

## Future of the Gardiner Expressway/Lake Shore Boulevard East Reconfiguration EA and Integrated Urban Design Study Stakeholder Advisory Committee - Meeting 15-9

Tuesday, October 20, 2015 | 6:30 – 8:30 pm  
Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 310

### Meeting Summary

#### 1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction

Liz Nield, CEO at Lura Consulting, welcomed Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members and thanked them for attending the session. Ms. Nield introduced the facilitation team from Lura Consulting and led a round of introductions. She reviewed the meeting agenda and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to present and discuss the proposed evaluation criteria and hybrid urban design concepts.

Chris Glaisek, Vice President, Planning and Design at Waterfront Toronto, also welcomed SAC members. Mr. Glaisek explained that the design of the Hybrid option has been narrowed down to three main alternatives, each with sub-components that can be mixed and matched. He also noted that since the last SAC meeting, Hargreaves & Associates has been exploring potential public realm improvements for each alternative to provide a better sense of how the public spaces surrounding each alternative alignment might look like in three areas: west of Cherry, Cherry to Don, and east of the Don. Mr. Glaisek also briefly outlined the next steps in the project which include a SAC meeting in November to present the results of the evaluation, followed by a public information centre (PIC) in December. The project team anticipates reporting the results of this phase of the EA to the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee (PWIC) in early 2016.

David Stonehouse, Director, Waterfront Secretariat at City of Toronto, briefly reviewed the staff recommendations included in several reports submitted to Executive Committee, PWIC and Council in September which covered the following topics:

- Tunnel Option;
- Tolling and Road Pricing Options;
- Strategic Rehabilitation Program;
- Hybrid Alternative Design Concepts;
- Accelerated Repairs.

The meeting agenda is attached as Appendix A, while a list of attending SAC members can be found in Appendix B.

## 2. SAC Member Briefing

Don McKinnon, Project Manager at Dillon Consulting, and Gavin McMillan, Senior Principal at Hargreaves & Associates presented the work completed since the last SAC meeting covering the following topics in two parts to allow for focused discussion:

### Part I – Don McKinnon

- Process / Next Steps
- What We Heard at SAC #8
- Updated Evaluation Criteria

### Part II – Don McKinnon and Gavin McMillan

- Review of Viaduct and Consolidated Proposals
- Urban Design Update

## 3. Facilitated Discussion

The following provides a summary of the recurring themes and ideas discussed by SAC members on the material presented, as well as written feedback from SAC members. More detailed accounts of the discussion can be found in Appendix C. Appendix D includes additional written comments submitted by SAC members following the meeting.

### **Proposed Evaluation Criteria:**

#### *General Comments*

- Ensure the public understands there is no significant difference among the alternatives for certain criteria (e.g., list the criteria that have been deleted from the evaluation process).
- Ensure consistency when presenting capital costs but also ensure they are current (e.g., present them in 2013 and 2016 dollars if necessary).
- Measure the quality and value of active transportation, recreational and development opportunities (in addition to quantifying them).

Feedback about specific criteria is included in Table 1 (next page).

**Table 1 - Feedback on Proposed Evaluation Criteria**

Study Lens	Criteria Group	Criteria	Feedback
<b>A. Transportation and Infrastructure</b>	A.1 Automobiles	A 1.1 Commuter Travel Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify how &lt; or &gt; 2 minutes was chosen as the metric for this criterion.</li> </ul>
	A.3 Pedestrians	3.1 North-South Sidewalks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a measure to assess pedestrian access to the water's edge and Keating Channel.</li> <li>Consider adding a measure to assess pedestrian crossing times.</li> <li>Clarify why crossing distance has been removed.</li> </ul>
		3.2 East-West Sidewalks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify if the location and effect of on-off ramps to the Gardiner will be included as a measure.</li> <li>Add a measure to assess access to the Don River.</li> <li>Consider the opportunity to create an east-west pedestrian promenade along the Keating Channel.</li> </ul>
	A.4 Cycling		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider whether there is a need to distinguish between commuter cycling routes and recreational cycling routes – including routes to water's edge.</li> <li>Include measures to assess the quality of cycling routes; quality and connectivity are both important.</li> </ul>
	A.5 Movement of Goods		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify why construction impact is only considered for this sub category – it should be included for all transportation modes or confined to A.7.</li> <li>Consider network flexibility in this criteria group.</li> </ul>
	A.6 Safety	A 6.1 Pedestrian Conflict Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider conflicts created by Gardiner on-off ramps.</li> <li>Consider the effect of road reconfiguration at the Lake Shore Boulevard/ Jarvis Street on this criterion.</li> </ul>
		A 6.2 Cyclist Conflict Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider conflicts created by Gardiner on-off ramps.</li> <li>Add a measure to assess the presence of poor sightlines.</li> </ul>
		A 6.3 Motorist Conflict Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider a measure to assess opportunities to improve safety through improved sightlines or adding shoulders.</li> </ul>

Study Lens	Criteria Group	Criteria	Feedback
	A.7 Construction Impact	A 7.1 Duration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider whether the duration, extent and precise nature of the travel disruption are more significant factors than the length of the construction period.</li> </ul>
		A 7.2 Transportation Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the potential impact on vehicular traffic.</li> </ul>
<b>B. Urban Design</b>	B.1 Planning	B 1.2 Consistency with Precinct Plans and Other Plans and Initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a measure to assess the impact of development on Cherry Street as a major gateway/connector between the City Centre/West Don Lands and the extension of the City into the Port Lands.</li> <li>Add the Villiers Island Precinct Plan and the Lower Don Lands Framework Plan to the list.</li> </ul>
		<i>B 1.3 Impact on Keating Channel East (proposed new criterion)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a measure to assess the ability to create a viable new precinct that connects the Port Lands to the rest of the City (i.e., ability to maximize the development potential of the City-owned lands in the Keating Channel precinct).</li> </ul>
	B.2 Public Realm	B 2.1 Streetscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a measure to assess: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the opportunity to create a successful east-west spine to support development in the Keating Channel precinct.</li> <li>quality of place throughout the Keating Channel Precinct.</li> <li>the ability to improve degraded or absent north-south connections to the water's edge.</li> <li>the ability to create an attractive pedestrian realm.</li> <li>Consider the effect of road reconfiguration at the Lake Shore Boulevard/ Jarvis Street on this criterion.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
		B 2.2 View Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a measure to assess: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the opportunity to improve visual connections between precincts and transportation routes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Study Lens	Criteria Group	Criteria	Feedback
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>and the water's edge.</li> <li>○ the opportunity to improve visual connections to the Don River Mouth.</li> <li>○ minimizing the impact of elevated infrastructure on view corridors.</li> </ul>
		B 2.3 Amount of Public Realm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand the measure to assess the "quality" of the public realm not just the quantity.</li> <li>• Add a measure to analyze the impact on public realm plans for the Keating Channel Precinct.</li> </ul>
		B 2.4 New Park Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a measure to assess the quality of surplus land.</li> </ul>
	B.3 Built Form	B 3.1 Street Frontage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand this criterion to look at the relative potential for creating viable/quality development sites with potential for high quality retail along Lake Shore Boulevard or an extended Queen's Quay.</li> </ul>
		B 3.2 [Referred to in participant feedback]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify why references to built form opportunities including constraints created by location of transportation infrastructure (including ramps) were removed as they are key considerations in terms of comparing the urban design impacts of the design alternatives.</li> </ul>
<b>C. Environment</b>	D.2 Natural Environment	C 2.4 Storm Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reinstate potential to reduce paved/non-permeable surfaces.</li> </ul>
		C 2.5 Microclimate/Heat Island Effect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain this criterion as there is potential for varying degrees of concrete among the three Hybrid options.</li> </ul>
<b>D. Economics</b>	D.3 Fiscal Net Benefit	D 3.1 Capital Cost and Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share the cost of the railway bridge extension in Alternative 3 with other projects that would potentially benefit from any flood conveyance improvements.</li> </ul>
		D 3.3 Public Land Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a measure or criterion to capture spin-off</li> </ul>

Study Lens	Criteria Group	Criteria	Feedback
		Creation	<p>advantages or disadvantages of longterm economic activity (e.g. future revenue created as a result of new development).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a measure to assess the economic benefit of increased development.</li> <li>• Explain or clarify that an evaluation exercise will be completed to assess the land freed for redevelopment in the evaluation criteria.</li> <li>• Ensure public land distribution proceeds reflect the varying quality of the development sites created by each alternative.</li> <li>• Expand public land value creation to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A measure to assess potential positive or negative impacts on the value of adjacent lands (e.g., publicly owned lands along the Keating Channel in the Villiers Island precinct).</li> <li>○ The comprehensive valuation of the future economic activity that will be generated under the build-out of the three alternatives.</li> <li>○ An assessment of any positive or negative impacts on the development pace of precincts currently being planned (e.g., Keating, Villiers and Film Studio District).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Proposed Urban Design Concepts:

### *General Comments*

- Consider minor road improvements on Lake Shore Boulevard west of Cherry Street, particularly to enhance north-south connectivity and relationship to new developments in the area.
- Consider making the Lake Shore Boulevard and Lower Jarvis Street intersection a “scramble” crossing if no structural modifications are possible.
- Locate cycling routes/trails near the water as much as possible.
- Continue the Lower Don Trail south to Villiers Island along the Don River without merging the route with the street grid.
- Provide more information about the need for on-off ramps close to Cherry Street in the EA reporting (e.g., supporting data, space requirements as well as their impact on surrounding streets and local traffic, developable land, environment, and quality of life).
- Consider that the needs and quality of life of local residents should not be sacrificed for the convenience of a small percentage of Expressway drivers.
- Consider providing three-dimensional renderings to provide SAC members and the public with a ground-level perspective on the qualitative differences between Alternatives 2 and 3.
- Participants expressed support for Alternative Designs 2 and 3 (both with the realigned Lake Shore Boulevard) as they both increase:
  - The potential to unlock development in the Keating and Villiers Island precincts.
  - Opportunities for active transportation and recreation uses along the Don River that connect the Keating Channel Precinct with the Port Lands and re-naturalized river mouth.

### *Alternative Design 2*

- Participants expressed support for Alternative Design 2 (with the realigned Lake Shore Boulevard in Alternative Design 3) as it would increase:
  - Opportunities to unlock development in the Keating and Villiers Island precincts.
  - Opportunities for active transportation and recreation uses along the Don River that connect the Lower Don Trail to Villiers Island.
- Consider reversing the vertical relationship between the Gardiner Expressway and Lake Shore Boulevard so that the Boulevard is higher than the Expressway to:
  - Minimize the perceived visual barrier caused by the Expressway, and;
  - Explore opportunities to create a double-sided street along Lake Shore Boulevard.

### *Alternative Design 3*

- Participants expressed support for Alternative Design 3 as it would increase:
  - Opportunities to unlock development in the Keating and Villiers Island precincts.
  - Opportunities to create iconic destinations and architectural structures along the Don River (e.g., park, bridge).
  - Opportunities for active transportation and recreation uses along the Don River that connect the Lower Don Trail to Villiers Island.

## 4. Next Steps

Next SAC meeting: January 14, 2016, 6:30 to 8:30 p.m., Metro Hall, Room 310.



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

### Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #9

Tuesday, October 20, 2015

6:30 pm – 8:30 pm

Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 310

### AGENDA

#### *Meeting Purpose*

- Present and discuss the proposed evaluation criteria, hybrid urban design concepts and next steps.

#### **6:30 pm      Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions**

- Liz Nield, Lura Consulting, Facilitator

#### **6:40 pm      Project Update and Next Steps**

- Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting
- Gavin McMillan, Hargreaves & Associates

Presentation to include:

##### Part I

- Update from Executive Committee, PWIC and Council
- What We Heard at SAC Meeting #8
- Process/Next Steps
- Updated Evaluation Matrix
- Facilitated Discussion

##### Part II

- Urban Design Update
- Review the Viaduct and Consolidated Proposals
- Facilitated Discussion

#### **7:00 pm      Facilitated Discussion – Evaluation Criteria and Urban Design Concepts**

1. Thinking about the proposed evaluation criteria:
  - What is missing, or is there anything further that you would you like to see explored?
2. Thinking about the urban design concepts presented:
  - What do you like?
  - What concerns you and why?

## Appendix A – Agenda

- Do you have any additional advice to the project team as they move forward to flesh out the urban design plans?

**8:25 pm**      **Summary/Closing**

**8:30 pm**      **Adjourn**

## Appendix B – List of Attendees

### SAC Meeting #9 List of Attendees

Beach Triangle Residents' Association  
Civic Action  
CodeBlueTO  
Cycling Toronto  
Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association  
Heritage Toronto  
St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association  
Toronto Financial District BIA  
Toronto Industry Network/Redpath Sugar  
Transport Action Toronto  
Urban Land Institute  
Walk Toronto  
West Don Lands Committee

A summary of the discussion is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

### *Facilitated Discussion – Part I*

**Q. Since there is already construction happening on the west end of the Gardiner Expressway that is scheduled for completion in October 2016 – what does the P3/AFP model under the Strategic Rehabilitation Program entail?**

**A.** The rehabilitation taking place in the west is using conventional construction methods (e.g., jackhammering, re-pouring roadways, etc.) and applies to only a small segment of the Gardiner Expressway. The program being studied would involve saw-cutting sections of the Expressway in the remainder of the corridor and replacing them with pre-fabricated pieces. The rehabilitation scheduled to October 2016 applies to a small section of the Expressway between Strachan Avenue and approximately Bathurst Street, however rehabilitation is still needed east of there. The rehabilitation program includes: 1) accelerating the repairs, and 2) seeking a partner to design, build, finance, operate and maintain the Expressway.

**Q. Will the elevation of the Don Roadway and Lake Shore Boulevard intersection change as a result of the Don River Naturalization and Flood Protection project? Is there any clarity regarding the future of the rail spur near the intersection?**

**A.** We are accommodating the rail spur in our design work to allow for the possibility of the rail link being rebuilt in the future – whether the rail spur will be rebuilt is a longer-term decision. As part of the Don River flood protection work; the elevation of the intersection will likely be higher, however the elevations are not yet confirmed. We are talking in conceptual terms about replacing the bridge with a wider, higher and slimmer structure.

**Q. To clarify, evaluation criteria that have been removed from the matrix are no longer included because there is no significant difference among the alternatives, correct?**

**A.** Yes, the suggested deletions were made because those criteria or measures are no longer applicable or there is no significant difference among the alternatives.

**C. It would be useful to list all the criteria that have been deleted when presenting this to the public. It has come up in previous meetings that people would like to see an “apples-to-apples” comparison in this process. If there is no significant difference among the alternatives it is important for people to know that.**

**A.** One of our objectives is to simplify this process by trying to focus on the criteria and measures where there is differentiation.

**Q. What time horizon is being considered in terms of future traffic demand on the Don Roadway given the longterm development of the Port Lands? The Don Roadway is going to be source of traffic as people start inhabiting the Port Lands – is that being considered in this process?**

**A.** Transportation forecasting is based on the year 2031 and assumes development in the Port Lands, so yes it is being considered. Forecasting also includes impacts from a potential entrance on the First Gulf property. There is a separate transportation study that is looking at the Port Lands and South of Eastern area to determine how the street network could be enhanced to accommodate more demand in the future.

**Q. Criterion B 2.4 New Parkland should include measures for quality surplus land, not just the quantity. Why was criterion C 2.5 Microclimate / Heat Island Effect struck out? There is potential for varying degrees of concrete in the three options – I would think this still applies.**

**A.** It is based on our ability to measure that particular criterion and come up with meaningful differences among the alternatives.

**C.** There is a qualitative difference among the alternatives in terms of piers, elevated ramps, and the existing Expressway.

**Q. The measure for criteria group A.4 Cycling focuses only on connectivity to other planned and existing routes. The quality of the route should be considered as well (e.g., lighting, drainage).**

**A.** Is that a comment on how the facility should be designed or whether different alternatives provide different opportunities for the quality of the cycling experience?

**C.** It's about how the different alternatives can improve the experience. Sections of the Martin Goodman Trail are located underneath the Expressway – there is no lighting and water falls down from the elevated structure at these sections of the trail.

**A.** Measures for quality of place, whether for walking or cycling, are captured under the criteria group B.2 Public Realm.

**A.** Yes, that is true. However there may be a desire to single out specific elements of the alternative (e.g., cycling lanes) or certain options that provide a better quality experience, but we do have to be careful not to double count the measures.

**C.** If the quality of the trail is poor, no one will use it. There is a section of the Lower Don Trail that passes beneath the railway corridor. On a map the trail looks nice, but in reality a lot of people don't use this section because it feels like riding through a sewer pipe. Quality and connectivity are both important.

**A.** Linear and quantitative amounts could be measured for high-quality environments.

**A.** Another related topic is the quality of development space – not all development space will be the same. We recognize that certain concepts provide an opportunity for higher-quality development space than others. We appreciate that when it comes to trails it is not just a quantitative linear measure.

**Q. What specific measures will be used to assess Economic Competitiveness – it would be a good idea to include the assumptions behind them?**

**A.** The measures included in the matrix are the same measures used during the evaluation completed earlier in the EA. The proposed Hybrid options provide the same transportation function – the question is whether there is a difference among them from an economic competitiveness standpoint. This is likely one of the measures where there is not a lot of difference among the options. We are carrying this measure forward as there are stakeholders in the community who have concerns and would question its absence.

**Q. What does “ability to accommodate future changes to the Gardiner – LSB corridor” under A 1.3 Road Network Flexibility / Choice mean?**

**A.** Simply, it assesses whether one of the alternatives would be more amenable than the others to changes in alignment 20 or 30 years from now.

**Q. Does the measure for criteria group A 2.1 Transit Impact include the East Bayfront LRT?**

**A.** It relates back to flexibility and creating opportunities to bring transit through the Keating area. We are not proposing a new LRT line as part of this process.

**Q. “Presence of free turns” is crossed out from the measures for criteria group A 6.1 Pedestrian Conflict Points – does this refer to channelized turns or something else?**

**A.** It refers to turns to access on-ramps to the Expressway, for example, at Jarvis Street that are not within intersections. There are no examples of these turns between Cherry Street and the Don Roadway.

**Q. A measure to assess the economic benefit of increased development should be added to the section under Economics.**

**A.** The current thinking is to undertake an evaluation of the lands that would be available for redevelopment under the various Hybrid options as well as costing. This includes land within the Keating area as well as the south edge of the Keating Channel/north side of Villiers Island in terms of land benefit created by moving the current Expressway further north of the Keating Channel.

**C. Could that be reflected in the evaluation criteria?**

**A.** Yes, it can be provided for clarification.

**Q. You mentioned that capital costs will be presented in 2013 dollars; I assume that is for consistency.**

**A.** We have not made a final decision on that. We appreciate the need to link back to the numbers that were previously prepared and the desire to keep the time scale consistent.

**C. If you do report in 2013 dollars, you should also report in 2016 dollars too.**

**A.** Whichever year we land on we will be consistent.

**Q. Did the proponents of the Consolidated Plan specify what would be at the bottom of the building that is now underground?**

**A.** No, there appears to be some detail lacking.

**Q. You stated that the Viaduct Option does not serve the north-south streets – can you explain this?**

**A.** Access to north-south streets from the Viaduct Option would only be possible at either end of the Viaduct, or ramps sloping down to Yonge Street as an example, would have to be added.

**Q. Both these proposals have the de facto effect of moving the Expressway north. What consideration has been given to noise impacts on existing and new neighbourhoods north of the Expressway? The current structure amplifies noise in the St. Lawrence neighbourhood.**

**A.** There is a potential for noise to impact neighbourhoods north of the Expressway in the Consolidated Plan. There is also potential to mitigate the noise, but it is something that would have to be looked at further.

### *Facilitated Discussion – Part II*

**Q. The presentation gave the impression that sections of the Martin Goodman Trail are incomplete. The trail is there, but the problem is that it switches from the north side of Lake Shore Boulevard to the south side without the necessary road crossings. Some sections of the trail were constructed but not completed with wayfinding (e.g., painted lines, signs). Both the Martin Goodman and Lower Don Trails should be located near the water as much as possible – people like the Lower Don Trail because it is primarily a park trail along the water.**

**A.** The north side of the Keating Channel is not intended for bike use, but it would not be prohibited. We can explore opportunities to continue the work done on the Martin Goodman Trail on Queens Quay.

**C. Alternative Design 3 with the straightened Lake Shore Boulevard is interesting. It is probably one of the only opportunities to have a park with frontage on the Don River which could become an iconic space for Toronto. Opportunities to increase connectivity to the open space on the north side of the Expressway should also be explored. The crossing over the Don River could also become an architectural feature if it is treated like a bridge (e.g., Prince Edward Viaduct).**

**Q. Is the plan to maintain Lake Shore Boulevard as it is or are you exploring ways to improve traffic flow?**

**A.** Lake Shore Boulevard east of the Don River is open game; the road needs to be redesigned. There is also opportunity for some redesign through the Keating Channel area. Things are more restrictive west of Cherry Street. There are many intersection improvements being proposed by the City to address existing concerns (e.g., safety). Changes to improve the pedestrian experience do not involve major infrastructure changes to Lake Shore Boulevard.

**C. Consider minor roadway modifications on Lake Shore Boulevard west of Cherry Street, particularly to enhance north – south connectivity.**

**A.** The Lower Yonge Precinct study may include roadway improvements along Lake Shore Boulevard.

**Q. Alternative #3 is my preference – I like the idea of opening the mouth of the Don River and creating a destination. I don't quite understand references to ramps inside the elevated Expressway – can you please explain this?**

**A.** Essentially, there will be two lanes of traffic travelling westbound from the Don Valley Parkway and two more lanes coming up to the Expressway from Lake Shore Boulevard for a total of four westbound lanes. The two lanes connecting the Expressway to the DVP will be the outer two lanes. Travelling in the reverse direction, the two outer lanes of the Expressway would connect to the DVP while the two inside lanes would slope down, connecting to the eastbound Lake Shore Boulevard.

**C. I do like the idea of the two lanes opening up the interior of Expressway.**

**C. I am concerned about how the Lower Don Trail merges into this area. Consideration should be given to continue the trail under the bridge feature alongside the river to connect it with Villiers Island without becoming part of the street grid. It will be a challenge to maintain the trail near the sediment management area, but that can be overcome through detailed design. The third alternative provides more opportunity to play with these ideas. The Unilever site provides further opportunities on the east side of the river.**

**C. On a vertical plane, consider reversing the relationship between the Gardiner Expressway and Lake Shore Boulevard in Alternative 2. Essentially, this means playing with the current elevation so that Lake Shore Boulevard is higher than the Gardiner Expressway. There is potential to do this particularly if the Boulevard is going to be raised as part of flood protection work. The benefit is that the Expressway is kept low and out of sight from the community. The railway spur would go over the Expressway. I can submit drawings and additional comments to explain this further.**

**C. If elevating Lake Shore Boulevard is feasible, it may provide the opportunity to develop the space north of the Gardiner Expressway to create a double-sided street experience.**

**C. The section of the trail proposed near the railway corridor and the sediment treatment plant does not sound very pleasant.**

**A.** We are aiming to provide the same basic level of service to the trail system in the three alternatives so that one isn't better than the other. The trail can be designed so that passing by the sediment facility can be a positive experience.

**Q. It was mentioned that the Consolidated and Viaduct Proposals do not provide north-south connections from Lake Shore Boulevard – can you clarify this?**

**A.** By the nature of these options they are either above the rail corridor or tied up against the rail corridor – access is at either end of the Gardiner Expressway. There is however full north-south access on Lake Shore Boulevard.

**Q. Do you have data on where people travel to when they come into the City via the Gardiner Expressway?**

**A.** We have Bluetooth data which picked up signals from people driving into or out of the area. We can follow-up on how far the data carries into the downtown.

### Transport Action Ontario

Thank you very much for your presentations and generating great discussion at last week's SAC meeting.

As requested, I have prepared some drawings to illustrate what came to my mind after Gavin's presentation involving a different vertical approach to Option 2 (with the Option 3 version of the Lake Shore Boulevard alignment). With minor exceptions, the horizontal is effectively the same as presented; the focus is on the vertical. In that respect, this could perhaps be thought of as "Option 2A."

Starting from around Cherry Street, where the Gardiner Expressway is elevated and Lake Shore Boulevard is below, heading east, three things begin to happen:

1. The Gardiner Expressway dives down at -3% (assumed maximum based on 400-series highway standards; if steeper permitted, may yield some improvement (?));
2. Lake Shore Boulevard, after descending slightly to maintain vertical clearance while still beneath the Gardiner Expressway, shoots up at 4%; and
3. The rail spur gently ascends towards the Don River crossing instead of descending like it does today.

The eastbound Lake Shore lanes jut out from below the Gardiner on the south side and hug the edge immediately south of it after clearing the east limits of the Cherry St intersection. Once east of the Stormwater Management Facility on the north side of Lake Shore, the westbound Lake Shore lanes swing out to the north side of the Gardiner to clear the way for the Gardiner to descend while Lake Shore ascends as they occupy the same elevation range. The westbound lanes of Lake Shore during this northern swing-out are occupying the space Gavin identified as undevelopable in his presentation due to noise and odours associated with the future sediment control facility for the Don. It is around this point that a shorter ramp structure can take shape in the left lanes.

When the Gardiner is low enough below Lake Shore and Lake Shore high enough above the Gardiner, the westbound Lake Shore lanes swing overtop the Gardiner as Lake Shore meets the rail spur. Both the Gardiner and Lake Shore level off vertically to very gentle grades, as the Gardiner swings away north to the DVP and Lake Shore heads across the Don River towards Logan Ave (using the Option 3 alignment in the attached). Lake Shore is much higher in Option 2A, as is the rail spur, as the rail spur and Lake Shore are both above the Gardiner just west of the proposed sediment control facility for the Don Mouth Naturalization. The rail spur (along with Lake Shore) is at about the same elevation as the main line rail corridor (Kingston subdivision) further north at its crossing with the DVP, and the Gardiner also at about the same elevation as the DVP at its crossing with the Kingston subdivision. Considering that flood protection measures would raise Lake Shore Blvd across the Don River anyway, this would be an incremental rising. At Don Roadway, Lake Shore would be at an elevation of around 81m in Option 2A, which appears to be less than 2m higher than it would have been for flood protection based on a waterfront graphic I have that indicates the crossing would be between 79 and 80 metres crossing the Don River on a new, higher bridge. I would expect this to result in a modest incremental cost on earthworks while reducing the concrete quantities involved in the Gardiner as less of the Gardiner structure is elevated in Option 2A.

The descent of Lake Shore east of the Don River is shown as a very gentle 0.8%, out of consideration for the rail spur. Marginally steeper may be acceptable - if so, wonderful, but I assumed less than 1% would

be sought by the railway. Lake Shore (and the rail spur) would reach its existing grade around Bouchette St.

It also appears that staging opportunities may improve with Option 2A, as one may expect fewer vertical conflicts between old and new expressway structures across the Don River, creating potential opportunities for enhanced traffic staging strategies that would both reduce the duration of detours and perhaps also the associated costs from detour works.

As discussed at the meeting, this opens up interesting public realm benefits as the Gardiner becomes more "out-of-sight, out-of-mind" with Lake Shore at a higher elevation than the Gardiner in the eastern half of the Keating precinct. The development frontages on the higher portions of Lake Shore would, by extension, also be at a higher elevation. Among other things, it creates opportunities to hide parking in a flood-sensitive area that may not otherwise have been viable. The sediment control facility structure could also be tucked under Lake Shore like Gavin suggested, similar to the slide that showed it tucked under the Gardiner in option 3 - the south wall would have to be inoffensive, however, with noise and odours directed towards the north side of Lake Shore.

The attached drawings are intended to be roughly geographically representative but are not to scale; I've included just enough to convey the concept so that the details can be looked at by the team. I hope this is useful and constructive and I would be very interested in any results of a more detailed review of this Option 2A.

---

### West Don Lands Committee

Although I was not at SAC #9, the draft evaluation matrix was shared with me. Without having the benefit of the discussion at the meeting, below are my comments and a few questions. I expect that much of what I have noted was already covered by meeting participants, but if not, I hope this might be helpful.

*[The feedback provided by the West Don Land Committee on the evaluation criteria has been integrated in the table on page 3].*

---

### CodeBlueTO

Alternatives 2 and 3 presented at SAC #9 in tandem with the realignment of Lake Shore Boulevard have great promise to improve the Hybrid design and unlock the development potential of the Keating Channel precinct and Villiers Island. These changes would allow for the Don River to be opened up to north-south views through to the Port Lands. It will also make possible better active transportation and recreation uses along the Don that connect the Keating Channel Precinct with the Port Lands and re-naturalized river mouth. It would be very helpful to have some three-dimensional renderings or virtual "walk-throughs" of the alternatives from a ground-level perspective to help the SAC, the public, and politicians understand the qualitative differences among them.

The preliminary concepts for making the study corridor more accommodating to non-automobile use were encouraging. We would like to reiterate that re-engineering Lake Shore Blvd. should continue to the west of Cherry Street. While the elevated structure is not expected to change significantly in this

area, this should not limit a fulsome investigation of the potential to improve Lake Shore Blvd. and its relationship to north-south connections and new development throughout the study area.

The backing traffic studies to justify including new ramps on and off of the elevated structure at Cherry St. have still not been tabled. We expect that this information would be transferable to the promised feasibility study of the Viaduct option. It is important to have all of the facts that support critical design decisions presented to the SAC and included in EA reporting.

The changes to the Evaluation Matrix Criteria largely make sense but there are two concepts that were brought up at the SAC meeting that we would like to emphasize:

When it comes to active transportation, recreation opportunities, and developable land, (add comma) it is less important to quantify them in length and area than it is to measure their quality and value.

Secondly, in the Fiscal Net Benefits criteria there is no mention of any spin-off advantages or disadvantages in terms of longterm economic activity and tax base. Adjacent areas such as Villiers Island also need to be included in any net benefit analysis. Land sales and direct costs do not begin to describe the differences in net economic benefits among the different schemes.

---

### **Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association**

Under economics, I have a note that the increase in land values for the north shore of Villiers Island would be considered, but this is not included in the matrix. I would like to see the evaluations for each option.

Also, in economics, we have always indicated that we would like the economics to show, not just the land values, but also the possible future revenue created via property and retail taxes etc.

\*\*\*

I very much regret not being able to attend the SAC meeting last week. I have seen the draft evaluation matrix and have these comments:

1. I endorse the comments that have been sent to you on behalf of CodeBlueTO.
2. I support CodeBlueTO's request that you provide us with all possible data regarding the need for on-off ramps close to Cherry St. As well as the issue of whether or not traffic volume makes them necessary, the effects that such ramps have on surrounding streets and neighbourhoods should be taken into account. In addition to the amount of space they would take up, reducing the quantity of developable land, their effect on development around them and the quality of life of inhabitants and visitors could reduce the value of neighbouring sites. On-off ramps generate traffic which would have to find its way through local streets creating all the kinds of nuisance that traffic generates. Noise and air pollution as well as danger to pedestrians would deter buyers of homes and other buildings. The effect on pedestrian safety would mean more choices to drive within the precinct, surely the opposite of what is desired.
3. The existing on-ramps at Jarvis and Lake Shore make Lower Jarvis a very nasty place for much of the day and are the main reason the intersection is such a horror for pedestrians. If no modification of them is possible, perhaps making this a "scramble" intersection is the solution.

This is urgent given the imminence of major amount of pedestrian and bicycle traffic from the Daniels development at Jarvis and Queens Quay.

4. The effect of any road reconfiguration on traffic at the Lake Shore Boulevard/ Jarvis Street intersection, i.e. whether to increase or decrease the number of vehicles accessing the Expressway there, must be considered in both pedestrian safety and urban design categories.
5. We know from traffic studies that the number of people who really need to drive on the highway is most likely exceeded by the number of people who live and will soon be living close to it. The needs and quality of life of the larger number must not be sacrificed to the convenience of the smaller number.