

## **QUAYSIDE STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #1**

**Host Organization:** Waterfront Toronto

**Contact:** Carol Webb

**Date:** October 23, 2018, 6:00-8:30 pm

**Location:** 20 Bay Street, Toronto, ON, M5J 2N8

**Number of Attendees:** Approximately 18

**Notetaker:** Stephanie Chow, Waterfront Toronto

**Abbreviations:** Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC), Sidewalk Labs (SWL), Master Innovation and Development Plan (MIDP), Waterfront Toronto (WT).

### **Presenters and project team members:**

Waterfront Toronto: Carol Webb , Erik Cunningham, Jeff Ross, Kevin Greene, Meg Davis, Pina Mallozzi, Stephanie Chow

Sidewalk Labs: Habon Ali, Jesse Shapins

**Guest Speaker:** Michael Noble, Waterfront Secretariat, City of Toronto

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

On October 23, 2018, members of the Quayside Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) participated in the first meeting to review the committee's purpose and workplan, and to receive project updates from both Waterfront (WT) and Sidewalk Labs (SWL) team members.

- Meg Davis (WT) welcomed the SAC and provided the project introduction.
- Michael Noble, Waterfront Secretariat at the City of Toronto, provided an overview of the Waterfront Secretariat and the City's role in the project. The City is not a participant in the project but is providing input to help guide the proposal with a view to ensuring it is consistent with City goals and policies and builds on existing work. The City will conduct its own public consultation on the draft MIDP, in coordination with the the broader consultation efforts by project team.
- Carol Webb (WT) reviewed the Terms of Reference that were distributed before the meeting, and having received no comments on the draft Terms of Reference, they are considered to be adopted. SAC members were also asked to provide recommendations, if any, for additional participants to be invited to join the SAC, and were also canvassed for the next meeting date.
- Jeff Ross and Kevin Greene (WT) led a presentation and discussion on WT's approach to evaluating the Master Innovation and Development Plan (MIDP) and its goals and objectives against which the MIDP will be measured.
- Jesse Shapins (SWL) provided a project update on the public realm pillar and received feedback and responded to questions.

This summary report was written by Stephanie Chow (WT). A summary of the SAC's overall feedback, questions and comments is provided below. Please note that this is not intended to be a verbatim summary.

## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **Summary of Comments and Questions related to the Terms of Reference**

Q: Will the City have consultation before the MIDP is released?

- Michael Noble, The City of Toronto: The City's consultation events will take place after the draft MIDP is released and the City will work closely with WT to make sure the respective processes are well coordinated.

Q: Why will the next public roundtable meeting take place on a Saturday?

- WT: It is expected that there will be a large amount of information to be presented. Hosting the meeting on a Saturday will allow for two full sessions to be offered, each including a plenary session and a number of topic specific breakout discussions and will also make it easier for a large number of people to attend at a time of day that suits them. This timing gives participants the opportunity and time to learn about the topics that they are most interested in.

One stakeholder wanted to ensure that WT is mindful of other important meetings (such as Metrolinx) that are taking place in November before choosing the date for the next SAC meeting, which is tentatively set for November 19, 2018.

Stakeholders were asked by WT to suggest additional community members or organizations to participate on the SAC. Member recommendations are to be forwarded to a member of the WT team over the next few weeks.

### **Summary of Comments and Questions related to the WT Presentation on the MIDP**

#### **Public Engagement**

Q: Does the public consultation process go beyond the greater Toronto area to other communities?

- WT: One of the aspirations of the project is to see how the ideas and technical solutions that come from this neighbourhood can be implemented elsewhere, both in the city and nationally. It is a waterfront for everyone, so the engagement and consultation needs go beyond the immediate waterfront area.

One stakeholder mentioned the value of having community members involved in the development of the plan from the beginning and wanted to ensure that involvement continued after the plan has been approved.

One stakeholder felt that a residents group or construction liaison committee (CLC) should be established to ensure that citizens continue to be involved in the development of the plan and have the opportunity to consult on the process after construction begins. Waterfront Toronto's West Don Lands CLC was recommended as a successful model to follow.

## Data Governance

One stakeholder wanted clarification on the *Implementation Requirement* that indicates SWL will create project specific policies that will define the new global standard in digital governance. From what they understood from the Digital Strategy Advisory Panel meeting on October 18, WT would have control on this issue and set the standard for privacy policies with the government, not SWL.

- Meg Davis clarified this statement by saying that the governments, not SWL, will be creating the policies around data governance and WT will act as the conduit between the private sector and the government. Meg noted that this point had previously been addressed at the DSAP meeting and the presentation will be updated.
- Michael Noble mentioned that the City has defined policies on privacy and data governance for data that is collected and used by the City of Toronto. The application of these policies to ideas proposed by SWL require further analysis and in some cases, potentially new or modified policies. There is no simple solution, but the idea of a data trust such as proposed by SWL in mid-October is an emerging concept in the broader world of data governance which can be explored by the different governments.

Q: Are there existing divisions within the province and federal government that are dedicated to policy making in data governance and intellectual property, or is that being sorted out?

- Michael Noble: Yes. Broadly speaking, there are people at every level of government who are responsible for policy making within their particular area of responsibility and have rules and regulations currently in place to address some of these issues. The Chief Information Officer of the City would have a better understanding of how the pieces of this specific project connect to these broader policies. There is a lot more work that needs to be done in order to help us analyze and respond to proposals and ideas coming from this project.

One stakeholder asked for clarification of the term "third parties" in the presentation under the *Implementation Requirements for Data Privacy & Governance*. It was clarified that "third parties" meant organizations other than SWL and WT. The stakeholder then wanted to know if this meant that the data was going to be restricted to SWL use only, and whether this was the cause of concern for citizens. Kristina Verner, WT's Vice President of Innovation, Sustainability and Prosperity, was unable to attend this SAC meeting but will be at the next meeting to respond to these questions and provide further clarification. It was also suggested that the language be revised to ensure clarity for the average community member. WT

agreed and will reconsider the language for future use.

### **Local Developer Engagement**

One stakeholder wanted to understand what the “involvement of local development communities” means and if this was part of the public engagement requirement. Meg Davis said that this particular point needs more thought and agrees that using the word “involvement” is not clear enough. WT needs to see the financial model for the project to better understand how developers will ultimately be engaged on Quayside, and she adds that WT still needs to figure out how to engage the development community in ways other than just consultation. WT will work on developing this point further.

### **Economic Impact**

One stakeholder asked about the lack of the word “incubator” in the presentation and Meg Davis clarified that WT purposefully decided not to create an incubator as several different incubators have been established elsewhere around the city. Ultimately, the project is a lot larger than a traditional incubator and WT also did not want to take away from the other incubators and partners that are being established in the city.

### **Housing Affordability**

One stakeholder felt that it is important to consider models that leverage public lands, such as free land, as well, as public sector participation. The stakeholder used the West Don Lands as an example of a model for affordable ownership. Meg Davis added that there are ways to achieve a long-term plan that remains in public ownership, and WT has to exceed the affordable housing requirement in perpetuity. She agreed that there are other models that can be examined.

### **Digital Platform**

Kevin Greene noted that any questions related to these targets would be logged and directed to Kristina Verner (WT). No questions were asked by stakeholders.

### **Sustainability**

Stakeholders agreed that they would be very happy if the first target, *Climate Positive*, was achieved.

### **Mobility**

Q: Is the plan to have the development completed before the revitalization of Queens Quay East is completed?

- Pina Mallozzi (WT): Transit couldn't come to the Quayside site without all of the pieces of the complete Queens Quay design in place, it must be connected to the network. In terms of delivering

this plan into the public realm of Queens Quay, it's possible that the timelines may not sync up; they may overlap, or Quayside could be delivered in advance.

One stakeholder raised a point about Lake Shore Boulevard and the Gardiner Expressway being a barrier, both physical and psychological, and wanted to ensure that solutions for North-South connections to the Quayside site were being considered within the plan's objectives.

Another stakeholder wanted to ensure that SWL, WT and the City were coordinating with the various other projects underway in the area as the plan develops. WT acknowledged that this coordination is important and ongoing, and agreed to capture this point in the objectives.

### **Public Realm**

One stakeholder pointed out that the site would need a long-term maintenance plan to ensure the survival of the trees in the area. This mechanism is accounted for in the objectives, and WT agreed to make this point more specific to include the trees that are planted in the area.

### **Buildings**

No comment.

### **Community Services**

Stakeholders were concerned that community services such as daycares, schools and community centres were not sufficiently detailed under the targets, and suggested that having these services in close proximity to the site is vital and beneficial for the community that will live and work there. They also wanted to know why SWL is responsible for this aspect of the plan and not WT.

- WT: The WT team wants SWL to present a plan that takes into account the variety of neighbourhoods that surround Quayside and reflects all of the community service needs based on demand. WT is working with TDSB on the possibilities of having a school in this area as well. All of these requirements are being considered and will become more specific after the MIDP is drafted.
- Jessie Shapins from SWL added that although there is no requirement for community centres in Quayside, that doesn't eliminate the possibility of having them on the site.

One stakeholder wanted to ensure that when these objectives are next presented, at least one of the targets within the Community Service tab be identified as a priority, consistent with the other objectives. WT agreed.

### **Summary – WT Goals and Objectives**

One stakeholder wanted to ensure that intellectual property and ownership were addressed in the goals

and objectives. WT ensured that this target is addressed in the digital governance section and within the components of the evaluation framework.

One stakeholder asked if entrepreneurs in the tech world would be able to share the data collected from the Quayside site and be part of the development of the area. WT agreed to take this comment back to the WT internal subject matter expert.

### **Summary of Comments and Questions related to the SWL Public Realm Presentation**

One stakeholder wanted to know why the park in the plan is placed near the silos. WT explained that the location of the park is established within the pre-existing Keating Channel Precinct Plan, as is the school on the southern side of the site. This was done to ensure that there is a good relation between the two areas. SWL added that they want to expand the park so it can integrate with the silos and the water on both sides. WT added that there is a heritage view corridor on Queens Quay to the silos, so the positioning of silo park would serve to preserve the heritage corridor.

One stakeholder expressed a desire to see the water from as far north as possible (Mill Street or Front Street) and was concerned that the underpass design looks like a barrier that creates a longer walk to the waterfront. SWL said that the bridge design was influenced by transparency and the desire is to expand the street to the lake. Parliament Plaza is the beginning of this experience of moving from underpasses to the water. Stakeholder agreed that making a water effect in colour, texture and lighting throughout the underpasses is an interesting project and positively commented on SWL's desire to bring the water north.

### **Final Comments and Questions**

One stakeholder was happy with the amount of information that was shared in the meeting and appreciated hearing about the detail and thinking that has gone into the planning work.

Q: Will the alternations that are being proposed in this area change the way Queens Quay is being developed?

- Pina: We will have to work from a mobility perspective to solve this challenge. We have left it to SWL to show us what that interface would look like if we went from one-way or two-way roads. All of this needs to be examined over the next few months before the MIDP is published.

Q: Do you see this site as an experiment and then Queens Quay will revert back to an original plan? Will Union Station be a focal point for the streets?

- Pina: All good questions and we are working with transportation consultants to get the answers.

One stakeholder expressed that knowing more about what is being built and what data will be collected will help committee members inform the public about what the project is all about.

## **NEXT STEPS**

- Meeting minutes and notes will be produced and shared within two weeks.
- A hold for November 19<sup>th</sup> will be sent to all committee members.
- Committee members to share recommendations of people, organizations or perspectives that they feel ought to be included on the committee.
- Committee members to share additional comments or ideas with WT team before next meeting.
- WT to consider different meeting start and end times for future meetings.



## Quayside Stakeholder Advisory Committee

### Meeting #1 – Agenda

October 23, 2018, 6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Waterfront Toronto Boardroom

20 Bay Street, Suite 1320

Toronto, Ontario M5J 2N8

<b>Item:</b>	<b>Presenter:</b>	<b>Approx. Time</b>
1. Welcome and Introductions	Meg Davis	5 mins.
2. Project Introduction	Meg Davis	15 mins.
3. City of Toronto Role	Michael Noble (City)	10 mins.
3. Terms of Reference	Carol Webb	20 mins.
a. Review		
b. SAC workplan		
c. Additional membership		
4. Waterfront Toronto - Approach to evaluating the Master Innovation and Development Plan	Jeff Ross	60 mins.
a. Presentation and discussion		
5. Project Update	SWL	20 mins.
6. Other	All	