

# Queens Quay Revitalization Environmental Assessment

## *Public Consultation Summary Report*

December 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**1. CONSULTATION CONTEXT ..... 1**

**1.1 Purpose of this Report..... 1**

**1.2 Central Waterfront Master Plan ..... 1**

**1.3 Queens Quay Revitalization ..... 2**

**1.4 Consultation Objectives ..... 2**

**1.5 Municipal Class EA Consultation Requirements..... 3**

**1.6 Consultation Plan ..... 4**

**2. COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES..... 4**

**2.1 Project Mailing List & Database ..... 4**

**2.2 Notice of Commencement ..... 5**

**2.3 Postcard Mailer ..... 6**

**2.4 Public Meeting Notices ..... 6**

**2.5 Project Website..... 6**

**2.6 First Nations Outreach..... 6**

**3. CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES..... 7**

**3.1 Central Waterfront Stakeholder Committee ..... 7**

**3.2 Queens Quay Revitalization EA Stakeholder Advisory Committee..... 7**

        3.2.1 SAC Meeting #1: September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2007 ..... 8

        3.2.2 Stakeholder Site Walk: October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2007 ..... 9

        3.2.3 SAC Meeting #2: November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2007 ..... 9

        3.2.4 SAC Meeting #2B: December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2007..... 10

        3.2.5 SAC Meeting #3: November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2008 ..... 11

        3.2.6 SAC Meeting #4: March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009 ..... 12

**3.3 Public Forums & Drop-in Centres..... 12**

        3.3.1 Public Forum #1: January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008 ..... 13

        3.3.2 Public Forum #2: December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2008 ..... 15

        3.3.3 Public Forum #3: March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009..... 18

        3.3.4 Drop-in Centre: March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2009..... 19

**3.4 Stakeholder Meetings & Interviews..... 20**

**3.5 Additional Opportunities for Public Comment..... 22**

        3.5.1 City of Toronto Executive Committee Meeting (June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009) ..... 22

        3.5.2 City of Toronto Council Meeting (October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009)..... 22

        3.5.3 Notice of Study Completion..... 22

        3.5.4 Part II Order Request..... 22

        3.5.5 Approval of the Project by the Minister of Environment ..... 22

**3.6 Agency Consultation ..... 22**

**4. SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES RAISED DURING THE CONSULTATIONS ..... 23**

## APPENDICES

- A. List of Meetings (Central Waterfront Master Planning Process)
- B. Notice of Commencement
- C. Household Postcard
- D. Meeting Notices: Public Forums 2 & 3
- E. SAC Terms of Reference
- F. SAC Meeting #1 Report
- G. SAC Meeting #2 Report
- H. SAC Meeting #2B Report
- I. SAC Meeting #3 Report
- J. SAC Meeting #4 Report
- K. Public Forum #1 Report
- L. Public Forum #2 Report
- M. Public Forum #3 Report
- N. Summary Table of Issues Raised During the Queens Quay EA Consultations

## 1. CONSULTATION CONTEXT

### 1.1 Purpose of this Report

This report documents the public consultation and community engagement activities that were carried out between 2006 and 2009 as part of the Queens Quay Revitalization Environmental Assessment (EA). This EA was conducted by Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto with the assistance of a project team consisting of several consulting firms: West 8 Urban Design and Landscape Architecture, du Toit Allsopp Hillier, MMM Group, and Arup. Lura Consulting was retained by Waterfront Toronto as a neutral, third party facilitator to plan and conduct the public consultation process for the EA in a manner that encouraged inclusiveness and constructive engagement and dialogue. This report has been prepared by Lura Consulting to summarize the consultation process that was undertaken and to document feedback received throughout the EA process.

### 1.2 Central Waterfront Master Plan

Although the Queens Quay Revitalization EA did not officially commence until September 2007, it is directly linked to Waterfront Toronto's larger Central Waterfront Master Plan initiative that began in 2006. Many of the Central Waterfront consultation activities that took place before September 2007 had a direct bearing on the Queens Quay EA study design, and are therefore outlined briefly below.

The Central Waterfront Design initiative began in 2006 with the launch of an innovative international design competition to bring a fresh, new perspective to a 3.5 kilometre stretch of Toronto's Central Waterfront. The objective of the competition was to connect and build on existing successful revitalization efforts along the Central Waterfront, to propose improvements to Queens Quay Boulevard, and to provide a distinct and recognizable identity for Toronto's revitalized waterfront.



From a field of 38 applicants, five teams were invited to submit full design proposals as part of the international design competition. Waterfront Toronto unveiled the five finalist designs at a public exhibition and solicited public input. A jury of design experts was tasked with selecting the winning design. The winning proposal featured the transformation of the south side of Queens Quay Boulevard into a cycling and pedestrian zone complemented by a family of eight new “WaveDecks” at the head of each waterfront slip, as well as the introduction of a public promenade along the water’s edge including six new bridges. Collectively these elements were intended to fulfill Waterfront Toronto’s core objective of creating continuous public access to the waterfront.



In a unique approach to public involvement, Toronto residents and visitors were able to experience key attributes of this new design during the Quay to the City event in August 2006. For ten days, the two eastbound lanes of Queens Quay were closed and replaced with two square kilometres of lawn, 12,000 red geraniums and an arch composed of 600 bicycles—allowing the Martin Goodman Trail to run uninterrupted for the entire length of the Central Waterfront. Both before and after the event, Waterfront Toronto conducted public opinion surveys and public meetings to gauge support for the Queens Quay redesign. While the public

overwhelmingly supported the redesign, several concerns around traffic and parking impacts were voiced. The local business community expressed concern about the problems that the revitalization of Queens Quay may create for those providing services and retail outlets in the area, as well as their customers.

In January 2007, Waterfront Toronto officially launched the Central Waterfront Master Plan process by hosting a public meeting to present the scope of the planning process, the results of the Quay to the City event and the proposed process for revitalizing Queens Quay. More than 250 people participated in this meeting, indicating a high degree of public interest in the revitalization of Queens Quay. Since the inception of the master planning process, Waterfront Toronto has undertaken more than 30 outreach events, including public meetings, presentations, workshops, and design charettes. A complete list of these meetings is included in Appendix A.

### 1.3 Queens Quay Revitalization

The Queens Quay Revitalization Project is one component of the larger Central Waterfront master planning project, which includes several different projects aimed at making improvements to Toronto's waterfront, including aesthetic improvements and consistency, better cycling and pedestrian environments, improved public transit, and improved public and green spaces.

The objective of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA process is to plan for facilities that balance the needs of all users, by successfully accommodating recreational, transit, bicycle, pedestrian and vehicular traffic while enhancing landscape features and the public realm along the Queens Quay corridor.

The co-proponents of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA – Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto – identified public consultation as a key component of the study, and undertook to develop a public consultation process that would build on the Central Waterfront Design consultations described above, and that would meet if not exceed the consultation requirements under the Municipal Class EA.

### 1.4 Consultation Objectives

The overall objective of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA consultation process was to provide an opportunity for non-government stakeholder groups, the general public and municipal and agency

representatives to become informed about the project and provide input at key stages in the planning process.

Specific consultation objectives included to:

- Build on previous consultations undertaken as part of the Central Waterfront Design process and Quay to the City.
- Generate broad awareness of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA and opportunities for involvement throughout the planning process;
- Facilitate input from stakeholders at key points in the planning process, well before decisions were made; and
- Meet and exceed consultation requirements under the Municipal Class EA.

Several guiding principles were established for the consultation process, including:

- Early and ongoing communication with, and involvement of, stakeholders;
- Openness, transparency and inclusiveness;
- Flexibility to adapt the consultation plan to meet the needs of stakeholders, Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto and their project team; and
- Traceability of decision-making.

### **1.5 Municipal Class EA Consultation Requirements**

All projects that involve construction or expansion of municipal infrastructure in Ontario are normally carried out as a Municipal Class EA under Ontario's Environmental Assessment Act. The Class EA is a planning process that is applied to certain classes of public sector (and some private sector) projects, specifically road, sewer and water supply projects that have similar impacts on the environment. As a proposed modification to an existing municipal road, the Queens Quay project falls into the Municipal Class EA category.

A Class EA includes:

- Consultation with affected parties early in the process and throughout it;
- Consideration of a range of reasonable alternatives;
- Consideration of the effects of each alternative on all aspects of the environment (natural, social, cultural, technical and economic/financial);
- Systematic evaluation of alternatives in terms of their advantages and disadvantages to determine their net effects on the environment; and
- Documentation of the planning process, to allow "traceability" of decision-making.

Schedule C of the Municipal Class EA process calls for consultation with the public at several key points during the study so that the public and stakeholders have an opportunity to review the study's

progress and contribute comments to inform the study process. This report documents the public consultation activities that were carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Class EA process.

### **1.6 Consultation Plan**

A Consultation and Communications Plan was developed to serve as a framework for obtaining input from those who may be affected by or have an interest in the Queens Quay Revitalization EA. The plan set out how the project proponents would meet the consultation requirements for a Municipal Class EA project, including how and when the technical design work would be presented to the public, and how the feedback received would be documented and responded to.

The Consultation and Communications Plan proposed the following main activities:

- 1) Establish a mailing list to receive notices and other project mailings;
- 2) Prepare a project webpage as part of Waterfront Toronto's website;
- 3) Establish and consult with a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC);
- 4) Consult with non-government stakeholders through a Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC);
- 5) Consult with First Nations;
- 6) Convene public meetings to coincide with key milestones in the planning process;
- 7) Document all public meetings and make meeting reports publicly available; and
- 8) Prepare a public consultation report as part of the overall Environmental Study Report.

Subsequent sections of this report provide more detail on each of the above communication and consultation activities, as well as the major issues and comments that were raised by consultation participants. Supporting materials, including notices, communications materials and meeting reports, are included in the appendices to this report.

Please see the Environmental Study Report – prepared by the EA project team – for information on how the issues and feedback raised by consultation participants throughout the EA influenced the project and its outcomes, including the preferred design alternative for a revitalized Queens Quay Boulevard. In addition, Appendix N of this consultation report provides a detailed listing of comments and issues raised during the consultation process, as well as project team responses.

## **2. COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES**

### **2.1 Project Mailing List & Database**

Through its ongoing work on transforming Toronto's waterfront, Waterfront Toronto maintains a database of interested individuals, stakeholders, agencies, businesses and organizations that it uses for communication and consultation purposes. At the time the Queens Quay EA started, the database contained approximately 6,000 contacts, including:

- Waterfront residents, businesses and community associations;
- City-wide groups with an interest in urban design, culture, heritage, recreation, environment, and transportation;
- Local media;
- First Nations;
- Municipal, provincial and federal politicians with constituencies in the project study area;
- Representatives of municipal, provincial and federal government agencies with a likely interest in the EA.

A notice that the project was beginning – the Notice of Commencement – was distributed to the initial mailing list. Subsequently, a postcard was mass-mailed (i.e., unaddressed ad mail) to residents and businesses in the study area, notifying them of the start of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA and the first public forum. The postcard invited recipients to contact Waterfront Toronto to add their name and contact information to the study mailing list.

As a result of the unaddressed ad mail and the additional interest generated over the course of the study, by the time of the third public forum, Waterfront Toronto's database had grown from an initial 6,000 contacts to more than 9,000 contacts.

## **2.2 Notice of Commencement**

The purpose of a Notice of Commencement is to advise those who may be affected by an undertaking that an EA is commencing, and that there will be opportunities for them to participate in the study process. At a minimum, the Notice of Commencement must contain:

- The proponent's name, contact person, address, phone number, fax number, e-mail address;
- A brief description of the purpose of the EA study (including identification of the opportunity or problem being examined); and
- A study area map.

In accordance with the guidelines for a Schedule C Municipal Class EA, a Notice of Commencement for the Queens Quay Revitalization EA was issued on September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2007 and e-mailed to all contacts in Waterfront Toronto's database. The Notice of Commencement was also published in the Toronto Star on September 20<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>, 2007 and posted on the Waterfront Toronto website.

The Notice of Commencement outlined the purpose of the EA, indicated that Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto were co-proponents for the study, and provided a map of the study area. The notice also included a general introduction to the consultation process and invited recipients to add their name to the project mailing list. A copy of the notice is included in Appendix B.

### 2.3 Postcard Mailer

Prior to the first public forum (January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008), a postcard was mailed to all residents and businesses in the study area. Approximately 11,000 households and businesses received the postcard as unaddressed ad-mail distributed through Canada Post.

The postcard invited recipients to attend Public Forum #1 and to add their names to the project mailing list. A copy of the postcard is included in Appendix C.

### 2.4 Public Meeting Notices

In addition to the Notice of Commencement and the postcard mailer prior to the first public forum, meeting notices were published in the local media and distributed via email to the project mailing list. Meeting notices were published for:

- Public Forum #1: January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008: advertised through the unaddressed ad mail to area residents and businesses and a notice published in the Toronto Star on January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2008.
- Public Forum #2: December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2008: notice published in Metro on December 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2008.
- Public Forum #3: March 25<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup>, 2009: notice published in the Toronto Star on March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009.

Copies of these meeting notices are included in Appendix D.

### 2.5 Project Website

The Queens Quay Revitalization webpage was launched at the time of project initiation and publishing of the Notice of Commencement. The website consists of a dedicated page on the Waterfront Toronto website (<http://www.waterfronttoronto.ca>). Information posted on the website includes general information about the project, the Notice of Commencement, Stakeholder Advisory Committee presentations and meeting summaries, public forum notices, display panels, presentations, workbooks, and meeting summaries. Waterfront Toronto's website also provides a "contact us" form through which online visitors can request information or ask questions.

### 2.6 First Nations Outreach

While much of the Central Waterfront area is urbanized, the Lake Ontario shoreline and vicinity is historically important to several Aboriginal groups. Waterfront Toronto has previously identified these groups, and included a representative of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation as a participant on the Central Waterfront Stakeholder Committee (see Section 3.1).

On November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2007, the following First Nations were sent a letter notifying them of the study commencement and offering an opportunity to discuss the project in more detail:

- Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation;
- Alderville First Nation;
- Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation;
- Six Nations of the Grand Territory;
- Hurons-Wendat First Nation;
- Metis Nation;
- Chippewas of Georgina Island;
- Chippewas of Rama;
- Curve Lake First Nation;
- Hiawatha First Nation;
- Iroquois and Allied First Nation;
- Beausoliel First Nation.

On January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2007, these First Nations were sent a package of information on Public Forum #1, and on November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2008, a notice of Public Forum #2 was mailed.

### 3. CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES

#### 3.1 Central Waterfront Stakeholder Committee

Waterfront Toronto previously formed the Central Waterfront Stakeholder Committee (CWSC) in order to provide an ongoing forum for stakeholder feedback and dialogue as part of the Central Waterfront Design Competition process. Membership on the CWSC included:

- Artscape
- Central Waterfront Neighbourhood Assoc.
- Citizens for the Old Town
- Council of Commodores
- Evergreen Foundation
- Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Assoc.
- Harbourfront Centre
- Harbourfront Community Assoc.
- Toronto Island Residents Assoc.
- Ireland Park
- Mississaugas of the New Credit
- Queens Quay and Harbourfront Business Improvement Assoc.
- Rocket Riders
- Sustainability Issue
- Toronto Bay Initiative
- Toronto Cycling Committee
- Toronto Pedestrian Committee
- Waterfront Action Committee
- Waterfront Regeneration Trust
- Waterfront School
- West Don Lands Committee
- Councillor Adam Vaughan
- Councillor Pam McConnell

For the purposes of Queens Quay Revitalization EA, the CWSC was introduced to the project at a meeting on July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2007 and asked to form a subcommittee of members with a specific interest in the Queens Quay corridor to provide stakeholder input and guidance as part of the project.

#### 3.2 Queens Quay Revitalization EA Stakeholder Advisory Committee

The Queens Quay Revitalization Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) was formed as a subcommittee of the CWSC to provide an ongoing forum for feedback and advice to the Queens Quay Revitalization EA project team on key aspects of the Class EA process. Drawing on the membership of the CWSC and advice from stakeholders, the SAC comprised representatives from the following organizations and individuals:

- Waterfront Regeneration Trust
- Central Waterfront Neighbourhood Assoc.
- York Quay Neighbourhood Assoc.
- Queens Quay Harbourfront Business Improvement Assoc.
- Residents-at-large
- Toronto Island Community Assoc.
- Loblaw Properties Ltd.
- Redpath Sugar
- Premier Conference & Events
- Toronto Bicycling Network
- West Don Lands Committee
- St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Assoc.
- Port Lands Action Committee
- Waterfront Action
- Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Assoc.
- Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Assoc.

- Radisson Hotel
- Brookfield Properties
- Harbourfront Centre
- Toronto Passenger Vessel Assoc.
- Bus and Boat Company
- Transit Advocate
- Pedestrian Advocate
- Councillor Pam McConnell's Office
- Councillor Adam Vaughan's Office

A non-political advisory committee, the SAC met five times over the course of the EA study. The SAC's mandate was to provide feedback and advice on:

- The problem and opportunity statement;
- Issues and opportunities to be addressed in the planning process;
- Alternative solutions and design considerations;
- Evaluation method and criteria;
- Preferred alternative strategies and design concepts;
- Proposed presentations for public forums; and
- Other relevant matters referred to the SAC for comment.

Terms of Reference were prepared for the committee and are included as Appendix E. The SAC approved the Terms of Reference at its second meeting.

As a sub-committee of the Central Waterfront Stakeholder Committee, it is anticipated that the role of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA SAC will evolve once EA is completed.

The following is a summary of each of the four meetings that were held with the Stakeholder Advisory Committee.

### ***3.2.1 SAC Meeting #1: September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2007***

The inaugural meeting of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA SAC was convened on September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2007. The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Review the Terms of Reference for the SAC;
- Receive a status report on the progress of the Class EA to date;
- Discuss the draft Problem and Opportunity Statement.

Fifteen members of the SAC attended the meeting, as well as staff from Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, and the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC). The meeting was facilitated and documented by Lura Consulting, and other project members, including Arup, MMM Group, and du Toit Allsopp Hillier, were there as a resource to the committee.

In addition to a briefing on the SAC Terms of Reference, Arup provided a presentation on the status of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA, including the proposed Problem and Opportunity Statement.

The discussion that followed the presentation focused on issues that should be taken into consideration as part of the study, as well as suggested revisions to the draft Problem and Opportunity Statement. The main issues identified by SAC members included:

- The need to include pedestrian, cycling, and public transit considerations as part of the EA study;
- The need to include traffic studies previously completed for Lake Shore Boulevard, and to consider the traffic impacts of large conferences and tour buses;
- A desire for accessibility to Queens Quay and the waterfront from all directions; and
- Emphasizing beautification and “quality of experience” in the revitalization plans.

SAC members also recommended revising the Problem and Opportunity Statement, such that:

- The need to create a sense of place around the Lake Ontario waterfront is emphasized in the context for the EA;
- There is stronger recognition of the residential presence in the study area;
- Economic viability is emphasized in the statement, and that tourism, restaurants, and retail need to be accommodated in the revitalization plans.

The project team clarified that many of the specific issues relevant to the revitalization would be included as part of the evaluation criteria, whereas the Problem and Opportunity Statement is intended to provide a basis for examining the proposed solutions against the project goals.

A copy of the summary from the first SAC meeting can be found in Appendix F.

### ***3.2.2 Stakeholder Site Walk: October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2007***

Waterfront Toronto invited the Queens Quay Revitalization EA Stakeholder Advisory Committee to participate in a site walk of the study area. The goal of the site walk was to develop a collective understanding of the functional requirements and challenges that users of Queens Quay experience. The walk commenced at Jarvis Street and the group continued west along Queens Quay to Lower Spadina Avenue. Disposable cameras were provided so that participants could photograph their experiences along the way.

### ***3.2.3 SAC Meeting #2: November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2007***

The second SAC meeting provided an opportunity to receive feedback on the revised Problem and Opportunity Statement, to approve the SAC Terms of Reference, and to present the four alternative planning solutions and the preferred solution to the SAC before they were made public at the first public forum. Sixteen SAC members attended the meeting, as well as staff from Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, the TTC, and consultants from the project team.

At the meeting, several minor changes were made to the SAC Terms of Reference and to the Problem and Opportunity Statement. (Refer to Appendix E for the final SAC Terms of Reference). The full Problem and Opportunity Statement, as endorsed by the SAC, can be found in the Queens Quay Revitalization Environmental Study Report. It was noted that the revised Problem and

Opportunity Statement was largely acceptable to the SAC and would be the subject of further consultation at the upcoming public forum.

Following the presentation of the four planning solutions and the preferred planning alternative, SAC members had several concerns regarding the potential for transportation conflicts and loss of traffic capacity along Queens Quay. To respond to these concerns, the project team noted that:

- A more in-depth traffic analysis would be completed during the next phase of planning;
- The goal was not to eliminate cars on Queens Quay, but to slow the growth of auto use relative to other modes of transportation (i.e., walking, cycling, and public transit);
- The Queens Quay revitalization was being planned in conjunction with other projects in the area, including TTC track replacement and the East Bayfront Transit EA; and
- Parking needs for the area, including tour buses, would be given consideration as part of the next phase of work, once the traffic studies currently underway were completed.

With regard to the presentation for the upcoming public forum, SAC members advised that it should include more information on why three of the four planning alternatives were rejected, including how each alternative passed or failed the evaluation criteria. SAC members also wanted to ensure that sufficient notice was given prior to the first public forum. Waterfront Toronto replied that 2-3 weeks notice was usually given, and that a postcard mail drop and electronic notices would be distributed.

A summary report from the second SAC meeting is provided in Appendix G.

### ***3.2.4 SAC Meeting #2B: December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2007***

This special additional meeting was called so that SAC members would have an opportunity to review the revised presentation before it was presented to the public at the first public forum in January. Seventeen members of the SAC, along with staff from Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, the TTC, and consultants from the project team attended the meeting. At the meeting, SAC members were walked through the updated presentation and each of the four proposed planning solutions. They were then briefed on the proposed format for the upcoming public forum and given the opportunity to provide feedback.

SAC members generally agreed that the revised presentation was much better, noting that their recommendations had been taken into account. Additional changes recommended by SAC members included:

- Ensuring that consideration is given to the winter environment along Queens Quay, and that more illustrations be included in the slide presentation;
- Avoiding use of the term “drive” when referring to the future Queens Quay as this may offend cyclists and pedestrians;
- Noting in the preferred solution that access to residential properties may be possible, but will be challenging;
- Giving additional consideration to the challenge presented by tour buses because this does not appear to be addressed at this point.

SAC members also asked questions and provided advice on the first public forum format. SAC members wanted to ensure that more visual aids would provide a clear picture of what each planning alternative looked like, in order to help participants better visualize each option.

Project team members noted that all information presented would be open for public feedback at the public forum and throughout the EA. Committee members asked the project team to ensure that the audience understands that the outcome need not be an “either/or situation” and that a blend of options is possible.

A summary of SAC Meeting #2B is provided in Appendix H.

### ***3.2.5 SAC Meeting #3: November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2008***

This meeting was held approximately 11 months after the previous meeting of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee. During this period, the project team worked to resolve technical concerns related to the various design alternatives.

The purpose of the third SAC meeting was to receive feedback on the design alternatives associated with the preferred planning solution that was selected following the first public forum in January 2008. The project team also wanted the SAC’s comments on the content, length and level of detail in the presentation. Twenty-two SAC members attended the meeting, along with staff from Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, the TTC, and consultants from the project team. Issues raised by the SAC included:

- **More Background Information:** The project team should provide sufficient background on the project – particularly regarding traffic impacts. It was noted that many details in the presentation will need thorough explanation. This will avoid confusion and save time in the end since fewer questions will be necessary.
- **South side Transit:** SAC members expressed strong support for transit (i.e., streetcar tracks) on the south side of Queens Quay. Design alternatives #4 and #5 presented the south side transit options, and SAC members generally recommended focusing on these options.
- **More Information on Process:** The SAC encouraged the project team to be explicit about budget, next steps, connections to other projects, and the EA process and timelines.
- **Parking and Access:** Tour bus parking and driveway access remained unresolved in the minds of some SAC members. Project team members advised that these issues would be taken into consideration in more detail in the coming months.
- **Quantitative Data:** More quantitative data on traffic and servicing impacts were requested to assess fully the impacts on landowners. The project team noted that this work would be done in the next phase, and that the project team would be meeting with individual landowners separately during the next stage of work.
- **Preferred Alternatives:** There was some concern that the project team had short-listed three design alternatives without the input of the committee. The project team explained that each alternative was evaluated against the Problem and Opportunity Statement, which was developed in collaboration with the SAC, and that the purpose of the meeting

and the upcoming public forum was to obtain feedback on the evaluation of the alternatives.

A summary of SAC Meeting #3 is found in Appendix I.

### ***3.2.6 SAC Meeting #4: March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009***

This meeting was the final meeting of the SAC prior to the preferred design alternatives being presented to the public at Public Forum #3 in late March 2009. Twenty-five SAC members attended the meeting, along with staff from Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, the TTC, and consultants from the project team.

The major elements of the preferred alternative – the south side transit option with either one-way or two-way traffic on the north side of Queens Quay – were presented to the SAC. These included a bus plan, servicing plan, parking plan, transit plan, site access plan, and site specific drawings for several properties. A presentation on the main findings of the traffic study undertaken by the project team was also provided. SAC members sought clarifications on many of these elements, with many comments focused on concerns about access to properties along the south side of Queens Quay, potential impacts on vehicle traffic, and issues regarding buses, taxis and cyclists. SAC members raised a number of suggestions on how these concerns could be addressed in the proposed plans.

The project team closed the meeting with information on next steps in the EA process. Public Forum #3 would be the final public meeting, but the project team will continue to receive and respond to public comments before the Environmental Study Report goes to City Council for approval. SAC members were told that once it is approved by City Council, the Environmental Study Report will be filed with the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. Prior to finalizing the study report, the project team will continue to meet with landowners and other stakeholders to address any specific issues and concerns.

A summary report on the SAC Meeting #4 is included in Appendix J.

### **3.3 Public Forums & Drop-in Centres**

The project team hosted three public forums and one drop-in centre to provide the broader public, particularly residents and business representatives in the Queens Quay study area, with information about the project and the opportunity to provide feedback. Each of the three public forums followed a similar format, with an open house at the outset of the session, followed by a presentation by the project team, and then an interactive feedback session either involving small table discussions and/or facilitated plenary sessions. Worksheets were distributed to the participants so that they could record their thoughts and provide comments in writing.

The open house sessions were held prior to each public forum, giving participants the opportunity to review display boards and speak one-on-one with Waterfront Toronto, City of Toronto and the project team consultants. As part of public forum #3, an extended drop-in centre was held on a separate day to enable participants additional time to review the proposed design plans and discuss concerns with Waterfront Toronto and their consultants.

Lura Consulting provided neutral facilitation services for the three public forums. Lura Consulting also prepared summary reports for each meeting. All of the materials from each of the public forums, including presentations, workbooks, and meeting reports, are available on the Waterfront

Toronto website. Each of the three public forums and the drop-in centre is described in more detail below.

### **3.3.1 Public Forum #1: January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

On January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008, the first public forum was held at the Westin Harbour Castle Hotel between 6 p.m. and 9 p.m. This first forum was designed to introduce the Queens Quay Revitalization EA process and provide an initial opportunity for public input on how Queens Quay could be improved.

An estimated 300 people participated in the meeting, along with members of the project team from Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, du Toit Allsopp Hillier, and Arup.



Following the open house portion of the evening between 6:00 and 7:00 p.m., the project team gave a presentation that was divided into two parts. Part 1 provided background on the EA process, on the Central Waterfront Master Plan, the Queens Quay Revitalization EA purpose and Problem and Opportunity Statement, and the planning policy context for the EA. Part 2 included a description of the four alternative planning solutions, how each alternative solution was evaluated, and the preferred planning solution.

The four alternative planning solutions were described as follows:

- 1) **Do Nothing:** Maintain the existing physical conditions and operations.
- 2) **Modify Operations:** No physical modifications, curbs remain in current location, add bicycle lanes, signal operation adjustment.
- 3) **Physical Modifications Within Existing Right-of-Way:** Includes modified operations, conversion of existing lanes to other uses, relocation of existing streetcar infrastructure, signal operation adjustment.
- 4) **Physical Modifications Within an Expanded Right-of-Way:** Would involve property acquisition to enable revitalization/redesign beyond the existing right-of-way.

The project team explained that Option 3 (Physical Modifications Within Existing Right-of-Way) was selected as the preferred planning solution because it favourably addressed nine of the ten evaluation criteria against which all four options were assessed.

A question and answer period was provided for participants to seek clarification on any of the information presented to them. A full record of these questions and answers is provided in the public forum report in Appendix K of this report. The issues raised during this session (and throughout the consultation process) are organized thematically in Appendix N (Issue Summary Table) to this report, along with responses from the project team.

Following the question and answer period, participants worked in small groups to consider three questions:

1. As you think about the study area (Queens Quay Avenue between Lower Spadina Avenue and Lower Jarvis Street)...
  - What works well now?
  - What opportunities do you see for improvement?
  
2. Thinking about your answer to Question 1 (what works well now; opportunities for improvement), and the preferred planning solution...
  - What do you like about the preferred planning solution?
  - What concerns do you have?
  
3. Do you have any additional feedback on any aspect of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA (planning policy context; problem statement; etc.)?

The following table provides a summary of feedback on each of the above discussion questions:

**Table 1: Summary of Roundtable Discussions**

1.a. What works well in study area?	Participants were happy with some physical elements of Queens Quay area such as the Music Garden, HtO Park, the Harbourfront skating rink, the transit right-of-way, and the Harbourfront Centre. Participants also spoke highly of the many festivals, recreational activities and cultural activities that are available in the Queens Quay area.
1.b. What opportunities do you see for improvement?	Participants felt that opportunities exist to improve traffic congestion, noise and air pollution, North-South connections, illegal parking, public transit, cycling lanes, economic activity, the Martin Goodman Trail, and seasonal activities in the study area.
2.a. What do you like about the preferred planning solution?	Participants were happy to see the preferred planning solution was pedestrian friendly, beautified the waterfront, created a neighbourhood, provided space for cycling, increased economic activity, discouraged car use, and increased recreational activities.
2.b. What concerns do you have?	Participants were concerned about the potential for increased traffic congestion, access to residences and local businesses, parking, maintenance, economic activity, emergency access, and interactions between pedestrians, cyclists, cars and transit.
3. Additional Feedback	Participants felt that a solution must be found to the illegal parking of tour buses along Queens Quay, a balance should be reached between the needs of residents, drivers, pedestrians, cyclists and business owners, and public spaces must stay within the public realm. Participants had a lively discussion about the location of bicycle lanes; no consensus was reached with respect to situating a bicycle route along

	Queens Quay versus along Lake Shore Boulevard or in other locations. Participants also recommended extending the study area west of Lower Spadina Avenue beyond Bathurst Street.
--	--

**3.3.2 Public Forum #2: December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

On December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2008, the second public forum was held at the Harbourfront Community Centre between 6 p.m. and 9 p.m. The purpose of the Public Forum #2 was to:

- Provide a progress update on the Queens Quay Revitalization EA;
- Present and receive feedback on a “short list” of alternative design concepts for a revitalized Queens Quay corridor; and
- Discuss next steps in identifying a preferred design concept, including opportunities for public input.

Approximately 250 participants attended the forum. The format for the evening was a one-hour open house followed by a presentation by the project team, a question and answer period, roundtable discussions, and a final facilitated plenary session.

To further define how the preferred planning solution (which was presented at the first Public Forum) might be implemented on the ground, the project team presented five alternative design concepts:

- 1) Do Nothing (no physical or operational changes);
- 2) Centre Transit With On-Street Bike Lanes;
- 3) Centre Transit with Martin Goodman Trail;
- 4) South side Transit with Martin Goodman Trail and Two-Way Traffic;
- 5) South side Transit with Martin Goodman Trail with One-Way Traffic.

After reviewing the evaluation criteria, the project team recommended that the Centre Transit with On-Street Bike Lanes alternative and the two South side Transit alternatives be short-listed for further evaluation.

A question and answer period was provided for participants to seek clarification on any of the information presented to them. A full record of these questions and answers is provided in the Public Forum #2 report in Appendix L of this report. The issues raised during this session are organized thematically in Appendix N (Issue Response Table) to this report, along with project team responses.

Following the question and answer period, participants worked in small groups to consider three questions:

1. Thinking about each of the “short-listed” design concepts – What do you like? What concerns do you have? What changes or improvements would you suggest?
  - a. Centre Transit: On Street Bike Lanes

- b. South side Transit: Martin Goodman Trail, 2-Way Traffic
- c. South side Transit: Martin Goodman Trail, 1-Way Traffic

2. What additional information would assist in identifying a preferred design concept?
3. Do you have any additional comments on any other aspect of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA (e.g., alternatives considered to date; proposed criteria to evaluate short-listed alternatives; etc.)?

**Table 2: Summary of Roundtable Discussions on Short-listed Design Alternatives:**

<p><b>Design Alternative:</b> (Centre transit with on-street bike lanes)</p>	<p><b>Likes:</b> Participants were happy with access for emergency vehicles and local residents, the landscaping designs, the pedestrian and cycling realm, cost savings associated with keeping the transit right-of-way in the same location, available parking, and good traffic flow.</p>	<p><b>Dislikes:</b> Many participants felt that this alternative is not pedestrian, cyclist and youth friendly, has no connection to the Martin Goodman Trail, does not improve Queens Quay beyond the status quo, and will cause traffic delays. It was also suggested that cars and taxis will park in bike lanes, and noise pollution and air pollution will both increase.</p>	<p><b>Suggested Changes:</b> Most participants preferred to abandon this alternative in favour of the south side alternatives). Participants suggested that if this alternative was to be modified it would need separated bike lanes, physically separated from vehicles and pedestrians.</p>
<p><b>Design Alternative:</b> South side transit with Martin Goodman Trail and 2-way traffic</p>	<p><b>Likes:</b> Participants were happy with the expanded pedestrian zone, the bike lanes that incorporate the Martin Goodman Trail, the “destination feel” of the design, plentiful trees and excellent landscaping, easily accessible public transit, increased safety of cyclists and pedestrians, and the traffic calming effect of the design.</p>	<p><b>Dislikes:</b> Some participants felt that this alternative would be costly, create traffic congestion and increase noise pollution, restrict access to south side residences and businesses, and restrict access for emergency vehicles.</p>	<p><b>Suggested Changes:</b> Participants would include public art as part of the design, extend the CN Tower skywalk down to Harbourfront Centre, bring the path south from Union Station, restrict access and parking for coach buses along Queens Quay, plant for seasonality, and make the street one-way for vehicular traffic.</p>

<p><b>Design Alternative:</b> South side transit with Martin Goodman Trail and 1-way traffic</p>	<p><b>Likes:</b> Many participants considered this alternative to be the best design for Queens Quay. Participants were happy with the balance of pedestrian, cycling, transit and vehicular needs, enhanced traffic flow through the area, dedicated bike lanes, and increased pedestrian &amp; cyclist safety.</p>	<p><b>Dislikes:</b> Participants felt that this alternative would create challenges for eastbound traffic, encourage speeding by cars, confuse tourists, restrict access to buildings on the south side, and cause problems with respect to access for emergency service vehicles.</p>	<p><b>Suggested Changes:</b> Participants would like to continue the design as far west along Queens Quay as possible, create a pathway from Union Station, eliminate parking on the south side, add more bike racks to the area, install cycling signals at eye level, create pick-up and drop-off bays for coach buses, lower speed limits, and plant more trees.</p>
--	--	--	---

In response to question two regarding what additional information participants would need to identify a preferred design alternative, participants requested:

- Up-to-date traffic statistics;
- Parking information;
- Locations of unloading areas for buses and taxis;
- Entry points to condominiums and parking lots;
- Demographics;
- Construction schedules;
- Noise pollution studies;
- Air pollution studies.

In response to the third question, participants provided a wide range of additional feedback. Overall, participants felt that the project team should consider the seasonality of the design, liability issues in winter, more frequent transit service along Queens Quay, restricting vehicular access to Queens Quay, accessibility for people with physical disabilities, increased signage, a pathway from Union Station, speed limits for cyclists, and additional public washrooms along the Central Waterfront.



A full record of these questions and answers is provided in the second public forum report in Appendix L of this report. In addition, the issues raised during this session are organized thematically in Appendix N (Issue Summary Table) to this report, along with project team responses.

### **3.3.3 Public Forum #3: March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

On March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009 a third and final public forum was held at the Westin Harbour Castle. It was followed by an extended Drop-in Centre on March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2009, at the Harbourfront Centre.

An estimated 350 people participated in Public Forum #3 on March 25<sup>th</sup>. The format for the evening was a half-hour open house followed by a presentation by the project team, and a facilitated plenary feedback session. The purpose of the public forum was to:

- Provide a comprehensive overview of the EA process undertaken; and
- Present and receive feedback on preferred alternative designs for a revitalized Queens Quay corridor.

The third public forum also provided an opportunity to present information and receive feedback on the East Bayfront Transit EA. A presentation on the East Bayfront Transit EA explained how that EA connected to the Queens Quay revitalization process, including the creation of a streetcar portal (i.e., the opening where streetcars emerge from the underground tunnel to the surface-level tracks), the eastern terminus of the Queens Quay East streetcar line, and the expansion of the Union Station streetcar loop. The presentation noted that a portal located between Yonge and Freeland Streets was being proposed as the preferred location.

The presentation on the preferred design alternatives for the Queens Quay Revitalization included a detailed description of the criteria that were used to assess each of the design alternatives, and whether or not each design alternative met these criteria. Based on the feedback received at the second public forum and detailed evaluation of each option against the project goals and evaluation criteria, the project team recommended proceeding with Design Alternative #4 (South side Transit: Martin Goodman Trail, Two-Way Traffic) or Design Alternative #5 (South side Transit: Martin Goodman Trail, One-Way Traffic). The project team noted that more work remains to be done to decide if one-way or two-way traffic along Queens Quay is preferred, and that the team was open to feedback on this matter.

Following the presentation, participants were asked to consider three questions as part of a facilitated plenary feedback session:

1. What feedback do you have on the results of the evaluation to date – What do you like? What concerns do you have?
2. What would you like the Project Team to consider further as the project moves into the detailed design stage?
3. Do you have any additional comments on any other aspect of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA?

**Table 3: Summary of Feedback from Public Forum #3**

<p>1.a. What feedback do you have on the results of the evaluation to date – What do you like?</p>	<p>Participants were generally pleased with the proposed plan for Queens Quay, the landscaping designs, the pedestrian and cycling realms, and public transit. There was overall support for the south side options, with more participants supporting the 2-way traffic alternative, or being comfortable with either of the two south side options.</p>
<p>1.b. What feedback do you have on the results of the evaluation to date –What concerns do you have?</p>	<p>Participants felt that the proposed plan should further consider seasonal changes; that it may negatively impact access to south side residences; that it does not address the western continuity of the Martin Goodman Trail; that it does not address the lack of public washroom facilities along the waterfront; and it may cause traffic delays and congestion. It was noted by a number of participants that decreasing Queens Quay from 4 lanes to 2 lanes of traffic may cause congestion and traffic delays, and a number of participants felt that making the two north-side lanes one-way may further increase traffic congestion and backups.</p>
<p>2. What would you like the Project Team to consider further as the project moves into the detailed design stage?</p>	<p>Participants requested that the project team consider expanding the PATH system from Union Station to the waterfront, design more for the winter season, increase public washroom facilities and public benches, provide a public swimming pool, consider the impact of the island ferry docks, and strive to make Queens Quay a destination itself.</p>
<p>3. Do you have any additional comments on any other aspect of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA?</p>	<p>Participants felt that the project team should start construction as soon as possible, be creative in their design of the Queens Quay, consider access for emergency vehicles, create plans for seasonal programming including closing Queens Quay for street festival and marathons, and ensure maintenance of bike paths and the water’s edge.</p>

The meeting ended with reminders that public comments would continue to be received until April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2009, and that deputations could be made when the EA study and recommended alternative is presented to the Executive Committee of Toronto City Council in June, 2009. A report on Public Forum #3 and the March 28<sup>th</sup> Drop-in Centre is included in Appendix M.

**3.3.4 Drop-in Centre: March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

The extended drop-in centre held at Harbourfront Centre on Saturday, March 28<sup>th</sup> provided participants with the opportunity to meet informally with project team members during a three-hour open house session. An estimated 150 participants attended the open house. While circulating

among participants, the project team recorded comments and suggestions on clipboards. These comments have been included in both the Public Forum #3 report in Appendix M, and in the Issue Summary Table in Appendix N.

### 3.4 Stakeholder Meetings & Interviews

Face-to-face meetings with stakeholder groups, resident groups, local businesses, landowners and government agencies were a vital component of the consultation process. Over the course of the EA, Waterfront Toronto held more than 50 meetings, including roundtable discussions, presentations, town hall meetings, workshops, and one-on-one briefings. The goal of these meetings was to ensure that there was broad understanding of the objectives of the EA and the revitalization, to obtain input and to collaboratively resolve issues and concerns. Feedback raised during these meetings was documented by the project team. The issues and concerns have been organized thematically in the Issues Summary Table included in Appendix N, along with project team responses.

In addition to face-to-face meetings with landowners, residents, and businesses with concerns specific to their properties and businesses, Waterfront Toronto’s approach to public consultation also took into consideration the concerns of city-wide interest groups, including cyclists, pedestrians, and environmental groups. Waterfront Toronto has met and worked closely with these and other community groups to ensure that the preferred design alternative balances these city-wide interests with localized concerns about access to properties and the prosperity of Queens Quay businesses.

The following table lists meetings that took place over the course of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA process:

**Table 4: Stakeholder Meetings & Interviews**

Group	Meetings	Dates
<b>Landowners &amp; Resident Groups</b>	10 & 20 Bay Street	January 23, 2008
	65 Harbour Street	February 21, 2008
	Redpath Sugar	July 29, 2008 September 19, 2008 January 15 & 23, 2009 March 31, 2009 May 5, 2009
	401 Queens Quay	October 22, 2008 January 15, 2009
	Harbourfront Centre	January 16, 2009
	Radisson Hotel	October 10, 2008 January 22, 2009 March 24, 2009
	Queens Quay Terminal	September 30, 2008 January 27, 2009 March 9, 2009 March 10, 2009 March 31, 2009

	211 Queens Quay	February 11, 2009
	251 Queens Quay	February 11, 2009 April 7, 2009 April 28, 2009
	Pier 27/Cityzen	February 24, 2009
	Harbour Square	January 25, 2008 September 23, 2008 January 22, 2009 March 10, 2009 March 24, 2009
	Bus & Boat Company	February 17, 2009 March 31, 2009
	Westin Harbour Castle	January 21, 2008 March 31, 2009
	250/260/270 Queens Quay West Osmington/1 Yonge Street	March 31, 2009 June 19, 2008 April 1, 2009 November 16 & 23, 2009
	Mariposa Boats	March 10, 2009
	Rabba	November 17, 2009
	99 Harbour Square	November 20, 2009
<b>Community Organizations</b>	Queens Quay Harbourfront Business Improvement Association	August 29, 2008 February 3, 2009 March 5, 2009 March 10, 2009 March 13, 2009 March 24, 2009 April 16, 2009 May 7, 2009 November 19, 2009
	Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association	April 15, 2009
	York Quay Neighbourhood Association	April 30, 2009
	Toronto Island Community Association	April 30, 2009
<b>Government Agencies</b>	Toronto Fire Services and Emergency Medical Services	June 25, 2008 January 22, 2009 May 6, 2009
	Police Marine Unit	January 27, 2009

### **3.5 Additional Opportunities for Public Comment**

#### ***3.5.1 City of Toronto Executive Committee Meeting (June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009)***

Members of the public were invited to make deputations to City Council's Executive Committee.

#### ***3.5.2 City of Toronto Council Meeting (October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009)***

The plans for the Queens Quay Revitalization were considered at City Council's meeting on October 1<sup>st</sup>.

#### ***3.5.3 Notice of Study Completion***

Waterfront Toronto will publish a notice that the Queens Quay EA has been completed in December 2009. It is also anticipated that the Environmental Study Report will be available on the Ministry of the Environment's Environmental Registry website for a 30-day comment period. The report will also be available on the Waterfront Toronto website, and at several public viewing locations throughout the city. Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto will endeavour to address concerns raised during the comment period.

#### ***3.5.4 Part II Order Request***

If concerns regarding the project cannot be resolved in discussion with Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto during the 30-day comment period, a person may request the Minister of the Environment to make an order for the project to comply with Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act (a Part II Order). A Part II Order requires a proponent to embark upon an Individual Environmental Assessment.

#### ***3.5.5 Approval of the Project by the Minister of Environment***

Once the Minister makes a decision on the EA, an additional comment period is provided so that the public can comment on the Minister's decision.

### **3.6 Agency Consultation**

Technical staff with the City of Toronto and other partner agencies provided comment and direction throughout the EA process. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met three times, once during each phase of the EA, serving as a checkpoint prior to the three public forums. Additional meetings were held with technical agencies throughout the process to address specific concerns and provide feedback on alternatives and plans.

The TAC, formed to provide in-progress review of the EA, included representatives from Toronto Fire, Emergency Medical Services, Toronto Police, Toronto Hydro, numerous City technical departments such as Servicing, Traffic Operations and Transportation, the Toronto Transit Commission, Toronto Port Commission as well as Harbourfront Centre, a federally funded cultural agency located on Queens Quay.

The first TAC meeting on November 5, 2007 was held at the offices of Waterfront Toronto. The project team presented the results of the initial phase of the process and invited feedback and comment on the Problem and Opportunity Statement. TAC members were also asked to help identify the alternative planning solutions and evaluation criteria.

The second meeting on February 8, 2008, also at the offices of Waterfront Toronto, focused on the presentation of the preliminary alternative design concepts. TAC members were asked for their

feedback on the concepts, and to help direct the selection of the appropriate evaluation criteria. The third and last formal TAC meeting on March 12, 2009 was held in the same location as the previous meetings. The project team presented the technically preferred design alternative, and asked for comments and to highlight any concerns or issues TAC members may have with the recommended alternative.

Key issues raised during the formal TAC meetings and further agency consultation encompassed a wide range of topics, from road operations to construction timing and coordination. Specifically, the primary issues included:

- Providing emergency vehicles access to both the roadway and TTC right-of-way;
- Developing a flexible street design to accommodate potential one-way conversion, if necessary;
- Identifying techniques to indicate to other vehicles that TTC right-of-way is not a driving lane;
- Resolving the unique asymmetrical intersection design;
- Providing signage and control of the Martin Goodman Trail;
- Designing traffic and transit signal operations;
- Accommodating access to utilities and scheduling for construction ;
- Removal of snow from the Martin Goodman Trail and if required, the TTC right-of-way.

#### 4. SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES RAISED DURING THE CONSULTATIONS

Throughout the consultations, several issues emerged as key concerns for consultation participants in the Queens Quay Revitalization EA. A more detailed summary of comments related to these key concerns is included in the Issue Summary Table in Appendix N to this report. In addition, the Environmental Study Report includes detailed information on how the preferred design alternative addresses each of these concerns.



In brief, the major issues that emerged during the EA consultation process are as follows:

- 1) **Access to South side Properties:** Throughout the consultation, residents and property owners expressed concern that the reconfiguration of Queens Quay would result in access challenges for properties located on the south side of Queens Quay. Specific concerns were expressed about the elimination of signalized intersections at 55/65 Harbour Square, the closure of Robertson Crescent that encircles the Radisson Hotel (249 Queens Quay), and the consolidation of other access routes and driveways.

- 2) **Bicycle/Pedestrian/Automobile Interface:** Many participants in the consultation process expressed concern with how the multiple modes of transportation could be accommodated as part of a redesigned Queens Quay corridor. Many pedestrians were concerned about the risks posed by cyclists using the sidewalk, whereas cyclists were concerned about the risks of sharing roadspace with cars. Cyclists and pedestrians were both concerned about safety at intersections. Many motorists felt that the narrowing of roadspace to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists in their own right-of-ways would result in greater traffic congestion along Queens Quay.
- 3) **Loss of Road Capacity:** As previously mentioned, many motorists were concerned that the narrowing of road space to accommodate public transit, cycling, and walking would result in increased traffic congestion.
- 4) **Tour Bus and Taxi Parking:** Throughout the consultation process, many participants expressed their concerns about the operation of taxis and tour buses along Queens Quay, including the traffic congestion, air and noise pollution and illegal parking.

For information on how the project team addressed these major issues and related concerns, please see the Environmental Study Report, as well as Appendix N of this report.