



**Future of the Gardiner East
Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)
Meeting 14-5**

**Tuesday, June 17, 2014 | 6:30 pm – 8:30 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 fifth 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 noted that the purpose of the meeting was to provide a detailed update on the Gardiner East project, including results from the March 4, 2014 Public Works and Infrastructure Committee meeting and next steps for the study.

Mr. John Campbell, President and CEO of Waterfront Toronto, also welcomed the committee members to the meeting. In his remarks, Mr. Campbell reiterated the importance of the SAC and encouraged members to speak up so the best solution can be developed collectively. He thanked members for their ongoing participation.

Mr. David Stonehouse, City of Toronto Waterfront Secretariat, expressed the City's appreciation for the participation of SAC members. Mr. Stonehouse indicated that rehabilitation has begun on the western portion of the Gardiner and the impacts are being felt. This work west of the study area will continue for several years and it highlights the importance of making a sound decision for the Gardiner East. He suggested that there is a window of roughly 12 months to make a decision.

A copy of 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

Mr. Dave Dilks, Lura Consulting, provided an overview of consultation feedback to date as well as the consultation process moving forward and role of the SAC.

Mr. Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting, reviewed the four alternative solutions (maintain, improve, replace, remove) and evaluation study lenses. He reiterated that that the remove option was presented as the preferred alternative to the public, SAC and Public Works and Infrastructure Committee (PWIC) meeting in March 2014.

Mr. John Mende, City of Toronto, provided a summary of the PWIC Meeting on March 4, 2014 including deputation letters received and PWIC's referral decision.

Mr. McKinnon presented the next steps in the work plan. He expressed that the project team is seeking SAC input as they address the issues and areas of further study identified by the PWIC. The areas of focus for further study are:

- Goods Movement
- Economic Competitiveness
- Remove Alternative Optimization
- Hybrid Alternative

He concluded by reviewing the study timeline for the remainder of 2014 and early 2015.

3. Facilitated Discussion

The following provides a summary of feedback and advice from SAC members on the material presented. A more detailed account of the discussion can be found in Appendix C.

Hybrid Alternative

- The large amount of land consumed by road and ramps in the hybrid alternative was discussed.
- Looking at examples of roads in Europe could help determine appropriate turning radius of ramps.
- Some members feel that this option sterilizes a lot of City-owned land and makes greenspace inaccessible to pedestrians.
- Other members feel that the hybrid option should be carefully studied and that land is not sterilized with this option as the roads and ramps are more tightly aligned with the rail corridor, making the land to the south accessible to the waterfront.
- There is interest in discussing alternative points of access to the First Gulf site.
- There is concern with what happens west of Cherry St. in the hybrid option.
- A pedestrian/cyclist bridge from the Don Valley trail to the First Gulf site should be considered in the design. Over one million people use the trail each year and access to the site should be provided.
- Access to the Port Lands, a much larger site than First Gulf, should be a priority.
- There is concern that resources will be spent analyzing this option, which should instead be directed towards optimizing the remove alternative.
- Suggestion that discussions be held with First Gulf about the importance of a network of streets/blocks to facilitate efficient movement.

Optimization of Remove Alternative

- Need to fully assess the impact on capacity with the remove option. Commuters and deliveries will find alternative routes on arterial roadways and it is important to fully understand the potential impacts on these arterials.
- Reconsider the potential for a 10-lane roadway.
- Look at the potential for grade separation on Cherry Street, while considering pedestrian and cyclist connections.

Goods Movement & Economic Competitiveness

- Dedicated goods movement lanes at certain times should be considered.

Future of the Gardiner Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
June 17, 2014 – Meeting Summary

- It is essential to maintain delivery capacity in order to get goods to area and downtown. Not all deliveries can be made at night.
- Need to look at trends in terms of employment areas and growth.
- When considering the economic impact, it would be helpful to refer to other cities that have undertaken the remove option.
- Need to look at how we are doing business. The operational side is very important.

Regional Perspective Needed

- The Gardiner is part of regional transportation network and must be looked at in this context.
- A continuous expressway link must be maintained.
- It is important to look at overall network capacity. Once capacity is lost, it can never be regained.
- Regional perspective must also be front and centre in looking at goods movement and economic competitiveness.

Process

- Several members expressed concern from a process perspective that the hybrid option has been introduced at PWIC.
- Further discussions should include stakeholders representing transit, the tourism/entertainment industry and restaurant association to better understand movement of traffic, deliveries and capacity issues.
- SAC members would like to play a more active role in decision making.

4. Next Steps

Mr. McKinnon indicated that the SAC members will be engaged in discussions regarding the areas of focus in the coming months, before going back to the public in the new year. 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 #5

Tuesday, June 17, 2014

6:30 pm – 8:30 pm

Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 308/309

AGENDA

Meeting Purpose: Provide a detailed update on the project, including results from the City's Public Works and Infrastructure Committee meeting on March 4th and proposed next steps and timeline for the study.

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

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

6:40 pm **SAC Member Briefing**

- Feedback from Round 3 of Consultations – Dave Dilks, Lura Consulting
- Recap of Alternatives Evaluation – Don McKinnon, Dillon
- PWIC March 5th Meeting Deputations and Decision – John Mende, City of Toronto
- Project Work Plan, Schedule and Next Steps – Don McKinnon, Dillon & Tony Medeiros, Waterfront Toronto
 - a) Further Study: Goods Movement & Economic Competitiveness
 - b) Optimization of Remove Option and Congestion Mitigation
 - c) Review of Hybrid Option

7:10 pm **Facilitated Q&A and Discussion**

SAC input/comments welcome on:

- PWIC Direction
- Key Issues that Need to be Investigated
- Proposed Project Work Plan
- Consultation Process

8:20 pm **Next Steps and Closing Remarks**

- SAC Consultations
- Next Public Meeting – early 2015

8:30 pm **Adjourn**

Appendix B – List of Attendees

SAC Meeting #5 List of Attendees

Beach Triangle Residents' Association
Canadian Automobile Association (CAA)
Canadian Courier & Logistics Association
City of Toronto
Cycling Toronto
Dillon Consulting
Don Watershed Regeneration Council
Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association (GWNA)
Heritage Toronto
Lura Consulting
Ontario Trucking Association
Redpath and Toronto Industry Network
St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Toronto Board of Trade
Toronto Centre for Active Transportation
Toronto Financial District BIA
Unionville Ratepayers Association
Urban Land Institute (ULI)
Walk Toronto
Waterfront Toronto
West Don Lands Committee

List of SAC members unable to attend

Canadian Urban Institute
Civic Action
Evergreen
Federation of North Toronto Residents and People Plan Toronto
Film Ontario
Food and Consumer Products of Canada
Greyhound
Lake Shore Planning Council
Leslieville BIA
Ontario Professional Planners Institute – Urban Design Working Group
Ontario Public Transit Association
Professional Engineers Ontario
Purolator Inc.
Retail Council of Canada
Rogers Centre/Blue Jays
South Riverdale Community Health Centre
Toronto Association of BIAs
Toronto Community Foundation
Toronto Society of Architects
Toronto Urban Renewal Network (TURN)
Transport Action Ontario

Appendix C – SAC Questions of Clarification, Feedback and Advice

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. At the last public meeting, my colleague asked that there be a weighting given to the evaluation of alternatives. I don't see that weighting presented.

A. We cannot change the results of the evaluation presented to PWIC. As outlined in the EA Terms of Reference, we have not instituted a weighting. All the lenses were treated with equal importance. However, there is a distinction between the levels of impact associated with the criteria. Our work for 2014 will evaluate the hybrid option against the evaluation criteria and address the traffic congestion concerns raised for the remove option.

C. Based on the presentation, there is a significant gap. When looking at movement of goods and economic competitiveness, words that are jumping out at me are words like "city" and "local". This is part of a regional transportation network; it can't be looked at in isolation, at a local level. It has to be looked at as part of a region. The people travelling on the Gardiner are not from the City of Toronto. You have to look at it with a bigger lens in mind.

A. We will take that comment back to the team.

Q. Regarding the optimization of the remove option, is it feasible to have 10 lanes?

A. We did go through that exercise as part of developing the alternative solutions. The results of our analysis show some minor improvement from a traffic flow point of view, but it was not enough to offset the negative public realm impacts.

C. I have another idea to propose. The major road crossing north-south is Cherry St. You might want to look at grade separation there.

C. Grade separation really hurts pedestrian access.

Q. What was in the traffic modelling for these alternatives? What was the level of service determined?

A. A paramics micro-simulation model was utilized in evaluating the alternatives. A number of transportation metrics were reviewed in developing the options for the purpose of comparing various alternatives.

C. My suggestion is to consider dedicated goods movement lanes at certain times depending on the outcomes of your analysis.

C. If you are having difficulty with the turning radius as part of the hybrid option, I suggest you consult some of the people who build roads in Europe. Europe is used to building express roads with tight curves, roundabouts etc. The essential element is that you maintain continuous expressway access.

Q. The remove option doesn't show the ramping to the west. Where would it come out?

A. The ramp on this image has been cut off. It was intended to be a snapshot in comparison of the hybrid alternative. Ramp connections are occurring half way between Yonge St. and Jarvis St.

C. The regional perspective needs to extend to the economic competitiveness element. Need to look at trends in terms of employment areas and where the growth centres are. For most of Toronto, except for people who live downtown, the car is still the dominant way people access the downtown core.

Q. Regarding optimization, for the hybrid option are we looking at methods for optimizing the network as well?

A. The intention is to develop the hybrid alternative to an equal level of detail as the other alternatives. We have a larger study area for the transportation component. The intent is to focus on the corridor but if there are other obvious opportunities that might allow for improvement we want to identify those.

C. People will be looking at where cars will go with these changes when transit is not close to being a reality.

Q. Are the gray blocks north of the corridor and east of Cherry St. city-owned lands?

A. Yes, these are the Keating Channel Precinct lands.

C. My observation is that the hybrid option sterilizes all the city land. Generally, this plan makes inefficient use of land. There is road all over the place. It makes greenspace at the foot of the Don River useless. It is a place you can look at as you drive by but not a place to spend any time in. Park land is at a premium.

Q. If you are indicating you are going to generate revenue on the north side, how are you going to do that? There are a lot of utilities in the existing corridor right now that would have to be relocated.

A. Utilities relocation was factored into the costing exercise. No costing of the hybrid option has been done to date.

C. I disagree that land would be sterilized in the hybrid option. With tightening the road and ramps closer to the rail lines, the land to the south is available with access to the waterfront.

C. We are looking at one idea here with the hybrid option. To have a full discussion we need to look at alternate points of access to the First Gulf site. We are not seeing that here. This hybrid option uses up a huge amount of land. It is a one-sided discussion.

C. It is disheartening that we spent a year looking at options, and someone comes in with a rough idea and ends up taking hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of staff time to go through something that has essentially already been looked at. I think you should minimize the amount of time you waste on this hybrid option and make the alternatives you presented more refined and more understandable.

Q. How did this hybrid alternative come up so late? Was First Gulf not consulted?

A. There were discussions with First Gulf. They were provided opportunities to provide comments on the alternatives. We were not aware that this alternative was going to be presented at the PWIC meeting.

C. You could look at partnerships with First Gulf. If they are looking for access and ramps, maybe they are willing to work with you in developing the option.

A. There are opportunities for access with all the alternatives. There are many unknowns, including the amount of development that this site could potentially support, what's the role of transit, etc.

A. The direction from PWIC was to analyze this alternative. We are following their instructions.

C. My concern with the hybrid option is what happens west of Cherry St. For us, that is where the benefit of removing the Gardiner is realized. If you keep the Gardiner up, you won't be able to have nice development beside it.

C. Once you lose capacity in the transportation network, it will be gone forever. The unintended consequences could spiral out of control.

C. Regardless of when the hybrid proposal came in, I think it is a worthwhile exercise to look at it to find the best solution. Looking at the impact of the Gardiner being under reduced capacity now, whether we like it or not, it will impact all of us.

C. When considering the economic impact it would be useful for us to have more information from other places that have removed their downtown expressways (e.g. San Francisco) and what that means to the economy. The economy is not just commuters. The economy is what happens on the land too.

C. From a driving point of view, the hybrid options looks very complicated. It fits no pattern. The Don Valley trail, which has over a million people using it every year, will be buried under these express ramps. If this hybrid option is going to be discussed, I would like to see a bridge from the Don Valley trail to the Unilever site so we can access it on bicycles or walking. Otherwise there will be no access unless you are in a car.

Q. Regarding economic competitiveness, are you looking at the opportunity costs of not doing anything? The First Gulf site has limited access now. Under the maintain option that would still be the case.

A. It is about improving the development potential of that site regarding the various alternatives. If we are not intending to design access ramps/roads into the First Gulf site, they need to provide commentary to provide access on a more conceptual level.

C. Right now we are giving priority to First Gulf. We are not giving any access to the Port Lands which is a larger site than First Gulf.

C. The Project Team needs to look at the whole region as an integrated unit. I am disappointed that the City can't seem to agree on anything. There have been so many delays.

C. Maintaining the continuous link is important. But it is the only stretch that is underutilized. We should also be looking at the impact on capacity with remove option, especially on arterial roadways. Commuters and deliveries will find alternative routes and we need to understand that.

C. There is a lot of pressure on all the downtown streets. Parked cars and deliveries are causing congestion where 80% of the people are walking not driving. Eventually there will not be room for cars. The idea of forcing deliveries to be at night needs to be looked at. We have to think where we are really going. The need for this car capacity won't be there in the future. Keep those things in mind.

C. I've just come back from Europe. Some of the roads have been made pedestrian roads and they specifically allow delivery trucks there. Not all deliveries can be made at night. It is essential to maintain the delivery capacity in order to get businesses to come. It will impact our competitiveness.

C. Access to the Port Lands which is a much larger area is through normal roads. My suggestion is to reach out to First Gulf and talk to them about streets and blocks rather than ramps. The direction we should pursue with First Gulf is to address density through streets and blocks as a basic planning notion.

C. My gut says there are a lot of very clever ideas with optimizing the remove option. The hybrid has its points, but it has the unintended consequence of sterilizing a lot of land.

C. Looking at best practices elsewhere, I find that a lot of times we are not looking at apples to apples (e.g. San Francisco). We need to look at overall network capacity not just road capacity of a certain site. There are certain assumptions about how businesses operate. We need to look at how we are doing business. The operational side of business isn't attractive and it's not what you want to see in a rendering, but it is how things work.

C. There is a gap with tourism. The entertainment industry and restaurant association should be asked to contribute. Regarding the process, I would like to be considered more than your buffer for the public. I don't want to come back in 12 months and be provided with a direction. No one wants to waste any more time. The fact that PWIC sent this back shows that there was a gap and maybe not every alternative was looked at.

C. Is there enough expertise in this group on transit? We've been talking about vehicles and roads. Transit needs to be discussed equally.