



**Future of the Gardiner East
Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)
Meeting 13-1**

**Tuesday May 28, 2013 | 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm
Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 308-309**

Meeting Summary

1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction

Mr. John Campbell, President and CEO of Waterfront Toronto, and Mr. John Livey, Deputy City Manager of the City of Toronto, welcomed Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members to the meeting and provided opening remarks.

In his opening remarks, Mr. Campbell explained the main purpose of the meeting was to reacquaint SAC members with the Future of the Gardiner East project. An Environmental Assessment (EA) was launched by the City and Waterfront Toronto to have an informed discussion and to develop practical and implementable solutions. Mr. Campbell indicated that ideas and inspiration from the six Design Ideas to be discussed today would inform the development of Alternative Solutions along with feedback from the public through the EA process. The results of the EA will result in a “made in Toronto solution.”

Mr. Livey provided a brief overview of the Gardiner Expressway in context of the City. He noted that it is a heavily used corridor that plays a vital role in the City’s prosperity. Mr. Livey also noted that the project resumed at the request of Toronto City Council. He explained that restructuring the Gardiner’s rehabilitation program to start at the western portion of the expressway allows for the resumption and completion of the EA. Mr. Livey noted a key objective is to review the options for the Gardiner East and reach a decision by spring 2014. He also emphasized the importance of public engagement during the EA process.

Following the opening remarks, the meeting facilitator Liz Nield, Lura Consulting, also welcomed SAC members and led a round of introductions. Ms. Nield provided a brief overview of the meeting agenda. She reiterated the purpose of the meeting was to reorient stakeholders with the project, while obtaining feedback from SAC members in preparation for an upcoming Public Forum.

A list of attending SAC members and a copy of the agenda is available in Appendix A.

2. SAC Mandate and Responsibilities

Ms. Nield provided an overview of the SAC mandate and responsibilities and asked members to review the revised SAC Terms of Reference. She noted that the purpose of the SAC is to work with the project team at key milestones during the EA process. Ms. Nield informed SAC members there will be seven (7) meetings scheduled over the next two years.

3. SAC Member Briefing

Three presentations were made to reacquaint SAC members with the project, and to present the results of international design submissions that were developed as part of the EA process:

1. Gardiner East Study Context and EA Process
Presented by: Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting
2. Case Studies
Presented by: Merrilees Willemse, Dillon Consulting
3. Design Ideas
Presented by: Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto

The presentations will be available online following the Public Forum in June.

4. Facilitated Discussion – SAC Questions, Feedback and Advice

SAC Questions of Clarification

A summary of the discussion following the presentations is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **R**, and comments are noted by **C**.

Q1. Before the project was suspended, I had the impression there would only be two design concepts. I see that there are in fact two design concepts per option. What happened during the actual pre-qualification and selection process? We had no input in either, can you speak to them?

R1. The competition was completed through a normal procurement or Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process. Forty (40) teams applied to the RFQ. The selection committee consisted of staff from Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto.

Q2. Were the design teams told to assume constant traffic volumes?

R2. General data was provided to the teams to consider in the development of the options. They were given instructions to accommodate changes in traffic. In the EA, a rigorous traffic modeling program will be followed to study each option.

Future of the Gardiner Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
May 28, 2013 – Summary Report

Q3. Do the concepts include factoring weather and climate as part of their environmental considerations?

R3. The criteria for economics will evaluate life-cycle costs to maintain each option. We are also looking at mitigating traditional environmental impacts and investigating opportunities to create new habitat, greenspace and environmental benefits.

Q3. But what is the ability of the new infrastructure to adapt, and be resilient to extreme weather?

R3. A consideration for the project will be how to build more sustainable infrastructure in general.

Q4. Do options presented in the design concepts transition from the new portion of the expressway east or west of Jarvis?

R4. The transition happens west of Jarvis, but there was some variation in the design concepts presented.

Q5. With respect to economics, is the economic importance of certain trips considered over others? For instance freight trips with multiple stops and deliveries versus personal vehicle trips which ultimately end up in a parking lot? Does the city have a handle on those trips?

R5. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee represents diverse interests which will inform the EA process. We started doing transportation modeling and research to look at users. We also completed a Bluetooth survey to determine start and end points of trips, as well as attitudinal surveys to study users' behaviours. All forms of trips (private vehicle and movement of goods and services) will be considered in the EA.

Proposed Approach for June 13th Public Forum

Ms. Nield informed SAC members of the upcoming Public Forum scheduled for June 13, 2013 at the Metro Toronto Convention Centre. Ms. Nield briefly outlined the format of the meeting which will include a series of presentations followed by roundtable discussions.

Ms. Nield indicated she would send the registration information to SAC members.

Facilitated Discussion – SAC Questions, Feedback and Advice

The following comments were provided by SAC members in response to the material presented. SAC members were asked to comment on presentation material and to think about what refinements could be made for the upcoming Public Forum:

- I was part of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee three years ago. I found the information and design concepts that were presented tonight hard to follow and confusing. It was difficult to visualize the design concepts in reality.
- I would suggest scheduling more time to present and review the design concepts. Display boards around the room would be helpful as well.
- My understanding is the intent is to use ideas from the design concepts in site specific interventions. It needs to be made clear that not every detail is important.
- I have a design background, but I agree that the information was presented too quickly. I think it's a good idea to provide the public with a digestible "Coles Notes" summary of each design concept.

Future of the Gardiner Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
May 28, 2013 – Summary Report

- Another way of looking at the problem is not to give too much information at this stage. There is a lot of complex material; give the public a snapshot of the features of each concept (e.g. intermodal, urbanism, landscaping) and save the details for a later meeting.
- What are the ballpark costs for each of these scenarios? You should give them some basis or explain how costs are factored into future phases of the project.
- There has been public interest in this issue for the past 20 years. The public is used to reviewing projects in silos. I think there is a danger to presenting the design concepts in silos. You want to know what they like or dislike about the components of the design concepts, correct?
- What do you want to get out the public meeting? The images are interesting but take a lot of time to unpack. How do you want people to react to them? It's too much information for a public meeting; it needs to be supplemented with boards.
 - It would be helpful if we group the ideas thematically, I think a buffet analogy fits, to unclutter the presentation.
- It is difficult to conceptualize the volume of traffic on the Gardiner. How is it different from traffic volume on the 401, or Steeles Avenue or the Yonge subway line? A basis for comparison would be helpful. You could also send the case studies to people to review as homework prior to the meeting, which would leave you more time to spend on presenting the design concepts. The case studies are practical examples, but most people don't realize there are other options out there.
- What do you want out of this forum? I agree that you need to distill the key messages. You also need to clarify whether the intent of the meeting is to collect feedback from the public or get them excited.
 - The key objective of the Public Forum is to get people's ideas of what they like, don't like and a range of possible options. The concepts are difficult to understand, some go beyond the scope of the project. We will provide context to the public.
- I also found the presentations to be confusing. It would also be beneficial to recap the vision of the study area from the City's existing planning framework (i.e. Official Plan).
- If you want to engage the public, you need to figure why the public is coming to this meeting. What do they want out of it? You need to understand what would motivate them to come to the meeting.
- I think you need to focus on half the material that was presented – the background, case studies and key elements from the design concepts. The other half of the material can be displayed on boards.

5. Upcoming SAC Meeting Dates

Ms. Nield thanked SAC members and the project team for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Next SAC meeting: TBD (approximate date fall 2013).



**Future of the Gardiner East
EA and Integrated Urban Design Study**

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting – 13-#1

Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 308-309

Tuesday, May 28, 2013

6:00 – 8:00 pm

AGENDA

- 6:30 pm Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions
- Liz Nield, Lura Consulting
 John Campbell, Waterfront Toronto
 John Livey, City of Toronto
- 6:45 pm SAC Mandate and Responsibilities – Quick Refresher
- 6:50 pm SAC Member Briefing
1. EA and Study Process
 2. Case Studies
 3. Innovative Design Options
 4. Proposed Approach for June 13th Public Forum
- 7:35 pm Facilitated Discussion – SAC Questions, Feedback and Advice
- 7:55 pm Upcoming SAC Meeting Dates
- 8:00 pm Adjourn

SAC Meeting #1 List of Attendees :

Purolator Inc.
Beach Triangle Residents' Association
Heritage Toronto
Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association
Walk Toronto
Rogers Centre/Blue Jays
Code Blue Toronto
West Don Lands Committee
Unionville Ratepayers Association
Civic Action
Toronto Centre for Active Transportation
Ontario Public Transit Association
Don Watershed Council
Cycling Toronto
Professional Engineers Ontario
Canadian Urban Institute
Federation of North Toronto Residents and People Plan Toronto
Redpath and Toronto Industry Network
Lake Shore Planning Council
Ontario Professional Planners Institute – Urban Design Working Group
Waterfront Toronto
City of Toronto
Councillor Shelley Carroll's Office
Councillor Pamela McConnel's Office
Dillon Consulting
Lura Consulting

List of SAC members unable to attend:

Food and Consumer Products of Canada
Redpath Sugar Ltd.
Retail Council of Canada
Toronto Association of BIAs
Toronto Board of Trade
St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Evergreen
South Riverdale Community Health Centre
Toronto Community Foundation
Canadian Automobile Association – South Central Ontario
Greyhound
Transport Action Ontario
Toronto Society of Architects
Toronto Urban Renewal Network
Urban Land Institute
Canadian Urban Institute