



MEETING NOTES

PROJECT: TTC-TWRC
East Bayfront Transit Environmental Assessment

MEETING NO: CLC 3

FILE NO.: 6377

DATE: March 5, 2007 **TIME:** 6:00 p.m.

PLACE: TWRC Boardroom, Suite 1310, 20 Bay Street

PRESENT: **Community Liaison Committee (CLC)**
Julie Beddoes GWNA and WDLC
Tom Davidson Office of Councillor Pam McConnell
Dennis Findlay Port Lands Action Committee
David Fisher Rocket Riders
Braz Menezes YQNA and QQHBA
Steve Munro Transit Advocate
Sylvia Pellman St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Margaret Samuel Central Waterfront Neighbourhood Association
David White Waterfront Action
Cynthia Wilkey West Don Lands Committee

Study Team (ST)
Bill Dawson TTC Service Planning
Mike Ronson TTC Service Planning
Tim Laspa City of Toronto Transportation Planning
John Kelly City of Toronto Transportation Services
Dennis Callan McCormick Rankin (MRC)
Hank Wang McCormick Rankin (MRC)
Mark Nykoluk URS
Alun Lloyd BA Group
John Hillier du Toit Allsopp Hillier (DTAH)

Moderator
Pino DiMascio Urban Strategies (USI/TWRC)

PURPOSE: EBF Community Liaison Committee Meeting #3

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

1. Review of Minutes

- a) Queens Quay Harbourfront Business Improvement Association (QQHBIA) is being represented on the CLC by Braz Menezes not Margaret Samuel.

MRC

2. Update on the ToR Approval Process

- a) The ToR was approved by the Minister of the Environment on January 24, 2007. The amended ToRs (East Bayfront, West Don Lands, and Port Lands) are available on the project website.

3. Introduction to Glenn Pothier – Facilitator for Public Meetings

- a) G. Pothier was introduced to members of the CLC. G. Pothier will be facilitating public workshop discussions throughout the EA study process.
- b) The upcoming West Don Lands public workshop will take place on March 21 at Enoch Turner Schoolhouse (106 Trinity Street). The East Bayfront public workshop will take place on March 28 at Novotel Hotel (45 The Esplanade). Doors will open at 6 P.M. with presentation beginning at 6:45 P.M.

4. Presentation of Study Team Recommendations on Planning Alternatives

- a) As a dry run for the upcoming public workshop, the Study Team began a PowerPoint presentation (available on the TWRC web site) of its recommendations on corridors and transit technologies/right-of-way for the East Bayfront. In summary, the Study Team recommends that ‘Queens Quay Only’ be carried forward to the design stage as the preferred corridor. The Study Team also recommends both ‘buses in dedicated right-of-way’ and ‘streetcars in dedicated right-of-way’ be carried forward for further analysis.
- b) See Item 6 for discussions on the Study Team’s findings.

5. Review and Discussion of Study Team Responses to CLC Comments

- a) This is the continuation of discussion from the March 1, 2007 West Don Lands (WDL) Transit EA CLC meeting concerning the Study Team’s detailed responses to comments/questions submitted by members of that CLC (available on the project website). Because the representative from CWNA had not been able to complete all of her comments at that previous WDL meeting, it had been agreed that her concerns would be discussed first at this meeting. However, given that she was pleased with the Study Team’s recommendation to carry forward both ‘buses in dedicated right-of-way’ and ‘streetcar in dedicated right-of-way’ for further analysis, the Study Team reduced some of her concerns.
- b) **MS:** If the TTC and the TWRC wish to meet with members of the CWNA directly to discuss the EA, it is the TTC-TWRC’s responsibility to contact condo owners who would be directly affected by this study; it is not the CWNA’s responsibility to notify the owners.
- c) **P. DiMascio:** The TTC-TWRC will send out postcard notices to condo addresses provided by M. Samuel.
- d) **MS:** There are some people who think that I benefit personally from the

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

fuel cell/hydrogen bus technology. For the record, I have zero commercial or personal interest/stake in that technology. I am a hedge fund manager by profession so I do benefit personally by the stock market and also when I short or long funds.

- e) **P. DiMascio:** Are you making that statement in response to any accusation from the group?
- f) **MS:** I am making that statement as the issue came out of email discussions amongst the CLC members over the past weekend.
- g) **P. DiMascio:** So you would like your statement on record?
- h) **MS:** Yes.
- i) **MS:** For comment D27 in the response table (and same for D37 and D38), why was streetcar/LRV compared with diesel bus?
- j) **ST:** Comparison with diesel bus was made to explain how new TTC track design, in combination with modern LRVs, can successfully reduce noise and vibration as a result of vehicle operation. The Study Team will continue to compare modern LRVs with modern bus technologies.
- k) **MS:** The CWNA has requested the TTC-TWRC to provide data on capital and operating costs of the transit technologies so we can conduct our own analysis and comment appropriately, but the TTC-TWRC does not seem to be forthcoming with our request. The CWNA cannot finalize its comments without those data. I will have to consult with CWNA board members for their input on this.
- l) **P. DiMascio:** Are you saying that because you do not have the costs for the transit technologies, you cannot provide your input on the Study Team's preferred corridor? That is, you wish to put Lake Shore Express back on the table because of that? Keep in mind that the Study Team is recommending both transit technologies (bus and streetcar) carried forward to the next stage.
- m) **MS:** No, it's not that. However, I would still need to get back to the CWNA for further comments.
- n) **MS:** For comment D36, I think you have misunderstood our message. We recognize that streetcar/LRV does not produce emissions at the point of operation, but our comment was made with respect to the source of energy. Streetcars draw their energy from the grid which is fed from coal-fired power plants. On the other hand, the wind turbine at Ontario Place can be expanded over time to power fuel cell buses.
- o) **MS:** For comment D38, I want to emphasize one the noise and vibration generated by the existing streetcar services on Queens Quay West. The noise and vibration are magnified between the condo buildings. You cannot dispel that.
- p) **MS:** Overall, given that the requested data are not available, I will have to get back to the group later with finalized comments from the CWNA.

MRC

6. CLC Comments and Discussion on the Study Team's Findings

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

- a) **JB:** Three comments. First, I am happy that careful analysis of the Lake Shore Express has been done. Second, in your presentation you have shown a cross section graphic from the West 8 group; there are also a couple of other design graphics done by West 8 so I think at the public workshop on March 28 we should display some of those as well. Third, at the public workshop when we begin the discussion on bus versus streetcar, it would be useful to have the TTC stats available that list the current bus routes that operate 54 buses per hour. It would also be useful to provide the stats on energy efficiency of various transit technologies.
- b) **DW:** Regarding the 'Suggested Alternative Loop' in your presentation, why was Yonge Street considered instead of Bay Street?
- c) **ST:** The trouble with Bay Street is that buses heading to Union Station would drop off passengers on the wrong side of the street. Yonge Street was chosen as the return leg of the loop because of the street's connection to King subway station.
- d) **DW:** There is a need for better connection between the GO Bus terminal on the east side of Bay Street and the PATH system so that GO Bus passengers would not run across Bay Street instead of using the existing teamway overhead.
- e) **ST:** The TTC's analysis has shown that approximately 70% of transit users exiting the streetcars at Union Station would transfer to the subway and disperse throughout the subway network. Only the remaining 30% would head for the inner core of the CBD or elsewhere.
- f) **DF:** Bay Street has its physical limitation: the sidewalks are too narrow to handle a large crowd of pedestrians and transit users.
- g) **SM:** When talking about using Front Street as a transit terminal, people need to be aware of the impact on pedestrian circulation of putting what is essentially half of the Finch bus terminal on Front Street. There is already a high volume of pedestrian activities on Front Street between York and Bay. Transit users are pedestrians when they get off the vehicles, so if you want to drop these passengers off in front of Union Station, you have to ask yourself how that would impact pedestrian circulation.
- h) **ST:** The Union Station District Plan has taken into account GO growth over the next 15 years. However, no decision has been made yet for Front Street. The district plan has assessed and evaluated a number of options for Front Street, but an EA study would be required to finalize recommendations.
- i) **DF:** I think your 8000 forecast peak hour ridership might be a little underestimated. I agree with dropping Lake Shore Express off the table now, but if in the future we add in an east-west transit service along Lake Shore corridor, that would bring in more people to Union Station. You have to look long term so that we will have enough capacity to handle additional future demand.
- j) **ST:** Our demand forecast accounts for a 30-year planning horizon so it does give us a long term projection, but you are right. We can provide

TTC/MRC

PROCEEDINGS:

ACTION BY:

some flexibility in our design to handle additional demand that may be generated by other future add-ons from the outside.

- k) The YQNA representative conveyed his organization's desire for better pedestrian connection between Union Station and the waterfront. Key suggestions include extension of the PATH network from Union Station south to the waterfront, removal of the existing York/Bay Street off-ramps from the Gardiner Expressway, removal of the existing streetcar tunnel portal on Queens Quay West, and commitment from the TWRC to initiate a south Union Station precinct plan that would examine issues and concerns raised by the YQNA. The Study Team recognizes the merits of the YQNA suggestions; nonetheless, the scope of this transit EA study is focused on the need to introduce higher-order transit to help shape development in the East Bayfront and further east.
- l) There was discussion amongst the group pertaining to transit user/pedestrian access at Union Station (in particular the York Street and Bay Street teamways) and the merit of distributing passengers around the CBD with a bus loop operation. The Study Team reaffirmed that transit user/pedestrian access at Union Station will be examined as part of the analysis of design alternatives. With regards to a bus loop operation around the CBD, the Study Team emphasized that a great majority of transit users arriving at Union Station by streetcar would transfer to the subway to complete their journey.

7. Next Step

- a) **P. DiMascio:** The Study Team wants to hear from people living in the area. Discussions at the upcoming public workshops will help guide the Study Team towards the next stage of the study. On that note, I would like to thank everyone for attending tonight's meeting. Public workshop notices will go out soon. We will see everyone on the 21st and the 28th!

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned within 48 hours of receiving these meeting notes at 905-823-8500.

Notes prepared by,
McCormick Rankin Corporation
Hank Wang