



Appendix J
SAC Meeting #4 Report





Queens Quay Revitalization Environmental Assessment Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #4

***Wednesday March 11, 2009 – 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
Waterfront Toronto, Main Boardroom***

Meeting Summary

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto, introduced himself and welcomed participants to the fourth Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting convened as part of the Queens Quay Revitalization Environmental Assessment (EA) process. Mr. Glaisek indicated that the purpose of this SAC meeting was to share with the committee detailed information developed by the Queens Quay EA Project Team that will provide the basis for the presentation at Public Forum #3 in late March. He added that public input will be sought in two different ways at the upcoming Public Forum: 1.) a public information centre will be held on Wednesday March 25th, which will include a formal presentation and a general question and answer period, and 2.) a drop-in centre on Saturday March 28th, which will provide an opportunity for more detailed feedback from the public through one-on-one discussions with the Project Team.

Mr. Glaisek noted that the preferred alternative for the East Bayfront Transit EA will also be presented at Public Forum #3, and added that members of the Community Liaison Committee for that EA had been invited to tonight's meeting.

David Dilks (Lura Consulting) re-introduced himself as the Neutral Facilitator for the SAC.

2. Walkthrough of Project Team's Preferred Alternative Presentation for Upcoming Public Forum

Chris Glaisek walked through the major elements of the preferred alternative for Queens Quay that will be presented at Public Forum #3. These elements included the:

- Bus Plan;
- Servicing Plan;
- Parking Plan;
- Transit Plan;
- Site Access Plan, including site specific drawings of property access plans for:
 - 401 Queens Quay
 - Fire/EMS
 - Radisson Hotel
 - Harbourfront Centre
 - Queens Quay Terminal
 - Harbour Square

- Westin Harbour Castle
- Pier 27
- Redpath Sugar

David Pratt, ARUP, provided background on the traffic analysis and transportation planning work for Queens Quay.

Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto, briefly reviewed the evaluation criteria and related measures that the Project Team had used to identify the preferred alternative for Queens Quay.

Bill Dawson, Toronto Transit Commission, presented a brief overview of the East Bayfront Transit EA and the preferred alternative.

3. Discussion and Feedback

The following is a summary of committee comments on the various presentations. Mr. Dilks requested that committee members provide feedback both on the content and on how the information should be presented as part of the upcoming Public Forum.

SAC members provided comments throughout the presentations. This feedback has been organized by topic below:

Bus Plan

- A committee member commented about the Portland Pier, noting that the driveway to that pier enables access to a number of private and commercial vessels on the east side of the slip. The committee member stated that there will be four commercial vessels using that pier in the near future, and that it is only accessible from eastbound Queens Quay, not westbound due to the streetcar right-of-way. The mouth of the driveway is not wide enough and there is a TTC shelter that is an obstacle. The committee member suggested that the area about 100m east might be a better access point for buses. A member of the Project Team indicated that this is the kind of feedback they are looking for, and the Project Team will consider the suggestion.
- A committee member commented on the proposed closure and bus turn around at Robertson Square. The committee member stated that space can be created but the management of that site with respect to getting vehicles in and out at a busy time of year will be difficult. The committee member noted that the police boat needs to access the site and cannot be blocked. A member of the Project Team stated that this will be considered as part of the Access Plan.
- A committee member asked how many bus lay-bys were being proposed. The committee member noted that coach buses need to be able to access the east end of Queens Quay in order to provide door-to-door service for clients. A member of the Project Team replied that seventeen drop off and pick up areas were being proposed for the Queens Quay study area, based on bus demand.
- One committee member asked who will enforce the bus plan, since the aim is to discourage illegal bus parking on Queens Quay. The committee member asked where the Project Team intends to put vehicles, and if there will be a plan for shuttles. The committee member noted that the Harbour Castle is one of the biggest hotels in the area, and a call back system such

as the one used in Niagara Falls is a great tool that could be implemented here. It was noted that the Harbourfront Centre was looking at the call back option. The committee member also explained that there is a significant difference between school buses versus coach buses and leisure travel. The committee member commented that taxi drivers are the biggest problem on Queens Quay since they park and wait. A Project Team member explained that a bus management plan for the waterfront will be developed, and Waterfront Toronto has committed to do this with the City of Toronto but it will be outside the scope of the Queens Quay Revitalization EA.

- Another committee member asked if the bus plan will extend over to the east. A member of the Project Team replied that it currently ends at Jarvis Street.
- A committee member asked if there is anything in place that might prevent people from exiting the buses on the north side and walking across the street to the south side. A Project Team member noted that this would be discussed as part of the site-specific analysis.
- One committee member suggested that when the Project Team presents this to the public, the public might have a hard time understanding how the bus plan will work if Queens Quay becomes a one-way street. The committee member suggested that the Project Team first explain how the street will function before showing this detail. A member of the Project Team indicated that the team will have a preamble for the public to explain the context.

Servicing Plan

- A committee member commented that delivery trucks cannot enter the driveway at the location of the Chinese restaurant. A member of the Project Team noted that most buildings have servicing off the street, such as Rabba Fine Foods.

Transit Plan

- A committee member asked if streetcar shelters on the platforms will have walls. A Project Team member replied that the plan is to use the standard three-sided style shelters used by the City, a design that is better than what is present today but not fully enclosed. Another committee member commented that bus shelters are currently being designed for Cherry Street, and suggested that the Queens Quay Revitalization EA Project Team consider those designs.
- A committee member noted that the Simcoe slip is a high intensity use area, and it would be beneficial to add a transit stop in that area since the walk from Simcoe to Rees is very long. A member of the Project Team noted that additional stops and the distance between stops was discussed, and that the Project Team wanted to avoid stops in places that are not signalized to avoid jaywalking.
- One committee member noted that the Project Team should be looking at the site from a seasonal perspective, including consideration of busy summer days when people will be running across the street. The committee member noted that priority should be given to pedestrians.
- A committee member asked if additional transit stops are not possible at Lower Simcoe because the buildings in the area are very close to the street and there isn't enough space to

add in a streetcar stop. A member of the Project Team explained that a high level of consideration has gone into the plan, and Simcoe and York are both problem areas.

- Another committee member asked if the platforms and shelters will be accessible to people with disabilities. A Project Team member replied that they will be accessible since this is will be a requirement under the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act*.

Site Specific Drawings of Property Access

John Quay (Radisson Hotel)

- A committee member asked how much of the sidewalk will be taken away in the area of the Radisson Hotel. The committee member noted that after a Jays' baseball game or any event at the Rogers Centre, the Radisson parking lot is full and there is a lot of congestion. The committee member stated that there a lot of venues in the area that draw big crowds, and the solution being proposed by the Project Team for this area might not be the best answer. The committee member suggested possibly restricting buses from exiting on the east side.
- Another committee member noted that this is the area where the EMS and police pick up people who are injured on the water.
- One committee member commented that the fumes that are released from the buses will be excessive, which would not be pleasant for those using a sidewalk café. A member of the Project Team noted that the Radisson feels that people need to get off a bus in view of the entrance to the hotel. Buses currently use the area, and the plan does not add more buses.
- Another committee member noted that people keep bringing up concerns about site access and parking, but it is possible there will be lower levels of private traffic due to the economic situation, and people will change their transportation habits. Thus, the Project Team should plan and build for the future rather than the last few years. The committee member noted that more people will be using public transit.
- A committee member stated that a new venue in the area will hold 500 people, and this venue will be serviced by buses. In order to transport 500 people the coach company will need to send ten buses to the site.
- One committee member stated that the goal should be to plan for greater visitation levels not lower visitation levels, given that Harbourfront will increase retail and activity in the area. The committee member also commented that if the design doesn't make it practical to do a u-turn or park, people will do it themselves, hence, there needs to be workable solutions.
- Another committee member asked if it is possible to cut into the police basin. A member of the Project Team noted that the issue still needs to be discussed with Toronto Police in order to establish how much space can be utilized.
- One committee member commented that the current car park has a limited capacity.

Harbour Square

- A committee member asked if bikes will be able to use the proposed laneway in front of Harbour Square. A member of the Project Team stated that legally a cyclist can use any paved roadway.
- Another committee member raised concern about cyclists racing through the area to get to the Martin Goodman Trail. The committee member indicated that any interaction between pedestrians and cyclists is a safety issue. A Project Team member replied that the team recognizes the need for a good signalling system for areas where the Martin Goodman Trail crosses the street and interfaces with pedestrian routes. The Project Team member noted that signalized lights for cyclists will likely be installed.
- One committee member asked if barricades will be constructed to stop cyclists from moving across the street. A member of the Project Team noted that the Martin Goodman Trail will be at the same level as the sidewalk in this area, and that along the remainder of Queens Quay, the Martin Goodman Trail will be removed more from the street.
- A committee member suggested measures should be looked at to reduce the conflict between turning cars and cyclists.
- Another committee member noted for the public meeting, cross-sections would help the public to understand the plans being presented.
- A committee member expressed his concern with cyclists, stating that cyclists ride very fast and can pose danger to pedestrians. A member of the Project Team indicated that the team is trying to create a beautiful and safe environment along the Queens Quay for all users.

Harbour Castle

- A committee member suggested that a crossing guard or a traffic attendant would be useful in front of the Harbour Castle during busy times, since this might ease conflicts.
- Another committee member suggested that the Project Team include the transit stops on site maps being presented at the public meeting.
- One committee member noted that every summer there is incredible congestion in front of the hotel because people crowd the area when trying to get to the island ferries.
- Another committee member stated that there is not enough space in front of the hotel for taxis and buses, and suggested that more spaces can be added to the area. A member of the Project Team replied that by law the area 30 metres from an intersection is a non-parking area, but it can be a pick-up or drop-off area.
- A committee member commented that some of the lay-by users that are servicing tourists actually sell tickets on site; hence these are not strictly drop and go. A Project Team member replied that there is sufficient curbside space available today, but a site management plan is needed.

Bathurst Street

- One committee member asked if the Project Team could speak about Bathurst Street to the west. A member of the Project Team stated that the study was extended further west to Bathurst, however additional funding will be required to implement major streetscape changes between Spadina and Bathurst.
- A committee member noted that currently there is a turn around for cars at the pier at Bathurst, which tightens up at the east side, but if the Project Team were to open it up it, this would allow coaches to get in, drop off and get out. A Project Team member indicated that the team will investigate the site some more, and the area that will change is from Yo-Yo Ma Lane to Spadina Avenue.
- Another committee member commented that many cars go straight across Queens Quay at Bathurst, and it is dangerous for cyclists.
- One committee member asked if the direction of traffic on Bathurst will be changing as a result of another project. A member of the Project Team replied that the team is not familiar with that proposal, but can look into it.

Traffic Feasibility Study

- A committee member asked for an explanation of the delay in deciding on one-way versus two-way operations along Queens Quay. A member of the Project Team explained that one-way traffic on Queens Quay going westbound would provide a very good level of service. The issue is that if eastbound traffic moves up to Lake Shore, traffic volumes there would be impacted. The team is still considering the pros and cons of one-way versus two-way.
- Another committee member asked what is meant by V/C. A Project Team member explained that it refers to volume ratio/capacity.
- One committee member suggested that it would be beneficial to explain these concepts and tables to the public in plain English, so they know what all these terms mean.
- A committee member asked if the Project Team feels that this study will have any lingering effects west of Bathurst Street on Queens Quay, since this area currently experiences bottlenecks. A Project Team member replied that the team has not looked at that since it is outside of the study area.
- Another committee member asked if the Project Team has a slide that shows the metrics based on the status quo. A member of the Project Team replied that an existing slide shows the existing baseline conditions.
- A committee member asked if the Project Team factored in the impact of island airport traffic. A Project Team member noted that the team factored in a modest growth factor of 5%, but can't be certain how much the traffic will increase if airport operations continue to grow beyond that.
- Another committee member questioned whether the reason the Project Team did not plan for a growth spike in terms of Porter operations at the airport was due to their use of studies with 2007 data; these studies were conducted prior to Porter opening, which is a concern.

- A committee member commented that Porter is trying to increase business, which in turn will increase traffic. The committee member also asked if the Project Team has considered marathons and other events that would occur in the area, which may shut down the street to vehicular traffic. A Project Team member stated that such events would fall under the City's jurisdiction, and an event-specific plan would be developed. The Project Team member noted that with the new design, the City will have the opportunity to use the public right-of-way rather than closing the whole street.
- One committee member asked what is meant by "typical busy urban conditions". A member of the Project Team explained that it referred to level of service D or better.
- One committee member was concerned that the traffic flow models did not include pedestrians. A member of the Project Team explained that the team is working on presentation materials that will include pedestrian and cyclist data for the public forum, and that pedestrians and cyclists have taken those into consideration when preparing the proposed plans. The Project Team member stated that counts were done for pedestrians and cyclists, and more details will be provided shortly.
- A committee member commented that the presentation seems to have no link with the EA plan. The committee member suggested that the Project Team show the larger context for the EA study.
- Another committee member suggested that it might be useful for people to know that the traffic levels being displayed are for peak times, and to indicate whether this is over an hour or a whole day. A member of the Project Team explained that the traffic models were based on the peak hour in the morning, and the afternoon peak hour. The committee member noted that it might be useful for the public to see that levels are significantly lower in the middle of the day.
- One committee member asked if the traffic study includes the Spadina bottleneck. A Project Team member explained that this is a problem spot the team is aware of, as it causes a delay in transit from Spadina onto Queens Quay.

Evaluation Criteria

- A committee member suggested that the Project Team may want to add the effect of future development based on a one-way or two-way street to the cost criteria.

East Bayfront Transit EA

- A committee member noted that although the presentation concludes that Solution #3 works best for the portal, it is important to let the public and stakeholders know that they can provide additional comments on the East Bayfront Transit EA process.
- One committee member noted that if the Project Team doesn't get it right on Queens Quay West, then this will cause people to give up on the west end and move east. The committee member suggested a balanced approach to planning.

Additional Comments

- One committee member commented that in the case of a two-way street with one lane in each direction, a tour bus parked in the eastbound or westbound lane will cause serious backups. A member of the Project Team noted that the decision has not yet been made with respect to making Queens Quay a one-way or a two-way street. Another Project Team member explained that an EA process is not required to decide whether to make an existing street one-way or two-way.
- Another committee member noted that not every coach that comes into Toronto is a tour bus. The committee member mentioned liability concerns with respect to dropping off tourists at the door to a hotel or venue. The committee member indicated that the coach industry specifically avoids dropping patrons off on the opposite side of the street, and from an industry perspective a two-way Queens Quay is preferred.
- A committee member questioned how the cycling lanes will work west of Spadina.
- A number of committee members commented that the maps displayed on the walls were missing details. The committee members suggested that the Project Team provide close up maps, as well as detailed plans of intersections and cross-sections.
- One committee member commented that not all cyclists travel at the same speed, and the only place a bike can pass another bike is at an intersection.
- Another committee member brought up the concept of ecotourism, noting that tourists come to do cycling tours of Toronto, which is another aspect of the tourism market to consider.
- A committee member noted that not everyone understands the EA process and the steps forward. A member of the Project Team explained that March 25th will be the final public forum, but the Project Team is still expected to respond to all public comments and resolve concerns before the project gets filed with the Ministry of the Environment (MOE). The Environmental Study Report (ESR) will need to be approved by City Council before it goes to the MOE at the end of August. There will be a 30-day period for comments once it gets filed. The MOE will then review the EA. The Project Team will continue to work with landowners throughout the process. Detailed design will not be done until the EA is approved. The Project Team will prepare the final designs with input from stakeholders and the technical advisory committee. There is still a lot to do before construction can begin.
- Another member of the Project Team noted that it is best to provide comments in writing. The final ESR goes to Council in June / July, after which point it will be hard to get comments considered before filing with MOE.

Mr. Dilks thanked the committee members for their feedback.

4. Review and Approval of November 27th 2008 SAC Meeting Summary

Mr. Dilks noted there was one change to the previous SAC Meeting Summary, based on a written correction by a committee member. Mr. Dilks suggested that should SAC members have any other comments on the minutes, they should send their comments to Andrea Kelemen at Waterfront Toronto.

5. Next Steps and Wrap-Up

Mr. Dilks indicated that the public forum will be held on Wednesday March 25th at the Westin Harbour Castle, and the open house on Saturday March 28th at Harbourfront Centre. Mr. Glaisek indicated that Waterfront Toronto can make the maps and diagrams available to SAC members before the public forum on request.

Mr. Dilks thanked committee members for their feedback and patience, and adjourned the meeting at 8:30 pm.

Appendix A: Attendance List

Name	Organization
Committee Members	
Malcolm King	55 Harbour Square
Julie Beddoes	West Don Lands Committee
Sylvia Pellman	St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Tom Davidson	Councillor Pam McConnell's Office
David Fisher	Transit Advocate
Braz Menezes	York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA)
Jennifer Chan	Councillor Adam Vaughan's Office
Michael Gerecht	Toronto Passenger Vessel Association (TPVA)
Jill Hicks	Toronto Passenger Vessel Association (TPVA)
Ian Goodwin	Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association
Corrie Galloway	Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association
Clay McFayden	Cycling Advocate
Kelly Gorman	York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA)
Ulla Colgrass	York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA)
Bob Rasmussen	York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA)
Ann Corbitt	Premier Conference and Events
Bob Traver	Gooderham Worts Neighbourhood Association
Robert Sherrin	St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Stefan Seles	Mariposa Cruise Lines
Carl Carter	QQHBIA
Robert Zeidler	Brookfield Properties
Jeff Orlans	Brookfield Properties
Steve Munro	Transit Advocate
David White	Waterfront Action
Waterfront Toronto	
Pina Mallozzi	Waterfront Toronto
Chris Glaisek	Waterfront Toronto
Michelle Noble	Waterfront Toronto
Amanda Flude	Waterfront Toronto
Samantha Gileno	Waterfront Toronto
City of Toronto and TTC Staff	
John Kelly	City of Toronto, Transportation

Eddy Lam	City of Toronto, Planning
Bill Dawson	Toronto Transit Commission
John Piper	Mayor's Office
Consultants	
David Pratt	ARUP
John Hillier	DTAH
Brent Raymond	DTAH
Adam Nicklin	DTAH
Facilitators	
David Dilks	Lura Consulting
Patricia Halajski	Lura Consulting