

**Greenwood Station Second Exit
Local Working Group (LWG) Meeting #8
April 11, 2018
St. David's Church – Basement 6:30 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.**

Meeting Purpose & Summary:

On April 11, 2018, the TTC hosted the eighth meeting of the Greenwood Second Exit Local Working Group (LWG). The purpose was for the LWG to submit their final rankings for a Greenwood Station Second Exit/Entrance building location to the TTC.

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

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).
- Meeting Schedule email reminder to contact list of all who have expressed interest (March 13, 2018)

Prior to the April 11, 2018 meeting, the third party Expert Panel for second exits reviewed the Local Working Group's rankings to ensure compliance with the evaluation framework.

Local Working Group Rankings

At the meeting, TTC presented a summary of the Local Working Group's final rankings. The LWG reviewed their location options and discussed the relative merits for each option using the Evaluation Framework categories.

After discussing their top two ranked locations (Option C: 1416 Danforth Avenue and Option H: 138/140 Monarch Park Avenue) in detail, including a category by category review as a group, **the LWG voted unanimously (13 members were present during the vote) that Option C -1416 Danforth Avenue is their recommended location for a second exit/entrance in the Greenwood Station neighbourhood.**

LWG's Final 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	Comparative Rank	4	7	3	10	9	8	6	1	5	2
Local Community Impact - Second Exit	Comparative Rank	7	4	1	2	4	3	6	8	10	9
Local Community Impact -Construction	Comparative Rank	8	10	9	7	6	5	4	2	1	3
Customer Experience	Comparative Rank	2	2	1	4	6	6	5	9	10	8
Cost	Comparative Rank	5	10	9	8	5	5	4	3	1	2
TOTAL COMP. RANK		26	33	23	31	30	27	25	23	27	24
RANK		5	10	1	9	8	6	4	1	6	3

Approximately 30 neighbours attended. A number of property owners and/or their representatives shared their input with the LWG, neighbours and TTC.

Next Steps and Updated Schedule:

TTC will contact the ten property owners of each location put forward by the LWG, to inform them of the LWG's final rankings. If the property owners wish, TTC will share their comments with the LWG.

The TTC project team must now consult with the City of Toronto on the LWG's location rankings.

Please note that the Community Meeting originally planned for May 1, 2018 will be rescheduled to a later date.

At the public meeting, the community will 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
Brian Freeman
Alan Hahn
Grace Bosley
Ian Scott
Alison Motluk
Simon Mortimer

Daphne Brown
Kathy Katsiroumpas
Alison Behrend
Bruna Amabile
Lily Chong
Pam Koch

Regrets:

Basil Mangano

Neighbours in attendance

Approximately 30 neighbours attended.

Third Party Expert Panel on Second Exits:

Simon Rees, Jeff Garkowski, Wayne McEachern, Carl Knipfel

TTC Staff:

Nada Zebouni
David Nagler
Steve Stewart
Denise Jayawardene
Lito Romano

City Councillor's Office

Rashid Katsina (Councillor Fragedakis's office)

Agenda:

- Introductions
- Presentation & LWG Discussion
 - LWG's Final Rankings
- 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 Statement:

The TTC Second Exit Expert Panel was assembled to develop an Evaluation Framework specific use document, for local community members (Local Working Groups), to utilize in an aggregate process to determine a suitable location for TTC Station second exit buildings.

The ongoing purpose of the Expert Panel is to attend regular LWG meetings and provide guidance for the use of the Evaluation Framework.

At a specific point, in a particular process, the Expert Panel meets to discuss concerns and govern the fair use of the Evaluation Framework.

On the evening of April 9, 2018, the Expert Panel met to analyze the ranking process for the proposed Greenwood Second Exit option locations. Unanimously, the Expert Panel determined that the Evaluation Framework should remain unaltered in order to maintain the overall integrity of the process.

- 2) What are the next steps?

A: TTC will review the recommended location in more detail and consult the City of Toronto who must also review the recommended location.

A public meeting will then be held at a later date for the wider 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 and deputations will be welcome at the TTC Board meeting once scheduled.

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

Budget Questions:

- 3) 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 projected 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. It was not economically feasible to complete engineering design work for all 10 proposed locations. The same level of detail and information was provided at Chester and Donlands for their LWG consultations.

- 4) Can the costs for Option C be reduced, if the existing building is retained in the design?

A: Extensive structural investigation would be required. No such investigation has been completed for any of the location options at this stage. The functional layouts for every location assumed a new building structure. A final cost can only be determined once engineering design is completed.

Location Questions:

- 5) Option B: 1410/1416 Danforth Avenue Rear and Option C (1416 Danforth Avenue) are located in almost the same location at street level, why do the drawings show two different pedestrian corridors? Does the TTC have flexibility to shift the corridor to Monarch Park Avenue front lawns/ROW?

A: The project team depicted the shortest distance travelled underground for each option.

While it would be possible to construct either pedestrian corridor (route underground) for both Option C and B, the pedestrian corridor in Option B (188 m) is longer than Option C (157 m).

Some considerations:

- A shorter and more direct route travelled underground is typically preferable. The project team depicted the shortest distance travelled underground for each option.
- Trees and landscaping on front lawns in the path of the underground corridors depicted in light blue on the drawings would need to be removed. New landscaping can be installed after construction, but is limited if it is directly over an underground structure. After a location is determined, TTC will hire a professional arborist as part of the engineering design process and will coordinate with City Forestry and property owners.

Small structures, like garages, can be rebuilt on top of the pedestrian corridor/underground infrastructure.

Safety Questions:

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

A: The location of the second exit at platform level (underground stairwell) 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. For every street level location east of the “underground station box”, locating the underground stairwell at the far east end of the station minimizes the length of the underground walkway, the amount of construction, cost and impacts. This is not the case for street-level options to the west.

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

Option B (1410/1416 Danforth Ave.):

- Why was Option C ranked well, but Option B (located in the same area) ranked so poorly?
- A member expressed that Option C’s entrance doors are located on the Danforth Ave., whereas Option B’s entrance doors are located on Monarch Park Avenue. A member felt that it was safer exiting directly onto the Danforth Avenue as opposed to the laneway.

Option C (1416 Danforth Ave.):

- An LWG member, who is also the Danforth Mosaic Business Improvement Area (BIA) coordinator noted that he consulted the local businesses with a survey; businesses prefer not to have a second exit/entrance on the Danforth Avenue due to the construction impacts, however it was noted that once built, it could have a long-term positive impact. Business owners are concerned about significant impacts to their operations during construction.
- Why was Option C on the Danforth ranked well for safety, when this option has one of the longest underground pedestrian corridors?
- One member who did not rank it well for safety (S4 sub criterion), expressed safety concerns citing bad sightlines in a long corridor that has many turns. He cited that at his University, similar underground pedestrian tunnels were seen as potentially dangerous, and advised against such a design for Greenwood Station. He advised that a walk down a residential street such as Strathmore would be safer than a comparable walk underground.
- Another member expressed that tunnels would have cameras and be well lit, streets are not as well lit and don’t have cameras. With appropriate design, there is no reason why an underground walkway cannot be safe.
- An LWG members indicated that having eyes on the street and direct sightlines to a Danforth second exit/entrance building is excellent for safety, and much more preferable to a location on Strathmore where there are no sightlines from the Danforth and also preferable to a location at the corner of Monarch Park at Strathmore.
- A member expressed that incidents can happen when cameras are present.

TTC Post meeting note: Please note that the TTC has stated before the Greenwood process began, that it will not build any second exit (in any location across the city) that does not adequately improve safety within a reasonable cost. The TTC Board will make the final decision.

- Why were the Danforth options rated well in the Permanent Community Impact Category?
- Some members expressed that they ranked Option C very well for “S4” safety (a qualitative category), due to its location on a well-lit, busy corner of the Danforth Avenue with excellent sightlines on a very busy street.
- Some members expressed that they did not rank it well for Safety under “S4” due to its long underground pedestrian corridor length.
- A member expressed that it is much better to be at street level in a business area on the Danforth rather than in a residential area that is quiet at night.
- A member expressed that Option C would be a good location, as density is will increase along the Danforth Avenue in the future and this location will provide excellent convenience.

Other Comments on Danforth location Options:

- A member expressed that multiple properties would be impacted for the mid-block Danforth location option (Option A beside Red Rocket). That location would have impacts to both Strathmore Boulevard homes and neighbouring Danforth businesses.
- A member expressed that Option A on the Danforth (midblock) would lead to jay-walking across the Danforth by school children, and would leave an empty lot on Strathmore Boulevard. The uncertainty for future use of the vacant space is a concern.
- A member expressed that they ranked Options A and C poorly due to the construction impact on the laneway during construction, as the laneway is important for deliveries and access to rear parking.

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

Linnsmore Cres. Options – Ranking Discussion

- A member expressed that the TTC provided quantitative rankings (S1-S3) for these options affected the overall rankings. The locations for underground stairwells for the Linnsmore locations were not located at the far east end of station box, as that would have meant a longer underground pedestrian walkway, more excavation, more property impacts and higher cost.
- Another member stated they wouldn’t walk the pedestrian corridor to come up at street level in the same place – directly across from the existing station. They would not use such a pedestrian corridor and they prefer a second exit/entrance in their neighbourhood that they would use often.
- A member cited safety concerns, if in the event of an emergency; all customers would convene on Linnsmore Crescent all at once, it would be better to have an option to spread out the customers.
- A member remarked that Option H and the Option G were ranked differently despite both being located on a corner on residential streets.
- A member expressed that the Linnsmore options impact trees on Linnsmore Crescent and on both sides of Strathmore Boulevard.
- A member indicated that from a customer convenience perspective, putting up a new building directly across from the existing station offers no added convenience for day to day entrance use. (An alternate opinion had been expressed at previous meetings from an LWG member noting that station users from outside the community want to get to Greenwood Avenue. Locating an entrance to the east --further away from Greenwood Avenue, would not be helpful for them).

Comments:

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

- A neighbour noted that while Option C and H were ranked equally by the LWG coming into the meeting –based on their individual evaluations, no LWG member voted for Option H at the meeting. The neighbour advised that this suggests the Expert Panel’s evaluation Framework needs to be re-visited and the process needs to be improved.
- A neighbour advised that the TTC’s quantitative criteria under the Expert Panel’s process for both Safety and Cost lead to an unfair process.
- The Expert Panel acknowledged that it is not a perfect process. The Evaluation Framework is a guide for Local Working Groups and attempts to provide a balanced approach. They indicated that the process cannot however simply be a matter of what people “like” or “don’t like” near their own home or business. It does need to have consistent evaluation criteria including for safety and cost.
- An LWG member noted she lives on Monarch Park, north of Strathmore. She expressed that this process has allowed her to get to know many of her neighbours and thanks the LWG for their efforts and for taking into consideration the community’s input via a challenging process.
- An LWG member advised that in his opinion, it was a fair consultation process.

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

Please see: **Local Working Group Presentation** – April 11, 2018

Upcoming Meeting:

- Community Meeting - Date TBD

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

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

Purpose: At the end of the Local Working Group’s evaluation process, their rankings of the locations will be presented to the community at a public meeting (date TBD) for additional review and community input.

The TTC project team will then report the LWG’s rankings, the wider community’s input and a recommendation on a final location to the TTC Board. The TTC Board will make the final decision.