



**Future of the Gardiner East
Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)
Meeting 13-3**

**Tuesday October 29, 2013 | 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm
Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 308-309**

Meeting Summary

1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction

Ms. Liz Nield, CEO of Lura Consulting, began the third Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting by welcoming committee members and thanking them for attending the session. She introduced the facilitation team from Lura Consulting and led a round of introductions. Ms. Nield also reviewed the meeting agenda and informed committee members that the purpose of the meeting is to obtain feedback on the draft evaluation criteria that will be used to assess the alternative solutions.

Mr. John Livey, Deputy City Manager, City of Toronto and Mr. John Campbell, President and CEO of Waterfront Toronto, also welcomed the committee members to the meeting. In their opening remarks, Mr. Livey and Mr. Campbell iterated the purpose of the SAC meeting to review the relative importance of the draft evaluation criteria as part of a broader city building exercise. Mr. Campbell noted that while the projected increase in travel times raised several concerns at previous SAC meetings, they are expected to increase regardless of the alternative solution recommended to Council as a result of population growth. He emphasized the point is to provide complementary transportation options to get in and out of the city and stated that the Gardiner East EA will help identify and implement those options. Mr. Livey and Mr. Campbell highlighted the importance of the evaluation criteria as part of a transparent decision-making process and thanked committee members for sharing their time and expertise.

A copy of the agenda is available in Appendix A, while a list of attending SAC members can be viewed in Appendix B.

2. SAC Member Briefing

Mr. Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting, reviewed the draft slide presentation which included:

- A summary of participant feedback from the public forum on October 16, 2013 and,
- A review of the draft evaluation criteria corresponding to each study lens group.

The draft evaluation criteria are available online at www.gardinereast.ca.

3. Facilitated Discussion – Evaluation Criteria

SAC members provided the following feedback and advice, organized by study lens/criteria group, during the review of the draft evaluation criteria.

STUDY LENS: TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE

Pedestrians

- Test the options based on how they teach motorists that they are entering a network of residential streets.
- Include criteria for pedestrian comfort and convenience in an east/west direction.
- Include a criterion to address the safety and urban design challenges created by concrete pillars.
- The average time to cross streets should consider families with young children as well as people who use mobility devices.
- The criteria are car centric for what has been emphasized as an urban planning exercise. Many other trips, particularly north-south crossings need more consideration.
- Consider the potential of these models to expand the PATH system.

Automobiles

- Once you start talking about cars, nothing is fast enough. Develop a range of travel times for each alternative and aim to have options under each solution that fall within that range.
- People are choosing to live near the Gardiner in order to access the elevated highway. There should be a measure for the group that leaves the City every day. The impact of the alternative solution on travel times for each measure should also be modeled.
- Include a measure for average travel time from Yonge Street to the DVP.
- Consider measures for regional and local travel within the corridor.

Transit

- Rank each measure in this category.

Active Transportation

- Add a criterion for conflicts between cyclists and other modes of travel, similar to the one for pedestrians.
- Walking is a form of active transportation, unless there is something different, combine the criteria.
- Keep the criteria/measure for pedestrians and cyclists separate because they do have some distinct concerns.

Safety

- Free turns are a safety concern for cyclists and pedestrians and should be captured in the criteria.
- It's possible to take safety beyond the level of traffic and consider it from a community "eyes on the street" perspective.
- Your metrics are the opposite of what you are trying to achieve. When mixing modes of transportation, safety is enhanced when traffic is moving at a slower speed. Vehicle speed is what you should be measuring. Change those metrics if you want to make it safe.
- Not all safety concerns between cyclists and vehicles happen during turns. There are also concerns when they move parallel to each other.

Future of the Gardiner Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
Oct 29, 2013 – Summary Report

- There will be a school and a community centre within East Bayfront neighbourhood and more to consider in terms of community safety.
- The criteria/measures are missing the removal of unsafe barriers (e.g., columns, lighting, etc.).

STUDY LENS: URBAN DESIGN

Urban Design & Planning

- It is also important to consider accessibility; think about people using mobility devices.
- Substitute the word landscaping for a park. No one is going to take their sandwich and book to landscaping. Use the word “attractiveness” in more places.

Street Vibrancy & Public Amenities

- Useful park space is more important than usable park space (e.g., Sherbourne Park). There needs to be a measure of quality about the park space.
- The criteria should consider how sidewalks will be animated and how development will contribute to vibrant street life.

STUDY LENS: ENVIRONMENT

Social, Health, Recreation and Business

- Consider GHG emissions from traffic as a measure.

Natural Environment

- One criteria could be to use less road salt.

STUDY LENS: ECONOMICS

Cost/Benefit

- Consider a criterion for new development projects as a way to recover costs.

4. Upcoming SAC Meeting Dates

Ms. Nield thanked SAC members and the project team for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Next SAC meeting: November 28th, 2013.

(N.B. The meeting has been postponed until January 2014).



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

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting – 13-#3

Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 308-309
Tuesday, October 29, 2013 - 6:30 – 8:30 pm

AGENDA

Meeting Purpose:

1. Review feedback received at PIC
2. Receive input on evaluation process & criteria

6:30 pm	Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lura Facilitator• John Livey, City of Toronto• John Campbell, Waterfront Toronto
6:40 pm	Update on PIC Input/Finalization of Alternative Concepts Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting
6:50 pm	Questions and Feedback
7:00 pm	Evaluation Presentation – Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting <ul style="list-style-type: none">• EA Act Expectations for Alternatives Evaluation• Evaluation Process Overview• Evaluation Criteria Review
7:30 pm	Criteria Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evaluation Criteria Review• Study Lens & Criteria Group Relative Importance
8:30 pm	Summary/Closing

Appendix B – List of Attendees

SAC Meeting #3 List of Attendees

Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association (GWNA)
Don Watershed Regeneration Council
Toronto Industry Network
Transport Action Ontario
Federation of North Toronto Residents and People Plan Toronto
Heritage Toronto
Canadian Automobile Association (CAA)
Cycling Toronto
Canadian Urban Institute
CodeBlueTO
St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Evergreen
Ontario Professional Planners Institute – Urban Design Working Group
Toronto Financial District BIA
Walk Toronto
West Don Lands Committee
Waterfront Toronto
City of Toronto
Dillon Consulting
Lura Consulting

List of SAC members unable to attend

Professional Engineers Ontario
Greyhound
Redpath and Toronto Industry Network
Toronto Urban Renewal Network (TURN)
Unionville Ratepayers Association
Urban Land Institute (ULI)
Toronto Centre for Active Transportation
Food and Consumer Products of Canada
Retail Council of Canada
Toronto Association of BIAs
Toronto Board of Trade
Lake Shore Planning Council
South Riverdale Community Health Centre
Toronto Community Foundation
Toronto Society of Architects
Purolator Inc.
Beach Triangle Residents' Association
Rogers Centre/Blue Jays
Civic Action
Ontario Public Transit Association
Leslieville BIA
Film Ontario

Appendix C – SAC Questions of Clarification, Feedback and Advice

SAC Questions of Clarification

A summary of the discussion following the presentation is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**.

Q. At the last SAC meeting, I suggested considering two four lane roads, separated by development parcels and pathways for active transportation as part of the replace option. Has any thought been given to this suggestion?

A. For all the alternatives, we've presented one possible conceptualization. We will be looking at a few different configurations for whichever solution is carried forward to the next step.

C. The alternative solutions all have downstream implications. You need to be able to conceptualize what happens at Yonge and Front Streets, for example, given the proposed reconfigurations.

Q. There has been no mention of land use and land values. Has this been discussed at all?

A. We're deferring that to the evaluation criteria.

C. Take the feedback received from the public forum with a grain of salt. If asked the same question about the waterfront, people will say they don't want condos. Give people a sign that the barrier can be improved and do something novel for the city.

Q. While conceptualizing the alternatives, I'm having a problem understanding the long-term costs. It would be helpful to know the life cycle of the structure.

A. The modelling is based on costs over 100 years.

C. That information should be more clearly expressed on slides and materials.

Q. In the feedback collected from the public forum, people emphasized the need for public transit within each alternative solution. Is it possible to broaden this study to include a discussion about public transit? There is a lot happening in terms of a Downtown Relief Line and projects under the Big Move. I think to get a grip on this we need a better understanding of major transit projects.

A. Transit is top of mind in this project. It is integrated in the modeling for different scenarios and as we coordinate with other projects happening in the city. The base assumption in the models does include approved projects by Metrolinx and GO.

Q. Is the corridor the same as a right of way? Does it include the rail lines?

A. The corridor means right of way.

Q. There are a lot of pairs under the measure for travel time within the automobile criteria group. Are they going to help us decide between the alternative solutions, or are they so different that we'll get a mixed response?

A. It's not a random selection of origin/destination pairs. It's based on a rationale of where trips are originating. We're looking at longer trips, from the east and west ends of the city. If we look at who is using the corridor, it's a necklace effect.

Q. With four different alternatives, we're going to get a cluster of results. It seems overly complicated. Is there a need for seven pairs?

A. We're trying to answer the public's question about how reconfiguring the Gardiner will impact various travel scenarios.

Q. Why are you only measuring the AM peak, and not the PM peak in trips? It's not an absolute reverse.

A. It's a good point and we do have some modeling results, but in terms of origin/destination data we are limited to an extent to the AM peak hours.

Q. How does the model react to parking supply? Can it be modeled?

A. No, it cannot.

Q. How will future transportation demand be managed outside the study area? This is the point which the general public will be most upset about. I think the criteria, and assumptions you make need to be carefully explained. People in their twenties have very different ideas than we do. Many of them don't even drive.

A. That's a good point. There are existing and predicted behaviours in terms of the modal split. The forecasts include assumptions to address those issues.

Q. You referred to the pattern of traffic as a "necklace". What percentage is that?

A. It's about 20 percent.

C. People will want to know about capacity in terms of travel time and the number of lanes, and how the capacity of surrounding streets are affected by changes to the Gardiner.

Q. Is there a way to factor construction times in these criteria/measures?

A. Yes we do have criteria for construction times.

Q. What do the Richmond/Adelaide off-ramps look like in this model?

A. The ramps are the same as they are today, except with cycle tracks on the roads. Improving the ramps would require more queuing space through the area which would impact congestion.

C. Under active transportation you need to add a criterion about conflicts between cyclists and other modes of travel like the one under pedestrians.

A. We do have a category for safety; it could be added there.

C. I think they are both different.

A. Is the concern about safety using a multi-use pathway?

C. An example of conflict is where cyclists are going in two different directions which is an unusual situation for motorists, who also have a right of way. There is a potential for conflict between vehicular and cyclist movement on multi-use trails.

A. If all alternatives include a multi-use trail then it's an inherent problem.

C. Again where did that come from? Did you consult with the pedestrian and cyclist groups?

C. Walking is a form of active transportation. Is there something different, if not, combine them.

A. We could collapse them into same category.

Q. Is the study looking at just the corridor to absorb the impact on the movement of goods and services?

A. No, that's part of a larger study area.

Q. Perhaps a shading study should be done to determine how much light will land at street level.

A. A shading study was completed during the development of the concepts.

Q. Is it outside the scope of the study to consider GHG emissions from traffic?

A. We are considering GHG as part of the air quality assessment.

Q. Has any thought been given to generating energy in any of the alternatives?

A. It's challenging to consider generating energy at this level, maybe during the next stage.

C. It could be more of an architectural issue.

Q. What about adding a criterion for new land parcels. The new projects from Build Toronto have increased land value significantly. It could be a way to recover development costs or recapture investment.

A. It would depend, and vary on a block by block situation.

Q. Are there any criteria to look at the impact on crossing the Don River?

A. It would have to be consistent with the Lower Don EA. Only one alternative would require reconstruction of that crossing.

Appendix D: Additional Feedback from SAC Members

From St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association:

Thank you for a very productive meeting last night.

I wanted to comment on an exchange that occurred at the beginning of the night while we were reviewing comments from the Public Consultation. One of the points presented/brought forward referred to I believe keeping the area green and pedestrian friendly. One of last night's attendees spoke to this and felt that this should be disregarded. I wish I would have commented on this last night but I don't think any input from a 300 strong consultation should be wiped out by a smaller group or a single individual. One may disagree with the comment which is fair to state. To suggest that the comment be wiped clear entirely (which is what I heard and I'm happy to be told I got it wrong), I think is inappropriate given we are trying to encourage and value public input.

As I say I may have got it wrong as I was just settling in but I just wanted to revisit that point.

Thanks again for the project and evening.

Thank you for circulating the Draft Evaluation Criteria. I think they look really good overall. After reviewing them, I would like to propose an addition which I think fits best under Transportation & Infrastructure.

At the last meeting I commented that I felt the criteria should reflect "upstream" impacts as well as those along the Expressway itself. The Expressway won't sit in isolation and does need to relate positively to future (Waterfront) and existing (St Lawrence and other) neighbourhoods.

So while we need to evaluate the options on an east/west spectrum, we should also look at the north/south impacts and in this case especially the north ones in the existing St. Lawrence Neighbourhood which is currently and will continue to be impacted by what happens on the Gardiner/Lakeshore. The situation is that we already have terrible gridlock especially along Jarvis St southbound at the afternoon rush hour every day. How each of the four options improves or worsens this situation will have impacts on the core Gardiner East EA Study Goal of 'Reconnecting the City with the Lake' and also The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan goal # 3 of 'Promoting a Clean and Green Environment'. Gridlock and Congestion also impact on economic health.

I would propose that we add the following under Transportation and Infrastructure:

Study lens: Automobiles

Criteria: Travel Time (PM Peak Impact on Feeder Streets)

Measures:

- Ave travel time southbound Jarvis St (Queen St to Lakeshore)
- Ave travel time southbound Sherbourne St (Queen St to Lakeshore)

Related Goals:

- Reconnect the City with the Lake
- Promoting a Clean and Green Environment
- Creating Value

I think this or something similar would capture this important idea.

From CodeBlueTO:

We talked a lot about the method for selecting the "preferred" alternative at the meeting on Tuesday. In particular a lot of time was spent on the transportation related criteria. Thank you for keeping the meeting on track and reasonably on time.

There are a couple of overarching concerns I want to raise on behalf of CodeBlueTO:

- While it is important to obtain a defensible level of traffic efficiency, the main goal of this exercise is urban planning and city building driven. In our examination of all of the myriad details we need to keep an overall perspective that ensures that whatever is chosen actually can move us towards our goals. In the end, the only question that matters is: "Will this help revitalize the waterfront and reconnect it to the rest of the city." Balancing modes of travel, sustainability, and the creation of value are either supporting statements or the outcomes of the alternative that fulfills the central question.
- It is the position of our group that the status quo is not acceptable. However, it is clear that if the replace or remove alternative is selected, it will be under great political pressure when it comes before city council in an election year. Given the low level of design sophistication that would be presented at that time it is entirely possible that the recommendation would not be accepted or delayed, essentially choosing the repair option by default. It may be worth considering going to council with a more flexible question that would allow further refinement of the preferred option before making a final commitment. Perhaps we can discuss strategies for building political support more fully at a future SAC meeting.