



**Future of the Gardiner East
Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)
Meeting 13-2**

**Tuesday October 1, 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 second Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting by welcoming the committee members and thanking them for attending the session. She introduced the Lura team and led a round of introductions. Ms. Nield provided a brief overview of the meeting agenda, and informed committee members that the purpose of the meeting is to obtain feedback on the material that will be presented at the public forum on October 16, 2013.

Mr. John Livey, Deputy City Manager, City of Toronto, also welcomed the committee members. Mr. Livey noted that while interim repairs to the Gardiner Expressway East are currently underway, the City needs a well-informed, timely, and implementable long-term solution for the eastern portion of the elevated roadway. He reminded the committee members of the four alternative solutions being considered: maintain, improve, replace and remove. Mr. Livey noted that, regardless of the option selected, we should have a practical, but inspiring solution that people can support.

Mr. Chris Glaisek, Vice President, Planning and Design, Waterfront Toronto, attended the meeting on behalf of Mr. John Campbell, President and CEO, Waterfront Toronto. Mr. Glaisek emphasized the benefit of the committee's feedback at the previous meeting while preparing for the first public forum. He outlined the public feedback collected during the first round of public consultations, noting the most important key ideas as chosen by participants were: balance modes of transportation, enhance connectivity, new transport infrastructure and enhance the public realm. Mr. Glaisek explained the information being presented is an evolution from the last meeting, and more technical in nature. He noted most of the options present some kind of reconfiguration to the expressway's capacity or function, although analyzing how these options work in detail from a transportation point of view has yet to be done. Mr. Glaisek encouraged SAC members to engage in a good discussion.

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. His presentation included:

- Feedback collected from participants during Round One of the consultation process;
- An overview of the Environmental Assessment (EA) study area boundaries, goals and process;
- An overview of each alternative solution;
- Preliminary information about the cost and travel time implications of each alternative solution; and
- Draft evaluation criteria that will be used to guide decision-making.

The presentation will be made available online at www.gardinereast.ca following the Public Forum on October 16, 2013.

3. Facilitated Discussion – Feedback and Advice

SAC Members provided the following feedback and advice after the presentation:

Presentation

- Many people said that the presentation was succinct and well communicated.

Transportation Modelling

- Request for further information about transportation modelling.
- Question if the modelling looked at impacts on downtown streets (e.g., capacity of Adelaide).

Cost

- Request for further information about cost for each alternative solution, as well as clarification about the different types of cost (e.g., what soft costs are, net present value, etc.)
- Concern about timing, especially heading into an election; need to communicate clearly that we need to think long term and that none of the solutions are quick and easy; need to be upfront about costs to maintain.

Travel Time & Capacity

- Request for clarity around travel time, and to provide more information about origin/destination points – currently it is not clear where people are travelling from/to.
- Presentation clear until travel time chart – the projected travel times for each option need to be explained in more detail.
- Suggest including more information about impacts for each solution and explain these during the presentation of each one; there was concern about maintaining transportation capacity overall and that people may be very concerned about this, especially because this is a system that is already strained and any loss of capacity will be seen as a red flag.
- Need to reiterate that this is a long term process and that we need to come up with a solution for the next 50 years. There is currently a lot of frustration about transit. What are the implications of this project over a 20-year time period? Better understanding of what the

Future of the Gardiner Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
Oct 1, 2013 – Summary Report

solutions mean and how they will be coordinated with other projects (e.g., Downtown Relief Line) is needed.

- Suggest planning to coordinate construction to ensure multiple streets aren't shut down.
- Travel times – give travel time differentiation from a few example locations, breakdowns will be helpful.
- A lot of cynicism at the moment relating to transit. Might also want to mention the benefits, refer to disappearing traffic, alternate routes, and other transportation options.
- More buildings/offices are being introduced - need to model loading capacity.
- Request for more information about which of the solutions have the potential to continue to the west. This should be an evaluation criterion.
- Request for more information about the traffic management plan for each of the different solutions, as well as information about constructability and construction stages. Must be considered that this is going to be a key component of which solution people pick.
- Suggest focusing on providing more information during the second half of the presentation – assessing the alternatives, transportation and criteria.
- Suggest getting a better understanding of what costs to individual drivers might change behaviour (e.g., tolls, transit) and how far can that envelope be pushed.
- Cost and timeline will be criteria that will be watched closely – provide more information about the timelines, especially long-term in terms of the impact to the City, as well as the costs associated with those timelines.
- Questions about maintaining or enhancing connections throughout the study area, especially North/South (presentation seemed to be heavy on East/West) – especially for pedestrians and cyclists; provide more information on North/South implications.
- Questions about remove option regarding activity and traffic between DVP and Lake Shore Blvd.
- Question about whether fewer ramps in the lower Yonge Precinct were being considered.

The EA TOR which was approved by Council states that a key direction is to balance modes of transportation and improve the public realm

- Would be useful to provide more information about the Council directive and approved EA that sets the context for discussion about alternatives.
- Have a list of initiatives/projects that are ongoing/current that will improve capacity.

Suggestions Regarding Solutions

- In the remove option there could be more developable space – would like to see what this urban street would look like (see park space as empty space).
- Both remove and improve options, mentioned in the text that more building parcels are possible but the images do not show that. Suggest showing a lively urban street with development up to edge of both sides (not just nice pictures of trees and bikes).
- Grand Boulevard will take up a huge amount of space. Looks like there is enough space for two streets north and south and enough space up to the rail corridor for development. The amount of green space/trail shown seems superfluous.
 - Response to this comment noted that park space is very important and all space can't be limited to pedestrians and cyclists.
- Suggest including more information on the evaluation of environmental impacts for each solution and explain them during the presentation.

Future of the Gardiner Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
Oct 1, 2013 – Summary Report

- Participants suggested that people will be disappointed if the tunnel isn't included on the list of alternatives for the public meeting – however, it should be noted that it has been evaluated, and that costs could be prohibitive.

Transit

- Years ago, during an EA on Queens Quay transit there was consideration of an express bus route on Lake Shore – this should be considered and would be useful if offered as a cross-city transit option.
- Suggest mentioning that transit options are being looked at.

4. Proposed Format for Upcoming Public Forum

Ms. Nield informed SAC members of the upcoming Public Forum scheduled for October 16, 2013 at the Bram and Bluma Appel Salon at the Toronto Reference Library. Ms. Nield briefly outlined the format of the meeting which will include a series of presentations followed by roundtable discussions.

5. Upcoming SAC Meeting Dates

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

Next SAC meeting: October 29th, 2013



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

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting – 13-#2

Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 308-309
Tuesday, October 1, 2013 - 6:30 – 8:30 pm

AGENDA

- 6:30 pm** **Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions**
- Lura Facilitator
 - John Livey, City of Toronto
 - John Campbell, Waterfront Toronto
- 6:45 pm** **SAC Member Briefing**
1. Proposed Alternative Solutions
 2. Proposed Evaluation Criteria
- 7:30 pm** **Facilitated Discussion – SAC Questions, Feedback and Advice**
- Thinking about the material presented and the main topics covered in the presentation, what feedback or advice do you have to improve the clarity of the material in preparation for the upcoming public forum?
 - Thinking about the proposed alternative solutions...What modifications or improvements would you suggest? Why?
 - What are the top 3 most important criteria to apply in deciding between alternative solutions? Which 3 criteria are least important? Are any criteria missing?
- 8:15 p.m.** **Proposed Format for Upcoming Public Forum**
- Do you have any advice or feedback on the proposed format for the upcoming public forum?
- 8:25 pm** **Next Steps**
- 8:30 pm** **Adjourn**

Appendix B – List of Attendees

SAC Meeting #2 List of Attendees

Walk Toronto
Canadian Urban Institute
Professional Engineers Ontario
CodeBlueTO
Financial District BIA
Don Watershed Regeneration Council
Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association (GWNA)
Heritage Toronto
Greyhound
West Don Lands Committee
Redpath and Toronto Industry Network
Toronto Urban Renewal Network (TURN)
Canadian Automobile Association
Unionville Ratepayers Association
Transport Action Ontario
Federation of North Toronto Residents and People Plan Toronto
Urban Land Institute (ULI)
Cycling Toronto
Toronto Centre for Active Transportation
Waterfront Toronto
City of Toronto
Dillon Consulting
Lura Consulting

List of SAC members unable to attend

Food and Consumer Products of Canada
Retail Council of Canada
Toronto Association of BIAs
Toronto Board of Trade
Lake Shore Planning Council
Ontario Professional Planners Institute – Urban Design Working Group
St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Evergreen
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

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. During the first phase of the study the possibility of removing ramps in the Lower Young Precinct Plan area was expressed, can you speak to that?

A. The team looked very hard at ramps, and it appears that the Jarvis connection is a significant one. It will cause people to access the north-south connections at-grade earlier if they are removed. The intent is to keep drivers off the at-grade roadway as much as possible if we are going to keep the elevated expressway.

Q. Regarding the costs associated with each alternative solution, the estimates you mentioned ranged from \$300 million to \$200 billion, what are the costs of the other two?

A. The other two are still in development. They fall within that range. The intent is to present a costing for each alternative at the public forum.

Q. Will there be more information about modelling and more information about costing?

A. Transportation modelling will be presented formally in the EA documentation. The information about traffic modelling presented here is the level of detail we plan to present to the public in October. We will also have a number of panels with plan views, lane configurations, connections to the DVP, north-south streets, and changes in the Keating lands. The plans which will be on display are more conceptual than technical. They will also be available online.

Q. Regarding the remove option, how do you handle activity between the DVP and Lake Shore Boulevard?

A. Connections at both ends are important. There would be new ramps from the DVP with a new at-grade boulevard. A plan drawing would depict those connections.

Q. There needs to be more clarification about the travel times presented. Is it for people traveling through the city or into the downtown core?

A. Many indicators came out of the transportation modeling. We could look at origin/destination points, or average travel times if that is helpful.

C. You need to clarify what is being presented and whether it affects people using the expressway versus people who live there. More information would be helpful.

C. Great presentation, it was clear until the travel times were presented. The projected travel times for each option need to be explained better.

A. The travel times depend on which points we're talking about. The impact could be small. It also depends on the implementation of other transit/transportation projects.

C. Regarding the conceptual image under the remove option on slide 36, this is not an area lacking in park space. Imagine the barrier if there is park space on both sides? There is potential for development on both sides of the reconfigured roadway. I would like to see an option that calls for more development space. I want to see an urban street. I see park space as empty space.

C. For both the remove and improve options, it was mentioned in the text that more building parcels are possible but you don't show that. You should offer a perspective, not only nice images of bikes and kids. Show a lively urban street with development up to edge of both sides. If the Martin Goodman Trail continues on Queens Quay, this trail seems superfluous.

A. This path is imagined as more of a commuter route.

C. The grand boulevard idea uses a huge amount of space. Grand boulevards aren't really that pedestrian friendly. The width that I see available here looks like there is enough for two streets north and south, enough space between two streets, and enough space for development right up to rail corridor.

Q. Has modelling looked at the impact to downtown streets? For example how the capacity to Adelaide Street will be affected? The modelling numbers used by the project are based on high level proposals such the Downtown Relief Line. There may be push back about the speculative nature of this analysis. Is the plan in the future to look at the west? Which of these plans have the potential to continue to the west?

A. Regarding a reduction in lanes, our modelling incorporated those changes and reductions. We understand that changes in this corridor may push traffic onto other corridors. Good point about push back. The study area is east of Jarvis Street to the Don Roadway.

C. We're talking about a \$2 billion investment, we need to start thinking about the western portion too. More information about constructability, construction stages, and traffic management plans for each alternative solution would also be helpful.

Q. I agree the presentation was really good and clear, but I would suggest focusing revisions on the second half. Missing from the presentation is the evaluation of environmental impacts caused by the project.

A. One of our lenses is the environment; we are doing modelling in terms of air quality. There is not a lot of natural habitat in the corridor. One of the project considerations is opportunities for enhancement in combination with the lower Don River revitalization initiative.

Q. What's the difference to the environment between taking down the Gardiner and replacing the expressway?

A. That's a good question we'll consider as we move forward.

Q. It would be helpful if you present each alternative and any impacts that may occur at the same time, rather than presenting them separately. Then summarize at the end. Was it not possible to maintain the capacity? If not, then you are setting this up to be politically challenging.

A. Historically looking back at trips into downtown, those numbers have flat lined. Whether they come in, or go out. The biggest change is people wanting to travel out of the city, the counter flow.

C. The charts presented show that you are decreasing capacity, this will cause great debate.

A. A proportion of the population in the downtown core will continue to rely on cars. We didn't enter the study with just transportation objectives. Urban design is also a significant component of the study. The trade-off is some reduction in capacity. The current trend in Toronto is less reliance on automobiles and it is expected that trend will continue into the future.

C. I don't think that's the way I would frame it. Saying that capacity will be reduced on a system that is already strained sets the project up for failure.

A. The Official Plan asks us to balance modes of transportation. We can work on that and include more information.

Q. The presentation is heavy on east/west connections. What about north/south connectivity, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists?

A. Good point, we can do a better job of explaining those. In our study the boundary is the southern edge of the corridor.

C. I'd like to respond to the comment made earlier that some of the greenspace in the study area is superfluous. In light of increasing population and development within the study area, local and regional access to usable park space is important. We also don't want to limit opportunities for cycling and walking.

Q. Years ago, another EA was done on Queens Quay transit. Has there been any consideration of an express bus route on Lake Shore Boulevard? It would be useful to have an express route on Lake Shore Boulevard which can help off-set cross-city traffic travel times.

A. It's a great idea. We have done some thinking about other transit options. The next step is analyzing where people are coming from and going to. The thing with transit is that it needs to function within a network.

Q. Can you define what soft costs are? Are your costs present value?

A. The intent is to present costs in present values. Soft costs are additional costs such as design and planning.

C. I have concerns about timing as we are heading to an election. We need to inform people that none of the options are quick or easy. We also need to be more upfront about the costs to maintain the expressway. There have been a few comments this evening about the bike lane along Lake Shore Boulevard. There has always been a bike lane there, although it may disappear from time to time. The TTC will also point out that the remaining columns along Lake Shore Boulevard are too close for bus stops and affect sightlines.

C. Regarding introducing more buildings/offices in the study area, we need to model loading capacity. If there are reductions at grade we need to look at impacts in terms of capacity. There is also some work being done looking at above grade connections for the PATH.

C. There was mention of looking at transit options that would capture drivers, the "carrots" side. The "stick" side is making it more expensive to drive downtown, such as tolls or parking surcharges which could also be a revenue tool. We should get a better understanding what costs to individual drivers could change behaviour, and how far can that envelope be pushed.

A. The modelling that came out of travel times is an extrapolation of previous trends. Some behaviour may change in the interim. The model says one thing, but people's reaction in reality may be different. Models are only reflective of the assumptions and inputs we put in. The graph showed road capacity being taken away, but there will be choices and alternatives.

C. As you go out to the public, another criterion that will be watched closely is cost and timelines. It would be good to have a slide on timelines. If we are going to replace the Gardiner how long will it take? If it costs \$2 billion to replace it, what's the timeline and impact to the city?

Facilitated Discussion – Feedback and Advice

The following questions were posed to the committee members by Ms. Nield on behalf of the project team.

Q. What is your opinion about dropping tunnel?

- Inform the public that the option was evaluated it, but the recommendation is to drop it because of the cost.

Q. How do you feel about the information that was presented? Are you satisfied with the content?

- It's going to be about the long term process. There is currently a lot of frustration about transit. What are the implications of this project, is it a 20 year process? We need more information to gain a better understanding of what these options mean and how they will be coordinated with other projects.
- Give travel time scenarios from a few example locations; the break downs will be helpful.
- The public will be upset about the outcomes being presented: inadequate transit funding, lane reductions, increasing travel time by 25 minutes or longer...people and politicians will be upset.
- There is a lot of cynicism at the moment relating to transit. You might want to mention the benefits of more transportation options.

Q. Is it helpful to stress that the purpose of the EA is to balance modes of transportation and improve the public realm and not necessarily maintain capacity? Is that going to help buttress that?

- A counterpoint might be who developed that rule and why was that the rule?
- It is useful to provide that context about the EA process and decision-making.
- Improving the public realm is a fairly subjective goal. I think it is a design process and a failure of engineering that will result in reduced capacity.
- Prepare a list of ongoing or current efforts that will improve capacity, including initiatives that may not have been communicated yet.

Appendix D: Additional Feedback from SAC Members

From Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association:

Once again, congratulations to all for the great work you have done since last spring. Tuesday's meeting was very impressive.

If I had tried to say all I wanted to say we would have been there much later so I hope you will forgive me for adding these comments.

1. First, I appreciated the way you have boiled down the options into more easily readable visuals. Several people I have talked to found the drawings by the various teams hard to read and confusing. As well, people will always read conceptual drawings as if they were approved plans and this will condition a different response.
2. I also appreciate the amount of research and refinement you have done already -- but please keep emphasizing over and over that this is preliminary and the findings so far could be modified as work continues.
3. I'd recommend that you emphasize and repeat that we must build for the future, not conditions decades ago. When you show the diagram of traffic volumes and exits at various points, that would be a good time to say that the thin line at the eastern end shows road conditions built for another expressway that never materialised and that Gardiner and LSB are well below capacity nowadays. Be brave. People will howl at any reduction in the number of lanes -- as they did every time Delanoë did this in Paris but they were popular after the fact and he got reelected as mayor over and over. (It might be interesting to look at the increasing tendency for people to not have driver's licences if figures exist. I know several highly trendy types in their early twenties who don't drive.)
4. Making LSB a regular street with buildings either side is a lovely thought but could this be done without pulling it farther south? There isn't much space between it and the railway berm right now. Moving it south and building under the highway if it stays makes sense as the buildings would be roofed anyway. I wonder, however, how this would affect East Bay Front and development north of Queen's Quay. Wouldn't Le Monde be in the way? Perhaps keeping it north and building under the expressway, if it's still there, would be easier.
5. Can things be done to remind traffic on Lakeshore that they are entering residential areas and should look out for pedestrians when they turn left or right? I raised this concern at the Lower Yonge precinct plan SAC and was told Lakeshore is not in the programme but that the new environment would be enough indication. I fear that by the time this registers some poor person, perhaps me on my way to 20 Bay St., who was only crossing east-west on a green light, will be knocked to kingdom come.
6. Wild rumours are circulating about EBF transit and I look forward to a SAC meeting to bring us up to date on that issue. But it would make a big difference to the ease of getting across the south of the city and whatever the current state of affairs is could be made clear on the 16th.

From CodeBlueTO:

CodeBlueTO has an interest in this EA as it relates to unlocking the potential of the waterfront to the east of Yonge and into the Port Lands. The current roadway is an impediment to this, so while we are open to Replace and Remove options it is unlikely that we will be convinced that Maintain or Improve can accomplish this goal (but in the spirit of the EA, we will not completely rule them out).

With this in mind, upon further consideration of the content of last night's meeting, I have some further comments:

1. The issue of travel times will be politicized in a heartbeat. You should be very careful and clear as to what gets presented at the public meeting because once the statements are made, no matter how preliminary, they will become fact for those who may be inclined to do nothing.
2. Any projections on traffic load and travel times should be tempered by empirical evidence from real world examples. For instance, in the case of Remove, San Francisco's Embarcadero Freeway.
3. Pragmatism and engineering has taken over the process. This is a necessity to move the EA forward but the contrast between the first public meeting that displayed bold ideas and the upcoming meeting that will present only the basic configurations is striking. All steak and no sizzle makes for a cold and uninteresting meal. The public will still need bold ideas to rally behind.
4. Further to the above point, and in support of a number of the other comments at the SAC meeting, the use of the land freed up on the north and south sides of the roadway in the Remove scenario as linear parks is problematic. Let's face it, a park sandwiched between a railway berm and a major arterial road or on the north side of a wall of high buildings would not be a pleasant place to hang out. While parks and public space are critical to the success of Waterfront Toronto's planning, using leftover space for parks by default will not serve the public well. It would be far better to create an urban boulevard with buildings on both sides - setting aside appropriate park and public spaces within the larger planning framework. This would reduce the psychological barrier of crossing the rail and road corridor and provide opportunities for increasing the value of land to help pay for this exercise.

One more point about the public presentation:

We were shown the mid-point conditions for the four alternatives. Just as critical are the transition conditions. What happens at either end of the study zone in terms of connections to the existing and planned road network, ramps, bridges, etc. will be very important in the success or failure of each of the alternatives. Either on the presentation boards or in the presentation itself you will need to answer specific questions such as "What happens to the east of the Don Valley Parkway?" The answer to what happens in the transition zones will have a great impact on the planning of the Port Lands and the Lower Yonge precinct.