summary:

On March 21, 2018, the TTC hosted the seventh meeting of the Greenwood Second Exit Local Working Group (LWG).

Please note that TTC has not put forward, accepted or approved any of the locations that the LWG has put forward for review. No decision on a second exit/entrance location has been made.

Notification for the 2018 meeting schedule included:

- Addressed Mail via Canada Post.
- More than 800 properties in the local neighbourhood (January, 8, 2018).
- 35 local property owners with offsite mailing addresses via Canada Post (January, 8, 2018).
- Email to contact list of all who expressed previous interest (December 22, 2017 and again on January 9, 2018).
- Registered mail to each property owner whose property was put forward as a preliminary location option for discussion by the Local Working Group and/or other local residents or businesses owners (January 10, 2018).
- Registered mail to each property owner whose property was identified as an additional potential property impact during the functional review (January 18, 2018).
- TTC website update with notice of the 2018 meeting schedule (posted January 9, 2018).
- Email reminder to contact list of all who have expressed interest (March 13, 2018)

TTC summarized the LWG's preliminary rankings. The LWG reviewed and discussed their preliminary rankings.

LWG's Preliminary Rankings:

		Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E	Option F	Option G	Option H	Option I2	Option J
		1366 Danforth Ave.	1410/1416 Danforth Ave.	1416 Danforth Ave.	7 Linnsmore Cres.	9 Linnsmore Cres.	11 Linnsmore Cres.	15 Linnsmore Cres.	138/140 Monarch Park Ave.	257/259 Strathmore Blvd.	Strathmore & Monarch Park Ave; S. of ROW
Safety	Preliminary Comparative Rank	6	7	3	10	9	8	5	1	4	2
Local Community Impact - Second Exit	Preliminary Comparative Rank	7	3	1	2	5	4	6	8	10	9
Local Community Impact - Construction	Preliminary Comparative Rank	8	10	9	7	6	5	3	2	1	4
Customer Experience	Preliminary Comparative Rank	2	3	1	4	7	6	5	8	10	9
Cost	Preliminary Comparative Rank	5	10	9	8	5	5	4	3	1	2
TOTAL COMP. RANK		28	33	23	31	32	28	23	22	26	26
RANK		6	10	2	8	9	6	2	1	4	4

The LWG reviewed their location options and discussed the relative merits for each option using the Evaluation Framework categories.

Approximately 40 neighbours attended. A number of property owners and/or their representative shared their input with the LWG, their neighbours and TTC.

Next Steps and Updated Schedule:

The LWG will submit their final rankings to the TTC by March 28, 2018. The third party Expert Panel for second exits will review the Local Working Group’s rankings to ensure compliance with the evaluation framework.

One additional LWG meeting will be held on April 11, 2018 for the LWG to discuss and finalize their rankings.

A public meeting will then be held on May 1, 2018 for the community to review the LWG’s overall rankings of their 10 locations, and give additional input to both the LWG and to the TTC.

Finally, TTC staff will report to the TTC Board on the LWG’s findings and the wider community’s input. The TTC Board will make a final decision on a second exit/entrance location for Greenwood Station.

LWG Members in Attendance:

Duncan Rowe	
Oliver Hierlihy	Daphne Brown
Brian Freeman	Basil Mangano
Alan Hahn	Alison Behrend
Grace Bosley	Bruna Amabile
Ian Scott	Lily Chong (via conference call)
Alison Motluk	Pam Koch
Simon Mortimer	

Regrets:

Kathy Katsiroumpas

Neighbours in attendance

Approximately 35 neighbours attended.

Third Party Expert Panel on Second Exits:

Simon Rees, Jeff Garkowski

TTC Staff:

Nada Zebouni
David Nagler
Steve Stewart
Kamran Ehsani
Denise Jayawardene
Lito Romano

City Councillor’s Office

Rashid Katsina (Councillor Fragedakis’s office)

Agenda:

- Introductions
- Presentation & LWG Discussion
 - TTC review of locations, additional information requested
 - Preliminary Rankings s Update
- Q&A with neighbours attending

TTC Post Meeting Action Items:

- TTC to post presentation and meeting notes on the Second Exit project website (completed).

Meeting Question and Answer Summary:

Process Related Questions:

- 1) Referencing Safety Criteria S1, S2 and S3, a neighbour noted that when the quantitative rankings are added up, Option H and Option J are placed as the safest options despite having longer tunnels than Option I2.

A: Expert Panel:

TTC Engineering has accurately provided the technical information necessary for the Local Working Group to evaluate the 10 options for Greenwood Second Exit. The Evaluation Framework was designed to be used across the network and was not specifically designed for Greenwood Station or any other individual station. When applied in this process, S1 and S2 happen to have the same rankings. The sub criterion "S3" measures the distance from the platform to outside, and Option "I2" ranks best in that particular criterion. Criterion S4 (customer security) is qualitative. The Expert Panel will review the Safety criteria accordingly.

- 2) What are the next steps?

A: The LWG will submit their final rankings to the TTC by March 28, 2018. The third party Expert Panel for second exits will review the Local Working Group's rankings to ensure compliance with the evaluation framework.

One additional LWG meeting will be held on April 11, 2018 for the LWG to discuss and finalize their rankings as a group.

A public meeting will then be held on May 1, 2018 for the community to review the LWG's overall rankings of the 10 locations, and give additional input to both the LWG and to the TTC.

Finally, TTC staff will report to the TTC Board on the LWG's findings and the wider community's input. The board report will be made public online.

The TTC Board will make a final decision on a second exit/entrance location for Greenwood Station.

- 3) What is the process for breaking a tie? How much weight does TTC Board give to cost when they will ultimately approve the LWG's top ranked option?

A: The LWG terms of reference specifies:

- *It is expected that groups will generally arrive at decisions by consensus. However, should a decision require a vote, each member will have an equal vote.* (See 3.3 Decision Making).
- *Recommend the location that ranked highest according to the evaluation framework.*
- *Present their recommendation to the Expert Advisory Panel on Second Exits to review for compliance with the evaluation framework, after which time the recommendation will be presented to the community for feedback.* (See 1.2 Responsibilities).

The Expert Panel has explained that the LWG may vote by consensus or majority at the final meeting to recommend a location that does not necessarily have the highest rank going into the meeting. This is consistent with the Expert Panel's approved approach as implemented most recently at Donlands. The LWG would have to provide a clear explanation/rationale for this. Both the overall rankings and recommended location would be provided in the report to the TTC Board.

Changing individual preliminary rankings based on new information and/or discussions held at the meetings is entirely acceptable, as it is an iterative process. At both Chester and Donlands, multiple volunteers adjusted their rankings based on group discussions and consideration of different perspectives. Of course, altering ranks to suit any pre-conceived preference or bias is not acceptable, nor in the spirit of the process.

For the Donlands process, the Local Working Group had ranked two locations very closely. After discussing the relative merits in detail at the final meeting the LWG concluded, near unanimously, that 17 and 19 Dewhurst Boulevard (Option E) was their clear recommendation. They voted 9-2 on

this specifically. Option E at 17/19 Dewhurst was subsequently accepted and approved by the TTC Board.

Please note that the TTC has stated before the Greenwood process began, that it will not build any second exit (in any location) that does not adequately improve safety within a reasonable cost. The TTC Board will decide what cost is acceptable.

Budget Questions:

- 4) Can you provide more information on how the costs will breakdown for each option?

A: The costs presented for each second Exit/entrance location option include cost estimates for construction and acquiring property. The vast majority (approx. +/- 90%) of the cost is for construction, including utility relocation, major excavation and underground works. Note that these are Order of Magnitude estimates. A final cost can only be determined once engineering design is completed. The same level of detail and information was provided at Chester and Donlands for their LWG consultations.

Distance Questions:

- 5) Can you provide statistics on the direction that people travel to and from Greenwood Station?

Post meeting note:

A: TTC's Service Planning Department has provided the following summary of the where people walk to and from Greenwood Station. It is based on data provided to TTC from the University of Toronto's Transportation 2011 survey.

Walking to Greenwood Station from:

- Northeast of the station 30%
- Northwest of the station 20%
- Southeast of the station 20%
- Southwest of the station 30%

Walking from Greenwood Station to:

- Northeast of the station 25%
- Northwest of the station 15%
- Southeast of the station 30%
- Southwest of the station 30%

Safety Questions:

- 6) Why are some of the layouts showing platform exits at the end of the platform while others are showing exits away from the end of the platforms?

A: The location of the second exit at platform level (underground) is determined by the relationship of the underground passageway connecting to the new Second Exit Building at street level and existing structures, such as the subway tunnel, vent shaft, station box, etc.

Easier Access Questions:

- 7) What will the accessible path be at Greenwood Station?

A: There are two elevators planned at the existing Greenwood Station building. One elevator will go from street level to concourse, down to the eastbound platform. A second elevator will connect the concourse level to the westbound platform. This is necessary at Greenwood as the subway platforms are on either side of the tracks (unlike St. George Station which has a centre platform design).

Customer Service:

- 8) Will the second exit/entrance be staffed by a collector in a booth?

A: No. The collector position is being phased out. Instead of having to ask questions of a collector behind a booth, TTC staff will be out and about in the station to assist our customers. This will be possible as fares will be paid through PRESTO and automated machines, eliminating the security challenge of staff accepting cash payments.

LWG Location Comments: The LWG discussed the location options that they put forward. The following summarizes the discussion

Option A (1366 Danforth Ave.):

- Some members expressed that they did not rank this location well for the S4 safety criterion due to concerns with mid-block pedestrian crossings on Danforth Ave and potential for jay-walking.
- A member indicated they did not rank this location well for S4 safety because there is less space on the sidewalk for customer flow.
- A member indicated a safety concern with creating an empty lot in a residential area on Strathmore if this midblock Danforth option were built.
- One LWG member expressed concern about the long construction timeline and related impacts.
- A member raised a concern about its economic impact, including during construction due its direct impact to the middle of the laneway that is used for business deliveries and access.
- A member raised concern about significant economic impact during construction to the neighbouring businesses.
- Concerns were discussed regarding the lack of construction staging space available and permanent impacts to neighbouring business properties and construction impacts to neighbours residential properties were noted.
- A member indicated concern about unknown property requirements to the adjacent businesses that could only be determined through TTC's future detailed design.

Option B (1410/1416 Danforth Ave.):

- One member expressed that this option would lead to removal of many mature trees and ranked it poorly under permanent community impact for vegetation.
- A member indicated that from a convenience perspective, many customers would not use it, as it is a long underground walkway.
- A member indicated that from a Safety perspective, exiting or entering from this location beside the laneway ranked poorly, in addition to its long underground corridor.

Option C (1416 Danforth Ave.):

- Some members expressed that they ranked Option C very well for S4 safety due to its location on a well-lit, busy corner of the Danforth with many "eyes on the street".
- Some members expressed that they did not rank it well for Safety under S4 due to its long underground pedestrian corridor length.
- An LWG member expressed that from a customer convenience perspective, a second exit/entrance in this area would spread the access well to neighbours to the east of Greenwood Station.
- A member expressed that a location on the Danforth would have a positive effect on local business.
- Some members indicated that from a permanent community impact perspective (economic impact and social impact) they favour this option as it would be prominent in the community, serve potential future developments well, and avoid purchase of any homes.
- A member indicated that in terms of social impact, removal of second floor residential tenants should be taken into consideration as negative impact.

Options D, E, F, G (7, 9, 11, 15 Linnsmore Cres.):

- A member expressed support for Linnsmore Crescent options due to its proximity to the existing main entrance, where residents are accustomed to transit users on their street. A Linnsmore option would avoid presenting new impacts to another local residential street in the neighbourhood.
- A member expressed concern that all the options on Linnsmore Crescent may lead to significant construction impacts including potential temporary access impacts to homes on the north side of Strathmore Boulevard.
- A member expressed concerns about the permanent impact to mature trees and inability to plant new trees over the tunnel structure, which would run underneath both sides of Strathmore Blvd.

Post meeting note:

How will residents access their homes during construction?

A: Details such as hoarding and exact construction impacts will be developed during the detailed design phase. For some options, a shared porch may need to be built to provide access to homes where required. The properties are listed in the functional layouts. Below is an example of temporary shared front porch access that was constructed to maintain access during Woodbine Station construction. If any porch is required to be removed during construction, then at the conclusion of construction, new porches will of course be built in consultation with the homeowners. If it is not technically possible to maintain access for any duration of construction, occupants would be relocated temporarily into accommodations paid for by the TTC/City. Every effort would be made to stage construction in such a way to avoid such a temporary impact.



Comments:

Multiple neighbours, business owners, property owners and their representatives participated in the Q&A.

- The property owner of 140 Monarch Park expressed the following:
 - When totals for S1, S2, and S3 are added up, it places Option H/Option J as the safest options (which have longer underground corridors than Option I2).
 - The Expert Panel was asked to review the framework, given that for Greenwood, S1 and S2 rankings happen to be the same for multiple location options.
 - The homeowner submitted a suggested alternate safety scoring for the Expert Panel to review and comment.

The Expert Panel advised that they would review the submission and provide a response.

- A resident asked that the LWG carefully consider the significant impact of removing on-street parking spaces due to the scarcity of permit parking.
- A resident asked that the Expert Panel also review the Safety criteria S1-S3 given the layout of Greenwood Station and amend as necessary to ensure quantitative measures for Safety are most fairly measured.
- The Expert Panel advised that there is an anomaly at Greenwood whereby S1 and S2 criteria happen to be ranked in the same order for each location. They re-iterated that they would review, as the Evaluation Framework was not specifically designed for Greenwood or any individual TTC station.
- A neighbour indicated that the two location options at the corner of Monarch Park and Strathmore and the midblock Strathmore locations are poor from a permanent community impact perspective and they do not support any of these three locations.

Appendices:

The presentation from the meeting is posted on the project website:

[http://www.ttc.ca/About the TTC/Projects/Second Exit Projects/Greenwood Station/index.jsp](http://www.ttc.ca/About%20the%20TTC/Projects/Second%20Exit%20Projects/Greenwood%20Station/index.jsp)

Please see: Local Working Group Presentation – March 21, 2018

Upcoming Meeting:

- LWG Meeting #8 - Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Location: St. David's Anglican Church, 49 Donlands Avenue

Time: 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Purpose: Purpose: The LWG members will review and discuss the LWG's final rankings of their location options.