| Submitted On | What aspects of the economic development strategy do you find the strongest What aspects concern you if any What advice do you have if any to address those concerns | How well do you think the economic development strategy described in the MIDP aligns with Waterfront Torontos objectives and the objectives put forward in the Quayside RFP | Locating a new Google campus on Villiers Island is a significant part of the economic development strategy What advantages andor concerns do you see with this proposal | Under what conditions if any do you think the Sidewalk Labs proposal to offer upfront financing for necessary municipal infrastructure is in the public interest | How well does Sidewalk Labs proposed economic development strategy support the healthy technology ecosystem that currently exists in Toronto How can we ensure that this plan strengthens Toronto companies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/23/2019 17:55:56 | i find the longer term vision best | reasonably | no concerns and it would be useful to have google jobs in the city | i do not think sidewalk labs should offer upfront financing I think the city should do this | i do not think we have a healthy technology ecosystem in toronto. I think this question is biased |
| 07/24/2019 13:46:15 | | | Google does not act or have any reason to act in Toronto and Torontonians' best interests. | | It literally does not in any ways strengthen Toronto companies. It hands a hugely valuable chunk of resources over to a morally dubious American company. |
| 07/24/2019 22:36:20 | Urban Innovation Institute excite me. Nothing concerns me. | Completely aligned. Probably exceeds the RFP vision. | Fair land exchange is the only concern. Advantage is the ability to attract additional investment and make sure Villiers Island is not a bedroom community. | Nothing wrong with offering it. But let's do it without that help. | Very well. |
| 07/25/2019 14:17:45 | No comments | No comments | No comments | Potential for Government revenues to increase but also a risk for revenues to be reduced. | No comments |
| 07/26/2019 23:13:23 | G | N | M | O | H |
| 07/27/2019 11:54:32 | The leveraging of future development charges and property tax increases is a rational economic model for development of a highly underutilized part of the city. Cooperating with Sidewalk Labs to clarify these ideas would be a great role for Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto to take on. Creating such a model could then be used elsewhere in the city where it is needed. | Above I read a lot of concerns about "risk" in Waterfront Toronto's responses. These should be put in context: the much bigger risk is in nibbling this innovative proposal to death with timid quibbles, and failing in the end to get the benefits of this plan. | No concerns. Google/Alphabet is one of the most innovative companies on the planet. Getting this campus in Toronto has to viewed as a huge win for the people of Ontario in terms of future job prospects and auxiliary benefits. | Totally in the public interest. Toronto has underfunded municipal infrastructure for decades now and it shows. Increasing infrastructure with partners is totally the way to go. | Have you ever heard of Silicon Valley? Highly successful tech companies spin off hundreds or thousands of new startups. The best way this plan could be improved for Toronto is if the city and/or province created a tax-advantedged hightech investment fund, administered by Silicon valley execs rather than risk adverse Canadian bankers. I've had personal experience with many Toronto area high tech startups that had to move to the States to get funding. Leverage the Sidewalk Labs/Google investment to make Toronto into Silicon Valley North! |
| 07/29/2019 18:58:45 | It needs to be clarified and fully fleshed out where the money is coming from, where it is going to and how it will be supported in the future, who owns what, etc. | Not well but it's hard to tell for sure because I haven't seen either in full detail1 | What this was? I didn't see this until I got to this question! Which is an obvious ISSUE because what else has not been told or addressed?!  I am concerned because I have no idea what this 'Google Campus' is. I need more information. But NO data collection! | I am hesitant because this offer is going to expect some sort of return from us and I'm afraid to see what that is. I need to know what their end game is. What do they want in exchange to offer this upfront funding? It cannot be allowed to outweigh the benefits of receiving this money either financially or through control, etc. | This section needs to work with the rest of the city not as a separate entity. If done properly, it can help spur better change across the whole city. Need to help strengthen Toronto companies? Why don't you start by asking them what they need? Then push their suggestions back to public, to see if what they want is reasonable or feasible. |
| 07/30/2019 10:39:53 | | | This will add to our being the fastest growing tech hub in North America. Also compliments with East Harbour | We need the lawyers to figure this out. We can look at p3 for sure. I don't care anymore who pays just get this done. I think the City learned its lesson with MFP financing. | This will not be a detractor. |
| 07/30/2019 12:04:51 | If we are going to urbanize more and more of Toronto and make it denser, I think we should counterbalance that with expansion natural areas along the water's edge. It is a matter of public health, well being and sanity. Leave people a refuge that's close enough to reach easily. | It doesn't, does it? | We should tell Google to go away. | If Sidewalk Labs wants to invest its capital in Toronto, that's fine. Financial planners can advise them about many ways that others do just that ... maybe in the stock or bond markets. | I have no idea. |
| 07/30/2019 15:26:31 | The idea of an urban innovation cluster is appealing. However, Sidewalk Labs and Google should be providing far more funding and leadership for this initiative. The notion of funding other Portlands development in exchange for future fees is not appealing. | No comment | The advantages would be that the campus would bring a large number of other tech companies to the area, with a virtuous cycle being created in terms of future developments, including new employment opportunities for Canadian tech graduates. The concern is that it become a bit of a US branch plant economy, with little opportunity for small Canadian companies and new workers. | None. | As noted above, this could be tricky. I think it could be positive, but I don't know that you can put restraints on who could come to the area or who Google could choose to work with. There are current government tax incentives and grants that help to foster the tech sector, so a review of those and how they could be applied here (agencies such as Ontario Creates should be involved). |
| 07/30/2019 22:04:46 | Land value uplift should be permanently captured by government by owning all the land. | Aligned but contrary to public benefit. | Tech campuses need to be heavily regulated: unions, minimum wage, diversity requirements. | When it comes from taxation or regulatory fines. | Ditch VC model.  Provide financing for worker owned cooperatives similar to the Chantier de l'Economie Sociale in Quebec. |
| 07/31/2019 0:37:33 | Google HQ + Innovation HUb + investment in a tall timber factory.  I also believe that the investment in the LRT and enhanced infrastructure make sense, if the private sector is not able to finance these elements in a timely way. | Very well | This is a generally a very positive idea. Huge number of good jobs.  Potential for very significant benefits to Toronto tech companies. Continues to strengthen Toronto's global draw as a tech centre.  Throughout the precinct planning process for Villiers Island there was a sense that  catalytic use needed to be attracted and that space for such a use should be preserved.  The Google HQ is entirely consistent with this idea - although it may result in the residential-commercial mix shifting and the need to ensure that there is either increased residential on Villiers (more density) or more residential planned for adjacent precincts in order to ensure a critical mass of residential. | If the public sector is not able/willing to fund the infrastructure in a timely way.  If the business case makes sense in terms of the cost/benefits.  If the risk of future economic downturn can be largely shifted to SWL. | We can make partnership with Toronto companies a condition of the agreement. Is there a way to ensure that at least half of the work that is contracted out goes to Toronto based companies, or other measures of local collaboration?  There should also be a strong community benefits program that ensures hiring and support for representatives of marginalized communities. |
| 07/31/2019 11:33:02 | We can't take any of the claims of economic development at face value. They are not transparent about the methods. This is a best case scenario. What is the worst case? | Aligns well! But this is prime real estate in one of the fastest growing cities in NA. Why do we think we need google to move to the waterfront to catalyze a cluster. We have great institutions already trying to relocate to the waterfront. | this is prime real estate in one of the fastest growing cities in NA. Why do we need google to move to the waterfront to catalyze a cluster. We have great institutions already trying to relocate to the waterfront. | im dubious. We can get debt financing from other places. | does anyone in the technology ecosystem think this will be a boon for them? Im curious! |
| 07/31/2019 13:48:30 | | | The word "campus" is a red flag applicable to the suburbs of the San Francisco but not to a vibrant urban community in downtown Toronto. A google office building should be of a small scale, say the size of the Corus building. It should be one of a number of similar sized or smaller commercial buildings on Villiers Island tenanted or owned by a wide variety of commercial interests. Diversity is our strength. | If they buy government bonds on the market. | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 19:49:26 | | | Sidewalk Labs has repeatedly stated that they are "not Google" in the media in order to alleviate concerns that Google incredibly poor reputation for privacy, security, and secretive business practices would impact Sidewalk (https://www.citylab.com/design/2018/09/how-smart-should-a-city-be-toronto-is-finding-out/569116/), and yet here they argue they have the power to bring Google to Toronto. This seems like a substantially mixed message. Let's be more honest here — Sidewalk Labs IS Google and they are using this new Google HQ as a bargaining chip<br>My biggest concern with integrating Google HQ with Sidewalk is that this would create a direct gateway for Google through to consumer data, the urban environment, the private realm, and GOVERNANCE within the IDEA district and potentially the rest of the city, rather than our actual partner (who I presume our contracts would be with) Sidewalk Labs, giving Google power and authority that they were never supposed to have.<br>It also seems like a power-play bargaining chip. It's clear a Google HQ in Toronto, would be advantageous for Google, here it feels like Sidewalk Labs is holding this over Torontonians heads—"build our city and our government and give up your privacy or else we won't bring Google to Canada"? | | |
| 07/31/2019 19:49:53 | | | Sidewalk Labs has repeatedly stated that they are "not Google" in the media in order to alleviate concerns that Google incredibly poor reputation for privacy, security, and secretive business practices would impact Sidewalk (https://www.citylab.com/design/2018/09/how-smart-should-a-city-be-toronto-is-finding-out/569116/), and yet here they argue they have the power to bring Google to Toronto. This seems like a substantially mixed message. Let's be more honest here — Sidewalk Labs IS Google and they are using this new Google HQ as a bargaining chip<br>My biggest concern with integrating Google HQ with Sidewalk is that this would create a direct gateway for Google through to consumer data, the urban environment, the private realm, and GOVERNANCE within the IDEA district and potentially the rest of the city, rather than our actual partner (who I presume our contracts would be with) Sidewalk Labs, giving Google power and authority that they were never supposed to have.<br>It also seems like a power-play bargaining chip. It's clear a Google HQ in Toronto, would be advantageous for Google, here it feels like Sidewalk Labs is holding this over Torontonians heads—"build our city and our government and give up your privacy or else we won't bring Google to Canada"? | —Sidewalk Labs is already asking for a lot of control over our city, we should question whether they should be given financial control as well and how this may be abused<br>—It seems like this is a one-sided marketing proposition. SWL gets to say they are funding public transit, yet they are only offering a market rate loan to be repaid with interest. Seems like we are doing them a favour, offering them guaranteed income, yet they are reaping the good PR and improving their brand image under misleading marketing | —SWL proposed seed funding is incredibly small given the scope of their proposed technologies and development |
| 07/31/2019 23:16:47 | The STOA is highly innovative. | Great fit. | Phenomenal opportunity. | Smart idea. | Keep the conversations going. |
| 08/01/2019 7:07:26 | Economic Impact Analysis' are notoriously nonsense. There are so many assumptions made that basing any evaluation on the economic outcomes is rather bunk, particularly when determining public sector outcomes. SwL makes big claims about public tax revenue (6x the revenue of baseline!) but I am unclear how they got there. This needs to be aggressively evaluated, and assumptions explicitly called out. Much of this seems to be contingent on accelerated development.<br><br>This pitch is obviously making governments salivate, but I am doubting the reality of these claims. | | | This will set a terrible precedent. I am also unconvinced that the additional public tax revenue generated would offset the cost, as SwL claims.<br><br>One potential condition for this would be SwL financing at no-cost - but, even so, I think I disagree. If Toronto, and Ontario, and Canada wants better public transit, we should pay for it, or we will be locked into a cycle where we are begging private sector to build things that should be our responsibility. | |
| 08/01/2019 14:13:21 | The amount of non residential space is encouraging by itself for economic development. The site should attract an innovation cluster along with all the other sites including East Harbour and East Bayfront etc. | Generally , yes | A New Google Campus would be a big plus for the City. Assuming it's on the Villiers Island site is not automatic. Lots of work will need to be done to land on that site without a competitive process. | The actual detail of how much money is required up front and when it will be repaid and under what conditions will be where the deal will or will not be successful. It should work but there will lots of discussion about risks and who takes them. | ITs complementary and similar to many other new projects on the go. |
| 08/01/2019 18:31:04 | The strongest element is the commitment to move Google Canada's head office. This would create a critical mass that would attract other businesses and talent.<br><br>Securing government and municipal funding is the major concern. These are good ideas that could be submerged by politics and bureaucracy. This is a far greater risk than any concerns about data. | Very well - in fact Sidewalk Labs' proposals seem to have gone above and beyond Waterfront Toronto's objectives. | This is a significant commitment to the project and to Toronto. It would create a critical mass that would get Quayside off to a great start and that would attract other businesses and talented people. I see no downside - in fact this is a critical success factor. | It's entirely in the public interest; in fact it's a generous offer. It's not Sidewalk Labs' role to promote job creation and business formation in Toronto - yet they have demonstrated their commitment to the city and the Quayside project by providing upfront funding. | The proposals support the existing and growing tech sector in providing additional space and by providing an innovative. "world class" place to live and work. Tech companies in Toronto are already discovering there is a shortage of attractive and affordable working spaces. Quayside offers a solution with the attraction of proximity to Google Canada - plus an attractive district (on the water) where people from Toronto and outside will want to live and work.<br><br>Some coordination between the existing eco-system (perhaps as represented by the accelerators/incubators (like Ryerson's DMZ and OneEleven) and major investors (like OMERS Ventures) would be beneficial to make sure Quayside complements what exists today - but it's not a major concern. |
| | | | | | |
| Submitted before the deadline: | 17 | | | | |
| Submitted after the deadline: | 3 | | | | |
| Total | 20 | | | | |

| Submitted On | How receptive are you to exploring this proposal from Sidewalk Labs | Why | What do you see as the risks with Sidewalk Labs Economic Development Proposals | Under what conditions if any would you want to see Waterfront Toronto pursue these proposals further |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/16/2019 10:16:10 | Receptive | | | |
| 07/16/2019 17:51:09 | Not receptive | I don't feel the Canadian government should be funding a for-profit venture from google | It feels like google is playing by their own rules already. Let them comply with the original City proposal. | See above. I feel there should be outreach to other vendors |
| 07/19/2019 11:30:30 | Receptive | It is necessary to understand if the project will be sustainable in economic aspects. | The risks are the project become possible just for a segment of the society already privileged in terms of opportunity. It will depend on how inclusive the project will be. | If the revenues to the public government will be reverted to the rest of the society by providing more public and high quality services, it would be interesting going further. Otherwise, we would just be handing in our rights and freedoms to the private sector to manage. |
| 07/19/2019 14:21:42 | Not receptive | Sidewalk labs is not to be trusted. again read the doucments, looka the experts "Cavoukian's departure comes weeks after TechGirls Canada founder Saadia Muzaffar left her role on the advisory panel. Muzaffar said she had "profound concerns" about apparent "a lack of leadership regarding shaky public trust" and what she considered unacceptable questions around privacy and intellectual property. " | The Quayside project, announced last October by Waterfront TO, has proved a lightning rod for criticisms from digital privacy advocates, who have argued that Sidewalk Labs has not been forthcoming enough about what data might be used for.<br><br>Cavoukian said she hopes her resignation will spark a wider discussion about the project can be built while ensuring that privacy is protected. | none. GET RID OF SIDEWALK LABS NOW. NO CCTV surveillance area,no thanks! THats not fun! |
| 07/19/2019 17:10:32 | Not receptive | Public-private partnerships are almost exclusively disastrous. They ultimately cost more to the city than would fully funding the projects in the first place. The only reason to even consider them is to avoid having to raise taxes on this city's pathetically tax-averse populace, but since that is required in the plan anyways, there is less than no reason to degrade ourselves by considering one. | As if it wasn't enough that we're considering giving Google our rights and our land, they're floating the idea of giving them our money too. | None |
| 07/19/2019 23:00:41 | Receptive to some | Property taxes should be raised on those who choose to live there, not by anybody else. In addition, the acceleration of the port lands is a nice-to-have not something exigent so it should not warrant that much consideration into giving a giant company like google's sidewalk labs more funds from the city when we could use that money towards higher priority neighbourhoods where more marginalized populations live (because we both know that quayside is not going to be that neighbourhood) | Too much innovation funding that depends on google, not enough diversification to ensure that google doesn't have some unwarranted edge over other tech companies. We as a city should no be a slave to google | There are clear regulations on diversification of innovation funding. We must think long term about how this seed funding will affect future funding, emerging companies, and talent in a decade and beyond |
| 07/22/2019 4:05:21 | Not receptive | I am very concerned about Sidewalk Labs' arbitrary expansion of the original request for proposal. This is a very young (created 2015) company with no record of a large development project. Except for its ties to Google, it would not be considered for a project of this importance and magnitude. It's unclear why Waterfront Toronto would grant Google a prime spot for its headquarters when Quayside was agreed upon as the original location. Any changes should be the subject of public debate. | The $10 million investment in the Urban Innovation Institute is laughably small. There is a strong risk that this Institute would be dependent upon public funds for its ongoing operation. | More information should be made available about the supposed benefits of Google's Canadian headquarters being relocated to Villiers Island. Google states that 2,500 employees could work there, but that's subject to business and economic conditions. Is Google overstating the possible economic benefits of its presence there? The Urban Innovation Institute is highly vulnerable to a disruption in funding. |
| 07/22/2019 16:54:38 | Receptive to some | Toronto already has innovation happening all over the place, why do we need a specific cluster? Is this cluster going to allow for competition or only be Google focused?<br><br>By the focus on technology I wonder if its a lure to get the top Toronto talent to give their innovations to Google so they can potentially gain a monopoly?<br><br>I am all for more public transportation though! | The money - who exactly is paying for all this innovation? Innovation is an exciting and fun word but what exactly is going to be the long term outcome here? | A good records manager / Toronto archives / Toronto open data tracking the long term trends and results.<br><br>Actual finances that make sense. Respecting the City of Toronto's long term vision. |
| 07/23/2019 16:46:53 | Receptive | I think this is a great pilot opportunity and will inspire economic growth | none, I believe there will be interest in investment | |
| 07/23/2019 17:53:54 | Receptive | i am interested in new economic models for sustainable development | the city needs to be clear exactly what the deal is and do not give away too much including land and intellectual property rights | as above |
| 07/24/2019 13:44:23 | Not receptive | I don't think a private corporation should be involved in this. | This huge chunk of funding could make a great difference for existing, local nonprofits. It is not appropriate or moral to hand this money over to Sidewalk Labs. | I do not want Waterfront Toronto to pursue these proposals further. |
| 07/24/2019 22:33:56 | Receptive | We could be the centre of "urban tech". A brand new home grown industry. | No risks as long as public subsidies are not required. | No public subsidy for the Google HQ. |
| 07/25/2019 9:20:09 | Receptive | Toronto will benefit greatly fro an Urban Innovation Innovation cluster and institute will create jobs and move us into a leadership position on the world stage. | no risks | |
| 07/25/2019 14:13:28 | Receptive | Support the principle of creating an urban innovation cluster. | Risk that Government revenues could also be reduced under the alternative financing option. | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/25/2019 17:08:57 | Not receptive | Innovation for whom? Will the jobs that are being created on the waterfront be geared towards all Torontonians? Silicon Valley has a terrible track record at hiring equity seeking groups, including women, racialized groups and the LGBTQ community. Secondly, are these jobs good jobs? How many will be full time and how many will be short term, 3 month contracts? | n/a | n/a |
| 07/25/2019 22:29:28 | Receptive | | | |
| 07/26/2019 10:09:36 | Not receptive | Again, why should we allow a NON-ELECTED corporate body to re-engineer our plans and financing model for this large portion of public (and, to push further, Indigenous) land? Why should we believe that Sidewalk Labs will not extract all the profit they can from the land and information circulating on that land? It is imperative to look at other examples worldwide to understand the risks involved. | Redirecting revenue that should go back to the city to pay Sidewalk Labs. | No conditions |
| 07/26/2019 11:00:20 | Receptive | It's an exciting proposal for the city, province and country to be involved in, so who wouldn't be receptive? Did I just say that? This is Toronto after all! Nothing gets done with any urgency it seems -just look at transit. Or Olympic proposals. Some people are always opposed to big ideas. | I don't see any risks to Toronto except maybe to Sidewalk Labs. of course this means Sidewalk can't do anything it wants but has to stick to an agreed upon proposal.I would not set down any | I would not set down any proposals out of hand just because a few people are strongly opposed. IF those people have an open mind they will listen to common sense solutions to their objections. If they won't listen, then buy them some sand to stick their head into and then get on with it. |
| 07/26/2019 18:54:15 | Not receptive | IP and data driven economies are extractive which is why the tech industry is currently dealing with winner-take-all economics. The notion that Sidewalk is coming to Toronto to help advance Canadian economy when Google's own Canadian branch plants currently take out 3 billion out of our economy is a joke. This economic development plan asks us to suspend our belief in innovation economics. Also, there is no mention of Canadian scale ups in the MIDP. Yet those are the companies that contribute the most to our innovation outputs. | Major erosion of our prosperity and gutting of our innovation sector. | None. Waterfront Toronto needs to work with domestic technology companies to build our own economy. |
| 07/26/2019 23:13:06 | | J | J | |
| 07/27/2019 9:34:18 | Not receptive | They seem to be asking for a lot but giving very little up front. They want to give as a little as possible while taking as much as they can. And making the government repay them? Not good. I'm very suspicious. | Holding future governments hostage to what could be a bad deal for the city (but a great one for the shareholders of google). | Nope. Find another way. |
| 07/27/2019 10:15:48 | Receptive | The urban innovation cluster concept is a tremendous opportunity for incubation of ideas for Toronto | Transit funding and figuring out who pays the right amount for that to actually get it built is absolutely critical to having this neighbourhood develop. | With government and public consultation in mind.  We need to move forward. What good is leaving things the way they are as that area needs a massive makeover that could benefit all of Toronto. |
| 07/27/2019 11:43:46 | Receptive | The proposed mix of public-private funding, through increased tax revenues due to increased development, is a great idea being used extensively outside of Canada. It's time to catch up to the rest of the world and give this a try.

Furthermore, the longer term benefits of the all cross-laminated wood construction to Toronto and to Ontario could be very large. Increasing value added to our forestry industry and reducing $CO_2$ from steel and concrete is an environmental benefit that will become more popular in the coming decade. Positioning Toronto as a leader in this industry will have large economic as well as environmental benefits. | As above, that timidity and lack of imagination in our political/administrative elites will suppress a worthwhile and innovative proposal. | They definitely should be pursued. Clarity on development charges, incremental property tax and incremental land value should be sought, and the possibility of bond proposals whose future payments would come from such charges and taxes should be used to support the project. Ask private bond rating companies to evaluate the risks involved in this, rather than highly risk-adverse city officials. |
| 07/29/2019 11:26:26 | Receptive to some | Pieces sound good, but this just seems like again an incremental approach that will have the net result of a large corporation getting a sweetheart deal / way to launder their image at largely public ongoing cost.

Claims such as: "Sidewalk Labs has indicated that these initiatives, together with the Google Canadian Headquarters, could create the foundations for an urban innovation cluster" seem to reify the benefit of SL / Alphabet in ways that continue to externalize the costs of them doing business here. | - Funding and development timelines are too ambitious
- SL misrepresents commitment
- City of Toronto caught out in an untenable position around financing
- SL / Google allowed to capture "benefit" while externalizing "cost" | Stronger framework for holding SL to account for the statements they make. |
| 07/29/2019 18:46:11 | Need more information | Details are vague | Need more info | Need more info |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/29/2019 18:52:38 | Not receptive | They want to fund their project, they fund it themselves. No exceptions. Tax money is for the people not for a private company with big dreams. There is a 'promise' that they would provide money that would be larger than government funding. If that is true then they can fund it themselves because clearly they'd be making it all back anyways. There is also no sold plan on how the non-profit would continue independently without government or their own bailout.<br><br>And I didn't see it here, but if it is true (saw this in a newspaper), they should not be allowed to become part of a new level of government. Private companies do NOT have the right to come in and start running the city, the province nor the country! If they requested it - the answer is no! Our country is not theirs to have nor is any part of it. | It is very unclear where Sidewalk Labs starts and our government begins. Which is ours and which is theirs' in this proposal? Ownership, control, responsibility needs to be made very clear. In fact, more details and more clarity is needed for all of this.<br><br>Funding is also a big issue. It has not been properly planned out and rides on huge government support which from what I can understand is not deserving. | I need more information. I also need to feel like they are not invading us through this proposal. They make big demands with little to offer in return. |
| 07/29/2019 21:44:31 | Receptive | I am hugely supportive of an urban innovation cluster. It is easy to see that the Canadian economy for many decades has been largely dependent on oil & gas, and since 2015, our economy has paid the price for this dependence. I think that diversifying (and potentially trailblazing)  in to the field of tech and artificial intelligence is a smart move not just for our city, but our country.<br><br>There are a lot of cities around the world that are competing for the computer science grads coming out of university, and with such strong academic institutions in Toronto, it would be a crying shame if we experienced brain drain to cities like NYC, London, Melbourne etc. because they beat us to the urban innovation cluster. | Delays in getting this Urban Innovation Cluster formed. In this fast paced tech sector, it's all about who's first to market, and this is very true for cities also looking to establish themselves as the most desirable place to live/work. I fear that if we take too long to get this going, a city like Austin would beat us to it, and we would have invested all that money for nothing. | Under less conditions. Let's just build already. |
| 07/29/2019 21:49:18 | Not receptive | Sidewalk should receive less return than government for financing since they stand to be biggest beneficiary | | Google upfronts entire LRT cost as a no-interest loan to city. |
| 07/30/2019 7:55:01 | Not receptive | A paltry 10M is laughable. Especially when we consider how much we're going to have to fork over for public transit. Will google be collecting data from the transit the public builds?<br><br>Also it's the height of arrogance for sidewalk to essentially say they're the only way we're going to be able to develop the area. It's highly sought after real estate. | Everything. They aren't acting in good faith at all and Waterfront TO should turn them down. Also tying ourselves further to google by taking a loan from them to build the transit they want  is the worst idea I've ever heard. | No conditions at this stage in the game. Sidewalk shouldn't be worked with. |
| 07/30/2019 10:08:44 | Receptive | It sounds like they want to get a project done without the many years of bureaucratic time it would take for the city to do it alone.  Let's face it nothings going to be built without them.  It also sounds like there's a risk to starting a business district just like there's risk to starting any business. | I honestly believe that the only real risk is not proceeding with this project and allowing Toronto to stay in the 20th century. | Please proceed with SWL. Cmon guys. |
| 07/30/2019 10:37:46 | Receptive to some | Urban Innovation hub would be a great compliment to MaRS | Seed money needs to be increased for both ideas | More info. Long term commitment from Sidewalk |
| 07/30/2019 11:55:42 | Not receptive | Economic development gave us the west side of the waterfront ... a crowded, noisy, expensive stack of glass towers. It is not a good basis for planning. | I see the risk of looking backwards to plan for the future. Or rather, the selling of the future with promises of outdated benefits. Jobs are an example. Income distribution is already not job-dependent for a big part of our population. This will probably be true for more and more of us, as software and robotics take holds on former employment opportunities. | No conditions. We should so No. |
| 07/30/2019 12:27:23 | Receptive | If we have a financial certainty from them and the risk is minor , what is it to loose | To be in the hook for money and not able to complete the project and tax payers paying for nothin | Financial certainty |
| 07/30/2019 14:08:50 | Receptive | I feel that with effective negotiation and management the potential rewards could outweigh the potential risks. | Required public investment not adequately rewarded relative to Sidewalk's financial gain. I assume that the negotiations include evaluation of competently prepared business plans relative to a range of possible scenarios. | Deal deeds to be properly balanced, and to include mechanisms for adjustment based on performance. |

| Date/Time | Receptiveness | Comment 1 | Comment 2 | Comment 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/30/2019 15:05:28 | Receptive to some | As many tech companies do, Sidewalk Labs is pushing for timelines and developments beyond the scope of what is currently being approved by our governments. While I agree that a shorter timeline would be good for the development of the Portlands, that development must be undertaken within the context of our current democratic governments. Who ultimately is in charge and accountable to the public - I do no want that entity to be Sidewalk Labs. | Giving Sidewalk Labs the control of any development in the Portlands. | with a clear understanding of the role of Waterfront Toronto and all levels of government, with a subsidiary role for Sidewalk Labs. |
| 07/30/2019 15:18:14 | Not receptive | I agree with WT's early thinking on risks. | Who benefits? Is this the best use of our public land resources? Who is in control of this process? WT is meant to be a more active partner but is now playing the role of "reviewer"? | |
| 07/30/2019 16:06:14 | Need more information | Why does everyone assume that 'innovation' is always a positive thing? The atomic bomb was certainly innovative. What does 'Urban Innovation' mean? Can you give me some concrete examples of urban innovation or research areas? | As you say the financing is out of their control. Toronto and Ontario cannot even agree on how subways should be built. Who is to decide what innovation areas are to be considered. I'm sure Sidewalk Labs will say any and all. | Take your time. Technologists hate this. One of the biggest problems around technology is that it moves faster than the regulators can keep up with it. Thereby creating unregulated space that technologists will fight for tooth and nail. Just look at how much Google spends on Lobbyists and Lawyers. Take your time and do research around different types of financing, don't trust Sidewalk Labs. |
| 07/30/2019 21:59:12 | Not receptive | Aggressive timeline is pie in the sky.<br><br>Another VC fund is not needed, there are too many already.<br><br>Financing should be achieved through municipal bonds. | Private gain, public risk. | None |
| 07/31/2019 0:03:47 | Receptive | It would be valuable for Toronto to have a multi-sector and post-secondary unified urban institute and a fund (albeit small). However a 10m seed fund would need to be augmented.<br><br>The proposals around P3 funding are worth exploring. We need to build out infrastructure on the waterfront if the potential is to be realized and governments are not jumping into the opportunity. | As long as a data trust is established and IP generation by all players supported it is a viable plan.<br>Risks are that the revenue streams are less than predicted. | Sidewalk should be encouraged to make a larger investment. It is also important, given the concerns around Google, data protection and the need to develop Canadian companies that there be complete IP independence for companies and collaborators. |
| 07/31/2019 0:25:28 | Receptive | I think the proposal is both responsive to the WT RFP and to the original vision of a tech cluster set out by Robert Fung. Structured properly, I see this as an important opportunity to advance the Canadian tech sector and advance Toronto/Ontario as a leader in urban innovation. This is critical time when we are grappling with a global climate change crisis, a local housing affordability crisis and a transforming economy. This could be a catalytic opportunity for Toronto | There has to be a sound and sensible business plan that ensures that Toronto will benefit in the long run. Who bears the risk if there there is an economic downturn is an important consideration. That risk should be shifted to the private sector (SWL and partners) as much as possible. We also need to ensure that social equity and affordability in the IDEA District neighbourhoods are protected so we do not experience the adverse economic consequences of FAANG HQ locations that have been experienced in the US. We need to seriously learn from those experiences. | Waterfront Toronto, not SWL, leads the development at all stages. The business deal is peer reviewed extensively to ensure that this is demonstrably a good deal for Toronto. Some kind of phasing is implemented by which SWL must demonstrate a certain level of success in Quayside before getting access to Villers West. A clear commitment to ensuring at at least 50% of SWL partnerships are Canadian and particularly Toronto-based companies. A better than 10% sharing in revenues from Toronto based patents/IP. Commitment to a strong community benefits program for construction and long term operation of Quayside properties, the Google HQ and the Innovation Hub. |
| 07/31/2019 7:49:04 | Need more information | | Meeting the assumed greater public investment in infrastructure will presumably take money away from other planned municipal infrastructure projects. Public transit in the city is in dire need of improvement; should this area be given priority over projects and neighbourhoods that have been waiting a long time already for action? | |
| 07/31/2019 9:47:03 | Receptive | Continuing to line our waterfront with concrete factories is a shame. Exploring expansion into this region is inevitable. Will it happen now or 40 years from now? That's all up to us. | "If you build it, will they come?" Assuming that other tech companies will want to locate themselves on the waterfront in a mixed-use community that is accessible to the city is a fair assumption. As a leader in the innovation sector, and CEO of Canada's largest startup career hub, I believe strongly that growing innovation companies will see this as a vibrant place to build their business and a massive value-add to attracting talent within and to the city.<br><br>Big risk -- Assuming the concrete factory owners want to give over this land for development. They should, but there might be resistance that prevents the expansion from happening. | The conditions are clear now. As a life-long Torontonian and a proud national leader in our country's innovation economy, I believe that this proposal is a cornerstone to Toronto and Waterloo's ranking as one of the world's top innovation superclusters. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 11:06:09 | Receptive | This infusion of cash will start to get things done. Please get moving. I don't like the idea of Sidewalk getting tax money. | Seems to me that the Waterfront Toronto people are to secure all collaborative funding. They must get the best deal. | |
| 07/31/2019 11:29:04 | Need more information | SWL claims the project would have seven times the economic impact projected to occur by that time under more traditional development in the area – SWL's proposal to a baseline of whats proposed under current plans and zoning. but SWL will need new zoning. so why isn't the null hypothesis/baseline here "some other developer building at the same density as SWL. | Can SWL deliver? They are a relatively new firm who have never done anything like this before<br>How do we account for Alphabet/ Google past behaviour? In March, Google was hit by a 1.5 billion euro fine for anti-competitive behaviour by the European Union, on top of a 4.3 billion euro fine last year and a 2.4 billion euro fine the year before that. | would need to see a more accurate Economic modelling numbers to evaluate their claim. And then decide if it's worth selling the land at a loss. |
| 07/31/2019 11:47:53 | Receptive to some | Seems risky in relation to finding the funding. | See above. | A real commitment from provincial/federal governments. |
| 07/31/2019 13:40:26 | Need more information | As WT has already indicated, the seed money of $20 million is pretty modest. Is this what the industry needs? Would it duplicate MARS? WT should consult with the wider Tech community including small participants to find out what is needed not leave it to Google and it's subsidiaries to decide. | If Google-SWL has money to lend, they can buy the Canadian, Ontario and City of Toronto bonds at the low interest rates that they yield. The "partnership" that has been discussed is more akin to Google-SWL acquiring shares in the waterfront development project. In this latter model the shareholder would exert some measure of control maybe even leading to a hostile takeover.<br><br>If WT needs capital funds to proceed with vacuumed garbage and recyclables and district heating they need to try harder to get other orders of government to back them. WT has already been successful in getting financial support from the provincial and federal governments for the flood protection project. This project also entails risk in that there is no certainty that the investment will result in the anticipated real estate development that flood protection makes possible.<br><br>Development is already proceeding east along QQ without an LRT and notwithstanding SWL's assertions will probably continue to do so. Indeed WT is already assuming Villiers Island can go ahead with BRT in a dedicated ROW. No doubt Quayside can also proceed with ordinary bus and later BRT technology. LRT | If financed under the usual capital funding process that the city uses elsewhere |
| 07/31/2019 17:19:44 | Receptive to some | United Way Greater Toronto appreciates Sidewalk's commitment to including jobs and community benefits in this MIDP. We want to again endorse the community benefits commitment that 10% of construction hours would be targeted to low income and racialized youth, women, and Indigenous people. | | |
| 07/31/2019 19:07:40 | Receptive | I think the components of this proposal for economic development are great. The Urban Innovation Cluster would be a great opportunity to allow Toronto to become an innovative leader. | | |
| 07/31/2019 19:49:24 | Not receptive | Asking for greater public investment in order for the success of the project sounds like shifting responsibility for the success of the development to the city rather than SWL sticking within the parameters of the proposal and taking responsibility for their development. | | |
| 07/31/2019 19:58:47 | Receptive | I think they have a lot to bring to the table | I think with money upfront to reduce costs, risks of advancing the project is mitigated. I also think there will be interest from philanthropic investors and I also think Toronto residents would be fine with a slight tax if it means bringing such an unique opportunity to our city and being able to showcase us a leading city. | I think this is a great opportunity to pursue |
| 07/31/2019 23:14:58 | Receptive | Toronto needs this! | City Hall slowing this down. | Just do it. |
| 07/31/2019 23:22:03 | Receptive to some | I would like a greater explanation on how the LRT will be built (ie. P3) as well as who will own and operate it. Will it be integrated with the TTC? I would also like to know more details about its costs and how it would be funded and repaid. | It is unclear what the space will be for businesses there to be contributing from the taxes they pay on their profits. Who will have access to urban innovation clusters? Will there be a way for local and Canadian talent to access it? | The city is hurting for LRT infrastructure in low-income, marginalized areas. Privileging the construction of an LRT here looks bad. There needs to be an upfront discussion about the costs of an LRT and how it will be repaid. You also need to explain what level of access local and Canadian businesses will have to the urban innovation cluster. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 08/01/2019 6:51:37 | | This whole proposal is framed as an economic development exercise. SwL promises "tech innovation cluster", and op-ed after op-ed from the City's elite frame this as too-good-to-be-true opportunity to generate enlightened prosperity for the City.<br><br>The framing is bullshit. Toronto's economy is thriving. There is literally no NEED for any economic development boost for the City. Moreover, it is the booming nature of the City that is causing and exposing many of the challenges we are facing. There may be other great reasons to support the proposal, but it seems economic development is a strange one. | I'm glad to see the risks Waterfront Toronto has identified - I agree with those. | Sure, nothing wrong with the private investments in venture fund or institute, just dont think they should form the basis for supporting the proposal. $20 million is so unbelievably tiny a contribution. SwL is not needed for these at all. |
| 08/01/2019 14:05:05 | Receptive to some | I agree with the WT cautions. $10 million is just a downpayment on a much larger investment and it dulplicates similar proposals and projects elsewhere | Up-fronting the capital requirements for municipal infrastructure is a reasonable proposal and there are precedents for this. And while it is a risk , the City's future success in generating revenues from development is makes such a scheme worth exploring. | The devil will be in the details and in the skill all parties need to have in devising a reasonable scheme |
| 08/01/2019 18:18:02 | Receptive | Sidewalk Labs proposed urban innovation cluster could position Toronto as a leader in this space (which is only going to be more important as cities around the world deal with congestion, pollution and aging infrastructure).  It would create jobs and attract talent to the city.<br><br>Waterfront Toronto describes Sidewalk Labs' initial investment as "relatively modest".  But I suspect that doesn't account for the commitment to move Google Canada's head office to Quayside - itself a big investment.  Regardless, it's outside Sidewalk Labs' remit to fund new businesses, innovation and job creation in Toronto.  That's up to the federal government, the province and the city.  In that light, Sidewalk Labs' proposal represents a generous commitment - and Sidewalk Labs has said it's open to exploring options for repaying its investment. | The major risk is that the three levels of government do not make the investment that's required to make Quayside a success.  Public transit - i.e. the Waterfront Light Rail Transit line - is a critical success factor.  It would be a disaster if the development went ahead without committed investment in public transit.  But sadly it's not  without precedent - look at Liberty Village or the delay in building a school in City Place.  Sidewalk Labs has made some interesting proposals but mitigating the risks associated with government and municipal funding is outside its remit. | First, ensure that funding is available to build the required infrastructure - notably the Waterfront Light Rail Transit line.  All options need to be explored; in fact the idea of using private capital to build the Waterfront Light Rail Transit line is attractive as it would accelerate the development of Quayside and add some certainty to the plans.  (We have no objection to private funding for other infrastructure - e.g. telecommunications.)<br><br>Second, accept the proposals for the "urban innovation cluster", flesh out the details and explore other options for funding it (probably a combination of public and private sources like the DMZ at Ryerson and OneEleven). |
| 08/02/2019 13:35:50 | Receptive | Any improvements and advancement in infrastructure are welcomed. An investment by Sidewalk Labs (SL) in infrastructure such as an LRT should be accepted as part of development charges but also repayment attached to other builders as they reap the benefits of the Sidewalk Lab investment. As landowner the City doesn't have the funds to act as a land developer so with Sidewalk Labs proposal some of the infrastructure investment will become the burden of all builders to share. If Sidewalk Labs leads the charge with initial development then great but they should recoup money to pay for the investment as the whole of the Portlands are developed. I think the proposal by SL will front end and speed up the development process. SL should be prepared to pay without reimbursement some of, what might be called, frill and experimental aspects of their proposal. | The economic proposal will set a precedent for other development sites in the GTA. The proposal could put into place and unconnected infrastructure that is unique and burdensome. The test site needs to illustrate how neighboring areas will be connected and benefit from the innovations being offered. ( i think this connectivity is recognized in the proposal though.) | Waterfront Toronto has been wise to make this RFP call. WT has created this look into how communities are to be built and structured. While SL's response may differ from what was envisioned it is indeed interesting to see where this proposal will lead us. Certainly, it can be as good and substantially better from the method of building the City is currently experiencing. The WT might want to consider alternative ownership scenarios that will bring increased affordability to the project. |
| 08/06/2019 22:24:11 | Receptive | I prefer that the financing proposed by Sidewalk Labs is not advertising based so these alternate forms of repayment are worth exploring. | As long as details of revenue models are transparent and fair, this proposal should be considered as it will greatly speed up development. | See above. |
| 08/07/2019 20:35:53 | Receptive | Accelerated development would be quite beneficial. | | |
| | | | | |
| Submitted before deadline: | 52 | | | |
| Submitted after deadline: | 6 | | | |
| Total: | 58 | | | |

| Submitted On | Do you think that discrepancy between the draft midp and the cityapproved precinct plans are problematic and if so which ones | Do you think that the proposed development plan for quayside would create a vibrant neighbourhood is this a place that you would want to live why or why not | If you could change elements of the proposed plans for quayside what would you change and why |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/16/2019 10:15:16 | | Yes, it is very innovative and would make Toronto a more attractive place for people to live, for investors and for real estate development overall. | |
| 07/16/2019 17:45:35 | In general, I find the fact that a vendor is asking for more land and governance rights than the city-approved precinct plans a complete non-starter (especially when the company involved is foreign and very large). | I would as long I had self-governing rights from publically elected officials and there was complete transparency regarding data collecting and sensors. I would also want complete public financial disclosure of all vendor payments and income. In addition, I would want a formal and transparent complaints procedure to city government (not google) officials. | 1) Public, electable governance, 2) Transparency (policy and financial) 3) Right for the public to reevaluate4) No financial breaks for a company that plans to use this project for profit 5) Adherence to the City approved precinct plans 6) A clear policy for dispute resolution that takes power imbalances into account |
| 07/17/2019 12:06:51 | I do not think the discrepancies are problematic. I think the nature of planning is that plans are prepared and then detailed planning submissions propose something that fits within the general intent of the plans. I think the variations proposed from the plans are completely acceptable and in many cases are an improvement on the original plans prepared by the City/WT. | Yes. I believe that the proposed Develpment Plan for Quayside would create a vibrant neighbourhood. I would want to live there and I suspect that a lot of young people, young families, elderly people and those in desperate need of affordable housing would want to live there. | I would not change anything and I sincerely hope that WT and City Council will adopt the ideas in the MIDP and proceed with the proposed Development Plan and let planning applications be submitted. |
| 07/18/2019 13:19:17 | Major issues -the city appears to have no concept of what they are dealing with | Under no circumstances.   1. lack of infrastructure such as libraries, shopping etc 2. Access to my personal information.  At no times do I consent to this at present and given the hegemony of the company you are engaging with there will never be any effective control of their use of personal data. 3.  Lack of park /beach space | No ownership by foreign companies, no experimental lab of humans and no implicit or explicit alteration of Canadian laws and regulations to accommodate an uncontrollable foreign entity |
| 07/19/2019 11:13:56 | I don't think they problematic. Some indexes are different such as the density and the heights of the buildings are lower than the codes. But I think the difference will actually help the environment be less stressful. Other proposal such as the direction of the buildings and interior commercial lanes might be discussed in more detail to be better understood their real impact in the neighborhood. | The proposal brings a lot of innovative features and promises inclusiveness so I think those are factors that will contribute to build a vibrant neighborhood. I want to live in such a modern place, but it will depend on the price and availability. Toronto has become an unaffordable city so it is not completely clear how the development will cope with this problem. I believe that, even if they find a way to make the housing more affordable so it would fit my budget, I would have a tremendous difficulty to find a slot due to the high demand for living in well located place. | A detailed plan to connect to the public transportation or proposing its own version of public transportation. As the parking space is reduced, it is expected the access to the neighborhood is planned in a way that not impact negatively a place already problematic in terms of traffic. Also, as the neighborhood is digitally innovative, that would be awesome if they tried to bring more organization in the issues that the waterfront promenade failed such as the frequent conflict among pedestrians, cyclists, drivers and street cars. Another important feature that I didn't see is including swimming pools for all ages. It is frustrating living in the water edge and not enjoying being in the water. The concept could be different from the outdated community centers facilities with rude staff and unwelcome hours that practically exclude most of adults. There should be pools for children and also more  for different kind of swimmers (and no -swimmers that line just to relax). As the society is now flexible in terms of work hours, the leisure facilities should also follow the tendency. Just focusing on the profitable spaces is just contributing to build another stressful neighborhood. Leisure facilities are just as important as the housing and work spaces. |
| 07/19/2019 14:17:41 | it is very problematic. "A privacy expert who resigned this week from her role as an advisor to Sidewalk Labs, the Google sister company set to build a "smart" neighbourhood on Toronto's waterfront, is concerned that the "treasure trove" of data collected there will be vulnerable to attacks." It was there that Sidewalk Labs revealed that, while it has committed to stripping all of the data it collects of personal identifiers, it could not guarantee that other groups participating in the project would do the same.<br><br>"When I heard that, I knew I had to resign," Cavoukian said in an interview on CBC News Network. | I don't want any spying get sidewlak labs OUT OF THIS Proposal. I don't want ot live in CCTV police state cameras everywhere. | GET RID OF SIDEWALK LABS NOW! |
| 07/19/2019 16:53:32 | The massive increase in size, for a start. It was bad enough when it was small. | The neighbourhood would be as vibrant as any other neighbourhood, minus the effects of being supervised, analyzed, recorded, tracked, and profited off of by Google/Alphabet. Maybe some people would be fine knowing that their democratic rights have been sloughed off in favour of ~whatever exactly it is that Google wishes to do~. Personally, I wouldn't. I would not live here, and would not visit this area. | I'd eliminate Google/Alphabet's involvement entirely - they have been evasive and opaque in detailing their intentions, and their corporate history is one of increasing misanthropy. I'd rather deal with the known greed of developers than the unknown greed and demonstrated malice of Google. |
| 07/19/2019 22:45:24 | Yes, Quayside affordable housing MUST be built on the land they were allocated. They must follow the rules. Google should not be given extra land at a discount to build affordable housing that they were expected to do on the vast expanse or land they were awarded. | No, I want transparency in ALL THE INFORMATION they are collecting on me. I am concerned about what information they are collecting from people casually walking through the development, what they would be collecting in terms of conversations and even what is in my garbage. | building the affordable housing units on the original allocated property by removing a residential building or something else. Otherwise this is getting ridiculous.<br><br>Signs on the boundary that warn passersby of what data is being collected on them if they set foot in the development.<br><br>Alter (REDUCE) the amount of property tax that Google can take away from Toronto |
| 07/22/2019 3:54:53 | Yes, the discrepancies are very important. First, Sidewalk Labs was asked to prepare a bid for Quayside and now this plan has expanded to include the entire so-called IDEA District. I understand that Sidewalk Labs contends that its ideas are more effective and cost-efficient at scale, but it's highly problematic that the company has arbitrarily expanded its scope without any explicit permission or consultation with the public The entire public consultation was based on the Quayside district with the understanding that any additional land would be the subject of additional permissions. | No, I would not want to live here. Sidewalk Labs is incorporating some classic urban design elements: mixed-used buildings, narrow streets, emphasis on public transportation, and lots of public space. That's great. What's not great is the heavy dependence on sensors to collect data. I don't see the benefit of curbless streets and real-time pricing on pickups/dropoffs. The creation of five new regulatory bodies and a super Public Administrator (across the IDEA District) proposes to transfer a great regulatory burden and bureaucratic costs to the public sector. Why does a new, relatively small neighbourhood need so many new regulatory bodies? How do they work with the rest of Toronto? | More information is needed on the proposed data governance plans for Quayside (and the entire IDEA District). The urban data trust, which has transformed since it was introduced in 2018, is vague, the subject of Sidewalk Labs' arbitrary definitions (e.g., "urban data"), and does not accord with Canadian privacy law. More public consultation is needed on Sidewalk Labs' contention that data from urban spaces should be (largely) publicly accessible by default. Sidewalk Labs needs to strengthen, not water down privacy protection. More information is also needed on how Sidewalk Labs plans to treat data, as currently it says it will share data with third parties, including Alphabet, with explicit consent. That subtle phrasing would appear to go against their public declarations that data will not be sold or used for advertising. |
| 07/22/2019 16:39:24 | Density is super problematic! Toronto needs to seriously think about affordable housing! The character and vibrancy of Toronto depends on the people living within the city -- and rests upon the fact they can AFFORD to live in the city. So far this planning seems to be resting upon some nice idealized vision of a tech playground. Where do the rest of us fit in?<br><br>We also need to be aware of who is control of what. | No. It does not seem to meet the need to create affordable housing within the area. While there are many fantastic ideas, I am wary about the assumptions that areas outside of the Quayside will pick up the slack on things like parking. While getting Google headquarters seems good we need to be wary that Toronto does not become another San Francisco where even tech workers are unable to afford places to live.<br><br>Need to keep a long term focus as to what we want the character of Toronto to be. Toronto can be future leaning and take some of the ideas from the plan without having to adopt the entire kit and caboodle. | Taller buildings, set rent for affordable housing (less "luxury" more "affordable but nice for the average wage worker" type condos).<br><br>I like more transit, and pedestrian streets but need to respect the other plans already rolling out by other groups in Toronto. |
| 07/23/2019 5:16:38 | yes, it should stay at 12 acres and should not be predicated on granting any additional powers. | Concerns about inclusivity - if you don't agree to terms of the data collection, can you live there? will there be differences for landlords and tenants? | New proponent |
| 07/23/2019 16:44:08 | no | I would love to live in this place, I think it is well thought out and would create a vibrant neighbourhood with incredible amenities and accessible places to come together as a community. | |
| 07/24/2019 13:35:15 | | No, I think it is wildly inappropriate and short-sighted to hand these lands over to a private corporation. | |
| 07/24/2019 16:44:15 | Extremely. From 12 to 190 hectares is ridiculously greedy, and that it was hidden from Torontonians shows that Google an Alphabet are not acting in good faith from the beginning.<br><br>Once a Google campus is built in Toronto, it will supercede our municipal governance for urban planning. Kreuzberg in Berlin has opposed a Google campus in Berlin for reasons of data privacy. They know what the imposition of a surveillance society did to their country because of the history of the Stasi. We should prioritize public educational institutions, not multinational companies, to determine our waterfront's future. | No. Toronto has no difficulty in attracting investment, and Waterfront Toronto is essentially donating $1.35 billion in flood remediation measures to a multinational corporation that has made no substantial contribution to the City of Toronto. | I am completely opposed to this project, and technologically, do not feel that the benefits of advanced fibre optics, their version of sewage disposal and usb ports have any future scalabilty or value for the City of Toronto. Do we want, or will be able to afford, self-heating sidewalks throughout Toronto. No. The GTA has an antiquated sewage system, transit connectivity issues, and future problems with climate change and water filtration. Sidewalk Labs is not focusing on resolving Toronto's issues; they are focusing on using Torontonians to record data on their R and D projects without prioritizing our own.<br><br>In addition, Google and Alphabet have left incomplete fibre optic projects, one in Louisville, Kentucky, and have outstanding lawsuits regarding data violations and unfulfilled contracts internationally.<br><br>The social infrastructure in IDEA City Google has thrown back to the City of Toronto? Schools and daycares because Google knows that they cannot collect data on minors. The hypocrisy of it all. |
| 07/24/2019 19:12:16 | l | l | l |
| 07/24/2019 22:29:54 | No. This is less density and less height than approved. A bit more density would not be objectionable at all. The plan to create pedestrian plaza is awesome. | Yes. I love the elements for inclusivity. The commitment to affordable housing is important. And the strategy for inclusive uses at grade instead of traditional retail is great. The public spaces are excellent. | A bit more density - and related - more affordable housing. |
| 07/25/2019 0:21:17 | No. | The development must promote Co-ops. The Cooperative Housing Federation of Toronto or the Cooperative Housing Federation of Canada can provide models. Co-ops are approaching a century of being a trusted model in Canada. If the Development Plan for Quayside cannot include Co-ops. where democracy shapes the development, where differences can be negotiated, changed re-thought and lived with, then popular fears of data ownership and 'slick salesmanship' will not be overcome. A development that can include the quirks and strengths of Co-ops will have legitimacy. | Do not promote uniformity. Have rentals with Co-op membership. These can be partnered with existing Co-ops in Toronto or can join existing Co-ops as 'offsite' members. Do not let developers have too much control and authority. Co-ops can vote on their own policies. They will add an 'X factor'. An identified and accepted 'irregularity' is better than an imagined one. |

| | F | T | H |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/25/2019 3:18:52 | F | T | H |
| 07/25/2019 9:12:07 | I do not think they are problematic. | Yes it will definitely create a vibrant neighbourhood and this type of mixed use, technologically advanced, beautifully designed waterfront property will add tremendous property value to the waterfront. I would like to live there. | I wouldn't change anything. I think it is a brilliant design and plan for the location. |
| 07/25/2019 11:44:15 | I think that the Draft MIDP took a very rational approach to achieving (and largely exceeding) the priority outcomes presented in the waterfront Toronto RFP. I think the areas where the MIDP diverges from the precint plan are largely a positive outcome (more non residential, more street/waterfront activation, fewer parking spaces, lower density). | Yes. I think the proposal represents a large step forward in Toronto's public realm vibrancy. Yes I would want to live in the neighborhood. There innovative approach to the physical buildings and their proposal to utilize technology to improve civic infrastructure is globally significant and I would want to be a part of this change. | I think that the transit integration is a critical component to achieving the mobility objectives, however I believe that the reliance on the City to extend the Queens Quay LRT leaves this objective in a somewhat precarious position. While I believe that a streetcar expansion would be beneficial, it is concerning if the whole project's future is contingent on that happening |
| 07/25/2019 12:37:57 | If the applicant would have been asked to do a zoning review with real drawings like everyone else, then the public would know what those exact variances are. Why would WT think it is appropriate to not make the applicant submit real drawings for a review so the public knows what the real factual variances are? https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/9838-Preliminary-Project-Review-Application.pdf | There is not enough information. It is egegious that WT is allowing public consultations without proper stamped drawings by preossionals with actual dimensions and statistics. The minimum disclosure should be what the City asks of an applicant. You would think at minimum dimensions and professional reports and stamps would be required. https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/867e-City-Planning-Development-Approval-Planning-Checklist.pdf | It is ridiculous to not provide the residents with a detailed list of changes. A review notice would have outlined the changes so that there is proper transparency. Same rules and guidelines ffor everyone who requires changes from zoning approvals. Even site plan. |
| 07/25/2019 13:47:10 | I do not consider the differences to be problematic. I particularly support the following aspects of the draft MIDP: lower density and lower heights (creates a more liveable neighbourhood and more appropriate to the waterside location); wider mix of uses (provides greater economic resilience and opens up the development to a wider range of the population. Design retail units on key routes so they can be more easily converted to alternative uses in the future (community, residential, office); and reduced car parking provision (new neighbourhoods should be planned to reduce single occupancy car trips and  investment in infrastructure for cycling (sheltered and secure public cycle parking), extensions/upgrades to transit routes (transit only access on main roads) and car sharing (zip car etc.). | The draft plans present a vibrant neighbourhood and I would consider living here. Affordability is my main concern. | Retail units - encourage independent retailers/cafes/restaurants to take up commercial space<br>Public open space - provide facilities for market traders and community events<br>Public health - provide dedicated running and cycling trails along the water (away from cars and car exhaust emissions) |
| 07/25/2019 16:57:08 | | Based on the little information Google Sidewalk Labs has provided, I would not want to live in this neighborhood. I want to live in a neighbourhood connected by people, not technology. There are legitimate questions about equity and access to technology and use of data, which Google does not adequately answer to. Technology is not the antidote to what ails the city. Solutions must be human-centered and based on mutually agreed upon and easily understandable values. | Please avoid technocratic jargon. "Vertical development" and "building massing" is not easily understandable to an average person. |
| 07/25/2019 22:28:09 | No, I don't think they are problematic. | Yes I do and it's indeed a place that I'd want to live and work. There is access to water, it's close to the downtown, and the housing will be affordable. | I think it's excellent. I can't think of any significant changes to make. |
| 07/25/2019 23:08:37 | Yes, I do. I believe the MIDP should not be approved, so we can begin this process again and start with the precinct plan. If a vendor is to be partnered with, this decision should not be made unilaterally by Waterfront Toronto. | No, I do not think it would create a vibrant neighbourhood. It is not possible to create a neighbourhood "from the Internet up"--neighbourhoods can be planned, but this must be done democratically by the residents of the city, and not by a for-profit corporation. It is not a place I would want to live. | I would prefer that the plans were discarded so we can begin this process democratically. |
| 07/26/2019 10:47:19 | I believe precinct plans are general guidelines to give a proposal a necessary framework and should not be a straightjacket that hampers innovation and logic. Also I would bet that a lot more work went into the Draft MIDP than went into the precint plans. | I think the plan would produce a very exciting neighbourhood in which to live. I would like to live in this neighbourhood or at least near to it so that I could easily walk to this new neighbourhood to enjoy all that it has to offer. An animated streetscape makes an area more dynamic and people friendly especially when there are not cars eveywhere. We need more areas like this that are people friendly as opposed to car-centric. | I like the animated waterfront area and would nor dumb that down. I also like the idea of specialized wood construction. I'm not sure I understand the TTC routes from the above simplified sketch but that is something that will be discussed ad nauseum I suppose, but it is important to have that public access and soon rather than later as is usual in Toronto.<br>Let's hope this project doesn't end up in extensive delays like most things done in Toronto.So in essence I don't seem much that needs to be changed at this point although there are always modifications at the engineering stage.<br><br>Get on with it! |
| 07/26/2019 12:14:10 | I'm generally pro-density, but I think the city has been allowing developers to build too many tall towers. There is a big problem with the 'missing middle.' I don't know if this level of density qualifies as such, but it's certainly closer than a lot of buildings that have been going up recently. | Yes, I do think it would be a vibrant neighbourhood. I wouldn't want to live here as I'm looking to move to a less busy neighbourhood (married, kids, etc), but 5 years ago I would have said yes. | Nothing specific comes to mind immediately. |
| 07/26/2019 12:19:18 | | yes...close to water..downtown....energy efficient place...for traffic..etc... | |
| 07/26/2019 15:06:08 | The City of Toronto needs to really start moving forward FAST with making decisions on developments and creating better opportunities for its people. Finally, there is an innovative private sector that wants to do something with that unused land. I do not think it's problematic. Sidewalk Labs is an innovative company and they are putting their innovation hat forward. The City staff really need to start being more open to accepting innovation, otherwise it's your own kids that will get hurt from the lack of development. | I love their proposal and it will definitely create a vibrant neighborhood. Particularly bringing those traditional Italian inspired designs to make it pedestrian accessible, instead of vehicles, it is their unique transportation system.<br><br>I also love the unique building design that it can be modified depending on the needs and uses. It's very ambitious and unique. It will certainly put Toronto on the map and draw a huge international eye on this unique ecosystem.<br><br>My only concern is everything being connected. Electro magnetic frequency (EMF) impact on our brain is one issue to consider. | I would ensure that there are major Canadian companies that are developing this. Knowing that an American company is designing this area, raises questions for me as most of the financial return would go across the border than to us. |
| 07/26/2019 15:39:07 | If the density of the city-approved precinct plans are not met, this needs to be discussed further with Sidewalk. Increasing housing availability goes a long way in promoting affordability. That being said, Sidewalk's plan includes more affordable housing than the current precinct plans outline and this to me seems like a step in the right direction to addressing the affordability crisis in our city.<br>Sidewalk's proposal to include mixed-use zoning and more commercial and retail space seems like a positive in my opinion as it makes Quayside a destination beyond just a residential neighbourhood.<br>Limiting vehicular traffic on Parliament would be a great addition to the area. Currently that bike ride or walk down Parliament under the train tracks and Gardiner is very unpleasant. There are plenty of ways for cars to get around in this city, removing access to this portion will not be that big a deal. We should be planning for people first, not private vehicles. The loop that Sidewalk Labs proposes for the Parliament bus seems alright as long as it has that connection the the LRT at Parliament Plaza.<br>Reduction of parking would help incentivize people to not drive to the area further promoting use of transit and active transportation. The city cannot realistically decrease mode share of private GHG emitting vehicles if it continues to subsidize parking in the downtown core. | Yes, I believe the mixed use neighbourhood and the plans to promote active transportation and limit private vehicle traffic can create a vibrant neighbourhood I would be happy to call home. I do have concerns on the data privacy issues brought up by many experts but believe if an Urban Data Trust is properly implemented, it could have very interesting impacts on improving the neighbourhood over time. | New innovations in mass timber out of Vancouver have pushed the limits on how high a mass timber building can be built. This can probably address the density and height issues outlined above. That being said, the scaling down of buildings closer to the waterfront can have a nice impact on providing good views for more people. |
| 07/26/2019 18:46:17 | Yes because Waterfront has no jurisdiction to even review the draft MIDP let alone approve it. Indeed, no government currently has power to approve this plan and Sidewalk is openly demonstrating that it does not respect current government processes and directions. | No. I think the plan as currently envisioned presents a major threat to our prosperity and civil rights.<br>I wouldn't want to live there nor would anyone I know. | Restart the whole RFP and do it in a transparent and democratic way. No more secret deals. |
| 07/26/2019 20:02:24 | No, I don't think the discrepancy is problematic. Toronto doesn't have many well thought (and struck) 'master plan communities', so my instinct here is — the more space the better. Though I do think that profit sharing with the city and investment into infrastructure (transit, pedestrian realm, park space) is ultimately paramount. | I do think that it would create a vibrate neighbourhood, while putting Toronto architecture on the map on a world-scale. I do want to see this project get built, though I don't think I would ever see myself living there. I would definitely visit though! | It's no secret that Toronto needs more park space. I'm interested in seeing more of that investment in this development. Think city flagship park, like MTL's Parc de la Fontaine. |
| 07/26/2019 23:12:04 | Ug | Th | Hmm |
| 07/27/2019 8:59:25 | I like the lower building heights.  I don't like the increase in non-residential areas generally speaking without knowing in detail what that means. | It has potential.  Access to TTC would be vital.  Plenty of green space is also important. | Don't have enough detail at this point.  From these vague statements it could be good or bad. |
| 07/27/2019 9:14:03 | Yes. Density, height, and more retail/business than planned are all very problematic.  We need more affordable housing for everyone. I'm not sure it will be solved because sidewalk labs is a business who bottom line want a 'good return on investment' which is not consistent with good city planning as cities need to think about all their citizens not just the ones that will make them money. | I think their needs to be more mixed income housing, more density. I'm okay with less car traffic and parking as long as there is good public transportation that connects seamlessly with the TTC. I would visit but not want to live there - I value my privacy and don't believe a private company should be designing and controlling any part of a city. | More housing, more density, all governance by the city not a corporation or third party. This is a part of the city of Toronto and should be planned and run as such. Not "googleville". |
| 07/27/2019 9:24:55 | Yes. Density, height, and more retail/business than planned are all very problematic.  We need more affordable housing for everyone. I'm not sure it will be solved because sidewalk labs is a business who bottom line want a 'good return on investment' which is not consistent with good city planning as cities need to think about all their citizens not just the ones that will make them money. They also plan to take over a large section of it with their own headquarters. Huge problem with that. Taking the best parts for themselves is not okay on any level. | I think their needs to be more mixed income housing, more density. I'm okay with less car traffic and parking as long as there is good public transportation that connects seamlessly with the TTC. I would visit but not want to live there - I value my privacy and don't believe a private company should be designing and controlling any part of a city. | More housing, more density, all governance by the city not a corporation or third party. This is a part of the city of Toronto and should be planned and run as such. Not "googleville". Also ditch the river district plans. They have to prove they can build something and be successful at it before we hand over all that prime property. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 07/27/2019 10:03:32 | Waterfront access that is open to all and connected east to west is critical. The presence of a school is important so that the area attracts a multitude of generations. There has to be the right balance of commercial vs residential to ensure the neighbourhood has conveniences for those who live and visit there but that it also does not become a plethora of empty storefronts. It is important that independent businesses/retailers/restaurants can thrive there so that the area does not become a bland, boring mix of the same old, same old homogeneous brands. | It would absolutely create a vibrant, innovative, progressive neighbourhood that offers a modern lifestyle. I love my own home and neighbourhood so would not consider moving here but it is a place that I could support others living in to have access to many amenities and the rest of the city could benefit from what is learned there. It is time for Toronto to stop living in its anxiety ridden, NIMBYism past and claim it's rightful place on the global stage. | Transit is a must. There are too many parts of the city already underserved. Sugar Beach area is only served by buses now which is environmentally wasteful and frankly, quite silly if Toronto expects to be a global city. Consistent well run transit here would also alleviate some of the parking challenges on the plans. |
| 07/27/2019 11:25:20 | Density and height are lower: this is actually a good thing. Provision of public transit will eventually raise density in adjoining areas. Height limits are a good thing near the lake. Connectivity and Parking: by the time Quayside is built, urban transportation modes must and will change, due both to CO2 constraints and self-driving vehicles. Reducing road space and parking are both consistent with these forward-looking goals. | This looks like a vibrant place I'd be happy to live in. Why? 1. proximity to lake and river; 2. Public transit; 3. Lower-rise residential towers | Clarity on the area between Martin Goodman trail and Merchant's wharf. In the drawing this is unclear. Will it be park and open spcae? |
| 07/27/2019 21:04:20 | Yes. Primarily, the split of residential and non-residential uses as described in the previous box. Additionally, there should be no off-site or on-site parking -- in fact, none of the lands proposed for development in Quayside should have *any* parking whatsoever, except for a de minimis number of spaces in proposed residential developments. | I don't believe the plan will create a vibrant neighbourhood due to the improper split of residential and non-residential uses. There is a housing crisis in the city with staggeringly low vacancy rates, where in contrast, the vacancy rate of office space and other commercial/light industrial uses is significantly greater. | Remove *all* proposed surface and above-ground parking, creating a community for people instead of a community for cars. Require the development to be at least 90%+ residential (practically, limiting all non-residential uses to ground-floor commercial and institutional uses). |
| 07/28/2019 1:04:12 | Yes, to varying degrees. Quayside is below density. While this is driven by the all mass timber design which I appreciate, it comes at the expense of hitting a slightly higher density. Why not use a more practical mixed approach used elsewhere with mostly wood and some steel or concrete to allow slightly higher buildings than 30 stories particularly Site 5. Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto must reject the River district grab. The RFP was for Quayside only and Waterfront Toronto should be reviewing the proposal for that site alone or reject the proposal entirely. The proposal for Villiers Island to reserve the best piece of real estate created by the Waterfront master plans for a Google campus is highly offensive. The confluence of the Don River and Lake Ontario is a civically important area that has been tragically abused and ignored for most of the City's existence. We have the opportunity to get it right. I disagree strongly that a corporate campus would be a catalyst for this site. A public entity such as a cultural institution would be the best fit. Google headquarters can go somewhere else. | Yes, this can be a vibrant neighborhood. Sustainability objectives, streetscape ideas with dedicated bike lanes, less parking, wider / heated sidewalks, waste and truck delivery ideas interesting and worth further development. Certain data tracking / app ideas such as reserving 'public' space silly and counter to City objectives. While intent is for a demonstration precinct, I worry that the infrastructure is too different to ever be integrated into the rest of the City therefore this ends up being a bubble enclave. | The proposed governance model needs to be revised. The City has trouble enough running our current infrastructure without introducing an entirely new model that essentially replicates the same roles. The streetcar stipulation needs to be revisited. The mass timber idea to create an Ontario factory should be expanded to allow for partnering with existing industry Canada-wide, as required to meet supply requirements. While I agree with reduced parking rate, the proposal should foist their requirements offsite for someone else to deal with. Some technology driven approaches seem overly complicated and would seem to be a waste of energy such as the dynamic curbs. Look to Europe for existing low tech approaches to sharing the sidewalk / road space. Data tracking and privacy concerns for the average Citizen who chooses not to live here but is tracked nonetheless needs to be addressed by both the proponent and Waterfront Toronto. |
| 07/28/2019 16:36:51 | | It will not create a vibran neighbourhood where I would like to live. While some of the design ideas are interesting, I do not want to live in a neighbourhood created by a corporation with the purpose of gathering data to sell products. They do not have any experience in doing this, despites all their media efforts to prove the opposite. | I would not stop the process and start all over again to guarantee a democratic and transparent consultation. |
| 07/29/2019 9:56:37 | No. | Yes, it would be a unique place to live, promoting social interaction and interaction with the waterfront. | None. |
| 07/29/2019 11:16:14 | Yes, I have deep concerns over many key areas (too many to list), just a couple:<br>- role sidewalk labs proposed to take on as lead developer<br>- much larger proposed area that was often pushed out of the frame while consulting<br>- under-planning for residential area (and scant addressing of the affordability crisis in all this)<br>- incrementalism around environmental and climate crisis | No, I don't think it creates a vibrant neighbourhood, instead I think it would create a neighbourhood for a select few in the city (and perhaps only those who worked there), continuing to circumscribe access. | This questions feels too large to be addressed in a text box of this size, which implies I could provide a succinct list of small items to capture the way that the proposed plan differs from what I hoped was possible.<br><br>As I mentioned above, we need to act boldly to address the entwined climate and affordability crisis in our cities and world. This plan speaks of benefiting those already a part of the "business as usual" |
| 07/29/2019 11:16:24 | Yes, I have deep concerns over many key areas (too many to list), just a couple:<br>- role sidewalk labs proposed to take on as lead developer<br>- much larger proposed area that was often pushed out of the frame while consulting<br>- under-planning for residential area (and scant addressing of the affordability crisis in all this)<br>- incrementalism around environmental and climate crisis | No, I don't think it creates a vibrant neighbourhood, instead I think it would create a neighbourhood for a select few in the city (and perhaps only those who worked there), continuing to circumscribe access. | This questions feels too large to be addressed in a text box of this size, which implies I could provide a succinct list of small items to capture the way that the proposed plan differs from what I hoped was possible.<br><br>As I mentioned above, we need to act boldly to address the entwined climate and affordability crisis in our cities and world. This plan speaks of benefiting those already a part of the "business as usual" |
| 07/29/2019 12:04:46 | Yes, specifically changes to density, massing and connectivity. With an affordable housing crisis any investments in building a 21century city should be designing for better integrated residential density over retail. Connectivity is also the most attractive and most risky factor in my opinion. The data that can be and will be extracted for this experiment by Google is invaluable and seemingly this commodity will be harvested with no fair trade for its value back to the city of the individual citizens data will be harvested from - this is both a privacy concern and security concern and a loss of extremely lucrative data currency. | Yes, but it doesn't mean its the only way to accomplish the same goal. While its incorporates many exciting and creative design ideas and possibilities it also brings a new element of unknown costs/ risk and unanticipated and seeming contingent land demand for a larger development than first agreed. | A data rights and data fair trade agreement developed by the city and signed onto by Google before and development. |
| 07/29/2019 17:52:57 | Yes.<br><br>Density: Need higher density.<br><br>... and therefore, greater Building Heights<br><br>Massing: Why is SWL's massing proposal different? Is it hubris or, do they have more recent (& perhaps better?) data,<br><br>Mix of Uses: Higher Density will mean being able to have BOTH<br>a) the higher amount of non-residential (including retail, commercial, social infrastructure and production) than the precinct plans.,<br>AND<br>b) a greater number of residential dwellings<br><br>Community Facilities: Allott space for an elementary school within Quayside AND provide additional community facilities space, as proposed by SWL<br><br>Connectivity: FOLLOW SWL's recos<br><br>Queens Quay: We're aligned here. Let's move!<br><br>Parking: Autonomous, on-demand vehicles will require lower no. of inefficient dedicated parking spaces. Get with the future, already, people!!!<br><br>Ground Floor Animation: Embrace SWL's proposal for retail along Grd Flr of laneways in addition to ground-related commercial or retail uses, particularly on Queens Quay.<br><br>Water's Edge: Good! Let's go!!! | Yes, not only do I want to live here; but also do I want to collaborate w Sidewalk Labs to bring their developments forward. Sidewalk Labs, pl contact me<br>- Anand Murthy<br>416 857-6035 | Are the City-approved precinct plans as recent & current as SWL's? Likely not! ... I'd change the precinct plans fully to embrace Draft MIDP, with mods as suggested above.<br><br>Let's giterdun, people! |
| 07/29/2019 18:21:43 | It's funny you mention this: not only did I almost miss this survey's existence but I have not seen either of these plans. All I have is the brief overview you have provided plus what I have read in the newspaper. You mention four volumes in the Sidewalk Labs proposal alone but I have not seen it nor know where to find it. I'm getting sick and tired of these kind of things being pushed through behind everyone's backs and even when we do catch wind of it, details are foggy, incomplete and hidden. From what I can understand from your summary it doesn't appear to be much of an issue since the proposal falls short in most places of what you were expecting as opposed to say, overreaching the limits already placed out. But I cannot really comment unless I actually see the draft and city approved plans! | No. My bigger concerns with this proposal stems especially from Sidewalk Labs, which I will cover in a later section; namely their request for money and data.<br><br>I also would love a house to live in as opposed to those condos/apartments all clustered together. Don't get me wrong: I don't need a lot of space. But I want my autonomy. You have no control over your living space living in an apartment or condo, not to mention you're paying fees for the rest of your life and can be turfed from your building at second's thought.<br><br>It is not clear to me if this is the case but I would also like it commuter friendly: you should be able to walk, bike, transit and drive with ease in, out and throughout here. | Like I said, hard to say. You keep saying mostly consistent, less than expected, etc. but I haven't seen either the draft nor the plan! This needs to be made not only public but easy to access and understand. I've been searching and waiting for a chance to voice my opinion and for more understanding of what is going on and I still have very little idea! The one I know the most about is Sidewalk Labs proposal - one that I'm not happy with! |
| 07/29/2019 18:42:15 | From my experience traveling or visiting downtown, parking is a huge issue. Reduced parking will just increase this issue. | Not really a downtown, high-density sort of person, so I wouldn't want to live there but the set-up of the buildings look okay. Don't really have enough information to make an informed decision. | Not enough info from general outline to really make a decision. |

| Timestamp | Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/29/2019 21:14:42 | | It would be a hi-tech, modern communications center for the world, for sure, but maybe people there could be happier living in Don Valley parkland, in the middle of nature. | The Proposed Deal sucks the big one. We need a better deal, and a 50-50 private-public partnership to make it interesting...<br><br>Sidewalk Labs proposals for Quayside and Villers Island are interesting, but they make me think of when Europeans bought Manhattan from the Natives for $24 worth of shiny beads. Sidewalk Labs proposals are full of shiny beads, and we don't know the value of those beads. As far as the deal goes, we just don't know if it's a good deal, for Toronto.<br><br>We know Sidewalk Labs will profit from this venture, and so they should. If Google actually invests a billion dollars, and if the city invests a billion dollars worth of land,<br>this partnership could achieve great things, maybe. But at this point, Sidewalk Labs proposals look more like a 90-10 deal, in favour of Sidewalk Labs.<br><br>It might be educational to put a dollar value on everything being proposed so far. The city is being asked to contribute a billion dollars worth of its most valuable waterfront land. Plus we must add the city's infrastructure costs, and city transportation and all other city services. This might add up to another billion, or more. So the city has a minimum $2 billion stake so far, in Google's waterfront development proposals. It will be interesting to see if Google puts $2 billion into this project, or if the city pays all the bills.<br><br>Consider all that Google might be getting from this deal.. money, data, and information systems which can contribute toward Google's tech supremacy of the entire world, etc.<br><br>Google is proposing that any products or services that are commercialized from this research experiment, will belong 100% to Google, and Google can sell these services around the world. That might be worth a few billion dollars in a few years. But Google is only offering 1 or 10 percent of the profits on |
| 07/29/2019 21:17:27 | Not familiar with this issue, so I do not wish to provide comment. | Yes to both questions. The public space they are proposing contains many innovative designs, and meant to draw people in and encourage them to interact with each other. This is the golden idea of being a community: stepping out of our isolated homes and coming together as one people, one city. | I understand that Sidewalk labs wishes to supply either 5,000 or 500,000 sqft of developed office space to their Google staff. I would instead like to see some diversity in the office tenants. Perhaps a mix of canadian startups, or small-mid sized canadian tech companies.<br><br>But either way, I like the idea that the area is developed to be a district for innovative companies to be in a close and collaborative environment. |
| 07/29/2019 21:36:42 | The fact that Sidewalk's proposal goes outside the RFP is in of itself problematic. If it is not outright dismissed then what's to stop other developers from ignoring the boundaries of future RFP requests? | No. Explosion of tech jobs and tech industry incomes will increase inequality for the rest of Toronto that is not linked to the tech industry. Majority of people in this neighbourhood will be living in market rate properties which would hint that majority are high-income. | - Flat property tax rate for entire area regardless of land usage<br>- Zero condos, all housing should be purpose-built rentals |
| 07/29/2019 21:52:08 | Everything about this project is problematic. | I don't know why you guys are breaking out the plan into 3 pieces when as a whole it is fundamentally flawed and unacceptable to those who care about democracy. How can we trust a foreign corporation whose sole directive is profit to run an entire city for us? Especially when Google has proven untrustworthy globally, and is using tactics not dissimilar to those of extractive industries in their neo-colonial exploits? | None. Because of all of the above. |
| 07/30/2019 7:45:05 | Yes I do. It signals to me that sidewalk is acting in bad faith with clear long term plans they have not discussed with the public in a meaningful way. | "Vibrant" is an entirely vague term. I wouldn't want to live in an area specifically designed to gather my data, and I believe that far outweighs any positives. | Remove all association with sidewalk labs. The area has world class potential, we don't need sidewalk and it's shady history to realize that potential. |
| 07/30/2019 8:56:39 | Not sure. | Yes. It is an exciting vision for the future and even as a senior, it is one I am keen to be a part of. | More greenspce and more schools |
| 07/30/2019 9:58:09 | The city approved Precinct plans are much like the downtown city planning that has so far made downtown Toronto an ugly giant condo-ridden space lacking any personality. Do we really want more of this? Do we trust the current cityscape of giant soulless housing with no infrastructure schools, stores to really support the density of people? I trust 21st century designers over what the city has approved to modern Toronto. | Yes, bring on the development! What's there now? Nothing. What has Ontario independently come up with on their own? A casino and a Ferris wheel? We have the opportunity to enter the 21st century here with Sidewalk Labs. Let's not squander this opportunity because of paranoia and misinformation. | I honestly think Sidewalk Labs has taken some of the best thinkers around to come up with a new district that we should embrace. I wonder if Waterfront Toronto is up to task for this thing to happen. You guys are wishywashy about the whole thing. It's the best thing around and then you criticize it sometimes based on misinformation. You guys should consider yourselves lucky to have an opportunity like this. |
| 07/30/2019 10:29:26 | MIDP does not need to include McCleary, Keating or Lower River. I would say MIDP could include Quayside and West Villiers for development. | Yes, need more info. Worried the "efficient" unit are too small. Will the affordable units be mixed with condos? How will the land price be calculated? Maybe not so many bells and whistles are once. | More trees, follow WT urban design. THe double row of trees needs to continue as part of the branding. Grocery store needs to be further east. |
| 07/30/2019 11:10:57 | | I do think it could create a vibrant neighbourhood, and it is a place that I would consider living. I applaud the focus on pedestrian safely and building a livable neighbourhood.<br><br>I also like to see a developer (Sidewalk in this case?) have some skin in the game so to speak. I have seen too many developers in Toronto build the largest footprint building they can get approved, sell units, and move on to their next project without any ongoing relationship with the neighbourhood/community that they built for. In general, I don't think most developer's incentives are properly aligned with the ongoing needs of a community 5, 10 and 50 years post-build/sale. | The biggest issue I hear about, and potentially see is related to data privacy. I also think the issues can be properly solved through government policy, and through the creation of a shared data trust - where ownership and stewardship of collected data (from public spaces) is shared between public and private groups, with final policy being set by and elected body. |
| 07/30/2019 11:19:25 | Very problematic. Sidewalk Labs has ignored the 12 acre scope of the RFP and submitted and MIDP of more to its liking and advantage. The we-know-better attitude makes the company a poor choice for any further dealings. | No, I would not like to live there. The proposed environment looks sterile and artificial. I think residents would move out, as they are from Songdo, South Korea's "smart city". I would not like the surveillance. | I would like to see Sidewalk Labs proposed plans shelved. I see nothing in them of any special innovative value and they over-reach in terms of real estate and governance. |
| 07/30/2019 12:17:13 | This will be a lab to study a futuristic life stile, date has to recorded in order to see how as human adapt to all these changes and what is good and what is bad...the data should be used only for these purpose. We need more information about Villeirs Island. I think that island should be run by the city and have google only as a tenant. In regards to connectivity, there are not buses running there,I like the idea of restricting traffic and made it more walk friendly | Yes, I would live there, Hi tech neighbourhood, low rental units and by the water | My only concern is about the city giving up rights to govern the area |
| 07/30/2019 13:22:32 | I do not. From what I can tell, most of the discrepancies are simply Sidewalk Labs having bigger ambitions than the City itself, and that is ultimately to our benefit. As I understand it, there is some anxiety about data however, frankly, if people were that concerned about it they'd throw out their cell phones and stop using google, Facebook, YouTube, etc. but I don't see that happening any time soon. The hand-wringing of Luddites should not stop Toronto from taking such an exciting step. | I firmly believe that the proposed development will create a vibrant neighbourhood in Toronto. It is very much a place I would like to live. From cutting edge technology to the ability to help create work across Toronto (Such as the planned local Timber sourcing I've been reading) it would be, frankly, something exciting, innovative and new in Toronto at long last. | I'd stop giving so much credence to the Luddites and Tech-Nationalists who are trying to suffocate the project in it's crib and keep Toronto's scenic undeveloped urban wastelands as undeveloped wastelands. Let's stop hand-wringing and do something exciting for once. |
| 07/30/2019 13:36:50 | No | Yes it would create such a neighbourhood, and I would like to live there so long as high quality public transportation was in place when I moved in. I like the urbanity and mix, the broader neighbourhood, the innovative ideas being incorporated. | I would prefer that some limited form of vehicular traffic continue to directly connect Parliament St. To Queens Quay. I believe that without it the very large Plaza would lack access and urban vitality during Toronto's 9 months-a-year of uncomfortable weather. |
| 07/30/2019 14:57:18 | The reduction in density is odd - given the site's proximity to the city centre, why wouldn't we want this site to be reasonably dense. I see no reason to change the East Bayfront and Keating plans that have gone through all the public consultations and refinements to start all over again. | The idea of a mixed-use community is a good one, but the decrease in the percentage of residential is troubling. How does the mix in the IDEA district mesh with the current plans for adjoining sites such as the 3C site, the Keating Precinct and the remainder of the Portlands? The location of the site will make it a place many people would 'want to live' depending on other factors such as mass transit, density and other uses. | |
| 07/30/2019 15:08:13 | The increase in non-residential is a concern but if it is community space rather than commercial then that's okay. | I would like to live near the water and being close to downtown is nice.  What about green space?  There is talk in either plan about how much in terms of connected acreage of green space.  A park is not enough.  The expanded area that Sidewalk Labs wants to control needs significant green space. | There are very serious issues that will be addressed in later area's but for this page there's not enough detail for me to give significant proposals |
| 07/30/2019 15:11:05 | Seriously problematic. The development plan was meant to be for a much smaller area – this is a bait-and-switch and is deeply concerning. Public land resources must be used to maximize public benefit, including the creation of deeply affordable RGI housing. | No I do not think this plan would create a vibrant neighbourhood and no I would not want to live here. Given how this process has played out so far, I do not trust Sidewalks Labs to deliver on what is being asked of them. What is their track record? I have noticed how their sister company Google has "cut-and-run" on public infrastructure or utility projects when the mounting costs did not align with their primary objective of generating profit. | Hit the re-set button and start over with a fresh process that is driven by the public (not Google) with sufficient regulatory mechanisms in place. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 07/30/2019 15:24:21 | Yes. As mentioned above, we are in an extreme housing shortage with prices rising, pushing out many people and families. We need high density areas. We also need public transportation that is accessible. I'm also concerned that the public funded services like a school are allotted space but will not be built.

No Side Walk Labs in Toronto! | While it is great that there are lots of pedestrian areas I would never live in neighbourhood that is run by a private company that is for profit, wants to collect data about my comings and goings, and has been lacking in transparency each step of the way. The gall to ask the city to share tax revenue to manage streets that SWLs plans to use for surveillance is despicable.

Public spaces in Toronto are valuable. They belong to the city and to the people who live here. It's important that our elected government not give valuable lands away. There are too many questions about how data will be used, how to opt out of surveillance and who gets to live here.

With Toronto in a housing crisis, the density of this proposed plan is a failure and the proposal should not be approved.

No Side Walk Labs in Toronto! | Higher density, more public transportation, more publicly owned space, more public services, no privatization of our city and waterfront. |
| 07/30/2019 21:49:15 | Duplicating existing governance bodies. | No

No one wants their children to live beside a freeway. Quayside should be commercial / institutional only. | Purchase all lands through eminent domain prior to value uplift.

Establish rental only through all areas to capture value uplift for government. |
| 07/30/2019 23:50:39 | The changes in density, height and massing seem to be a response to a thoughtful and consultative planning process. The discrepancies do not seem problematic but rather an adaptation to opportunities to build a model neighbourhood. There is also a strong focus on public realm. | The Development Plan is thoughtful and integrates a variety of usages. It has better integration of work, commercial and residential than original waterfront plans.  I would definitely consider living in Quayside. I am excited about the experimentation with different kinds of built form and materials as well as the ways that the waterfront is imagined.  There is a lot of attention to walkability and other kinds of mobility that would enhance the neighbourhood. | I would ask for more of a focus on creating an arts and culture component to the plans but understand that this may have seemed outside of Sidewalk's jurisdiction. |
| 07/30/2019 23:55:49 | I don't view that as problematic so long as the result is consistent with Waterfront Toronto's mandate, the Central Waterfront Plan goals and the spirit of the East Bayfront and Keating Channel precinct plans. | Yes, I think it would be a very interesting neighbourhood and think it would be a desirable place to live. | I would look to simplify the proposed governance structure and embed as much of the management as possible within existing city structures or within new city structures. |
| 07/31/2019 7:36:40 | I find it disturbing that he proposed development significantly oversteps the area originally offered by the city for development submissions. I currently live in a neighbourhood where carefully thought-out city plans have been consistently shoved aside to accommodate developers. We have urban planners for a reason; their work should not be set aside to enrich developers at the expense of the public good. | I think the physical specifics of the development plan can only be considered in light of the implications of other aspects of the proposal - particularly those that relate to privacy and surveillance questions. I would not want to live in a neighbourhood where I felt my activities were being constantly monitored. I would even be reluctant to visit or shop there. (We all know by now that there is no such thing as "anonymized data.") Toronto's waterfront should be one of its greatest assets, and public access should be facilitated, not made into a choice between access and privacy. | I would restrict plans for the development to the original area. This is an experimental project; the size should be kept to experimental proportions. |
| 07/31/2019 9:22:06 | This is a leading question and should not have been approved.

To state it properly: "What do you think about the discrepancy between the Draft MIDP and the City-approved precinct plans? Do you have any concerns? Are there changes you are happy with?"

Plans and ideas evolve in every business endeavor. I think that the discrepancy is a reflection of The SWL team is ambitious and sees the potential. Unless you believe that cement factories should dominate our skyline forever, the proposal is worth considering. | I strongly believe that the proposed plan would create a vibrant, humanity-centric neighbourhood that reflects Toronto's status as a future-focused city. Born and raised in this city, I have seen it transform over the past 30 years. Sky-high glass condos have dominated the skyline, with little attention paid to community, culture, and human experience. Cityplace is a perfect, disgraceful example of how not to bring people together, and what cheap, poorly-planned condo life can look like.

Quayside development puts human interaction and environmental impact at the center of their thesis -- prioritizing pillars of the community, such as "functional" common space, flexible retail, modular living design, education, creativity, and environmental respect.

I am 32 years old and looking to start a family soon. This is the type of urban neighborhood I hope I can raise my children in and a place where we can grow and experiment with the future of urban living. | I want to hear more about how Toronto residents can invest in property in Quayside. |
| 07/31/2019 9:22:16 | This is a leading question and should not have been approved.

To state it properly: "What do you think about the discrepancy between the Draft MIDP and the City-approved precinct plans? Do you have any concerns? Are there changes you are happy with?"

Plans and ideas evolve in every business endeavor. I think that the discrepancy is a reflection of The SWL team is ambitious and sees the potential. Unless you believe that cement factories should dominate our skyline forever, the proposal is worth considering. | I strongly believe that the proposed plan would create a vibrant, humanity-centric neighbourhood that reflects Toronto's status as a future-focused city. Born and raised in this city, I have seen it transform over the past 30 years. Sky-high glass condos have dominated the skyline, with little attention paid to community, culture, and human experience. Cityplace is a perfect, disgraceful example of how not to bring people together, and what cheap, poorly-planned condo life can look like.

Quayside development puts human interaction and environmental impact at the center of their thesis -- prioritizing pillars of the community, such as "functional" common space, flexible retail, modular living design, education, creativity, and environmental respect.

I am 32 years old and looking to start a family soon. This is the type of urban neighborhood I hope I can raise my children in and a place where we can grow and experiment with the future of urban living. | I want to hear more about how Toronto residents can invest in property in Quayside. |
| 07/31/2019 10:49:05 | I would like to see Sidewalk honour the original plans but I do not have a problem with them asking for more. I would like Waterfront to tell them they are not to build something half baked because, they say, they didn't get the land they asked. | The plan is good. I would consider living there. I think the feeling of a "neighbourhood" will take time, look at Canary and how long it takes for a vibrancy to take place. But it is interesting and it has some advances that would be great. It seems to me to be a truly modern place. | Seems to me that the advances are mostly taken from somewhere else, all except the "algorithms" the will measure every movement. I don't have a problem with being watched as that already happens, I do have a problem with the lack of transparency of these algorithms. |
| 07/31/2019 11:16:51 | The zoning changes are not inherently problematic, but any changes to governance or administration needs way more oversite and review | We do not have enough information to determine this. | The plan is a series of could be's and wishes. It all sounds nice but we need to understand the impacts of this doesn't work. What is the recourse for residents if the new technologies dont work the way they are advertised.

SWL would have no part in designing the regulations, the standards or the vision. Watefront Toronto should have led the process and SWL would be responsible for working within our framework to deploy technologies if they want. SWL is no a new Urban planning arm for the city - they are a service provider and their role should be |
| 07/31/2019 12:04:14 | I have no problem with reduced height and density. The density proposed by SL will still be more than adequate to support public transit. More retail space than proposed in the precinct plan could be a problem if there is no market for it. Vacant storefronts do not contribute to vibrancy.

Years ago when we were consulted on East Bayfront and in particular on the redeveloped QQ, WT advised us that there might not be a large enough market for continuous retail on QQ from one end to the other. | It is not possible to say at this early stage whether the ultimate community would be vibrant. Just as the Canary District does not seem very vibrant right now it might be too early to tell before it is fully built out. At this stage Canary District seems to have too much space between buildings, space that seems to serve no purpose. It has somewhat the feel of a suburban "master planned community"

Same with the area around Corus and George Brown. Sugar Beach is an obvious success and could be described as vibrant. The waterfront promenade is also pleasant.  But as a whole, the district is not yet vibrant. Maybe it will be as it develops further.

I wouldn't want to live here if I couldn't afford to and unless there is a major reset on the matter of "affordable" housing most people in Toronto, including me, won't be able to afford to live here except in a small percentage of the apartments. | I have not had time to really understand how buildings would be laid out. But as my earlier comments on Canary District suggest I think it is important not to have too much open space that has no apparent use. Architect Jack Diamond once made a good point when appearing before a city committee that the waterfront in Venice along the canals is interesting for its small intimate spaces that you often come upon unexpectedly as you turn a corner. |
| 07/31/2019 17:10:35 | The MIDP's proposed density and apartment heights are lower and there is higher amount of non-residential use recommended than in the precinct plans. We hope the MIDP promotes a good discussion on what is really needed in a complete community.

The precinct plans set aside space for an elementary school, which is included in MIDP.  The additional community facilities space proposed by Sidewalk Labs need to be considered.  United Way Greater Toronto has a Building Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy and we have been committed to community development and infrastructure support.  We know that people in neighbourhoods need social infrastructure and community space to thrive. Neighbourhoods without this are stressed. | United Way Greater Toronto (UWGT) have been working with Sidewalk Labs in the development of some of the ideas included in the proposed Master Plan. For UWGT, there are three key areas where we hope to see progress:
1. A concrete plan for building mixed income communities through an ambitious plan for affordable housing, modeled on the targets outlined by Sidewalk Labs.
2. Community and social infrastructure that is at the centre of the development, such as the community and health services hub included in this proposal.
3. Local economic opportunities that give residents from surrounding neighbourhoods a stake in building this community and building skills for the future – the inclusion of community benefits in this proposal is a promising start.

 (UWGT) feels the elements outlined in this MIDP truly reflect what is needed for a complete community.  The plan ensures not only housing but almost 37% of the space will be non- residential including versatile social infrastructure, as well as public and commercial spaces.  As well, the plan outlines and plans for jobs throughout the MIDP.

We look forward to participating in the consultations in the Fall | Generally, we like the plans.

 We have more questions related to financing, and look forward to continuing discussions about how City building such as this can be financed. |
| 07/31/2019 18:21:46 | | I'm greatly concerned that Quayside, as proposed by Google Sidewalk Labs, will collect and harvest data, hurt privacy, build a city that does not represent the technically illiterate, and expand the gap between the haves and have-nots in an increasingly unaffordable city. | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 18:58:25 | | I think it would certainly create a vibrant neighbourhood and is a place where I would want to live. This is because this will be an innovative village with minimal impacts on the environment. This village would be a unique to the world and will be a good example for the future developments. In light of climate change and the expanding human footprint, redeveloping our cities to minimize environmental impact will be important. Using mass timber for the buildings is one step forward in helping to shift Canada towards a sustainable circular economy. | |
| 07/31/2019 19:46:09 | —Decreased density, decreased parking, more varied building forms, more pedestrianization, and more activated ground floors can be good, but they need to be in line with the city's actual needs. The fact that they deviated from the city approved plans shows a lot of negligence on their part. If city planners can independently substantiate why this would be in the city's interest they can be considered. | —I think aspects of their proposal have the potential to create a vibrant city but they are overshadowed by the overwhelming amount of control by one party of the urban plan that in the long term would severely compromise the urban environment. Good cities require diverse building lots, diverse competing developers, diverse investors, diverse ideas, in order to generate diverse and vibrant communities NOT a single entity creating an urban dictatorship, regardless of how benevolent the proposal (and there is no reason to believe the benevolence of the proposal is anything more than positive marketing for a for-profit company. They are not government urban planners working in the public interest, they are a private foreign company working in the interest of shareholder profit). Creating a private monopoly over the city in terms of development and urban planning then prescribing diversity afterwards is not a sustainable recipe for diverse and vibrant communities long term. I think Sidewalk Labs (SWL) has committed a serious misreading of Jane Jacobs' work when they invoke her, given she first and foremost supported diversity of control and interests in cities as well as grassroots power, not top-down authority from a single for-profit company. -It is also important to note that publicly accessible spaces are not public spaces and will operate very differently. They create a different power dynamic in which those that own or control the space dictate the terms of the use of the space and has been abused for commercial purposes in the past. A good example of this is Toronto's PATH which operates as a "second city" for the city's elite, connecting the financial district's office towers and residences, while creating winding paths with historically little signage and no public oversight or urban plan that effectively excludes large portions of the city's inhabitants and removing a social group from city streets that could have provided valuable diversity and purchasing power to street-level merchants. Publicly accessible space may also be subject to different data privacy laws or protocols, creating invisible barriers of non-meaningful consent to private data collection as well as restricting the involvement of those who do not wish to consent to personal data collection. | Sidewalk Labs should be forced to submit a response to the actual constraints of the RFP on the Quayside site alone before we consider their proposal. The River District and the Villiers West site proposed by Sidewalk are a huge overstep and outside the bounds of the agreement we have with them. The area of the proposed IDEA district is too big for a single entity to have that much influence over and would be a severe detriment to an equitable city under normal circumstances. With the additional technology proposed by Sidewalk I worry that this would create an even greater area of corporate surveillance and testing that would subject even more Torontonians to surveillance, analysis, and commercially motivated manipulation. |
| 07/31/2019 19:47:58 | No I don't see it as problematic | Yes I think it will create a vibrant community - one I would love to live in! | I do not have any recommended changes |
| 07/31/2019 22:47:03 | There are so many problematic discrepancies between these two plans that I could devote thesis-like study on the subject. The most troubling is the inclusion of any land outside the immediate boundaries of the 12 acres (approx) of Quayside in any plan proposed by Sidewalk. There are well-developed plans for the Keating, Polson, Villiers, McCleary, South River areas. An "IDEA district" as a laboratory for Google's urban product development is unacceptable. Sidewalk proposing to bleed the scope of this project into City owned and controlled land, that already has fully developed, costed, approved plans underway is insulting. | Vibrant neighbourhoods evolve, they aren't created. Continuous experimentation doesn't equate vibrancy. Some of the elements suggested in the MIDP are known promoters of human connection: public space, greenery, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, retail space and community-purposed indoor space. Many of the suggested "innovations" have a overly-experimental feel - living in a "lab" space (as it's frequently called) feels dubious at best and exploitative at worst. I don't want my neighbourhood experience and interactions to enrich a corporation despite the possible "innovation" benefits. Home should be relaxing, safe, predictable. The prospect of continuous surveillance, for whatever positive, supposedly community benefit just feels invasive. I'll gladly live without heated sidewalks and imperfect municipal functions to maintain a sense of autonomy. No, I wouldn't want to live in Quayside. | Again, there are so many objectionable element that I want to see changed. I'll expand on my suggestions this Fall in the next round. |
| 07/31/2019 23:09:58 | Yes. The Draft MIDP asks for more public lands than the city-approved precinct. That is a major change in scope - not discrepancy. | Since I do not know how personal data will be used by Alphabet and its affiliated companies, I would not want to live in this neighbourhood. There is no plan on how social service agencies will operate here. Further, there is no space for mixed income zoning. I do not know whether there will be a library. An LRT and cycling infrastructure should be built while this area is developed. | Provide the opportunity to co-create a data governance framework with the public. |
| 07/31/2019 23:12:24 | Not at all. | Yes bc I am worried about sustainability. | Speed up timelines! |
| 08/01/2019 0:17:18 | It is a real stretch to suggest a national headquarters for a big secretive tech company with tight security could be considered a "catalytic use". When the public consultations for Villiers were taking place the understanding was that the catalytic use would be some kind of accessible publicly minded entity such as a museum or other cultural facility. | | |
| 08/01/2019 6:30:51 | Not really. It's kind of...boring to be honest. | Probably.

The Stoa is an interesting concept. The varied pattern/scale of the architecture looks good, albeit lacking in any sort of detail which makes evaluating it next to impossible. However, it is also clear that all the buildings will shoot up another 10 storeys at least by the time this process is done, which wouldnt be a problem (the density can easily be greater), but is also highly deceiving. | The amount of "open space" is nice to see. However, one problem with the plan is the lack of clarity surrounding public and private space. Is there even any truly "public" space? Can a protest happen here? Can homeless people hang out on benches? They seem to muddle and blur the distinction between public and private, which may look good conceptually (and presupposes a strong degree of enforced urban etiquette and conformity of action) but is a proven failure internationally. |
| 08/01/2019 6:52:44 | | Overall, these plans look good and exciting from a strictly urbanist perspective, and would certainly be a place that I would like to live. | |
| 08/01/2019 8:44:59 | | My concerns lie in the lack of truly affordable housing planned in this development. Toronto has an affordable housing crisis. How does this development address this issue? For a truly vibrant neighbourhood you need to have residents from all socio-economic backgrounds. This also means that retail needs to reflect the needs of all residents not just the wealthy. I do not want to live in what could be easily become like most downtown Toronto neighbourhoods, upper middle class, wealthy and white and homogenous. | Deeply affordable housing is crucial for this development to address the housing crisis. Affordable retail is necessary so that all residents can live in the neighbourhood. |
| 08/01/2019 10:35:39 | | Yes. I. think the plan aims to bring both vibrance and serenity. | |
| 08/01/2019 13:52:26 | No with the exception of the parliament street connection to Queen's Quay. Some sort of vehicular connection between Cherry and Sherbourne will be required. | yes, its quite a compelling vision for a mixed use development. And yes it would be attractive to live there as part of the new neighbourhood on the inner harbour | |
| 08/01/2019 17:26:36 | No - the precinct plans probably are based on old, outdated and unimaginative ideas. The proposed plan represents new and innovative ideas. In particular, it's very welcome that it encourages public transit, walking and cycling over personal motor vehicles. Toronto's past plans have prioritized personal vehicles to the detriment of the quality of life and mobility. | Yes - the proposed plan represents a refreshing change from the cookie-cutter, glass-walled condo towers that commercial developers typically propose. It will make Quayside an attractive place to live and work. The waterfront needed more density but we have enough (probably too many) 600 square foot condos. We need more variety in types of housing and the proposed plan offers some interesting and innovative ideas. | Nothing material - perhaps accelerate the timetable so the plan gets built. |
| 08/01/2019 18:54:32 | | Vibrant for whom? It's nothing more than an aquarium for surveillance Capitalists to measure every conceivable metric of human life for the gain of a behemoth Capitalist organization. I would never live there, and it should be illegal for it to even exist. To think that Alphabet wanted to participate in city tax revenue is INSANE and supports the argument that the sovereignty of the citizenry is being eroded by these companies. | Move it to Silicon valley so the revenge of the nerds can suffer rather than Canadians. |
| 08/02/2019 12:59:27 | The concern with the Sidewalk Labs proposal appears to be in you have taken over Villiers Island with little regard for City concerns or plans for the area. Definitely, need some employment opportunities in the area and how the site will thrive because of its mixed-use. If this is not approved I fear that the land will become just a continuation of the condo district currently being built to the west on Waterfront lands. Not affordable options currently in the developer handbag of offers. | Vibrant neighborhood - yes. A place to live - if affordable. The concept will work as a food housing scheme. The technological advances are nice but not necessary for livable space. I guess the nice thing though is the proposed technology that is being offered and the convenience will afford users, dwellers, and visitors. Some necessities should be constructed -ie the LRT routes. | The plan looks pretty good now. I think consideration should be given to a little more green space - lawns and softscape. There is very much plenty of hard surfacing. |
| 08/06/2019 16:50:23 | The Draft MIDP plan offers many similar approaches to reshaping this specific area of Toronto's waterfront (in terms of sustainability, mobility, mixed-use, improving public access, etc.), but with the one very distinctive difference - the data-driven, smart city component. For various reasons, there are many skeptics of collecting personal data to inform design (i.e. privacy, data breach/ fraud, economic advantage, etc.); however, I believe this is a bold solution to refine and redefine urban development to maximize potential positive aspects associated with human influence on the environment. Technology strives for efficiency, and if the aim is focused in the right direction, a unique data-driven development could be the key to sustaining and improving our environment for future generations. | The proposed Development Plan for Quayside would most definitely create a unique, unprecedented neighbourhood along Toronto's waterfront. It would bring life to the portion of Toronto's waterfront that is currently lacking in both character and identity. The experience would be very different, but convenient and exciting in many respects. I feel that it would be an interesting place to live, particularly given all of the effort that would be put into sustainability and creating an emission-free environment. | I believe that the Sidewalk Labs team has been working with various entities to vet design decisions throughout the development of the Draft MIDP plan, including both public and privates stakeholders and government organizations. By working directly with Waterfront Toronto and selecting a team of reputable, qualified design and engineering professionals, Sidewalk Labs has developed a very thorough and detailed proposal for this site. It would be interesting for the team to take further investigate additional forms of renewable energy to harvest to maximize sustainability (i.e. utilizing Lake Ontario and the Don River). |
| 08/06/2019 22:12:31 | No major concerns, as long as the residential units don't stray too far from the precint plans. | Yes. The plan highlights many areas that are lacking in developments around Toronto, specifically regarding affordability, sustainability and accessibility. I am optimistic about the project and would live in the neighbourhood if it is created. | Nothing. Solidifying funding and fasting tracking development of the LRT would be great. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 08/07/2019 20:31:37 | Too much affordable housing. Just unacceptable. | I would live here but not if 40% of units are affordable housing. There is no place for affordable housing on the waterfront. It should be somewhere far from downtown. | Not more than 20% of housing should be "affordable". |
| 08/09/2019 21:02:59 | I don't feel it is a problem, I believe that between planning and implementation you will always find areas for better ideas and improvements. | Yes vibrant and I would want to live there, I think it's a desire of most to live close to the water. | The one element that I would be inclined to change is affordable housing in this area. Not everyone can live on the beach, placing affordable housing in this area would be contrary to financial suitability by reducing values, and reducing tax base, |
| | | | |
| Submitted before deadline: | 82 | | |
| Submitted after deadline: | 13 | | |
| Total: | 95 | | |

| Submitted On | What aspects of Sidewalk Labs Social Infrastructure proposal most excite you What aspects most concern you | Do you think the community facility spaces proposed by sidewalk labs address present and future community needs what would you like to see in terms of community services  facilities |
|---|---|---|
| 07/19/2019 14:20:20 | NONE. PRIVACy. GET RID OF SIDEWALK LABS NOW! | They can promise the world but they are already not being transparent with dat acolleciton i don't belveive a rod they say, WATERFRONT ROTON, I lvoe you but you have not scrapepd htis propsal is insutling toeopel of Toronto.<br>We can do MUCH better. |
| 07/22/2019 16:49:07 | Walking distance to things.<br> Potential affordability --- but still concerned on this becoming San Francisco expensive where we gotta track human excrement on the sidewalk type app situation.<br>Being environmentally friendly.<br><br>If everything is built in modules and imported what about being able to fix it on the spot? | I think we need library, community league, hospital, general doctor offices etc.<br><br>Housing for the homeless, with a program to help them get back on their feet. |
| 07/23/2019 17:52:50 | no concerns the fact that they are thinking community and mixed income is exciting | I would like to see flexibility to that spaces can change as the community develops and identifies its own needs |
| 07/24/2019 13:42:33 | I don't think a private corporation should be involved in this. | |
| 07/24/2019 22:32:44 | Civic Assembly excite me. No concerns. | Yes. A library would be nice. |
| 07/25/2019 14:05:49 | Use of digital tools to complement social infrastructure and public spaces is an interesting concept. Digital tools are becoming commonplace in workspaces but this concept has not been trialled at neighbourhood level before (as far as I'm aware). | Present/future needs should be monitored by regularly engaging with the community after construction. |
| 07/25/2019 16:51:56 | The layout and integration with the City are most exciting | Yea |
| 07/25/2019 17:05:00 | N/a | If you take away the cringe-inducing branding of "tech bar" and "civic assembly," you are effectively talking about community centres. Toronto has dozens of publicly financed community centres that did not involve partnering with a global tech behemoth with endless breaches of privacy and business ethics. Why is Google Sidewalks Labs having a seat at the table? |
| 07/25/2019 22:29:18 | | Yes. Sufficient schools and community centres are critical. |
| 07/26/2019 23:12:43 | M | M |
| 07/27/2019 11:36:05 | I think the tech-based social mechanisms are an underexplored area in general. The proposal should support open source and private additions to this tech infrastructure. Nothing concerns me other than the paranoid attitudes about privacy loss in the press. As recent studies show, we have already lost almost all privacy to Facebook and other aggregators of personal information. If constructed in a partnership with government to control 3rd party use of information, this is a good plan. | Yes. As I said above, making sure plenty of green outdoors space is a must. |
| 07/29/2019 10:07:10 | The waterfront spaces are very exciting. I have not significant concerns. | Yes, the proposed community facility spaces have taken a forward looking approach. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 07/29/2019 18:43:53 | Stepping up and saying I want to make some mass amazing change is exciting. We need to get up and start making positive change. I appreciate that drive and determination.<br><br>The biggest concern I have is with the data collection. I am sick and tired of my privacy being violated. You have malls that collect your movements without your consent just because you shop there. Nobody has the right to collect information on another without their consent. Especially it is being used to turn a profit as opposed to something that would actually help the community. | A community should be able to support itself. It should not have crumby transit like Brampton, it needs easy travel. It needs places for people to live: not just as in residential but also places to get food, socialize, etc.<br><br>It should be environmentally friendly. They keep saying how technologically great they are, they should use their 'greatness' to help this planet. They are making a huge proposal over a large space, if they want to take any responsibility which they are claiming to with their proposal, then the first responsibility is to this Earth. This includes all buildings have recycling pickup (the building I work in everything goes in the garbage because no recycling - and the government has the nerve to complain about plastic straws! How about whole buildings throwing everything into the garbage?!)<br><br>It is on the beautiful water so I expect clear air. No drugs, no cigarettes, no garbage, no pollution would be nice. Might stretching my wishes a bit past reality but hey that's what I think the future needs. And again, it's on the water, maybe do something cool with incorporating that? Not filling in the land their no, no, but something nice with the boats or something. |
| 07/29/2019 21:57:29 | None. See above responses. And while you're at it, go watch The Big Hack on Netflix. | Same as previous responses. No. |
| 07/30/2019 11:47:09 | Soil remediation may be a good idea, although much of that would happen naturally if we just stopped our toxic activities. My concern is that we will attempt to monetize the waterfront rather than renaturalize it. | I am not interested in Sidewalk Labs vision for our community. I would rather see us grow up independently and make our own community spaces. Livable cities grow more organically than Sidewalk Labs is able or willing to comprehend. Their conceptions suggest that we should want to live in their "platform", with all the limitations and restrictions that implies. |
| 07/30/2019 13:29:59 | Timber based structures. Green Energy/Power potential and general environmentally friendly infrastructure. Cutting edge technological infrastructure (Including... yes.... DATA COLLECTION! *Cue hand-wringing by Luddites*)<br><br>I really don't know what aspects concern me, as not many do.<br><br>Don't make a mistake we'll regret for ages. Don't turn down this wonderful opportunity for Toronto, Ontario and Canada, and pass it on to some other city, because Luddites thought that technology was scary and would rather throw up ugly 1980s Concrete Monoliths that "At least don't collect your data" and will be a big ugly scar across our skyline for decades. | Common Land, generally speaking? It could be a wonderful tech hub, and if `that was opened to the public, a sort of Maker Space/Tech Library, that would be an excellent step forward for the future. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 07/30/2019 15:53:59 | Sidewalk Labs want to frame this entire project as improving the quality of life of those living there and eventually everyone in the city. But they don't define what that means. Of the top 10 most livable cities in the world only one is a 'Smart City' My biggest concern is that there is no discussion of what 'big data' is and what kinds of impacts it could have on individuals, communities, and beyond. I give you a quote from Larry Page co-founder of Google and now at the top of Alphabet. "Maybe we should set aside a small part of the world...as technologists we should have some safe places where we can try out some new things and figure out what is the effect of society, what's the effect on people, without having to deploy kind of into the normal world." This from a May 16, 2013 issue of Business Insider. When Page talks about a safe place he is talking about being free from regulation | The challenge here is that usually community services and facilities are decided upon by observing an existing community. Things like demographics, are there young children, teenagers, seniors? Income levels, are there supports for low income people/families? Diversity, are there cultures that have particular needs, churches, mosques? That doesn't exist in this model so I can't comment on what the community needs. I assume the same kinds of things that are needed across other communities in the city. While this is part of an existing riding it has the potential to be very different from any other neighborhood in that riding. |
| 07/30/2019 21:46:42 | Intermediating government functions is concerning. | No. Combined library / community centre / health centre / athletics. |
| 07/31/2019 0:11:56 | Dedicated space most excites me + the potential for integrated wellness/health services + life long learning I am most concerned about how such services could be funded and whether a unique digital layer makes sense/is needed in terms of managing wellness care or community programming. Again, would prefer to see solutions that enhance the ability of existing city departments to delver these services. | I think the proposals look promising. I would hope that the idea of flexibility within the neighbourhood would also support additional services that are identified in future. Daycare is one service that I feel should definitely be included in multiple locations. Other than that, I don't know what services would be needed, but the key is to have enough flexibility to provide space when/if needed. |
| 07/31/2019 11:23:51 | more civic spaces is so important! These interactions cannot be managed or mediated by a for profit entity who uses data in order to influence / manipulate people. Even if SWL was the most benign organisation (they are not!!) this sets a precedent and opens the door to other bad faith actors. | We absolutely need more community facility spaces, and the conversation about who runs them is important. This conversation should not be led by, or involve a for-profit company's business case |
| 07/31/2019 12:34:51 | I wouldn't say I am "excited" about schools, libraries, community centres and community health centres. I just expect them. | Public Library Branch. |
| 07/31/2019 17:18:25 | | The initial plans are good. Wherever there is flexibility for growth, spaces to adapt to changing community needs, and integration with other parts of the community will serve Quayside well. In United Way Greater Toronto's experience, infrastructure is the first step. However securing operating funding needs to be a key part of the discussion and plans going forward. |
| 08/01/2019 13:57:32 | Hard to say without more detail | Hard to say without more analysis and info on the social infrastructure |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 08/01/2019 17:55:36 | The digital tools are interesting ideas that merit further exploration.  Most people have smartphones and access to the Internet now - and that will be increasingly true.  We don't want to repeat the City's mistakes in relying solely on people having to use the telephone to enrol in some of its programs.<br><br>Nothing concerns me; there is nothing in these ideas that suggest we should not proceed to the stage and flesh out the plans. | Hard to say at this stage - we don't really know much about the community that will occupy Quayside.  Regardless, the success fo the proposed spaces is at least as much about how they are funded, managed and programmed than the physical structures - and funding, management and programs are probably outside Sidewalk Labs' remit. |
| 08/02/2019 13:17:18 | The plan is a neighbourhood for grown-ups. It needs some child-related activities. | Maybe, but realistically until the project is marketed it will be unknown what type of social and community infrastructure will be required as support. If families with children are resident along with seniors the community facilities might have a different look if the area is inhabited by only double income no kids. |
| | | |
| Submitted before deadline: | 22 | |
| Submitted after deadline: | 3 | |
| Total | 25 | |

| Submitted On | How receptive are you to exploring this proposal from Sidewalk Labs | Why | What do you see as the risks with Sidewalk Labs Social Infrastructure Proposals | Under what conditions if any would you want to see Waterfront Toronto pursue these proposals further |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/16/2019 10:15:57 | Receptive | | | |
| 07/16/2019 17:49:17 | Need more information | I want a chance for public review and will be out of town during the town halls near me | The information above states "All existing roles for governments would be unaffected" yet this differs from what many are saying. I have not been able to personally clarify the governance section. | I would want the initial City proposal accepted, and other vendors to have a chance to apply for it. |
| 07/19/2019 11:18:40 | Receptive | It is important to understand how the residents will organize to share and maintain the place. | In a complex society there might be conflicts that are not considered in the plan. | |
| 07/19/2019 14:19:20 | Not receptive | https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/ann-cavoukian-sidewalk-data-privacy-1.4872223 | "Just think of the consequences: If personally identifiable data are not de-identified at source, we will be creating another central database of personal information (controlled by whom?), that may be used without data subjects' consent, that will be exposed to the risks of hacking and unauthorized access," she wrote.

"As we all know, existing methods of encryption are not infallible and may be broken, potentially exposing the personal data of Waterfront Toronto residents! Why take such risks?" | NONE! DO NOT USE SIDEWALK LABS, PEIROD! Who would want to visit knowing the privacy violatiosn risks when there is a hwle city where I'm not being watched vor everything. |
| 07/19/2019 17:03:43 | Not receptive | Any innovations and community spaces Sidewalk provides come with huge, unknown strings attached. There is no reason to enlist them when community spaces are perfectly capable of thriving without private corporate involvement. | Data mining and individual tracking; private control/supervision of public spaces/activities; use of public spaces to further private ends; further erosion/invasion of what precious few public infrastructure is left. Google's history of privacy breaches, unagreed-to data harvesting, prioritization of profit over social good, and eagerness to provide services to repressive governments is well-documented. Giving them not only a part of the city, but an opportunity to explore how they can profit by injecting themselves in the governing process, would leave both Toronto and any number of other cities worse off. | Absolutely none. It's a bad idea that's gone on too long already. |
| 07/19/2019 22:53:03 | Not receptive | I don't agree with the amount of tax payer money they want to take from the city. They should just make the community centre smaller, since that is their sole excuse for demanding more taxpayer money. If they reduce the size of the public spaces that are already in excess, they can make room for affordable housing units on their own property instead of demanding more space at a discount. | If I as a toronto resident want to use these facilities, I sounds like I have no choice but to be defeated and allow google or sidewalk labs to collect my data. That's really disappointing that there's a caveat to using anything on the property | If they're building a tech lab, it should primarily promote googles products. It should be agnostic of different tools be it from Microsoft or Apple or Salesforce or open source software.

I want a reduction in their receiving of public funds to pay for the centre. It's their fault they made the space larger than requested; we shouldn't give them more city funds just because they propose something way bigger and more ostentatious. |
| 07/22/2019 3:58:55 | Not receptive | In the master plans these initiatives were lacked specific details. Seed appears to be an app version of what already occurs with commercial real estate agents. Ongoing funding and operational support for the community hub and civic assembly are not clear. | It is unclear how the Community Hub will be funded and supported as an ongoing initiative. I am concerned with an American company, which is involved in private health care initiatives in the United States and the United Kingdom, being involved in community health care initiatives in Canada. | |
| 07/22/2019 16:45:02 | Receptive to some | Worried that instead of being accessible this will become more of a gated community for the rich.
For community support is this the traditional Community League type of deal?
Who is funding the Tech-Bar? Will this include Right to Repair? Or will this end up being a swanky library with tech capabilities? (Nothing against Libraries!! They are great places!) | Ok so Care Collective to be clear will just be a zone that has like a hospital / general usual Canadian healthcare and not privatized? There is a worry of privatizing what traditionally is government run. | There are some good ideas, but my overall concern is 1) Who is in charge 2) Can we take a few of the ideas and ditch the others without penalty 3) Why does Sidewalk have to be running the show? |
| 07/23/2019 16:45:16 | Receptive | I think it is an exciting opportunity for our city | I don't see the risks | |
| 07/23/2019 17:52:43 | Receptive | they are trying to address some of our more important city problems | I do not see this as high risk given the small area and the fact that people will choose to live there | I think Waterfront should be clear what they want and proceed in partnership on the 12 acre proposal |
| 07/24/2019 13:42:18 | Not receptive | I don't think a private corporation should be involved in this. | I don't think a private corporation should be involved in this. | I do not want to see this proposal pursued. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/24/2019 17:07:59 | Not receptive | We already have highly respected and efffective CSIs in Toronto that are Canadian-focused and based. Congrats to Tonya Surman and Spacing Magazine.<br><br>I am very concerned that Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto will be involved in serious litigation that will drain the GTAs resources to regain this highly profitable land and will lose. Google is a nation state, and beyond my concerns regarding using Torontonians as walking data sensors, generating profit for a company that has no substantive ties to Toronto, that minors will be incuded in this data, and that this area will be a walled and gated data generator, I am amazed that we are using our resources looking over a 1500 page proposal when the GTA cannot resolve its own transit needs. | Sidewalk Lab dictating to city council and Waterfront Toronto their terms and conditions and imposing their will on a significant area of the waterfront in perpetuity. Once Sidewalk Labs has built a campus on the waterfront, they are tenants and effectively own the land. In effect, as Leonard Cohen said, "First they take Manhattan, then they take Berlin". Why did we cede our sovereignty to a mutinational corporation more powerful than our federal government? For a couple of timber-framed buildings, fibre optics (which no one needs and Bell cannot giveaway) and USB ports and for Sidewalk Labs, by their own admission, to use Toronto as a Lab. Unconscionable and not sustainable. | None. We have very serious issues in Toronto with transit, sewage disposal, stormwater treatment, flood remediation, protecting the Toronto Island as a park system, and Waterfront Toronto and the TRCA are doing an excellent job working on resolving these issues. As a full admission, I am an internationally trained expert in human rights and data surveillance and I have the last 11 years documenting, writing about, and filming Toronto. I love this city. Thank you for your time. |
| 07/24/2019 22:32:00 | Receptive | We need community spaces in new developments. | Is there a need to launch digital tools? Not sure. | Negotiate a good, fair deal. Maintain public control along way. |
| 07/25/2019 0:29:39 | Not receptive | Self-selected social slice, homogenous sector: artificial social group should mix with a variety of "others" rather than their mirror images. | Ridicule. | There are none. |
| 07/25/2019 9:15:28 | Receptive | I work and live in the area and am very encouraged to see Sidewalk Labs committing to significant social infrastructure. | I see no risks | |
| 07/25/2019 11:53:28 | Receptive | The incorporation of additional communities makes a neighborhood more dynamic and livable. I am supportive of the proposed areas dedicated to this function. | The reduced overall density, coupled with the increased area dedicated to social infrastructure could make it challenging to achieve a sustainable funding scheme if left to funding by city fees and DC's. Local development partners may be less inclined to work within this framework if the financial investment (upfront and ongoing) doesn't offer a return. Further - the structures are striving for higher TGS tiers so this would only serve to reduce the available DC funds | I would encourage waterfront Toronto to carefully assess the feasibility financially. I believe this kind of social infrastructure is important and necessary to make a vibrant inclusive mixed use neighborhood, but I think there are challenges balancing this desire with the sustainable construction and improved physical infrastructure expenditures |
| 07/25/2019 12:42:23 | Not receptive | Noone had a referrendum on turning public domain into private space. There is uncertainty about data rights and privacy protections. De-identification is not certain and experts say it is possible to re-identify with modest effort. | Noone gave the right to a private limited liability company or to WT to control, manage, advise on any social infrastructure. | None |
| 07/25/2019 13:55:56 | Receptive | Continuous engagement with community spaces users (through digital tools and community outreach) after the construction of the development could help to meet the needs of the community as they evolve over time. | No obvious risks. | Support development of further digital tools. |
| 07/25/2019 16:51:09 | Receptive | Will allow Toronto to be at the forefront of the smart City concept | Acceptance by other public stakeholder groups | The proposals should be pursued -- this project will provide a significant enhancement to the City of Toronto |
| 07/25/2019 17:03:00 | Not receptive | A global, tech behemoth like Google should not be drawing the parameters for social infrastructure, civic engagement and local democracy. There are many developments, such as the David Crombie Park/St. Lawrence neighbourhood, and dozens of co-operative housing communities, that have inculcated community and social infrastructure without a global tech behemoth.<br><br>Secondly, community is built through more than just structured spaces and buildings. Communities are built via relationships that are fostered on the sidewalk, in the hallway, at bus stops and in living rooms. | Google Sidewalk Labs is setting the boundaries for what is and what isn't valid social infrastructure. Torontonians can foster community without a global tech behemoth at the table. | Remove Google Sidewalk Labs from the discussions and start from scratch. |
| 07/25/2019 22:28:46 | Receptive | | | So long as affordable housing is provided for. |
| 07/26/2019 9:58:09 | Not receptive | Why would we outsource the provision of social infrastructure to a massive, for-profit corporation? We don't need these services-- we need to augment our already-existing social services, and we need to elect governments that will do this, by taxing the ultra-wealthy. | To me, this proposal amounts to a huge concession on the part of residents of the city; we give up trying to agitate for better services and outsource to the private sector. This will only further erode our existing services and make us dependent on such corporations. | No conditions |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/26/2019 10:52:35 | Receptive | I think it's an exciting proposal for the city of Toronto and Ontario and Canada. | I know that there is a lot of concerns about privacy and data but those are all concerns that can be addressed and Sidewalk has agreed to discuss those with the appropriate authorities and the public. | Let's just discuss this publicly and at the appropriate levels and get on with the project without delay. |
| 07/26/2019 12:19:47 | Receptive | This kind of integrated planning is something the City of Toronto has been very poor at. Only now - years later - is the city fixing access to Liberty Village, and now they're building new towers along Strachan. This might actually undo progress from good projects like the King Street Pilot. There seems to be a real lack of density planning, which is leading to congestion, reduced park space, etc. Fresh thinking like this is what we need. | The greatest risk I see is that the city has not mandated enough public services within the precinct plan. SWL seems to be meeting or exceeding the expectations laid out. | No conditions. |
| 07/26/2019 15:45:51 | Receptive | Increased data collection and digital innovation is going to happen whether we like it or not. Sidewalk Labs is proposing some interesting uses to leverage technology to benefit society and build a more cohesive community. With the right direction and framework in place from an entity like Waterfront Toronto, this can set the stage for the city to take control of the direction urban technology takes and can harness that to make Toronto a leader among other cities worldwide. | One of the big risks with the plan is how this infrastructure will be maintained after being set up by Sidewalk Labs, where will the funds come from and who will manage these projects? This needs to be hashed out and communicated properly. | If the right team of experts and community leaders can be put together to ensure these innovations are protecting individual privacy and benefiting the community, Waterfront Toronto should continue explore these proposals further. |
| 07/26/2019 18:49:07 | Not receptive | Sidewalk is a R&D unit of Google which not only has no record of building social infrastructure but has a long history of violating it. The company is currently under 7 investigations for negative impacts on social infrastructure. | Undermining Canadian civil rights, sovereignty and community. | No conditions. |
| 07/26/2019 23:12:33 | | U | H | V |
| 07/27/2019 9:30:59 | Receptive to some | Community programming and space is always good. | Those with little to no access to digital/computers are left out or behind - which is mainly low income people. I see no options for making sure their voices are heard because the assumption sidewalks lab is making is that everyone living and working here will have constant access to a computer. But with low income households or immigrant families that isn't always the case. Just look at the number of people using the public library computers. | There needs to be a way to make sure all voices are heard, including those with little to no access to the internet. A public library located in this district would go a long way to ensuring this. |
| 07/27/2019 10:11:10 | Receptive | I have always been open to change and progress. Toronto has the opportunity to become a world leader here. | Some of the space names "care collective", "civic assembly" sound a bit borg-like or 1984-ish versus people friendly and welcoming. To get people to engage in the plan, there needs to be an emotional connection and not sure this naming fosters that. School and childcare is key. There needs to be enough community space for the community. Regent Park opened their community and recreation centre and because of the shortage of programs across Toronto, spaces are often snapped up by those who live in other neighbourhoods so Regent Park is left short. Finding that access and balance is important. | With government and public consultation. It is important to find enough progressive voices who are ready for change and not have the "old guard" or those few who speak loudest derail this. This is a tremendous opportunity for Toronto. |
| 07/27/2019 11:32:48 | Receptive | The Care Collective and Citizen's Hub are forward-looking community planning. Using newer technology tools deliberately to improve social infrastructure is a good idea. If you disagree, look at how much time most people spend looking at their phones. People are already using tech for social purposes, but without any real efforts being made by tech providers to produce social benefits. | That old-school Torontonians will once again reject an interesting idea, and that we'll end up with a wall of high-rise condo's with minimal social infrastructure on the model of the western waterfront instead of Sidewalk Lab's well thought out proposals. | The proposal to fund the transit line from increased property tax income should be broadened to include some operational funding for social infrastructure. Otherwise, great plan - go forward with it, Waterfront Toronto! |
| 07/28/2019 16:39:31 | Not receptive | Google is a corporation which business model is based on gathering data and selling products based on that. What should they plan a community in Toronto? What experience do they have? | Undemocratic processes, surveillance capitalism, shortcut of public engagement | No conditions. This process is not transparent and I do not support the development in any form. |
| 07/29/2019 9:58:41 | Receptive | It represents a unique opportunity for development of the City and the waterfront. | No significant risks. | I believe that SWL should be given leeway to proceed with their development proposals, even if there are conflicts with some typical conditions of WT and the City. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/29/2019 11:20:55 | Need more information | At least these proposals name areas where we need to think about community / social infrastructures. However I fear they are being whitewashed in Sidewalk's approach.<br><br>Also, does SL need to be the leader in developing these (or in this case proposing these without a plan to implement them and just pushing them on the City of Toronto, etc...)? | Per above -- no real plan to operate them, ambiguity of who has proposed them, unclear about "ownership" around these ideas and actual needs/appetites from future residents, I'm nervous that developing/platform language was used and a framing that technologizes when much of social infrastructure is about meeting face to face, working in common, and conviviality, something that appears largely underconsidered this proposal . | |
| 07/29/2019 12:12:03 | Receptive | There is great potential here to create and innovative and creative connected 21st century city model - if we get it right. | One of the world largest and most powerful companies, based in the US is driving the minutest details of this project and that same company's greatest currency is data and information ( trade in private data exceeded global oil profits last year) and this project has unlimited experimental data potential that can be adapted globally. | Iron clad data rights and fair data trade agreement for sharing, monitoring and modifying plans based on the foundation of what is best fro the health, well-being and safety and privacy of Torontoians. |
| 07/29/2019 17:56:26 | Receptive | SWL has started from first principles | That unthinking idiots & Luddite neighbours who can't c contribute positively will squeak a lot & derail the initiative to a point where Toronto shows itself to be anti-progress | Let's give them some breathing room & embrace innovation instead of this stupidly Luddite NIMBYism on display now |
| 07/29/2019 18:35:58 | Need more information | Because the only information I have is from here and newspapers which is not enough! You have provided 'highlights' and that is all they are. I am not informed enough to make a full decision. However I can say, there is some things they proposed I do not agree with and would throw their whole proposal out based on if they are determined to leave it there. | Data collection: who has access to this data? What data is being collected? Is it properly protected (details on how that data will be protected is needed!)?<br><br>If we fund the community facility space it should be solely ours and forever ours. No government sell off to other parties for a cheap buck like they did with our highway they built with tax dollars and had the nerve to sell cheap to a private company who is rolling in toll fee dough while our current highway crumbles! In fact, everything we fund should follow that same principle. If other groups such as Sidewalk labs cough up some cash for such things that does no guarantee any ownership or control: it has to reflect their contribution. Not just money up front but money for maintenance forever and only then do they get a reasonable percentage of ownership which is immediately terminated if they pull out. | I need more information. But, conditions that would have to met are:<br><br>-They want something for their own gain, they pay for it themselves<br>-If it is something for their own gain their has to be a mutual benefit for us to let them do this. We also have to agree it's okay for them to do it, whatever they propose. No free liberty here.<br>-If it is something to benefit us, we must have appropriate ownership. As explained earlier, if we pay for it, it is solely fully ours.<br>-No data collection unless willing given by people through informed consent. Informed consent does NOT mean merely walking there, it means you ask if you can collect it and a written, signed response from that person is given agreeing to the collection. This is also only if the person truly fully understands what data they are collecting, what it will be used for, who will view their data, and how their data will be protected. I don't care if the data is apparently free of identifying information: data is literally money especially to companies like Google who are affiliated with Sidewalk Labs. And if the data is being used for their profit they should have to pay for the data. No freebies. |
| 07/29/2019 18:44:38 | Need more information | Haven't really received many details on Sidewalk Labs proposal and those details are not easy to find. | Don't have enough information | More transparency. |
| 07/29/2019 21:45:33 | Need more information | Need information on financial model and sustainability of community funding | Short-term funding / partnerships where programs eventually collapse when funding dries up | Large endowment for neighbourhood social infrastructure is setup and managed by Toronto Foundation |
| 07/29/2019 21:56:47 | Not receptive | These sound like interesting initiatives, but not run or spearheaded by Google or any of its subsidiaries. They should directly be a result of democratic processes that have been put in place and fine tuned over many years. | This is a corporation selling us shiny objects to distract us from their real reason for being here - to extract unprecedented amounts of data from citizens and experiment on us like lab rats. | None. There are many wonderful tech incubators and companies in Toronto, and many vibrant and thriving community organizations which you could turn to for leadership instead of Google or any of its subsidiaries. |
| 07/30/2019 7:49:12 | Not receptive | I've lost faith in their ability to be honest, I also have zero faith they're acting in the best interests of Toronto. | Sidewalk is clearly involved in this project to gather as much data as possible. I believe it's irresponsible to engage them in areas people likely will not want to be monitored. I am also extremely concerned what sort of data sidewalk will gather at the school. Very inappropriate if any at all. | At this point I can't see how WT can proceed with sidewalk labs or this plan. |
| 07/30/2019 8:59:07 | Receptive | Most innovative proposal forToronto in decades | Very little | None |
| 07/30/2019 10:03:12 | Receptive | More public access to your own neighborhood? Sounds good to me. | I don't see risks. | Why do we need specific conditions? Everyone is caught up on some data collection that everyone else is already doing without disclosing. These kind of conditions. I say proceed as planned. |
| 07/30/2019 10:35:58 | Receptive to some | No point in duplicating what the city already does. Maybe not well but . . . | Outside their lane. Care collective is a medial arts which we can offer. Civic Assembly can we organized by the community and rec centre staff. | Support exiting infrastructure not duplicate. |
| 07/30/2019 11:11:16 | Receptive | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/30/2019 11:36:37 | Not receptive | I do not trust Sidewalk Labs. They have insisted on in camera discussions while touting transparency. They collect wish lists from the public and feed the wishes back, saying that's what we are going to do. That's not planning, it's PR BS. I do not believe that Google is not interested in the collected data, as the CEO has publicly suggested. | Ask the Indigenous people how things worked out, when the last batch of colonizers showed up. I see the risks as similar or worse. Sidewalk Labs made plans for more land than they were asked to make proposals for and suggested changes to they way we should be governed. I am concerned that our civic leaders may be bought off, legally, by hiring them as consultants and appointments to prestigious positions. | No circumstances. I think we would be wise to sever relations with these people and deliver a firm No to their proposals. |
| 07/30/2019 12:21:13 | Receptive | You have to try new ideas before you say no | When too many people give opinion nothing gets achieved | No idea |
| 07/30/2019 13:26:15 | Receptive | It's innovative and exciting. It will make Toronto a city of the future, not one constantly mourning the end of the bloody 1980s. It will help the city, and region, continue developing as a tech-hub, where the industry of tomorrow lies. It's a good thing for the city, province and country. | I understand there is some concern over Data Collection, but, frankly Sidewalk isn't going to start or stop that. Facebook, Google, Apple, the Government, they've all been gobbling up all the data they can for years. Why is it only when an exciting proposal to make Toronto a city of the future that we can be proud of comes along, that the bloody Luddites come out in force?<br><br>To me, the biggest "risk" is that you'll listen to the Luddites, kill the project, keep the port-lands a wasteland, and try to shackle Toronto to the past, because technology is scary or some such nonsense. | Do it. Pursue these proposals. Don't be insane. Don't shackle Toronto to the 80s. |
| 07/30/2019 13:50:21 | Receptive | It incorporates many innovative concepts that could add value to the experience of living there or visiting. | Affordability, needs careful balancing of public and private interests. | The primary issue in my view is to ensure the availability of high quality public transportation. Of course I would expect an appropriate balance to be struck re the data privacy issue that reasonably protects individuals' rights. |
| 07/30/2019 15:00:16 | Receptive to some | While the proposal on its face is positive, the notion of developing new digital tools is troubling. and Sidewalk Labs level of transparency to date has been poor. | "Sidewalk Labs aspires for more digital tools beyond Collab and Seed Space to be developed by the community and through future partnerships" | There should be a full regulatory framework in place to control the development and implementation of any digital tools. |
| 07/30/2019 15:00:46 | Receptive to some | While the proposal on its face is positive, the notion of developing new digital tools is troubling. and Sidewalk Labs level of transparency to date has been poor. | "Sidewalk Labs aspires for more digital tools beyond Collab and Seed Space to be developed by the community and through future partnerships" | There should be a full regulatory framework in place to control the development and implementation of any digital tools. |
| 07/30/2019 15:15:18 | Not receptive | Inadequate. And again we need to ask who is driving this process – not the public – who will be govern it, and who will be the custodian for the data generated. I have zero faith in Sidewalk Labs stewarding this project given everything that has transpired so far. | Risks include technocratic "Google knows best" approach, undemocratic governance, data insecurity, undue enrichment and profiteering from public assets and private personal information. | A fresh process, driven by the people of Toronto. |
| 07/30/2019 15:26:01 | Need more information | The "Care Collective" must be run by the existing Ontario Health Care system. Sidewalk Labs can have no part in this. Especially when it comes to providing digital networks. | I have done and continue to do research around Google, Alphabet, and Sidewalk Labs. Their stated goals, their unstated goals but implied from statements made by such people as the Chief Economist of Google. Also, there is amply evidence of how all these companies put up vast sums of money in Lobbying and lawyers to fight any form of regulation. Not just about data but even things such as building codes. I could go on and on. | Sidewalk Labs will try to reassure government officials and the public that they are dedicated to privacy. But privacy isn't really the issue, it's agency and decision rights. Google, (and let's be clear, Sidewalk Labs is only an offshoot of Google, their core business model is the same) has made it clear but not clear to the public that they have the right to do what they want with any data that they can collect and or infer from our behavior.<br>This would have to be addressed in plain language. |
| 07/30/2019 15:30:17 | Not receptive | Do not trust this massive, for profit corporation. Their main agenda is profit, not livable spaces, equity, fair access, or community development. | For profit agenda. Blurred boundaries between public and private space, responsibility, and spending. | A small area owned by SWLs. VERY clear guidelines and policies about how they will be gathering data on citizens. Clear consequences if they breach the conditions. |
| 07/30/2019 21:43:45 | Not receptive | Duplication of existing government programs. No value in digital tools. | Creeping privatisation. | None |
| 07/30/2019 23:57:02 | Receptive | These are traditional resources that communities need to thrive. The difference is that there is a stronger sense of how to integrate emerging digital technologies in service support and provision. This is valuable, if successful, for communities well beyond this zone. | I don't see risks in these proposals if there is a skills sharing component to the Tech Bar. I particularly like the idea of working with the community to undertake public programming, the risk is that this requires continual, professional resources which need to be built into community infrastructure. That is a risk not a deterrent. | It would be good to include plans to upgrade neighbourhood skill sets. Sidewalk should work with partners in Toronto able to support these goals such as Toronto Public Library, Universities and Colleges, arts and culture centres and a range of health providers, including mental health. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 0:05:04 | Receptive to some | I like the provision of space for health and wellness and community activities.  I am not entirely convinced that all of the digital overlay for this is critical to the success of Quayside.  It seems like these enhancements should be developed and initiated city-wide with Public Health and Parks.  It may be that there are some digital applications that could enhance social development within Quayside, but I do not see then as essential to moving ahead with the project. | Little risk with the provision of space.  I am confident that it will be taken up.  With the digital overlay the risk is creating a set of neighbourhood services that isolate Quayside from the rest of the community.  In addition, it is not clear who would have the resources to administer the programs.  It should, in my mind, be the responsibility of the City of Toronto to provide these programs.  SWL may have some interesting ideas about how to organize and engage community members, but I don't think it is an option that is not needed to achieve the objectives that WT has set out for the project. | I would definitely want WT to pursue the idea of affordable or dedicated space for wellness or community activities.  I would only want to see the digital overlay if it were a collaboration with the relevant City departments. |
| 07/31/2019 7:40:50 | Not receptive | I do not see Sidewalks Labs as an entity that is truly concerned with the social good of Toronto residents. It is a business run by one of the largest data-gathering entities in the world, whose main goal is monetizing data. Why would Toronto cede valuable waterfront land and social infrastructure to an external entity whose motives are suspect? | | |
| 07/31/2019 9:41:20 | Receptive | Toronto is increasingly becoming a global hub for innovation, immigration, and inclusivity. I believe we should be welcoming organizations who believe this city demonstrates the shape of urban landscapes of the future | There are risks in every development! The only risk I see is failure -- where they assume people will use a space that is paid for with tax dollars and it becomes an unused, expensive upkeep portion of the project.

Again, so was City Place. A glowing example of failure to create meaningful communal space. | |
| 07/31/2019 10:57:33 | Receptive | Hopefully, we will understand what truly needs to be done to enable people to live very full lives | Profit to large corporations has destroyed many lives in the past. Will the "tools" be agile enough to change with the best alternatives for people or will they stifle organic growth with artificial parameters. | I want to see these tools be negotiated until completion by all parties. |
| 07/31/2019 11:21:09 | Need more information | More community space is great! what does that have to do a technology provider? This is a conversation about the role of public space that Canadians should be having, without the timeline of this proposal | To what extent will Sidewalk Labs' assumed economic, social and environmental gains be compromised if, for example:
Timber skyscrapers don't work or aren't approved? automated cars don't work out? the City balks at prioritizing waterfront light rail? b how will this effect these social infrastructure pieces? | Only once the municipal, provincial and Canadian governments have created a legislative framework for protecting data, AI, machine learning and algorithms that are open, transparent and accountable to residents. |
| 07/31/2019 12:32:30 | Need more information | What's a "Tech Bar"? An Apple Store? Sounds Gee Whiz but what is it?

Collab: Nothing new here. Every chain store provides an opportunity for customers to fill out an online survey on the "customer experience". They even offer free draws for prizes if you participate.

Seed: Nothing new here. For the last 20 years or more anyone can book a hotel room online anywhere in the world. Not a big deal to extend the idea to booking a room for a community meeting. Possibly the City of Toronto already provides this service.
' | I don't see any risk with having a community centre, a school, a community health centre. We already have these things in Toronto and any new ones should be operated on the same public and not for profit basis. Health centres and some community centres (e.g. 519 Church) have local boards of directors and this model should continue. No need for Google to have reps on the boards. And no need for their corporate logo to be plastered all over the facilities.

BTW: What about a public library run by TPL? TPL already runs "Tech Bars". They already have computers for all to use free of charge. TPL's deployment of IT is already sophisticated and comprehensive and they would be an excellent agency to support in the further development of IT resources for the enjoyment and education of the waterfront community. | By all means establish schools, community centres, community health centres, public libraries etc. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 17:15:37 | Receptive | The plan includes an innovative and wide-reaching set of social infrastructure elements. We like the flexibility and multi use spaces built into the plan. The Care Collective is like United Way Greater Toronto's community hubs which we see as key support to strong neighbourhoods. | Securing funding and proponents to lead the development of social infrastructure, while ensuring ongoing community involvement will be key.<br><br>The digital piece is important but addressing concerns re privacy are key.<br><br>It is also important to ensure integration of the three physical spaces of the Care Collective, Civic Assembly and an Elementary School as well public realm space to maximize use and impact. We are pleased to see a childcare centre in from the start.<br><br>The final plan should indicate how the social and health services in other communities will support Quayside residents and how the social infrastructure will also be available to people outside Quayside. Overall integration across Quayside, the rest of the waterfront and existing adjacent communities is essential. | WT or whoever will manage the project would need to bring partners together like United Way Greater Toronto, Unity Health Toronto and other community, social service and health partners to help plan for the care collective. Always residents need to be involved in any planning. Resources to do this planning will need to be made available. |
| 07/31/2019 19:02:11 | Receptive to some | | I feel like the 3 proposed community facilities are too limited. There should be something that could attract youth as well for example a recreational facility or a green park area. I don't understand why there is plans to build an elementary school. What about a High School? I understand there is an attempt to attract young families but would building a school be necessary to do that? | |
| 07/31/2019 19:48:22 | Not receptive | | I am HIGHLY skeptical of both Collab and Seed. Collar on the surface appears to be some sort of aspiring direct democracy/referendum/feedback service for the city, on the surface this should give citizens more democratic power, yet other Google technologies also appeared this way and had incredibly negative results. For example, YouTube was initially seen as a democratizing platform for everyone to share their voice. Instead, the way Google's suggestion algorithms work is highly biased and led to the radicalization of the far-right (https://www.cjr.org/the_media_today/youtube-conspiracy-radicalization.php) (https://www.theguardian.com/media/2018/sep/18/report-youtubes-alternative-influence-network-breeds-rightwing-radicalisation) even within Canada. The only way a tool can be democratic is if it is hosted, designed, controlled, and overseen by democratically elected government. This means our government must be given complete control of this system including any algorithms that drive it, otherwise it can be abused to manufacture public consent, or push specific agendas. Our government should consider this an incursion on the democratic process, and a potential first step in undermining Canadian municipal democracy by a foreign for-profit entity. | Social spaces can move forward with public oversight, but digital social infrastructure can only move forward if the government can have full control over the systems put in place, including influencing the design of the systems to eliminate biases, and control over the back-end algorithms that would influence how issues are presented or feedback is collected and analyzed. |
| 07/31/2019 19:53:42 | Receptive | I think Toronto needs to embrace innovation and needs to look at social infrastructure proposals that allow us to think bigger, think differently and expand the opportunity as we grow. We have the opportunity to become a leading city through this project and I think it would be a missed opportunity if we did not embrace this test pilot initiative. | I think the risk is in not embracing the opportunity and learning about non-traditional methods. The biggest risk is to keep doing what we have been doing for social infrastructure. | I am 100% that this Sidewalk Labs proposal moves forward, I have no conditions. |
| 07/31/2019 23:12:12 | Receptive | Great opportunity for Toronto. | City Hall will hold it up. | Just do it. |
| 07/31/2019 23:13:54 | Receptive | Great opportunity for Toronto. | City Hall holding it up. | Just do it! |
| 07/31/2019 23:15:57 | Not receptive | I do not know whether there will be a library or a public square. The proposed spaces are geared towards facilitating technology or technological service uses, which I'm not quite sure what they are right now. | A lack of trust from the public in the purpose of these places, ie. community hub, civic assembly. | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 08/01/2019 6:42:46 | Receptive to some | Because there is nothing interesting about this proposal. It literally takes existing things and rebrands them. A community centre + health clinic has now become a "Civic Assembly" and "Care Collective". For the uninformed reader, a liberal middle to upper middle class person (someone that I would assume would be the majority of those reading this proposal), this may seem progressive and wonderful, as they may have never actually stepped into one of Toronto's existing community centres or health clinics which already do the majority of the things described here. | Does Toronto's existing facility and service expansion plans call for new healthcare facilities or community centres in this area? (Apologies, havent gotten through all 1500 pages to confirm) Because if not: 1. we are burdening our system will additional operating expenses they have not accounted for (because operations will continue to be the purview of the public sector, as it should), and 2. why should the residents of Quayside get a higher level of care and service than residents elsewhere in the City. | |
| 08/01/2019 13:55:39 | Receptive | social infrastructure will be needed to make this community and adjacent one successful | No apparent city or provincial funding coming in a timely way ..too many competing projects city wide | |
| 08/01/2019 17:48:22 | Receptive | Sidewalk Labs has taken the Precinct Plans into account and has proposed some good ideas to make these requirements real. The ideas merit further explanation; they are certainly not a reason to reject the Proposed Plan. | 1. No funding from the City and TDSB - or at least delays in securing funding - to build and operate the proposed facilities 2. Lack of interest from the community in leading and participating in events and programs | The proposed apps are very interesting and we should investigate further. Several commenters have raised fears about the security of personal data. These fears are at least premature and at best unfounded. Of course, as with any app or program, users need to understand the arrangements for keeping personal data secure. But we can't say at this stage they are pernicious; Sidewalk Labs should (and I'm sure will) provide much more information about them. |
| 08/02/2019 13:13:19 | Receptive | Technology has had a great impact on how people use spaces, how maintenance is provided and how people interact. The plans provide for a realistic if not even a futuristic look and the public realm. | Probably the risk of Sidewalk Labs proposal will be it's success as a connected social space. Torontonians may ask why this kind of service cant be supplied elsewhere in the City. Pressure will also erupt upon the City to how they can manage the social aspects of the proposal. There does not seem to be any department in the civic government that can oversee and maintain the proposed ether and connectivity of the social environment. | There appears to be a requirement for how these elements will be supplied and paid for by whom. While the statements above mention more community space than the Bayfront plan - that is good, but realistically both the bayfront Plan and Sidewalk Labs could do better on the pubic realm and community space offering. My preference would be to have Sidewalk Labs investigate further how the projected populations for the site will be accommodated in terms of open-space, community space, and public realm. The community space metrics also should include the whole of the Portlands area. Sidewalk Labs needs to illustrate how their open space and community spaces fall into a larger planned network for the area. |
| 08/06/2019 17:16:23 | Receptive | I think this is a very interesting approach to development that should be further explored because technology will inevitably become intertwined with urban development. | With any bold change that re-invents the wheel you run the risk of not getting it right. I believe the changes (to the norm) that are being proposed are all in favor of improving the social experience on-site. I think that this will create a more inclusive environment in theory, but many times that is very hard to achieve for any new development, particularly one that has a prime location along the water's edge. If a very well developed plan for maintaining affordable housing is not strictly followed, overtime there is a risk that this site could easily become over-occupied by the wealthy, versus an all-inclusive development. | Waterfront Toronto should continue to explore this plan without delay. There are questions regarding data collection and privacy that the public deserves explanations and answers to, but I believe in Sidewalk Labs mission to re-define this area of Toronto's waterfront. |
| 08/06/2019 22:17:55 | Receptive | The proposal sound like a great way to build a sense of community | Not duplicating services from existing businesses further west in the east Bayfront area (for example, health services that may already be established in the neighbourhood). | I think it should be explored without any conditions |
| 08/07/2019 20:33:53 | Receptive to some | Sounds fine overall. | N/a | |
| | | | | |
| Submitted before deadline: | 68 | | | |
| Submitted after deadline: | 7 | | | |
| Total: | 75 | | | |

| Submitted On | Under what conditions would you support the construction of efficient units and shared spaces to increase the supply of affordable housing on the waterfront as proposed in the MIDP | What are your initial impressions of the proposed Waterfront Housing Trust and 1 Condo Resale Fee What are the potential benefits and risks of these proposals | To what extent should residential buildings on the waterfront be constructed from mass timber versus other typical building materials such as concrete or steel | What do you see as the strengths andor challenges of the building and housing proposals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/22/2019 4:59:15 | Affordable housing needs to meet standard size limits -- no micro-pods. | | This is a question that should be answered by qualified engineers. | |
| 07/24/2019 13:57:41 | There are so many amazing nonprofit and co-op housing organizations providing affordable housing in Toronto, and they are well poised to create new housing. There is absolutely no reason for a Google subsidiary to be involved, and it's pretty insulting to those who are already doing amazing work here. | | | There are so many amazing nonprofit and co-op housing organizations providing affordable housing in Toronto, and they are well poised to create new housing. There is absolutely no reason for a Google subsidiary to be involved, and it's pretty insulting to those who are already doing amazing work here. |
| 07/26/2019 11:12:28 | After the appropriate safety testing. | Not sure at this point. | I think it's time to experiment with this new technology -that's how we advance society and civilization. | Will open up a whole new industry with a chance for Canada to become a world leader in this technology |
| 07/27/2019 12:26:20 | This is an excellent plan. Do it! | 1. Excellent way of reducing speculation. 2. Good way of funding | Mass timber is totally the way to go. Concrete and steel should be de-emphasized. | This is a very strong proposal. If acted on promptly, it would help Toronto and Ontario to get in on the forefront of what will become a major new mode of construction. The challenges are as usual the "we've never done this before so we're not sure it can be done" attitude. Look to existing examples in British Columbia, Portland OR, Europe, and learn from them! |
| 07/29/2019 19:30:31 | As long as they give people autonomy not overpaying. | As long as the fee is used for good and not abused. | I'm not sure, not an engineer. What advantages/disadvantages are there to both for cost, durability, environment, fire risk, etc? | I like the amount of affordable housing. |
| 07/30/2019 10:52:17 | I don't think we are there yet. 362 sq feet is tiny. Shared spaces. not everyone will want this. Don't park all seniors in the same category as lonely etc. | I would like to see more info on how this works. It seems sustainable?? | I think we could do some base with concrete and steel as well as all timber. | I still don't understand how the flexibility works, will there be one moving day where people can go larger or smaller? |
| 07/30/2019 13:04:49 | | | | Lack of knowledge on some new technology proposals<br>Some exciting new ideas that hopefully will increase quality of life and benefit people in need |
| 07/30/2019 22:28:28 | Ownership by government or non-profit land trust, management by network of housing co-ops. | WHT-like entity should be the owner, not banker. | 100% | Strength: lower towers.<br><br>Challenges: private ownership will eventually remove affordability. |
| 07/31/2019 1:13:49 | Only if SWL also provides the enhanced amenities that the MIDP describes - shared common space that could be used by residents for entertaining or to accommodate guests - reasonably priced off site storage.<br><br>Also would want to see this done as a pilot with a robust assessment to determine whether an appropriate quality of life, in addition to affordability is achieved. | Great idea - may be very hard to get political support. Council has already rejected a call for a 3% fee on resale of luxury condos.  However, in the absence of adequate funding from government, affordable housing must be funded from somewhere.  The figures suggest that even with free land and city fee exemptions, a capital grant of more than $200,000 / unit on average must be found to reach CMHC average rents.  The SWL work again confirms what housing advocates know: there is no magic bullet for affordable housing.  It is expensive and to meet our needs funding has to come from some where. SWL work has laid out a possible strategy to substantially increase the affordable housing being built | Given the environment advantages, we should be building in mass timber as much as possible... | |
| 07/31/2019 6:48:16 | No comment | Positive, although the role of the Waterfront Housing Trust wold have to be more fully developed. | 100% | The use of mass timber is a positive, as is the inclusion of significant below-market rental housing. The fact that the below market housing cost is based on a smaller size unit is not so positive. The 1% condo resale fee is positive. |
| 07/31/2019 19:52:32 | I think smaller housing is not a pathway forward to affordability. Housing in Toronto is already incredibly small for non-affordable units. To make it smaller would greatly diminish the standard of living offered. We need to solve the big picture reasons of why housing in Toronto is un-affordable. Smaller units should not be considered at all. | I support taxes from the higher income brackets being used to support lower income groups, however, I think we need to make the contracts/laws around this air-tight and monitor how these taxes are being collected and used to ensure this social support system is not being abused. It also seems like a stop-gap measure when in the long term we should consider higher taxation at high incomes and more social support for lower income brackets. | | |
| 07/31/2019 23:27:05 | No brainers. | Clever. | All wood | Creative affordability  ideas. |
| 07/31/2019 23:37:51 | I don't know what is meant by shared spaces. Kitchens and bathrooms as in rooming houses? Does efficient mean even smaller than what is presently being developed inToronto?<br><br>I think people of low and moderate income should be able to expect privacy in their own self-contained apartments and space standards that are no more meagre than that which are currently offered in existing social housing. | It would be in effect another land transfer tax. It is hard to predict how much revenue this mechanism would produce. It might be usefully deployed on higher end units in order to capture some revenue from windfall profits to be applied to the public interest. | We should go slow on this technology rather than go all in all at once. Building codes have been built up slowly based on often bitter experience. We need real world experience to determine how these buildings perform under adverse conditions such as fire. The tragedy of the apartment building fire in London where seventy some people lost their lives should serve as a warning. Almost certainly the cladding material in that building was tested in a lab and deemed to be safe but the real life experience proved that it was not. | I prefer the word weaknesses to challenges. The weakness is that the proposals will result in a community that is higher income, probably much higher than Toronto as a whole. Why would we pursue such a result as a public project? |
| 08/01/2019 14:56:17 | | Makes sense at 1% or greater. | | |
| 08/02/2019 14:36:45 | Great that housing has an affordability component.<br>Unit design and building design should take their cue from the City of Toronto document Growing UP - a document that speaks to how units and buildings can be built that are more conducive to raising families. | I would have to know more about how the money would be used.<br>Theoretically could be good, however, it could just fule bureaucratic salaries. | Welcome the required change to the building code for higher mass timber buildings. It really is a fire fighting concern. My steel and glass comments are stated above. Better architecture, more use of wood and brick construction is welcomed. | Foundations and structural conditions of the soil in the waterfront area. |
| 08/05/2019 17:53:19 | | | | Strengths are:<br>- adaptable buildings constructed using sustainable techniques<br>- a mix of rental units and units for sale - plus affordable housing |
| Submitted before deadline: | 13 | | | |
| Submitted after the deadline: | 3 | | | |
| Total | 16 | | | |

| Submitted On | How receptive are you to exploring this proposal from Sidewalk Labs | Why | What do you see as the risks with Sidewalk Labs Building and Housing proposals | Under what conditions if any would you want to see Waterfront Toronto pursue these proposals further |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/16/2019 10:17:39 | Receptive | | | |
| 07/19/2019 17:29:20 | Not receptive | Build low-energy buildings without Google's "help". Low-energy housing is of no use to anyone if they have to grant control of the roof over their head to a ruthless corporation. If the technology you seek to develop only serves to further tighten the private grip on public throats, you've done the future (and the present) a great disservice. | Accepting them would be giving a grant to Google to seek ways to further immiserate society for the benefit of advertisers. Plus, please, not another public-private partnership, I beg of you. They make a desert and call it progress. | None |
| 07/19/2019 23:11:19 | Not receptive | Public funding concerns<br>Affordable housing stipulations | They are demanding extra land at a discount | Build the affordable housing on the allocated land, don't ask for more land. Even if it means reducing the number of units on the permitted land. They should be considerate of the current permit and not try to strongarm their way into more land. |
| 07/23/2019 16:54:02 | Receptive | Innovation is required to address the issues around housing this is a brilliant idea | I think old ways of thinking and traditional models are holding us back in addressing the issues, this proposal will advance housing opportunities in the city | |
| 07/24/2019 13:57:29 | Not receptive | There are so many amazing nonprofit and co-op housing organizations providing affordable housing in Toronto, and they are well poised to create new housing. There is absolutely no reason for a Google subsidiary to be involved, and it's pretty insulting to those who are already doing amazing work here. | There are so many amazing nonprofit and co-op housing organizations providing affordable housing in Toronto, and they are well poised to create new housing. There is absolutely no reason for a Google subsidiary to be involved, and it's pretty insulting to those who are already doing amazing work here. | None. |
| 07/24/2019 22:41:49 | Receptive | Affordable housing commitment. Sustainable buildings. Perfect combination. | No risks. | No conditions. Get it done. |
| 07/25/2019 9:30:20 | Receptive | I want to see these green buildings built. | I see no risks. these buildings have been successfully built in Vancouver and around the world. | I definitely want this proposal approved and these buildings built. |
| 07/25/2019 17:23:20 | Receptive | We need publicly financed, community-oriented development, without private interests. | | |
| 07/26/2019 11:09:40 | Receptive | Toronto desperately needs more affordable housing. | Nothing. | Definitely pursue asap. |
| 07/27/2019 10:27:25 | Receptive | The mix of housing options is important to creating a neighbourhood of opportunities for a mix of socioeconomic statuses that supports diversity and innovation. | Size of affordable units is a risk - how small do condos get before they are too small - this moves the bar lower again. Not sure about the mass timber factory - there are other more critical things to invest in. | Including affordable housing in the mix is absolutely critical and it needs to be done in a dignified, fully integrated way. |
| 07/27/2019 12:22:43 | Receptive | This is an innovative and excellent proposal for Toronto and Ontario. I've listed some reasons why in previous sections. | Timidity/delay in building code administration. For contrast, let's note that Stockholm is building a 34-story residential mass timber tower to be completed in 2023, and an 80-story tower has been proposed for Chicago's waterfront. Check this Architecture Daily article out: https://www.archdaily.com/796649/the-tallest-timber-tower-yet-perkins-plus-wills-concept-proposal-for-river-beech-tower | These should be vigorously pursued, while bringing into the loop city and provincial officials who would need to manage code changes. |
| 07/29/2019 18:52:24 | Receptive to some | | | |
| 07/29/2019 19:26:06 | Need more information | How come every page I'm reading has yet another new committee, non-profit or some other sector being created? Who is filling these roles? Who is owning these groups?<br><br>I would like to more autonomy given to owners if they must be stuck with condos which offers very little currently. | It has the same risk that other affordable housing does - which can be easily fixed by the way. With a no tolerance policy. You let in a drug dealer? Destroy the place? Otherwise break the rules, laws or cause trouble? You're kicked out permanently not just from that building but from any affordable housing. Affordable housing is for those who deserve it not for criminals or for people who simply don't care about anyone and love creating havoc. They can pay to clean their own mess. | If it is condos, I assume there is a condo board? Who is running/owning the building? There are some greatly running condos but others who have done some pretty underhanded things at the detriment to the living occupants. |
| 07/30/2019 10:30:45 | Receptive | After fossil fuels, concrete is the worst thing for the environment. Let's build greener. And let's stop building massive ugly condos. And let's not use fear of bureaucratic what-ifs to not move forward. You guys have three layers of government. Where there's a will there's a way. | No risks. | Please proceed. |
| 07/30/2019 10:49:29 | Receptive to some | Tall timber is the rage right now. But does everything have to be tall timber? | Need to seethe mix of all units | more details on the mix of units |
| 07/30/2019 13:02:30 | Receptive to some | I'm not sure about building such high building with timber Creating its own supplier of timber may create problems such as; unions, subsidies, lack of competition, corruption, and delays | It seems they are offering a variety of options for social housing, which I think are OK., Building to high shows the interest on selling condos to make money...for whom? and for what? | Strict building codes Each building should have its own management, controlled by a set of rules established and comunity by the city |
| 07/30/2019 15:30:19 | Not receptive | We need true affordable housing, which means Rent Geared to Income at a sustainable level. References to a % of market rates do nothing to guarantee affordability when the market itself is unregulated and skyrocketing. | | |
| 07/30/2019 15:53:13 | Not receptive | Timber construction is fine, but it is not innovative and we do not need Sidewalk Labs to do it. Such buildings are already going up in Toronto. We need real innovative construction so that bedbugs and cockroaches can't spread through multi-unit dwellings the way they do now. | Just because we CAN build 30 storeys high with engineered wood, we risk doing it and repeating the towering mistakes on the west side of the waterfront. 30 storeys is too high. | Don't. |
| 07/30/2019 17:43:19 | Receptive to some | Mass timber sounds interesting especially as I believe the construction process has a much reduced carbon footprint than traditional methods. I believe there are mass timber buildings in Vancouver.<br>Where does it come from? Does it not put significant stress on a timber industry that is already being viewed by environmental NGO' s? | "Shared Equity housing" sounds like vacations shares or a way for a group of investors to create an Airbnb. The affordable housing ideas are good but they won't last if they become nothing more than investment properties. Looks what's happened to housing prices in TO. Are there plans to prevent that?<br>Real time building monitoring needs significantly more detail, and I mean technical detail. What sensors will be installed? How many? Will individuals or individuals homes be monitored? | Plans to prevent out of control housing prices. A certainty that no 'Smart Home' technology will be installed neither will any infrastructure to support 'Smart Homes' be installed. |
| 07/30/2019 22:24:17 | Receptive to some | CLT is good. | Ownership by government or land trust to prevent speculation post development. | Buy the land, open bids from any CLT builder. |
| 07/31/2019 0:23:47 | Receptive | These elements of the proposal are well thought-out and articulated. Of particular interest are the mix of market pricing for new build - so essential in a city struggling with affordability. Also impressed with the potential for tall timber. | As with a number of these proposals having the skill set to implement will be critical. | I support them going forward. |
| 07/31/2019 1:04:18 | Receptive | Affordable housing strategy is stronger than any other developments. 50% purpose built rental is important. 40% affordability +40% 2-bedroom plus - are higher standards than any other developments. The 1% condo tax would create a significant fund for future affordable housing. These are strategies that could be adopted across the city. | Approval of tall timber. Availability of tall timber and the library of parts that is necessary to achieve construction efficiencies. Flexible buildings, smaller units and co-living are all new concepts that have not been proven in the Toronto context. | The affordable housing proposal should proceed on the condition that non-profit partners should own and manage the affordable housing, affordability should be protected indefinitely (in perpetuity). |
| 07/31/2019 6:44:11 | Receptive | Mass timber is definitely something we should be using for buildings and this proposal could accelerate their use. | The technological components are unproven and could be costly to implement. | Determine whether the province is prepared to approve these mass timber buildings. |
| 07/31/2019 8:15:52 | Not receptive | I am uncertain of the safety and efficacy of high-rise timber construction, and suspicious of the need to rewrite existing regulatory standards in order to accommodate them. It is also unclear what the advantage is, other than to make things more convenient and less expensive for the developers.<br>I am also skeptical of the plan for smaller housing units. Many new condo developments in the city today contain units that are barely large enough for a couple, and impossible for a family. Again, more units = more profit for the developers, while the area becomes a neighbourhood for affluent singles and shuts out families. | | |
| 07/31/2019 11:16:05 | Receptive | this makes more sense to me than the other sections | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 17:27:23 | Receptive | United Way Greater Toronto is very supportive and impressed by the recommendations for the amount and diversity of housing for low and middle-income individuals and families. This is greater than any municipal requirement. If this is the kind of housing mix that gets translated across all the area- this will have a real impact on housing supply.<br><br>We appreciate Sidewalks support of $77M. The versatility of housing design is strong.<br><br>As we assisted in the roundtable discussions with non-profit leaders representing local housing organizations, we would want to continue to see strong plans for collaboration with non-profit operators to deliver on the affordable housing units. | | |
| 07/31/2019 18:02:15 | Receptive to some | How realistic is it to get Ontario to change its laws regarding timber building height - how long would that take? Have these large timber buildings been tested? What about fire hazards?<br><br>There should be more below market housing - there is a worry that this will become a gated community for the rich tech workers. :/ Do not want a repeat of San Francisco!<br><br>Toronto has a real opportunity to help with the housing crisis in this matter.<br><br>Isn't "Shared Equity Housing" simply.... rent to own? | Ontario government says no to taller timber buildings. What then?<br>This turns into a "gated" rich people community. | Need to see if such large timber structures are truly viable. Need to consider the audience/ population of who is going to live here.<br>Is it going to include minimum wage workers to staff that fancy cafe in the Stoa? Or are they going to be taking the early train in from Scarborough? |
| 07/31/2019 19:52:34 | Receptive to some | | | I think smaller housing is not a pathway forward to affordability. Housing in Toronto is already incredibly small for non-affordable units. To make it smaller would greatly diminish the standard of living offered. We need to solve the big picture reasons of why housing in Toronto is un-affordable. Smaller units should not be considered at all. |
| 07/31/2019 20:09:47 | Receptive | Our city is crumbling under the issue of lack of social and affordable housing, we need to get creative in addressing housing. This proposal offers the opportunity to test new methods in a confined opportunity that could perhaps solve some of our city's most pressing issues. It also creates employment! | I don't see any risks, I think they could even test the tall timbers prior to full adoption. | I think it is a must! |
| 07/31/2019 23:26:01 | Receptive | Love what I am reading. | Someone stops it. | Please approve it. |
| 07/31/2019 23:28:15 | Need more information | You need to better define affordable housing. Lower in price compared to what year? | The building industry not buying in. | |
| 07/31/2019 23:38:13 | Need more information | I don't know how the affordable housing proposals relate to the actual need in Toronto. But whatever the affordability needs of Toronto are, that should be the basis on which we define and set out numbers of affordable units to be developed at Quayside and the rest of the residential portions of the waterfront particularly on public land.<br><br>In concrete terms that would mean using the 30% of income housing cost standard and then ensuring that each household income demographic is served in proportion to their number. Thus 10% of all housing developed on the waterfront should be affordable to and reserved in perpetuity for the lowest income decile of households in Toronto. Twenty percent should be affordable to and reserved for the lowest income 20%, 30% for the lowest 30% etc. And indeed the whole thing should be skewed downward somewhat in recognition of the acute need at the low end. Towards the higher end there might be less need to preserve affordability in perpetuity although this is where the 1% tax on resale might be applicable in order to capture a proportion of windfall profits for the public good. (BTW: Not more than 1% should be affordable only to the 1%)<br><br>Given that the median household income in Toronto is only in the range of $65,000 per annum Waterfront Toronto would need to go far beyond the definition of affordable housing that the City of Toronto currently uses to ensure that waterfront communities are affordable to all of Toronto. Since there is currently so much public attention being given to Quayside, and a whole new energy in public participation at the consultations, this would be an excellent time for Waterfront Toronto to step boldly into the the lead and set a high standard of affordability for housing developed within its jurisdiction. It | The biggest risk is that most people in Toronto won't be able to afford to live in Quayside. | If WT commits to true affordability as defined by what Toronto households can afford. This might mean that development will slow down while we await funding programs from government particularly the province and Ottawa. But this is where WT needs to try harder. WT succeeded in getting funding for flood control. They need to turn their energy to do the same to get funding for truly affordable housing.<br><br>It needs to be acknowledged that various proposals that Google-SWL makes for private sector financial support for affordable housing will be a side issue not the main event. A viable funding strategy for affordable housing that requires minimal government funding is a pipe dream. There is no getting around the need for government financial support if the issue of housing affordability is going to be seriously addressed particularly at the low end where the need is greatest. Further, new building technology might make a contribution to affordability as it always has in the past but the savings will come in small increments. For example, drywall replaced plaster decades ago and represented an important cost saving as did power tools and any number of innovations but housing still remains unaffordable for too many. |
| 08/01/2019 14:55:40 | Receptive | The low energy, high performance wood construction is the most compelling part of the SWL proposal. And second on the list is the 40% below market and 59/50 split on rental and ownership. EXCELLENT! | The economics at this scale are tricky but should be doable. | WT should embrace these elements wholeheartedly |
| 08/02/2019 14:28:11 | Receptive to some | It seems the SL proposal is profitable from the standpoint that they will be the owner and supplier of the mass timber component. Not much different from the builders and developers that own the road building and infrastructure companies, the drywall companies and the concrete and brick companies that build homes.<br>I do like the mass timber construction scenario, however. It is a welcomed change to the steel and glass condos that are built today with little architecture and form given to the balcony shape. The buildings are only as good as the caulking holding the windows in. We will see many bankrupt condo corporations that can't afford to repair the 5o-year-old condos in the future. | Supplier construction chain - benefit - SL. control both supply and demand.<br>This will be good for creating jobs in Ontario. | Certainly good for the environment to pursue this construction method |
| 08/05/2019 17:50:11 | Receptive | These proposals are strikingly innovative - indeed original. Waterfront Toronto should be applauded for being so far-sighted to involve Sidewalk Labs in this process; no commercial developer would have been so daring.<br><br>Sidewalk Labs' ideas not only deliver on what Waterfront Toronto asked for, they provide solutions that Toronto needs. We now have a massive oversupply of glass-walled towers which contain only small condo units that are available only to buyers. These buildings are not environmentally friendly; the units are not suitable for families; and they suit only people who can afford to buy. Sidewalk Labs' ideas address these issues with adaptable, sustainable mixed use buildings. On top of that, they would put Toronto in the forefront of the trend towards timber building. | The city and Province may not share Sidewalk Labs' vision for the use of timber buildings and may delay the necessary building code approvals - but that would be shortsighted. | Accept the proposals and conduct appropriate due diligence, for example on the technical issues associated with taller timber buildings. |
| 08/07/2019 20:41:40 | Not receptive | Affordable housing on the waterfront? That's just ridiculous. We should build normal condo buildings that are market priced | | |
| | | | | |
| Submitted before the deadline: | 32 | | | |
| Submitted after the deadline: | 4 | | | |
| Total | 36 | | | |

| Submitted On | What assurances should be put in place to ensure that neither Sidewalk Labs nor any other party obtains monopolistic control over digital infrastructure | What provisions should be in place should infrastructure elements fail or no longer be supported by Sidewalk Labs | Should the MIDP consider solutionssuch as a decentralized credential servicewhich do not focus on solving specific urban challenges Why or why not | Are there specific areas of the digital innovation proposals that you believe you need additional assistance in understanding prior to being able to determine whether or not you support these elements If yes please provide the topics that you feel you need this additional level of information for | What do you see as the potential benefits and risks of the digital proposals put forward by sidewalk labs |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/22/2019 5:46:22 | There are no current assurances that Sidewalk Labs cannot (or will not) assume monopolistic control. This company, a sister company of Google, has considered financial and technical resources to dominate the collection and, more importantly, the analysis of data. Sidewalk Labs states that it will share data, including with Alphabet companies, with the explicit consent of users. Sidewalk Labs can thus monetize data from this project. | Government needs to take over the process for deciding rules about the collection, storage and use of data, whether about identifiable individuals or deidentified. This project needs to be built on privacy regulations that accord with and strengthen provincial and federal privacy laws. | Decentralized credential services are largely untested technology. There is a large and significant gap in public trust on this issue. Sidewalk Labs does not have the trust of the public, nor is it a legitimate actor for creating a data governance structure. There needs to be broader involvement by government, privacy officials, academics, and civil-society groups. | More information is needed in regards to how personal information will be protected in smart cities, as well as how people may be meaningfully consent for the collection and use of their data. | There is a strong risk that Sidewalk Labs' proposals regarding its data trust will not be seen as legitimate by the public It appears to be a self-interested creation to facilitate data collection that serves Sidewalk Labs business interests. There is a strong reliance in its proposal on de-identification techniques. However, these techniques are not 100% reliable. The idea of publicly accessibly data by default needs to be revisited, as it will not deter monopolistic behaviour. |
| 07/24/2019 22:48:41 | Create open standards. No lock-in. No proprietary systems. | Letter of Credit/Financial backing. | Need more information. If private information is not collected, I don't understand the point. Seems unnecessary complication. | No. | New standard for government regulations. |
| 07/29/2019 19:44:01 | Probably best not to put this in at all. Better safe than sorry. | There is that too isn't there? Better not to have it. If we must have it, Sidewalk labs must be bound to give appropriate notice if they pull out. They must also find another party to maintain it then or dismantle it. And people can then learn to live without it. | Probably better to put forward ideas that actually help us rather than it sounds cool. | Data privacy | Allows everyone to fully connected digitally but at a high risk of corruption in such a large network. |
| 07/30/2019 18:39:54 | This should be straightforward regulation. Who has jurisdiction? The problem is that all governments are way behind the tech companies in terms of what can be done. | That should be in any contract. SL needs to continue support or pass it on to another at the approval of the city, | Decentralized is a misleading term. But more important is why we should have any kind of credential service. | What exactly is a decentralized credential system? I think I know but hopefully I'm mistaken. | No benefits. Everything they will propose as a benefit is in fact a redirection from their real purpose |
| 07/30/2019 23:01:17 | Open standards determined with other cities. | Open standards, local provider option. | Populate first, then ask residents. | | Ubiquitous high bandwidth |
| 07/31/2019 0:39:03 | Create the data trust. | Great question - look to ORION or other high speed network. | | | Benefits are 1) a test bed and the ability to meet residents and work force needs efficiently.<br>2) Talent development opportunities.<br>3) New technologies that will change our urban experience, in areas as diverse as mobility, to healthcare. |
| 07/31/2019 14:32:07 | This would need further investigation. | This would need further investigation. | This would need further investigation. | This would need further investigation. | The notion that this proposal only works in a larger area needs to be carefully considered - if that is a requirement, then Waterfront Toronto should not proceed. There is a benefit to both the connectivity and the implementation of a standard for the installation of all data gathering devices is a benefit. |
| 07/31/2019 18:16:37 | Have Toronto outright be in charge of the data using proper policies etc.<br><br>Need to look at RFP's critically - don't want a Phoenix Payroll disaster here.<br><br>Sometimes not fancy is cheaper/better/more reliable. | Right to repair! Information to how things are made etc. What are all the features? Especially if Sidewalk decides to abandon the koalas | | | Technology can really aid us in being more efficient. But things also break down a lot - especially if made by people who dont happen to live in winter cities. |
| 07/31/2019 19:55:33 | We need new and robust anti-trust laws that respond to the realities of contemporary technology. This means ensuring no propreitary systems are created that few companies can work with, that umbrella companies like Alphabet don't leverage the contract of one company like Sidewalk to put in place other Alphabet subsidiaries, and that cities do not accept contracts with companies that are dependent on other technologies from the same conglomerate (for example we should not accept a Sidewalk Labs transit contract that contractually or technologically binds us to Google payment systems.) | | | | |
| 07/31/2019 23:34:56 | Government regulation | Warranty | I don't care | No | Efficiency |
| 08/06/2019 16:51:54 | Why is this an issue? Beanfield has an effective 10-year "monopoly" over the communications infrastructure on the waterfront - and that relationship is an acceptable one. Why mot mirror this arrangement with Sidewalk Labs? | A contract with Sidewalk Labs (as with Beanfield) should be enough to guarantee Sidewalk Labs continues to support the infrastructure they propose. Other players (such as Bell Canada, Rogers and TELUS) would also be able to support the infrastructure. | | Data governance, security and privacy policies and practices that Beanfield and Sidewalk Labs propose to adopt. | |
| | | | | | |
| Submitted before the deadline: | 10 | | | | |
| Submitted after the deadline | 1 | | | | |
| Total | 11 | | | | |

| Submitted On | How receptive are you to exploring this proposal from Sidewalk Labs | Why | What do you see as the risks with Sidewalk Labs Digital Innovation proposals | Under what conditions if any would you want to see Waterfront Toronto pursue these proposals further |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/18/2019 22:43:40 | Receptive | | | |
| 07/19/2019 17:40:32 | Not receptive | I don't care what clever thing they have cooked up - I want no part of whatever "solution" they're offering. Cell phone data already works fine, and there is nothing to be gained by making the hells of the internet even harder to avoid. | I do not see what problem this solves, and "no privatization of public assets or roles explicitly proposed" opens the back door for any amount of traditional Google malfeasance. Does anyone actually want this? Furthermore, does anyone want this provided by a private, third-party? | None |
| 07/22/2019 5:46:27 | Not receptive | Sidewalk Labs initially sidestepped all questions about data governance (and intellectual property). Its October 2018 digital governance proposals were rushed, incomplete and introduce the concept of "urban data" that is unrecognized in Canadian law. Sidewalk Labs' assertion that data from public spaces should be publicly accessible by default, mean that Sidewalk Labs sees most data collected within public spaces as a public asset. Individual consent, however, is a problem and it's not one that Sidewalk Labs can address with its proposed signage. | There are strong risks that the proposed signage that Sidewalk Labs developed will not be accepted or understood by the public as informing them of data collection in public spaces. Recent surveys by Forum Research show a high level of distrust of Sidewalk Labs' capacity or intentions with people's data. People do not trust Sidewalk Labs not to use their data for advertising or to monetize it in another way. Sidewalk Labs' urban data trust is vague and poorly understood. At best, it is a weak framework designed to facilitate the large-scale collection and use of data with little regard for public opinion. | Instead of developing Sidewalk Labs' proposal of an urban data trust, the municipal and provincial governments need to take the lead in doing so, working in consultation with industry, academia, and civil society. As proposed, the urban data trust puts Sidewalk Labs in the driver's seat to implement its rules and standards on data collection, such as making data publicly accessible by default. The rules and governance structures on data need to be fundamentally reworked to ensure the proper protection of data, and to regain public trust. |
| 07/23/2019 16:56:35 | Receptive | We need to be utilizing technology to advance | None | |
| 07/24/2019 22:46:41 | Receptive | Commitment to government regulation. It's about time a tech company admits this. No hold them to it. | The government regs to go with it need to be strong. And apply to public sector too. Responsible data collection and use should apply to everyone. | Government regulations on data to be in place before occupancy and/or implementation of digital tools. |
| 07/25/2019 9:44:25 | Receptive | I do not believe there are privacy issues with this technology. | I do not believe there are privacy risks. | i would like this proposal approved. |
| 07/25/2019 17:25:19 | | What happens if the police demands that Google provides them with personal data collected on the street to assist in an investigation? What happens if Google gets hacked and this information becomes public? | | |
| 07/26/2019 19:02:36 | Not receptive | This digital infrastructure proposal is a brazen effort to control all of Toronto digital infrastructure, a truly scary prospect given the non-economic effects of data. | Complete erosion of our digital sovereignty and economic potential. . | None. These are ridiculous ideas that should be shelved. |
| 07/28/2019 18:39:06 | Need more information | I AM NOT SURE WHAT AREA I SHOULD PUT THESE ISSUES/QUESTIONS/THOUGHTS IN--SO PLEASE ASSIGN THEM TO THE PROPER AREA<br>The area/issues surrounding 5G technology has not been made clear to the public.  (I have attended 2 sessions)  Here is a little search I did.  Having lived through the tobacco issues and the thalidomide issues, I believe that, because no INDEPENDENT tests have been done--the public should not be guinea pigs.<br>1. For 5G:  It appears that no long-term studies have been done on humans by independent scientists. Is this true?  Has the public been informed<br>2.  The US standard only considers heat emissions—nothing else  This is being criticized by some scientists.<br>3.  G5 requires towers  every few hundred feet or so.  People will be much closer go to the source.  Currently telephone poles are being considered.  The towers are much smaller than current cell towers and will not be too visible.<br>4.  Some places have passed legislation to prevent local government's ability to regulate those installed on pubic property.  This limits the city's income.<br>5.  Some have identified security issues.<br>6.  Note that approx 250 scientists & Physicians have signed a petition warning of potential serious health impacts.  Note that one signatory is Frank Clegg, Former President of Microsoft Canada<br><br>https://www.spandidos-publications.com/10.3892/ol.2018.9789<br>Dec 2018:<br>Authors: Michael Carlberg Lena Hedendahl Tarmo Koppel Lennart Hardell Affiliations: Department of Oncology, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Örebro University, SE 701 82 Örebro, Sweden, The Environment and Cancer Research Foundation, SE 702 17 Örebro, Sweden, Department of Labour Environment and Safety, Tallinn University of Technology, Tallinn 19086, Estonia<br>Excerpt:  The International Commission on Non Ionizing Radiation Protection established guideline 2 of 10 W/m2 (2,000,000 10,000,000 µW/m2) depending on frequency in 1998, and has not changed it despite solid evidence of non thermal biological effects at substantially lower exposure levels. 1/5 | If 5G iS NOT implemented, how much of the innovations would still be done?  ie Does the whole plan rely on 5G technology?  Would it, or parts of it,  still go ahead without 5G ?  We should no upfront and public.<br><br>the worst case scenario is that the health of all citizens will be compromised.  Are we willing to proceed without these tests? | I understand that there are "naysayers" whenever a new technology is introduced but it seems to me that there are now some credible voices indicating their concern--and at the least asking for upfront independent testing.   I don't think this is too much to ask.  I think that there are great ideas here.  We should investigate them.  But we should never have another thalidomide--nor ever, to my mind, proceed without upfront testing  We should never use the whole population as a laboratory. |
| | | These environmental RF radiation levels are expected to increase with the introduction of 5G for wireless communication.<br>Same Authors: Case Report: Pub Mar 2018<br>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29725476<br>Conclusion:  RF radiation of sufficient intensity heats tissues, but the energy is insufficient to cause ionization, hence it is called non-ionizing radiation. These non-thermal exposure levels have resulted in biological effects in humans, animals and cells, including an increased cancer risk.<br><br>https://www.globalresearch.ca/scientists-and-doctors-warn-of-potential-serious-health-impacts-of-fifth-generation-5g-wireless-technology/5609503<br><br>We the undersigned, more than 180 scientists and doctors from 36 countries, recommend a moratorium on the roll-out of the fifth generation, 5G, for telecommunication until potential hazards for human health and the environment have been fully investigated by scientists independent from industry. 5G will substantially increase exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMF) on top of the 2G, 3G, 4G, Wi-Fi, etc. for telecommunications already in place. RF-EMF has been proven to be harmful for humans and the environment .<br><br>LAURA'S NOTE:  The latest I could find is over 250 signatories.  Here are the ones from   CANADA<br><br>Frank Clegg, CEO, Canadians for Safe Technology (C4ST); Former President of Microsoft Canada<br><br>Paul Héroux, PhD, Occupational Health Program Director, Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Occupational Health, McGill University Medicine, Montreal, PQ Anthony B. Miller, MD, FRCP, Professor Emeritus, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, 2/5 | | |

Malcolm Paterson, PhD, Director, Research Initiatives, BC Cancer Agency Sindi Ahluwalia Hawkins Centre for the Southern Interior, Kelowna, BC

Michael A. Persinger, PhD, Professor, Biomolecular Sciences, Behavioural Neuroscience and Human Studies, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ontario

Magda Havas, Associate Professor, Trent University, Canada

https://www.euractiv.com/section/cybersecurity/news/cybersecurity-agency-warns-of-extremely-dangerous-risks-of-5g-technology/
Security Issues: European Union— come with "extremely dangerous cybersecurity risks.

https://www.brusselstimes.com/brussels/55052/radiation-concerns-halt-brussels-5g-for-now/
Apr 2019: Brussels Times:
Radiation concerns halt Brussels 5G development, for now Monday, 01 April 2019
Plans for a pilot project to provide high-speed 5G wireless internet in Brussels have been halted due to fears for the health of citizens, according to reports. In July, the government concluded an agreement with three telecom operators to relax the strict radiation standards in Brussels. But according to the Region, it is now impossible to estimate the radiation from the antennas required for the service

"I cannot welcome such technology if the radiation standards, which must protect the citizen, are not respected, 5G or not," Environment minister Céline Fremault (CDH) told Bruzz. "The people of Brussels are not guinea pigs whose health I can sell at a profit. We cannot leave anything to doubt," she added.
https://www.cnn.com/videos/business/2019/07/23/huawei-cell-phone-avlon-reality-check-newday-vpx.cnn
CNN: How 5G technology could be a security risk.
 3/5

https://interestingengineering.com/is-5g-harmful-for-humans-and-the-environment

This author enthusiastically supports G5, but at the end says:
"But over 215 scientists from 40 different countries have appealed to the United Nations for urgent action to reduce the EMF (electromagnetic field) exposure emitting from wireless sources. These scientists also submitted a letter to the FCC, asking the body to consider health risks and environmental issues before rapidly deploying 5th generation wireless infrastructure.

"All of these scientists have conducted EMF studies and published their results in peer-reviewed journals that show adverse biological and health effects caused through EMF sources developed by humans.

"In another letter written by Dr. Martin Pall, a biochemistry professor at the Washington State University discussed the severe biological and health effects resulting from 5G, stating that the current FCC guidelines are inadequate, obsolete, and in favor of telecommunications industry".
Dr. Pall also believes that there may be major ill-effects in long run after 5G implementation such as blindness, hearing loss, skin cancers, male infertility and thyroid issues.

"Surprisingly, FCC's perspective on 5G is different and is making sure that the technology is deployed at the earliest. Instead of laying out strong and effective guidelines, the agency's efforts are towards developing a legislature that will prevent local governments from restricting the implementation of 5G.
Apart from 5G specific studies, there are numerous other researches that show evidence of harmful effects of low-intensity, extremely high electromagnetic radiation on animals" https://venturebeat.com/2019/04/19/5g-is-live-in-3-countries-but-we-still-need-answers-on-health-risks/
4/5

Balanced article - but ends by " it's clear that the time is right for cellular carriers, chipmakers, and governments to provide a better answer to the "is 5G safe?" question than "we're not sure" or "already asked and answered." I'm no fan of needlessly drawn out environmental impact studies or moratoriums on development, but if health or lives are at stake, there should be assurances that the networks that blanket our neighborhoods and the devices we let our kids carry are safe.
"Assuming 5G carriers and companies have done their due diligence and the evidence is as clear as scientists and engineers have claimed, providing a solid, comprehensively reassuring answer shouldn't be difficult. And it would conclude this debate for a long time — enough to enable widespread adoption of a new technology that has great potential to change the world for the better, rather than risking harm to people across the globe."

https://www.celltowerleaseexperts.com/cell-tower-lease-news/5g-cell-towers-are-they-safe-who-decides-where-they-go/

Legislation has been proposed, and in some cases passed, to prevent local governments' ability to regulate these installations on public property.
That means traffic lights, light poles and public buildings could be sites for small cells. This also means revenues from these small cells or cell towers is limited, which reduces the amount of money the city can then receive for the devices.https://www.lifewire.com/5g-cell-towers-4584192 How they work
3. G5 requires towers every few hundred feet or so. People will be much closer go to the source. Currently telephone poles are being considered. The towers are much smaller than current cell towers and will not be too visible.
4. Some places have passed legislation to prevent local government's ability to regulate those installed on pubic property. This limits the city's income.
5. Some have identified security issues.
6. Note that approx 250 scientists & Physicians have signed a petition warning of potential serious health impacts. Note that one signatory is Frank Clegg, Former President of Microsoft Canada 5/5

| Date/Time | Receptiveness | Comment | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/29/2019 12:02:05 | Receptive to some | Mostly it seems like such a narrow focus for digital innovation: koala mounts and plug and play sensors and devices. A shame that innovation as framed precludes any form of transformative practice.<br><br>Rethinking the digital as it will interweve governance (and the social infrastructure) seems like more of a place for something powerful to happen, and yet SL and traditional non-profits models have been portrayed as "service provider" | Mostly that a narrow subset of private companies will be able to capitalize on them. the "decentralization" of identity providers will follow the same path as cryptocurrency and "recentralize" with a new subset of folks. | |
| 07/29/2019 19:41:01 | Need more information | Okay with providing wifi EXCEPT it could easily be hi-jacked and there is nothing to propose how to protect from that. And who would own and maintain this? | Privacy violation if information is taken from this free wifi service. | Needs to be safer. I need more information. |
| 07/29/2019 19:45:34 | Not receptive | Seems like a huge landmine for potential data theft and potential malicious interference. Not only is there a lot of information being collected through a single network, there is also a reliance on third-party devices. Nor is there very much information on how this information and network itself will be secured. | Same as above. | |
| 07/30/2019 8:08:02 | Not receptive | This idea seems less like a technological marvel and more like an open air prison the more I read. | Surveillance of citizens. | None. |
| 07/30/2019 10:33:26 | Receptive | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/30/2019 10:59:19 | Receptive to some | Its being used now | Too much collection. Need to ensure that there is no breach Citi financial had a breach today | see what the feds come up with for policy |
| 07/30/2019 15:31:01 | Not receptive | | | Fresh process, re-set. |
| 07/30/2019 18:32:33 | Not receptive | A decentralized digital credential system to allow individuals to be identified. Are you kidding? How about a tattoo on my arm? This is a fundamental invasion of privacy. Why on earth would I allow Sidewalk Labs to be able to identify me wherever I am? This entire concept is about collecting personal information. I see no possible benefits! | Hacking into this system is hacking into the entire urban system that SL has proposed. Hacking will occur.<br>Personal information will be sold. Sidewalk Labs will say that all data is anonymized but anyone who has looked into this know that is a fallacy. A privacy researcher in 1997 proved that she could get the medical records of the Governor of Massachusetts using publicly available information. | This should not be allowed. I suspect if this is proposed to Sidewalk Labs then they will walk away, This is the core of their surveillance |
| 07/30/2019 22:57:04 | Receptive to some | Universal bandwidth as city infrastructure - metro WiFi. | Proprietary standards in Koala.<br><br>Digital credentials should be government issued and regulated. | Small test sites. |
| 07/31/2019 0:36:10 | Receptive | The urban data collection strategy is viable, and this is again an opportunity for Toronto and Canada to deploy, test and improve urban informatics.<br>It is a test bed (see Koala notes) so of core in is vulnerable. However, the solutions that will be derived will not be Sidewalk dependent. | The main concern expressed is with data protection. It is good to see politicians paying attention to the questions of data harvesting. However Sidewalk intends to do no more than already occurs with our data and in fact they are planning to test a new model for data collection and maintenance. | |
| 07/31/2019 8:24:53 | Not receptive | Any and all of Waterfront Toronto's suggested risks: Reliance on third party decisions (such to create Koala-compatible devices or integrate with a digital credential system) to achieve benefits<br><br>Potential creation of a preferential environment for vendors who have partnerships or capacity to create Koala-compatible devices or integrate with credential system<br><br>Potential that a bad actor could gain access to data flowing through Koala mounts or prevent public realm data from being shared in an open, non-discriminatory manner<br><br>Potential that reducing the burden of installing devices that collect personal information could lead to increased surveillance<br><br>Potential that Koala mounts or other Sidewalk Labs-installed technology could be a target for malicious activity that disrupts infrastructure | | |
| 07/31/2019 11:19:37 | Receptive | I want to live in a hi-tech place | hi-tech usually ushers in corporate greed, hackers and org crime. | |
| 07/31/2019 14:27:11 | Receptive to some | The connectivity is a benefit. The amount of data gathering proposed by Sidewalk not so much. | Too much data. | No comment |
| 07/31/2019 18:13:47 | Receptive to some | If it is going to follow the city data rules and policies thats fine. A lot of this seems to read like typical aspects of Open Data - which Toronto already has.<br>City data should be owned by the city. | Alright - those Koala mounts look nice with all their accessories and all the things they can do but...<br><br>If we take this a step back to the whole "Design of Everyday Things" Don Norman style - how easy is it to use these koala mounts? Is it a lot of tech talk and apps and excitement that wont actually be that effective? If this becomes abandoned ware and the city has bought it and it's not going to be update what then? Will the city just have these koalas hanging around which could potentially be hacked for other purposes?<br><br>Would an old fashioned method of a person and a clicker actually be cheaper and more effective?<br><br>Plus we are already being tracked via our cellphones so...<br><br>How reliable is the wifi - can it easily be hacked etc? | Need to think of all the issues of why a koala mount is better than old fashioned methods of tracking.<br><br>Do not get dazzled by the technology! |
| 07/31/2019 19:52:53 | Not receptive | | | Ubiquitous wi-fi needs to be strictly without any network traffic monitoring. We should not consider a proposal in which Alphabet companies monitor the traffic as this would force the underprivileged who can't afford extensive data plans to give up their right to privacy, while the well-off could afford data plans. The LinkNYC wi-fi networks Sidewalk installed in New York were also a surveillance program in disguise, providing free wi-fi but with stations that have various sensors to collect data. We shouldn't allow technologies to be deployed that have other uses or capabilities that aren't publicly disclosed or advertised—people may support a free wi-fi network that doesn't spy on their activity, but may agree to it without the awareness that the wi-fi stations also contain cameras with facial recognition technology, wi-fi traffic readers etc. |
| 07/31/2019 20:13:35 | Receptive | I think it is the way of the future | Data security practices would have to be in place. | Unsure |
| 07/31/2019 23:31:44 | Not receptive | How will data from wi-fi be used? Will there be an easily understandable terms and conditions page when signing in for wifi? | | |
| 07/31/2019 23:33:14 | Receptive | Why not? | City being too slow to work with this proposal. | Time is now |
| 08/01/2019 15:08:07 | Receptive to some | I'd pay close attention to WT concerns | | |
| 08/06/2019 16:46:11 | Receptive | Deployment of digital technologies for surveillance and monitoring is inevitable - in Quayside and the rest of the city. It's better that this deployment is handled by organizations like Beanfield and Sidewalk Labs' whose policies, standard and practices can be monitored and influenced. | Very few - and none that can't be easily managed and mitigated. There are risks relating to privacy and security associated with any deployment of connected networks and associated equipment. But practices have been developed to mitigate these risks. Sidewalk Labs' proposals don't present any additional or more complex challenges. (And specifically the Koala mounts are simply a passive mechanism for mounting sensors and other equipment easily and cheaply.) | Beanfield and Sidewalk Labs should develop policies and practices with regard to data security, governance and privacy that are consistent with best practices worldwide and comply with Canadian regulations. |
| 08/07/2019 20:43:15 | Not receptive | This is just too much "innovation". Why can't we build a normal neighbourhood? With normal housing and lots of parks? | | |
| | | | | |
| Submitted before the deadline: | 27 | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Submitted after the deadline: | 3 | | |
| Total | 30 | | |

| Submitted On | What do you see as the strengths and or challenges of the mobility proposals | Which gaps or challenges if any does the proposed Waterfront Transportation Management Association WTMA address with respect to mobility within waterfront neighbourhoods What are the potential benefits and risks of establishing this model | Under what conditions if any should governments consider the use of taxincrement financing to accelerate deployment of Waterfront LRT as proposed by Sidewalk Labs |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/19/2019 14:25:03 | sidewlak labs gogole has history of privacy invasion, "trust us" I DONT THINK SO! | sideawlk labs scarp it. | none. |
| 07/22/2019 16:58:58 | | Need to get less car dependent but if people are coming in from outside of Toronto and all they have is a car where are they going to put it? And what about people with reduced mobility who need their own vehicle to travel? | Don't. |
| 07/24/2019 22:39:04 | Parliament Plaza and breaking the cycle of dependence on streets and cars. | Need more information. Make sure it is a public agency and it isn't redundant. | Perfect place to do it. Government can invest in a transit system that has the impact of raising the value on its own land base. Automatic payback. It's not rocket science. |
| 07/25/2019 22:30:40 | Very creative. | | |
| 07/26/2019 11:06:28 | The main strength is to open up the eastern waterfront to the public | Ok as outlined. | This project needs an LRT to be viable. Everyone know this. Waiting for this to be done the conventional way may take a dozen years. Toronto and this project cannot wait that long. Other viable financing options need to be investigated. |
| 07/26/2019 16:15:17 | Major strengths are the focus on people first streets and limiting access to the neighbourhood via private vehicles. The bypassing of traditional LRT funding can expedite the process and avoid future challenges like getting the province or the feds to pitch in to funding the LRT without political egos derailing the process and adding further delays (example, Relief Line). | what would the handshake between WTMA and TTC be? What would the mandate look like, what is the scope of their mandate? All this needs to be addressed and communicated. I can see potential benefits such as accelerating improvements on the waterfront corridor by being more focused as opposed to dealing with the whole city or region but it's too high level at this point. | Governments should definitely consider this option considering how terrible transit investment has been in the GTHA in the last decades. We cannot afford further delays caused by successive governments and political games being placed with our transit infrastructure. If this model means the project will be funded fast and construction will start more quickly then I'm all for it. We need to invest quickly in public transit if we're going to do anything about curbing our emissions from the transportation sector and reduce congestion in this city. |
| 07/27/2019 12:03:51 | Very forward looking. This is where we need to go. Do it! | WTMA governance rules need to be properly spelled out to avoid cronyism (no appointing party hacks to the board as rewards for party service. Consider making these elective rather than appointed positions - reduces the chances of cronyism. | Absolutely this should be done. |
| 07/29/2019 19:11:08 | Pushing better transit and more environmentally friendly options. Challenge with cars as rest of city heavily dependent on cars and you want it to be connected with the rest of the city. | Is it AODA compliant? This whole project not just mobility should be accessible by everyone and be AODA (Accessible Ontarian Disabilities Act) friendly. | If it helps the public fine but then the government owns the transit not the Sidewalk Labs. Plus, there has to be enough people traveling via the Waterfront LRT to worth funding in the first place. If Sidewalk Labs contributes money, then the contribution has to be continuous to give them any partial ownership and that ownership is terminated if they pull funding or reduced if they lower funding. |
| 07/30/2019 10:45:47 | | | To pay for the LRT!!! Now |
| 07/30/2019 15:25:17 | Ideas that work elsewhere may not work with our population. Witness the mistakes already made with curbless Queen's Quay. Cars were driving done subway tunnels until a gate was installed. Pedestrians, often tourists, are threatened by speeding bicycles when then inadvertently step into cycle paths. More and more signs and signals indicate problems, not solutions. | The benefit goes to Sidewalk Labs and private corporations, would would prefer to deal with such a body, rather than present overseers. | We should not do it, unless we are talking about incrementing taxation of developers. Sidewalk Labs does not want to invest without an LRT or some such, that's fine. They can wait and see if others beat them out of the opportunity. If we fund our own transportation, with our own tax dollars, I think we will get a better deal, anyway. |
| 07/30/2019 15:30:07 | Any real mobility strategy is going to require implementation over a much larger area - I would start small and work up to it. the pedestrian and cycling proposals are good. | I do not like the WTMA - period. | None |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 07/30/2019 16:56:07 | I like the idea of 'people first' streets. I fear SL is using this a a slogan but I can see how some of their ideas can improve on TO's work on this. | SL has reduced the number of public parking spaces so how many spaces does the WTMA set the price for? Or they need to control the pricing of nearby lots outside of Quayside, taking revenues away from the existing operators. No one will like the curb pricing. Who puts up the money in the first place? How much? Does SL imagine that the revenues collected will support the activities of the entity.<br>The private stakeholders mentioned almost certainly include SL and it's supporters, giving it inside access to city governance. | I wish I understood this and will research it. If it causes the LRT to be built before the relief line I can see problems |
| 07/30/2019 22:11:45 | Dynamic curb is the only real innovation proposal. | Metrolinx/TTC/PTCs need integrated management anyway...fix that. | Governments should become landlords. |
| 07/31/2019 0:49:18 | | | If there public sector is not prepared to move forward. If there is a public peer review of the business plan that demonstrates the economics are sound from a public interest perspective. Possibly a limited RFP or Swiss Challenge type of process should be considered to satisfy the public that any funding arrangement is reasonable. Most importantly, the opportunity to advance the Waterfront LRT should be seriously entertained. |
| 07/31/2019 15:00:46 | | It takes revenue that should be shared with the city as a whole and deploys it for the exclusive benefit of the Quayside community. A virtual gated community. | None. |
| 07/31/2019 17:42:07 | Yay public transit and bikeability.<br><br>Is there proper drainage for melted sidewalk snow?<br>Does mobility include people with disabilities or is this still an able bodied world? | How is this going to really connect and blend in with the rest of Toronto? esp if there is no where for cars? | Under well reviewed legal advice. |
| 07/31/2019 17:42:18 | Yay public transit and bikeability.<br><br>Is there proper drainage for melted sidewalk snow?<br>Does mobility include people with disabilities or is this still an able bodied world? | How is this going to really connect and blend in with the rest of Toronto? esp if there is no where for cars? | Under well reviewed legal advice. |
| 07/31/2019 19:50:32 | | —A major risk is that this entity will be used to push through Alphabet's agenda, rather than creating a specialized government body with the adequate knowledge to oversee and regulate Alphabet's behaviour. We should not accept ANY governance proposals from a foreign for-profit company. Our government derives its power from public support through democracy, not foreign corporate influence.<br>—Alphabet companies have a long history of using services to disguise data collection. This includes Gmail email's being read, Google Streetview cars not only capturing photos but also reading wifi traffic including individual emails, and Sidewalk Labs own LinkNYC wifi hotspots being used to collect personal data and snoop on personal internet traffic (https://www.harvardmagazine.com/2019/05/smart-cities-big-tech-surveillance). How can we ensure that data collected is only in line with the services being provided and that it is only being used in support of that service? Consumers expect their services to do only what the service advertises, it should not be used as a trojan horse to collect data outside of its direct application. | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 21:52:34 | | It takes revenue that should be shared with the city as a whole and deploys it for the exclusive benefit of the Quayside community. A virtual gated community. | None. |
| 07/31/2019 23:19:43 | Cycling infrastructure  especially  green wave.<br>LRT | Finally transit will get moving. | Just get building transit with their financial help. |
| 08/01/2019 14:30:35 | | | Tax Increment financing is starting to become a panacea for solving all the City's municipal financing woes. Most appropriately used in distressed areas as a measure of last resort, the Quayside site does not fall into that category. And if SWL qualified so too would every other development site in the City that needs an LFT to go ahead. Another rabbit hole |
| 08/02/2019 13:56:19 | Really like the multi-functionality of the road and how it can be converted from vehicular use, complete street to pedestrian-only. | Again the WTMA is yet an additional layer of red tape and possible operational quagmire. Sure some sort of mobility oversight and operational advice is required, however, it might be better reviewed and discussed in the context of existing management. | No - let SL carry the burden. It's their proposal but as stated earlier there will need to be recognition from future builders to pay. if the mobility items are development benefits to all then all should pay at their time of building or developing. I guess that is tax-increment financing to an extent but the builders might recognize savings in their construction by not building so much underground parking so their construction cost will be reduced and replaced with the tax- increment financing so they maintain affordability in their pricing |
| | | | |
| Submitted before deadline: | 20 | | |
| Submitted after the deadline: | 2 | | |
| Total | 22 | | |
| Duplicates: | 1 | | |

| Submitted On | How receptive are you to exploring this proposal from Sidewalk Labs | Why | What do you see as the risks with Sidewalk Labs Mobility proposals | Under what conditions if any would you want to see Waterfront Toronto pursue these proposals further |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/29/2019 19:05:42 | Need more information | Like I've said before I have not seen the full proposal or original draft! How can I make an informed decision if I'm not fully informed? | I'm going to say this yet again - NO DATA COLLECTION. If data must be collected it must be to the benefit of the community, be stripped of identifying information and NOT be used for a profit.

I like lowering the use of cars but remember: you want to connect with the rest of the city. Unless you make the rest of the city also easy to travel without car this could present a hurdle for some would end of driving down and then having to put their cars somewhere while using the local transit which would also require transferring modes of travel and people already hate switching buses let along vehicles... | If our privacy isn't violated, perhaps. |
| 07/31/2019 11:36:30 | Need more information | These are pretty standard values for progressive urban planning. I want to understand how the data would be used in real time. How are the algorithms weighted? How are disputes about use solved? | we are effectively outsourcing decisions about space allocation to a machine and I think most people will not understand how and why those decisions get made. what is to stop effective lobbying by car companies to tweak the algorithm in favour of cars? Tensions between vulnerable road users are very high and this proposal doesn't have a plan for that. | we need federal laws that ensure any-kind of algorithm is open, transparent, accountable |
| 07/16/2019 17:55:38 | Not receptive | The project should be governed by existing public governance not the WTMA. Google (via the WTMA) should not be collecting money from the public nor be in charge of decisions regarding non-profits. Again - use existing public structures. | Google has a conflict of interest in autonomous vehicles. Jobs for people not robots. If this proceeded I fear google would use non-profits to further it's own interest in robotics. | I would prefer to work with a smaller Canadian company |
| 07/19/2019 14:24:26 | Not receptive | same. sidewalks labs not trust, they arent honest | all of it, | https://www.nationalobserver.com/2019/02/15/news/alphabets-sidewalk-labs-was-secretly-considering-big-plans-toronto-neighbourhood

"'No way on God's green Earth'"
The Sidewalk panel: Last October, Sidewalk Labs announced it would form its own separate panel of private-sector, non-profit and academic leaders to offer advice on Quayside. HELL NO! |
| 07/19/2019 17:15:44 | Not receptive | These proposed solutions to city accessibility all involve high technology that necessarily requires private investment. By trying to achieve and improve accessibility this way, you make the city more dependent on private interests. Our time and energy is far better spent finding a democratic means of accessibility rather than outsourcing it to an unaccountable international corporation. | Toronto paying for, and being burdened with, expensive and hard-to-maintain luxuries that are less useful than basic roads, but make technology fetishists excited. | None whatsoever - just make as many streets car-free as possible and ensure bike lanes and TTC access are sufficient, just like is being done everywhere else in the city. |
| 07/22/2019 4:24:08 | Not receptive | I support Sidewalk Labs emphasis on public transit. However, there are risks that Sidewalk Labs will not find this plan in its economic interests without a guarantee of light rail. It's strange that there is little (if any) mention made of buses or street cars as possible public transit solutions. I agree with an emphasis on making biking and walking within the city safer. | One significant risk is that Sidewalk Labs bases this entire proposal on light rail in the IDEA District, which is not planned in the near future. Another significant risk is the heavy reliance on the rapid availability of autonomous vehicles. Even Sidewalk Labs' master plan estimates that "around 2035" is a hopeful timeline. There is a strong reliance upon the effective development of the mobility management system for real-time traffic management and parking prices/curbside pricing. There is no discussion of the timeline or cost to build such a detailed, data-intensive system. What are the benefits of such as system? Why such an emphasis on curbless streets? The physical and digital infrastructure required to make curbless streets effective as described in the master plan would seem to outweigh the benefits (decreased idling time, more effective pickups/dropoffs).

The contention that parking spots can be transformed into community gathering spots seems bizarre. Given the traffic fatalities in Toronto, anticipating that people would use temporarily empty parking spots for community gathering seems naive and potentially risk. | More detail is needed on the proposal of the mobility management system, including the data collection, store, and analytics. Much more detail is needed on the proposed Waterfront Transportation Management Authority. Why is a new public regulatory body needed? What amount of public funds would be required to create and maintain such a body? What is the relationship of this body to other government departments in Toronto and Ontario? What are the cost-benefits of real-time pricing for parking and pickups/drop-offs? What are the risks if light rail and autonomous vehicles are delayed? This plan would then appear to rely entirely on private vehicles and ride hailing operations like Uber and Lyft. |
| 07/22/2019 16:58:01 | Not receptive | "Pricing incentives and active management of the mobility network with pricing applied in real time to manage demand"

What exactly does this mean? Is this run off data - is this given freely? Who is governing this information?
All for more public transportation and people first sidewalks and areas, but honestly Toronto can look to Europe for those types of designs.
Heated sidewalks sound nice but long term what is the practicality? That's an area that is likely to flood - will the flooding screw that all up? | Data! Privacy! Need to think about data collection - is this necessary to be SMART? | Underground freight tunnels seem cool. I'm more into public transportation and people first. But concerned with some of the bigger data driven ideas. |
| 07/24/2019 13:46:58 | Not receptive | | | None |
| 07/25/2019 17:13:29 | Not receptive | I am deeply concerned about the penetration and growth of multinational tech transportation companies, like Uber, that have a history of labour exploitation and destroying the local economic regulatory environment.

Who will be in charge of the maintenance and monitoring of heated pavement? Will they be contracted out or will it be unionized employees with a liveable income? Will the delivery robots hurt the local courier economy? | - Loss of well-paid, unionized jobs from unionization
- Creeping privatization of public services that are accountable to the public and provide liveable wages to local residents | n/a |
| 07/29/2019 19:19:32 | Not receptive | I do not believe a private corporation should be planning our cty. | We're talking Google here folks, one of the most data hungry organizations on the planet. There is too much opportunity for loss of privacy and citizen control of our community. | Remove Google from the equation. Set up public input channels fr citizens to impact decisions. Never ever hold a private (no edia access) meeting on this issue again. We need full transparency. |
| 07/29/2019 21:52:13 | Not receptive | - Ridesharing shown to increase congestion
- RFP asked for "innovative funding strategy", Sidewalk proposed financial plan that gives them huge profits | | Google pays full cost of LRT as a no-interest loan to government |
| 07/30/2019 7:58:54 | Not receptive | WTMA should be 100% public. There's no reason sidewalk, alphabet or google should be included at all. | Data being #1. Also the lack of rules constraining sidewalks roadside data collecting. | None. Shut this deal down. |
| 07/30/2019 15:08:11 | Not receptive | It is not the place of Sidewalk Labs to suggest how we should govern ourselves or tax ourselves. The citizens of Toronto and their elected representatives should retain these powers and be accountable to voters for their decisions. | The obvious risk is reduction of public control over mobility systems in the whole Waterfront area. The proposals affect a much wider area than the RFP set out. We risk handing too much authority over public services to private companies whose interests will often be quite different from those of the people they are supposed to serve. | We should not pursue these proposals further. |
| 07/30/2019 15:27:35 | Not receptive | We already suffer from a democratic deficit – to usurp local government in favour of a new body that would include private stakeholders would be a serious step backwards.

Privacy and data governance concerns as well. | | A fresh process. |
| 07/30/2019 16:32:47 | Not receptive | Sidewalk Labs wants to mine our lives for data, that is their sole interest. On this basis i am not receptive to any of their proposals. | The gradual erosion of our rights to life and liberty via unathorized collection and exclusive ownership of the data of our lives | |
| 07/30/2019 16:44:00 | Not receptive | This is a key component of Sidewalk Labs being able to collect what is called behavioral surplus. All of this gives them massive amounts of data, and they want it in real time.
I don't understand what problem the 'Dynamic Curb' solves. What it does do is enable charging of fees for something that is now free. The citizens whom this will affect will not see it until it is in place and a fait accompli. I'm sure there are significant delivery issues in downtown NYC and even some in Toronto but in an area where delivery areas haven't been designed this is nothing more than data capture for it's own sake.

Columbus Ohio entered into a demo project with Sidewalk Labs to use their Flow software (free of charge) to manage the mobility network and integrate travel modes. To do this SL needed access to public transit data and parking data. This result I believe was an overall increase in parking fees and the city is dependent on SL's proprietary software. Fee would change in real time so what a driver paid for parking on one day could be more the next day or even the next hour. That will go over well. The robotic collection of garbage and recycling is interesting but will it not put current collectors out of work? Delivery of freight puts those companies at the mercy of SL not to mention the fees they can charge.
The WTMA is just a conflict waiting to happen. It affects too many other agencies who already do much of this making it an island unto itself, no doubt with SL people on it's board. | These are solutions for problems that don't really exist. While they are innovative there is no discussion of whether they are important to the life of the immediate or more important larger community and in what ways. This is a discussion of how we see our future and SL wants that to be their decision. | Clear agreements on agency, decision rights, and the monetization of OUR data. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 14:57:49 | Not receptive | Drop all the distraction about a WTMA.<br><br>Drop "innovative" financing models. There is no free lunch.<br><br>This is another exercise in Gee Whiz. As pointed out, the City of Toronto proposes that 75% of all trips within 5km be taken by foot or bicycle. If this goal is pursued successfully 75% of the trips in Quayside and for a large part of the eastern waterfront beyond and into the downtown office core would be by foot or bicycle. Another percentage would hopefully be by public transit. for especially more distant origins and destinations.<br><br>Presumably, given ambitious goals to reduce private automobile use, there will only be minimal space for vehicles on the streets that are designated for vehicle use. Even the main street, QQ will have only one lane in each direction. The rest of the space should be adequate for bikes and pedestrians. It is hard to imagine huge surges of pedestrians and bicycles that suddenly need extra space on the streets except for special events. Therefore there is no need to invest in an expensive in ground lighting system when a few traffic cones can be deployed once in a while for special events when portions of streets need to be closed to all motor vehicle traffic.<br><br>If active transportation and public transit account for most local trips, there won't be much need for cabs, Uber or Lyft and therefore not much revenue for use of the curb. If freight delivers are underground there will be even less revenue.<br><br>Also there won't be much revenue from parking if there aren't many cars. TheTPA is already up and running and has lots of experience collecting parking revenue. No need for a new agency.<br><br>There is also reference to off-site parking that would deploy attendants to retrieve the car. If autonomous vehicles become a reality presumably one's car would arrive at the curb with a few clicks on the phone. Also, unless the parking garage is more than 5km away 75% of the trips to the parking garage would be by foot or bike. | Data collection that is not rigidly aggregated.<br><br>All these electronics and robots will need complex and expensive maintenance commitments. Some high rise building operators already have trouble keeping simple elevators functioning reliably.<br><br>The WTMA and other proposed special governance bodies would have the effect of setting Quayside apart from the rest of the city having its own source of revenues for certain functions. The goal should be to integrate the community into the larger city not set up a virtual gated community. | Pursue the City of Toronto's goal of 75% of local trips by active transportation |
| 07/31/2019 19:50:23 | Not receptive | | -The amount of technology suggested in the paver system sounds very unsustainable. Will the benefits of light up pavers really justify the amount of circuitry and electronic hardware put into roads, or will the environmental impact of producing these pavers and heating the roads be worse than current roads? Some road flexibility and pedestrianization can be good, but it doesn't have to be at such a rapid speed of change to justify putting micro controllers in our streets. Is this a data grab with sensors in disguise?<br>-We should also consider the risk that the new systems being put in place can be designed in a way to favour greater profits for Alphabet companies rather than the most cost-effective and sustainable solution for consumers. We need to prioritize public transit and bicycling first, then publicly-owned ride share options, then privately owned ride-shares, then private car ownership last. Could their ride-routing software be used to funnel people to their own services rather than public transit?<br>-Previous SWL projects have also found economic ways of gutting public transit that would not be in the public interest, for example re-routing public subsidies for public transit to ride-share apps. (https://www.theverge.com/2016/6/27/12048482/alphabet-sidewalk-labs-public-transport-columbus-ohio)<br>-Previous SWL projects have showed fine optimization for parking enforcement which could lead to predatory behaviour that costs the public more (https://www.androidpolice.com/2016/06/28/report-alphabet-subsidiary-sidewalk-wants-to-drag-us-public-transit-and-traffic-management-into-the-21st-century/)<br>-Previous SWL projects have created an obligation to hand over transportation payment systems to Alphabet (https://www.androidauthority.com/google-alphabet-control-public-transit-parking-700565/) how much of our services will be reliant upon Alphabet companies? What other Alphabet companies are involved? How can we be sure that a proprietary system is not being created that makes us as a city dependent upon Alphabet? Are we not creating a cross-industry | |
| 07/31/2019 23:23:48 | Not receptive | Why can't a division in the City of Toronto do this? | Questions about the transparency and level of public accountability for the WTMA. | a board for the WTMA that has roles for citizens to take part in it. |
| 07/16/2019 10:16:45 | | | | |
| 07/23/2019 16:48:14 | Receptive | I think it offers great responses to the mobility and innovative solutions | None | |
| 07/23/2019 17:57:01 | Receptive | getting people out of cars and thinking about other forms of mobility is vital | little | i think we need to revisit this as the technology further develops |
| 07/24/2019 22:37:33 | Receptive | Creative thinking to addressing Vision Zero principles. | Too much reliance potentially on traffic management systems. Keep it simpler. | Place a critical eye on the amount of traffic management systems employed. Not sure we need them all. |
| 07/25/2019 9:26:15 | Receptive | its very forward thinking and will improve current Toronto mobility plans | i don't believe there are any risks and I do not agree that there are privacy risks. Personal identity is not breached when traffic/mobility monitoring is put in place.<br><br>Personal identity and privacy risks happen daily through our regular cell phone use. | Definately pursue these proposals. |
| 07/25/2019 22:30:13 | Receptive | Love the public realm design and the integration of cycling, transit, etc. | | |
| 07/26/2019 11:02:27 | Receptive | I think the mobility proposal make sense. | I think any risk is more on Sidewalk than on Toronto. | Definitely pursue |
| 07/26/2019 16:10:52 | Receptive | I believe the focus on increasing transit, pedestrian and cycling mode share are important aspects of this proposal. focusing on reducing the need to own a car will not only help with affordability for residents but start setting the stage of limiting car use in our urban areas. If we plan for limiting cars, people | I do question what the implications of creating WTMA would be and if this is something TTC could handle (assuming they get some more subsidies to actually operate efficiently) | Most of the aspects of this proposal should be seriously considered. The WTMA needs to be discussed an hashed out further but the pedestrian only streets, faster LRT construction, cycling priority are all positive aspects of the plan. |
| 07/27/2019 10:18:12 | Receptive | Mobility and transit support is key for this neighbourhood. | Establishing a WTMA. Sounds like another layer of bureaucracy which is the last thing Toronto needs as there is already way too much. | Figure out the transit solution and how to fund it as that is critical. |
| 07/27/2019 12:01:37 | Receptive | moving away from private vehicles is a must and will happen. This proposal would create a test case for one way to do this, that the city could learn from and adapt to other areas. | The primary risk, as correctly identified by Waterfront Toronto staff, is "Complexity of establishing the WTMA and associated financial considerations". Toronto and Ontario have a poor record of creating and managing such entities.<br><br>The other big risk is that Toronto and Ontario and the Feds won't fund the waterfront LRT promptly. Given that we are still wrangling about creating a relief line first proposed in the 1930's, this is a real risk. That is why I proposed, in the Finance section, raising this money through a Bond offering. Bay Street would be delighted to stick-handle this. The governments involved could also consider making income from the bond tax-reduced in the hands of private investors, on the model of US municipal bonds. | Get going! Do it now! |
| 07/30/2019 10:18:04 | Receptive | Toronto has too many cars. And Toronto caters to drivers more than they should. Let's reduce. And let's add mass transit. | I think the biggest risk is just angering people who think they should be able to drive alone in their car and park anywhere in downtown Toronto. It's time to let go of our toxic relationship with our cars. I think this constructively addresses this. | The conditions to which this project can proceed with the least amount of various bureaucratic Taipei's how I see the most success. |
| 07/30/2019 12:40:08 | Receptive | Except for The WTMA, I thing the ideas are good | Only the WTMA | Giving to much power to WTMA would make it autonomous and we need to measure the risks of that,We need to know if an autonomous area within the city it is good or bad for the whole city, because after all it still will be part of Toronto.<br>If there's not commitment to build LRT from either side, the project might collapse as people will need cars to move and will create a chaos. |
| 07/31/2019 0:08:40 | Receptive | Frankly, this is one of the most sophisticated and thoughtful components of the proposal. Having a zone to develop and test and perfect the integration of various transportation modes, AVs, flexible streets, etc. would benefit Toronto and also be an economic stimulus.<br>As I noted early P3 strategies around transit are of critical importance right now. | Lack of clarity regarding who owns data. | Our data is constantly collected - not sure why SIdewalk has to be the lightening rod. This could also be a threshold project in terms of effective data collection, privacy, etc. |
| 07/31/2019 9:50:03 | Receptive | Mobility is changing. Toronto is North America's leading hub for autonomous vehicle research and testing. It only makes sense that we would make room for these types of experiments and explorations to happen. | Establishing new regulations is big and will inevitably run into dead ends. This will set the precedent for how we make Toronto, as a whole, a more sustainable city when it comes to human mobility. The city, Waterfront Toronto, and SWL must work together to set these rules. These things can and should take time. | |
| 07/31/2019 11:13:35 | Receptive | We need to start creating next-gen thinking into our mobility | Measurement tools not agile enough to enhance organic growth | this is good, plans need more transparency |
| 07/31/2019 19:16:55 | Receptive | In a city, mobility is very key, and the steps you have outlined in this proposal for mobility are sound promising. For example, having electric power stations is a good way to encourage people to purchase and drive electric vehicles. Often, the lack of charging stations discourages people from purchasing electric vehicles in the first place.<br>Also making public transportation more accessible, and implementing "people first" streets would not only lower gas emissions but also get people to walk and be active physically. | I think what you have proposed is very bold and would be impressive if achieved. | |
| 07/31/2019 20:01:57 | Receptive | I think they have the capacity to advance this project and will bring interesting innovative approaches and the funds to be able to drive the innovation. | No risk, I think the risk is in missing this opportunity to be a leader by not moving forward. | I think it is imperative that Waterfront Toronto pursue these proposals, otherwise we run the risk of stagnating as a city. |
| 07/31/2019 23:17:57 | Receptive | Toronto needs this. | City Hall delays it. | Nothing. We need this. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 08/01/2019 14:25:33 | Receptive | Overall i like most of the SWL proposals on Mobility. People first, limited car ownership and stronger pedestrian and cycling emphasis is a strong part of the proposal. and the Dynamic curb, real time pricing and the underground waste collection is worth exploring. I'm sceptical about the underground freight tunnels but again that is a matter of detailed design not evident at this stage | The governance model is a dog's breakfast. Too many questions of interface with the City unattended and it will lead you down  paths that will detract you from the overall mobility objectives. Work out an arrangement for permits with the city/province where necessary. | |
| 08/02/2019 13:43:15 | Receptive | Adopting "people-first" streets would be welcome a first for Toronto.  Until now, Toronto has either put vehicles first or has been equivocal (the congestion on Queen's Quay West is testament to an approach that tries to accommodate pedestrians, cyclists and cars at the same time).  The good news is that technology like dynamic curb are now available to make this idea a workable proposition. | As Sidewalk Labs itself notes, failure to develop the LRT along Queen's Quay East would be fatal to the success of Quayside.

The other risk is getting too far ahead of the technology.  For example, autonomous vehicles are coming but no-one can agree on a timeline.  Anticipating autonomous vehicles makes sense; betting on them doesn't. | Accept the ideas and do due diligence on the ideas and the technology. |
| 08/02/2019 13:47:25 | Receptive | People moving is essential to living in this neighbourhood. The more mass transit that can be supplied the better for all who live, work and visit the area. Mobility data collection happens now weather it is through companies like Uber or public entities that use Presto. where you are is known to many. | A little bit of a ransom to say the project will not proceed without the construction of the LRT immediately. I do think the LRT is required but not at the expense of all the other good ideas the project promises. Transit planning is bigger than just one development project and we all know how complicated and political they are. the LRT might be a chicken and egg proposal. I can see why SL wants it now but can also understand why it might have to wait. | Pursuit should be undertaken with a good relationship build between all levels of government - municipal, provincial and federal. WT as a tri-level entity should be the one who pursues the LRT fiance, layout and design. |
| 08/06/2019 17:37:20 | Receptive | The proposal offers new and innovative avenues to improve mobility, which are much needed in today's expanding, space constrained urban environments. | Confusion and safety concerns, particularly with intertwining the various modes of transportation on a similar plane.  Technology associated with digital traffic control devices could fail and lead to accidents (yet one could argue that for a common traffic light). | I really appreciate the limited focus on the traditional automobile with this proposed development.  We've become overdependent and changing that paradigm is a shift in the right direction today, and for future generations. |
| 08/07/2019 20:37:19 | Receptive | | | |
| 07/19/2019 23:05:13 | Receptive to some | I like the idea of active transportation, but I am wary about how google will benefit from this (will mostly google autonomous vehicles be allowed for ride shares?). Who (quayside or the city) is responsible for road delays in | What data is collected from people using transit or even walking through the neighbourhood, whether or not they live there | They can guarantee that google or its affiliates don't have some exclusive priority over the ride share or autonomous car share market in toronto or even in that neighbourhood |
| 07/20/2019 11:06:15 | Receptive to some | I am concerned about the density - so many buildings in a small area and making Queens Quay East essentially s dead end thoroughfare. Taking away the connectivity between QQE and Lakeshore at Parliament. This part of the proposal totally disregards drivers trying to go east from this area - will create problems in adjacent areas. Very single minded thinking. | See above | Address my concerns |
| 07/27/2019 9:41:57 | Receptive to some | No to the WTMA.!!! This is a part of the city of Toronto not googleville, it should all go in the city's coffers. All data collected should belong to the city, full stop.

Yes to LRT. Getting transit out of political hands and into the realm of fact and statistics is good. | Two-city system - segregation. Rich waterfront area, poor rest of city. Googleville gets lots of money while the rest of the city struggles to fund things for all their citizens, not just the ones rich enough to live in a segregated waterfront googleville. | All data collected is owned by the city. All revenue is collected and administrated by the city just like all the other areas of Toronto. One city not two. |
| 07/29/2019 18:48:52 | Receptive to some | | Heated sidewalks interesting idea but could be very expensive to maintain, especially in a public area. Could also create safety hazard if drainage for melting snow is not properly designed | |
| 07/30/2019 10:44:51 | Receptive to some | We need to embrace complete streets. People first | Not a fan of vehicle, electric or otherwise. If Toronto Island can be car free so can here. Many cities in Europe have no cars in the downtown. Not sure it is cost effective to use hex pavers vs pavers we have now in WT | Do we really need WTMA? |
| 07/30/2019 15:28:29 | Receptive to some | I like the general ides, but the WTMA is a non-starter for me. | What is the WTMA, who controls it, and how does it fit in with the existing regulatory framework? | without the WTMA. |
| 07/30/2019 22:08:52 | Receptive to some | Dynamic curb needs a real world testbed. Feedback could be used to plan further areas. | WTMA duplicates existing agencies. | Propose a small test site for dynamic curbs at Quayside. |
| 07/31/2019 0:45:36 | Receptive to some | Aggressive measures to support pedestrian and cyclist priority are very welcome.  Safer and dynamic street design that limits vehicle domination of streets is also very welcome.

Love the underground delivery concept, but is it practical and can it be exported to the rest of the waterfront or anywhere else in the city? | Definitely concerned with the proposed management structure for mobility management.  As with other initiatives would like to avoid creating new bodies and look to integration of the management services into existing or new city departments.

Not convinced that autonomous vehicles are going to be as revolutionary and transformative as sometimes claims | I would like to see the LRT funded by SWL, if the private sector will not step up - on the condition that it is funding only and does not imply and level of ownership or operation by SWL.  Would only support if done under the leadership of the TTC. |
| 07/31/2019 8:02:16 | Receptive to some | Discouraging use of cars in the downtown core, making streets more bike- and pedestrian-friendly, and improving public transit options are all good ideas. Creating a new public sector entity at the behest of developers, and funding public transit through private corporations are not. | MAny of the suggestions seem to be geared toward setting up the development area as a separate, autonomous region within the city. I would prefer to see a development that works within existing parameters, and which could eventually be expanded without ceding control of municipal authority to a private company. | |
| 07/31/2019 17:36:11 | Receptive to some | I like the idea of tunnels for deliveries etc.
Big fan of public transportation and designing a city around people and not vehicles. | There is an assumption that autonomous vehicles will actually take off. What about Doug Ford? They are assuming as premier he is rational and won't do something bizarre with the TTC.

Also does not take into account that people from outside of Toronto may be visiting, and while the core of Toronto is great for public transit etc, this is not necessarily so for the rest of Ontario (which yes does indeed exist.) | Realistic transit plans - big fan of more transit, but we should probably be connecting areas that are not as well connected.... Geothermal heated sidewalks sound nice but -- what if it floods? This is a high flood zone - those risk need to be considered. |
| 07/31/2019 17:42:15 | Receptive to some | I like the idea of tunnels for deliveries etc.
Big fan of public transportation and designing a city around people and not vehicles. | There is an assumption that autonomous vehicles will actually take off. What about Doug Ford? They are assuming as premier he is rational and won't do something bizarre with the TTC.

Also does not take into account that people from outside of Toronto may be visiting, and while the core of Toronto is great for public transit etc, this is not necessarily so for the rest of Ontario (which yes does indeed exist.) | Realistic transit plans - big fan of more transit, but we should probably be connecting areas that are not as well connected.... Geothermal heated sidewalks sound nice but -- what if it floods? This is a high flood zone - those risk need to be considered. |
| | | | | |
| Submitted before the deadline: | 48 | | | |
| Submitted after the deadline: | 5 | | | |
| Total | 53 | | | |

| Submitted On | Are there specific areas of the privacy and digital governance proposals that you believe you need additional assistance in understanding prior to being able to determine whether or not you support these elements if yes please provide the topics that you feel you need this additional level of information for | Do you find the creation of the concept of urban data to be helpful by clarifying what data should be considered a public asset andor subject to enhanced oversight by a data stewardship body or do you think that currently recognized terms such as personal and nonpersonal data are more helpful to establishing the stewardship issued related to these different types of data | Do you generally support the idea of data stewardship for data collected in quayside do you feel it is necessary if so what are your views on the model proposed by sidewalk labs under the name urban data trust what would you keep andor change what central data stewardship structure would you support to oversee compliance of all applicable laws relating to data use in the quayside do you believe governments should be bound by the data trust do you believe business should be bound by the data trust | Do you support the creation of a digital credential solution to support the delivery of the project if not are there any changes andor conditions which would make you more comfortable with the concept | How would you envision data collected in the public realm being used for the public good do you think the proposals related to open data would support that after reading the draft midp what digital governance concerns if any do you consider to remain unanswered | Sidewalk labs suggests a funding model for a data trust do you agree with the model they propose or do you have concerns |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/22/2019 6:07:45 | The responsibilities, limitations, and operations of data trusts in Canada, especially in relation to beneficiaries. The utility and limitations of "urban data" as a term to describe data from publicly accessible spaces. The issue of consent for data collection in public spaces. | No. Urban data is unrecognized by Canadian law. Urban data unhelpfully collapses distinctions between personal information and non-personal information. It artificially creates distinction between so-called "transaction" data and urban data.<br><br>Overall, the vendor should not be creating new terms to describe data. Nor should the vendor be proposing new governance structures that will then serve to approve the vendor's collection and use of data. This is an apparent conflict of interest. As a creation of Sidewalk Labs, the urban data trust would have no legitimacy among the general public. | No. The data trust idea has evolved but it is still vague and does not accord with Canadian law. As it stands, Sidewalk Labs proposes that the trust act as a legal structure to enforce legal agreements among applicants. That's not a governance structure that exists to protect data. That idea of an urban trust as envisioned in the MIDP simply facilitates the collection and use of data. The government (all three levels) should be involved in data governance. This is a much bigger conversation than just data collection in the IDEA District. | No. More research is needed in this area. A strong governance framework is needed before looking to technological solutions to protect data. | More detail is needed in regards to how data from the public realm should be made "open" and "accessible." Sidewalk Labs has unilaterally declared that data should be publicly accessible by default. That's problematic as data can be reidentified. As well, Sidewalk Labs has not been completely forthcoming in its intentions for data. It says it won't sell data or use it in advertising. However, it says that it will share data, including with Alphabet companies, with consent. This needs to be better explained to the public. Sidewalk Labs' proposal of signage for consent was virtually ignored in the MIDP. How does it propose to use this signage? How will the public be educated about signage-based consent? How can one opt out of data collection in public spaces? | No, I do not agree. This model is not recognized in Canadian law. Essentially it's proposed that it will rely upon user fees. This funding model does not appear to be sustainable. It is unclear how the trust would be operated as a public body, how it would interact with other regulatory agencies in the city or province, and source of its regulatory authority. |
| 07/29/2019 19:50:04 | Just don't collect data and private information from anyone. Period. | No I think they are just throwing in new terms to skirt the law. | Do not collect data. Period. | Do not advance this project. | Do not collect data. Do not violate mine or anyone else's privacy. | No just don't collect any data. Thus you do not need any funding. |
| 07/30/2019 23:13:54 | I would like to understand what the pathway would be, if these proposals are adopted and prove effective, to be applied at a larger scale. We do not talk enough about how Sidewalk has put together a real potential strategy to see how improved data governance can work.<br><br>I would also like to understand how the general public might be able to participate in data trust decision-making. Who elects the Board? | Urban data is actually a term that is used by other organizations not just Sidewalk Labs. I like the term because it suggests that it is non-personal data that belongs to more than just the data collector, but that actually is relevant to everyone who lives in a city. | I generally support the idea because I see few other concrete proposals for how to approach this. While there are still a lot of details to be worked out, this is a good starting point and we should seriously consider it as citizens of Toronto rather than disregard it simply because it is from a sister company of Google. Regulations in other sectors have always been influenced by the private sector - not sure why this is so different. I would want to see a clear funding model developed for this entity, and I do also believe that governments should be bound by the data trust - governments are frequently the entities advancing the most invasive technologies (i.e. Toronto police and facial recognition) with very little transparency. | Yes. The idea of a digital credential is key to putting people in control of their data, and Toronto can really lead here by bringing this concept to a real place in very tangible ways. | Public realm data should not be collected unless there is a clear public good that it is used for. Open data is about data access and availability after it is collected and should not be conflated with decisions around whether or not to collect the data. These are separate issues. | I need more information on how this might work. That said, I do believe that the approach to prototype the data trust(s) through a series of contracts to allow for flexibility and testing is the right approach. There is likely not one way to do this and creating a mechanism through which this policy making body can evolve is crucial. |
| 07/30/2019 23:17:56 | How is Quayside data any different from a modern shopping mall? Is it a different type of digital space? | Personal data could be separated into private, shared and public realms. "urban" is not helpful. | Stewardship yes - done by government, criminal penalties applying to business, government and persons. | Yes, but should be administered by city. | Public health, basic research.<br><br>Where is the criminal penalty for de-identifying data? | Trust should be funded from proceeds of metro WiFi. |
| 07/31/2019 0:45:46 | | I like the idea but it needs a footnote, as this question has framed it. | Yes to all questions. | | | |
| 07/31/2019 14:42:27 | Not at this time. | Yes I do like the idea of urban data, especially in terms of what data can be collected and how it could be used; the current concepts do not provide enough detail. | Yes. I think the proposals and discussion in Waterfront Toronto's Civic Labs series cover this issue pretty thoroughly. | No comment. | No comment. | I ahve not examined the funding model. |
| 07/31/2019 18:28:11 | Toronto needs to be in charge of its own data destiny. | Urban data - public data - need to be added to our lexicon. This issue is not going away. | It has potential, so long as proper policies are in place and everyone follows the rules. | | Data life cycle. When will it be destroyed ? Which types will be destroyed? What's going to be sent to the archive? | |
| 07/31/2019 20:02:20 | | I think this term needs a legally defensible definition in order to move forward. Without this it can be used to limit the protections offered by the "urban data" classification and be exploited. It also makes public discussions fundamentally difficult as we don't have any understanding of what data would fall under "urban data" protections. It could be that with all the extensive sensors Alphabet places throughout private property as well they consider this not to be urban data and therefore urban data protections would have little to no impact on public well-being in terms of Alphabet's role | I do not think an open data platform is the solution as it only gives more access to data to more bodies that provides the opportunity for greater exploitation. Sidewalk Labs has repeatedly used the urban data trust to sidestep any issues with their usage of data, however we should be highly skeptical of this because of Alphabet's extensive lobbying history. Not only was Google the biggest US lobbier in terms of capital investment in 2017, ( https://fortune.com/2018/01/24/google-facebook-amazon-apple-lobbying-efforts/) Sidewalk has already lobbied our government 63 times (https://lobbycanada.gc.ca/app/secure/ocl/lrs/do/vwRg?cno=361287&regId=888914) and other Alphabet subsidiaries continue to lobby our government. How can we have any assurances that this data trust would truly operate independently, especially when Sidewalk Labs is proposing the design of the data trust? | | | I worry that the economic model for the data trust would encourage them to give out data by collecting fees each time data is given, you offer economic incentive for the data trust to give out as much data as possible when actuality their role to protect the public interest should be to restrict all data sharing unless under highly controlled and ethical settings. |

| Submitted On | How receptive are you to exploring this proposal from Sidewalk Labs | Why | What do you see as the risks with Sidewalk Labs Digital Governance proposals | Under what conditions if any would you want to see Waterfront Toronto pursue these proposals further |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/18/2019 22:45:41 | Receptive | | | |
| 07/19/2019 17:42:48 | Not receptive | Would you hire a wolf to develop a sheep protection plan? | https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Google#Criticism_and_controversy | None |
| 07/22/2019 6:07:43 | Not receptive | The data governance plans are rushed, incomplete and do not propose to introduce mechanisms to protect data. Sidewalk Labs is simply proposing untested and vague idea ("urban data," "urban data trust"). There is no perceived independence of the proposed trust from Sidewalk Labs. There is a strong public concern with the collection of data by Sidewalk Labs and a mistrust of its motives and intentions. As a result, Sidewalk Labs has very little legitimacy in proposing data governance frameworks. | There is a risk that the urban data trust will not provide the data governance functions to protect data as envisioned by Sidewalk Labs. It is not clear that this trust can remain operational on user fees and it would likely be dependent upon public funds. The proposed transition of the trust from a non-governmental entity to a public body is unclear. There is a strong risk that this trust would not be perceived as independent or legitimate by the public. Instead, it would likely be seen as a corporate-friendly vehicle designed to rapidly approve data collection and use within the IDEA District. | Waterfront Toronto, which does not have expertise in data governance, should seek input from privacy officials, privacy commissioners, academics, and civil society groups. There needs to be a much more comprehensive and independent creation of data governance mechanisms. |
| 07/23/2019 16:56:56 | Receptive | | | |
| 07/25/2019 9:46:08 | Receptive | I want this development built. | I see no risk in using new technologies. We must start somewhere with all technologies and advance our techniques. | I would like this proposal approved. |
| 07/25/2019 17:26:28 | Not receptive | "Privacy" and "Google" is a contradiction of the highest regard. Google's entire existence is from data collection and data analysis for the purpose of selling advertisements. | "Privacy" and "Google" is a contradiction of the highest regard. Google's entire existence is from data collection and data analysis for the purpose of selling advertisements. | |
| 07/26/2019 19:06:53 | Not receptive | Sidewalk is a unit of a company whose business model was built on the principle of mass surveillance. They refused to discuss data aspects of the deal until they were smoked out publicly. Their data trust proposal is not even a trust. . | Massive undermining of our individual autonomy. | None. Waterfront does not even have a mandate to pursue digital infrastructure of this type or scale. |
| 07/29/2019 19:45:46 | Not receptive | They have no right to collect any data or commit any privacy violation which they would do if they continue with this. I don't care if the data is 'publicly available - it is nobody's business! | Privacy! | DO NOT PURSUE |
| 07/29/2019 19:54:31 | Not receptive | While data collected in a public space is not protected by Canadian privacy laws, I do not agree with having a system that is specifically designed to continuous collect information about people for data mining purposes, especially since a lot of what is being collected and what it will be specifically used for, has not been easily accessible for the public. Nor do I trust this data to be completely secure for outside groups who are not approved researchers or designers for the public space. Readings such as air quality and temperature are fine, but not something that would track the movements of people, no matter if it's done as a 'crowd-based' recording. | | |
| 07/30/2019 8:08:17 | Not receptive | | | |
| 07/30/2019 10:33:39 | Receptive | | | |
| 07/30/2019 11:00:32 | Receptive to some | Why not | Not in their lane. All governance lies with the government. All of this is forcing us to do what we should have done years ago. | |
| 07/30/2019 15:31:50 | Not receptive | Do not trust Sidewalk Labs to do this properly, appropriate regulations need to be place first. | | Hit the re-set button, refresh on the process. |
| 07/30/2019 19:57:31 | Need more information | Google has been a master at breaking privacy regulations then fighting them while continuing to break the law, then saying sorry and redirecting the focus. There are multiple areas of concern and one of the biggest is that Sidewalk Labs will have too much influence in the creation of data privacy regulations. They are know to be against regulation and while their public face will not admit that there are plenty of examples. | Sidewalk Labs will push for the process to be finished before an adequate consultation has occurred. As mentioned there are many levels of government and others to address digital governance but the pace of these discussions will be too slow for SL. Here is one of my biggest concerns. Urban Data Trust: a "steward of urban data and the public interest without stifling innovation." The phrase "...without stifling innovation." is a directive that fundamentally days that in a conflict between individual or public interest and innovation, innovation wins every time. This phrase must be removed. | Digital governance regulations that Sidewalk Labs has not been involved with creating. Consulted with sure but not at the table where they are written. |
| 07/30/2019 23:03:44 | Receptive | There is not enough thought put into the why and purpose of data collection and digital technology. Privacy protections (existing ones) fall short of actually providing protection for people especially groups. | The main risk is that we do not use this as an opportunity to try something new and test ways to see how we can ensure the technology is in service of people (and not the other way around) | I would be curious to know how Waterfront Toronto might scale these data governance proposals to other developments that it oversees. How has Waterfront Toronto's other developments put safeguards like these in place? |
| 07/30/2019 23:08:37 | Receptive to some | Data should be regulated independently of capital or material. | Trust separate from government will not have sufficient regulatory clout. Criminal penalties are needed for infractions. | When government provides the mechanism. |
| 07/31/2019 0:44:17 | Receptive | It will be a unique opportunity for university researchers, Not for Profits and government to access this large amount of data. If an appropriate oversight body is created it would herald a new form of data management.

In the 21st century data is a medium and a massive, irreversible one at that. | The risks are 3rd party users of the data which is a common problem. Data licensing with conditions of anonymity may make sense. | Find a super credible partners like the Toronto Public Library. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 8:30:44 | Need more information | | | The development of the data/digital governance framework should not be left to Sidewalk Labs, an arm of an entity that relies on the exploitation of user data. |
| 07/31/2019 11:20:03 | Receptive | like last section | | |
| 07/31/2019 14:39:15 | Receptive to some | I am in favour of a Urban Data Trust and the framework establishing that. The definition of urban data, what is private and what is public, and the regulatory framework all need far more work | The main risk is that Sidewalk Labs becomes the de facto owner and/or controller of data in Quayside and the IDEA District. | Far more work needs to be done here. |
| 07/31/2019 18:26:12 | Receptive to some | OpenNorth https://www.opennorth.ca/ would be good to have on board in regards to this.

I think if done correctly data is a great tool, and can really benefit us. | Data is simply records management / archives but everyone seems to be ignoring this fact.

Need good policies in place - what information are we keeping, whats the "record/data schedule" ? what is necessary to be kept and used?

Is Open Data Toronto which already exists going to be involved in this?

I'm concerned that Sidewalk Toronto is so excited in creating new bodies of governance that they have overlooked the excellent structures already in place in the city of Toronto! | The city has to be in charge of the data. |
| 07/31/2019 19:56:41 | Not receptive | | -I think we cannot move forward with these proposals without robust, independent, and democratically produced data privacy laws, and human research subject protections laws. The reason for this is that surveillance, and technologies that leverage surveillance to influence public opinion or buying power can strongly impact the foundations of our democratic society and the rights, freedoms, opinions, and upwards class mobility of our citizens, as elaborated below:

-"Privacy is essential to our well-being and moral development. It isn't an abstract notion. Privacy affects our ability to get life insurance. Most of us are monitored in retail stores, our location minutely tracked as we shop. We are monitored in airports, sporting arenas and in so-called smart cities. We are even monitored in our workplaces. Our children are monitored in their schools. Privacy violations affect everyone, but they often disproportionately affect immigrants, people of color, women, people who live in poverty, L.G.B.T.Q. people and children. Domestic abusers use surveillance tools to spy on their victims. The Department of Homeland Security uses social media history to make immigration decisions. Children in schools are subjected to extensive and intrusive monitoring of their behavior. Many of these technologies are prone to error, including potentially lethal ones." (https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/16/opinion/privacy-project-nytimes.html)

-Surveillance undermines democracy by squashing social movements before they can start and breaking down the barrier between private life and public life that is needed for citizens to consider critiquing politics. "We know that surveillance has a chilling effect on freedom. People change their behavior when they live their lives under surveillance. They are less likely to speak freely and act individually. They self-censor. They become conformist. This is obviously true for government surveillance, but is true for corporate surveillance as well." … "Ultimately, this fear stagnates society in two ways. The first is that the presence of surveillance means society cannot experiment with new things without fear of reprisal, and that means those experiments—if found to be inoffensive or even essential to society—cannot slowly become commonplace, moral, and then legal. If surveillance nips that process in the bud, change never happens. All social progress—from ending slavery to fighting for women's rights—began as ideas that were, quite literally, dangerous to assert. Yet without the ability to safely develop, discuss, and eventually act on those assertions, our society would not have been able to further its democratic values in the way that it has." … "The second way surveillance hurts our democratic values is that it encourages society to make more things illegal. Consider the things you do—the different things each of us does—that portions of society find immoral. Not just recreational drugs and gay sex, but gambling, dancing, public displays of affection. All of us do things that are deemed immoral by some groups, but are not illegal because they don't harm anyone. But it's important that these things can be done out of the disapproving gaze of those who would otherwise rally against such practices. If there is no privacy, there will be pressure to change. Some people will recognize that their morality isn't necessarily the morality of everyone—and that that's okay. But others will start demanding legislative change, or using less legal and more violent means, to force others to match their idea of morality." (https://www.wired.com/story/mcsweeneys-excerpt-the-right-to-experiment/) 1/3 | -We should not collect any data in either the private or public realm without clear meaningful consent, public knowledge of what the data will be used for, and when it will be destroyed. We cannot proceed supporting any data collection without data privacy laws. Europe's GDPR laws are a good reference point to start. Any collection of data must be done with meaningful consent, by living in an area, not by being in a public area, and not by an "opt out" policy. Any data collection done should be with an explicitly stated objective and not be used for any other purpose. Data collected in line with a service (ex transit, free wifi hotspots) must only be used to further their own services. In other words, consumers expect that the data they give up with a service to be used for that service only, and not for ulterior motives, therefore any additional uses should require additional consent or be restricted. Data should only be collected in controlled and limited settings in line with the proposed use of the data, in other words, data pertaining to the use of the public space doesn't need to be collected 100% of the time, only during a limited window that informs how the public space is designed, then the collection of data |
| | | | -All data should be anonymized at source, however it is important that the public and our government to understand that there is no way to fully anonymize data, and we should treat all data as personally identifiable because of that. Even when Sidewalk Labs discusses anonymized data we must understand that it can always be re-identified and should not be used as a defence to use that data to a greater degree or to collect it more. This is because different anonymized data-sets can be used together (ex: correlating your phone's location information with security cameras even with faces blurred out) and machine learning can be used to detect patterns that link you to your behaviour. "Researchers from Imperial College London and the University of Louvain have created a machine-learning model that estimates exactly how easy individuals are to reidentify from an anonymized data set. You can check your own score here, by entering your zip code, gender, and date of birth. On average, in the US, using those three records, you could be correctly located in an "anonymized" database 81% of the time. Given 15 demographic attributes of someone living in Massachusetts, there's a 99.98% chance you could find that person in any anonymized database."… "This isn't the first study to show how easy it is to track down individuals from anonymized databases. A paper back in 2007 showed that just a few movie ratings on Netflix can identify a person as easily as a Social Security number, for example." (https://www.technologyreview.com/s/613996/youre-very-easy-to-track-down-even-when-your-data-has-been-anonymized/?utm_campaign=the_download.unpaid.engagement&utm_source=hs_email&utm_medium=email&utm_content=74964917&_hsenc=p2ANqtz--g_Vsv26X4VItIf9lVu89tS5HrrDYticXNEJszNYtpOk3oRp7P6SHyNt6J-sLK3WWCyCvSadSS8HCKZgdFmic5YN86h9YJRNgWw7VpY95t80Votes&_hsmi=74964917)

-The discussion has also been very limited to data surveillance and privacy, however we must also recognize and respond accordingly with regulations, that the technologies being proposed are not passive, they are actively using this data. Shoshana Zuboff refers to this as instrumentarian power in The Age of Surveillance Capitalism. The New York Times published an article that not only has Google experimented with social engineering being trying and succeeding to manipulate people radical political views (https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/07/opinion/google-ads.html), they also published a guide to help their advertisers also perform social engineering to change people's opinions (https://redirectmethod.org). Google has already done live testing on humans with their company Niantic Labs' Pokemon Go in Canada and without lawsuits, which directed people to "gyms" and rare pokemon at locations paid for by advertisers, effectively creating a social experiment in which they tested their ability to control the purchasing decisions of consumers using hidden features in their technology platforms. (https://thewest.com.au/business/finance/paid-pokemon-go-gyms-and-pokestops-on-the-way-for-wa-ng-ya-112917) Sidewalk Labs own 2017 vision document says that they are proposing: "a virtual laboratory to experiment with changes in infrastructure, policy, and the built environment." 2/3 | |
| | | | There is no way to read this other than that this means Sidewalk will be performing live social, economic, and political testing on unconsenting and unwitting citizens. In academia and other industries there are strict standards and procedures to perform any tests with live human subjects, Human Research Protections, but the private technology industry has so far evaded the ethical laws. We are talking about live testing on real human beings and their ability to test this for themselves and make their own decisions, why is the public not being educated about this and why is the morality of this not being addressed in any capacity by either Sidewalk or Waterfront? We need to create new, enforceable policies with consequential penalties that will restrict and oversee any testing done that involves human subjects that includes the technology industry and their digital/online/hardware/software platforms. We need to make sure that any testing done on the people in our cities is approved to be ethical by the government, there are no conflicts of interests such as side political or commercial motivations, that the public is informed of this process, and is given the opportunity to opt-out. Since these experiments don't happen in a lab-setting but in the real world by changing how certain algorithms work in the back end of apps, we need to come up with an oversight process that ensures there is no testing being done without our knowledge. 3/3 | |
| 07/31/2019 20:15:29 | Receptive | I think they would take privacy concerns more seriously than others and would understand the issues surrounding it and would put best practices in place. | I do not see the risks. | |
| 07/31/2019 23:36:22 | Not receptive | Personal data and how it is used needs to be overseen by a third-party body that is credible by the public, government and industry. It needs to be something like the Canadian Radio and Telecommunication Commission. It cannot be this urban data trust. There needs to be citizen involvement in such an institution. | Lack of trust in who oversees the data collection through the Urban Data Trust. | If the previous conditions and concerned are properly answered. |
| 08/01/2019 15:08:39 | Need more information | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 08/06/2019 16:57:10 | Receptive | | Very few and they can be mitigated. | Accept the proposals and develop a staged plan to move forward. Conduct due diligence on technologies and data policies and practices. At each stage collect information related to privacy and digital governance and evaluate before moving to the next stage. |
| 08/07/2019 20:43:42 | Not receptive | Too much | | |
| | | | | |
| Submitted before deadline: | 24 | | | |
| Submitted after deadline | 3 | | | |
| total | 27 | | | |

| Submitted On | What do you see as the strengths andor challenges of the public realm proposals | Which gaps or challenges if any does the proposed Open Space Alliance a new nonprofit organization address with respect to parks and public spaces on the waterfront What are the potential benefits and risks of establishing this model | How could the proposals outlined in the sidewalk labs midp improve or diminish the experience for residents and visitors spending time in waterfront parks and public spaces |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/23/2019 16:51:58 | Improved access, greater efficiency in daily activities | Communication of the benefits and clarity on the experience will be important to demonstrate the positive impacts | I think by being on the leading edge we will be able to incorporate efficiencies in many areas and create an unique experience to visitors and residents. |
| 07/25/2019 17:18:34 | | We risk the "bureaucratization" of public space. | I don't need LED lighting or an "outdoor comfort system." I just need a few friends, a plot of grass and a picnic basket. Why is Google making this so difficult? |
| 07/27/2019 12:11:48 | The OSA is an interesting idea. Currently, Toronto Parks is starved by the City of funds for maintenance and struggles just to keep up with litter and mowing. Bringing a new approach to put public space management into different and differently funded hands would be an improvement. | Please see comment above. The city of Toronto currently underinvests in Parks and public spaces. The OSA, if it does better than the city, would become an example for the city to learn from. | I have been in other cities where public spaces are much friendlier and more inviting. The Sidewalk Labs plan seems to move in this direction. It should be tried. The technological improvements proposed are exciting ways to upgrade our city management practices into the 21st century. |
| 07/29/2019 19:19:56 | Not enough information provided to make an informed decision. We need more time, more detail and more say. | This supposed non-profit does not address anything except the fact they want our tax dollars which they can very well forget it! | I could see it diminishing it as it is like they are trying to run their own little community and control and own things using public money! The waterfront is part of Toronto not its own separate country run by Google at arms length through Sidewalk Labs and the OSA! |
| 07/30/2019 10:48:04 | I like that the tech is built in so when we have community events it is easier | OSA - nope don't need it. Get the mayor to charge the tax to fund parks and let them do this. | I don't need an app telling me when a bench is available |
| 07/30/2019 17:25:23 | "Stoa" is completely undefined except on a vague concept. | This seems to be Sidewalk Labs saying they can do a better job than the existing organizations that already do this. It won't make friends. And I suppose SL will want to be part of the governing body giving them more access to city decision making. | It sounds too good to be true so in deeper reflection that's true. Heated sidewalks so no snow. Where does the melt water go? What about the wind off the lake that goes right through you? I don't see any actual improvements, just virtual ones. |
| 07/30/2019 18:15:02 | The Open Space Alliance (OPA) must be carefully designed to serve the public. There is a challenge in building digital tools and physical structures that can work effectively in harsh weather conditions. And the funding model seems vague. | How does the OPA represent both residents and non-residents? Who comprises the OPA? How is it funded? | The design of streets and public spaces does present opportunities for improved use and maintenance. The ability to bring individuals and groups together in public spaces is especially interesting. But any entity overseeing these sites must ensure that all people are given equal access and opportunities to the spaces. |
| 07/30/2019 22:18:41 | Attempting all weather usability. | Challenging duplication of city functions without new benefit. | Local experiments with public space designs can be exciting, but should not come at the expense of committing to a grandiose project. |
| 07/31/2019 0:19:23 | Challenge is creating effective and ongoing leadership to implement this. | A more rigorous arts and culture regime is needed. Funding models need to not only use existing sources but expand. | A coordinated approach to the flexible use of resources with an arms length management system would be a positive step building on such resources such as the Grange Park Community Association. Experimentation with materials that can allow visitors to have an outdoor experience could be a positive contribution. |
| 07/31/2019 11:39:07 | | | - what evidence exists that technology helps mediate / increase public participation? - how will disputes be managed? |
| 07/31/2019 19:51:39 | | Again, WE SHOULD NOT ACCEPT ANY GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM A FOREIGN FOR-PROFIT COMPANY. We are a democratic society with public institutions responsible to Canadian citizens. The fact that Waterfront Toronto launched this RFP asking for urban innovations without any prior public consultation and without any regulatory preparations for the technologies they were inviting is a complete breach of public trust and incredibly negligent on Waterfront's part. My concern is that new governmental bodies would be used to push through Alphabet's agenda, rather than housing the regulatory power and technical know-how to properly regulate and oversee Alphabet's operations. If we are to consider Alphabet's proposal our oversight process must be as technically proficient as Alphabet's on not only the technologies and services that are publicly marketed and provided, but also those that are being worked on outside of the public eye. My other concern is that accepting foreign influence on the design of our public institutions opens the door for loop-holes that could favour corporations and hurt the public interest, and set a dangerous precedent for accepting governance structures designed by foreign companies. | |
| 07/31/2019 23:22:15 | Amazing outdoor space with amphitheatre, trees, and parks. | Interesting  model. Let's  give it a shot | Totally enhanced quality of life for all Torontonians. |
| 08/01/2019 14:51:05 | The generous provision of public realm is a huge strength. Whether its truly public or a POP will not matter if people feel that it is accessible and welcoming for all. | Once agin the devil is in the details and those details can make or break the concept. | If the images in the artists renderings become reality, it will be an exciting place for all. If it is perceived as the playground of the rich and famous, it will be a big disappointment |
| 08/02/2019 14:18:57 | The dedication of wide active complete street is a positive. The fact that a lot of the activities are being programmed or planned for seems a little counter-intuitive to a more laise-fair attitude toward peoples use of space. How can the place grow a patina of culture and users might be asked. What elements in the public realm are incubators for activities and how are these incorporated. Some of this kind of thought is evident in the plans. Please do not over plan or think the public realm. | More red tape and approvals toward the use of public space. Would like to understand more of how OSA would incorporate union and labour laws currently provided to maintenance and park employees | |
| | | | |
| Submitted before the deadline: | 12 | | |
| Submitted after the deadline: | 2 | | |
| Total | 14 | | |

| Submitted On | How receptive are you to exploring this proposal from Sidewalk Labs | Why | What do you see as the risks with Sidewalk Labs Public Realm Proposals | Under what conditions if any would you want to see Waterfront Toronto pursue these proposals further |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/16/2019 10:17:20 | Receptive | Very cutting-edge proposals that would make Toronto at the forefront of urban design. | | |
| 07/16/2019 17:57:44 | Need more information | The public realm should be planned by the public of this city. | Citizens of Toronto, not a large foreign multinational should make these decisions. Think Jane Jacobs | If the citizens of Toronto were driving the conversation, not Google |
| 07/19/2019 14:26:32 | Not receptive | Jim Balsillie: The former co-CEO of Research in Motion (now BlackBerry) disapproves of the Sidewalk project. In a Globe and Mail opinion piece, he called it "a colonizing experiment in surveillance capitalism attempting to bulldoze important urban, civic and political issues." Waterfront Toronto has sought his advice about Sidewalk, though he is not officially part of its Digital Strategy Advisory Panel. | Fearful of more regulatory scrutiny, Silicon Valley has been in non-stop damage control mode, overhauling terms of service and cracking down on how third parties can use the data their products collect. Last October, Google rolled out videos and user guides to show how its search engine and tools monitor users' online habits. Google says it eventually plans to expand privacy features to other products, like mapping applications.

This is the context in which Waterfront Toronto, and Canadians generally, must decide the Quayside project's fate. | NONE, GET RID OF SIDEALK LABS NOw, |
| 07/19/2019 17:24:25 | Not receptive | With the exception of infrastructure mapping, these ideas are all weak - expensive, environmentally unfriendly non-solutions to non-problems. I have no interest in funding Google so they can learn how to sell ludicrously expensive e-roads to short-sighted municipalities (like Toronto threatens to prove itself). | They add nothing but expensive bloat to existing operations. The only unambiguous benefit they offer is to Sidewalk Labs, who will get to harvest as much data as they possibly can. | None. Please stop. |
| 07/19/2019 23:07:32 | Receptive to some | Concerned about data collection of people casually passing through the neighbourhood of quayside | Invasion of privacy | Ensure there are easily visible and large signs warning anyone entering quayside about what data is being collected on them the moment they enter quayside (movement data, BIOMETRIC DATA, etc) |
| 07/22/2019 4:48:38 | Not receptive | Heated sidewalks, while attention grabbing, would not appear to be the main priorities of Torontonians who are concerned about affordable housing, transit, and the environment. I am very concerned about the proposal for the Urban Space Alliance, a sprawling public-private body that Sidewalk Labs proposes should be responsible for a range of duties in the IDEA District, from snow clearing to road maintenance and, improbably, technology procurement. I'm very concerned that Sidewalk Labs envisions the Urban Space Alliance as a testbed for the technology that Sidewalk Labs develops. This would appear to unfairly privilege Sidewalk Labs technology and, as the Urban Space Alliance will likely require public funding, would appear to provide Sidewalk abs with public subsidies to develop its research. | There is a substantial risk that the Urban Space Alliance will require significant public funding. Part of this funding will come from the city's Parks and Recreation Division, thereby depriving that Division of funds. The Urba Space Alliance, as proposed, would be responsible for multiple important duties, a difficult task to bring under one department.

There is a strong emphasis in the plans on flexible streets and curbless streets, but I don't see the cost-benefit analysis for these design proposals. | More information is needed about the proposed Urban Space Alliance, a public-private body that would be responsible for multiple duties in the IDEA District. Why is there a need for this body when the Park and Recreation Division of Toronto undertakes some of the same duties? How much funding is the Urban Space Alliance estimated to collect through fees? How much funding would be required to be diverted from the Parks and Recreation Division? |
| 07/23/2019 16:49:12 | Receptive | We need to advance our thinking in this area and incorporate technology into our planning | None | |
| 07/24/2019 13:48:06 | Not receptive | It's intensely inappropriate and creepy to hand these powers over to newly created private nonprofits spun off from Google. | It's intensely inappropriate and creepy to hand these powers over to newly created private nonprofits spun off from Google. | None |
| 07/24/2019 22:40:30 | Receptive | Raises the bar and the quantity and quality of public space. | Don't put too much technology in public spaces. | Make them stick their word - "No technology for technology's sake". |
| 07/25/2019 9:27:36 | Receptive | I work and live in the neighbourhood and would like to see this approved and built | I see no risks | I would like this project to move forward and get approved. |
| 07/25/2019 17:16:30 | Not receptive | I am deeply alarmed by the "bureaucratization" of public space. We should not have to use an app to play soccer on a soccer field or throw a Frisbee around on a public patch of grass. This is solutionism at it's worst. This is solving an issue that is not a problem in the first place! | | |
| 07/26/2019 11:08:31 | Receptive | Love the plans for the public realm! | I don't see any major risksWeW | we dont need to put a lot of conditions on this proposal other than the normal review process. |
| 07/26/2019 18:57:59 | Not receptive | | A private company should not be in the business of creating public realms proposals. Public spaces needed to be designed and built between the government and citizens in a mutually accountable way. | Waterfront knows better than to propose these overreaching and silly proposals. |
| 07/27/2019 10:23:20 | Receptive | Some of the items proposed may help support/test options to support Toronto's Vision Zero pls (which so far has been unsuccessful). | | With government and public consultation in a reasonable way.  Be conscious of the "old guard" and the "naysayers" running this out of town. This should be about "how" we can get this done effectively, not about finding ways not to do it. Ensure progressive millennials and Gen Zs are at the table as they are the future of Toronto. |
| 07/27/2019 12:07:19 | Receptive | Very interesting, possibly game-changing for Toronto public and semi-public spaces. | Again, timidtiy on the part of Toronto. Note that you stated above "Sidewalk Labs proposes technology-based tools and space management concepts that would extend beyond typical practices on Toronto's waterfront". Yes! This is the point!! Try new things and learn from them. | Absolutely pursue them as hard and as fast as possible! |
| 07/29/2019 18:51:25 | Receptive to some | | How well will all this be maintained? My experience with technology is that it's great for the first 6 mos to 1 yr, then when things start acting up... not so great. | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/29/2019 19:17:39 | Not receptive | Why should OSA get control and money with no strings attached? They should not get that kind of control nor funding. If Sidewalk Labs wants to put in a committee they can fund it themselves! OSA also has should no right to have the privlege of making such decisions instead of leaving it to the government. There is a claim that this is supposed to incorporate with the rest of the city, then why are you inserting your own level of government running your own little hub? Sidewalk Labs needs to BACK OFF - this property is the publics not some private firm wanting to create their own Disney World. Plus, why should we fund their dream? We fund our own dreams! | Them slowly sneaking in control over part of the city. What's next? We want to run the city of Toronto?! They have no right to take over any level of government or government duty! | I like the design of the space technology wise. DO NOT like: data collection, demanding control via OSA and other means, and funding for their private interests. |
| 07/30/2019 8:03:02 | Not receptive | It seems very unrealistic to create and maintain large scale heated sidewalks, sidewalks we have no experience maintaining and will likely be on the hook for the many repairs. Also DATA COLLECTION in public spaces, there's no way to protect torontonians from googles data collection if they're just wandering through the public park their taxes pay for. | Data collection in public spaces, paid for by public funds. And the lack of ability to give consent to that data collection. | None, shut this deal down. |
| 07/30/2019 10:25:17 | Receptive | Are you f kidding me? Who has a problem with this? This is a beautiful use of city land unheard of in this country so far. We currently are being stalked by own own iPhones yet everyone owns an iPhone. What additional private data do we actually have left? And who is actually trying to improper lives with current Data collection now? No one. | The biggest risk is focusing on data collection when it's already happening Everywhere already and shutting down this whole amazing project because this one company actually wants to have a conversation about the data collection. I'm amazed that Toronto is even considering not taking advantage of this opportunity. | No conditions, let's start this thing. |
| 07/30/2019 10:46:47 | Receptive to some | | too much programing. less busy around the slip | |
| 07/30/2019 12:47:38 | Receptive | All the ideas I think are good. OSA can be run as a co-op and the city should budget as park and recreation without giving any special treatment | No risks | To increase quality of life for citizens without increasing or becoming a financial burden for the city |
| 07/30/2019 15:28:28 | Not receptive | | | |
| 07/30/2019 15:40:47 | Not receptive | I hate the idea of setting up a reservation system for public spaces. It is too regimented and people will game it. Who is going to watch the users, to make sure they leave when they are supposed to? Who is going to check their ID, to make sure they are the "right" people? This ifea is so bad, it's embarrassing. | I see an Alliance Against Open Space (AAOS) or a Closed-off Space Alliance (CoSA) seizing public land, assuming powers of taxation and running its own bureaucracy. | Run, do not walk, away from them. |
| 07/30/2019 16:36:07 | Not receptive | Because the ultimate goal here is not to simply improve life - while that may be a side effect of the larger project, we should be cautious about the "price" which is not a dollar value but weakened democracy | The continuation of the disproportionate power and information held by Alphabet | |
| 07/30/2019 17:19:12 | Not receptive | Dorothy and friends go down the hall to the Wizards inner sanctum and there they find an almost Utopian place with places to picnic, where it never rains or snows and everybody communicates with ease and equality.  The problem is that there is no Toto to pull back the curtain because the curtain is in the servers and the algorithms that determine what they see and where they can go.<br>Do they mean parks when they say "open spaces"?  We have them.  We also already have a way to reserve places within those parks.  It's just that SL doesn't have access to that information,<br>"Stoa"?  What is that and why is it managed by a computer?  Where does the data from it's use end up?  This is a data collection tool in an area that currently has no data.<br>3D mapping might be a good idea, you'd have to ask the people who go down there.  Water, hydro, gas, various cable companies.  This mapping would have to be turned over entirely to the City. They could use Quayside as proof of concept with the hope that they could charge the city to do everywhere but then the map MUST be turned over to the City.<br>Comfort areas, heated sidewalks, are we babies? How much would that cost? | The risks are the same in other areas.  Is Sidewalk Labs making money off any of this? They are looking for billions of dollars of revenue and to continue to grow in these areas,  So how are they making money? | Much greater transparency of how they intend to monetize the data they collect from any of this and to remove SL from any influence over future city decision making. |
| 07/30/2019 18:09:42 | Receptive to some | The use of public spaces is vital to ensuring a community is healthy and accessible to all. However, the public spaces should be owned and controlled by the public. | The gathering of data in public spaces must be limited and in the control of public entities. There is a danger that reliance on digital tools and data gathering will lead to a lower prioritization for the actual physical space and for suers who are not digitally adept. | All data, ownership and management of public spaces should be retained by the public entities. |
| 07/30/2019 22:16:38 | Receptive to some | Stoa model has human scale. | OSA is another funding/liability nightmare. City needs to manage space. | Experiment with raincoats, pavement, shelters in different areas and see what happens. |
| 07/31/2019 0:14:25 | Receptive | This is an area where there have been positive community consultations and apparently many productive ideas. It will function as a test-bed for emerging technologies and the efficacy of these. | Establishing the OSA is a risk, however, Sidewalk is also test-bedding such collaborative programming of the public realm in a district. If successful it could provide a viable model outside of the BIAs. | This could be a major arts and culture zone, not only a dynamic SME and commercial space. If funded a cultural plan and partners should follow. |
| 07/31/2019 0:53:09 | Receptive to some | Like the open space concepts very much, including the Parliament Plaza concept<br><br>OSA - why is this needed? as opposed to managing open space in the way it is done in the rest of the city | Stoa concept needs to be completely winter proofed to be successful.... | |
| 07/31/2019 8:08:00 | Not receptive | Excessive dependence on technology leaves the development open to problems if a major interruption or failure of the technology occurs. In addition to simple malfunctions, the development would be vulnerable to hacking and ransom attacks such as those occurring more and more frequently in U.S. cities. | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 9:55:11 | Receptive | We need more experimentation in public realm spaces. | If data collection is a concern, we should be worried about it across the city. Toronto has bred surveillance companies across the board -- where retailers on Queen Street and in the Eaton Centre can scrape your data as you walk by their store, including your email, identity, and personal characteristics. Data collection in public spaces should not be limited to this proposal.<br><br>If the aesthetic of the space in the winter is a concern, we should also take a closer look at many of the developments going up across our waterfront and city. There has been a lot of oversight (understatement) in the development of a year-round aesthetic experience in our city's developments. I have no doubt that by pressing on this issue, you will ensure that SWL thinks more about this than any other developer. | |
| 07/31/2019 11:14:55 | Receptive | I feel the same here as with other sections. | | |
| 07/31/2019 11:38:10 | Need more information | The innovations proposed in the MIDP - from built form to governance -  can not be separated out from the massive gaps in our data and privacy laws. The benefits of this proposal can not be effectively evaluated until we are honest about what a private, american company benefits from this deal, and the risks of privatizing our public processes does for democracy. | governance, transparency, security | The innovations proposed in the MIDP - from built form to governance -  can not be separated out from the massive gaps in our data and privacy laws. The benefits of this proposal can not be effectively evaluated until we are honest about what a private, american company benefits from this deal, and the risks of privatizing our public processes does for democracy. |
| 07/31/2019 17:22:12 | Receptive | United Way Greater Toronto likes the various public realm concepts.  Arrpecaite the innovative idea of flexible interior space on the ground floor of buildings, called "Stoa".  This would engender pop up shops, social enterprise and other innovations to support the economic livelihood of the community.<br><br>We would want to understand more about the idea of establishing a new, independent, not-for-profit organization called the Open Space Alliance (OSA) to assume responsibility for operations and maintenance of all public realm. Community involvement and oversight if inclusive and representative of the entire community is a strong component.  But clarity on what the OSA would do relative to Municipal responsibility for public space would be helpful. | We would prefer access to outdoor public space with a 4 season use for some of the space. So, we support Waterfront Toronto's idea in the initial RFP for urban and building design to account for different seasons such as all-weather colonnades. | |
| 07/31/2019 17:27:50 | Receptive | United Way Greater Toronto likes the various public realm concepts.  Arrpecaite the innovative idea of flexible interior space on the ground floor of buildings, called "Stoa".  This would engender pop up shops, social enterprise and other innovations to support the economic livelihood of the community.<br><br>We would want to understand more about the idea of establishing a new, independent, not-for-profit organization called the Open Space Alliance (OSA) to assume responsibility for operations and maintenance of all public realm. Community involvement and oversight if inclusive and representative of the entire community is a strong component.  But clarity on what the OSA would do relative to Municipal responsibility for public space would be helpful. | We would prefer access to outdoor public space with a 4 season use for some of the space. So, we support Waterfront Toronto's idea in the initial RFP for urban and building design to account for different seasons such as all-weather colonnades. | |
| 07/31/2019 17:50:01 | Receptive to some | "Sidewalk Labs proposes establishing a new, independent, not-for-profit organization called the Open Space Alliance (OSA) to assume responsibility for operations and maintenance of all public realm"<br><br>Toronto already has parks and recreation and other municiple bodies to deal with this. Why should this area get it's own special branch? Seems inefficient, silly and a waste of money.<br><br>STOA - are these not fully closed off? Is this opening exposed to the windy lake ? Sure outdoor comfort spaces are a GREAT idea but how efficient will they be? Are we looking to other cities when it comes to Winterscaping? Is this based off of tested/plausible ideas?<br><br>I think aesthetics and design are very important - and this proposal is very aesthetic, but I wonder if it will actually take off.<br><br>Also Toronto already has a function on how to book public space/ picnic tables / tennis courts. That should be a relatively smooth implementation (unless they mean a whole new system?) | 3D mapping is cool, but how expensive is it? If all we are relying upon is that technology whats the back up plan when a pipe bursts and the network fritzs up etc etc? | I like the LED lit up sidewalks thats cool. |
| 07/31/2019 19:50:51 | Not receptive | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 19:51:25 | Not receptive | | "A system of open spaces coupled with digital tools, including a platform enabling people to reserve public areas" This is a serious incursion on social protocol and one that has not been created with in dialogue of citizens. Why should citizens accept Alphabet mediate/internet mediated/digital mediated social controls in public settings? Why should an app tell people what to do our how people should organize? This is a tremendous shift in the status quo of how people interact and essentially social engineering. It also creates more borders between groups than connections—why can't groups merge? ask each other if they can cohabitate? wait? As a citizen of a city I do not want my experience to be digitally governed. It also opens the opportunity for exploitative social engineering—will this be used in the public interest? Or to generate more profits by pushing groups towards certain products/stores/restaurants? A former Alphabet company, Niantic, already used social engineering to herd video game players to specific businesses (https://economix365.com/use-pokemon-go-phenomenon-business-profits/), largely without the knowledge or consent of their users. We need to ensure that any digitally mediated social interaction is not done in a way that manipulates consumers without their knowledge, not only for the benefit of consumers who should not be exploited commercially for unrelated services, but also for the sake of local businesses. If businesses can pay Alphabet to drive customers | |
| 07/31/2019 20:05:05 | Receptive | I would like our city to utilize this opportunity as a chance to experiment and innovate so it can inform and hopefully shape our future infrastructure projects and the integration of technology in achieving optimum outcomes. | No risks, we need to do this | I think it is very important, we need to move forward or we will be left behind. |
| 07/31/2019 23:20:30 | Receptive | Great opportunity | City Hall saying no. | Just do it |
| 07/31/2019 23:26:34 | Not receptive | There needs to be a public data governance system in place. It is currently not there. I also do not know what you mean by "augment" public space. Why can't OSA be a part of the City of Toronto? | It is too ambiguous. Give the public greater details on these proposals mean | |
| 08/01/2019 14:39:04 | Receptive to some | its hard to discern what is public realm and what is private open spaces. | In this case I can see the need for another special purpose body to animate and maintain the POP and supplement the public spaces. But, it will be difficult to secure extra public park dollars when they are so scarce already in the City. Perhaps WT or the senior levels of government will participate but I wouldn't bank on it. | |
| 08/02/2019 14:09:21 | Receptive to some | Not so keen on the ability of people to reserve public spaces on a whim. True public space should be welcome to all users. Specific reservations of the public space can compromise the use by many for a select use by few. Just seems to increase the policing of space use. Creates more of a problem than it solves. Sure permitting of spaces and for festivals and special events should happen. | A potential risk is STOA spaces might go unused based on the rental and reservation costs. I can understand the benefits of having a STOA type enterprise but it could lead to constant turnover and change to the neighbourhood. I don't mind the idea of 5-year leases that has a fixed value attached to space, permits tenant improvements and offers some stability to an area. the nice thing about STOA, however, is it might keep that big corporate stores out of the area and permit a unique and diverse retail component. Like the raincoat ideas but not a necessity. Seems like and gimmicky solution to something that can be resolved through good architecture. | |
| 08/04/2019 17:56:09 | Receptive | These ideas represent fresh thinking; the city and Waterfront Toronto should encourage innovation and Quayside provides an ideal opportunity to test these ideas.

Sidewalk Labs' proposals do not present any additional risks with regard to the collection and governance of data collected in public spaces.  Of course, we need to understand Sidewalk Labs' approach to data security and privacy.  But anyone in Toronto who carries a smartphone (and most do) is tracked by a variety of organizations. Most people are content to give up some privacy in return for the benefits (e.g. using smartphone mapping apps);  and it's hard to point to any malicious use of data that is collected. Additionally there are many cameras in Toronto that track people's movements on streets and in buildings.  Again no-one is concerned because in many cases that data is used to solve crimes. | The greatest risk is with the establishment and funding of the OSA - although as far as I can see, the proposals could go ahead without the OSA.

There will no doubt be political and ideological objections; some will see this as privatization. However, the city already allows other organizations to carry out functions that it could carry out.  Examples include garbage collection and maintenance and construction of public housing (plus providing security services) by Toronto Community Housing Corporation. | Conduct a feasibility study of the OSA.

Develop a better understanding of Sidewalk Labs' data privacy, security and governance. |
| 08/07/2019 20:38:25 | Receptive | | | |
| | | | | |
| Submitted before deadline: | 41 | | | |
| Submitted after deadline: | 4 | | | |
| Total | 45 | | | |

| Submitted On | How receptive are you to exploring this proposal from Sidewalk Lab | Why | What do you see as the risks with Sidewalk Labs Sustainability proposals | Under what conditions if any would you want to see Waterfront Toronto pursue these proposals further |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/19/2019 17:34:00 | Not receptive | Sustainable buildings are all a good idea. Building them with proprietary Google software, hardware and infrastructure is not. This technology - from its design to its creation to its implementation to its operation - absolutely must be completely free from corporate control. Whatever Sidewalk Labs may claim, their intentions are to make money off of this process, which requires control of some aspect of it. Democratic entities like the City of Toronto should not be subsidizing the means by which Google would make itself an indispensable, rent-seeking part of a green future. | The usual - corporate greed, corporate control, corporate anti-democracy, and the continuing privatization of the essentials of city life. | None |
| 07/23/2019 16:54:48 | Receptive | It is comprehensive and impressive | None | |
| 07/24/2019 13:57:53 | Receptive to some | | | |
| 07/24/2019 22:43:22 | Receptive | The future is about addressing climate change. No, wait. That is the present. We can't wait. | Will get stuck in red tape and beuracracy gets in the way. | Give the City the opportunity to bid on systems in case they want to provide them. Perhaps, right of first refusal. |
| 07/25/2019 9:36:01 | Receptive | I would like this development built. | I do not feel there are any risks.  Sidewalk Labs will add value to the waterfront area. It will not devalue it. there are no privacy issues with home monitoring. this type of monitoring is used by millions and people are openly using their cell phones knowing that is a greater risk of privacy issues. Wastewater treatment is an issue for the Municipality to work with all businesses working directly on the lake. this is ongoing for all of the waterfront and is not an unusual issue to tackle. | I would like this development to move forward and the Sidewalk Labs proposal to be approved. |
| 07/25/2019 17:23:42 | Not receptive | | | |
| 07/29/2019 18:53:13 | Receptive to some | | | |
| 07/29/2019 19:34:54 | Need more information | I'm okay with most of this: not happy with all this automation and monitoring technologies. Do not invade other people's privacy. I do not want you know my movements. I can set things myself! | Privacy violation and unnecessary data collection. | If they remove anything that would violate people's privacy. |
| 07/30/2019 8:06:23 | Not receptive | | | |
| 07/30/2019 10:32:46 | Receptive | It's like asking if you want to dishwasher or a bucket was a hole in it and a sponge. | | |
| 07/30/2019 10:54:15 | Receptive to some | We need to look at infrastructure with respect to stormwater | cost | details on how these systems have a good ROI otherwise don't bother. Hex pavers I think I read we get 13% ROI over 30 years. Not worth it. New technology will out before |
| 07/30/2019 15:30:40 | Not receptive | | | Fresh process. |
| 07/30/2019 18:08:15 | Need more information | The smart disposal system is intriguing but it requires an offsite facility otherwise the infrastructure seems expensive.  Who builds that?  Why do tenants have to unlock the chutes?  Does each tenant have an identifiable code or key? We're not monitoring individuals waste activities. What does "obligations to connect to thermal and electrical grids to access low-carbon energy." mean?  There's something wrong with the word obligations.  Are the obligations to Sidewalk Labs? Why does Sidewalk Labs have any input into whether I use a car or not?  Big Brother... | Offsite facility creation and operation.  If this doesn't exist it seems the whole concept falls apart.  Feasibility of capturing Ashbridges Bay Wastewater Treatment Plant waste heat. The WSA seems overblown or over controlling, Surely this can be managed by existing departments within the city. | Schedules to control blinds and lighting are in public areas only and in the beginning are subject to public input to determine if they are working and if not to be shut off, No Smart Home monitoring of any kind. |
| 07/30/2019 22:41:25 | Receptive to some | All waste streams should be increasingly taxed and regulated (heat, solids, liquids, gases).

Establishing Quayside as a low emission zone could encourage innovative solutions. | Overly complex. | Regulate, then bid on solutions for individual buildings. |
| 07/31/2019 0:29:37 | Receptive | This is an excellent test bed for advanced systems. This is what data collection and communication should be based on. | Small technical glitches could impact credibility. | Need a coordinating agency for the bullets. |
| 07/31/2019 1:15:13 | Receptive | Very serious attempt to get to net zero. | Mobility and particularly reduced car usage is critical, but the public may not be receptive yet.... | |
| 07/31/2019 8:21:37 | Receptive to some | I am in favour of climate-positive measures, however I am skeptical of Sidewalk Labs' ability to deliver on many of its proposals. I am also opposed to home automation and monitoring technologies. While many potential residents may be fine with this, such a development would automatically exclude people who do not want to live under these conditions. | | |
| 07/31/2019 11:17:14 | Receptive | I like this | will all of these sensors always work and what if they are not working? | |
| 07/31/2019 14:20:13 | Receptive | This is a key issue for any future developments and there are some interesting ideas here. | There is a high degree of technological innovation proposed, and as with any innovation some things may not work as planned. | Continue to reference the RFP goals. |
| 07/31/2019 18:06:03 | Receptive | All for green technology.

Concerning solid waste -- isn't it being turned into fertilizer???

I like including passive housing into the green plan. Save energy if it's built right! | Is there actually a need for Waterfront Sustainability Association (WSA) or  can existing municipal bodies be in charge of this? | Vigorous review for ideas like the waste water heat! |
| 07/31/2019 20:11:13 | Receptive | I would like to learn more | I do not see the risks | I don't have any conditions. |
| 07/31/2019 23:29:27 | Receptive | Very interested | City not approving it | This is urgently  needed. |
| 07/31/2019 23:30:09 | Not receptive | Unclear in what data will be captured by home monitoring systems. | | |
| 08/01/2019 0:01:58 | Need more information | They are all interesting ideas but there is no independent information at least in the summary documents that show that any of them are feasible or would result in important public benefits | What experience does Google-SWL have in developing utilities. Might be simpler if WT contracts directly with experienced engineering consultants. | After independent assessment of feasibility. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 08/01/2019 15:06:53 | Receptive | Another strong suit from SWL on sustainability. An excellent list of initiatives, some of which have been implemented elsewhere but as a whole would distinguish Quayside. | The risks are numerous, city permitting and provincial regulations being the most problematic but not insurmountable. | I'd have WT enlist the support of the Province to have enact a regulation to identify Quayside as a environmental demonstration zone that allows innovation and will rely on certified engineering reports to validate the merits of deviating from any existing process or standard in order to achieve higher environmental performance. |
| 08/07/2019 20:42:07 | Receptive | | | |
| | | | | |
| Submitted before deadline: | 23 | | | |
| Submitted after the deadline: | 3 | | | |
| Total | 26 | | | |

| Submitted On | To what extent should the public sector be prepared to subsidize climate positive development and why | To what extent do you support building automation/data collection to advance sustainability and utility affordability goals at Quayside and why | Are there any elements of the sustainability strategy that are not explained fully enough for you to comment on If yes please outline which areas/initiatives require further clarification | What are your initial impressions of the Waterfront Sustainability Association What are the potential benefits and risks of establishing this model | To what extent do you support the development of a distributed energy model with private utilities to advance climate positive objectives and promote resiliency at quayside and why |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 07/22/2019 5:10:36 | There should be strong government involvement in the development of energy sustainability. But the public sector should not simply fund private-sector proposals. Those proposals need to be developed in cooperation with the private sector. | Before plans are further developed in this area, a data governance strategy needs to be put in place. Sidewalk Labs' proposed civic data trust (now the urban data trust) is not sufficient. A data governance strategy needs to be developed by government (not solely one company) with consultation with the private sector and civil society. | | More information is needed on the need for, regulatory authority of, and the public funds necessary for the creation and ongoing operation of the Waterfront Sustainability Association. What is the anticipated private-sector support for the creation of the WSA? What regulatory authority will it have? How will it work with other city and provincial agencies? | |
| 07/23/2019 16:55:57 | 5% | 100% | no | Great model | I support this |
| 07/24/2019 22:44:35 | Very prepared. | I am supportive. | I get it. | Is it necessary? Is it redundant? | I am supportive. |
| 07/25/2019 9:41:48 | the public sector should subsidize to contribute to reducing our greenhouse gas emissions and to collectively ensure our energy bills are lower and the strain is off the grid, Green developing and retrofitting is the fastest way to reduce our emissions. | I completely support this advanced technology . I do not believe it is a privacy risk at all. | I am clear on all the objectives. they are very impressive. | | I completely support this. We need innovative and progressive ways to reduce our emissions as quickly as possible and take the load off the current grid. Our climate commitments are not being met and Sidewalk Labs is a model to show us how we could be easily achieving our climate positive objectives in this country and around the world. |
| 07/29/2019 11:58:07 | I think this should be subsidized, however whether possible ensuring that private companies bear the load of funding these opportunities! | This feels a bit like a bait and switch -- I think sustainability and climate positive building does not require the degree of complexity and technology proposed. I am nervous about creating a path dependency for automation/data collection with these proposals when there are other avenues to pursue around sustainability and affordability. | | This is the third (?) proposed association / governance entity distinct from the "social infrastructure," which now largely appears to be window dressing or shallow to the degree of rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic.<br><br>It seems like a cavalier attitude from SL to think that this many governance structures can be spun up trivally without adding a huge degree of complexity. | I think that utilities should be nationalized / made public, so I'm not in alignment with the public-private partnerships proposed. |
| 07/29/2019 19:37:55 | As long as it is for the public not a private company and it truly helps save this planet I'm willing to put forward a reasonable amount. Reasonable as in I should be able to live comfortably even after helping. | I do not support it all. Data collection is not necessary to be more sustainable, more affordable or more environmentally friendly. | Nothing in this whole proposal and survey is explained enough. Give me the original report and proposals in plain English please. | DO NOT LIKE PRIVACY VIOLATION. Do not mind some of the purely sustainable proposals minus data collection and privacy violation. | I need more information but from what I can tell I'm okay with it. |
| 07/30/2019 10:58:03 | We do need to get on board. It will be a while before we are climate positive. | Building automation is already here so no big deal. Data collection, depends on what is being collected and how it will be used. | | No associations if the city is already doing this | Yes, better energy models are needed |
| 07/30/2019 18:17:03 | Completely. We are in a climate crises and Canada is the worst per capita in the world. Pay up people. | Automation can be a good thing in the ways it has been described by SL however it almost always leads to loss of jobs.<br>Data collection is a very tricky thing. There are ways in which this could be a positive for Toronto Unfortunately Sidewalk Labs reasons for data collection is untrustworthy. What could be positive for Toronto may not be a revenue stream for SL. | see above. | There seems to be too many Associations. The greatest risk is that ever neighborhood would want one, at the expense of the city. I don't see the benefits.<br>All of these Associations seem to be Sidewalk Labs experimenting with city jurisdictions | I would like a lot more information about this. |
| 07/30/2019 22:49:40 | Greater than existing subsidy for climate negative development - for survival. | Fine when you are saving the planet.<br><br>Not OK when spying, controlling and extracting value from people. | WSA | Duplicating existing layers of government. | Distributed network of consumer coops puts people in charge. |
| 07/31/2019 1:18:23 | We are in the middle of a life threatening climate change crisis. The public sector needs to be investing an multiple strategies to reduce GHG emissions. | Where it makes sense, without compromising personal privacy and without undue reliance on elaborate independent monitoring agencies | | Again the question is whether a new agency is required or whether this can be designed to fit within the mandate of an existing public agency | Strongly |
| 07/31/2019 14:23:53 | The public sector has an interest in reducing GHG emissions so I'm in favour of public subsidies. The extent of that subsidy should be determined on a case-by-case base=is. | To a very limited extent - building wide data is fine but I have serious concerns with any data monitoring on an individual residence or leased space basis. | no comment | As with all the other new entities proposed by Sidewalk, I would need to see both a business case and a plan that fully protects the public interest. | 100%. This is an idea that has been proven to work elsewhere. |
| 07/31/2019 23:31:00 | Don't care who does it just get it done | 100% | No | Give it a try | 100% bc we are in a crisis |
| 08/01/2019 0:01:56 | Could be ok. The Liberals, if re-elected will be looking for projects to fund to achieve their Paris commitments once they reach their announced carbon tax ceiling in a few years. If elected, the Tories will be looking for similar projects in lieu of a carbon tax. | Fine if not collecting data on individuals and making it public or profiting from it for private gain.<br><br>BTW: Toronto Hydro and Enbridge colllect data and share it with me on each bill showing how much energy I used compared to last month and last year etc.<br><br>Also I guess every office and commercial building of any size already has automated hvac controls. What's new here apart from Google-SWL selling the data? | We need to know what a "smart grid" is. Is the proposed "thermal grid" district heating and cooling? | Toronto has civic departments and publicly owned enterprises that can fulfil this role | Why only with private utilities? Publicly owned Toronto Hydro might be an obvious participant. As I understand it Toronto Hydro once owned the district heating system in the office core and might well be the developer of a district heating and cooling operation in the eastern waterfront especially if the public asset of sewage heat is to be exploited. |
| Submitted before the dea | 12 | | | | |
| Submitted after the dead | 1 | | | | |
| Totals: | 13 | | | | |

| Submitted On | What do you see as the potential benefits and risks of moving forward with government investments and regulatory reforms proposed by Sidewalk Labs | What suggestions if any do you have for Waterfront Toronto in terms of how they consider  mitigate these risks |
|---|---|---|
| 07/24/2019 22:58:32 | If it becomes a "cut red tape" exercise. These need to be thoughtful reforms. | Smart policies. Keep that target in mind. |
| 07/29/2019 20:17:21 | Why do they want government funding on top of land given to them at below market price so THEY can turn a profit and just throw in a few affordable housing units to claim that it'll be such a benefit to us? If we have to pay for all of it why don't we just do it and Sidewalk Labs can take a walk? | Keep public money for public interest not for private interest. Do not just hand things over without well though out and binding restrictions. Do not give away assets for less than they are worth. |
| 07/29/2019 20:20:45 | I agree with having government regulation of Sidewalk Labs proposals but I'd need more information on the actual proposals and reforms to make an informed opinion on this. | |
| 07/30/2019 20:32:49 | There is more concept than content is these statements. | As noted before Alphbet/Google/Sidewalk Labs are extremely against regulation of any kind.  However, they are also smart.  Smart enough to create via small innocuous changes large 'inevitable' changes to more important legislation,  It is critical that any change to regulation or legislation be analysed for creating potential precedent for larger changes. |
| 07/31/2019 0:13:15 | Insufficient profit sharing with government. | Procure, then lease all land. |
| 07/31/2019 1:14:19 | Governments consistently engage with public - private or P3 partnerships, this is not new.  Risks are financial impacts on City of Toronto, also risks if Sidewalk does not fulfill. | Balance social and benefits goals against economic or better, integrate these with longer term thinking. |
| 07/31/2019 19:53:20 | I am opposed to the idea of creating new non-profit entities except in limited, well-defined instances. I am in favour of government investment in infrastructure to support development, and I hope that all levels of government see the opportunity that is before us and swill step up (like building the LRT). | It will be up to all 3 levels of government to be actively involved in this process. |
| 07/31/2019 23:46:14 | Great new concept | Stop worrying |
| 08/01/2019 15:30:51 | Generally I think we should enable new standards and test drive some of them where feasible. | |
| | | |
| Submitted before deadline: | 8 | |
| after deadline: | 1 | |
| total | 9 | |

| Submitted On | What do you see as the potential benefits and risks of moving forward with financing mechanisms proposed by Sidewalk Labs | Under what conditions if any do you think they could be useful to consider |
|---|---|---|
| 07/25/2019 10:01:55 | the benefits are world class, environmentally advanced design on the waterfront, improved mobility and connection of the waterfront to the city, and the creation of many jobs.The financing mechanisms have been planned in great detail and will provide increased value to surrounding lands, increased revenue in taxes and cost saving in transportation through the offer by Sidewalk Labs to loan the money to install the LRT. | This plan should be approved. |
| 07/25/2019 17:28:34 | Google is private corporation, and its interests are purely to make money for its shareholders. Google is not working in the public's interest. | N/a |
| 07/29/2019 12:18:52 | This project is driven by one of the worlds most powerful companies and profit - not people is their bottom line.  Any risks/ partnership or financing schemes they propose to achieve their ends must be viewed with the skepticism of knowing - people and public good are not their first priority. | If the city determined that this was something we needed to enhance the public good - we should decide terms and find our own financing and only if we own what we invest in. |
| 07/29/2019 19:55:23 | We're bled dry of cash as it is. Not interested. | When they become practical. |
| 07/29/2019 20:03:08 | I do not agree with the use of tax-increment financing at all. Sidewalk Labs is being run by a for-profit organization, none of this should be publicly funded. | |
| 07/30/2019 11:05:04 | Financing cannot be another MFP fiasco | If the terms are reasonable |
| 07/30/2019 20:07:50 | Why is tax increment financing rarely used in Canada?

Not enough detailed information provided. | |
| 07/30/2019 23:30:25 | Too enmeshed with private gain. | |
| 07/31/2019 0:56:26 | We need new financing models and seems useful to test tax increment financing. | |
| 07/31/2019 16:00:35 | Anything that could speed up development of the Portlands should be looked at, but any mechanism must be of net benefit to Toronto and its taxpayers. | As above. |
| 07/31/2019 20:20:13 | I think the benefit of investment upfront is beneficial and think it will inspire innvestment. | I think they are very useful |
| 07/31/2019 23:38:29 | Huge benefits  for cash strapped city | No conditions |
| 08/01/2019 15:20:09 | I like the idea of a Section 28 Community Improvement Area. It provides flexibility to the developer and the City for financing and agreements. | |
| | | |
| Submitted before the deadline | 12 | |
| submitted after the deadline | 1 | |
| total | 13 | |

| Submitted On | What do you see as the potential benefits and risks of moving forward with Sidewalk Labs proposals for targeted regulatory adjustments and enhanced requirements on development | Under what conditions if any do you think they could be useful to consider |
|---|---|---|
| 07/24/2019 22:52:26 | It's needed. That's the benefit. The risk is that becomes a "cut red tape" exercise. That's not the point. But smart policy is. | They are useful now. |
| 07/25/2019 9:57:47 | I see the benefits being a world class environmental sensitive design that will attract world attention, and tourism,  improved mobility for the city with impressive LRT funding, mixed use of a currently unused stretch of waterfront, greater access to connect the waterfront to the city, the creation of an innovation hub and education centre in Toronto that will be world-leading, commitments of significant social contributions to the community and the production of many new jobs. | they should approve the proposal |
| 07/29/2019 19:54:32 | They are demanding way too much power that they have no right to have. This is like country invasion through buyouts. | NEVER CONSIDER. |
| 07/29/2019 20:00:57 | need more information | |
| 07/29/2019 21:19:43 | They will take data and sell it  / use it. People have rights to privacy. Sidewalk labs refuses | |
| 07/30/2019 11:04:31 | Sidewalk is not in a position to comment on WT's mandate | This would be up to the City |
| 07/30/2019 15:35:42 | The risk is that a private corporate is calling the shots rather than the people of the city. | |
| 07/30/2019 20:06:29 | You have not given me any information on what regulatory changes SL wants | |
| 07/30/2019 23:28:27 | In general, development and regulation needs to change but these proposals do not capture enough shared value while still exposing the public to all risks. | Once all land is publicly held in perpetuity. |
| 07/31/2019 0:54:15 | I agree with this approach as long as it is able to support innovation. | |
| 07/31/2019 15:59:38 | There is a place for the regulatory adjustments where we have lagged behind other jurisdictions such as mass timber and possible mixed-use developments. However, I would be reluctant to introduce an entirely new regulatory framework for the IDEA district. | Very limited as noted above. |
| 07/31/2019 20:18:12 | I do not see the risks, I think they would be the leader in this area | I do not have an opinion |
| 07/31/2019 23:37:45 | Stop fretting and do it | Just do it |
| 08/01/2019 7:20:22 | | This is not a bad idea. I like it in principle. However, public sector needs the tools to properly evaluate. The benefit of the current system is a degree of consistency. |
| 08/07/2019 20:44:32 | Na | Na |
| | | |
| Submitted before the deadline: | 13 | |
| Submitted after the deadline: | 2 | |
| total | 15 | |

| Submitted On | What information would you need to assess whether these governance proposals would work well for Toronto | What do you see as their potential benefits and risks And under what conditions if any do you think they could be useful to consider | How open are you to discussing changes to governance |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/24/2019 22:51:17 | Don't implement their proposal. Just take the commitment to public control and let government decide and make the rules. | The benefit is in stronger public oversight over all developers. | Open. |
| 07/25/2019 9:51:07 | annual general report | I think there is a great financial benefit to the community | open |
| 07/29/2019 19:53:44 | I need to know who does what, who owns what, how it would be funded and what other solutions are available. | Too complicated which leads to further risk as opposed to keeping it clean and simple. Very ambitious as well which could easily land on its face rather than accomplishing what it wants. | Not open. They have no right to try to tell us how to run our government, our country our provinces, territories or our cities. |
| 07/29/2019 20:00:12 | Infrastructure and traffic modelling to see how it would affect surrounding neighbourhoods, projection of how the building of these places will affect housing prices, what sort of businesses would go in the area, what sort of community centres would go in, and how the programs there would designed and regulated, how public data collection will be regulated and protected and what will be collected, will the areas where recordings are made be marked for public knowledge, etc. | | |
| 07/29/2019 21:19:02 | | Ask Sidewalk labs about the use of SUPL in the cell phones to register location of all android phone users. Ask how users know this is being collected. Ask how this data is stored (in canada?). Ask their processes for deletion of personal data upon request. | |
| 07/30/2019 11:02:47 | No to public administrator. Not their call. | They need to start small and then expand. There will be new ideas coming out | All of this belongs to the various levels of government |
| 07/30/2019 15:34:00 | How do they enhance the direct democratic governance of ordinary people in Toronto, not private stakeholders or new third party entities? | | Not at all, given the tenor of these discussions, it is less democratic governance as it undermines the role of public institutions. |
| 07/30/2019 20:05:08 | Are there other agencies in the city that do similar work?
Would these new agencies create impetus to create more?
How does the funding work and how will they affect current city budget decision making? | Until other questions are answered I cannot consider benefits or risks. | I'm open to this but I need much much more information on current governance models in the city and what if any overlapping jurisdictions there are. |
| 07/31/2019 0:53:06 | Need to understand how these build on existing entities and governance practices and how these are improvements, need to understand fiscal implications.  Need to have ability to ensure that the plan as adopted will be implemented and that there is accountability. | Benefits are collaborative tables that bring all players with clear objectives. Risks are that cannot be generalized as unique to Sidewalk. | There are a variety of models of effective (and ineffective government). Change and innovation is good. |
| 07/31/2019 1:23:42 | I would only want to consider this proposal if the public administrator was Waterfront Toronto acting under its mandate as revitalization lead. | The waterfront housing trust makes sense, if the 1% fee were to be instituted.  The Waterfront Transportation Management Association and the Waterfront Sustainability Association should both reside within the City of Toronto. | |
| 07/31/2019 8:57:59 | | | I do not believe developers should be dictating changes to governance. |
| 07/31/2019 11:23:12 | will any of these things actually work of will they just be talked about? | All of the hi-tech stuff needs oversight | somewhat, I think the experts need to get deeply involved |
| 07/31/2019 15:57:46 | I'm not in favour of the establishment of any new entities in the IDEA district; the Sidewalk Labs proposal would lead to a section of the city with unique governance and development frameworks instead of ensuring that this district is fully integrated into the existing city fabric. This is a non-starter for me. | I don't understand the need for, nor benefits of this proposal. Perhaps it would allow swift implementation of development and innovations but I don't agree that that is a benefit. I think the idea should be rejected early in the process in order to focus on what is feasible and of benefit. | Not at all. |
| 07/31/2019 20:07:45 | | | With Sidewalk Labs, NOT AT ALL. A foreign, for-profit company should have no influence on Canadian democratic policy.

We do however need to implement massive new protections for Canadians in terms of data privacy, digital rights, human research subject protections, and anti-trust laws in order to protect Canadians from the real risks the technologies Waterfront has invited into Canada propose. Not least of which include the fact that surveillance damages the strength of our democracy and hurts our disadvantaged groups disproportionately more (https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/16/opinion/privacy-project-nytimes.html), and suppresses important social movements( https://www.wired.com/story/mcsweeneys-excerpt-the-right-to-experiment/)  but also these technologies are not passive, but actively influence public opinion, buying power and political thought. (https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/07/opinion/google-ads.html) (The Age of Surveillance Capitalism, Shoshana Zuboff) (The People Vs Tech: How the internet is killing democracy (and how we save it), Jamie Bartlett) |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/31/2019 20:17:00 | I am unsure | I do not see the risks | Yes |
| 07/31/2019 23:37:00 | Just try it and see | City slowing it down | Open |
| 07/31/2019 23:37:03 | Not sure. | Not sure. | Not sure. |
| 08/01/2019 7:20:17 | How disconnected the governance authorities are from the public - as in, how many layers of bureaucracy are there from elected officials who are DIRECTLY accountable<br><br>The public administrator is given extraordinary power here. There is a difference between the development of policy/structures/etc and the implementation of the same. The development needs to occur in a democratically accountable way, while it is more acceptable for the implementation to be somewhat removed. HOWEVER, there needs to be a clear way of holding this public administrator accountable for its actions. The proposed model seems highly unaccountable - if there were complaints about the Waterfront Sustainability Association, how would they be addressed? The City (or Province, or feds for that matter) currently have no clear control over Waterfront Toronto (as successful as that organization as been). Introducing additional layers even further removed is worrying. | Benefits - implementation could be consistent regardless of government in power, or political winds changing course<br><br>Negatives - the exact opposite - limited public accountability despite claims of being a public agency. | Maybe |
| 08/01/2019 15:14:47 | 1 | if you set out to delay the success of Quayside you couldn't invent a better way to do that than invent a Public Administrator. | if you did due diligence in submitting a bid on Quayside you would know that it is a tough regulatory environment. Make the best of it and don't get distracted with governance. |
| 08/07/2019 20:44:13 | N'a | | |
| | | | |
| Submitted before the deadline: | 17 | | |
| submitted after the deadline | 3 | | |
| total | 20 | | |

| Submitted On | What information would you need to assess whether these proposals would work well for Toronto | Under what conditions if any do you think they could be useful to consider | What advice do you have for Waterfront Toronto as they review and evaluate these overarching proposals that frame the entirety of the Draft MIDP |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/24/2019 22:53:44 | I have all the information I need. | They are useful now. | Make a deal you think is in the public interest and bring it back for discussion. |
| 07/25/2019 10:06:30 | profit sharing and loan repayment details listed above. | I think this is a brilliant plan and that it should be approved. | My advice is not to lose this partner. There are not other partners that could bring such an advanced plan to Toronto and certainly not one that will generate significant revenue for Toronto. |
| 07/29/2019 19:59:26 | You asked for a proposal and they keep offering different than what you asked for. Only a few things align Either they aren't paying attention or they are trying to wiggle something in that they shouldn't.

Plus, offering solutions of things that don't exist? That doesn't even make sense. | They need to cut back to a reasonable test site before launching such a huge initiative. | Make sure it covers the people's needs not the private companies needs. Make sure they don't overstep their autohority in ways of power, funding and privacy. |
| 07/29/2019 20:07:51 | What is meant by cutting edge design and technology? Those are just buzzwords that give no information about what will actually be implemented or used for design. What is meant by 'Set fourth principles for technology deployment'? | | I'm not sure of the actual proposal that was given to Waterfront Toronto, but I think exact details for each of these vague, over-arching proposal points should be established before any sort of decisions or agreements are made. |
| 07/30/2019 11:06:46 | Sidewalk started with saying they were urban geeks using tech to better our lives. Now they see themselves as leader developer. No, that is WT. Of course they can collaborate | | Take the best and leave the rest. This is all long term. We don't have to decide everything right now |
| 07/30/2019 20:13:23 | who oversees Sidewalk Labs? What are the penalties for violation of contractual obligations? | | Don't be pushed. Sidewalk Labs will want things to move fast. Google hates moving slow. |
| 07/30/2019 23:36:44 | Which elements can be used only at Quayside and if Sidewalk is not interested in the smaller parcel can any ideas from the MIDO be put to other bidders? | If Quayside development proceeds with another vendor then Sidewalk could be asked to bid on Villiers when that becomes available. | Stay in charge, maximize shared value. |
| 07/31/2019 1:01:06 | Might want to test a pilot project. However these are adaptation of mechanisms which could radically improve developer engagement, public investment, etc. | | Need to look at structures that include Canadian industry, public entities and individuals not just Sidewalk Labs. Look at jurisdictions where these kinds of partnerships have thrived. |
| 07/31/2019 16:04:17 | Why would Sidewalk Labs be a lead developer - they have no expertise nor track record as such. If they require something other than what is on offer in the RFP to prove out their concepts, Waterfront Toronto should reject their offer. The other roles seem worth considering, but again within a framework developed by Waterfront Toronto and other levels of government. | As above. | As above. |
| 07/31/2019 23:39:32 | MIDP is enough | Just do it | Go for it |
| 08/01/2019 7:29:38 | The biggest issues at the outset seem to be Roles 2, 3 and 4.

Role 2: Locking in an advisory role - what if they are no good? Can we get rid of them? Why do we want a private sector company, with a VESTED INTEREST in a lax regulatory environment, advising on the creation of that very regulatory environment. That is called regulatory capture, and this is why corporate regulations are extraordinarily and strangely weak in many situations. This is not a good idea at all.

Role 3: others may know more about this than me, but the patent pledge is non-sense because it would only apply to operations in Canada (access to US/globally is critical for startup success - SwL would then get a cut as soon as that happens). Further the shared profit as proposed is very very low, and for a very limited amount of time - I would imagine that uptake on these technologies will be slow (thats the reality, despite what futurists often think), and that 10 year cap would deliver limited revenue. | | This should be the focus for the entire review. The rest is distraction. Whether I think a particular innovation is cool or beneficial is entirely irrelevant if the foundation they are being built upon is harmful. This should not be a situation where we trade off governance and public stewardship and accountability for the promise of hypothetical, unguaranteed benefits. |
| 08/01/2019 8:04:43 | | | SwL is owned by Alphabet, a multinational conglomerate with annual revenue of $137 billion USD (2018). That is a touch below the revenue for the entire Province of Ontario.

SwL has adopted two positions on this. Their whole pitch and existence is based upon the financial power, technological mastery, and "glam" factor of Alphabet (and Google). SwL is a company with literally no experience building cities or doing anything remotely close to this project, but are counting on public trust that Alphabet will get the job done. Moreover, the MIDP explicitly links the two (new Google headquarters! experience with new innovative technology!). Therefore, this affiliation must be considered as part of the evaluation.

However, this ownership affiliation also exposes the project to the track record for Alphabet and of SwL. Alphabet/Google (making a distinction is unimportant for these purposes) is a terrible corporate citizen. There are mainstream and high profile calls to invest it for anti-trust violations and monopolistic behaviour, stifling competition and damaging the free market. It has been continuously accused and convicted of tax avoidance in major jurisdictions around the world. This matters and should be considered. Is this a company we want to be doing business with, a company that talks a good game about public goals and community building, and then turns around and hides money from governments that are trying to achieve those goals? |
| 08/01/2019 15:23:43 | Prove out the concepts that are scalable for 12 acres before assuming anything beyond that. Establish your ability to deliver on the Quayside site. Be ready to compete for the Villiers Island site/sites once WT releases an RFP for those lands. | | |
| | | | |
| Submitted before deadline: | 10 | | |
| Submitted after the deadline | 3 | | |
| Total | 13 | | |

| Submitted On | What do you see as the potential benefits and risks of moving forward with the economic transactions proposed by Sidewalk Labs for municipal infrastructure and advanced infrastructure | What suggestions if any do you have for Waterfront Toronto as they review these infrastructure proposals | What are we willing to give/invest in order to receive the benefits sidewalk labs proposes |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/29/2019 20:09:32 | Getting little to no or irrelevant value in return of practically giving away our lands when they are worth a lot! | Make them pay full price for the land. | Why are you asking the same questions again?<br><br>As said before, NO we should not sell off our land cheap to them. They are going to make money running these buildings and they are a large rich company. Why do they deserve it? Not to mention we can do what they promise in return ourselves since we own the lands already! |
| 07/29/2019 20:15:05 | | | Same as previous; Sidewalk Labs is profiting from this, they are not a publicly funded organization or charity. This is an investment they are making. There should not be much price reduction, if any. |
| 07/30/2019 20:25:48 | | | these policy objectives can be difficult to measure or at least have conflicting methodologies.  How is this solved. |
| 07/30/2019 23:54:41 | Governance is too tied to a single entity (Alphabet). | If a development can be off grid and achieve the sustainability targets it should not be forced to purchase infrastructure which is not used. | Reductions on short term lease, with option to increase on renewal. |
| 07/31/2019 8:51:49 | | Sidewalk Labs stands to profit enormously from this development, in many ways, or it would not be interested in taking it on. The benefits it offers are yet to be proven; the additional costs to the city in terms of infrastructure are also unknown. Th price of public land along the waterfront should not be reduced to accommodate the developer. | |
| 07/31/2019 19:44:20 | I'm not in favour of Sidewalk Labs providing infrastructure financing instead of governments, so if we're limited to advanced systems, there could definitely be benefits in developing new systems, but the degree of technological innovation may lead to problems building robust and reliable systems. | None. | Sidewalk Labs should be taking most of the risk here, as they are looking to develop and implement systems that could be sold worldwide. |
| 07/31/2019 20:08:44 | "In order to achieve the project objectives, Sidewalk Labs proposes residents of the IDEA District would be required to use the services provided by the advanced infrastructure operators" Absolutely not, this is clearly a move to push a monopoly and reduce the power of free-market competition. | | |
| 07/31/2019 23:44:28 | Work would get done | Think big | PERMISSION |
| 08/01/2019 15:29:04 | | | not my call |
| | | | |
| submitted before deadline: | 8 | | |
| after deadline | 1 | | |
| total | 9 | | |

| Submitted On | What are we willing to give/invest in order to receive the benefits Sidewalk Labs proposes | What do you see as the potential benefits and risks of moving forward with the Intellectual property transactions proposed by Sidewalk Labs | What suggestions if any do you have for Waterfront Toronto as they review these Intellectual property proposals |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/24/2019 22:57:30 | I don't understand. They are giving us a share. Seems like a good deal. | Windfall for Waterfront Toronto. More likely just a little stream down of revenue down the road. | Seek advise from industry experts. |
| 07/29/2019 20:14:38 | We invest for stuff that benefits us not solely them. | It is very unclear how this intellectual property will be properly protected and not violated. | Think about all possible outcomes.

I saw something also about a fourth volume but only see three here? Not to mention this survey needs to be given in small doses - it is way too long. I feel like they are trying to push things through quickly and in high volume so it's hard to tell what is a good or bad idea. And that usually means they're up to something. They should be scaled back to reasonable levels and tackled one at a time so we don't overload on too much information. |
| 07/29/2019 20:16:14 | Is this supposed to be the same question as the previous or is this being duplicated? | | |
| 07/30/2019 20:28:02 | nothing should be given up in this area. | | Protect and support Canadian research and companies. |
| 07/31/2019 0:10:00 | Short term leases. | Since Canadians are the test subjects they should receive lifetime benefits from the technologies being developed, including worldwide revenue. i.e., Waterfront Toronto receives an equity stake of any technology tested or implemented at Quayside, e.g. 50% for foreign investments (Alphabet), 25% for Canadian. | |
| 07/31/2019 1:10:12 | Need to construct a revenue return from innovation and other funding that returns as tax benefits for Toronto. | Need a pledge that would cover all IP creation including academic partners. | |
| 07/31/2019 19:49:43 | I'm not sure what the benefits for us are, so any investment would have to be based on that assessment. A Patent Pledge for Canada only seems far too limited, the profit sharing should be revenue sharing and the figure is far too low. | Sidewalk Labs will have a huge advantage in knowing what the data can be used for when combined with their existing access to Google data, and they also will have more expertise in terms of monetization. | Tread carefully. |
| 07/31/2019 20:11:31 | | | —The 10% of profits for the first 10 years is incredibly small and problematic terms. Firstly, the data collected will almost certainly be used to train AI to be used to automate industries or predict/predetermine consumer choices, that ultimately will have a profound impact on Canada's economy as automation replaces jobs and commercialization asymmetrically benefits large-scale companies. This means that Canadians are being asked to train the algorithms that will later put them out of jobs and squeeze the buying power out of their pay check as dynamic pricing models, sharing economy services, and purchase prediction/steering optimize company profits. Secondly, any money earned from data collection should be in terms of revenue and not profits, given that creative accounting can easily hide profits through false or misrepresented finances and many technology companies operate at a loss for decades to undercut competition, subsisting on investor money. (For example Amazon only turned a profit 20 years after they were founded). Once implemented, automated industries won't go away and only spread further without contributing back into the economy. There is a massive windfall of money expected to be made from this data collection and implementation, many orders of magnitude larger than the value of a single neighbourhood. Dan Doctoroff himself said that he expects to "make a lot of money" (https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/27/opinion/cities-privacy-surveillance.html), therefore if any proposal moves forward, it should be in terms of a share of revenue in perpetuity, not a share of profits for a very small window of the product life-cycle.

-"Sidewalk Labs states that "neither Waterfront Toronto nor the public is primarily a technology developer," and asserts that co-created technology (for which there would be co-owned Intellectual Property) is not likely to arise." Although the public is not primarily a technology developer, what Sidewalk Labs is proposing to develop is not solely technologies—they intersect with many other industries including energy, transit, architecture, urbanism, building science, etc. The assertion that there can be no co-creation because they are the only technology company involved is false as technology is only one aspect of their work. Furthermore, the products rely on the testing of their experimental technology on |
| 07/31/2019 23:45:26 | PERMISSION | City Hall will be too cautious | Think big |
| 08/01/2019 15:29:32 | not my area of expertise | | |
| | | | |
| submitted before deadline | 9 | | |
| after deadline: | 1 | | |
| total | 10 | | |

| Submitted On | What suggestions if any do you have for Waterfront Toronto as they review this proposal | What are we willing to give\invest in order to receive the benefits sidewalk labs proposes | What do you see as their potential benefits and risks of moving forward with the economics proposed by sidewalk labs for the real estate transaction |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07/24/2019 22:55:57 | Get a deal done. Show you are a useful public organization. | If they are proposing things we ask for, or if we put restrictions on land, then that should be reflected in price. Beyond that, it is fair market value. | The chair is a strong real estate negotiator. We are in good hands. |
| 07/25/2019 10:26:02 | Be open to the partnership and get better informed on the privacy issues . There are no privacy issues associated with Sidewalk Labs proposal..  There are greater privacy issues from our cell phone use than there will be from the technology Sidewalk Labs is proposing. | The partnership is fair and financially viable. it is an innovative approach to achieving a world-class destination and design on the waterfront. It checks all the boxes that Waterfront Toronto required of the partner.<br><br>If this land was sold to traditional developers at a higher market value the land would be cemented over and used for condo towers.  This is not acceptable.  The waterfront has not be designed in a way that makes it accessible for the public and Sidewalk Labs is proposing a tremendously beneficial development for the public and for the city of Toronto. | I see the benefits are:<br>world class design<br>increased tourism and world attention on Toronto<br>advanced leadership in green building & technology that produces jobs<br>reduction of the environmental footprint on that land<br>increasing mobility and connectivity to the downtown core from the waterfront |
| 07/29/2019 20:03:03 | DO NOT just give them what they ask for! They have no right to ask for it. What they promise in return we could quite frankly do ourselves since we already own the land! | I'm not willing to sell off very expensive land for something cheap just for the promise that they'll do us good in return. They are making money on these buildings but they also want to be given cheap land? While people are struggling to find enough money to even rent let a lone rent a place you're going to give a rich powerful company such value resource for lower than value cost? They don't deserve it and can't be trusted. | HIGH risk on them running out like bandits with our land. They want our expensive land they can pay full price for it. |
| 07/29/2019 20:11:40 | | This is an investment being made by Sidewalk Labs for profit, current prices should be something they already took into account when looking at developing the area. Although some discount could be considered given the magnitude of the area being invested in, like as in a bulk sale, but job creation and economic development is not solely beneficial to the city, so it shouldn't buy them much in negotiation. | |
| 07/30/2019 20:20:06 | Look at cities who have partnered with Sidewalk Labs for various services | Revise this question as 'what are we willing to give up?'  Not sure but not overall control of what is done with the land, | One risk is disagreement on whether the policy outcomes have been achieved.  How will this be mediated? |
| 07/30/2019 23:45:21 | Short term lease with option to increase to full market rate at lease renewal. | Favourable initial short term lease with option to increase to full market rate at lease renewal. | Risk of packaging too many land parcels in one deal.<br><br>Smaller parcels distribute risk around different tenants. |
| 07/31/2019 1:04:06 | Do a significant test of interest in partnerships before moving forward. | Taking a more patient timeline to look at economic benefits from a quadruple bottom line would benefit Toronto in the long run. There are not necessarily other players who would provide the capacities that Sidewalk will and the negative impacts of poor planning and opportunity lost could also be expensive for Toronto. | |
| 07/31/2019 16:22:45 | None. | I have no problem with using a Policy proposal land value, but the details and the actual $ figures will of course be key. And I'm not sure how Waterfront Toronto will put a value on what Sidewalk proposes. | As noted, is there enough value of a developer to enter into a transaction. And the future value of the Sidewalk contribution may be less than estimated. |
| 07/31/2019 23:40:46 | Just do it | Permission | Something  would actually  get done |
| 08/01/2019 0:21:16 | Consider the possibility that this is little more than a real estate play as some commentators in the business pages have suggested.<br><br>Consider the possibility of seller's remorse when the real estate is gone for a cheap price and for various reasons the public benefits don't actually materialize. | | |
| 08/01/2019 7:43:20 | | Thats the question for the entire proposal, isnt it?<br><br>Focusing on this specific situation (eg. land sale value), I don't see the below market land sale as problematic, given that is standard practice and SwL has committed to achieving objectives at or greater than other developers. | |
| 08/01/2019 15:27:15 | | This is a matter between the parties SWL and WT) to sort out and come to agreement that will withstand the scrutiny of many people. I'd ensure that the City staff will be able to support any agreement. | |
| | | | |
| Submitted before deadline: | 9 | | |
| submitted after deadline | 3 | | |
| | | | |
| total | 12 | | |