



**Appendix I**  
**SAC Meeting #3 Report**





## **Queens Quay Revitalization Environmental Assessment Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #3**

***Thursday November 27, 2008 – 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.  
Waterfront Toronto, Main Boardroom***

### **Meeting Summary**

#### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto, welcomed participants to the third Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting convened as part the Queens Quay Revitalization Environmental Assessment (EA) process. Mr. Glaisek assured the committee that Waterfront Toronto and the Project Team are committed to this project and have been working diligently over the last 11 months. The Project Team has been collaborating closely with the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) and the City of Toronto, and is at a point where the alternatives that are being presented at this meeting are thought to be technically feasible. Mr. Glaisek explained that the Project Team does not yet have a preferred alternative and that the purpose of this meeting is to hear committee feedback on the presentation before it is presented to the public in a couple of weeks. Mr. Glaisek noted that in the next few months, the Project Team will do more detailed analysis of the alternatives and will meet with each of the affected landowners along Queens Quay.

A committee member expressed his disappointment with respect to how long it has taken to get to this point and meet as a full committee again. The committee member voiced the concern that the committee and the public are being left out of the process, and noted that this was not acceptable. Mr. Glaisek explained that the long wait time between committee meetings was a product of the many technical concerns that came up in relation to the various alternatives and needed to be studied. Mr. Glaisek indicated that the Project Team wanted to take the time to reach agreement internally before meeting with the committee.

David Dilks (Lura Consulting) re-introduced himself as the Neutral Facilitator for the SAC, and noted that this was the fourth meeting of the committee although it is actually referred to as meeting #3. The previous meeting was meeting #2B, which was an additional meeting prior to the first public meeting . He indicated that the Project Team is now commencing consultations as part of Phase 3 of the EA process, which involves consideration of shortlisted alternatives.

#### **2. Agenda Review and Meeting Purpose**

Mr. Dilks reviewed the meeting agenda, and indicated that committee members should have the following materials:

- Meeting #3 agenda;

- A copy of the PowerPoint presentation slides; and
- A two-page summary handout of the current status of the EA.

Mr. Dilks indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to get feedback on the work done by the Project Team over the last eleven months as well as have the committee preview and focus test the PowerPoint presentation for the upcoming public forum on December 8, 2008.

### **3. Walkthrough of Draft Public Forum Presentation**

John Hillier (DTAH) delivered the presentation to the committee on behalf of the Project Team. Committee members were provided with a handout of the presentation and asked to hold questions and comments until after the presentation in order to get a sense of its approximate length.

### **4. Discussion and Feedback**

Mr. Dilks indicated that the Project Team was looking for committee feedback on both the content of the presentation and on its appropriateness (length, level of detail, etc.) for the upcoming public forum. The following is a summary of committee comments.

- One committee member asked why the Project Team is considering leaving the streetcar tracks in the centre of the road given that there is an opportunity to move away with the problems typically associated with centre transit right-of-ways (ROW). The same committee members noted the issue of car traffic crossing in front of streetcars, referencing the current problems on Spadina Avenue, and indicated that these issues can be avoided on Queens Quay. Strong support for the south side option was expressed.
- A committee member stated that there is a lot of detail in the presentation, but that this is necessary and there is a need to go through the presentation thoroughly, as this will save time since fewer questions will be asked by the public at the end. The committee member noted that the content and quality of the presentation was very good overall.
- Another committee member commented that the ideas discussed as part of the presentation need to be presented together with background information (such as relevant traffic data) and context (such as the relationship between the revitalization of Queens Quay and the overall Central Waterfront Master Plan).
- A committee member echoed support for transit on the south side of Queens Quay. The committee member noted that the one-way street proposal was a good idea, in contrast to having only one lane in each direction. The committee member also suggested that the Project Team look at removing the centre poles in the transit ROW.
- One committee member endorsed alternatives 4 and 5 (south side transit), and indicated that the Project Team and the committee should concentrate on those two alternatives. The committee member went on to comment that the presentation is fine but more detailed explanation is required at the public forum, specifically with respect to the difference between alternative 4 and alternative 5. The same committee member indicated that members of the public may ask the Project Team about overall Central Waterfront Master Plan, as well as question what Waterfront Toronto is doing to improve general access to the area. The public may also want to know how long this EA is going

to take and what is the timetable and budget if the Project Team receives full approval to go ahead with the preferred alternative. The committee member also noted that the turning circle on slide 39 seems too small. A member of the Project Team replied that the TTC is still doing more work and can provide additional details on the turning radius in the next phase of analysis. The Project Team member noted that aspects of this study need to be aligned with other EAs being undertaken for transit to the east, and more time is needed to resolve the placement of the portal. The Project Team member noted that specific meetings will be held with stakeholders about the portal placement early in 2009.

- Another committee member asked about the budget and timeframe for the Queens Quay Revitalization EA. A member of the Project Team replied that it will have taken between 18 months to 2 years to complete the EA. The Project Team would like to go to City Council with the EA results in 2009, and from that point onward it will take about one year to do design work, and the construction likely probably begin in early 2010. The Project Team member noted that Waterfront Toronto's long-term plan was approved in September and it includes a budget for Queens Quay.
- One committee member noted that vehicular traffic should be on the north side of Queens Quay so tourists can cruise the boulevard in the summer and watch people having fun along the water, however the transit ROW in the center of the roadway will block the view.
- A committee member commented that the presentation was excellent, and represents an incredible step forward for the Project Team and the public. The committee member noted that the Project Team should consider the full experience of a pedestrian or cyclist, and provide space for all users rather than create a commuter route. The committee member praised the idea of a one-way street.
- Another committee member stated that adding the section west of Bathurst Street to the study area was a great idea, and the revitalization concept should be implemented all the way along Queens Quay to Bathurst Street.
- One committee member noted that the car parking illustrated in the PowerPoint presentation is illegal and the Project Team should make that clear in the presentation. If the Project Team wants cyclists to listen, then they need to show they are serious about keeping tour buses off Queens Quay and stopping illegal parking. The Project Team needs to establish and implement serious repercussions for bus drivers who park illegally. The committee member asked if there is a plan in place to deal with coach buses. A member of the Project Team stated that plans are still being considered, and the answer lies in street management and enforcement. The Project Team noted that this is a challenge since local hotels and businesses need to be served, and these issues will be more fully addressed in the next round of analysis and consultation.
- A committee member commented that some businesses have issues with respect to accessing south side driveways, and tour buses exiting hotels is a major issue in the area. The committee member suggested that the Project Team should show a slide or two in the presentation illustrating these complications. The Project Team agreed to show existing conditions in the presentation to illustrate the point.

- One committee member stated that bus parking should be possible in the large parking lot by HTO Park, and if this were the case, then no tour buses would ever reach Queens Quay, solving the illegal parking issue.
- Another committee member was concerned that the presentation is full of great ideas but lacks factual data about what effects and impacts will result on the local landowners. The committee member noted that in order for a landowner to make a stance or a decision about the alternatives, they require more quantitative data, traffic impact studies, levels of service studies and so forth. The committee member stated that hard data is needed to help differentiate between each alternative presented by the Project Team. A member of the Project Team indicated that the requested information will be available in the next round of analysis, and the Project Team will be meeting with all landowners individually.
- A committee member commented that the presentation was short, concise and to the point. The same committee member noted that he has requested a traffic study and is still seeking more detailed information. A member of the Project Team indicated that the request has been noted and the Project Team will provide traffic data. The Project Team member noted that a study about existing traffic conditions has already been completed. The committee member expressed concern that the Project Team was getting too far along on the design before properly integrating the traffic studies. The Project Team member stated that the Project Team was using computer models to simulate the alternatives to help visualize the impacts. The Project Team will ensure that all three options will be supported by traffic analysis, and this will be made available to the committee in the new year.
- Another committee member commented that the photos on slide 37 show the streetcar area without fencing, which would be a more attractive option in Toronto as well. The committee member also asked about the situation with respect to the underground parking garage for buses. A Project Team member indicated that underground bus parking is part of the long-term plan, and discussions are underway with respect to implementation and cost.
- A committee member was concerned that the presentation was prepared without the input of the committee, including identification of the short-listed alternatives. The committee member felt that the “do nothing” approach was misrepresented since that option does allow for some things to change as part of the regular city planning process. The committee member expressed his disappointment with the lack of a fair, open and fruitful discussion on all five alternatives. The committee member requested to know what details the committee had not seen. The committee member suggested a Central Waterfront Master Plan meeting be held with discussion about all local projects and EAs. A member of the Project Team acknowledged the comments, and stated that this project is one piece of the Waterfront Master Plan, there will be future consultations on the overall Master Plan. The Project Team member also noted that the “do nothing” alternative can be revisited if there are significant comments from the public or if Council does not support the other alternatives. The Project Team member specified that the alternatives were evaluated against the Problem and Opportunity Statement, which was developed in collaboration with the SAC.
- Another committee member stated that none of the alternatives will solve all of the problems encountered on Queens Quay. The committee member noted that bus and

servicing issues are very important. The committee member suggested that the Project Team stop looking at Queens Quay in a very linear way but rather consider the various north-south connections and how each alternative deals with these connections. The same committee member commented that the presentation was effective but it should include more examples and avoid the use of acronyms such as ROW.

- Another committee member also requested up-to-date traffic data, and suggested considering legal bus parking to drop passengers on the north side of Queens Quay to bring more people to local businesses. The committee member noted that the local Business Improvement Area (BIA) representatives wrote a letter about the issue of bus parking and made a request for a traffic study to Waterfront Toronto and are still waiting for a response. The committee member concluded by stating the “do nothing” option is not a viable option and there has been progress with respect to this EA.
- A committee member noted that there have been many discussions and too much emphasis on bike lanes and pedestrians. Toronto is a city that experiences winter and there is a need to look at Queens Quay as accessible year round destination. The committee member commented that poorly planned recreational property will only collect snow and debris in the winter and Toronto is a car based society and that nothing we do here will change this. The committee member commented that Toronto is a tourist destination and thus needs to be accessible by car, public transit and coach buses. The committee member suggested that the Project Team make access to Queens Quay easy so as to avoid any negative impacts on the businesses owners in the community. The committee member noted that buses bring people who spend money on area businesses and services.
- Another committee member commented on the bus parking issue on Queens Quay. The committee member suggested that there needs to be a commitment for underground parking facilities for buses.
- A committee member suggested that the Project Team illustrate the EA process more thoroughly as part of the presentation. The committee member also requested studies on pedestrian traffic and other sustainable modes of transportation in the area in a seasonal context. The same committee member stated that slide 12 in the presentation can be removed since it adds no real information.

Mr. Dilks thanked the committee members for their feedback.

## **5. Next Steps and Wrap-Up**

Mr. Dilks indicated that the public forum will be held on Monday December 8th at Harbourfront Community Centre, and the next SAC meeting will be held in early 2009.

A committee member requested that touching base with SAC members on a regular basis should be a key part of the consultation process, in the form of a newsletter or update email. Mr. Glaisek noted that the Project Team waited too long to hold a SAC meeting and such long periods of inactivity will not occur in the future. Mr. Glaisek then reminded the committee to provide any additional comments on the presentation and the overall process by December 6<sup>th</sup> in order to include the changes in time for the upcoming public forum.

One committee member questioned when a public forum to discuss marine-related issues will occur. A member of the Project Team stated that this particular EA is focused on Queens Quay, but there will be an opportunity to deal with the marine issues in the near future, and committed to provide an update on this at the next SAC meeting.

Mr. Dilks thanked committee members for their comments and adjourned the meeting at 8:10 pm.

## Appendix A: Attendance List

Name	Organization
<b>Committee Members</b>	
Damian Ivers	Great Lakes Schooner
Shey Clarke	Great Lakes Schooner
Malcolm King	55 Harbour Street
Patrick Harrington	Loblaw Properties
Anna Prodanou	Toronto Island Community Association (TICA)
Pam Mazza	Toronto Island Community Association (TICA)
Julie Beddoes	West Don Lands Committee
Sylvia Pellman	St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Dennis Findlay	Port Lands Action Committee and WaterfrontAction
Tom Davidson	Councillor Pam McConnell's Office
David Fisher	Transit Advocate
Dermot McKeon	Radisson Admiral
Vicki Barron	Waterfront Regeneration Trust
Braz Menezes	York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA) and QQHBIA
Stephanie Tencer	Feet on the Street
Helder Melo	Harbourfront Centre
Jen Chan	Councillor Adam Vaughan's Office
Michael Gerecht	Toronto Passenger Vessel Association (TPVA)
Kevin Currie	QQHBIA
Clay McFayden	Cycling Advocate
Kelly Gorman	York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA)
Ulla Colgrass	York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA)
<b>Waterfront Toronto</b>	
Pina Mallozzi	Waterfront Toronto
Chris Glaisek	Waterfront Toronto
Michelle Noble	Waterfront Toronto
Andrea Kelemen	Waterfront Toronto
<b>City of Toronto and TTC Staff</b>	
Jayne Naiman	Waterfront Secretariat
John Kelly	City of Toronto, Transportation
Tim Laspa	City of Toronto, Transportation
Kathy Thom	City of Toronto, Planning

Bill Dawson	Toronto Transit Commission
<b>Consultants</b>	
David Pratt	ARUP
John Hillier	DTAH
Brent Raymond	DTAH
Adam Nicklin	DTAH
Steve Willis	MMM
<b>Facilitators</b>	
David Dilks	Lura Consulting
Patricia Halajski	Lura Consulting