



**Future of the Gardiner East
Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)
Meeting 13-4**

**Tuesday, February 4, 2014 | 7:00 pm – 9:00 pm
Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 308-309**

Meeting Summary

1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction

Ms. Liz Nield, CEO of Lura Consulting, began the fourth Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting by welcoming committee members and thanking them for attending the session. She introduced the facilitation team from Lura Consulting and led a round of introductions. Ms. Nield also reviewed the meeting agenda and informed committee members that the purpose of the meeting was to present and discuss results of the evaluation of alternatives.

Mr. John Livey, Deputy City Manager, City of Toronto and Mr. John Campbell, President and CEO of Waterfront Toronto, also welcomed the committee members to the meeting. In their opening remarks, Mr. Livey and Mr. Campbell reiterated the purpose of the SAC meeting to discuss results of the evaluation of alternatives; and asked SAC members to indicate if anything had been missed, or anything should be considered moving forward. Mr. Livey and Mr. Campbell indicated that the report would be going to Public Works and Infrastructure Committee on March 4, and Council following that date. They thanked committee members for sharing their time and expertise.

A copy of the agenda is available in Appendix A, while a list of attending SAC members can be viewed in Appendix B.

2. SAC Member Briefing

Mr. Chris Glaisek, VP, Planning and Design, Waterfront Toronto, reviewed the draft slide presentation which included:

- A summary of participant feedback heard to date and,
- A review of the results of the evaluation of alternatives.

For more information about the evaluation of the alternatives, please visit the consultation website www.gardinereast.ca.

3. Facilitated Discussion – Evaluation Criteria

SAC members provided the following feedback and advice on the material presented:

Costs

- Simplify and clarify the information presented in Slide 51 (i.e. difference between blue and green columns). Consider showing the green and blue values on two different slides, or including only one or the other in the presentation. Some members said they liked that both valuations were shown and that it is important to clearly explain the difference between the two.
- Consider presenting a calculation to illustrate the value of commuting time lost (could use same valuation as Metrolinx does).
- Clarify that the cost of new ramps is included in costing for the remove option.
- Consider including a slide that shows total net cost to the City of the various options.

Peak Hour Volumes

- Explain the information presented in the slides depicting travel volumes and distribution more clearly (e.g. peak hour is 8:00 – 9:00 am; numbers are for vehicles traveling through the area, not actual volumes).
- Include information depicting the number of single vehicle occupants per hour. Compare this to number of transit users on the King or Queen streetcar lines (or on a GO train).
- Compare, or explain peak hour volume in relation to traffic over a 24-hour period to provide people with more context.
- CAA noted they have traffic counts that differ from those presented.

Distribution of Traffic

- Explain the intent of this slide (pie chart) more clearly and verify the values.
- Identify which modes are constrained – need a more transparent way of depicting them.

Evaluation Summary

- Explain the factors that were used in the evaluation to demonstrate the process was not arbitrary (e.g. emphasize the pedestrian crossing in the Remove and Replace options).
- Clarify weighting in summary slide of evaluation results. Consider how to present results more “equitably”.

Public Transit

- Include information about where and when investments in public transit will be implemented – it’s important for the public to get a sense that some of these lines may not get built, or take a long time.
- Emphasize the need for improvement in transit across all options.

Other

- Include a map showing the downtown cordons.
- Fix the view corridors for the Replace and Remove options, depicted incorrectly.
- Other the “next steps” slide, make alternatives singular – assumption should be that detailed design will be done for one alternative, not several.

4. Upcoming SAC Meeting Dates

Ms. Nield thanked SAC members and the project team for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Next SAC meeting: To Be Determined.



Future of the Gardiner Expressway/Lake Shore Boulevard East Reconfiguration EA and Integrated Urban Design Study

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #4

Tuesday, February 4, 2014

7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 308/309

DRAFT AGENDA

Meeting Purpose:

1. Review feedback received during Round 2 of consultations
2. Present and discuss results of the evaluation of alternatives

7:00 pm Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions

- Liz Nield, Lura Consulting, Facilitator
- John Livey, City of Toronto
- John Campbell, Waterfront Toronto

7:10 pm SAC Member Briefing: Evaluation Results and Preferred Solution

- Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting

7:50 pm Discussion

Participants will be encouraged to address the following discussion questions, as well as ask questions of clarification on the material presented.

- Thinking about the material presented, what feedback or advice do you have to improve the clarity of the presentation in preparation for the upcoming public forum?
- Thinking about the results of the evaluation...
 - What do you like? What concerns do you have?
 - What advice do you have for the project team as the study moves into the next phase – which will consider design options for the preferred solution?

9:00 pm Summary/Closing

Appendix B – List of Attendees

SAC Meeting #4 List of Attendees

Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association (GWNA)
Don Watershed Regeneration Council
Beach Triangle Residents' Association
Redpath and Toronto Industry Network
Heritage Toronto
Canadian Automobile Association (CAA)
Canadian Courier & Logistics Association
Cycling Toronto
Canadian Urban Institute
CodeBlueTO
Ontario Professional Planners Institute – Urban Design Working Group
Toronto Financial District BIA
Unionville Ratepayers Association
Toronto Urban Renewal Network (TURN)
Urban Land Institute (ULI)
Toronto Centre for Active Transportation
Walk Toronto
West Don Lands Committee
Waterfront Toronto
City of Toronto
Dillon Consulting
Lura Consulting

List of SAC members unable to attend

St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Evergreen
Transport Action Ontario
Federation of North Toronto Residents and People Plan Toronto
Professional Engineers Ontario
Greyhound
Food and Consumer Products of Canada
Retail Council of Canada
Toronto Association of BIAs
Toronto Board of Trade
Lake Shore Planning Council
South Riverdale Community Health Centre
Toronto Community Foundation
Toronto Society of Architects
Purolator Inc.
Rogers Centre/Blue Jays
Civic Action
Ontario Public Transit Association
Leslieville BIA
Film Ontario

Appendix C – SAC Questions of Clarification, Feedback and Advice

SAC Questions of Clarification

A summary of the discussion following the presentation is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**.

Q. Slide 51 – the cost line needs to be clarified. Are there not ramps needed in the remove option? This seems biased.

A. That's not what we're trying to do. The blue numbers represent the funding allocated to maintain the section east of Jarvis Street in the City's capital budget. Long-term capital maintenance budget has not been defined yet. The cost estimate is to enhance the rest of the structure.

A. Consider it as a credit it to remove. We don't have to rehab the section between Yonge and Jarvis if it is removed.

Q. Interesting to do a cost valuation of the time lost for that extra 10 minutes of commuting.

A. It's difficult to do - what is the value of time. Should it be based on household average income, or is better as opportunity cost. It requires judgement.

A. It's challenging to do. We tried to duplicate the Metrolinx study. To apply the same study to this project did not make sense because of the range of factors (e.g., vehicle operating costs, emissions, delay costs). Some people will change the way they move around due to capacity constraints. There is no real distinction between options that would change the conclusion.

Q. How you measure safety?

A. We consider a range of factors (e.g., geometry of ramps, visibility of columns, etc.).

C. Interesting to know where vehicle trips, not taking into consideration, are going and how they impact safety.

Q. First slide – amount of trips can you clarify what the numbers represent?

A. Peak hour is 8:00am to 9:00am. Volume measured in 1 hour, can be multiplied over 2-3 peak time. Pattern doesn't change. It's about where people peel off.

Q. My cordence count doesn't match these numbers.

A. They are based on screen lines, this is just volume on the Gardiner per hour.

Q. Slide on economics 51 – confused by blue and green values. Requires clearer explanation.

A. We will look for better labels.

C. Number of vehicles per rush hour slide – 5650 vehicles per hour. You could note that they are single vehicle occupants. Could compare to King and Queen street cars.

A. We could show a comparative of modal split.

Q. From a pedestrian perspective there is no significant difference between remove and improve – can you explain?

A. Several factors were analyzed (e.g. under structure, hidden by peers, crossing distance, etc.) not just the crossing distance.

C. Present the factors to show they are not arbitrary. The summary slide implies the criteria are equally weighted.

Q. Economics (revenues) – reasons not to include revenue from more valuable land over time.

A. The general uplift in land value doesn't apply to tax revenue. Tax revenue remains neutral. It doesn't fit in a discussion of this magnitude.

C. In terms of net present value – just show the blue. Or show two slides. It's hard for people to grasp net present value as a concept.

C. Formidable presentation. Terrific presentation. A huge amount of information was presented in a clear format. I didn't feel lost at any point. Something like this slide (costs) may be cause some confusion. Appreciate it.

Q. I don't have a sense of traffic over a 24 period. How many people will be inconvenienced?

A. Peak hour volumes are about 10% of 24 hour volumes. Haven't showed off peak volumes, peaks are critical. Off peak flow moves more freely. The expressway operates at less than capacity during off peak for all options no real distinction.

C. There's a need for comparison. People might draw the wrong conclusion that the world might end. Also, one of the slides is incorrect. The perspectives of replace/remove in the view corridors.

C. Presentation was great – my advice is to add a Next Steps slide. I want to know how input is going to be used.

Q. With the remove option there is potential to retrieve between 5 and 10 acres of developable land, where, on the north side?

A. It's a combination, mostly on the north side currently used by ramps. It's enough to make site developable, but it's not traditional. It is a tight space.

Q. One slide mentioned Ossington Avenue, is that in the study area?

A. Ossington Avenue was mentioned as a references for distance.

Q. Back to values and net gains. Where is the value from the private sector coming from?

A. All the money the city would recapture is from publically owned land that is undevelopable because it is currently occupied by the Gardiner infrastructure.

C. Regarding assumptions to build certain transit initiatives, show a slide about when those projects are being implemented. Important for public to get sense that some of these lines may not get built, or take a long time.

A. We're constrained by the model to 2031, that land use is beyond 2031.

A. We require transit improvements for all options, that's an important point to make.

Q. Are you going to be identifying the preferred alternative.

A. We need to continue with consultations first.

A. We have an obligation to Committee. The actual recommendation will be made public after it goes to council.

Q. The pie chart about in bound modes – emphasize the small percentage of trips. It's worth highlighting.

C. The numbers relating to walking and cycling are misleading. They are seasonal and tilted toward the local population. They are vastly different than incoming traffic which has much longer journeys.

A. The pie chart does not reflect volume or length.

C. It's a misleading slide.

A. We're not trying to mislead. The Gardiner volume is low because of the capacity constraint. This shows volume coming in from all modes.

Q. Are there other ways to measure this?

A. We looked at several ways to measure impact on travel time. This is the most effective.

Q. What happens toward Yonge street and other side of river? At some point we need to address either end.

A. The same city staff are working on other projects (Port Lands, Yonge precinct). It's something we can address directly.

Q. What are the results from the public consultation

A. We have a summary slide and report online, which will be presented to the public on Thursday.

C. I don't want to mislead you about volumes. The diagram is a distribution of traffic. It's a static shot. The intent is to show distribution of traffic as a through route. It does show that that volume is less than capacity. That's why we're considering this section.

A. I appreciate you clarifying that, because I knew that.

C. In terms of transit, you could add a point in favour of the remove option if one of the 8 lanes on Lake Shore could include an express bus service. Darken the shade of green.

Q. Which arterials will be impacted the most?

A. Richmond Street and Adelaide Street, all the typical ones would absorb displaced traffic. The 401 less so.

C. Emphasize that population downtown tripled in past 5 years.

Q. Pie chart, call out what is explicitly what is constrained. More transparent way of showing mode of transport. Shore medium long term plan of GO corridors are they compatible with remove option, or experience more pressure.

A. Also doing EA for bike facility on Rich/Adelaide. Not much of an impact, constraint is at Parliament. Bike facility is as far east at Sherbourne. Didn't affect our option.