



WATERFRONTToronto

**Waterfront Design Review Panel
Minutes of Meeting #139
Wednesday, Nov. 18th, 2020**

Present

Paul Bedford, Chair
Betsy Williamson, Vice Chair
George Baird
Peter Busby
Pat Hanson
Janna Levitt
Nina-Marie Lister
Fadi Masoud
Jeff Ranson
Brigitte Shim
Kevin Stelzer
Eric Turcotte

Regrets

Claude Cormier

Representatives

Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
James Parakh, City of Toronto
Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

Recording Secretary

Leon Lai

WELCOME

The Chair opened the meeting by providing an overview of the agenda, which included reviews of:

1. 60 Trinity Street Enbridge Station A- Detailed Design
 2. Lower Yonge Public Realm Implementation – Issues Identification
-

GENERAL BUSINESS

The Chair asked the Panel to adopt the minutes from the Oct. 21st, 2020 meeting. The minutes were adopted.

The Chair asked if there were any conflict of interest. No conflict of interest was declared.

The Chair then asked Christopher Glaisek, Chief Planning and Design Officer with Waterfront Toronto, to give an update on last month's projects.

Update on last month's projects:

Mr. Glaisek began by noting the consensus comments for **West Don Lands Block 10 Indigenous Hub Detailed Design 2** have been circulated to the proponent team. The project received a vote of Full Support in October's DRP and is not expected to return. One Panel member noted the October review did not provide adequate update on the residential portions of the project. The Panel member noted the comments were concentrated on the AHT building and felt not enough opportunity was provided to comment on the other residential volumes. Another Panel member felt further review is needed as the presentation was primarily focused on the AHT building and not the full extent of the project. The Panel member noted it is important to see more information on Cooperage street design as part of this public realm was glanced over. Mr. Glaisek noted there was urgency around the AHT and there have been suggestions to split the project into two parts to allow the AHT to move forward first. One Panel member suggested to reach out to the City and explore the possibility of bringing the project back for additional review only on the residential portions. Mr. Glaisek noted it is a good suggestion and will speak with the City.

Mr. Glaisek noted **Lake Shore East Public Realm Detailed Design** received Full Support, completing the DRP process, and is not expected to return. In the upcoming workshops, the design team is focusing on the public realm to improve legibility of the innovative approaches, such as low maintenance planting and stormwater management. Mr. Glaisek noted **178-180 Queens Quay East Schematic Design** consensus comments have been circulated to the design team, with a total of nine Conditional Support and three Non-Support votes, the City and Waterfront Toronto are hoping the team would return to further discuss the building and landscape design.

Construction Update:

Mr. Glaisek provided an update on **Port Lands Flood Protection** bridge, noted that a barge carrying the first bridge has arrived in Toronto's Harbour to be installed. Waterfront Toronto hosted an "arrival" watch party to mark this important moment. Mr. Glaisek noted the **Stormwater Management Facility** is on track for the March 31st, 2021 completion, noted that the layout of mechanical and electrical equipment inside the building continues.

Chair's remarks:

The Chair then concluded the General Business segment and motioned to go into the project review sessions.

PROJECT REVIEWS

1.0 60 Trinity Street Enbridge Station A- Detailed Design

Project ID #: 1117
Project Type: Building
Review Stage: Issues Identification/ Schematic Design
Review Round: One
Location: West Don Lands
Proponent: Enbridge
Architect/ Designer: Enbridge
Presenter(s): Mohamed Soliman, Senior Advisor, Construction & Project Management, Enbridge
Delegation: Aron Murdoch, Enbridge; Stephen Lefneski, Manager, WalterFedy Architect; Leon Lai, Waterfront Toronto; Emma Loewen, Waterfront Toronto; Josh Hilburt, Waterfront Toronto; Megan Rolph, City of Toronto; Deanne Mighton, City of Toronto

1.1 Introduction to the Issues

Leon Lai, Manager of the Design Review Panel with Waterfront Toronto, began the introduction by recapping the project background, description, and the anticipated approval timeline. Mr. Lai thanked the City for recommending the project to DRP and Enbridge for going beyond to address Panel comments and returning a second time for review. Mr. Lai provided a recap of the site context, noted the project came to DRP in July 2020 for Issues Identification and Schematic Design, and today the review is Detailed Design. Mr. Lai noted the July 2020 consensus comments: reference adjacent developments in terms of design and materiality, fit into both existing and future context, evolve the station as a typology to respond to the urban site, consider the visual impact of the building and site as viewed from high up, accommodation of a green roof, utilization of a real brick finish on the perimeter wall, replace barbed wire and chain-link fence with alternatives, and improve animation strategies at the perimeter wall. Mr. Lai noted the areas for Panel consideration: the revised brick exterior, perimeter details, visual impact of the project, and revised lighting at the perimeter wall. Mr. Lai then introduced Mohamed Soliman, Senior Advisor, Construction & Project Management with Enbridge, to continue the presentation.

1.2 Project Presentation

Mr. Soliman began by recapping project description, background, site context, history, and primary requirements of the station. Mr. Soliman provided an update on the mechanical layout, noted the unmanned station compound and buried pipelines that are visible above grade. Mr. Soliman noted the team tried to address all major DRP comments: the aesthetic influences from adjacent structures, the periodic brick wall elements, lighting, and coordination with adjacent future developments. Mr. Soliman noted the updated day and night renderings of the perimeter wall, brick sample photos, and the action plan of the project.

1.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the West Don Lands streetscape design includes street trees. Deanne Mighton, Senior Urban Design with the City of Toronto, answered that the future streets A and B will use a street section same as the new east-west street at Blocks 3,4,7, which will include street trees on the north side. The Panel member asked if the wrought iron fence at the top of the wall is purely aesthetic or performs actual security function over and above the wall. Mr. Soliman noted the wrought iron fence serves both aesthetic and functional purposes.

Another Panel member asked for the rationale behind the partial green roof and is concerned that moss would not survive in Toronto's climate like the traditional green roof. Mr. Soliman noted the partial green roof is due to the removable section of the roof.

One Panel member asked if the team anticipates swapping out equipment frequently. Mr. Soliman noted it depends on the equipment and roof access is required, essentially turning the area into a construction site.

Another Panel member asked for clarification on the rear gate and how it relates to the main gate. Mr. Soliman noted the rear gate is used for larger vehicles, the height will match the top of the wall and it will not have any barbed wire.

One Panel member asked if the brick samples shown are meant to be for the precast wall. Mr. Soliman noted it will be real brick at the perimeter and precast for the main building.

Another Panel member asked for the ground surface material. Mr. Soliman noted it is all gravel and is completely permeable.

One Panel member asked if Trinity Street has any street trees. At this moment, Ms. Mighton answered that Trinity Street's cross section will likely stay the same and is not anticipated to change, not sure if trees can be accommodated. Mr. Soliman noted the team will locate any below grade work away from street trees. Mr. Murdoch noted for any below grade that is required in areas with street trees, the team will do an "order locate" and follow different restrictions to coordinate with the street infrastructure. The Panel member asked how the green roof area will be distributed since it does not cover the entire surface. Mr. Soliman noted the green roof will cover two-thirds of the roof to allow space for equipment moving. The Panel member asked for clarification on the west gate's facing condition, existing and future. Mr. Soliman noted there will be a lane in the future.

Another Panel member asked if the team has considered solar panels on the roof or other forms of renewable energy on site. The Panel member asked if the building will be conditioned or heated. Mr. Soliman noted roof solar has not been considered, the building's interior will be maintained at above freezing temperature for equipment and it is not conditioned during summer.

1.4 Panel Comments

One Panel member congratulated the team on moving the project significantly forward and commended the substantial improvement to the design.

Another Panel member appreciated the team's effort at revising the design and suggested for the benefit of cost savings to consider only doing the real brick at the perimeter wall and not on the main building. Use the budget elsewhere. The Panel member does not support reproduction of historical element and recommended removing the wrought iron from the design. The Panel member noted the improvements of the gate, real brick, and green roof, are content.

One Panel member suggested that the main building inside of the perimeter wall can be honest with it being an industrial building and supported the resubmission. A green roof would be a great asset for the project.

Another Panel member noted while the real brick is supported, it would be good to review the actual details. The Panel member noted the heritage brick used in the adjacent historic buildings is no longer produced so the new brick specification requires thoughtful and careful considerations. The Panel member cautioned that some bricks look suburban. The Panel member noted there are products where the green roof layers are constructed with a built-up roof, with sedum that would survive in this climate, and recommended that the design of the rear gate be aesthetically the same as the main gate even though it is less used – urban continuity and consistency are important to establish on all facades.

One Panel member suggested for the green roof to do something other than sedum, consider more naturalized systems, refine the lighting of the brick wall to create a unique syncopation rhythm with the street.

Another Panel member commended the much-improved design, noted the brick specification is very critical, such as the mould, grout joint color, and coursing pattern – consider all these early as they will have construction cost impact.

One Panel member appreciated the background research and the revised design tying lighting with the wall perforations. The Panel member advocated for opportunities of community use and activation on the perimeter wall and that any savings should go towards sustainability features such as the green roof.

Another Panel member felt the brick on the main building is an important feature that should be kept and suggested the team to explore salvaged brick to create an authentic old expression while achieving a carbon neutral facility. The Panel member felt carbon neutral is easy highly achievable with supplemental heating and electricity, this is the goal of Enbridge as an organization and this project should demonstrate these values.

One Panel member noted a lot of concrete will be used for this facility, consider specifying on all concrete, precast, or cast-in-place, supplementary cementing materials – it might be cost effective even at 50% - to lower the embodied carbon of the project.

Another Panel member noted ordinarily faux brick is not recommended, however with the cost savings of doing precast on the main building likely not reinvested elsewhere

in the project, and that the Panel has not seen any alternatives, the precast brick on the main building envelope is still the supported direction.

1.5 Consensus Comments

The Chair then summarized the Panel comments on which there was full agreement.

General

- Appreciated the team for addressing Panel comments.
- Commended Enbridge for going beyond and setting a new precedent for a public utility building.

Building

- Most Panel members supported the idea of using precast cladding on the main building, however there was some reluctance as the cladding specification was not discussed.
- Strong support for the use of real brick for the perimeter security wall, it is essential.
- Provide a typical wall section and brick samples, before the final specification is selected, to Waterfront Toronto for review to ensure the details such as grout joint colors, coursing pattern, brick texture, and size are contextually designed. Recommended the team to spend a lot of time on refining the brick detail and specification.
- Consider the possibility of using salvaged brick as a sustainability strategy.
- Supported the strategy of a partial green roof but expressed concerns for a moss roof. Consider a planting system that is appropriate for Toronto's climate to ensure survivability. Explore market-ready built-up green roof systems.
- Consider applying the same design treatment for all entrance gates and doors to ensure a high level of design quality and continuity along the entire perimeter wall, i.e. matching the northwest gate with the east in terms of height, design, materiality to improve its future facing condition with adjacent developments.

Public Realm

- Consider the future east-west street design, specifically the street tree configurations.
- Lighting of the perimeter wall can be very important, consider back lighting from the interior side to create more street level visual interest when looking through the perforations.
- Continue to consider the design of the facility from the perspectives of the pedestrian, streetscape, and adjacent neighbours.

1.5 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project.

The Panel voted Full-Support for the project on the condition that the team would provide Waterfront Toronto with a typical wall section of the brick perimeter wall, brick

and pattern samples before the final specification is selected for review and comments.

The Chair then asked if the proponent would like to provide a brief response.

Mr. Soliman appreciated the comments and noted for the most part the brick wall will be treated with sensitivities and fit in. The team will explore, with the architect on board, options on sourcing and smaller brick size. Mr. Soliman noted that the team cannot commit to the green roof yet and that the north gate being designed to match the main gate is a challenge because it is not motorized. Mr. Soliman noted the team will continue to work on addressing the comments.

2.0 Lower Yonge Public Realm Implementation – Issues Identification

<i>Project ID #:</i>	1119
<i>Project Type:</i>	Public Realm
<i>Review Stage:</i>	Issues Identification
<i>Review Round:</i>	One
<i>Location:</i>	Central Waterfront
<i>Proponent:</i>	City of Toronto Transportation Services
<i>Architect/ Designer:</i>	WSP
<i>Presenter(s):</i>	Tunde Paczai, Senior Urban Designer, WSP; Jim Gough, Department Manager, Transportation and Planning, WSP
<i>Delegation:</i>	Prabir Das, City of Toronto; Adam Novack, Waterfront Toronto; Pina Mallozzi, Waterfront Toronto; Caroline Kim, Waterfront Toronto; Sonja Vangjeli, City of Toronto; Nader Kadri, City of Toronto; Owen Plamenco, City of Toronto; Easton Gordon, City of Toronto

2.1 Introduction to the Issues

Prabir Das, Gardiner Express Lead, Project Manager, with City of Toronto, began by introducing the team, site context, project scope, project timeline, and anticipated DRP review schedule. Mr. Das noted the team is looking to get feedback from the Panel at an early stage of work. Mr. Das then introduced Adam Novack, Design Project Manager with Waterfront Toronto, to continue the introduction.

Mr. Novack recapped the consensus comments from Sept. 2015 and provided an overview of the Lower Yonge Precinct Plan and Public Realm design. Mr. Novack noted the area context of the plan, key open spaces, mid-block connections, street types, and street sections from Harbour to Lower Jarvis Street. Mr. Novack noted the streetscape details including the waterfront-district streets with single row of trees, promenade streets, Harbour Street southside, service streets, Gardiner public realm, Queens Quay northside interim condition, and pavement materials. Mr. Novack highlighted the signature lighting design, street furniture, planting details, and noted the Lake Shore Public Realm work in relation to Lower Yonge Public Realm. Mr. Novack noted the project is here for Issues Identification review and the areas for Panel consideration: ensure the precinct vision is adequately implemented, integration with adjacent major

projects, ensure configuration of street trees meets precinct plan, materiality alignment and consistency with waterfront standards.

2.2 Project Presentation

Jim Gough, Project Manager with WSP, began the presentation by noting the project scope: the expanded study area based on the Lower Yonge Precinct Plan boundary and the not-in-scope elements which will be developed by private developers. Mr. Gough noted the 30% design scope includes streetscape design of the conversion of Harbour St. to 2-way operation, Yonge Street, Reconfigured Harbour St./ Yonge ST. intersection, and Lake Shore from Yonge to Jarvis St. Mr. Gough noted the first step is to remove the Gardiner Expressway eastbound Bay St. on-ramp and Jarvis St. off-ramp, replace with a new eastbound Yonge St. off-ramp and intersection design, to follow with the reconstruction of new streetscape of Lake Shore between Yonge and Jarvis St., the preliminary engineering design for the conversion of Harbour St. to 2-way and streetscape improvements, and the installation of cycling infrastructure along Yonge from Queens Quay to Front St. Mr. Gough noted the next step as defining the profile of Cooper St. between Queens Quay and Lake Shore to accommodate future tunnel, and the conceptual design for the two remnant plaza spaces at Yonge and Harbour St. Mr. Gough noted the project schedule with on-gong stakeholder start-up meetings in the Fall of 2020. Mr. Gough introduced Tunde Paczai, Senior Urban Designer, WSP, to continue the design presentation.

Ms. Paczai provided the existed conditions, Environmental Assessment Plan, key cross sections, design considerations, materiality, and precedents for the following area: Lake Shore, Harbour Street, Yonge Street, and Cooper Street. Ms. Paczai noted the conceptual design context for the Yonge and Harbour plazas, and their precedent inspirations. Ms. Paczai noted the key design ideas and issues for the key areas, and provided additional hardscape, furnishing, water, lighting, and historic design inspirations and considerations. Ms. Paczai concluded by noting the next steps as completion of site investigations, coordination of standards, and preliminary concepts for the two new plazas.

2.3 Panel Questions

The Chair then asked the Panel for questions of clarification.

One Panel member asked if the traffic modelling would inform the functional changes to the design and clarification on the final outcome of the public realm. Mr. Gough answered that the road design is not likely to change in a significant way. The Panel member asked if the team is responsible for the plaza designs or setting parameters for future designers. Ms. Paczai noted there are two plazas: northeast one being designed by NAK and Pinnacle with streets coordinated by WSP, the other plaza is being designed by WSP. The Panel member asked how lighting and public art approaches fit into the overall public art strategy of the precinct and if it will be coordinated with Waterfront Toronto. Ms. Paczai noted it has been a few years since the EA was completed, the team is looking forward to the design workshops with NAK. So far the process has been productive. The public art strategy will be coordinated with Waterfront Toronto. The Panel member asked for clarification on the design scope at the foot of Yonge street. Mr. Gough noted WSP is coordinating with the Queens Quay design team from edge of right-of-way to the south side of the street.

Another Panel member asked for clarification of the team's role, if it is primarily coordination between various aspects for construction or design work, and provide more information on the specific sites being designed. Ms. Paczai noted their contract is to look at the redesign within the right-of-way, however the property lines straddle so a lot of coordination is required between the projects to establish a cohesive approach. Furthermore, design work on the developer side has progressed so the team is catching up while own scope is being finalized. Phasing is another key component of the work.

One Panel member asked if the road section is the focus of review. Ms. Paczai noted the team is looking for feedback on the EA and any issues that has been missed so far.

Another Panel member asked why the project has taken so long to arrive here. Mr. Das noted traffic impact due to other projects have caused delays, the team cannot work on too many intersections at the same time as the traffic demand is extremely sensitive.

One Panel member asked for the projected population for this precinct to get an overall sense of the order of magnitude for this project. The Panel member asked for clarification on the scope, design, location, and implementation of the park. Nader Kadri, Community Planner with City of Toronto, noted the park has been tied with the block 4 of the Menkes development, part of the warehouse building on the site will be demolished and the City will have to get ownership of the land from Menkes which will take a few years. The City is obligated to design and build the park; a design competition will take place. The Panel member asked for clarification on the division of work between West 8's Lake Shore work and WSP's scope. Mr. Gough answered west of Jarvis St. is WSP's scope, east is West 8. In trying to understand more of the context and material palette of the sites, the Panel member asked if there is on-going dialogue between the major project teams, such as with the Lake Shore Public Realm designers. Pina Mallozzi, Vice President, Design and Planning with Waterfront Toronto, noted that West 8's work is focused on the Gardiner structure upgrades and we hope it can be extended to the west. Mr. Das noted he is the project manager on both projects and the teams will be coordinating with each other. The West 8 report is ready and has been shared with the consulting teams to ensure design continuity along Lake Shore.

Another Panel member asked the team for clarification on the current thinking and research around width and length of road construction, and if there is possibility to continue to narrow the width to make streets more hospitable for pedestrians. Mr. Gough answered that the team will have to follow the City's street width standards to ensure buses can be accommodated.

One Panel asked if the team could provide more information on how this plan will help the City manage stormwater runoff and if this is part of the public realm mandate. Ms. Paczai noted the team is interested in harvesting runoffs from the street and integrate into the soil trenches, this strategy has been successful in the past, along with pop catch basins. It is a top priority for the team. Ms. Paczai noted the team is exploring bioswale if there is room and will do everything to lower stormwater output.

Another Panel member asked for the status on the Cooperage and Church Street tunnels. Mr. Glaisek noted it is uncertain when they will happen, Waterfront Toronto's goal with the precinct plan is to encode the ideas in the neighbourhood – maybe this is something we need to bring up with the City.

One Panel member asked for further clarification on the sustainability issues around the public realm as they seem very diagrammatic. Ms. Paczai noted they are top priority for the team and more will be provided.

2.4 Panel Comments

The Chair then asked the Panel for comments.

One Panel member commented that seamless integration of all the pieces and having a well-coordinated big picture are critical – ensure Waterfront Toronto, City of Toronto, and the design work together as the canvas requires multiple players. Continuity is very important. The Panel member asked the team to provide a drawing to show all the pieces coming together, a large-scale ground floor plan including loading, existing and future developments, POPS, and other public spaces. The Panel member asked for cross section drawings to demonstrate planting zones are maximized to ensure mature growth, biodiversity, and sustainability features – WSP should take a leadership on these deliveries.

Another Panel member noted it is important for the team to bring leadership for nature-based solutions and capital investment in green infrastructure. The Panel member noted cross sectional diagrams on these are critical to ensure they are brought to life, including capacity for regenerative trees, diversity of planting, real targets beyond ornamental, public realm green infrastructure, and health benefits. The Panel member asked the team to consider managing rain as a resource for its benefits and provide more details at the next review.

One Panel member noted the implementation area is very large, the magnitude of impact goes beyond the site, it is critical for this project to achieve civic and cultural engagement with citizens to ensure long-term success of the downtown core. The Panel member felt the diagrammatic nature difficult to follow given the normative impression of the road and street sections and that the primary function is still traffic. Consider including green infrastructure with cultural and civic assets as inspiration, seasonal difference, thermal comfort in summer, solar exposure on one side of the street in the winter, and the experiential qualities that can be included in the design thinking.

Another Panel member felt that the project needs a bold, cohesive idea, and noted while Yonge street a special place, it is also not a very friendly street, consider a really robust idea for pedestrian, bikers, and support infrastructure. Understanding the team must follow the City's design guidelines, the Panel member noted Lower Yonge still needs to strive for design excellence that can merge with Waterfront Toronto's vision and can set a standard for the part north of Front Street, particularly the area around the rail corridor which is both heavily shaded and dense. Consider looking at the other proposed underpass designs and go beyond their design. The Panel member noted it is

important to reconsider the right-of-way and be inventive dealing with the harsher, darker, unpleasant moments of Yonge St.

One Panel member noted it is not possible to assess the project properly from only within the scope of the project. The Panel member felt more than coordination between the teams is required and asked the City and Waterfront Toronto to show the current state of all adjacent designs and concepts as part of the introduction to the review. A more elaborate context will be useful and appropriate for the review to proceed.

Another Panel member noted the public realm here has a lot of pressure due to the roughly thirty-five thousand future residents and visitors. The new developments in the area are very dense, new typologies and the Lower Yonge team is lagging relatively behind– a big catch up is needed. The Panel member noted Waterfront Toronto’s three guiding qualities: leading by landscape, integration, and continuity of the public realm, are contradicted here with the major park space being delivered so far in the distance and it is a big issue. The Panel member recommended to develop the park as a temporary project with art as a projection of the future neighbourhood, consider bringing all players to the table now and create something concurrent to the development of the adjacent buildings that would precede the ultimate park design. The Panel member noted it is important to have conversations with West 8, build on their work as a starting point for this project since a lot of design effort has already taken place. East or west of Jarvis St. is not important, the Panel member recommended to focus on the bigger picture of the public realm and bring all players to discuss the specific issues pertinent to this public realm. Return to Panel when that has been completed. The Panel member noted the mid-block connections in this precinct are an emerging network, part of a larger sequence of private public spaces, and recommended that they be reinforced as part of this study and continue to evolve the DNA of the waterfront.

One Panel member commented that this proposed system has a huge green infrastructure potential to help the City manage water. While this is Issues Identification, the team is recommended to study the below surface conditions, metrics applicable to the system, and explore other ways to help buildings manage their runoffs.

2.5 Consensus Comments

The Chair then summarized the Panel comments on which there was full agreement.

General

- Appreciated the opportunity to raise questions on an important project. The Panel is highly interested in the project and is committed in supporting the team in creating a unique and special Lower Yonge.
- Encouraged the team to capitalize on the need for the public realm to not only match but surpass past experience. It is important to not repeat more of the same but plan big, bold, and long-term.
- This precinct is highly populated with residents, workers, and tourists, the team is encouraged to be bold and integrate all aspects of design into the implementation strategy.

Public Realm and Landscape

- Provide a large-scale masterplan of the ground floor at the next review to the best of the team's ability, that sets out the total context to help understand the comprehensive public realm thinking, including the ground floors of major existing and future developments. This will allow future relationships between the various initiatives and developments to be tracked, analysed, considered, and ensures that nothing is missed.
- Strongly encouraged the team to use this as an opportunity to reconsider the right-of-ways to provide more space for pedestrian and green infrastructure and minimize vehicular allocation.

Sustainability

- It is important to advance the sustainability mandate and objectives in every way possible to inspire the public, improve functional performances, and demonstrate landscape biodiversity.
- With high development intensity around the Lower Younge precinct, it is important to focus on strategies for a radical green transformation.
- It is critical to manage rain as a resource.

2.6 Vote of Support/Non-Support

The Chair then asked for a vote of Full Support, Conditional Support or Non-support for the project.

No vote was taken at Issues Identification.

The Chair then asked if the proponent would like to provide a brief response.

Ms. Paczai thanked the Panel for the comments and noted that they are in line with the team's thinking, the support is appreciated. The team will provide more detailed drawings at the next review; the cross sections today are from the Environmental Assessment and will be improved. Mr. Das noted the team will be coordinating with West 8 on the design of their other projects.

CLOSING

There being no further business, the Chair then adjourned the public session of the meeting after a vote to go into a brief in-camera session.