



**Queens Quay Revitalization Environmental Assessment
Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Meeting #2**

***Thursday, November 15, 2007 – 5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
Waterfront Toronto, Main Boardroom***

Meeting Summary

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chris Glaisek (Waterfront Toronto) welcomed the meeting participants and a round of introductions followed. Mr. Glaisek commented that the purpose of the meeting was twofold. First, he indicated that further feedback would be sought on the revised problem statement, which had been substantially revised to reflect the specific comments provided by the SAC at the last meeting. Second, the alternative planning solutions and the preferred alternative would be presented to the SAC for comment.

2. Agenda Review and Meeting Purpose

Meeting facilitator David Dilks (Lura Consulting) reviewed the meeting agenda. He indicated that the agenda items for the meeting included:

- obtaining feedback on the revised problem statement
- presentation of the alternative and preferred planning solutions
- update on the public consultation process
- revised SAC Terms of Reference

3. Approval of SAC Meeting #1 Summary

The Committee reviewed the summary from SAC Meeting #1. The minutes were approved with the following change:

- Section 4, second last bullet should read – “600 km of the waterfront trail...”

4. Consultation Update

A representative from Waterfront Toronto provided an update on the EA process and consultation program. They reported that 35 people participated in the walking tour and observed what works well and what does not about Queens Quay. She indicated that the project team intends to prepare presentation boards about the walk for the upcoming public meeting.

It was noted that a presentation was made by the project team to a recent meeting of the Business Improvement Area (BIA). It was also noted that many businesses on Queens Quay are interested in the process and want to be involved in the consultation process.

The representative also informed that the Technical Advisory Committee held its first meeting on November 5th.

There were no questions from SAC members following the update.

5. Approval of SAC Terms of Reference

Mr. Dilks reviewed the revised Terms of Reference with the committee and noted that there was a substantive change to the introduction. He said that the revised problem statement was included in the introduction of the TOR in response to suggestions to include a common element that both SAC and project team members would work towards. He indicated that there were several other editorial changes to the draft discussed at the last meeting.

Mr. Dilks then asked the committee for any final feedback before a decision to approve the TOR.

One committee member suggested that, if there is a need to relocate the TTC tracks, then there should be a reference to accessibility in the TOR. Mr. Dilks noted that the TOR is intended to establish the process the committee will follow and that "content-related" discussions will follow.

It was suggested that the problem statement include a reference to residents in addition to tourists moving along the lakefront and the edge of Queens Quay.

Another committee member commented that it is a good idea to include the problem statement in the TOR and that it solved her previous concern. She felt that it would provide a good checklist against which to measure the project outcomes.

The TOR was endorsed unanimously by the committee, with the understanding that the revised problem statement will be inserted into the introduction, once finalized.

6. Project Team Presentation

Roger DuToit (DTAH) and David Pratt (Arup) delivered a presentation on the status of the EA process, focusing on the revised problem statement and the alternative and preferred planning solutions. Mr. Dilks noted that the presentation deck will be e-mailed to the committee members shortly after the meeting.

Mr. Dilks asked for any questions of clarification from the committee.

- One committee member asked if it was anticipated that pedestrian traffic would increase, would there be a corresponding decrease in car traffic? Mr. DuToit responded that there will be a more in-depth traffic analysis during the next stage of work. He noted that Queens Quay acts as both a local access road and as a through-fare. He explained that the congestion on Queens Quay is caused by bottle necks, and that the street has more capacity than its current volume. The current rate of 700-800 cars per hour is approximately half its potential capacity. Mr. Glaisek noted that the goal is not necessarily to reduce the amount of cars, but to slow the growth of auto use compared to other modes.
- Another committee member said that he disagreed that the Quay to the City pilot was a success. He said that the commute home was a mess because of the number of events, and

that there were many traffic conflicts. Mr. DuToit noted that it had been a success for pedestrians and cyclists, but that there were access and vehicular traffic issues.

- The committee member commented that the check marks indicating pass-fail were very subjective and it appeared that the planning solution was pre-determined.
- A committee member asked if water routes were considered in the planning scenarios as an option and if this could help address the higher summer time transportation numbers. Mr. DuToit replied that this may be possible, but that there is currently no data.
- A committee member asked if the planned 2009 TTC track replacements were still going proceeding. Jim Sinikas (TTC) responded that the tracks are still scheduled to be replaced in 2009, but the design of the tracks will depend on what revitalization scheme is recommended for Queens Quay.
- A committee member asked about the timing of the East Bayfront transit EA studies in relation to the Queens Quay EA. Mr. Sinikas noted that East Bayfront has been delayed so that it can be planned in conjunction with other adjacent transit studies.
- A committee member asked if more detailed projections of pedestrian and transit traffic were planned, and Mr. DuToit indicated that they were.

7. Roundtable Discussion

Discussion on Problem Statement

Mr. Dilks led the committee in discussion about the revised problem statement. The purpose of the discussion was to identify any refinements to the problem statement before it is presented to the public at the upcoming public forum.

A summary of the suggestions and comments follows:

- The third bullet should include residents and tourists.
- Both the north and south sides of Queens Quay should be reflected in the problem statement. The north sidewalk needs to be widened in order to attract retail customers.
- The word “waterfront” does not reflect Queens Quay, as very little of the street is on the actual waterfront.
- It should be noted that Queens Quay should be a public realm that lifts peoples’ spirits – a place of aesthetic beauty.
- The traffic design for Queens Quay should reflect the intent of the street – is it to be a busy through-fare or a quiet street for local traffic?
- The planning of condo sites needs to be improved so that they do not locate passenger pick-up areas in no-stopping zones.

Committee members were invited to send in any additional comments they have on the problem statement following the meeting.

Alternative Planning Solutions

Mr. Dilks asked the committee members to think about the four planning solutions and their evaluation and to provide their comments.

Mr. DuToit noted that he saw the planning options as being on a sliding scale, where some would drop off and some might be combined. He suggested that the options provide a spectrum of solutions, and that the final preferred solution could be a hybrid of the options.

One committee member noted that the various committee members would have their own bias, and that she supported the design selected in the competition. She felt that the presentation provided a graphical way to explain why the preferred solution was chosen.

Another committee member agreed but noted that she was surprised by the access issue. She noted that there may be developments that could ease some of the problems, such as a TTC expressway or turning Queens Quay into a local street. She asked the status of the underground parking lot proposal at Harbourfront Centre. Ms. Mallozzi noted that it was still in the midst of a feasibility study. She noted that they were looking at parking linkages with other areas, such as a Simcoe Street entrance. She also noted that there may be some synergies with currently underutilized land.

Another committee member noted that there was an effort to get the feasibility study of Canada Square to address underground bus parking. He noted that there are too many developments taking place for the City planners on staff to keep pace. He suggested that Waterfront Toronto should use its ability to access three levels of government to talk with Mayor Miller to stop some developments so that they can be handled correctly. He also noted that there is a need to look at the land behind the LCBO to see if it can be better utilized.

One committee member said that the presentation needs a more balanced approach to show what works and what does not work. He said he wants to see Queens Quay improved, but cautioned that selecting one solution while not dealing with the other issues will result in a solution that does not work. Steve Willis (MMM) noted that there will be a more detailed level of analysis in the next phase of the EA.

The committee member suggested that the presentation left the audience with the impression that the preferred solution was already selected without detailed analysis and without input from the public. He said that the presentation appeared to funnel down towards a single solution. Mr. Willis and Mr. DuToit noted that the presentation will need to be clarified to show the preferred solution more clearly and to better present the purpose of Phase 2 and 3 of the EA.

One committee member suggested that the public should be provided with information describing why alternative solutions passed or failed the criteria. Another committee member noted that too much information in the presentation would also be confusing.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Chris Glaisek suggested that feedback on the presentation was helpful and would be instrumental in helping the project team to refine the presentation prior to the public forum.

8. Upcoming Public Forum

Mr. Dilks noted that the upcoming public forum would be early to mid December, and asked the committee members for their comments.

One committee member asked if Toronto Waterfront could be accused of not providing enough lead time or enough notice. Another suggested that December might not be the optimal time for the meeting in view of the upcoming holidays. Ms. Mallozzi replied that Waterfront Toronto usually gives about three weeks notice. She said that they plan on doing a mail drop and sending notices to everyone in their database prior to the meeting.

One committee member questioned if it is right to take out car lanes to put in bike lanes. He said that it needs to be made clear how the lanes are being used – for through traffic, stop-start traffic, or illegal parking. Another committee member noted that the question is not about car lanes versus bike lanes, but rather is about finding a balance of traffic flow. He noted that it would be divisive to think about who has to give up what.

Another committee member commented that the EA process is trying to come up with a solution that will make the waterfront more livable. He added that while it will be difficult to find a balance between pedestrians and vehicles, everyone will ultimately benefit.

One committee member commented that she liked the graphics showing how the streets are being used, and that she would also like to see a graphic showing the percentage of roadway use per user.

Mr. Dilks noted that any additional comments can be provided to Waterfront Toronto by November 23rd.

9. Central Waterfront Update

Ms. Mallozzi provided an update on the Master plan. She said that the project team has come up with options and that they will show them at the public meeting.

She also noted that construction is about to start on the Spadina Slip. All of the committee members will be invited to the upcoming groundbreaking ceremony.

10. Next Steps and Wrap-Up

In summing up the meeting, Mr. Dilks noted that the committee members can provide any additional feedback in writing by November 23rd, that the public forum is tentatively scheduled for December 11, and that the next SAC meeting will take place in early March 2008.

Appendix A: Attendance List

Name	Organization
Committee Members	
Clay McFayden	Cycling Advocate
Patrick Harrington	Loblaw Properties Ltd.
Jill Hicks	Cruise Toronto
David Dunphy	Resident-at-large
Julie Beddoes	West Don Lands Committee
Sylvia Pellman	St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Dennis Findlay	Port Lands Action Committee/Waterfront Action
Tom Davidson	Councillor Pam McConnell's Office
Dave Fisher	Rocket Riders
Vicki Barron	Waterfront Regeneration Trust
Braz Menezes	York Quay Neighbourhood Association and QQHBIA
Pam Mazza	Toronto Island
Stephanie Tencer	Feet on the Street
Karen Honsinger	QQHBIA
Malcolm King	Central Waterfront Neighbourhood Association
Ange Kinnear	Councillor Adam Vaughan's Office
Waterfront Toronto and City of Toronto Staff	
Pina Mallozzi	Waterfront Toronto
Chris Glaisek	Waterfront Toronto
John Kelly	City of Toronto
Bill Lashbrook	City of Toronto – City Planning Division
Andrea Kelemen	Waterfront Toronto
Jim Sinikas	Toronto Transit Commission
Jayne Naiman	City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat
Consultants	
David Pratt	ARUP
Colin Wong	ARUP
Roger DuToit	DTAH
John Hillier	DTAH
Ayako Kitta	DTAH
Steve Willis	MMM
Marc Ryan	West 8
Facilitators	
David Dilks	Lura Consulting
Jean-Louis Gaudet	Lura Consulting