



**Future of the Gardiner East  
Stakeholder Advisory Committee  
Meeting 15-6**

**Monday, April 13, 2015 | 6:30 – 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 sixth 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 reviewed the meeting agenda and noted that the purpose of the meeting was to present the results of additional work requested by the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee (PWIC), the updated evaluation as well as next steps for the study.

Mr. John Livey, Deputy City Manager, also welcomed the committee members to the meeting and thanked them for their ongoing contributions to the project. In his remarks, Mr. Livey reminded SAC members that the project team was directed by the PWIC to complete additional work as well as study a hybrid option. He emphasized the importance of the SAC in helping the project team better understand community issues and stakeholder perspectives.

A copy of the meeting agenda is attached as Appendix A, while a list of attending SAC members can be found in Appendix B.

**2. SAC Member Briefing**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto and Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting presented a summary of the EA work completed to date, including the additional work directed by PWIC and updated evaluation of alternatives, covering the following topics and material:

- Gardiner East in Context
- Public Works and Infrastructure Committee (PWIC) Direction
- New Work Completed
- Alternatives Evaluation
- Next Steps

### 3. Facilitated Discussion

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

#### Presentation

- Include more images/renderings of the alternatives (particularly the hybrid) earlier in the presentation to better illustrate the proposed changes.
- Better illustrate the fact that travel time increases under all options including maintain.
- Explain the assumptions used in traffic modelling (e.g., travel times, mode shift, traffic volume).
- Provide more information about the viability and lifecycle costs of the hybrid alternative.

#### Environmental Assessment Process

- Clarify how the evaluation results are being weighted.
- Provide sufficient information and data to the PWIC and Council to support evidence-based decision-making.

#### Costs and Funding

- Consider reinvesting the money saved through the remove alternative in transit infrastructure.
- Develop a financing strategy for each alternative.

#### Remove Alternative

- A majority of SAC members at the meeting expressed support for the remove alternative, citing the following reasons:
  - Contributes to city building;
  - Reconnects the City to the waterfront;
  - Balances current and future needs;
  - Enhances safety by removing aging infrastructure;
  - Supports the development of new communities; and
  - Presents a cost-effective solution.

#### Hybrid Alternative

- A few SAC members expressed support for the hybrid alternative, citing the following reasons:
  - Maintains local and regional transportation routes; and
  - Encourages creativity in city building.

### 4. Next Steps

Next SAC meeting: To Be Determined.



## Future of the Gardiner Expressway/Lake Shore Boulevard East Reconfiguration EA and Integrated Urban Design Study

### Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #6

Monday, April 13, 2015

6:30 pm – 8:30 pm

Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 308/309

### AGENDA

#### ***Meeting Purpose***

Present and discuss:

- Optimizing the Remove (boulevard) alternative
- Evaluation of the Hybrid option

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

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

#### **6:40 pm      SAC Member Briefing: Project Update and Evaluation Results**

- Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
- Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting

#### **7:20 pm      Discussion**

*Public Works and Infrastructure Committee and Toronto City Council will soon consider what to do with the Gardiner East. Thinking about the results of the additional work and updated evaluation...*

- What are the most important considerations in making this decision?
- What other advice do you have on making a decision that involves finding a balance among diverse priorities?

#### **8:25 pm      Summary/Closing**

#### **8:30 pm      Adjourn**

## Appendix B – List of Attendees

### SAC Meeting #6 List of Attendees

Beach Triangle Residents' Association  
Canadian Automobile Association – South Central Ontario  
CodeBlueTO  
Corktown Residents and Business Association  
Don Watershed Regeneration Council  
Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association  
Purolator Courier Ltd.  
Toronto Centre for Transportation  
Toronto Financial District BIA  
Toronto Industry Network / Redpath Sugar  
Toronto Society of Architects  
Toronto Urban Renewal Network  
Transport Action Ontario  
Unionville Ratepayers Association  
Urban Land Institute  
Walk Toronto  
West Don Lands Committee

### List of SAC Members Unable to Attend

Canadian Courier and Logistics Association  
Canadian Urban Institute  
Civic Action  
Cycling Toronto  
Evergreen  
Federation of North Toronto Residents Association and People Plan Toronto  
Film Ontario  
Food and Consumer Products of Canada  
Greyhound  
Heritage Toronto  
Lake Shore Planning Council  
Leslieville BIA  
Ontario Professional Planners Institute - Urban Design Working Group  
Ontario Public Transit Association  
Ontario Trucking Association  
Professional Engineers Ontario - Working Group, East Toronto Chapter  
Retail Council of Canada  
Roger's Centre  
South Riverdale Community Health Centre  
St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association  
Toronto Association of BIAs  
Toronto Board of Trade  
Toronto Community Foundation  
Toronto Environmental Alliance

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

A summary of the discussion is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

**Q. I don't quite understand the hybrid option. Could you explain it again?**

**A.** The hybrid option largely maintains the existing Gardiner Expressway as it is today with the same configuration and number of lanes. The major change is the removal of the Logan Avenue on/off ramps, which would be replaced with a new six-lane at-grade boulevard and the creation of new on/off ramps and a new access road east of Cherry Street in the Keating Channel Precinct.

**C.** It would be helpful to include more visuals at this point in the presentation to better illustrate the proposed changes (e.g., ramp connections) and differences between the alternatives.

**Q. Is there a traffic light at the connection near the mouth of the Don River?**

**A.** This is where the Don Roadway would connect to Lake Shore Boulevard at a signalized intersection. It is an existing signal. Some changes would be made to the intersection to improve its existing function (e.g., adding a left turn lane).

**Q. In the remove alternative can you explain how people will be able to continue westbound on Lake Shore Boulevard?**

**A.** In the remove alternative, you would continue driving westbound on Lake Shore Boulevard by driving around the on/off ramps to the Gardiner Expressway. If your destination is the Gardiner Expressway, you would access it via the ramps approaching Jarvis Street.

**Q. [Referring to Auto Travel Times] Why is there an increase in travel time from E to D (Kipling/Lake Shore to Union Station) in the remove alternative?**

**A.** With this alternative there will be greater attraction to travel across the south end of the City to new developments in the east end (e.g., Port Lands). Some cars may choose to exit earlier, even though their destination is further east.

**C.** The travel time for that scenario is worse in the remove alternative than it is the hybrid alternative.

**A.** We may find under the hybrid alternative, even if the Gardiner remains, that some people will exit the new Cherry Street ramp to the Port Lands. Some people may also choose to exit earlier and use Lake Shore Boulevard as an alternate to the Gardiner Expressway.

**Q. [Referring to Auto Travel Times] It may be helpful to split out where the increase in travel time is coming from in C to D (Victoria Park/Kingston to Union Station). For example two minutes from the removal of the Logan Avenue on/off ramps and three minutes from traveling from the Don River to Jarvis Street.**

**A.** Several factors are being reflected in the model. The removal of the lower ramps is the biggest change with the hybrid alternative; however there are also other changes that contribute to the increase in travel time.

**A.** The increase in travel time is not just from the removal of the Logan Avenue ramps, it's now the fact that you are traveling on an arterial in the remove alternative. The increase in travel time is not isolated to only that section.

**C.** When I look at the chart I see increases in travel time in each of the origin destination pairs under the remove alternative. C to D in particular includes the removal of the Logan Avenue ramps which explains the additional two minutes under the remove alternative.

**A.** The difference between the two alternatives from C to D is the difference in travel time from the Don River to Jarvis Street. The hybrid alternative maintains the option of using the Cherry Street ramps to access the Gardiner Expressway to get to Jarvis Street, while under the remove alternative, vehicles coming from Victoria Park Avenue need to pass through an at-grade boulevard.

**Q. It would be helpful to clarify your assumptions about traffic levels. Are you making assumptions about the proportion of people using different modes of transportation or alternate routes? My feeling is that there has been a cultural change and regardless of which alternative is selected less people will choose to drive downtown.**

**A.** The graph presented earlier illustrates that the increase in downtown commuters has been absorbed primarily by transit. The volume of commuters on the Gardiner Expressway has flat lined; it has been the same for the last 20 years. The expectation is this will not change. There will not be a decrease in the demand for automobile use in Toronto; the limiting factor is available road capacity. For the most part, 95 percent of new commuter demand is going to be accommodated through transit.

**Q. [Referring to Auto Travel Times] Have you done any analysis to determine what travel times would be from each of the origin points to the First Gulf site comparing the hybrid and remove options?**

**A.** The City does not have a formal development application from First Gulf. There is still some uncertainty about the demand to travel to and from the site. The volumes we have assumed are for 25,000 jobs at the First Gulf site.

**Q.** Why then is the hybrid alternative even being considered?

**A.** There is a general understanding about what is being proposed at that site. First Gulf does recognize that the majority of workers would use transit to access the site; automobiles would not be the dominant means of transportation.

**Q. Is the increase in travel time due to decreased levels of service or congestion?**

**A.** Level of service is a description of the resulting outcome of the volume moving through a roadway. The Remove option reflects the removal of some amount of road capacity and the conversion of elevated freeway lanes to an at-grade boulevard. It's a combination of the change in the concept that is slowing traffic down.

**C.** There must be a way to present this information to help people understand that travel times will increase regardless of the alternative.

**A.** Even if we did nothing travel times in the City will increase as a result of growth.

**Q. What is the modal shift projection with respect to cyclists?**

**A.** We have assumed a higher mode split for pedestrians and cyclists. They currently account for 5,900 out of 157,000 commuters during peak hour.

**C.** Perhaps you could provide those at the public meeting.

**Q. Why is there no change in the percentage uptake by cars in those accessing downtown in the base case from 2012 to 2031?**

**A.** The reason is that the roads are at capacity. There may be an increase on other routes, but the Gardiner Expressway is at capacity. It is important to note that these travel times are an average of all the various routes that commuters use between the origin and destination of their trip.

**C. The lenses that I would like to see applied to this decision are city building, cost and sustainability. We also need some perspective on what we're talking about. This is not a transportation study. Given the fact that we're talking about half a billion to maintain the status quo (i.e., the hybrid alternative),**

**from my perspective nothing presented suggests that the hybrid can be a better city builder than the remove alternative.**

**C. I fully concur with the previous conclusions. From what I understand, the hybrid scheme loops around taking a wider turn to reach down from the Don Valley Parkway (DVP). After that does it touch down on Cherry Street to become a boulevard or is it elevated the entire way?**

**A.** It's elevated the entire way. The original vision for the hybrid alternative was to remove the existing connection from the Gardiner Expressway to the DVP and put it tight against the rail line, however that was not feasible. The alignment we need to follow is essentially the existing alignment of the Gardiner Expressway; it was designed that way for a reason. For the most part, the hybrid alternative maintains the existing DVP/Gardiner infrastructure.

**C.** The Toronto Society of Architects does value the potential of the remove alternative to support city building in that area (e.g., reconnecting the city to the waterfront).

**Q. I also concur with the previous comments. I have some concerns about the presentation and the evaluation of alternatives. The hybrid option interferes with the city building and urban design aspirations of the Keating Channel, West Don Lands and East Bayfront areas. Adding more infrastructure via the Cherry Street ramps is inconsistent with the Michael Van Valkenburg plan to activate the Keating Channel and connect it to the communities being developed around it. There has not been an appropriate articulation of the negative impacts of the hybrid alternative on the urban design work that has been done in the area. None of the benefits of the remove alternative (i.e., removing the infrastructure barrier to the waterfront) are apparent in the hybrid alternative. The presentation doesn't answer those negative impacts.**

**A.** The removal of the eastbound Lake Shore Boulevard lanes would create an opportunity for a public promenade on north side of the Keating Channel. I do appreciate your comments about the impact of new ramps that would create a barrier. There will be an opportunity for a new pedestrian crossing at Munition Street.

**C.** But there would not be an opportunity for cafes along the promenade if the elevated Gardiner Expressway remains. Also, in terms of the longer travel times presented, we're talking about three to five minutes. That should be quantified as a minimal extension of travel time.

**C. I also agree with previous comments. We may be underestimating the way the future is going to be different than the present. The Gardiner Expressway was built to service an industrial area. Sixty years later it has lived out its lifespan. What are the estimates of the lifespan of the hybrid alternative? I can't imagine that the travel patterns and options of the future will be the same as the ones we are planning for. Why saddle our grandchildren with the debt to pay for infrastructure they likely will not use? Spend more time presenting the viability of the hybrid option. A more sensitive evaluation of the different modes of transportation is also needed. Also, public feedback provided at the deputations to PWIC expressed concerns about the quality of development in the East Bayfront. The potential ramps north of the Keating Channel would extend the blight.**

**C. My concern with the hybrid alternative is that it maintains the existing structure that is falling apart. How much can be done to really extend the life of the elevated expressway. I really don't like the idea of the extra ramps; they would become even more of a barrier between the City and the Port Lands. My preference is the remove alternative for safety and aesthetics purposes.**

**C. It's important to consider the regional context of the Gardiner Expressway. It forms a ring road linking up the 400 series highway, which is an asset in the City. I'm having trouble imagining cafes in**

**the remove alternative along a boulevard with four lanes in each direction, especially when you consider Lake Shore Boulevard east of the Don River. It's not welcoming; you don't see too many pedestrians and cyclists. In general, the remove alternative would have a negative impact on the region from a transportation standpoint.**

**Q. We haven't seen a lot of the Jarvis Street connection in the remove alternative. Is it similar to the connection presented in the hybrid alternative?**

**A.** It's a little different because of the conditions on lower Yonge Street. There is a possibility of using Harbour Street. The actual configuration (e.g., corridors, ramps, signals, etc.) would be explored in the design phase of the preferred alternative.

**C.** In a perfect world we would have made different investments in transit that would have enabled more choices from a transportation perspective. It is important not to impact access between the downtown core and the region. There has been some interesting work and award winning work completed in the context of the Gardiner Expressway (e.g., Underpass Park and Fort York Visitors Centre). We need to push ourselves when looking at the hybrid option to think more creatively.

**C. My concern is about the environmental assessment (EA) process and how the results are weighted. The previous phase of the EA presented the results of the evaluation. At the moment it looks as if there is no recommendation of a preferred alternative.**

**A.** The information that will be presented to the public will be in a similar format to what we presented previously. The intent is to present the results of the additional work directed by the PWIC and obtain feedback to inform the recommended alternative. Weighting is an important factor, but it is not a technical exercise.

**C.** My point is that someone is going to do the weighting. I don't want to leave it to Council.

**C. It is important to present strong evidence to support whichever recommendation you make. The biggest objection to the remove alternative will likely come from the transportation sector even though the travel times have improved. I am supportive of the remove alternative. If that is also what you plan to recommend make sure you have the evidence to support it.**

**C. First Gulf lobbied Council with its own proposal which is why the hybrid alternative is being considered. This process has become a waste of time for taxpayers and the City. It is important to consider the results of a study completed by Hemson Consulting which indicates that it is unlikely that this area will evolve into the mixed-use commercial development First Gulf is proposing. It would be unfortunate to maintain the Gardiner Expressway because one developer is proposing to build office towers but may end up building big box stores.**

**Q. You mentioned only a minority of the commuters that use the Gardiner Expressway use it as a through route. The way that information is presented is confusing and should be clarified.**

**A.** What you said is accurate. How important is it to maintain that connection for 20 percent of traffic – that's a big question. I can't answer it alone. It's something we'd like feedback on. There would be a reduction of the 20 percent under the remove alternative as people would opt for other routes. The importance of that link and the number of users needs to be considered.

**Q.** The staff report to the PWIC did include a recommendation for the remove alternative. What I've seen tonight seems to reinforce that recommendation. Has anything about your recommendation changed?

**A.** We will be including the same level of analysis in the report to ensure Council receives good information. We are still looking for feedback to help us with us with the recommendation.

**A.** In a sense we have to look at two time periods in terms of impact – construction and long-term. We need to balance the short-term construction impacts with long-term benefits. All of the alternatives include a period of construction (i.e., delays, lane closures, detours, etc.) which need to be carefully considered.

**C.** Drop the 2012 base case numbers in the chart about travel times (i.e., find a better way to show that travel time increases under all cases including maintain).

**C** I am not impressed with the hybrid alternative which is really the maintain alternative plus the removal of the Logan Avenue on/off ramps. It does not contribute to city building. There is also the fact that it needs to be paid for; the money could be better spent elsewhere. There is a need for a financing strategy.

**C.** I prefer the hybrid alternative because there is less impact on traffic. If the expressway is already at capacity, removing it will displace current traffic onto side streets. The remove option will also slow down traffic on the DVP and lead to more infiltration on side streets.

**C.** Two criteria that need to be considered more are cost and city building. There isn't really a ring road – you can only approach the City from three sides. The origin destination study results indicate the connection is immaterial. People will travel downtown whether the expressway is there or not. Also, consider the money saved through the remove alternative or gained through development should be reinvested in transit.

**C.** I agree with previous points that were made. There is no doubt that the impact on commercial activity is a point of concern. Car traffic is also a problem. By 2031 there is going to have to be something else to reduce the amount of cars that travel downtown (e.g. congestion tax). The legacy we would be losing by going with the hybrid option is incredible.

## Appendix D – Additional Comments from SAC Members

### **West Don Lands Committee:**

As I think you could tell, I was very disappointed in the technical presentation at tonight's SAC meeting. I do not think that in its present form it is suitable for a public meeting that aims at high quality information. In the past, the EA has provided high quality, detailed reporting of the study results and a thoughtful and credible assessment of the alternatives. Tonight's presentation strayed far from that standard.

The explanation of the hybrid option was confusing and incomplete, crucial information such as the approximate location and design of the proposed ramps at Cherry Street and associated service roads was missing, the information comparing the Hybrid option and the Remove option seemed to be very unbalanced, to the detriment of the Remove option. The factors that had led city staff to support to the Remove option as the preferred alternative in the past were not in evidence and not applied in any rigorous way to the Hybrid option. The negative urban design impacts on the Central Waterfront of the Hybrid option were ignored, even though an impetus for the EA in the first place was to look at options for ameliorating effects of the Gardiner between Jarvis and the Don River. (What has happened to that priority?) The significant improvement in the transportation effects of the Remove option were treated as insignificant, as compared to the neutral effect of the Hybrid design. In the end, the impression is left that the EA and the City have abandoned the rigorous work that led to the Remove option being put forward as the preferred option in favour of what is essentially the Do Nothing option, with a tweak that addressed the concerns of First Gulf, but worsens the urban design conditions along the Keating Channel. How can this be explained in light of the evaluation criteria that had been established for the EA up to this point????

I hope I am wrong about the direction that this is going. I hope that what we see on Wednesday night will have a higher level of quality and integrity. I am happy to discuss this in more detail, if that is helpful.

---

### **Code Blue TO:**

There was a lot of information packed into the stakeholders meeting on the Gardiner East EA on April 13. As a result there was not enough time for detailed examination of the presentation and its implications.

The presentation:

1. The focus of the presentation is traffic capacity, which largely understates the other significant aims of the EA. Council direction regarding further study of goods movement and economic effects does not change the underlying goals and should not be given more prominence in the presentation. Many people at public meetings will be seeing this information for the first time and need to know more than travel times. The EA is not only comparing the Hybrid and Remove options. All of the options should be listed using the original evaluation

chart. This will help put the Hybrid option in context, a context that would show that it is very similar to the Maintain Option. Comparing the Hybrid to Remove options only in regards to traffic and economic impact is not the goal of the EA.

2. In regards to capacity numbers, what people really want to know is if the change were to happen right now what would the effect on travel times be? 2031 is 16 years off and a very abstract concept for most. There is also no mention of the potential of capacity limiting measures such as limiting truck access during peak hours or congestion road pricing. Some perspective on the significance of peak hour commuters travelling along this route would be useful - an LRT or perhaps SmartTrack implementation would easily carry more passengers than the existing roadways.

3. Most of the material shows the alternatives in a birds eye or map view. This understates the effect that the elevated highway has at ground level. Vague indications about additional ramping in the Hybrid option doesn't begin to describe how that will interact with the waterfront and surrounding potential development.

4. While Net Present Value (NPV) has a place in analysis, it should be listed in the appendix, not the presentation. Actual dollars are what the public and politicians will have to deal with over the coming decades.

Analysis of the options:

The Hybrid option can be summarized as "half the benefits for twice the cost". It may help the First Gulf site but that comes at the expense of the Keating Channel and the waterfront from Jarvis to the Don River.

It is our position that the recommended option should be the best choice for cost, sustainability, and city-building.

We urge your team to re-recommend the Remove/Boulevard option. It carries a significantly lower price tag, will require a lower level of ongoing maintenance, opens up the waterfront to the city, connects the East Bayfront through the Keating Channel, Port Lands, and First Gulf site while adding to the tax base and generating revenues to pay for the project.

The choice comes down to all of these very real benefits for the city versus a few minutes of travel time during rush hour for a very small group of commuters.