



**Future of the Gardiner East  
Stakeholder Advisory Committee – Recap for New Members  
Meeting 14-5b**

**Thursday, October 9, 2014 | 9:00 – 10:30 pm  
Waterfront Toronto, 20 Bay Street, 13th Floor, Toronto, Ontario**

**Meeting Summary**

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

This Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting was convened by the project team to provide a recap of work on the environmental assessment (EA) for several new members as well as existing members who have been unable to participate in the study process to date.

Mr. David Dilks, President of Lura Consulting, welcomed committee members and thanked them for attending the session. He introduced the facilitation team from Lura Consulting and led a round of introductions. Mr. Dilks also reviewed the meeting agenda and noted the purpose of the meeting was to provide a comprehensive recap of progress on the project to date. He added that the presentation would not contain any new information, but rather consisted of material presented at previous SAC and public meetings.

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**

Antonio Medeiros, Manager – Planning and Design, Waterfront Toronto, presented a summary of the EA work completed to date, covering the following topics and material:

- Scope and goals of the EA from the approved Terms of Reference;
- Case studies, design concepts and public ideas for the Gardiner Expressway East corridor;
- Plans for each of the options;
- Evaluation criteria and lenses (Economics, Transportation & Infrastructure, Urban Design and Environment);
- Detailed evaluation during the Alternative Solutions phase of the EA; and
- Next steps including development of the Boulevard and Hybrid options and additional Goods Movement & Economic Competitiveness studies.

### 3. Facilitated Discussion

The following provides a summary of the key themes and ideas discussed by SAC members on the material presented. A more detailed account of the discussion can be found in Appendix C.

#### **Traffic Modelling and Transportation Network Capacity**

- The current capacity of the Gardiner Expressway, Don Valley Parkway and Lake Shore Boulevard transportation network and opportunities to alleviate congestion were discussed.
- All options (Maintain, Improve, Replace and Remove) assume additional transit in order to meet future land use demands.
- The limitation of summarizing complex transportation analysis into slides such as the travel time table was discussed.

#### **Public Transit & Land Use**

- Assumptions about public transit (existing and planned service routes) used in traffic modelling, projections and the options were discussed in addition to future land use for the 2031 horizon year.

#### **Goods Movement & Economic Competitiveness**

- Additional study on both Goods Movement and Economic Competitiveness will be undertaken to respond to direction from the March 2014 Public Works and Infrastructure Committee.
- The split between commercial and non-commercial vehicles (i.e., percentage of trucks) using the Gardiner East was discussed.
- Ensure a broad understanding of changing market conditions that may affect future truck traffic.

#### **EA Process and Next Steps**

- A probable timeline for construction was discussed, taking into consideration next steps in the study and the City Council approval process.
- The likely level of Council support for the recommended alternative was discussed, with the recognition that there will be a new Mayor and Council after October 27.
- The results of the additional studies requested by the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee (PWIC) will likely be considered by PWIC in the second quarter of 2015. The project team anticipates another SAC meeting in the winter/ spring followed by a public meeting; however specific dates have not yet been identified.

#### **Costs**

- There was a brief discussion about the lower estimated contingency costs for the maintain alternative compared to the estimated costs for the other alternatives, due to the fact that the design and budget for maintaining the expressway are known.

#### **Hybrid Alternative**

- Discussed how the EA team will review and develop the “Hybrid” option which maintains the expressway from Jarvis to Cherry and replaces it east of Cherry.

### 4. Next Steps

Next SAC meeting: To Be Determined.



**Future of the Gardiner East  
EA and Integrated Urban Design Study**

**Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) – Recap for New Members**

Waterfront Toronto, 20 Bay Street, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor, Toronto, Ontario

Thursday, October 9, 2014

9:00 – 10:30 am

**AGENDA**

- 9:00 am      Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions - David Dilks, Facilitator
- 9:10 am      Gardiner East EA Recap for New Members – Tony Medeiros, Waterfront Toronto
- 9:50 am      Facilitated Discussion – SAC Questions and Feedback
- 10:25 am     Next Steps
- 10:30 am     Adjourn

## Appendix B – List of Attendees

### SAC Meeting #5b List of Attendees

Transport Action Ontario  
Toronto Society of Architects  
South Riverdale Community Health Centre  
Retail Council of Canada  
West Don Lands Committee/Corktown Residents and Business Association  
Toronto Region Board of Trade

## Appendix C – SAC Questions of Clarification, Feedback and Advice

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.

**Q. [Referring to Slides 6 and 7, Downtown vs. Through Trips] The data used to model traffic flows is from 2010. Do you have a sense as to how traffic has changed since then?**

**A.** The depicted routes are at capacity during the AM peak hour in 2010. The transportation model forecasts future demand based on land use growth and changes of infrastructure.

**Q. The current capacity would be slightly less than presented due to lanes being taken out of service for construction; this would constrain volume further, correct?**

**A.** Yes, there would be some redistribution of traffic due to the rehabilitation work underway.

**Q. Are the Don Valley Parkway (DVP) and Lake Shore Boulevard also at capacity as well?**

**A.** They can be at capacity or not, depending on the section, direction and time period being considered.

**Q. Are walking and cycling forms of transportation projected to grow?**

**A.** Yes, but the growth in these modes is not as readily apparent based on the scale of the graph.

**Q. Do you have information about the split between commercial and non-commercial vehicles using these routes?**

**A.** We will be doing an additional study on goods movement as part of the EA. However, it really depends on the location in the network, but off-hand, I would estimate truck traffic accounts to be about 0.5 to 2 percent of total traffic. [Subsequent to the meeting, a check of the numbers indicates that truck traffic specifically at the east end of the Gardiner and Lake Shore Boulevard is approximately 4.5% of total traffic on each of the roadways.]

**Q. This analysis is based on projections that were made before the regional expansion of GO transit service was announced, correct?**

**A.** Yes, the project assumes upgrades and improvements to transit service including GO transit.

**C. [Referring to Slide 14, Emerging Neighbourhoods] You highlighted the West Don Lands and Corktown neighbourhoods on the map through the use of colour, but you also need to label them.**

**A.** Yes, you're correct. They are emerging neighborhoods.

**Q. Have you considered the impact of provincial requirements for accessibility (Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act) in public spaces?**

**A.** Yes we have. At this level of planning, we didn't come across any major issues related to accessibility; this will be considered in more detail during the design stage of the project.

**Q. [Referring to Slide 70, Costs] Can you explain why the Maintain alternative has a contingency of +/- 10% while the other alternatives are +/- 20% in terms of costs?**

**A.** The City has already completed designs and budgeting exercises for infrastructure improvements to maintain the Gardiner Expressway. As such, we have a better idea of what maintaining the Gardiner Expressway East will cost versus the other alternatives.

**Q. Are there any higher level policy pieces that could be used to establish a weighting system for the evaluation criteria (e.g., GHG emissions, provincial plans)?**

**A.** The project Terms of Reference (TOR) speak to those higher level policies (e.g., City of Toronto Official Plan, Central Waterfront Secondary Plan, etc.). It would be a difficult process, regardless of the presence of policy documents, to weight the evaluation criteria without introducing our own biases, among other things. In the end, we decided not to introduce any weighting.

**Q. Will the same consultant be doing the additional study on goods movement for the Remove alternative?**

**A.** A sub-consultant (to Dillon Consulting) with specialized expertise will be working on the goods movement study.

**A.** The study will be a comparative analysis of goods movement between the Boulevard and the other three options which are elevated expressways (Maintain, Improve, and Replace).

**Q. [Referring to the Hybrid Option] What is the purple line east of the DVP?**

**A.** It's a new GO transit line.

**Q. Is the main argument for the Hybrid Alternative about general access to the site or specifically about highway access to the site?**

**A.** The developer is concerned about the right type of access to their site. Their preference would be to improve access from arterial roads and the DVP.

**A.** As a project team, we also have to keep in mind Council's directives for other projects taking place at the same time. There are broader city building objectives being studied and planned (e.g., Port Lands Planning Framework, Don Mouth Re-Naturalization, South of Eastern) to consider while determining the best alignment for the Hybrid option.

**C.** First Gulf is planning for multi-modal transit on their lands. Their objective is to look for the best they can get. The success of their project does not depend on this project.

**Q. Will the slides be available to us to distribute to our networks? What are the next steps?**

**A.** The slides presented this morning are already available on the project website at [www.gardinereast.ca](http://www.gardinereast.ca). We essentially combined three presentations into one. We anticipate another public meeting before we go to Council in the winter/spring, but we don't have a specific date in mind for the meeting at this time.

**Q. Is there a more specific timeline, when more information will be presented to the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee?**

**A.** Roughly the middle of 2015 is the timeline we are working with. We are assembling stakeholders as part of the goods movement and other studies requested by PWIC, but it is taking a little longer than we expected.

**Q. Will construction of the Boulevard alternative take place in the early 2020s?**

**A.** Should Committee and Council endorse this option, it is likely a six year timeline, but there are still a few more steps to go through, including approval and design. Rehabilitation of this portion of the Gardiner Expressway was deferred from its original schedule in order to complete this study. We can't wait much longer than 2020; we need a decision so we don't have to revisit this question again.

**Q. Has Council seen this presentation? Have you received any preliminary feedback from Council?**

**A.** We have not gone to Council as of yet as we were directed by PWIC to complete additional studies. We don't have an accurate idea of Council's position on this project. A new Council will be elected in a few weeks, which makes it harder to guess.

**Q. Will further analysis be conducted on Lake Shore Boulevard, specifically to deal with pinch points caused by turning? Have you considered an underpass for left turns?**

**A.** We are looking at options for optimization. An underpass would not be ideal as it would reintroduce problems which we're trying to remove from the corridor.

**Q. What are the projected demands for transit? I am wondering about the adaptability of the options for transit within the Lake Shore/ Gardiner corridor?**

**A.** We did spend some time discussing transit options in the corridor within the study area. We are also factoring existing transit initiatives into our base assumptions (e.g., Broadview Extension, Relief Line, etc.). There isn't a specific need to add transit, but there are options which are more adaptable than others if there is interest in introducing transit.

**Q. One option precludes transit, can you speak to that?**

**A.** We don't equate it that way; it's not a zero sum calculation. Transit operates on a network basis, there needs to be consideration for connections to the existing network. It may appear feasible, but it's not as simple as adding a line here and there.

**A.** Metrolinx also has plans to run trains on existing lines during off-peak hours. Other initiatives to improve transit are also being prioritized.

**A.** There is no reason why we can't study transit in the corridor in the future.

**Q. If the Boulevard alternative is chosen will there be any studies to provide more exit options on the DVP (traveling southbound) and therefore relief from congestion down the line?**

**A.** We are currently studying that. We have found that there are not a lot of opportunities to add more exits to the DVP as they would impact existing local streets that are already at capacity.

**C. [Referring to Slide 48, Auto Travel Times] It appears the DVP could be causing more problems than the Gardiner Expressway.**

**A.** The origins and destinations were chosen to represent different users, but not necessarily how many users.

**Q. There were a number of people representing the trucking industry at the last SAC meeting in June who expressed some valid concerns. As a downtown resident, I don't see how maintaining the existing infrastructure can be the only viable solution. You need to provide a viable solution for truck traffic if you want to move forward with the Boulevard option.**

**A.** That's a good example of where we need to dive down into the impacts of each alternative so people have a better understanding and can appreciate the impacts and implications.

**C. It is possible that as industry declines, there will be less truck traffic.**

**A.** We need a better understanding of what is happening in the marketplace. The nature of work is changing. We need a better understanding of the impacts of new technologies, just in time delivery, etc. There is a lot happening that we hope to have a better and broader understanding of as a result of doing the additional work on goods movement and economic competitiveness.

**A.** On a more concrete level, as soon as construction started on the western portion of the Gardiner Expressway, the modal split shifted slightly. Metrolinx noted 500 new passengers per day taking GO transit at an early count. Drivers also altered their routes.

**Q. Looking into the future, what is the vision for the City? It appears we're already at capacity in terms of volume in and out of the City. It might be helpful to show people which roads are at already at capacity and that even with solutions, travel times are not necessarily going to get better.**

**A.** We did make that point at the public meetings. The directive from the PWIC was to try to mitigate the increase in travel times.

**C.** I'm not convinced the public understands that the road system is at capacity and trying to reduce travel times is futile.

**A.** We would have tried to optimize travel times when we reached the design phase of the project. The Committee's directive asks us to step into that phase a little earlier and provide a more robust analysis.

**A.** I agree that we need to do a better job of explaining this. There are better ways to communicate that information.