



Project: Under Gardiner

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Tuesday, March 22, 2016

7:00– 9:00 pm

Location: Harbourfront Community Centre – 627 Queens Quay West, Toronto ON, M5V 3G3

SUMMARY REPORT

On March 22, 2016, approximately 29 members of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee participated in the second stakeholder advisory meeting for Project: Under Gardiner. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update on the Environmental Assessment process and the design, to gather feedback, and facilitate a brainstorming session for programming the space.

MINUTES

Waterfront Toronto's Director of Planning & Design, Pina Mallozzi, opened the meeting with a welcome and brief introductory remarks.

Chris McKinnon, public engagement lead for the project, acted as chair and called the meeting to order at 7:10pm.

1. Consent Agenda

The committee unanimously supported the agenda as it was circulated.

2. SAC #1 Meeting Minutes

The committee agreed that a free online tool to discuss the project was not deemed necessary at this time and the committee will continue to use email as the primary means to communicate. The minutes from January 11, 2016 were unanimously approved.

3. Environmental Assessment Update

Don McKinnon from Dillon Consulting gave an overview presentation on the environmental assessment for Project: Under Gardiner. He clarified that the Municipal Class EA focuses primarily on the Fort York Boulevard crossing and confirmed that the

notice of commencement was published in the Toronto Star and sent out electronically on February 24, 2016.

The presentation outlined the problem/opportunity statement, followed by four groups of planning alternatives and the evaluation criteria. The four groups of planning alternatives were Do Nothing, At-Grade Crossing, Bridge and Tunnel. The draft evaluation based on those criteria showed that a bridge alternative would be preferred.

4. Design Update

Ken Greenberg from Greenberg Consultants Inc. made introductory remarks on the design presentation. He provided context for the project, outlined the many connections that the project will make in downtown Toronto, as well as the project schedule and the master plan.

Marc Ryan from PUBLIC WORK then provided an overview of the updated design and design elements for Project: Under Gardiner.

5. Operations & Maintenance

Jamie Springer from HR&A provided an overview of the operations and maintenance study that is currently underway. HR&A is tasked with identifying the costs for operating and maintaining the site, developing a funding strategy to meet the operating needs, and recommending a governance structure.

6. Questions from Committee Members

Are you taking into consideration that cyclists may have a preference for an at-grade crossing at Fort York Blvd over a bridge/tunnel? Whenever a cyclist has to dismount their bike to cross it becomes a barrier.

The project team noted this feedback and suggested that the EA's evaluation for "connectivity" could be adjusted for the cycling transportation mode.

Please clarify how a tunnel at Fort York Blvd would create a greater footprint than a bridge?

The design team explained that in order to avoid underground conflicts with the Gardiner Expressway's footings, the tunnel option would have to dig as much as five metres underground. This is a more considerable grade change than is required for the bridge. As a result, to maintain a slope no greater than five per cent, both ends of the tunnel would have to be set further out to accommodate the required depth. This would create a larger footprint for the bridge. Furthermore, to access the tunnel crossing long sections of open cut area would be required on each side of the roadway to provide ramp access to/from the tunnel.

Will there be a cost/benefit analysis for the Fort York Blvd crossing? Torontonians might want the money that is allocated for the crossing to be put towards other infrastructure components within the project.

A cost/benefit analysis is not a requirement under the Class EA process. While cost is a consideration in the evaluation of alternatives, the EA is also considering other considerations including the opportunity to create a piece of iconic infrastructure that improves the public realm,

attracts visitors (tourism), and provides new views of the city and the Fort York National Historic Site that otherwise would not exist. The other criteria consider how the different crossing alternatives create continuity with the rest of the project and whether the options deliver a continuous, unobstructed path from one end to the next. It was noted that all the presentations made to the SAC would be revisited to ensure that the presentations, slides and display boards at the Public Information Centre more fully explain the different alternatives and how they perform in the draft evaluation.

Could a signalized crossing not be very useful at the Fort York crossing to help slow down traffic in this busy area?

It was noted that signalized crossings would conflict with a future LRT line along Fort York Boulevard as it would introduce an additional signalized intersection that would hinder transit service. Both the bridge and tunnel options could be designed in order to ensure that a future LRT line could be integrated into Fort York Boulevard.

Does a decision need to be made on the Fort York crossing before the rest of the project is finalized?

The project team explained that the decision on the crossing needs to be made within the timeline outlined for the Environmental Assessment (EA). The design process is running in parallel to the EA process. Should the bridge be the recommended alternative, the design will need to be completed in order to begin construction in fall 2016, immediately following completion of the rehabilitation work on the expressway structure. The goal is to construct as much of the project before July 2017 as possible, including the crossing. The project team will report back on this matter at the May 2016 SAC Meeting, once the budget and schedule have been more refined.

Bathurst Street and Spadina Avenue crossings will also require signalized intersections – is this not part of the EA? Why does this EA only focus on the Fort York crossing?

Signalized intersections don't require Environmental Assessments and the crossings at Bathurst and Spadina should be easily implemented by Transportation Services. The intersection at Fort York Boulevard, however, is more challenging. The project team believes that a grade-separated crossing is required at this location, which is what triggers the need for a Municipal Class EA.

Is it possible to build a bridge where cyclists don't have to dismount? We'd like to see a truly continuous path for everyone, including cyclists.

The project team suggests that the design presentation will explore this in greater detail. The eastern abutment of the bridge will land on what is currently private property, owned by developer ONNI. In order to have a proposed bridge land here and not overshoot much of the site and land closer to Bathurst, a switchback may be required. This could create a design challenge for cyclists, which could possibly be mitigated at a later stage in the design.

The design plan appears to show a park at what is currently a parking lot at Strachan. Can you please clarify?

The project team is working with Fort York and Parks, Forestry and Recreation to create landscape improvements to this area. It is intended that the area would continue to be usable as

parking when required, but would also double as landscaped open space that will feel like park space when not in use as vehicle parking. This area is being considered as a future loading and unloading area for school buses, tour buses and charter buses.

Have you considered including recycled tire products in the design?

The design team is interested in using salvaged and recycled materials. Recycled tire products could be very useful in some areas, particularly in the children's adventure play zones or in the winter skating rink areas that require rubberized areas.

Is there a lighting consultant being engaged in this project? People's impression of this space is often that it's too dark.

The design team is excited about the potential to transform the space through light. They have brought on a lighting consultant. This consultant will be charged with considering light in the space both at night and during the day. There may be opportunities to use rigging in the upper canopy as a lighting structure, or opportunities to create reflective surfaces or mirrors to bound light into the space. Both artificial and natural light sources will be evaluated.

Will the Garrison Road Bridge be restored?

Fort York is currently in the process of improving the connections around the area of the fort. Garrison Road has been brought down to grade with the parking pushed down the road in order to restore the original battlefield. The upper section of the Fort is now pedestrian focused, which makes it more functional and accessible. In the future, the only vehicles accessing this road will be those needed for events or emergency vehicles.

In reference to potential funding models, will there be opportunities for naming spaces within the project? Discreet spaces/rooms that could be named present a great potential for funding.

Jamie Springer from HR&A Advisors – the consultants studying future programming, operations and maintenance options – suggested that this is something for them to consider. The City of Toronto has policies on space naming that must be taken into consideration. Naming opportunities could potentially be one of several methods of paying for the on-going costs associated with the space, however if it is it will be part of a mix of funding.

Is there some mechanism for evaluation once an operations and maintenance model has been selected? This is an important if we are to finding ongoing investment.

This depends on the type of model that is recommended to and approved by City Council. The specific model will help determine how best to evaluate it. For example: the High Line surveys users every year and gets information on where they come from, how much money they spend, and how often they come back. This information is then used to make adjustments to the model as necessary. The project team recognizes the importance of evaluating the model that is created.

Has there been any consideration to connect with international projects or installations?

The design team has been approached by the cofounders of the High Line and they are going to share their best practices with us. The design team will also be working with Lord Cultural Resources, who are familiar with programming. The objective is to create space that will be lively and animated, but the project team recognizes that these sorts of spaces can be difficult to activate sometimes.

It's important that once we design these spaces that we consider the upkeep. The renderings show lots of greenery, trees, etc. and we should ensure that we plan to follow through with this. If we are to include beautiful plantings and trees, then we must include a plan to maintain and replace them where necessary. Same with the roads, connections, etc. We show a lot of connections that don't currently exist and it's equally important to follow through with our promise to create and maintain them.

The project team acknowledges this. Recommending the best way to fund the on-going operations and maintenance is part of the scope of work being undertaken by HR&A Advisors. The project team will report further at the next SAC meeting in May.

7. Public Consultation and Naming Campaign Update

Due to time constraints, we were unable to provide these updates.

Action: Chris McKinnon will email SAC members these updates.

8. Group Brainstorm

Lauren Abrahams from PUBLIC WORK led a group brainstorm session where the committee was asked to form groups of 7-8 around tables. Each table was provided large maps of the project area.

Each group was then asked to write down programming they would like to see on post-its, and place them on the maps in areas they wish to see that programming take place. They were encouraged to think about what types of programming might be complementary or have the ability to share similar types of spaces at different times, and to group these activities together as they placed them on the map.

Finally, each group was charged with choosing their three top "groupings" of activity and placing those on a larger map alongside the top choices from the other tables.

All of the maps were photographed for record keeping.

View an album of those photographs here: <https://goo.gl/photos/p5trUkiGxHnyF3WM7>

APPENDIX A - Under Gardiner Project Team

Waterfront Toronto

Chris Glaisek, VP, Planning and Design

David Kusturin, Chief Operating Office

Project Manager: Pina Mallozzi, Director, Design

Public Engagement Lead: Chris McKinnon, Manager, Digital and Social Media

Andrew Hilton, Director, Communications & Public Engagement

Public Engagement Support: Meghan Hogan, Communications and Public Engagement Coordinator

City of Toronto

David Stonehouse, Project Director, Waterfront Secretariat

Project Manager: Pinelopi Gramatikopoulos, Project Manager, Waterfront Secretariat

David O'Hara, Manager, Fort York National Historic Site

Ashley Curtis, Transportation Services

Easton Gordon, Engineering & Construction Services

Naz Capano, Transportation Services

Gregg Uens, City Planning

Lynda MacDonald, City Planning

Nasim Adab, Urban Design, City Planning

Design Team

Ken Greenberg, Greenberg Consultants

Marc Ryan, PUBLIC WORK

Adam Nicklin, PUBLIC WORK

Lauren Abrahams, PUBLIC WORK

APPENDIX - Stakeholder Advisory Committee Membership

Residents Associations & Business Improvement Areas

Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association
CityPlace Residents Association
Fort York Neighbourhood Association
Liberty Village BIA
Liberty Village Residents Association
Waterfront BIA
Wellington Place Neighbourhood Association

Adjacent Residential Buildings & Landowners

35 Bastion Street
15 Bruyeres Mews
20 Bruyeres Mews
600 Fleet Street
628 Fleet Street
169 Fort York Boulevard
209 Fort York Boulevard
219 Fort York Boulevard
231 Fort York Boulevard
21 Grand Magazine Street
38 Grand Magazine Street
Concord Adex
Diamondcorp
ONNI
Wittington Properties Limited

Community Organizations, Institutions & Advocacy Groups

(STEPS) Initiative
Advisory Committee on Accessible Transit
Artscape
Canadian Hearing Society
Canadian National Exhibition
Civic Action DiverseCity Fellows
Cycle Toronto
Evergreen
Exhibition Place
Fort York Armoury
Fort York Library
Friends of Fort York
Harbourfront Community Centre
Jane's Walk

Manifesto Community Projects
Salvation Army Gateway
SKETCH
Stop Gap Foundation
Toronto Skateboard Committee