



# SECOND EXIT PLANNING AND CONSULTATION – DONLANDS STATION

**Local Working Group Meeting #5**

**Preliminary Rankings (Updates and Discussion)**

**June 14, 2016**



# TODAY'S MEETING OVERVIEW

Agenda	
• Introductions	6:30 - 6:35
• Review of Action Items	6:35 - 6:45
• New Votes	6:45 – 6:55
• LWG feedback received following May 31 <sup>th</sup> meeting	6:55 – 7:00
• Review LWG's Preliminary Rankings	7:00 - 8:15
• Discussion of rankings by category	
• Q & A	
• Discussion with neighbours, property owners	8:15 - 8:35



# LWG MEETING SCHEDULE & NEXT STEPS

SCHEDULE	DETAILS
February 25, 2016	LWG members submitted location options to TTC
LWG Meeting #2 – Thursday, March 3	Review location options LWG recommends up to 8 options for TTC technical review
Mid-March to May	TTC Technical Analysis of LWG’s options – 8-12 weeks
LWG Meetings #3 & #4 (May 17 & May 31 <sup>st</sup> )	LWG discusses TTC technical analysis based on feedback from LWG
LWG Meeting #5 June 14, 2016	LWG discusses preliminary rankings of their location options
LWG #6 June 28, 2016	Finalize location rankings based on 5 evaluation criteria
Community Meeting September, 2016	LWG location rankings presented to community for feedback (TTC and LWG )
TTC Board Meeting (TBC)	Final Decision is made by TTC Board



# OVERALL SCORING EXAMPLE

## COMPARATIVE RANK - FOUR OPTIONS

OVERALL SCORE				
	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
SAFETY	1	3	2	4
Community Impact - Long Term	1	2	4	3
Community Impact CONSTRUCTION	2	1	4	3
CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE	1	1	1	4
COST	2	1	4	3
<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>

How to rank ties

Lowest score is best/preferred option.



# ACTION ITEMS FROM LAST MEETING

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



# ACTION ITEMS FROM LAST MEETING

- Request to add comparative construction timelines for each location option (**complete - info was included in matrix**)
- TTC to update the cost of options taking into account returns from the sale of 1 and 3 Strathmore (**complete**)
- Request to add the updated costs for preliminary evaluations (**complete**)



# LWG VOTE – PREFERRED MEETING DATE

- LWG vote to meet on Tuesday, June 28 or Tuesday, July 5 to review and finalize their group rankings (**post meeting note: June 28<sup>th</sup> was selected as the next LWG meeting date to review the final rankings**)



# COST RANKING – LWG VOTE

A) Rank costs to a specific number (e.g. \$14.3m)

*or (as suggested by the Chester Station LWG):*

Score ties if different locations are within a specific six figure range to be agreed upon by Donlands LWG

B) If a range is preferred, vote on what the range should be for ties

(e.g. within \$100 000, 200 000, 300 000, \$500 000 etc.

(e.g. should \$12.5 m be scored a tie with \$12.6, 12.7 or 12.8m?)



# COSTS UPDATE:

- Every option (except 1 and 3 Strathmore) received a credit in “Cost” as all other options allow for the re-sale of 1 and 3 Strathmore
- Two reduced costs provided for review:
  - a) profit derived from sale of 1 and 3 Strathmore applied to all other options (difference between purchase price and projected re-sale price)
  - b) full projected re-sale value of 1 and 3 Strathmore applied to all other options



# COSTS UPDATE:

Applying a credit for “profit” or a credit for the “full resale value” of 1 and 3 Strathmore is important to see a full reduction to all options other than 1 and 3 Strathmore, *but does not actually change the order*



# Q&A

- Q: How long is construction fencing/hoarding in place in one location during construction?
- **A: Fencing and barriers will be in place to safely separate the work zone from pedestrian access areas. As with other road works, the construction areas will remain occupied with fencing and equipment which typically shift through different phases of the project. At this time, it is premature to determine how long hoarding would be in place in any specific location.**



# Q&A

- Q: Are the costs for the easier access project (elevators) included in the costs for the second exit evaluation?
- **A: No. The costs presented for each Second Exit location option include cost estimates for acquiring property and construction itself.**



# Q&A

- Q: Are the costs for the easier access project (elevators) included in the costs for the second exit evaluation?
- **A: No. The costs presented for each Second Exit location option include cost estimates for acquiring property and construction itself.**



# Q&A

- For Option “E” (17/19 Dewhurst), would the lots currently used for parking at the back of these houses be available to neighbours for parking or otherwise during construction?

**A: No. That area would be required for construction.**



# Q&A

- Post construction, for Option “E” (17/19 Dewhurst), could the area currently used for parking be sold to neighbouring Strathmore residents for parking or additional egress, or re-purposed for TTC customer bike rack/bike storage or another use that benefits the community?

A: Should 17/19 Dewhurst be chosen, TTC will carry forward these suggestions into design and would endeavour to provide an amenity for the community at the second exit if space permits and the City allows. As the owner, the City would ultimately determine the future use of any land that is not required for TTC for the purpose of a second exit.



# Q&A

- **Q:** How does one interpret Criteria LC9 - is it about which option has the least potential to damage existing vegetation?

**A:** Yes.

**Options that have the least impact on vegetation rank most favourably. Particular sensitivity is given to protection of mature trees. Replanting opportunities after construction is captured.**

**A graphic explaining the different depths available for plantings post-construction is on the project website.**



# Q&A

- Q: Please clarify what Criteria LC3 (Public Stakeholders) is trying to get at as it relates to the Donlands second exit?

**A: The “LC3” criterion accounts for:**

- a) each option’s ability to support local City Planning initiatives**
- b) each option’s potential for new opportunities to work with public bodies such as the City of Toronto, Schools, or other levels of Government for mutual benefit**



# CONSTRUCTION TIMELINES

Local Community Impact - Construction	Criteria	Option A 14 Dewhurst	Option B 888 Danforth	Option C 890 Danforth TD Bank	Option D 890 Danforth TD Bank Parking Lot	Options E 17 & 19 Dewhurst	Option G 1 & 3 Strathmore	Option H 53 Donlands	Option I 53 Donlands Parking Lot
C2	Construction timeline	Longer than average construction duration due to impact on utilities, existing properties and longer underground structures.	Longer than average construction duration due to impact on utilities, existing properties and longer underground structures.	Well longer than average construction duration due to impact on existing properties and longer underground structures.	Longer than average construction duration due to impact on existing properties and longer underground structures.	Average construction.	Shorter than average construction.	Well longer than average construction duration due to impact on utilities, existing properties and longer underground structures.	Well longer than average construction duration due to impact on utilities, existing properties and longer underground structures.



# PRELIMINARY EVALUATION SAFETY

		Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Options E	Option G	Option H	Option I
Safety	Total Score	11	13	14	12	10	5	16	19
	Comparative Rank	3	5	6	4	2	1	7	8
	Total Score	10	11	11	11	11	11	16	17
	Comparative Rank	1	2	2	2	2	2	7	8
	Total Score	12	13	11	11	11	11	13	16
	Comparative Rank	5	6	1	1	1	1	6	8
	Total Score								
	Comparative Rank	2	4	4	3	1	4	4	4
	Total Score								
	Comparative Rank	7	7	2	5	5	1	2	2
	Total Score	10	11	13	14	13	9	10	12
	Comparative Rank	2	4	6	8	6	1	2	5
	Total Score	18	12	13	10	8	12	16	17
	Comparative Rank	7	3	4	2	1	3	5	6
	Total Score	10	11	13	11	9	8	16	18
	Comparative Rank	3	4	6	4	2	1	7	8
	Total Score	13	13	13	13	13	12	10	12
	Comparative Rank	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	2
	Total Score	9	8	6	7	9	10	12	12
	Comparative Rank	4	3	1	2	4	6	7	7
Total Score	<b>93</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>123</b>	
Total Comparative Rank	<b>37</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>58</b>	
Prelim. Comparative Rank	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	



# PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

## SECOND EXIT

		Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Options E	Option G	Option H	Option I
Local Community Impact - Second Exit	Total Score	42	26	35	33	12	55	58	63
	Comparative Rank	5	2	4	3	1	6	7	8
	Total Score	36	29	16	28	40	59	26	27
	Comparative Rank	6	5	1	4	7	8	2	3
	Total Score	41	37	18	21	32	55	35	39
	Comparative Rank	7	5	1	2	3	8	4	6
	Total Score								
	Comparative Rank	2	4	4	3	1	4	4	4
	Total Score								
	Comparative Rank	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	7
	Total Score	28	28	22	33	42	51	12	12
	Comparative Rank	4	4	3	6	7	8	1	1
	Total Score	46	23	27	36	17	67	48	42
	Comparative Rank	6	2	3	4	1	8	7	5
	Total Score	47	31	18	32	27	52	28	27
	Comparative Rank	7	5	1	6	2	8	4	2
	Total Score	33	30	36	36	56	53	12	12
	Comparative Rank	3	2	4	4	6	5	1	1
	Total Score	48	24	23	13	55	72	32	33
	Comparative Rank	6	2	2	1	7	8	4	5
Total Score	<b>321</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>255</b>	
Total Comparative Rank	<b>47</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>42</b>	
Prelim. Comparative Rank	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	



# PRELIMINARY EVALUATION CONSTRUCTION

		Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Options E	Option G	Option H	Option I
Local Community Impact - Construction	Total Score	13	10	15	16	4	11	19	20
	Comparative Rank	4	2	5	6	1	3	7	8
	Total Score	12	12	15	8	13	12	10	10
	Comparative Rank	5	5	8	1	7	4	2	2
	Total Score	9	15	15	7	4	6	15	15
	Comparative Rank	4	5	5	3	1	2	5	5
	Total Score								
	Comparative Rank	2	4	4	3	1	4	4	4
	Total Score								
	Comparative Rank	3	3	6	3	1	1	6	6
	Total Score	9	13	20	14	8	3	14	14
	Comparative Rank	3	4	8	5	2	1	5	5
	Total Score	11	13	17	10	5	5	13	13
	Comparative Rank	4	5	8	3	1	1	5	5
	Total Score	15	15	15	11	6	5	14	14
	Comparative Rank	6	6	6	3	2	1	4	4
	Total Score	10	11	18	14	10	3	12	12
	Comparative Rank	2	3	6	5	2	1	4	4
	Total Score	12	11	13	9	9	13	15	15
	Comparative Rank	4	3	5	1	1	5	7	7
Total Score	<b>91</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>113</b>	
Total Comparative Rank	<b>37</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>50</b>	
Prelim. Comparative Rank	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	



# PRELIMINARY EVALUATION CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE

		Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Options E	Option G	Option H	Option I
Customer Experience	Total Score	19	21	13	15	11	11	25	29
	Comparative Rank	5	6	3	4	1	1	7	8
	Total Score	14	17	7	15	20	25	20	23
	Comparative Rank	2	4	1	3	5	8	5	7
	Total Score	20	16	4	8	12	32	24	24
	Comparative Rank	5	4	1	2	3	8	6	6
	Total Score								
	Comparative Rank	2	4	4	3	1	4	4	4
	Total Score								
	Comparative Rank	5	5	1	3	3	1	5	5
	Total Score	10	10	4	14	14	30	12	12
	Comparative Rank	2	2	1	6	6	8	4	4
	Total Score	23	19	4	15	14	30	16	16
	Comparative Rank	7	6	1	3	2	8	4	4
	Total Score	23	20	4	16	13	30	16	16
	Comparative Rank	7	6	1	3	2	8	3	3
	Total Score	23	20	16	17	24	20	7	7
	Comparative Rank	4	3	2	3	5	3	1	1
	Total Score	20	12	4	8	28	32	18	19
	Comparative Rank	6	3	1	2	7	8	4	5
Total Score	<b>152</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>146</b>	
Total Comparative Rank	<b>45</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>47</b>	
Prelim. Comparative Rank	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	



# PRELIMINARY EVALUATION COST

		Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Options E	Option G	Option H	Option I
Cost	Total Score	2	3	6	4	5	1	7	8
	Comparative Rank	2	3	6	4	5	1	7	8
	Total Score	2	3	6	4	5	1	7	8
	Comparative Rank	2	3	6	4	5	1	7	8
	Total Score	2	3	6	4	5	1	7	8
	Comparative Rank	2	3	6	4	5	1	7	8
	Total Score								
	Comparative Rank	2	4	4	2	1	4	4	4
	Total Score								
	Comparative Rank	2	2	6	2	2	1	7	7
	Total Score	2	2	6	2	2	1	7	7
	Comparative Rank	2	2	6	2	2	1	7	7
	Total Score	2	3	5	3	3	1	7	7
	Comparative Rank	2	3	5	3	3	1	7	7
	Total Score	2	2	6	4	4	1	7	8
	Comparative Rank	2	2	6	4	4	1	7	8
	Total Score	2	3	6	4	5	1	7	8
	Comparative Rank	2	3	6	4	5	1	7	8
	Total Score								
	Comparative Rank								
Total Score	14	19	41	25	29	7	49	54	
Total Comparative Rank	<b>18</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>65</b>	
Prelim. Comparative Rank	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	



# PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OVERALL

		Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Options E	Option G	Option H	Option I
<b>Safety</b>	Total Score	93	92	94	89	84	78	109	123
	Total Comparative Rank	37	41	35	34	27	22	48	58
	Prelim. Comparative Rank	5	6	4	3	2	1	7	8
Local Community Impact - Second Exit	Total Score	321	228	195	232	281	464	251	255
	Total Comparative Rank	47	32	24	34	36	64	41	42
	Prelim. Comparative Rank	7	2	1	3	4	8	5	6
Local Community Impact - Construction	Total Score	91	100	128	89	59	58	112	113
	Total Comparative Rank	37	40	61	33	19	23	49	50
	Prelim. Comparative Rank	4	5	8	3	1	2	6	7
Customer Experience	Total Score	152	135	56	108	136	210	138	146
	Total Comparative Rank	45	43	16	32	35	57	43	47
	Prelim. Comparative Rank	6	4	1	2	3	8	4	7
<b>Cost</b>	Total Score	14	19	41	25	29	7	49	54
	Total Comparative Rank	18	25	51	29	32	12	60	65
	Prelim. Comparative Rank	2	3	6	4	5	1	7	8
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>PRELIMINARY RANK</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>

