

## APPENDIX 1. Public Meeting Summaries

This Appendix includes four individual feedback summaries from each of the four public meetings held during Round One of the consultation, including:

North York Feedback Summary	Monday, July 15, 2019 North York Civic Centre, 6-9pm
Radisson Feedback Summary	Wednesday, July 17, 2019 Radisson Admiral Hotel, 6-9pm
George Brown Feedback Summary	Saturday, July 20, 2019 George Brown Waterfront Campus, 9am-12pm
Chestnut Feedback Summary	Tuesday, July 23, 2019 Chestnut Conference Centre, 6-9pm

## NORTH YORK FEEDBACK SUMMARY

### About this Feedback Summary

On Monday, July 15, 2019, Waterfront Toronto held the first of four public meetings to begin the process of reviewing and seeking feedback on the Draft Master Innovation and Development Plan (MIDP) submitted by Sidewalk Labs on June 17, 2019. Approximately 100 people participated, many of whom said that they lived in and around North York. This meeting report summarizes the feedback they shared.

The meeting was 3 hours in length, including about 30 minutes for an overview briefing, about 1.5 hours for four concurrent breakout room discussions (including 15-20 minute more detailed presentations by Waterfront Toronto in each room), and a one hour closing plenary that included reports from each breakout room and a full-room discussion. The four breakout rooms focused on each volume of the Draft MIDP (Volume 1: The Plans, Volume 2: The Urban Innovations, and Volume 3: The Partnership) with a separate room for Digital Innovation, Digital Governance, and intellectual property. Each breakout room had between 3 and 4 smaller table discussions, and each table had a representative from Waterfront Toronto and one facilitator.

This summary was written by the facilitation team from Swerhun Inc., the firm retained by Waterfront Toronto to support its Quayside public consultation process. Swerhun works exclusively for governments, public agencies, and non-profits working to support public policy. The Swerhun team's role is not to advocate for any particular project outcome, but rather to support the delivery of transparent, constructive, and meaningful consultation processes.

The intent of the summary is to reflect the feedback shared at the meeting. There are references to "few", "some", and "many" participants expressing a certain point of view, but it's important to note that not all participants were asked to confirm whether they did (or did not) agree with any particular point raised by the other participants. As a result, this summary is necessarily qualitative in nature.

**NOTE: The intent of this summary is not to assess the merit or accuracy of the feedback shared at this meeting, nor does the documentation of this feedback indicate an endorsement of any of these perspectives on the part of Waterfront Toronto.**

A draft of this summary was distributed to all participants for their review before it was finalized.

## About the Round One Public Consultation Process

This first round of consultation focused on orienting the public to the Draft MIDP from the perspective of Waterfront Toronto as a public steward working with the support of all three levels of government to revitalize the waterfront. To support the process of seeking public feedback, Waterfront Toronto shared the following materials:

- An *Open Letter* from Board Chair Stephen Diamond outlining Waterfront Toronto's responsibilities, confirming that Waterfront Toronto did not co-create the MIDP, acknowledging some exciting ideas and identifying early examples of concerns;
- A *Note to Reader* prepared by Waterfront Toronto based on its initial, high level review of the MIDP that provides a synthesis of what Waterfront Toronto asked for from its Innovation and Funding Partner, the response from Sidewalk Labs, where and how the Draft MIDP aligns with existing practices and what's new, where the privatization of public assets is being proposed (if at all), and financial impacts and risks.
- Waterfront Toronto's Draft Digital Principles; and
- A *Discussion Guide* providing an overview of the public consultation process.

All these materials and presentations are available at [www.QuaysideTO.ca](http://www.QuaysideTO.ca).

The public meetings were only one of several ways that the public could provide feedback during this first round of consultation. Other options included an online consultation ([www.QuaysideTO.ca](http://www.QuaysideTO.ca)), sending emails directly to [quayside@waterfrontontario.ca](mailto:quayside@waterfrontontario.ca), talking to Waterfront Toronto staff at one of seven drop-in sessions held in partnership with the Toronto Public Library, or completing a hard copy of feedback forms. A video recording of the third public meeting (held on Saturday, July 20, 2019) is available on the [Waterfront Toronto YouTube channel](#).

## Overall themes in feedback received

Participants at the North York Public Meeting expressed a range of perspectives on the Draft MIDP, with the majority of discussion focused on asking questions, expressing concerns, and identifying the conditions that they feel must be considered/met if the proposal is to move forward. The overall themes are reflected below, followed by more detail from each of the four breakout rooms and the closing plenary (see Attachments).

### **There were a few participants who made supportive comments related to the Draft MIDP.**

They said that they considered it an exciting opportunity for Toronto (if done properly). There was also support for affordability and receptivity to innovation (though a deep need for more information). Some thought the partnership could speed up the city's ability to implement new ideas, transfer learnings to other areas, and had positive economic development potential.

### **Many participants had concerns about the Draft MIDP and/or identified where more information was needed, including:**

- Concern that the proposal goes beyond what was asked for;
- Lack of trust in Sidewalk Labs, Alphabet, and Google with reference to their track record and evidence of past problems in other cities;
- Questions about the development process and land ownership;
- Need for more economic development detail (e.g. number and type of jobs);
- Conflict of interest concerns with Sidewalk Labs as both Advisor and Tech Provider;

- Lack of clarity around proposed governance structures;
- Concerns about data collection and use, and that a public agency would consider proposals that could see its citizens transformed into units for financial gain;
- Risk that Quayside will not be able to integrate with the rest of the city; and
- Concern that Waterfront Toronto is even considering the proposal.

**Many participants identified conditions that they feel must be considered/met if the proposal is to move forward, including but not limited to:**

- Must maintain public control and a failsafe “out” clause that can be used to end the partnership, along with strong public oversight and consequences for breaches;
- Start with a 12-acre pilot before considering whether to expand the partnership; and
- The need for more information on the track record of proposed innovations, what happens when they fail, and transparency regarding trade-offs with Sidewalk Labs.

**Snapshots from the four breakout room discussions**

<p><b>Volume 1: The Plans</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Supportive comments</u>: An exciting opportunity for Toronto if done properly, significant support for affordability</li> <li>• <u>Concerns and/or more information needed</u>: Concern that the proposal goes beyond what was asked for (i.e. Quayside only), concern about whether Sidewalk Labs can be trusted to work collaboratively with Waterfront Toronto in lieu of the expanded scope proposed, questions about the development process and who will own the land, more information needed about the economic development numbers (e.g. number of type of jobs, who-pays-for-what, what Sidewalk Labs wants in return for up-front funding), concern about climate change resilience</li> </ul>
<p><b>Volume 2: The Innovations</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Supportive comments</u>: Receptive to the innovations (interest in innovations that improve mobility, create innovative public spaces and streets, reduce GHG emissions, and create new types of construction and affordable housing), and a need for clarification about how the technology would work and the proposed governance structures</li> <li>• <u>Concerns and/or more information needed</u>: Risk that Quayside will not be able to integrate with the rest of the city (don't want it to be insular), concern around the legitimacy and track record of the innovations, lack of clarity around proposed governance structures (and how they would integrate with existing agencies and structures), concern about data collection and opt-in and opt-out provision, need for transparency regarding the trade-offs with Sidewalk Labs (and interest in knowing whether all these innovations could be delivered with only Quayside), and need to consider how the project can be protected from the technology if it fails</li> </ul>

**Volume 3:  
The  
Partnership**

- Supportive comments: Opportunities to innovate, improve efficiency, speed up the city's ability to implement new ideas, ability to transfer learnings from Quayside to other areas, economic development potential, potential "golden goose"
- Concerns and/or more information needed: Need clarity on Sidewalk Labs objectives (especially why the IDEA District is needed), Sidewalk Labs is not an established Toronto developer, need clarity on how proposed new governance structures would work (form, roles, accountability, elected, appointed, public access, etc.), conflict of interest if Sidewalk Labs provides tech and acts as advisor (because could advise to use their own tech), concern Waterfront Toronto even considering proposal, lack of trust in Google, need to think about bigger context and impact on adjacent areas (e.g. social infrastructure)
- Conditions: Must maintain public control, must have failsafe "out" clause that we can use to end the partnership, must start with 12 acre pilot before considering whether to expand partnership to larger area, must demonstrate affordability, must have independent mechanism to avoid conflicts of interest
- Other thoughts: Increased public awareness of the proposal is required (e.g. through videos), and Waterfront Toronto needs to protect itself from changes with elections

**Digital  
Innovation,  
Governance  
and IP**

- Data collection and use: Strong concerns about data collection and use, specifically concerns about the track record of Alphabet/Google, interest in understanding what mechanisms could control / regulate data collection and use; and access to data.
- Digital innovations: Some support for the innovations with suggestions for strong public oversight, consequences for breaches, taking a human rights-centred approach to thinking about data, using international standards, and the need to think through digital issues with a 21<sup>st</sup> century mindset.
- Intellectual property: Concerns about Sidewalk Labs' Intellectual Property proposals and seeing a public agency consider proposals that could see its citizens transformed into units for financial gain; suggestions on how Waterfront Toronto could ask for more in terms of sharing intellectual property.
- Other thoughts: Including the importance of learning from others, focusing on anonymity (as opposed to privacy) and the need for individuals to retain ownership/control over their data. If there are financial benefits that are the result of data collection about individuals, how can the upside be shared back to the source of the data?

## ATTACHMENT: Breakout room and plenary discussions





## Breakout room discussion on Volume 1: The Plans

There were approximately 11 participants from the public in this room who divided into three facilitated discussion groups, including one conversation about the Quayside and River District Plan; one conversation about social infrastructure; and one conversation about economic development. Participants represented a variety of interests and expertise including interested citizens, engineers; planners; technology specialists; a performance art theatre owner; a school board development officer, and others.

Participants in this room were generally keen to get more information about the proposals and the overall process. Participants asked questions and shared specific feedback on what they knew from reviewing the MIDP and supporting materials, what they have heard in the media, and the presentations at the meeting. Much of the feedback shared was general ideas and suggestions on what they think the area needs or would benefit from having.

### Feedback about the Plans

#### **An exciting opportunity for Toronto if done properly**

- Participants generally agreed that this process presents a good opportunity for Toronto to become a global leader in innovation and technological development.
- Waterfront Toronto needs to take a strong stance on their objectives and what's important to the residents of Toronto.
- Support in general for developing the area because it's currently a "dead zone" that acts as a barrier (especially for pedestrians) to move across the City along the waterfront.
- Concern that if Toronto doesn't take advantage of this opportunity another City will.

#### **Concerns around the scope of the proposal**

- Concern raised that Sidewalk Labs submitted a proposal for Quayside plus the River District despite the fact that Waterfront Toronto's RFP only asked for a proposal for Quayside.
- Concern this may be an all or nothing proposal from Sidewalk Labs' perspective and whether or not they can be trusted to work collaboratively with Waterfront Toronto in lieu of the expanded scope proposed.

#### **Questions about the development process and who will own the land**

- Participants wanted clarification on who will be leading the development process, including selecting future development partners. *Waterfront Toronto explained that they have established procurement procedures and that they take procurement very seriously in order to ensure development partners will help to fulfill Waterfront Toronto's priorities and objectives.*
- There were questions about who would own the land if/when it gets developed.

### Economic Development

#### **More information needed about the numbers in proposal**

- Questions about what Sidewalk Labs would be paying for, what others (Waterfront Toronto, the City, developers) would be paying for and what influence this will have on decisions and outcomes.
- Questions about how many and what kind of jobs are projected for the area, including the proposed Google Headquarters.
- Questions and concerns about what Sidewalk Labs wants in return for the upfront funding they are offering, including but not limited to the \$10 million for an urban innovation institute and \$10 million for an urban innovation venture fund.

## Social Infrastructure

### **Significant support for affordability**

- Many participants supported having affordable housing and asked if the amount proposed could be expanded.
- Participants expressed a desire to secure affordable commercial spaces, especially for non-profit organizations and SMEs (small and medium-sized enterprises) to help the area feel like a local neighbourhood.
- Suggestions to set a quota for the number of affordable commercial spaces, similar to processes used for affordable residential units, and explore mechanisms to make commercial space more affordable (e.g. make rents significantly less expensive for non-profit organizations and SMEs for the first 5-years with gradual increases).

### **More space for social services and clarity on what would be provided**

- Interest in seeing an upfront plan for social services, including a defined approach for making community facilities affordable. Participants wanted to know if local organizations would have free access to community facilities or if they would be charged a fee.
- Concern that the 90,000 sq. ft. proposed is not enough space, especially because up to 60,000 sq. ft. could be designated for an elementary school; leaving only 30,000 sq. ft. for additional facilities. There was a suggestion that 360,000 sq. ft. for social infrastructure would be ideal.
- Keep community facilities open to the public and provide flexible hours to cater to different users and needs.

### **Provide direction for arts and culture in the area**

- Participants said arts and culture are a huge part of bringing a community together and the Harbourfront and Quayside would be a great place to have more arts and cultural activities.

## Other Feedback

### **Impacts of climate change**

- A concern was raised about climate change resilience and what measures, if any, are being planned to help mitigate flooding from rising Lake Ontario water tables. A clear plan with a risk assessment should be undertaken prior to development. This information should be made available to the public.

## **Breakout Room Discussion on Volume 2 – The Innovations**

In the Urban Innovation breakout room facilitators convened four separate break-out groups that discussed one of four sets of urban innovations in the Sidewalk Labs proposal, including: mobility, sustainability, housing and buildings, and public realm.

### Public Realm

**There was a sense that some of the innovations proposed could improve the quality of life and public realm experience in the area.**

- The 3D map and the “green wave” on cycling routes were of interest to the group.

**Clarification is needed on many aspects of the public realm proposal within the MIDP**



- Participants wanted to understand more detail on logistics, mechanics and implementation of proposed innovations, such as how much time can be booked using the proposed public space booking tool.
- Another participant was unclear on how the profit-sharing would work.

#### **Skepticism about some of the proposed all-season comfort technologies**

- Some were wary of whether the screens and “raincoats” make much difference.

#### **Concerns that the Open Space Alliance (OSA) presented potential risks**

- Some said it seemed like a lot of new governance structures were being proposed. This was seen as a risk as management and governance are “always the biggest issues”.
- Questions about who would fund the OSA and what its composition would look like and who would do what were seen as needing to be answered.

#### **Costly requirements of maintaining innovative digital infrastructure over time**

- It was suggested that Sidewalk Labs may need to provide more support to make the maintenance sustainable and manageable.

#### **Lack of reference in the MIDP about heritage buildings**

- One participant said this called into question whether the proposal was rooted in actual conditions of the area and was seen as a potential risk (in terms of approvals and permits) and a missed opportunity (to capitalize on unique opportunities heritage buildings offer).

#### **There was general concern about there not being enough detail on surveillance**

- Participants felt that what is missing is the link between the digital proposal and what’s happening in the public realm, and they weren’t clear on what is being proposed. They would like more transparency on the real intentions, such as where, how and what data is collected.

#### **Other comments**

- There wasn’t enough time to digest what’s in the MIDP for this round of consultation
- Cycling infrastructure - want to be able to bike fast but also need to strike a balance between shared spaces and faster routes.
- Other questions included: Is there a risk of flooding around the Parliament Plaza? Where will all the timber for the tall buildings come from?

#### Sustainability

#### **Interest in, and needed more information about many aspects of sustainability in order to provide more feedback**

- Areas that were of interest included storm water management, plans to capture sewer heat, and where a generator for renewable energy generation will be placed.

#### **Questions about the mandate and scope of the Waterfront Sustainability Association (WSA)**

- Participants had many questions regarding the jurisdiction of the WSA, including: Would the WSA be involved in development applications? Would they be in charge of public or private infrastructure? How would the WSA enhance communication between public and private entities?

#### **Support for stronger transit system and preferred public transit, but skeptical about the process of reducing personal automobiles and personal car reliance**

- Someone suggested learning from the city of Freiburg's car-free city process. Group members responded to this by saying that complete removal of cars is not feasible but minimizing use of private cars is good.

#### **Food carbon footprint should be taken into greater account in the sustainability model.**

- Participants suggested that agriculture and community gardens should be a part of the plans, and suggested the latter could be on rooftops.
- There was general interest in how the tree canopy and vegetation would fit into the entire landscape, and soil coverage is an important consideration for absorption and flood reduction.

#### **Concern and suggestions for the heating and cooling innovations**

- Participants suggested that permeable pavement may be better than heated pavement, and that capitalizing on lots closer to Quayside for capturing waste heat would relieve Ashbridges Bay and be more efficient.
- It was also suggested that lake water be used for cooling, similar to tall (commercial) buildings that use this system, and questioned what the rationale and cost benefit is between considering this model versus geothermal/ground sourced cooling.
- There was interest in having more information on the provisions being made for cleaner air.

#### **Differing views on data collection conditions**

- Generally, the participants were receptive to data collection but it was dependent on the right conditions, receiving more information about plans, and what purpose the data use would be for.
- One participant felt comfortable with data collection because of how common it is today, and said that if the collection was to be effective that it should be an opt-out policy, as opt-in would not capitalize on the data model itself.
- Another participant felt strongly about having an opt-in model for data collection, and said that people should give consent to participating if they choose to.

### Mobility

#### **Interest in improving mobility**

- Generally, participants felt that innovation is necessary and that the excitement and radical thinking overshadows the issues.
- Participants were receptive to making transportation more sustainable and accessible, and that the projected 14% increase in transit use was an exciting and good starting place. Suggestions included providing a covered bike path and integrating autonomous vehicles.

#### **Receptive to multi-modal service packages but require more information and research**

- There was positive reception towards Sidewalk Labs' integrated transit approach, particularly with how it could reduce the incentive to drive.
- One participant was unsure whether the integrated mobility package was optional, and that there was general lack of information.

#### **Financial and reliability risk of new technology**

- One participant raised the concern that there is a financial risk in technology that doesn't have a proven track record, similar to the risks of start-ups. Another asked to consider how the project can be protected from the technology if it fails.
- Some participants felt that while there is excitement about the potential to increase quality of life, the risk is whether this technology is "flashy" and the effectiveness is unproven.

### **Concern and lack of clarity over integrating transit with Toronto**

- Participants discussed the development of the LRT, and had questions about when and how it would be implemented. One participant felt the current line moving westward along Queens Quay is very crowded already. There is concern about this connection, and how the increase in population in the area would impact Toronto without proper integration.

### **Risk of scalability between what is proposed and what was asked for in the RFP**

- Another participant felt that the rapid transit proposed in the MIDP wasn't scalable based on the Quayside RFP.

### **Risk of monopolization**

- Some participants flagged that they felt uncomfortable with Sidewalk Labs acting as the sole proprietor of the Quayside project.

### **Interest in, but lack of transparency about the jurisdiction of the Waterfront Transportation Management Association (WTMA)**

- Participants had many questions about the governance, and its role in implementing the LRT.

### **Innovation needs to be held accountable for accessibility**

- While the innovation was generally favorable, participants noted that new technology (such as dynamic curbs and light sensors) were not necessarily compliant for people with accessibility needs.

### **Differing opinion on prioritizing transit ROW**

- One participant would like to see TTC more open to public access – less designated right of way (i.e. walking, biking access).
- Another participant disagreed with this, and felt that it slows down efficiency of TTC.

## Buildings & Housing

### **Concern about potential amendments to the Ontario Building Code in order to provide tall timber buildings**

- Participants shared concerns over whether it is possible for one individual corporation to amend government regulations such as the Ontario Building Code and/or the National Building Code in order to fit a proposed development, since these documents were created to keep people safe.

### **Question about whether Toronto has the workforce to construct tall timber buildings since Toronto mostly has steel and concrete buildings**

- A participant shared concern that if there is no existing workforce for tall timber buildings, it could result in outsourcing jobs; and a 10-year timeline for these buildings may be too tight to adjust the local workforce.

### **Questions about if and how Sidewalk Labs' proposals fit into the conditions set by existing precinct plans and other planning documents.**

- *Waterfront Toronto staff explained that any amendments to existing planning frameworks would have to go through its respective public processes.*

### **The affordable housing components to Sidewalk Labs' proposal needs to provide units for a range of family sizes**

- Participants said that it is important to include affordable units for families of different sizes.

- Participants also discussed whether residents in affordable housing units would be working in the proposed Google Canadian Headquarters and/or the proposed innovation campus, since those might often be high-paying jobs.

#### **Ensure that tall timber buildings are safe to use**

- Participants asked questions about whether tall timber buildings are safe to use in Canada, and shared that there is new technology with concrete that can sequester carbon. *Waterfront Toronto staff shared that timber is a sustainable option that could be potentially sourced within Canada. Staff also shared that Norway and Vancouver are examples of places who have or are in the process of constructing tall timber buildings in similar climates to Toronto.*

#### **Ensure and maintain public access to the waterfront**

- Participants said that it is important for Waterfront Toronto to maintain public access to public spaces along the waterfront after new buildings are constructed. *Waterfront Toronto staff identified that ensuring access to the waterfront is an important component to their corporate plan.*

#### **Question about whether this development and the increase in waterfront population could affect/restrict the operations of the island airport.**

## **Breakout Room Discussion on Volume 3: The Partnership**

There were about 20 participants from the public in this room who divided into three facilitated discussion groups, along with one individual discussion. The make-up of the room was diverse, including (but not limited to) a nearby property owner, engineers, journalists, architects, people with a background in banking and finance, students, community leaders, and others.

There was a group of participants that were generally favourable towards the proposal and primarily interested in gaining more information and offering feedback. Another group of participants raised a number of concerns. The remaining participants had a mix of feedback, needing the need for more clarity in a number of areas, welcoming innovation, but also seeking that democratic accountability and measures to prevent scope creep in the Sidewalk Labs proposal be addressed.

#### Supportive comments:

#### **Like innovation and experimentation**

- Idea of innovation welcomed by many – the MIDP proposes many exciting things.
- Some support because of the need for more experimentation in the city, and also sets precedent on how to accelerate development in other places (like Downsview). It has already been 20 years since Waterfront Toronto was created – “We spend so much time in planning, we should get more quickly to doing things”. To support experimentation, consider establishing a small, focused team to create and test new ideas (much like the private sector does with major initiatives – such as the merger of Canada Trust and TD).

#### **Like tall timber**

- Some support for including the timber buildings.

#### **Some support for management and planning entities proposed**

- Some support for the use of management and planning entities (i.e., those which fall under the purview of the Public Administrator) – including support for the opportunity for these

management entities to drive development and innovation, particularly if they are integrated with each other and with the other levels of government. This is also connected to support for an efficiently-implemented development project that will generate profit.

### **Site-specific idea**

- Downsway is designated Employment Lands and has space – it could be the location for the proposed tall timber business.

Concerns and/or more information needed:

### **Out of scope**

- Some strong objection to the fact that Waterfront Toronto is considering this proposal at all. Specifically, concern that the request was for a pilot on 12 acres of land and the Sidewalk Labs proposal is not a pilot and goes beyond the 12 acres.

### **Toronto may get stuck**

- Concern raised about Waterfront Toronto's ability to get out of the agreement if in 5 years new information came to light. Specific phrases like "We might not know until it's too late" were used to express this concern.

### **Sidewalk Labs & its Objectives**

- Strong concerns about Sidewalk Labs and Google as companies. They're too opaque and that their objectives with this project specifically are not being made clear. Phrases like, "what's *really* in it for Sidewalk/Google?" referenced broader monetary benefits to the company beyond the revenue that this particular project would generate and that was accompanied by an expressed concern that we may not know just how valuable this project is until much later.
- Concern about the unknown factor related to Google not being a well-established or experienced land developer and the implications of that. Phrases like, "We know what we're getting with a land developer, we know their business model – we don't know this with Google" accompanied this specific concern.
- Concern that Sidewalk Labs' role as both a technology vendor and also a project consultant/advisor could lead to a conflict of interest.

### **Concern about degree of bureaucracy and distance from the public**

- There's a need to ensure "democratic accountability." Draft MIDP proposes too many new governing agencies and it's possible that it will become very bureaucratic for the public to know how to navigate. It's possible that there will be "no way for the public" to make decisions.
- Need clarity as to why Sidewalk Labs wants to be the lead developer for Quayside and Villiers West. Concern that Sidewalk Labs had assigned themselves to be a big part of this proposal without context as to why they would be the lead.
- Need clarity about how different the development for Quayside and Villiers West would look if Sidewalk Labs was the lead (while other lands would be the responsibility of other private developers). It could happen that the other land would just become a bunch of condos.
- There was a concern about the intentions of Sidewalk Labs beyond the scope creep. There were many new technologies being proposed by Sidewalk Labs in the MIDP.

### **Questions about regulatory agencies/management entities**

- Need to “flesh out” in greater detail the form and role of the planning/management entities. Furthermore, there is a need for greater clarification in terms of how these entities will be integrated with each other and the other levels of government, as well as with the public.
- Some expressed strong concern about the accountability of these entities and the accountability/reporting structure of the Public Administrator with advice to Waterfront Toronto - more clarity around reporting and accountability is needed.

### **Social Infrastructure**

- Lots of questions about how the social infrastructure piece would work in practice, not only within the IDEA District but the neighbouring areas as well. Schools and community centres were raised as specific examples.
- Concerns about affordable housing were also raised; strong concern about expensive condos going up in the area and that affordable housing would be measured through some broader average or aggregate and not in realistic ways.

### **Feasibility of changing the Building Code**

- Concern was raised about the feasibility of changing building codes in order to accommodate the timber buildings being proposed. Some participants were sceptical that the legislation would be able to change quickly enough (one participant noted that Sidewalk Labs was likely “going all in” in their proposal to illustrate innovativeness and what’s possible, while also recognizing that aspects of the plan—such as tall timber building—might have to be changed for reasons of feasibility). These participants were not negatively disposed towards the tall timber building innovations, rather they questioned whether the legislation would allow for it to occur. They strongly endorsed that Waterfront Toronto should work to expedite the changes to this particular area of legislation.

### **Public Bidding Process**

- A concern was raised related to whether a public bidding process should be undertaken for the next phases of development, or whether the profit-sharing incentives should take priority. While some participants supported a public bidding process, others suggested that the profit-sharing incentives offered by Sidewalk Labs are dependent on speed and efficiency in implementing the development plans, which would almost certainly be impeded by a public bidding process.

### Conditions:

#### **Need to ensure there is an exit clause**

- Look into putting a “fail safe” mechanism in place so that the public can back out any point. It was also suggested to include a 10 year check-in point.
- Waterfront Toronto needs to consider all possible outcomes and think through and/or negotiate the dissolution of the partnership (also referred to as exit clause) prior to signing a new agreement so that Waterfront Toronto could get out at any point. Phrases like “An exit clause should be in black and white before any agreement is signed”

#### **Need more clarity and proof of Sidewalk Labs’ capacity for roles they propose for themselves**

- Get further detail about Sidewalk Labs/Google as companies and more clarity about their objectives with this project. It was recommended that Sidewalk Labs compile a summary to make this information more concise and easily accessible.
- Sidewalk Labs needs to provide more context about the increased size of their proposed role.



- Better understanding for the public about the technologies being proposed and transparency about benefit back to Sidewalk Labs.
- Need much more clarity and detail on social infrastructure and affordable housing that's realistically affordable.

#### **Need more analysis of governance proposals**

- The Public Administrator proposal needs to be considered against all other possible options (those options weren't listed in detail but the question "can you reject/remove this part of it?" was asked).

#### **Need more work on data**

- Advice to Waterfront Toronto to work with the federal government on a data strategy (the federal government data strategy comment was made during the room discussion).

#### **Address any conflicts of interest**

- Where there is a potential conflict of interest related to multiple proposed roles for Sidewalk Labs (e.g. as tech supplier and overall project Advisor), one possible remedy could be to create an additional third-party advisory body to assist Waterfront Toronto in the evaluation of Sidewalk Labs proposals to assess viability and costs.

#### Other Feedback:

- Question and concern that the Province's overriding of the City (e.g. related to transit uploading) may impact the project and any government-related safeguards.
- Make sure Waterfront Toronto is able to protect itself from changes in government (during elections).

## **Breakout Room Discussion on Digital Innovations, Privacy, Digital Governance, and Intellectual Property**

There were approximately 50 participants who divided into three facilitated discussion groups. Two of the groups focused on Digital Innovations, Privacy, and Digital Governance, and one of the groups focused on Intellectual Property. The make-up of the room was diverse, including (but not limited to), students, journalists, curious residents, technology entrepreneurs, and people interested in human rights.

Several participants were in the room to listen and learn, while others were there to share feedback and concerns with Waterfront Toronto about the Sidewalk Labs Proposal.

#### Feedback about Digital Innovations and Digital Governance

- Some supported the proposal for WiFi in Quayside, though there was worry about mass surveillance if this WiFi comes from a single provider. Participants said the benefits to the public should be more clearly communicated: how do these innovations make life better (as opposed to be innovation for the sake of innovation)?
- Participants shared strong concerns about a private actor proposing governance models for Quayside.
- Conditions under which participants might be receptive to the Digital Innovations and Digital Governance:

- Public oversight. Participants were more receptive to the idea of a data trust (or something like it) if it had public oversight. Others said they didn't trust anyone to oversee a data trust since data breaches occur regardless of who's in charge.
- Stronger consequences for those responsible for data breaches, such as jail time.
- Use of international standards (e.g. IEEE/ISO). These standards should be in place before the project is running.
- A Human Rights-informed approach to tech laws, since my understanding is that current laws (like PIPEDA) are not enough to deal with level of tracking and surveillance proposed. Laws should be updated to be relevant to current data technologies and written in a way that would prevent government itself from misusing data.

### Feedback about data collection and privacy

Participants shared a range of perspectives on data collection and use:

- Some said there were no conditions under which they would be willing to see sensors and/or data collection in Quayside, saying it monetizes citizens and could lead to digital segregation.
- Others said they might be receptive to seeing data collection explored in Quayside if the following conditions were met:
  - A proponent other than Sidewalk Labs was being considered
  - There is a clear way to understand what is being collected, and what is NOT being collected.
  - Residents have meaningful control over data, including: a way to delete any data collected about them, a clear way to consent to data collection, and a clear way to opt out. Data collection should be opt-in rather than opt-out by default.
  - A public actor is in charge of / oversees data collection, since there are checks and balances on their actions (though some were very uncomfortable with public sector-led data collection, too).
  - Data is collected and used for the public good rather than private financial gain.
  - The government has sufficient legal and financial resources to oversee and enforce public protections (with doubt expressed that government can match Sidewalk Labs legal and financial resources)
  - Any data collected is open and public.
  - Some said that ownership is not the right model/concept to use when it comes to what should be public data.
  - Toronto and Canada are able to maintain their sovereignty
  - There is full transparency/accountability and the public is educated about the terms being used and there are multiple players involved from various industries at all stages
  - Data is collected only in aggregate, only for trends, and only stored for a limited amount of time

### Feedback about Intellectual Property proposals

#### **Concern about public sector profit from data collection**

- Strong concern that these proposals incentivize Waterfront Toronto to make money from the collection of personal data. "This is a city, not a test bed."

### **Feedback about the profit-sharing proposal**

- Concern that Sidewalk Labs proposes sharing profits once technologies are sold to the “second customer.” Questions and concerns included: How is Sidewalk Labs defining the “second customer?” Sidewalk Labs may never have a second customer.
- Participants also said the proposal for Waterfront Toronto to share in 10% of Sidewalk Labs global profits does not make sense since the company does not report global profits (it reports profits in the jurisdictions in which it has to).

### **Feedback about the patent pledge proposal**

- Concern that this proposal does not reflect consideration of the asymmetry between Sidewalk Labs and small Canadian firms. Strong concern that this pledge would still allow Sidewalk Labs to assert its patents on Canadian firms outside of Canada.
- More focus on community gain than on economic gain. Some would be more receptive to these IP proposals if the purpose of participating was to provide community benefit and make what is learned open source for the community.
- Better recognition of the value of our asset. Our data is of incredible value to Sidewalk Labs — it is more valuable to them than it is to us.
- Increase percentage of profit sharing. Waterfront Toronto should receive at least 30% of profits.

### Other feedback

- Data generated should be open and the public should have access to algorithms in order to be able do something with it.
- Consider Sidewalk Labs’ track record. Sidewalk Labs does not have a strong record on delivering its projects: Waterfront Toronto should be looking at / considering this when contemplating this partnership.
- Learn from other programs, such as Presto, which was poorly managed, prone to data breaches, and lacked transparency about how data was being collected, where it was stored, how secure it was
- Need to be very careful about unintended consequences. People working on quantum computing and neural networks have, in some cases, already lost control of the models they have created — this is too big a risk to contemplate in our cities.
- Make sure we’re not using 20<sup>th</sup> century thinking to think about 21<sup>st</sup> century issues. Even the best tech regulations and policies (like GDPR) are more appropriate to the 90s than 2019 and beyond.
- Use open source hardware and software on this site and make sure there is no proprietary control of either.
- Share technologies and lessons with other parts of Toronto if this is successful.
- Privacy is very important, even though participants said many people do not understand why.
- Interest in learning more about “urban data,” including whether urban data includes private, personal, public, infrastructure, and biometric data.
- Skepticism about de-identification and anonymization. The “lowest” form of tech should be used (e.g. laser or radar rather than cameras to count pedestrians) so as not to create the conditions for mis-use (though a sophisticated company like Sidewalk Labs could easily correlated multiple datasets to identify someone). Waterfront Toronto should adopt “anonymity by design” rather than “privacy by design” in its consideration of digital proposals.
- Support for WT’s Draft Digital Principles, which could help address many of the concerns raised about this project.

## Feedback from the Closing Plenary

The following feedback was shared in the Closing Plenary. Responses, where provided, are noted *in italics*.

- The more innovations that are part of project, the likelier they are to fail. Is the project design robust enough for it to survive innovations that don't survive? It's important to acknowledge that innovations might not work and question whether the project is robust enough to withstand it.
- At what point are we presented with Alphabet's corporate infractions? I'm concerned about a failure to produce their track record. They have broken laws etc. When does the process consider their past actions? They have shut down governments and silenced people. How and when will we consider this? *Facilitation team: The fact you've raised it in this meeting means that it is on the public record. Everything from the consultation will be fed into Waterfront Toronto's evaluation of the MIDP. Waterfront Toronto: Sidewalk Labs is a relatively new company, but it is a child of Alphabet. Waterfront Toronto required disclosures during the RFP process and we are tracking their previous infractions. We have to see what we can do to share that information in some way. If you have specific things you would like us to look at, you can also email us ([quayside@waterfronttoronto.ca](mailto:quayside@waterfronttoronto.ca)).*
- I am afraid of Google. The Draft Digital Principles from Waterfront Toronto look great. They go a long way to alleviating my concerns. Thank you, I hope this will be a leading project, maybe ahead of the game. *Waterfront Toronto: Sidewalk Labs will be required to adhere to the principles. They were formulated through previous consultations and other projects would also be required to follow them.*
- I understand that the Request for Proposal (RFP) came about because of contact between Sidewalk Labs and the federal government. Then RFP process unfolded and Sidewalk Labs was selected. Were there other proposals submitted? Why was Sidewalk Labs in the door from day one? Why are they spending money lobbying our government? *Waterfront Toronto: The RFP process originated with Waterfront Toronto. We worked on it for a year, and we did market sounding with 50 companies. As we told the Auditor General, we gave similar information to a lot of different companies. Sidewalk Labs was not given an information advantage or a timeline advantage. There was also no contact between Waterfront Toronto and the federal government at that time. A former Ontario Chief Justice was the Fairness Adjudicator. A Steering Committee at Waterfront Toronto and external experts also reviewed the process. In total, 6 submissions were received, and the Steering Committee short-listed the list to 3. At least one of those three have asked not to be named, though one has spoken on the public record. We spoke at the Federal Privacy Ethics Committee on this topic also, and you can watch the testimony on the Waterfront Toronto YouTube channel. (Part 1: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R35DSE0ajns> and Part 2: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GY7oqofL7k4>)*

# RADISSON HOTEL FEEDBACK SUMMARY

## About this Feedback Summary

On Wednesday, July 17, 2019, Waterfront Toronto held the second of four public meetings to begin the process of reviewing and seeking feedback on the Draft Master Innovation and Development Plan (MIDP) submitted by Sidewalk Labs on June 17, 2019. Approximately 150 people participated, including area residents, business owners, academics, community organizers, civil servants, technology entrepreneurs, and many others.

The meeting was 3 hours in length, including about 30 minutes for an overview briefing, about 1.5 hours for four concurrent breakout room discussions (including 15-20 minute more detailed presentations by Waterfront Toronto in each room), and a one hour closing plenary that included reports from each breakout room and a full-room discussion. The four breakout rooms focused on each volume of the Draft MIDP (Volume 1: The Plans, Volume 2: The Urban Innovations, and Volume 3: The Partnership) with a separate room for Digital Innovation, Digital Governance, and intellectual property. Each breakout room had between 3 and 4 smaller table discussions, and each table had a representative from Waterfront Toronto and one facilitator.

This summary was written by the facilitation team from Swerhun Inc., the firm retained by Waterfront Toronto to support its Quayside public consultation process. Swerhun works exclusively for governments, public agencies, and non-profits working to support public policy. The Swerhun team's role is not to advocate for any particular project outcome, but rather to support the delivery of transparent, constructive, and meaningful consultation processes.

The intent of the summary is to reflect the feedback shared at the meeting. There are references to "few", "some", and "many" participants expressing a certain point of view, but it's important to note that not all participants were asked to confirm whether they did (or did not) agree with any particularly point raised by the other participants. As a result, this summary is necessarily qualitative in nature.

**NOTE:**        **The intent of this summary is not to assess the merit or accuracy of the feedback shared at this meeting, nor does the documentation of this feedback indicate an endorsement of any of these perspectives on the part of Waterfront Toronto.**

A draft of this summary was distributed to all participants for their review before it was finalized.

## About the Round One Public Consultation Process

This first round of consultation focused on orienting the public to the Draft MIDP from the perspective of Waterfront Toronto as a public steward working with the support of all three levels of government to revitalize the waterfront. To support the process of seeking public feedback, Waterfront Toronto shared the following materials:

- An *Open Letter* from Board Chair Stephen Diamond outlining Waterfront Toronto's responsibilities, confirming that Waterfront Toronto did not co-create the MIDP, acknowledging some exciting ideas and identifying early examples of concerns;
- A *Note to Reader* prepared by Waterfront Toronto based on its initial, high level review of the MIDP that provides a synthesis of what Waterfront Toronto asked for from its Innovation and Funding Partner, the response from Sidewalk Labs, where and how the Draft MIDP aligns with existing practices and what's new, where the privatization of public assets is being proposed (if at all), and financial impacts and risks.
- Waterfront Toronto's Draft Digital Principles; and
- A *Discussion Guide* providing an overview of the public consultation process.

All these materials and presentations are available at [www.QuaysideTO.ca](http://www.QuaysideTO.ca).

The public meetings were only one of several ways that the public could provide feedback during this first round of consultation. Other options included an online consultation ([www.QuaysideTO.ca](http://www.QuaysideTO.ca)), sending emails directly to [quayside@waterfrontontario.ca](mailto:quayside@waterfrontontario.ca), talking to Waterfront Toronto staff at one of seven drop-in sessions held in partnership with the Toronto Public Library, or completing a hard copy of feedback forms. A video recording of the third public meeting (held on Saturday, July 20, 2019) is available on the [Waterfront Toronto YouTube channel](#).

## Overall themes in feedback received

Feedback shared by participants at the Radisson Hotel Public Meeting was generally critical. While a few participants said they were open to discussing or exploring some of the ideas in the MIDP, several said that the process and/or the substance of this specific proposal were very flawed. Most of those who spoke in either the plenary or the breakout rooms had concerns or questions. The overall themes are reflected below, followed by more detail from each of the four breakout rooms and the closing plenary (see Attachments).

**There were participants who were supportive of some of the ideas being shared in the Draft MIDP.** Their comments focused on the need for new thinking to address urban challenges and the fact that this project presents an opportunity for Toronto to: expedite transit and other development, be a world leader in digital governance, and gain new jobs and tax revenue.

**Many participants had strong concerns about the Draft MIDP and process, including:**

- Concern about the MIDP's proposals for land beyond the 12 acres of Quayside;
- Concern that Waterfront Toronto is consulting the public on things that are outside of what it asked for in its Request for Proposal (RFP) (the competitive process through which Sidewalk Labs was selected as Waterfront Toronto's Innovation and Funding Partner);
- Concern that we should not be contemplating a proposal like this until all levels of government have the policies and regulations in place to manage it (such as stronger protections against data breaches);
- Lack of trust in Sidewalk Labs, Google, and Alphabet;



- Lack of information about what the public benefits are in the proposals;
- Concern that the amount of affordable housing proposed is not adequate; and
- Safety and accessibility concerns related to curb-less street designs.

**Many participants identified conditions they feel must be considered/met if the proposal is to move forward, including but not limited to:**

- The need for more information about what could be accomplished at Quayside alone;
- The need for more information about what mechanisms could help achieve affordable housing targets;
- The need for more of a focus on beauty in the proposal and its evaluation;
- The need for more information on contingency plans for if/when technologies fail;
- The need for more detail about why the proposed governance structures are needed, how they would be staffed, and how they would be integrated with existing structures; and
- Data collection would need to be undertaken by a public agency and/or by public actors under strong public oversight.

## Snapshots from the four breakout room discussions

### Volume 1: The Plans

- Where people were comfortable/supportive included: some support for higher densities and innovations that can bring jobs, tech sector growth, and additional tax revenue. Some support for new tools and approaches to social infrastructure (e.g. the Care Collective and school).
- Where people need more information included: what can be achieved solely at Quayside versus what necessitates the development of the River District; how hard infrastructure would be paid for; what is new versus what is already being done elsewhere; what mechanisms can ensure affordable housing targets are achieved; how a timber factory would result in affordable housing.
- Where people were concerned included: the IDEA District is premature given Waterfront Toronto asked for a 12-acre proposal; potential for the proposal to make the waterfront unaffordable; potential for collection of personal data, especially at the Care Collective and school; potential lack of livability of the small units proposed; the proposal for 5% of housing to be deeply affordable is not adequate.
- Conditions under which some may be willing to move forward included: more focus on climate change, environmental protections, and resiliency; there is a slow pace to development; more of a focus on beauty; more consideration of senior-friendly infrastructure; ensure there is funding in place to ensure affordable housing proposals can apply beyond Quayside.

**Volume 2:  
The  
Innovations**

- Where people were comfortable/supportive included: some receptiveness to technology being used to think about building cities, public spaces, and sustainability; some support for dynamic curbs, the proposed STOA, snow-melting pavers, heated cycle path, passive house design, and building systems schedulers.
- Where people needed more information included: what sources of long-term and stable funding would be attached to these systems; if/how these innovations would benefit people beyond Quayside; what contingency plans are in place if/when technology breaks down; how would the proposed new governance structures be integrated with current ones, how would their staff be selected, and why are these new structures needed at all.
- Where people were concerned included: potential for curb-less street design to be unsafe for pedestrians; the lack of a commitment to the LRT (light rail transit) could stop the project; potential lack of compatibility between different technology systems; risk new governance structures turn Quayside into insular community; over-design of the public realm; lack of clarity about on-going funding to support complex technology; too much control of technology by Sidewalk Labs; too much risk being first buyers of technology;
- Conditions under which some may be willing to move forward included: there are assurances that the waterfront would remain open and available for everyone; there is space designed for food production; data collection is explicitly used to monitor and improve waste collection / reduction; there is a legal framework in place to manage uncertainty around tech.

**Volume 3:  
The  
Partnership**

- Where people were comfortable/supportive included: few positive comments; support for opportunity to expedite transit, housing, and commercial development, and empowering Waterfront Toronto to build on 20 years of waterfront progress; some support for the proposed Housing Trust.
- Where people were concerned included: concerns about an overreach by Sidewalk Labs; lack of information about potential harms, how the public would benefit, and how innovations would be maintained and failures managed; lack of detail on how Sidewalk Labs would be held accountable, questions about its relationship to Google, and questions about the capacity to deliver what is proposed; concerns about Sidewalk Labs' lobbying efforts and lack of innovation; a difficult-to-read proposal and overwhelming process, and; the relationship between Sidewalk Labs and Waterfront Toronto.
- Conditions under which some may be willing to move forward included: must maintain public control and must have clear "outs"/termination rights; proposal should be scoped back to a smaller geography and within existing governance structures; need a stronger case for proposed regulatory changes and additional land; need analysis of economic benefits to Toronto and Canada; consider a partnership with Canadian companies.

**Digital  
Innovation,  
Governance  
and IP**

- Where people were comfortable/supportive included: there is already data being collected about all of us so might as well explore it; if we don't do this, someone else will; this is an opportunity for Canada to become a world leader in digital governance. Some receptiveness to exploring digital cities generally.
- Where people were concerned or needed more information included: concerns about the process to date, including concern the proposal reaches beyond what was asked for; we do not yet have digital policies and regulations; lack of trust in US tech companies; concern Google could have access to data; lack of clarity about what the data is collected for; possibility of losing sovereignty if we lose control of data; public sector should not have an economic/commercial incentive to collect data about citizens. More information needed about the Urban Data Trust, including how funded.
- Conditions under which some may be willing to move forward included: first develop policies and regulations around technology use in cities (including mechanisms to prevent / punish breaches); data collection is opt-in; data collection is done by a public agency, multiple actors, and/or occurs under strong public oversight; data collection is limited to environmental data; data collection contributes to a public commons; data is stored in Canada; the timeframe of profit sharing is greater than 10 years; profits shared with Waterfront Toronto are reinvested directly into Toronto's waterfront; Waterfront Toronto considers potential harms (instead of risks).

# ATTACHMENT: Breakout room and plenary discussions



## Breakout room discussion on Volume 1: The Plans

In The Plans breakout room, facilitators convened four separate break-out groups that discussed different elements from Volume 1 of the Sidewalk Labs proposal, including: Quayside and the River District (two tables), economic development, and social infrastructure.

### Feedback about the Plans

#### **Concerns and additional information needed related to the scope**

- More information needed about the connections and distinctions between the proposals for the 12-acre Quayside area and proposals for the much larger River District.
- Participants wanted to know what innovations could be achieved solely within Quayside vs which innovations would necessitate the development of the River District to be successful. Participants were particularly interested to know if the proposed streetcar would require the development of the River District.
- Concern that the Idea District is premature and concern that Sidewalk Labs is bringing forward a proposal this large when Waterfront Toronto asked for a proposal for the 12-acre Quayside site.

#### **What's being proposed needs to be presented in a more accessible way**

- The 1500+ page MIDP is not an accessible/reasonable way to share information with the public on what is being proposed. Sidewalk Labs needs to find an accessible way to share and explain what they are proposing.
- It is difficult to provide feedback without having a clear understanding of what is being proposed.

#### **Additional focus on climate change and environmental protections**

- Innovations should include a focus on protecting the natural environment, including protecting and enhancing biodiversity along the waterfront.
- The proposals need to address the risk of flooding as a result of increased lake levels. One participant said they read the entire MIDP and saw nothing related to flooding.

#### **Infrastructure needs to be well planned and implemented**

- Some support for high density in the area so long as it comes with the necessary infrastructure to support it.
- Good transit infrastructure would be important to ensure people can easily move through the area. Space for active transportation also needs to be designed and supported.

#### **Concerns about developing the area too quickly.**

- Building quickly can result in mistakes. It also makes it more difficult for an area to develop organically and cultivate a sense of community with character.
- Suggestion to slow down development and use the precinct plans that have already been developed and approved for the area.

#### **More information needed about ownership of the land**

- Participants wanted a better understanding who owns the lands across both the Quayside and River District as well as who would own the lands should the proposals in the MIDP be implemented.

#### **Beauty should be included in the proposals**

- Beauty as a concept is important and different from design excellence. It should be one of the criteria for evaluating the proposals.

## Economic Development

### **Interest in innovations, and reservations**

- Interest and support for innovations that can bring more jobs to Toronto and stimulate additional economic benefit for the City. However, innovations should not prevent the design and implementation of more practical ideas and solutions.
- The MIDP is not especially innovative when compared to the precinct plans already in place for the area.
- Suggestion that use of timber is not innovative, especially when Canada has a steel industry across the lake that is hurting.

### **Interest in the Urban Innovation Institute**

- Want to understand how this is connected to the proposal to have a Google headquarters in the area.
- Interest in how increasing commercial space in the area could benefit the area and Toronto more broadly.

### **Economic development should not reduce affordability**

- Concerns were raised that development, especially the development of a technology sector, on the waterfront could result in making the area unaffordable for future and existing residents. Participants said they don't want to see this become a Silicon Valley, where even people with high paying jobs can't afford to live close to where they work.

### **A Google Headquarters has potential benefits and risks**

- Potential benefits identified included job creation, additional tax revenue for the City, and support for the growth of a local technology sector.
- Potential risks identified included Google taking existing and future talent from other local and Canadian tech companies, making the area unaffordable, potentially giving away or discounting some of the most expensive real estate in Canada.

### **More information on how infrastructure would be funded**

- Need more detail on how hard infrastructure (sewers, water, roads, transit, etc.) would be paid for and if/how Sidewalk Labs would be reimbursed should they supply upfront costs.

## Social Infrastructure

### **Support for innovations in social infrastructure**

- Having Sidewalk Labs design social infrastructure could help service providers learn new tools and experiment with new approaches at the proposed Care Collective.
- Interest in an innovative and well-designed school. Would likely become a big draw for parents who want their kids to attend. Suggestion to build the school close to the Civic Assembly and green spaces.

### **Need to provide safe and efficient connections to proposed social services**

- The proposed social services would likely attract a large number of people to the area. There needs to be an efficient road network and transit infrastructure to move to people to/from the area efficiently.
- There needs to be safe routes (including pedestrian crossing) to get students to/from the new school, especially if they are coming from neighbourhoods north of the Gardiner Expressway.

### **Concerns about the collection and ownership of personal data.**

- Need additional information on if/how personal health data from the Care Collective and children's data from the school would be collected and who would own this data.



- Need additional information on who would own the applications Sidewalk Labs is proposing. Some said they would not want to participate in the apps if they don't know who is taking their ideas.

### **Maintaining Social Infrastructure**

- A concern was raised that the proposed social infrastructure would be very reliant on technology and it's not clear how resilient it is. Need more clarity on how resiliency will be built in and how the social infrastructure would be maintained and fixed if technology fails.

### **Other feedback on Social Infrastructure**

- Sidewalk Labs should be consulting with local service providers to ensure its ideas make sense.
- Senior-friendly infrastructure is very important and should be included in the proposals (e.g. accessible wayfinding).
- Proposals should show a plan for how the development could cope with political shifts and funding changes.
- It would be cool to integrate some element of water transit.

## **Breakout room discussion on Volume 2: The Urban Innovations**

In the Urban Innovation breakout room facilitators convened four separate break-out groups that discussed one of four sets of urban innovations in the Sidewalk Labs proposal, including: mobility, sustainability, housing and buildings, and public realm.

### Public Realm

#### **Where people were comfortable/supportive:**

- Participants generally liked the urban innovations proposed in the MIDP. There was specific mention of dynamic curbs, the STOA idea, permeable surfaces capable of melting snow, and the green wave heated cycle path. Participants also liked that the public realm features signaled a fundamentally new way to think about city building – one that used design and technology in ways that had rarely been used before in development proposals.

#### **Where people are less comfortable/concerned:**

- Concern about adaptability by people using the public realm. Participants were concerned that the public realm is overly designed and managed, leaving little opportunity for adapting to individual needs. There was a sense that the impact of tourists to the waterfront was also not being recognized in the proposal.
- Questions about how the technology works, accessibility, and contingency plans for if it fails. Participants wanted more information about how the permeable surfaces worked, whether dynamic curbs are safe for pedestrians of all abilities, and what would happen to the innovations in winter weather. There is a desire for recognition that if technology fails, there needs to be a contingency plan for repair.
- Concern about the long-term future of the project, including interim conditions and funding. There was concern that if the project decision making process moves too slowly, that good ideas and opportunities would be lost. A participant asked what the proposed interim conditions would be on the public realm and its condition for the next 25 to 100 years. Lastly, there was concern about the long-term stable funding support for complex technology.

#### **Conditions under which participants may be willing to further consider the proposal:**

- Access to the waterfront must be for everyone. Access to the waterfront cannot be traded away for the proposed innovations and governance structures. Quayside public spaces should be available to everyone, not just the residents of Quayside.

## Sustainability

### **Where people were comfortable/supportive:**

- Interest in the mobilization of passive house design. A participant asked whether someone can learn from these designs and independently build their own passive house, or if there are laws and regulations that do not allow this.
- Interest in knowing more about resiliency and reduced living space in relation to the sustainability plans. Participants asked about resiliency as a tool and if it is in the MIDP, and whether reduced living space plays a significant role in the current strategy.
- Receptiveness to the proposed Waterfront Sustainability Association (WSA) and Open Space Alliance (OSA) and desire for more information to understand what the need is for other governance bodies beyond Waterfront Toronto, and how these governance bodies would be structured. A participant said that the WSA could be helpful for sustainability decision making, and another stated that the OSA is a good idea in order to have a different body regulate how space is used in the city, and would like to see it expanded across Toronto. There were questions about how staff for these organizations would be selected, whether it's necessary and the need is just to have presence immediately in the community, and how public parks would be a part of the system.

### **Where people are less comfortable/concerned:**

- Skepticism about the heavy reliance of technology within the sustainability strategy, and desire for there to be appropriate mechanisms designed to address failures, referencing the 'Right to Repair' movement, and ensure accountability. Participants want assurance that the plans for efficiency and cost savings are a formal agreement, and that there be penalties should Sidewalk Labs not be able to fulfill them. From an infrastructure standpoint, one participant likened buying the first version of a smartphone to the Quayside project: people often won't buy something in the prototype phase, and if they do, there should be warranty to mitigate technical issues and glitches.

### **Conditions under which participants may be willing to further consider the proposal:**

- Participants highlighted gaps and conditions that needed to be met in Sustainability Plans regarding the need for green space, food production and waste sorting.
- Generally, participants wanted to know what the plans were to *address potential risks*. One concern, in particular, was what would happen if the underground tunnels leak.
- One participant strongly felt that there should be space designated in the community for *food production*. Food security and community interaction is important, and one participant said this is a condition that should be met in order for them to show support in the proposal.
- Specific suggestions included creating *community gardens on rooftops*, as well as *allotment gardens* on the ground. One participant said the latter doesn't take up too much space and provides a connection to nature which is important to people, and provided Black Creek Gardens and the Regent Park Community Food Centre as examples to draw upon.
- Participant noted that the *market for purchasing waste* has collapsed, and wondered how that would impact the sustainability strategy. Many participants were receptive to municipal services (i.e. garbage collection) being privately operated in Quayside, under the condition that data collection would allow for closer monitoring than currently exists
- One participant would like the 200-year flood plain south of the Quay be taken into consideration and to help contextualize the plans in place for flood mitigation and management
- Support for building automation/data collection to advance sustainability and utility affordability goals as long as it is done in a way that respects the privacy of citizens and makes it accessible for everyone.

- Participants thought that schedulers are a good idea to create efficiency, and one participant felt that they are not particularly intrusive. However, they still need to have manual overrides or more options for people with accessibility needs (elderly/vision) as they may struggle with automatic schedules and changes made via smart technology.
- One participant strongly supported energy data collection to advance utility affordability and mentioned an example from a study that showed how people changed their energy use habits when they saw how much money they would save when comparing with their neighbours who used less. If residents' energy use is shared anonymously and privacy is maintained, then they can learn from one another.
- One participant supported data collection for the advancement of sustainability, but felt strongly that there needs to be an iron clad data strategy on reporting usages.
- Questions to consider is how much information would be okay to share, what the risks associated with data being tracked are, is it in the public interest, and would building automation design be shared with other public spaces to replicate and increase sustainability goals
- The 12 acres of Quayside should be a test run. Someone stated that expanding beyond the 12 acres proposed in the RFP is risky, and that it needs to be tested first to find out if the risk is worth it, and whether it is scalable or not.
- The public sector, and ideally the private sector, should be prepared to subsidize climate positive development. Participants would like to see the government take the lead, as it acts in the interest of the citizens. Another participant said that putting money in now would be saving money in the long run, and that a public-private partnership would be ideal to subsidize the climate positive development. There was a question if public money was put in, whether Sidewalk Labs would profit from it, if they would help to pay for it.

#### **Other**

- Recommendation for free digital literacy tools to increase accessibility, with the concern about who the Quayside development would exclude because of technology. One participant asked if a public library would be a part of the development, and another recommended there be a computer sharing program where people could sign out laptops if they didn't have their own to increase access to technology, and access the innovations proposed. Many participants felt concern about the affordability of the plans, and who would be excluded if they couldn't afford a smart phone, or to live in the area.

#### Mobility

##### **Where people are less comfortable/concerned:**

- There is concern with the proposed curbsless street design. While participants mentioned that the concept sounds good, the reality is that vehicles still dominate the public right of way. It could create an uncomfortable public realm and unsafe environment, and cited CityPlace as an example where they felt it was already unsuccessfully.
- Concern about who would build the LRT, and what would happen if it can't be delivered. Many participants felt that the surrounding neighbourhoods around Quayside already lack transit infrastructure, and were concerned that people wouldn't want to move there if it wasn't transit-oriented. One participant suggested a higher than 60% mode share model, and would like to see more transit. In general, there was understanding that funding for the LRT is not something Waterfront Toronto can commit to.
- Questions about why DC current is being proposed. Waterfront Toronto explained it assists with fire mitigation, and that walls can be moved without electrical relocation as its just cabling work.
- Concern about smart technology integration if Sidewalk Labs leads the development.
- One participant was concerned that there would be integration issues if Sidewalk Labs wanted to use their own AV technology. They suggested others may not work as well, and

that the compatibility issue is a problem when one company has the monopoly on the data and technology.

- Participants were concerned about how climate change would affect the innovations. One participant asked how freight service would continue if the tunnels flooded, as current buildings already have this issue. There was some concern that the heated sidewalk would use too much energy and would impact carbon consumption for the area.
- Participants want Quayside to be integrated, it can't be separate or insular. Participants felt that having separate governance structures, such as the Waterfront Transportation Management Association (WTMA), may result in feeling separated from adjacent communities

### **Conditions under which participants may be willing to further consider the proposal**

- It's important that there is a legal framework, as there are many unknowns with data collection. A participant said that data isn't useful to every single human being, and that there are many unknowns with how Google would use it to its benefit. There is concern that Google is too powerful, and that the City of Toronto can't go up against them if there is a legal challenge around patents and proprietorship. One participant suggested that Waterfront Toronto take Sidewalk Lab's history seriously and consider a Canadian company instead, as well as demand more transparency on the unknowns in case of the risk where "code becomes law".

### **Other**

- Digital governance and privacy should be an integrated topic in all of the discussion rooms. One participant understood the methodology behind organizing the first round of consultation to reflect the MIDP. They also said that data and privacy can't be viewed in isolation, and suggested taking a more integrative approach moving forward.

### Buildings & Housing

#### **Where people were comfortable/supportive:**

- Participants had many questions of clarification for Waterfront Toronto staff. Few recommendations were made, and they did not express comfort level with the proposal directly. There was interest in having questions answered and required more information.
- Interest in the scope of the affordable housing for the project, and whether it is enough to solve Toronto's problems. Waterfront Toronto shared what applied to the 12-acre Quayside land. There are 1,070 below market units, and 530 affordable units proposed. Waterfront Toronto also provided income range explanation and average market rent (AMR) figures.

#### **Where people are less comfortable/concerned:**

- Concern about the size of housing units and livability. Participants were concerned with the size of the proposed housing, mentioning that listing it as cheaper and 60% (575 sq/ft) of average size doesn't answer the question of livability. There was consensus around the table that there was a need for more specific information about unit size, including 2 bedroom and family units.
- Desire to know what of the innovations is already happening and how much is actually new. Some participants felt that some of the innovations have already been done before. One participant said that homegrown developers are already offering smaller units and more amenities, such as lockers, and another said that the proposed waste management isn't new. The participant wants to know what is already happening and what is new.
- Participants were concerned about the housing affordability of Quayside, and questioned how the 20% in building savings would connect to this cause. Participants believe that the proposal for deeply affordable housing, 5% of the housing, is not adequate given the percentage of the population that is below the Federal standard for low income. To address affordability, it was suggested to use low income cut-offs (LICOs) as the standard.

- Participants need more information about the mechanisms that ensure the current breakdown of the below-market housing program is met and the affordability levels proposed are maintained. Waterfront Toronto explained that its mandate and the RFP intent is for affordable housing to remain affordable in perpetuity. Other questions pertained to the rent and ownership balance, and if people who bought units would have to live there. More information is needed, and Waterfront Toronto explained that the condo “flip fee” or resale fee is new to Toronto.
- Participants had questions regarding the proposed timber factory, and how it would actually make housing more affordable. Participants wanted to know if Sidewalk Labs was proposing to own the prefab timber factory, or partner with another company. Waterfront Toronto shared that the idea is to keep the supply chain in Canada to increase standardization. Participants suggested that it be close to Toronto. Participants also had questions and concerns whether this production would make housing significantly more affordable and if it would rely on government subsidy. Waterfront Toronto said that N. Barry Lyon Consultants (or NBLC) (a firm specializing in housing, community renewal, development feasibility and real estate strategy) was retained as one of its subject matter experts and will assess the housing affordability impacts in the MIDP.

**Conditions under which participants may be willing to further consider the proposal:**

- If Quayside is a true experiment and reflects Toronto-based demographics, it should reflect what people can afford on public land. One participant felt that it wasn’t that risky to offer a greater amount of subsidized housing as Waterfront Toronto has funding from three levels of government, while another said that the cost of the Quayside development was a risk to the affordability effort.
- Questions regarding the scalability of housing percentages. Participants wanted to know if the proposed affordable housing went beyond the Quayside area. Waterfront Toronto responded that the percentages also go beyond Quayside to Villiers Island, and that it’s a combination of land and government subsidy. One participant said that a condition going forward should be ensuring that funding is in place, and another suggested that public lands shouldn’t be used for housing that isn’t affordable.

## Breakout room discussion on Volume 3: The Partnership

In the Partnership breakout room, facilitators convened four separate break-out groups that all focused on Volume 3. Where responses were provided by the Waterfront Toronto team, the text is *in italics*.

Where people were comfortable/supportive:

Very little of the discussion was dedicated to what people supported or were comfortable with. The following points were raised by participants at two of the four discussion tables:

- One participant noted that Sidewalk Labs seems to show a willingness to work with Waterfront Toronto, including a willingness to negotiate on their role in the project and how profits would be shared.
- There was some strong support for the opportunity to catalyze the expedited development of the eastern waterfront and Port Lands (including the LRT, accelerating housing and commercial development, etc.), and empowering Waterfront Toronto to advance this (building on 20 years of strong waterfront progress).
- One participant expressed some support for the Housing Trust, but also indicated that more information was needed in terms of how it would be managed and implemented.

Where people were concerned:

### **Concern about over-reach by Sidewalk Labs**

- There was concern that Sidewalk Labs had over-reached beyond the scope that was outlined in the RFP, both in terms of geography and governance.
- There was concern that Sidewalk Labs would dictate infrastructure partners working on the project.
- There was concern that that the role of the Public Administrator was beyond the purview of Sidewalk Labs (relating to this, one person suggested that Sidewalk Labs needs to “return to their lane”), particularly when it seems that Waterfront Toronto is already largely doing the job of the Public Administrator.

### **Concern about a proposal that seems to insulate a private company from democratic processes**

- There was a concern about the departure from values of Canadian democracy in what Sidewalk Labs has proposed in the MIDP. The comment was “has anyone ever been able to stop Google anyway from doing what they want?”
- The governance and decision making process identified in the MIDP is confusing and unclear. It was stated that what is proposed in the MIDP is very un-Canadian and does not abide by our democratic processes in Canada. There was a comment about “why are we taking advice from a non-Canadian” company on how to run our city?
- There were questions as to “Why does it make sense to accept new governance bodies? Would they last forever?” and participants who expressed suspicion, noting that: “It looks like they’re hoping to insulate themselves from existing democratic processes. We would be crazy to say yes to creating purpose-made governance bodies that a private actor creates and controls.” It was suggested that this seems like a solution looking for a problem.
- The efficiency of new agencies was questioned, noting that if other agencies are set up, the City would still have a duplicate set of governance responsibilities (that existing today).

### **Concerns about a lack of information about sustaining innovation and managing failure**

- It needs to be clearly explained how innovative the Sidewalk Labs innovations would be after 5 years. How can innovation be maintained all the time? Once you build a building, it won’t be changing every 5 years.
- Has Waterfront Toronto seen the article that was written by Dr. Saxe (Assistant Professor of Civil and Mineral Engineering at the University of Toronto) as an Opinion piece in the New York Times? It identifies a number of issues for people to consider related to the Sidewalk Labs proposal (e.g. “How long will systems last, and what happens when they fail?” <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/16/opinion/smart-cities.html>)
- One individual observed that the project relies significantly the integration of several technologies and systems – which would seem to pose a risk if there was a failure anywhere in the system.

### **Concern about lack of discussion on potential harms**

- There was a general consensus at one table that it is alarming that the MIDP does not clearly indicate the level of potential harm to the public (financial, technological, privacy, lack of community development).
- There was a serious concern the MIDP is, in effect, proposing to test technologies on humans.
- There was concern that there is no clear understanding or statement in MIDP about the effect on the people who live in/near the area that is being proposed to be developed (e.g. how residents in or near the area would interact with new technology and how their privacy could/would be impacted).
- There was a concern that the MIDP does not outline the long-term commitments that the public would be on the hook for in the years to come.

### **Lack of clarity on what Sidewalk Labs would give and how the public would benefit**

- Are there are non-negotiables for Sidewalk Labs in the MIDP? It is not clear which areas are more of a priority for Sidewalk Labs.
- There was a general consensus at one table that it was not clear in the MIDP about the balance between what Sidewalk Labs is proposing financially and the benefit to the public.

### **Questions for which answers are needed before making a decision about the Draft MIDP (focused on the capacities of Sidewalk Labs and Waterfront Toronto, and the details of the partnership)**

- Does Sidewalk Labs have the internal capacity to actually lead a development on this scale? How does Sidewalk Labs' relationship with Google work?
- Uncertain about if Sidewalk Labs can act as a good resource for city building, or will have a negative takeover effect - how to ensure there's trust and strong relationships
- What are the mechanisms for ensuring accountability for outcomes, conflict resolution? How would Waterfront Toronto ensure Sidewalk Labs does what it commits to?
- What if Google goes out of business in 5 years? What then?
- Does Waterfront Toronto have the management capacity and governance stability for this (given the recent Board membership and CEO turnover, etc.)?

### **Concerns about government lobbying by Sidewalk Labs**

- Sidewalk Labs has a number of lobbyists going to all levels of government. It seems they're bypassing Waterfront Toronto and engaging directly with governments. Why are they doing that if Waterfront Toronto is supposed to be the partner?
- Sidewalk Labs is asking for a lower price in exchange for building affordable housing. That seems normal, not innovative. Why are they asking for handouts? What's innovative about that?

### **Concerns about the proposal and the process**

- It seems like an embedded relationship between Sidewalk Labs and Waterfront Toronto. The notion that "everything is up for discussion" doesn't seem reasonable given the relationship and facetime that the two organizations have had with each other. It's reasonable that we have an apprehension that Waterfront Toronto is advocating for Sidewalk Labs' ideas – the staff have been sitting and working together.
- There has been a lot of consultation already. It's a bit confusing and overwhelming.
- The proposal is difficult to read.
- Does Sidewalk Labs have to go through another procurement to get access to West Villiers?

### **Flooding**

- A concern was raised by one participant related to the location of the development plans to the waterfront and the possibility of the flooding. This individual questioned whether the insurance industry would cover flooding for this development, or whether there would need to be changes of legislation needed to compel the insurance industry to provide coverage.

### **Housing**

- There was disappointment that the number of housing units was only 2600.

Conditions under which some may be willing to move forward:

### **Need to identify what works for Toronto**

- The Sidewalk Labs proposal may help us achieve our objectives 50 years sooner, but if we do that it would need to be on terms that work for us.
- Waterfront Toronto should "take the best and leave the rest."



### **The project must stay within the City of Toronto's existing governance structure**

- We need to ensure that the City of Toronto wants this, is an expert on how to handle this, and has the capacity (as the public) to administer and monitor it. This could include absorption of the different governance entities being proposed into/with existing City of Toronto structures (where there is overlap).

### **Waterfront Toronto must retain control**

- Waterfront Toronto must have the ability to stop going forward with the plan should it no longer be in the best interest of the public.
- It must be clear who is accountable for the development project and that there is a need for clarification regarding what Sidewalk Labs' role would be going forward.

### **Potential harms need to be identified**

- The MIDP needs to clearly identify potential harms to the public in all that is being proposed.

### **Need to identify how citizens benefit**

- There needs to be a clear explanation of how citizens would benefit from this proposal in terms of housing affordability, public amenities, etc. How continued citizen access to the waterfront would be ensured also needs to be explained (including access to and usability of public spaces, mobility for people without cars, dedication of Waterfront Toronto portfolio to affordable housing, etc.).

### **There needs to be a clearer idea of what's possible with existing governance structures and regulations**

- What's possible/not possible within existing governance and regulatory frameworks is not clear. What are the major regulatory barriers that would have to be addressed? We need an explanation of the impacts of these governance proposals on things like affordable housing more clearly laid out. A first stab at scoping down the Draft MIDP could be guided by what's possible with existing regulations.

### **There needs to be an assessment of the economic and public interest benefits for Toronto and Canada**

- The project offers benefits to the Canadian economy, but it also enables Google's global expansion. Waterfront Toronto needs to consider whether they could be partnering with Canadian companies instead to keep the benefits in Toronto / Canada. There were a number of questions raised, and interest in seeing an analysis completed to get answers to:
  - Whether there has been any economic impact analysis done around the benefits of partnering with Canadian firms?
  - Whether there have been investigations into whether there are trade restrictions against this (i.e. procurement under NAFTA, Canada-EU agreement)?
  - Whether Community Benefit Agreement models have been considered (like used with the Eglinton Crosstown) as way to spur local employment benefits and local economic impact?
  - What if other sources of local capital could be raised through City / Canadian coalition? (to address questions as to whether Sidewalk Labs is being given preferential treatment because of deep pockets)

### **There needs to be an analysis of risks and rewards**

- The MIDP needs to showcase "how profit is defined" so that it is clearer how Sidewalk Labs is benefitting from this MIDP (i.e. a "Risk and Rewards" analysis).

### **Need clarity on governance proposals**

- There needs to be clarification regarding the role of the public entities being proposed, including their scope and mandate.

### **The project needs to be anchored in frameworks/rules that are independently developed, fair, and in the public interest**

- This project could be vehicle for new models of policy development and smart cities if this condition is met – and it could benefit Toronto and be replicated elsewhere. Sidewalk Labs has obvious conflicts in proposing solutions and shouldn't receive one-off exemptions.

### **Sidewalk Labs needs to make the case for more than 12 acres**

- There is some exciting sustainability stuff, but going from 12 acres to 190 acres is a massive leap and Villiers West is highly valued land. Sidewalk Labs needs to make the case that something bigger than 12 acres of Quayside is needed, along with more details about the proposed Google Headquarters on Villiers.

### **Other conditions**

- Any risk of flooding due to the proximity of the development to the lake must be mitigated through insurance. There was uncertainty whether this might require additional legislation.
- If Sidewalk Labs is to be the lead partner in the project, then Sidewalk Labs has a responsibility to deliver on the transit promise.
- Relating to the concern over the integration of technologies, it was suggested that a condition for moving forward is to ensure that there is the necessary resiliency in the technology and infrastructure to mitigate against this risk.
- Another individual stated that the total number of housing units needs to be increased well beyond the 2600 outlined in the MIDP.

### Other thoughts and questions:

#### **Questions about the role of Waterfront Toronto**

- What would be the role of Waterfront Toronto in all the steps that are being taken from start to finish? This needs to be clear, including related to transit.
- What will happen to Waterfront Toronto beyond 2024? A representative from Waterfront Toronto clarified that the mandate has been extended to 2028 and is always subject to wind-up or further extension at the election of the three orders of government.
- Is Waterfront Toronto making money out of this proposal or just moderating the process? What financial benefits is Waterfront Toronto getting out of this MIDP that they have not shared publicly?

#### **Drawing on previous experiences**

- We need to remember “what we went through with Amazon” and be clear on why we are trying to attract Google.

#### **It would be useful to know the value of the public assets involved**

- It would be helpful to know how much public value we're talking about. Is it \$500 million? \$1 billion? *A Waterfront Toronto representative noted that Quayside is zoned for 2.7 million square feet of mixed use. The value is approximately \$200/square foot (based on a recent transaction and on buildable area (a density multiplier of site area)). The approximate value has been reduced historically, using offsets to address Waterfront Toronto policy requirements (such as affordable housing).*

## **Waterfront LRT**

- The eastern waterfront LRT has been studied by the City and Waterfront Toronto for a number of years. It's eligible for federal funding.

## **Questions focused on trying to understand the complex decision-making process**

- There were participants who wondered how Waterfront Toronto would deal with all the complexity around the different levels of government, and how the decision-making process would work, including the process and sequencing of decision-making related to the Waterfront Toronto Board's decision on the MIDP and when governments weigh in.
- Some participants wondered if there were any early signals of how other governments (Toronto, Ontario) feel about policy and/or regulatory changes they would have to make related to the proposal.

## **Breakout room discussion on Digital Innovation and IP**

In the Digital Innovation and Intellectual Property (IP) breakout room, facilitators convened three separate break-out groups, with two groups focused on digital innovation, and one group focused on IP.

### Feedback about the project overall

#### **Where participants were concerned about the project overall**

- Lack of trust in big, US tech companies and Sidewalk Labs / Google / Alphabet. Big tech companies have not demonstrated trustworthy behavior in the last few years or a willingness to be accountable to governments. For example, Facebook refused to appear before Parliament's Ethics Committee, and the City's recent regulatory changes to support Uber ended up harming Toronto's taxi drivers. Some participants said they would be more receptive to exploring a project like Quayside with a Canadian company as partner (e.g. Blackberry) or under the leadership of a new Crown corporation.
- Sidewalk Labs has reached far beyond what was asked for. They said the public should not even be entertaining or discussing any proposal that goes beyond the 12-acre site that was the focus of Waterfront Toronto's RFP.
- The need for a City-wide conversation about what we want from technology first. Several felt that we should first decide if/how we want to use technology in our cities before entertaining this kind of proposal.
- Concern the project is more about monetization of data than providing a good experience or neighbourhood.

### Feedback about the Digital Innovations

#### **Where participants were receptive or needed more information**

- A few participants supported further exploring the proposed Digital Innovations, though they wanted more information before they could support what is being proposed. There was also a suggestion that Waterfront Toronto recognize that what is being proposed here is new (as opposed to saying that this proposal builds on what already exists).

#### **More information needed and/or conditions under which some were willing to further explore Digital Innovations:**

- Several participants said there are no conditions under which they would be willing to explore Digital Innovations as part of this proposal.
- More information is needed to understand the digital credential system. How would it work? What about people who don't have a smartphone?

- Resilience and interoperability must be key considerations. If any of these Digital Innovations are explored further, there needs to be more information about how the systems that driven them are resilient and interoperable (e.g. what happens if servers go down?)
- What would happen to heat generated by the servers collecting data? Can it be used to help achieve climate resiliency?

#### Feedback about digital governance and regulation

##### **Where participants were receptive to digital governance proposals**

- Some said this project represents an opportunity for Toronto and Canada to become world leaders on data privacy and digital governance, saying “if we don’t do this, someone else will.” Others disagreed with this perspective, saying that Quayside is happening too far ahead of legislation and that we should have a national conversation about data privacy and governance models in place before making a decision about Quayside.

##### **Participants said digital governance and regulations should:**

- Be flexible so that policy that can evolve as fast as technology does.
- Demonstrate a tangible commitment to citizens and their interests, by: going beyond “just principles,” being supported by digital literacy programs, and reflecting citizen-led governance initiatives
- Include incident management provisions to protect against fraud and breaches.
- Include strong enforcement and incident management mechanisms, including regulators have the power to enforce regulations.

#### Feedback about data collection and privacy

##### **Where people were receptive**

- A few were receptive to data collection being considered in Quayside, saying that lots of data is already being collected about people in public space.

##### **Concerns about data collection and privacy**

- The idea that Google could have access to data collected in Quayside
- The lack of clarity about what that data is collected for, and possibility that people would have to opt-out rather than opt-in to data collection.
- Google’s poor track record with data collection, and its business model is based on “hyper-surveillance,” and lack of trust in Google.
- If we don’t have control of our own data, we might lose our ability to make decisions for ourselves — a concern that gets at the heart of our freedom.

##### **Conditions participants said would make them feel more comfortable with data collection:**

- Data collection must be opt-in rather than opt-out.
- Data collection is done by a government or public agency rather than a private, foreign corporation
- Data collection is done by multiple actors across a range of services rather than by a single actor.
- Data is part of a public commons that many people / companies can participate in.
- Only environmental data is collected, (i.e. no personal data), though others were skeptical that a smart city could exist without personal data.
- All data collected is stored in Canada and the US government does not have access to that data.
- People do not have to sign an “unlimited license agreement” that grants data collectors a range of uses for that data.

### Feedback about the urban data trust

#### **Where participants need more information**

- How would the Urban Data Trust be funded?
- Would the Trust have a monopoly over data in public spaces?
- How does the proposed Trust model compare to others around the world (e.g. Barcelona), up-to-date academic research, and best practices?

#### **Conditions under which some participants would be receptive to pursuing the Urban Data Trust**

- One participant said they would be receptive to exploring an Urban Data Trust if it was a co-operative.

### Feedback about Intellectual Property

#### **Participants concerns about Intellectual Property**

- Several said the government should not be collecting revenue from data collection at all.

#### **Conditions under which some would be willing to further explore Intellectual Property proposals**

- There are assurances that the money collected would be reinvested into Toronto's waterfront and harbor.
- Public agencies receive more than 10% of profits over a longer timeframe than 10 years (one person suggested 50 years). There was also a suggestion that public agencies receive the profits generated by the data collected rather than from the sale of the technology itself (since the real value is in the data).

### Feedback about Waterfront Toronto's evaluation and decision-making

#### **Concerns about evaluation and decision-making**

- Several participants were unwilling to engage in the discussion about Quayside, saying the proposal represents too much of an over-reach and we should not even be considering it.

#### **Conditions under which some participants would be willing to further consider the project**

- Waterfront Toronto re-visit the assumption that innovation is good. We should question whether the technologies being proposed are actually good and/or help us solve urban challenges.
- Waterfront Toronto reaches beyond subject matter experts in the evaluation process, since subject matter experts tend to give the same, supportive answers that we always hear.
- Waterfront Toronto considers "harms" instead of risks. Rather than evaluate potential risks, Waterfront Toronto should look at what types of harms innovation/technology would bring. For example, this project could lead to the development of artificial intelligence that could have impacts far beyond the urban realm. We could be supporting that development of technology that could lead to broader societal harms.
- Waterfront Toronto puts an exit strategy in place, especially since Alphabet has abandoned its technologies in other places.

## **Feedback from the Closing Plenary**

The following feedback was shared in the Closing Plenary. Responses, where provided, are noted *in italics*.

### Concerns about health impacts

- Concern about electro-magnetic fields and radiation damage. Many scientists around the world are saying that these sorts of technologies are bad for human health, especially children. The following article was referenced and shared at the meeting:  
<https://emfscientist.org/index.php/emf-scientist-appeal>

### Concerns about technology

- Concern that technology is not being acknowledge as about more than just sharing information; it's about developing artificial intelligence. Don't frame this project as only about data in cities. Instead of looking at risks, consider harms. Concern that focusing on innovation can make us worse off, not better off.
- Suggestions that Sidewalk Labs should be in a consultant role as opposed to being in control of any technologies.

### Affordable housing suggestion

- Suggestion that the community that lives in Quayside should be reflective of the population of the City, where the median income is \$65,000 a year and 20% of the population is low income. At least 20% of the housing in Quayside should be deeply affordable, and not more than 1% of the housing should only be affordable to the top 1% earners in the population.

### Process concerns and suggestions

- Concern about the process to date, including the RFP process that led to the selection of Sidewalk Labs.
- Suggestion that digital governance and intellectual property topics should be integrated in the others breakout session discussions (rather than separated out). *The Waterfront Toronto and Swerhun team thought about many different ways of organizing the content for this first round of consultation and settled on organizing it into the topics in a way that matches the MIDP to help orient people to it through Waterfront Toronto's lens. It was a difficult decision and something the team will consider for the second round of consultation.*
- Suggestion that participants be asked whether they are in favour of the proposal (and how they would like to see it modified at all) OR whether they are against the proposal (and what they would like to see considered in another, different project focused on digital city ideas)
- Suggestion for the consultation process to be meaningful, not perfunctory and dismissive (like in the Queens Quay design).
- If negotiating with Sidewalk Labs, we should be "un-Canadian" and have an aggressive ask to help with our urban challenges, like affordable housing.

### Need to remember that Harbourfront is a unique community

- Suggestion that the proposal should more explicitly reference the fact that this is Toronto's Harbourfront — a unique interface between Toronto and the rest of the world.
- Concern that the proposal does not include adequate provisions for a livable community, such as playgrounds. There is currently only one playground on the waterfront between Bathurst and Sherbourne.

### Appeal for beauty

- Suggestion for more consideration of beauty, both in the proposal and in Waterfront Toronto's evaluation. "I'm angrily, cautiously, supportive of the project – but not without beauty."

### Some tentative support for the project

- Some tentative support for project: "if you think you'll get different results from the same approach, you're crazy."

- Receptiveness to the proposal, saying it's a good opportunity for Toronto as long as many of the concerns being raised are addressed.

#### Concern about humans as research subjects

- Suggestion to expand the discussion about data protection to include human research subject protection since, if Sidewalk Labs' proposal is accepted, Torontonians will effectively become their research subjects. For example, Pokémon Go was used to research people's movements and influence their economic decisions.

#### Concern about public costs, lack of trust in the private partner and the process

- Concern that many of the innovations proposed are going to cost a lot of money and that the public would ultimately foot the bill for these innovations.
- Strong concern about Google / Sidewalk Labs as a partner: "I don't trust the process and I don't trust the company." We cannot give our governance over to a private company.



## GEORGE BROWN FEEDBACK SUMMARY

### About this Feedback Summary

On Saturday, July 20, 2019, Waterfront Toronto held the third of four public meetings to begin the process of reviewing and seeking feedback on the Draft Master Innovation and Development Plan (MIDP) submitted by Sidewalk Labs on June 17, 2019. Approximately 150 people participated. This meeting report summarizes the feedback they shared. A video recording of this meeting is available on the Waterfront Toronto YouTube channel.

The meeting was 3 hours in length, including about 30 minutes for an overview briefing, about 1.5 hours for four concurrent breakout room discussions (including 15-20 minute more detailed presentations by Waterfront Toronto in each room), and a one hour closing plenary that included reports from each breakout room and a full-room discussion. The four breakout rooms focused on each volume of the Draft MIDP (Volume 1: The Plans, Volume 2: The Urban Innovations, and Volume 3: The Partnership) with a separate room for Digital Innovation, Digital Governance, and intellectual property. Each breakout room had between 3 and 4 smaller table discussions, and each table had a representative from Waterfront Toronto and one facilitator.

This summary was written by the facilitation team from Swerhun Inc., the firm retained by Waterfront Toronto to support its Quayside public consultation process. Swerhun works exclusively for governments, public agencies, and non-profits working to support public policy. The Swerhun team's role is not to advocate for any particular project outcome, but rather to support the delivery of transparent, constructive, and meaningful consultation processes.

The intent of the summary is to reflect the feedback shared at the meeting. There are references to "few", "some", and "many" participants expressing a certain point of view, but it's important to note that not all participants were asked to confirm whether they did (or did not) agree with any particular point raised by the other participants. As a result, this summary is necessarily qualitative in nature.

**NOTE:**        **The intent of this summary is not to assess the merit or accuracy of the feedback shared at this meeting, nor does the documentation of this feedback indicate an endorsement of any of these perspectives on the part of Waterfront Toronto.**

A draft of this summary was distributed to all participants for their review before it was finalized.

## About the Round One Public Consultation Process

This first round of consultation focused on orienting the public to the Draft MIDP from the perspective of Waterfront Toronto as a public steward working with the support of all three levels of government to revitalize the waterfront. To support the process of seeking public feedback, Waterfront Toronto shared the following materials:

- An *Open Letter* from Board Chair Stephen Diamond outlining Waterfront Toronto's responsibilities, confirming that Waterfront Toronto did not co-create the MIDP, acknowledging some exciting ideas and identifying early examples of concerns;
- A *Note to Reader* prepared by Waterfront Toronto based on its initial, high level review of the MIDP that provides a synthesis of what Waterfront Toronto asked for from its Innovation and Funding Partner, the response from Sidewalk Labs, where and how the Draft MIDP aligns with existing practices and what's new, where the privatization of public assets is being proposed (if at all), and financial impacts and risks.
- Waterfront Toronto's Draft Digital Principles; and
- A *Discussion Guide* providing an overview of the public consultation process.

All these materials and presentations are available at [www.QuaysideTO.ca](http://www.QuaysideTO.ca).

The public meetings were only one of several ways that the public could provide feedback during this first round of consultation. Other options included an online consultation ([www.QuaysideTO.ca](http://www.QuaysideTO.ca)), sending emails directly to [quayside@waterfrontontario.ca](mailto:quayside@waterfrontontario.ca), talking to Waterfront Toronto staff at one of seven drop-in sessions held in partnership with the Toronto Public Library, or completing a hard copy of feedback forms. A video recording of the third public meeting (held on Saturday, July 20, 2019) is available on the [Waterfront Toronto YouTube channel](#).

## Overall themes in feedback received

Participants expressed a range of perspectives on the Draft MIDP, with some supportive comments, many concerns raised, and a heavy focus on putting Waterfront Toronto in a strong position to defensibly and critically evaluate the proposed Draft MIDP from Sidewalk Labs on terms that work for Toronto. The overall themes are reflected below, followed by more detail (see Attachment) from each of the four breakout rooms and the closing plenary.

### Themes that emerged from comments on the process

- **Many people emphasized the importance of reviewing the proposal from a position of strength given the great value of this public asset.** That includes requesting that Sidewalk Labs demonstrate if/how the RFP objectives can be met at Quayside, and if not, explain why not. This would also help the public understand the intentions behind the IDEA District.
- **Waterfront Toronto needs to support responsible public reflection.** It was flagged that most of what the public receives are polarizing commentators that are either fear-mongering or lending uncritical support. There were a number of suggestions for Waterfront Toronto to consider for the second round of public consultation, including: scoping back the discussion to what is reasonably feasible; structuring the discussion around Waterfront Toronto's

objectives (rather than Sidewalk Labs' proposal); completing a risk assessment (including where this has worked and where this has failed) along with analysis of the opportunity cost (e.g. recognize that "it's not Google or nothing", need to compare this proposal to what else could be done), and identify potential unintended consequences.

- **The document is difficult to get through.** Many said that a shorter, simplified version is required, while others said that more information is needed in key areas.
- **Appreciation for the consultation process and Waterfront Toronto's leadership.** This included appreciation for the 20 years that Waterfront Toronto has successfully coordinated the work of all three levels of government.

#### Themes that emerged from comments on the proposal

- **"There is huge potential, but also huge risk".** There was interest in the innovations, support for affordable housing, climate positivity, the opportunity to strengthen governance, etc. At the same time, there were many questions about how technology would work and whether innovation is always the answer. Potential harms need to be identified, along with analysis of potential issues if Quayside is insular and separate from the rest of Toronto.
- **Need to maintain public control.** Some said that the proposed governance structures lacked transparency, lay the foundation for the privatization of governance, and that much of what was suggested with the Public Administrator could be done by Waterfront Toronto.
- **Lack of trust in Alphabet (including its subsidiaries Google and Sidewalk Labs).** There were concerns about the overreach of the proposal and questions about the true objectives/ambitions of Sidewalk Labs – noting that they "act like bullies", are not accountable to any nation state, and concern that Google may "swallow up" smaller companies.
- **Interest in evaluating the merits of the proposal.** Others said that while there are many issues in the Draft MIDP, these should not stop the evaluation/reflection on the potential good that could come from it and that Waterfront Toronto needs to judge the project based on the merits of the proposal, not just the company itself.
- **Data governance needs to be strong and protect the public.** Many encouraged Waterfront Toronto to be a leader in creating a strong digital governance framework that: disincentivizes the stockpiling of data; ensures there are severe penalties for data breaches; creates clear conditions under which researchers could access data; and makes sure there are strategies to address indirect data collection. Waterfront Toronto was urged to avoid "boutique deals" on data governance with Sidewalk, but instead to work with the City to do something that applies across the whole city. It was suggested that the data trust be citizen-owned or user-owned, that it acts as an advocate, a protector for citizens and their data, and that it acts as a data fiduciary.

## Snapshots from the four breakout room discussions

### Volume 1: The Plans

- More information is needed and should be presented in an accessible way. A smaller and simplified version of the MIDP is needed to help the public and others properly navigate and evaluate the proposals and provide meaningful feedback; and there is a need for clarification on the roles and responsibilities of the various actors (i.e. Sidewalk Labs, Waterfront Toronto, and the City and other levels of government).
- While there are many issues in the Draft MIDP these should not automatically stop the evaluation and the potential good that could come from it.
- Trust in Waterfront Toronto and appreciation for the process. Support for the work being undertaken by Waterfront, including the consultation process. Maintaining good, transparent communication with the public will be very important.
- Interest in the innovations presented in the proposal. There is an opportunity for Toronto and the eastern part of the City to lead a globally scalable model that could serve as an economic development catalyst for the City.
- Support for affordable housing. Support for the proposed affordable housing with requests for additional information on the allocations and targets. Some concern that a tech headquarters and tech sector could result in gentrification and reduced affordability.
- Need more information about social infrastructure, especially implementation. Proposals related to social infrastructure do not provide enough information or a clear picture of what is being proposed and how it would be implemented and maintained. Proposals do not reflect the fact that other communities are waiting for social infrastructure (e.g. schools and clinics) and thus might not be as achievable as suggested.
- More information is needed on economic development. Need clarification on how Sidewalk Labs would deliver on what is included in the MIDP, including what they do and do not have the authority to implement.

### Volume 2: The Innovations

- While there is interest in the innovation, there is generally a need for more information before analysis can begin. Some participants, particularly at the Public Realm table, were interested in and excited by the proposed innovations. However, there were many questions about how the technology would work, and how far along in the process the project is.
- Concern about governance structures and transparency, and a desire to keep governance public. Participants felt that the proposed governance structures lacked transparency, and that the Quayside development has to be good for the city and managed by the City.
- Concern about the future of data use, and whether innovation is always the answer. Some participants were interested and concerned about the

future of technology use – technology and data is already so widespread, what are the ramifications when governance is trying to catch up to the innovation? Attention needs to be given to checks and balances, we need to question whether the highest tech solution is always the best.

- Desire to see Quayside be accessible and inclusive. Participants would like to ensure building and housing meets the needs of all individuals. One way of framing it is to use an 8-80 model; if a City is planned for an 8 year-old and an 80 year-old, then it's better for many people. Others challenged Waterfront Toronto to go beyond the minimum standards for accessibility to be truly inclusive and innovative.
- Issues of scalability and potential harms. Participants would like to understand the intentions behind the IDEA District and its feasibility. Wider conversations need to take place about what happens onsite, and the potential issues if Quayside is insular and separate from Toronto.

---

Supportive comments:

- Some interest in how the MIDP can benefit Toronto (e.g. housing, climate positivity, strengthening governance). “There is huge potential but also huge risk.”

Concerns:

- Questions about trust in Sidewalk Labs as a company, their true objectives/ambitions with Quayside, and the overreach in their proposal; concern the MIDP lays the foundation for the privatization of governance; concern that our regulatory framework for technology is not capable of accommodating this proposal; \$10 million Innovation Venture Fund “embarrassingly” low; Google may swallow up all the innovation and smaller companies; reticence about the need for another institute (Toronto has 5 already); concern that Waterfront Toronto is already a partner with Sidewalk Labs.

Range of perspectives on how to responsibly consider the Draft MIDP:

- Need to recognize that companies like Google, Microsoft, etc. are “bullies” and not accountable to any nation state. Need to understand where this has been done, where it has worked versus where it has failed.
- Sidewalk Labs has no right to do anything in the Port Lands, and just because they've proposed it doesn't mean there is an obligation to do it. We can start with 12 acres and when/if it works then maybe go bigger. Fairness and due process are required throughout.
- “It's a mistake to think that it's Google or nothing”. There are plenty of other possible options and partners for development. This needs to be compared with what else could have done with that area.
- Waterfront Toronto should do some kind of risk assessment or feasibility consideration prior to further public comment/consultations. Also an analysis is needed of the opportunity cost and long-term unintended consequences.
- Since Waterfront Toronto asked for an innovative proposal and Sidewalk Labs delivered one, the MIDP should be evaluated on its merit for what it is proposing. Waterfront Toronto needs to judge the project based on the merits of the proposal, not just the company itself.

**Volume 3:  
The  
Partnership**

How to support responsible public reflection:

- There's a need to explain how the Sidewalk Labs proposal is fundamentally different from past proposals to Waterfront Toronto, the risks associated with the project, and possible/realistic outcomes for them - to give the public an opportunity to have something to consider and judge (because most of what the public gets is polarizing commentators on either side with fear-mongering or uncritical support).
- As Waterfront Toronto moves forward, it is incumbent on them to inform the public what public funds have been invested in this land that has increased its , and Waterfront Toronto should consider the value of that investment when considering Sidewalk Labs' request to get that land at a discounted rate.

Conditions:

- Maintain public control; replace the profit-sharing model with a revenue-sharing model; prevent profits from being moved overseas after 10 years; consider lease of land (instead of sale) to protect for public lands needs in the future; need more clarity about the types of new jobs that the MIDP proposes to create; no data should leave the Canadian border.

**Digital  
Innovation,  
Governance  
and IP**

- More information needed to understand and/or provide feedback about digital innovations and governance: Participants wanted more information about the ubiquitous WiFi system, credential system, and structure / funding of the Urban Data Trust.
- Advice about digital governance framework, including: create a framework that disincentivizes stockpiling data; ensure there are severe penalties for data breaches; ensure there are clear conditions under which researchers could access data; ensure there are strategies to address indirect data collection.
- Need to see Toronto's assets properly valued in any Intellectual Property sharing partnership: including Toronto's reputation as a trusted place. Other advice around the Intellectual Property proposal included suggestions to increase the amount and duration of profit / revenue sharing agreements and to modify the patent pledge to allow Canadian companies to compete outside of Canada.
- Process advice: Desire to see Waterfront Toronto organize subsequent consultations around its RFP and objectives as opposed to Sidewalk Labs proposal.



## ATTACHMENT: Breakout room and plenary discussions





## Breakout room discussion on Volume 1: The Plans

There were approximately 25 participants from the public in this room who divided into four facilitated discussion groups, including two conversations about the Quayside and River District Plans; one conversation about social infrastructure; and one conversation about economic development. Participants included local residents and interested citizens, students, educators, representatives from local unions, and other professionals. Participants had a variety of interests and expertise including, urban planning, property development, carpentry, commercial law, and others.

### Feedback about the Plans

#### **Trust in Waterfront Toronto and appreciation for the process**

- Participants that identified as being familiar with Waterfront Toronto said the organization is both credible and capable with a proven track record.
- There was appreciation for the consultation process. Maintaining good communication with the public and a credible process will be very important even if the process is slow.

#### **Interest in the innovations presented in the proposal**

- Many participants felt that there is an opportunity for Toronto and the eastern part of the City to lead a globally scalable model that could serve as an economic development catalyst.
- The Urban Innovation Institute presents an opportunity for the east end of the City to be connected to Toronto's research sector.

#### **Issues in the proposal need to be dealt with diligently but should not automatically stop good opportunities**

- Waterfront Toronto established strong objectives and aspirations in their Request for Proposals. These objectives and aspirations should be used to examine and address issues identified in the proposals.

#### **More information is needed about the proposal and overall process**

- Participants want information and an assurance, with specific calculations, that the necessary infrastructure would be provided to maintain the proposed residential development (e.g. waste management, water and sewer, etc.).
- More technical terms being used need to be explained and clarified (e.g. districts, precincts, etc.)

#### **A more accessible version of the Master Innovation Development Plan (MIDP)**

- Participants would also like to have a simplified and smaller version of the MIDP to help them better understand what is being proposed. This would also help the public to provide informed feedback.
- There were suggestions to highlight the information that directly responds to information requested in the RFP and eliminate information from Sidewalk Labs that is outside the Quayside area.

#### **Clarification is needed on the roles and responsibilities of the various actors involved**

- Further clarification is needed about the specific roles of Waterfront Toronto and Sidewalk Labs, including what, if any, partnership currently exists between the two parties.
- There was a concern that Sidewalk Labs may attempt to use their corporate influence to "bully" Waterfront Toronto and/or the City into accepting their proposal.
- Additional information is needed on how the various levels of government and Waterfront Toronto will be working together.

### **Support for affordable housing and concerns about affordability**

- There was support for the proposed affordable housing with requests for additional information on the allocations and targets.
- There was a concern that the development of a technology headquarters and subsequent technology sector could result in gentrification and reduced affordability.
- A concern was raised that property speculation and foreign buyers could drive up property values. It was suggested that local residents should be given priority for the housing.

### **Support for community infrastructure**

- There was support for the proposed community infrastructure but disappointment that a high school is not being proposed for the area.

### **There needs to be a concerted effort to bring the public up to speed.**

- A concern was raised that Sidewalk Labs, Waterfront Toronto, and City Council are further along in their understanding of the process and the proposal. The public needs the opportunity to get up to speed to ensure everyone is on equal footing.

### **Conditions that should be achieved to move forward with the proposal**

- Affordable housing should be integrated with market housing, be located near good quality public space (include dog walking space) and accommodate growing families (2 to 3-bedroom units).
- A confirmed and guaranteed transit plan.
- Creation of a complete community with grocery stores.
- The planning be integrated with the City's Master Plans to ensure there is a long-term lens on development plans.
- Keep the 10% target of under-represented groups being hired for construction.
- Environmentally sensitive design that would not harm birds.

### **Other feedback related to the District Plans**

- The project should build more deliberately on Toronto's Indigenous history.
- The use of mass timber in construction could help to revitalize northern Ontario communities where lumber processing facilities have been closed.

## Economic Development

### **Clarifying what we mean by economic development, and understanding the risks**

- Is economic development about local economic activity in the Quayside district, or more broadly about economic development for the Toronto and national economies?
- We can't disentangle economic development from IP, data governance, privacy, and related issues (though understand why this approach was taken for the public consultation).
- Don't see this proposal as helping the Canadian tech sector.
- There is a basic "power asymmetry" with Google, which means there is a risk that what emerges is a closed ecosystem of Google products that blocks others; that limits opportunity for the local and Canadian tech sectors.
- Desire to better understand how the plan benefits the community, and local startups.

### **Cost to support Information Technology infrastructure**

- There was a concern raised that the implementation of the Information Technology infrastructure would place a financial burden on the City and the citizens of Toronto.

### **Governance and accountability for outcomes**

- How to ensure the partners - both Sidewalk Labs and third parties - actually deliver on their commitments? *Waterfront Toronto noted they have experience structuring contracts for this.*
- With the original RFP, why was it only for the 12-acre Quayside site? Would Waterfront Toronto retain ownership of the 12 acres of land?

### **Mobility capacity to enable economic development outcomes**

- Worry about transit connectivity to the site, whether it can accommodate the level of density - and concern that the Draft MIDP calls for LRT but not higher order transit (noting that the Great Gulf East Harbour development will get Smart Track).

### **What does economic development success look like, and who sets the objectives?**

- Confusion around motivations and objectives. Is Sidewalk Labs seeking a replicable economic model it can take globally, and if so, how does that align with Waterfront Toronto's focus on local jobs, growth, affordability, waterfront development objectives, etc.? With these divergent motivations, who's really going to lead this project?

## Social Infrastructure

### **Concerns around costs and financing**

- Don't feel the tax increment financing for new social infrastructure is an adequate plan.
- Concerns about ongoing operational financing, especially of replacing obsolete technology—social infrastructure space does not bring in much revenue.
- Concern around a private developer becoming involved in the development of public services infrastructure—could this lead to a spike in public capital costs?

### **Process concerns**

- The format of the MIDP is too vague, it's repetitive and not clear enough; it should be shorter and easier for the reader to understand.
- Sidewalk Labs commitment to the Waterfront Toronto Employment Initiative is unclear and more information is needed.

### **Questions/Need more information**

- The Care Collective proposal too vague. Is Sidewalk Labs proposing to become a deliverer of health services? If so, have they confirmed this possibility with the Ministry of Health?
- Would the social infrastructure be built to the specifications of the end user? For example, healthcare infrastructure is custom space and specific in what it needs to include.
- Concern regarding the equity of the development plan. Would the IDEA District receive a school faster than West Don Lands, which has been waiting for years?
- Concern regarding the modification of regulations (building codes). Exactly what modifications or exemptions would be requested? Would this set a precedent for other private developers to challenge legislation?

### **Conditions**

- Need more clarity about how Sidewalk Labs would do their needs assessment for the social infrastructure they propose (i.e. How would they decide which services and programming to provide and not replicate existing services?)
- Could Waterfront Toronto demand that Sidewalk Labs front-end the building of social infrastructure (i.e. prove it would follow up on its promises)?
- Waterfront Toronto needs to show that it is informed by the learnings from the development of the St. Lawrence Market.
- Need more clarity about how the new development would link into existing transit and social infrastructure – “it's important that this not be an island”.

### **Community and social services that should be integrated into the proposal**

- A big outdoor pool on the waterfront
- Services for teens (very important, there are very few things for teens to do in the waterfront area now)
- Supports for newcomers
- Services and supports for new parents (existing services are oversubscribed)

### **Other thoughts/suggestions**

- Sidewalk Labs is deceptive in implying it can make a school and a clinic happen when so many other communities are waiting in line for this kind of social infrastructure.
- Sidewalk Labs should be aware that new social infrastructure facilities are a city-wide draw. When the Regent Park Aquatic Centre opened, people would come from across the city. Planning should include this uptick in traffic and service access.
- Sidewalk Labs should figure out a way to break the Lake Shore/Gardiner barrier—that's our biggest challenge.
- The MIDP promises things that a private corporation is not in a position to deliver.

## **Breakout Room Discussion on Volume 2 – The Innovations**

There were approximately 41 participants from the public in this room who divided into four facilitated discussion groups, including one conversation about mobility; one conversation about sustainability; one conversation about public realm; and one conversation about building and housing. Participants included local residents and interested citizens, students, educators, timber consultants, and other professionals. Participants had a variety of interests and expertise including urban planning, AODA standards, affordable housing, sustainability, and more.

### Overall comments

#### **While there is interest in the innovation, there is generally a need for more information before analysis can begin**

- Some participants, particularly at the Public Realm table, were interested in and excited by the proposed innovations. However, there were many questions about how the technology would work, and how far along in the process the project is. Participants ask that there be more clarity moving forward.

#### **Concern about governance structures and transparency, and a desire to keep governance in the City**

- Participants felt that the proposed governance structures lacked transparency, and that the Quayside development has to be good for the City and should be operated by the City – just like the rest of the waterfront. In particular, questions regarding the Waterfront Transportation Management Association (WTMA) came up, and other operations and maintenance concerns regarding the public realm innovations.

#### **Concern about the future of data use, and whether innovation is always the answer**

- Some participants were interested and concerned about the future of technology use, and that considering technology and data is already so widespread, what the ramifications are for City's where governance is trying to catch up to the innovation.
- One participant would like to see attention given to checks and balances, and asked whether the highest tech solution is always the best solution.

### **Desire to see Quayside be accessible and inclusive**

- Participants would like there to be consideration with buildings and housing to ensure that it meets the needs of all individuals. One participant suggested using an 8-80 model, the idea that if a City is planned for an 8 year-old and an 80 year-old, then it's good for all people.
- Others would like to challenge Waterfront Toronto to go beyond the minimum standards for accessibility and AODA compliance, in order to be truly inclusive and innovative.

### **Need to ensure Quayside is integrated into the broader area**

- Participants would like to understand the intentions behind the proposal for the area beyond Quayside. Wider conversations need to take place about what happens onsite, and the potential issues if it is insular and separate from Toronto.

## Public Realm

### **Where people were comfortable/supportive**

- Some liked the innovations that were being proposed, but felt like they didn't have enough information to fully understand how they would operate. For example, participants wanted to know more about the reservation tool, who would run it, who would have access to it, and whether it would prevent people from having access. Some wanted more information to understand how the "stoa" would be managed, and how the physical spaces would change.
- Some expressed that they liked the flexible outdoor space, but had concern about how it would work in the winter months. Participants specifically liked the flexible outdoor space and heated pavement, as they thought that was very relevant for the location. However, they wanted more information on whether the City's maintenance approach would need to change in the winter.
- Participants wanted to know what the mechanisms would be to expand beyond the 12 acres of Quayside. Waterfront Toronto staff explained that while it owns much of the Quayside lands (approx. 10.5 acres), the lands beyond Quayside that Sidewalk Labs want to expand on are owned primarily by the City, and that any decision would be up to the City and subject to the City's process for the disposition of land. If any part of the MIDP does go through to implementation, Sidewalk Labs would need to go through the development approval process with the City.

### **Where people are less comfortable/concerned**

- There was some concern with Sidewalk Labs' proposal for parks and open spaces being governed by a new organization, the Open Space Alliance. Participants felt that the public spaces should remain public and in the ownership of the City, not by a group that would lead to the privatization and control of people in these spaces. Some participants felt that there was a funding gap, and that it isn't clear enough about how the Open Space Alliance would be funded or operated.
- Participants want more information on the governance model for the innovations being proposed for the Public Realm. There is a general need for more information about the funding and operations model for Quayside. Some participants are concerned with who would take physical control of spaces, manage, and operate them.
- There was a question on how Bill 108 would impact the funding of these spaces.

### **The group also brought up points beyond the public realm**

- There was concern over the lack of childcare and schools being proposed for the area.
- There was concern with healthcare and healthcare services: some felt that this wasn't specific enough in the MIDP and wanted more information / more emphasis on different types of healthcare services for the area

- If there is a proposal to reduce the need for private cars, and if that means closing off some roads to cars in the future, there was a concern about how this would need to be communicated with the public (for example, this person felt that there was a lack of communication with the King Street pilot and didn't want something like that to repeat itself at Quayside).
- Some wanted to know more about the Urban Innovation Institute, how the land would be developed, how that site would be used to study public life and if there would be any monitoring/data collecting program?

## Sustainability

### **Where people were comfortable/supportive**

- Positive reception to some innovations, and a desire to focus on a greater scale. Participants liked the green infrastructure and storm water management, and suggested more focus be given to green roofs and urban agriculture as it has mental health and community benefits. In general, participants think that the plan needs to think more holistically and go beyond minimum requirements.

### **Where people are less comfortable/concerned**

- Participants thought that the definition and scope of sustainability is unclear in this context. In relation to Quayside, the focus seems to be on technical and digital innovations, whereas true sustainability is much more complex than technological innovation. Some participants would like more clarity on the focus, whether it be ecological, social or financial sustainability. One participant said that natural systems and solutions should be explored, and that the high tech solution isn't always the best solution. Another person asked what would happen if the operators shut down, and that an overreliance of tech can be dangerous. Participants suggested that the project needs to consider the long-term impact.
- Risk of sustainable technologies and augmented behaviour. Participants felt that more consideration needs to be given to the risk vs harm factors. The way that "risks" are framed seems to put it too lightly for some, and they felt that it can be problematic to frame the conversation that way. Participants would like vigilant attention given to the review of these technologies.
- Participants had questions about the sustainability of timber construction. In general, they felt that more clarity was needed on the metrics being used, and where the lumber is sourced. Other questions included whether timber construction contradicts the need for trees and reforestation, what that replacement strategy is, and, if lumber needs to be treated with chemicals, which chemicals are being used. Participants were also curious about fire risk with timber construction.
- More information and clarity is required on the existing and proposed flood protection measures. Participants felt the current plans should be included in the in the sustainability presentation, and that lake level rising and flooding is an issue that hasn't been fully addressed.
- Interest to see more attention given to the greater community. Participants would like to see the Quayside proposal and sustainability initiatives go beyond just the test site to help local neighbourhoods, the City, and the Greater Toronto Area at-large.
- More clarity is needed regarding where the project is in the process. Participants asked what decisions have been made so far, and if there have been any commitments made to the various technologies.

## Mobility

### Broad Themes

- There were mixed feelings about implementing new technologies. While there was excitement and interest in the opportunities that technologies offered, concerns remain about the functionality and safety of the proposed mobility-related technologies. One participant felt that the possibilities were interesting and frightening at the same time, and wondered how much of the innovation was just repackaging of technologies that already exist. In general, participants needed more clarity about the privacy risks and one person suggested that the project look to Berlin, Germany for advice as they have strict rules around security privacy while still being a tech centre.
- There was debate about the governance and regulatory oversight of Quayside's proposed technologies as well as new technologies like autonomous vehicles rolling out throughout the city generally. Given how fast technology evolves and how much data is already made public, there was a discussion about how oversight can keep up with the pace and the extent to which there are potential harms in adopting innovative tech quickly and broadly.
- The role of Sidewalk Labs was a topic of interest and a source of distrust for some. People wanted to know more explicitly about both Sidewalk Labs' and Google's interests, level of influence on decisions, and whether other non-Google related vendors would be involved in the potential delivery of the proposed plan.
- People generally wanted more information. There was interest in understanding how mobility-related technologies work, the benefits and costs of new technologies as well as the LRT, and how the proposals on the Quayside site would impact the rest of the city. Participants were curious about how curbless streets would move, what the idea of curb pricing is, and if there has been thought given to the safety of this technology.

### Where people are less comfortable/concerned

- Participants advocated for the implementation of LRT, but were concerned by the process, how it would be paid for and its cost to residents. One participant noted that there have been a lot people who have been advocating for the LRT for a while. The participant said it is problematic that it takes Sidewalk Labs to put that conversation on the map. Participants also wanted more clarity on the costs and nature of the proposed LRT, and one participant felt that Sidewalk Labs' claim around the amount people would save in transportation costs doesn't align with how much the participant currently spends on transit.
- There was lengthy debate on the risks, concerns and fears of potential harm from innovation. One participant said that people already know what technology is capable of, and how intensive it will become. They said they don't want to support the concept of building cities in a way where technology feeds into machines and their evolution, and another participant expressed concern about the repercussions that could come from funding autonomous machines.
- Discussion about Sidewalk Labs' use of data capturing and privacy concerns. There was a discussion about whether Google would be stealing data through the proposed plan and a participant would like it to be clear what their relationships are to everyone involved and who would be making a profit. Regarding privacy, one participant noted that we already give a lot of data away, and that while it may not be a good thing, it's already underway so it needs to be a conversation about how to regulate it.
- Concerns for managing oversight of a fast-moving developments. There was general agreement that while oversight and regulations to address today's situation are needed, technology moves very fast, so there's a need to review the oversight and regulations regularly.



### **Conditions under which participants may be willing to further consider the proposal**

- Requests for clarity and further discussions around accommodating cars in Quayside and along the waterfront, and concern about off-site parking. Participants wanted clarity on the parking spots in Quayside, and its intentions to be carless. One participant was concerned about how residents would access off-site parking. Another participant noted that there are already precedents for more pedestrian-oriented neighbourhoods, such as Kensington Market.
- Discussion around autonomous vehicles (AVs) and the impact Quayside may have in rolling out AVs in the City. Waterfront Toronto clarified that Sidewalk Labs is not proposing an AV only community but rather that the design of the street infrastructure would be able to adapt to accommodate AV technology in the future. Participants wondered how this infrastructure would tie into other parts of the City.
- Spread out the power structure to multiple vendors. One participant asked whether Sidewalk Labs will open up their vendor list to other companies not affiliated with Alphabet. They noted that they're not against the proposal, but a condition should be that the power be distributed.
- Need for technology to be a broader discussion in the consultation process. There's a need to discuss the broader framework of technology and innovation. Breaking up the discussion on technology into separate topics makes it hard to talk about the overarching technology and innovation framework. One participant noted that while Sidewalk Labs seems to be saying that this proposal is not about Google, it is jarring that the Canadian Google Headquarters is proposed to be developed in the district. That creates distrust and SWL needs to be more transparent.

### **Other**

- Concerns about the quality of proposed buildings and mitigating environmental impact. One participant wanted to know whether the buildings were airtight or windows were able to open. They mentioned that while technological innovation is interesting, there is potential harm if the natural environment isn't considered, because it has a way of prevailing.

### **Building & Housing**

#### **Where people are less comfortable/concerned**

- Participants wanted more information about the mix of unit sizes proposed, and were concerned that the size would not be accessible. Waterfront Toronto staff responded that studios would make up 20%, one bedrooms 38%, two bedrooms 28%, three bedrooms 11%, and four bedroom+ 3%, and that size varies. There was concern that people who have mobility needs may not be able to live in these units due to size. Participants recommended advocating for accessible units that go above code.
- Desire for clearer information, particularly in terms of language used and numbers proposed. A participant requested clarity around what the numbers in the MIDP actually meant. Another participant expressed concern about the language used in the MIDP to describe specific entities, stating that it felt like imposing language and was unnecessary.

### **Conditions under which participants may be willing to further consider the proposal**

- Desire to see schools considered in the Quayside plans. One participant felt that schools have been missing from other large-scale developments in the City, such as Queen East. Waterfront Toronto staff responded that there is a potential school site, with more information in Volume 1 of the MIDP.
- Recommendation that transitional housing be included in the proposal. A participant said that offering people leaving institutions or jails short term housing options that can lead to longer term housing is important.

- Interest in life-long learning and social programs. Participants expressed interest in Sidewalk Labs' providing economic development and programs for people in affordable housing to give them additional opportunities.
- Desire to see explicit plans for inclusivity in the development and consultation occur. A participant would like there to be specific action for inclusivity in Quayside, and asked at what stage in the proposals people would be consulted on accessibility. Many people, those with special needs, or who live in a group home, may not have a place in this development. As an innovation hub, it is recommended that the project go above and beyond AODA standards.
- Solutions to ensure that buildings are good for infants to seniors. Apply an 8-80 age model, there was a discussion about "complete communities" and how having community amenities in walking distance, such as daycares and seniors facilities, makes buildings more accessible. The notion of co-sharing is another tool that is good for seniors and supports students, and communal kitchens is another idea for creating a sense of community.
- Clarifying questions regarding the timber industry. A participant asked whether the carpenters' union would be consulted by Sidewalk Labs, and another asked how companies in the timber industry would become involved with the project.
- Interest in exploring renewable energy cooperatives. One person recommended that renewable energy cooperatives be explored, where the coop owns the energy system and may generate enough money to contribute back to the grid and make money.

#### **Other**

- Process concern. One participant expressed concern regarding the process, and didn't like that Waterfront Toronto staff were at the tables instead of Sidewalk Labs. They wanted Sidewalk Labs to address questions directly.

## **Breakout Room Discussion on Volume 3: The Partnership**

There were about 25 participants from the public in this room who divided into four facilitated discussions groups. The make-up of the room was diverse, and those participating demonstrated a strong grasp of several relevant subject areas, including (but not limited to) interested residents, development, corporate finance, economics, technology, governance, engineering, urban planning, and finance. The quality of engagement was very high and there was great depth of knowledge and critical discussion.

The overall tone of the discussion was concern and caution, with a focus on the conditions under which some could be comfortable moving forward. There were a few participants who expressed some support for the innovativeness of the proposal and openness to treating it as a pilot project for Quayside only. Some said that they had not decided if they agreed or disagreed with the MIDP.

What people supported/were comfortable with

#### **There's huge potential and huge risk**

- This project is incredibly complex. It's a fantastic opportunity for Toronto – with huge potential but also huge risk.
- Some interest in how the MIDP can benefit Toronto (e.g. housing, climate positivity).
- Some felt the MIDP provided an opportunity to strengthen our public institutions around governance and processes.
- One person expressed support for Sidewalk Labs' choice to expand the scope of the proposal beyond Quayside to include Villiers West, but was far more reticent about the

scope of the development proposal expanding beyond those two sites (this same person stated that although Sidewalk Labs overreached in their proposal, he appreciated that it demonstrated innovation and that Sidewalk Labs are committed to public engagement and discussion regarding the ideas contained in the proposal).

### **On Waterfront Toronto**

- Waterfront Toronto is a respected organization and they are doing a great job by consulting the public.

Where people are less comfortable/concerned

### **Lack of trust in Sidewalk Labs**

- Concern and “real questions about trust” related to who Sidewalk Labs is as a company and their true objectives/ambitions with the Quayside project – Sidewalk Labs appears to be opaque and more information about the company needs to be provided to the public. Specifically, that they are young, a tech company and have been rejected by other cities. The phrase “Who are they and why should we trust them” was used.
- Criticism of the Sidewalk Labs proposal being too technical and concern that the company is using this to mask something.
- Concern that Sidewalk Labs had over-reached in the cost and scope of their proposal, and that the proposal seems like a “bait and switch” tactic. It was questioned whether there were enough good points in the proposal to justify moving forward given how broadly it had expanded beyond the initial scope of the RFP.

### **Concern about privatization of governance**

- There were questions and concern about why there is a need to have a different governance model for this particular project.
- Significant concern that the governance partnership proposed in the MIDP (i.e. through the use of entities like the Public Administrator) lays the foundation for the privatization of governance. “We need to resist the privatization of regular urban service.” Other participants acknowledged and shared this concern.
- Questions about the Public Administrator and whether that was or could be Waterfront Toronto. Comments that how it differs from existing entities was unclear and much more clarity was needed, specifically about how it would work (and work differently), accountability and how average citizens would be able to access it and inform it.
- There was a concern that the MIDP proposes a “4th order of government.” However, there was comment that this might have been proposed to go around the existing regulatory systems of the City of Toronto which are too slow and have too much bureaucracy to get anything done.

### **Our regulatory framework isn’t capable of managing this**

- Our regulatory framework for technology (and disruptive technologies) is primitive and not capable of accommodating this proposal. Artificial Intelligence standards don’t exist and the 3 levels of government aren’t in a position to regulate Artificial Intelligence (AI) yet. In May at the Open Government Summit in Ottawa, the Ministry of Natural Resources talked about the farmer who purchases a “smart” John Deere tractor not knowing that all the data it collects goes south of the boarder for data mining.

### **Profit sharing concerns**

- Concern about “profit sharing” with a corporate entity like Google (e.g. profits could be moved offshore after 10 years and no tax would be paid) because “corporate responsibility is usually minimal” when it comes transparent profit sharing.

- There was criticism that Sidewalk Labs was proposing a profit-sharing model, and it was strongly asserted that a revenue-sharing model would be in the better interest of the public.
- Criticism that the Innovation Venture Fund being proposed was only \$10 million (considered “embarrassingly” low).

### **Concern about Google HQ swallowing up innovation and smaller companies**

- Question around if Google HQ being in the IDEA district would mean that the economy of the area would be dependent of Google HQ. Reference provided of university towns or manufacturing towns. Concern that Google may swallow up all the innovation and smaller companies would have no chance.
- There was the concern of Sidewalk Labs having a consulting role for the full IDEA District, which some members at the table thought gave Sidewalk Labs too much oversight and control at the expense of possible competitors.

### **Reticence about the need for another institute**

- “There are already five urban institutes in Toronto, one of which is claims to be the largest in Canada.” The institute being referred to in the comment was MaRS, which prompted some disagreement from the other members of the table who observed that MaRS is involved in other areas beyond urban innovation

### **Concern about process**

- Some concern that it sounded like Waterfront Toronto was already a partner with Sidewalk Labs.
- The timelines for the project may not be realistic.

### Conditions/Considerations

### **Waterfront Toronto needs to recognize that companies like Google, Microsoft, etc. are “bullies” and not accountable to any nation state**

- Until Waterfront Toronto demonstrates that they understand that, they won’t earn the trust of the public. Waterfront Toronto needs to push back and require Sidewalk Labs to provide use cases (e.g. San Jose regulatory framework for 5G).
- There are “economic zones” in China. It’s possible that Sidewalk Labs is using the IDEA District to “shell” itself from regulations and “try to get away with things.”
- Where has this been done, where it has been done properly versus where it has failed? We need to know this to help inform our decision-making.
- The MIDP proposes innovation which therefore means there would be a lot of risk. No data should leave the Canadian border.

### **Just because Sidewalk Labs proposed something, doesn’t mean we’re obliged to do it**

- “I don’t know any developers in Toronto that aren’t bullies. Sidewalk Labs has no right to do anything on the Port Lands, and just because they’ve proposed it doesn’t mean we’re obliged to do it. We can start with 12 acres, then, when/if it works, we could maybe go bigger. And throughout all this we need fairness and due process, especially on how to table things like data. It may not be a bad business deal – I hope Waterfront Toronto can maintain the spirit of Stephen Diamond’s letter and continue to consult the public. I worry that people are making decisions too quickly.”
- “It’s a mistake to think that it’s Google or nothing”. There are plenty of other possible options and partners for development.
- Since Waterfront Toronto asked for an innovative proposed and Sidewalk Labs delivered one and so the MIDP should be evaluated on its merit for what it is proposing.

### **A lot of what Sidewalk Labs proposes are things that Waterfront Toronto could be doing**

- “I’m happy with Waterfront Toronto. It has been a godsend to institutionalize the partnership between the 3 levels of government over the last 20 years. I would need to be persuaded that a private corporation has a role in what Waterfront Toronto does.”
- “I would consider the concept of the IDEA district, provided that the decisions need to be under the governance of the current governmental structures (3 levels) and if any new entity is proposed, Waterfront Toronto is the lead for it since Waterfront Toronto already has a system in place for governance from previous transactions. Alternatively, if the idea of a new Public Administrator is on the table, we need to have the upmost detail about how it would work.”

### **Maintain public control**

- Waterfront Toronto should retain control of the land and future implementation agreements. Support for Stephen Diamond’s assertion in the open letter that Waterfront Toronto should lead a competitive public procurement process. Sidewalk Labs should not be sole sourced as the development partner.
- Governance and regular urban services should not be privatized (referring to the entities being proposed that would fall under the purview of the Public Administrator).

### **Approach to ensuring a fair financial return for Toronto**

- The profit-sharing model should be replaced with a revenue-sharing model.
- We need to get the legal agreements right when it comes to profit sharing to avoid things like profits being moved overseas after 10 years.
- If the project does not proceed, would Google HQ still move to this area? Waterfront Toronto should consider what its objective is and how innovative they want to be and work from there.
- Who buys the land/how does that process work? Waterfront Toronto should consider the windfall profits of that purchase and make sure to consider that when considering the public interest, such as some of that windfall being reinvested in Waterfront Toronto (e.g. King and Yonge).

### **Need analysis of opportunity cost and long-term unintended consequences**

- It’s important to map out longer-term unintended consequences of the MIDP. What would help is incremental breakdown of what the MIDP proposes. We need to compare this with what else we could have done with that area.

### **Need more information on jobs**

- More clarity about the exactly the types of new jobs that the MIDP proposes to create.

### **Waterfront Toronto’s process for Quayside**

- Some described the process as “troubling”, voicing concern about why Waterfront Toronto chose to proceed with public consultations when they hadn’t done a proper risk assessment – they are asking the public to take time commenting on something that may not even be feasible or realistic. It was suggested that Waterfront Toronto do some kind of risk assessment or feasibility consideration prior to further public comment/consultations.
- Concern that Waterfront Toronto is only presenting one concept instead of several to the public. It was suggested that Waterfront Toronto should have asked for three proposals with three different concepts and/or levels of innovation that they could have consulted the public on; concern that the “tail is wagging the dog” and if this fails, everyone has to start again.
- Waterfront Toronto needs to judge the project based on the merits of the proposal, not just the company itself.

## Public Education

- One person voiced a strong desire to see more public education related to the Quayside project, stating that there was a need to explain to the public how this proposal and process (primarily the former) were different from prior projects. Advice included providing:
  - a 1-pager outlining how the Sidewalk Labs proposal is fundamentally different from past proposals Waterfront Toronto has worked with; and
  - an outline of the risks associated with the project and possible/realistic outcomes for them, to give the public an opportunity to have something to consider and judge because most of what the public gets is polarizing commentators on either side with fear-mongering or uncritical support of the project.
- Advice that Waterfront Toronto simplify the whole review process by giving the public a sequence of decision-making timelines or a timetable of the entire review process, including government approvals, not just Waterfront Toronto's review and approvals process – this would simplify the public debate.
- As Waterfront Toronto moves forward, it is incumbent on them to inform the public that they have made investments in this land with public funds and that has increased the value of that land, and Waterfront Toronto should consider the value of that investment when considering Sidewalk Labs' request to get that land at a discounted rate.

## Lease instead of sell

- In 80 years there will be another generation that may need these public lands, so Waterfront Toronto should consider a lease instead of a sale.

## Many people are doing local work that should be better tapped

- It's unclear how aware Sidewalk Labs or Waterfront Toronto are to this work (e.g. 3D mapping). Specifically, there's an Asset 3D Mapping project that Carleton University is doing for the Ontario East Economic Development Commission covering municipalities between Oshawa and Ottawa. There's another mapping project in the Golden Horseshoe that covers Toronto:
  - ConnectOn – Agri-Food Asset Mapping Project <https://www.connecton.ca/history> for the Golden Horseshoe <http://www.foodandfarming.ca/current-projects/serving-up-local/>
  - Ontario East Carleton U 3D Mapping Project <https://newsroom.carleton.ca/story/putting-ontario-east-on-the-map/> (“The Ontario East 3D mapping project not only integrates data that the CIMS teams records, but also farm business registration data from the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. Using codes from the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), they can identify which farmers are growing what and where they're growing it.”)

## Questions/More information required:

Note that responses, where provided, that came from Waterfront Toronto representatives are provided in *italics*. In some cases the questions did not have answers or were not answered, and participants asked that they be identified as needing answers.

## Partnership, process, and connection to other waterfront projects

- What's different between Quayside and other sites that Waterfront Toronto has developed? *Here we own the land. Also it was an objective-based RFP, not specification based.*
- If there is already a contractual agreement in place, why did Sidewalk Labs proceed with an entirely different proposal?
- Were there other competitors with the original RFP?
- What other projects is Waterfront Toronto working on and will any of those be included in this proposal?

- Who else is Sidewalk Labs partnering with as part of this proposal?
- Would Sidewalk Labs be allowed to respond to future RFPs and to serve as the vertical developer? This was related to concern that Sidewalk Labs had positioned itself as both the lead partner for the design and also the future developer.
- What back-stop mechanisms would be put in place to address or mitigate possible cost over-runs, delays on completion, or future long-term underperformance of any technology ventures where profits are shared?
- How many of the proposed in the MIDP governance roles could Waterfront Toronto perform? *6 out of the 8. The MIDP proposes ideas from scratch, which may not be necessary as there are existing governance structures in place.*

### **Legislative framework**

- Does the legislative framework that established Waterfront Toronto support a partnership agreement between Waterfront Toronto and Sidewalk Labs? Is the Sidewalk Labs proposal beyond the scope of what is allowed under the existing legislation that established Waterfront Toronto?
- Will there be an “extension path” so that any legislative changes that have to be made are not focused only on enabling or benefitting this project or Sidewalk Labs, but rather that the opportunities and benefits are experienced more widely?

### **Public safety**

- If Sidewalk Labs proposes to install a 5G network, how would Waterfront Toronto evaluate that in terms of public safety?

### **Ownership**

- Who-owns-what land relevant to this proposal? *Waterfront Toronto owns most of Quayside (approx. 10.5 acres), the City owns a small portion and a small portion if privately held.*
- Are existing buildings in that area, such as TNT, on leased land?

### **Connection to the City of Toronto**

- How does Waterfront Toronto engage with the City of Toronto to ask questions on the level of participation from them that may be necessary? Or can Waterfront Toronto only commit to what’s in its mandate? *Waterfront Toronto is always in communication with the City. They are waiting until the Board has made a decision before doing their review and their own public consultation. They will review it from a regulatory perspective.*

### **Land reclamation**

- Does land reclamation need to be done for this proposal; will Waterfront Toronto mandate that land reclamation is required?

## **Breakout Room Discussion on Digital Innovations, Privacy, Digital Governance, and Intellectual Property**

There were approximately 50 participants who divided into three facilitated discussion groups. Two of the groups focused on Digital Innovations, Privacy, and Digital Governance, and one of the groups focused on Intellectual Property. The make-up of the room was diverse, including (but not limited to): residents, students, digital strategists, tech entrepreneurs, members of Waterfront Toronto’s Digital Strategy Advisory Panel, and others.



Several participants were in the room to listen and learn, while others were there to share feedback and concerns with Waterfront Toronto about the Sidewalk Labs Proposal. The overarching topics discussed in the room were:

- More information needed to understand and/or provide feedback about digital innovations and governance: Participants wanted more information about the ubiquitous WiFi system, credential system, and structure / funding of the Urban Data Trust.
- Advice about digital governance framework, including: create a framework that disincentivizes stockpiling data; ensure there are severe penalties for data breaches; make sure there are clear conditions under which researchers could access data; make sure there are strategies to address indirect data collection.
- Need to see Toronto's assets properly valued in any Intellectual Property sharing partnership: including Toronto's reputation as a trusted place. Other advice around Intellectual Property proposal included suggestions to increase the amount and duration of profit / revenue sharing agreements and to modify the patent pledge to allow Canadian companies to compete outside of Canada.
- Process advice: Desire to see Waterfront Toronto organize subsequent consultations around its RFP and objectives as opposed to Sidewalk Labs proposal.

## **Feedback about the project overall**

### **Different levels of comfort with smart cities**

- Some participants said they were comfortable with the concept of a smart city and discussed the conditions under which the proposed plan for Quayside could work for them.
- Others said they needed more information before they could have an opinion, saying there should be a careful, phased implementation if the project goes ahead.
- There was some interest in seeing Waterfront Toronto use this project to establish / protect Canada's reputation as a world leader in urban innovation informed by Canadian values.

### **Nervousness about Sidewalk Labs / Google as a potential partner**

- A few said that fear of private partners should not drive decision making and that Toronto could be left behind if it doesn't pursue this project.

## **Feedback about the Digital Innovations**

Several were open to exploring digital innovations in cities. Questions and issues they had with Sidewalk Labs' proposed Digital Innovations included:

### **What is the public benefit?**

- Several people said they needed to see what the public benefit of the proposed digital innovations is in order to intelligently respond as to how comfortable they are with the proposal.

### **Need more information about the decentralized identity system**

- On one hand, this system has the potential to increase privacy; for example, rather than show a bouncer a driver's license with first name, last name, address, and other personal information, a person could be anonymously authenticated by a system that knows their age. On the other hand, in order to work, that system requires a database with everyone's

personal details, which could be a huge privacy / security risk. More detail is needed about this system.

### **Other thoughts and comments**

- Questions and advice about the ubiquitous WiFi service. What kinds of data are being collected through the service? The WiFi service provider should use either hardware or software tokens to reduce the data collection from individuals.
- Interest in better understanding “urban data,” including why there is a need to differentiate urban data from other kinds of data.
- Need to know about Sidewalk Labs’ pursuit of a standard looks like, including the path to get to those standards. Sidewalk Labs should be working with a standards body like ISO (if they aren’t already), and Waterfront Toronto should require Sidewalk Labs to adhere to international standards and to describe how those standards would be applied.
- Need more detail about Sidewalk Labs’ “preferred vendors.” Sidewalk Labs lists preferred vendors but does not state which ones would be called up for any particular aspect of Quayside. Waterfront Toronto should ask for more clarity about their intentions since Sidewalk Labs likely knows what they want from certain vendors. It would also be helpful to know what the process is to add vendors to this list.

## **Feedback about digital governance, privacy, and data collection**

Participants discussed a number of topics related to digital governance, privacy, and data collection:

### **Interest in and advice around the Urban Data Trust**

Participants had both questions and suggestions for what could make an Urban Data Trust work. They asked about who would “own” the Data Trust and how it would be funded.

Suggestions included:

- The Trust should be an independent, publicly-owned body like a non-profit or co-op.
- The data storage and governance functions of the Trust should be separated.
- The Trust should be subject to regular audits by the government with oversight from a non-partisan group.
- The Trust must include both transactional and urban data.
- Rather than have a single Trust, there should be multiple data Trusts to generate competition and economic incentives to different Trusts.
- Funding for the Data Trust should not be tied to profits made from data sharing, which would bias the Trust’s decision-making in favour of money-making data uses.
- The Trust should be an entity everyone has faith in; Google should not have a role.
- Transparency and clarity are key to the Trust.

### **What would need to be reflected in digital governance?**

- A governance framework that makes data “like uranium”: something people want to get rid of as opposed to something they want to stockpile and hoard.
- Strong penalties for data breaches that hurt the offending party for the breach immediately upon discovery (as opposed to the consequences connected to that breach). For example, in Korea, corporations face a \$3,000 fine per individuals’ data set in a breach, regardless of whether data from the breach was ever used. Liability of data breaches should be tied to individuals so there is accountability.
- The framework should be universal across the city (not just applied to the waterfront)
- Clear conditions for external organizations to get access to data (such as an ethics review) and clear reporting related to research done with that data. For example, non-profit and

charity sector could get preferential rates on access to data, ensuring data is used for public good, not just economic uses.

- A way to manage / address the risks of indirect data collection and correlation of personal data across multiple data sets.
- A framework to inform choices about which technologies might get deployed, to prevent any one company from introducing technology without oversight
- A facial recognition ban.

### **Other digital governance topics discussed**

- Consent. Some participants felt strongly that it should be clear to anyone in Quayside how their data is being used. One group discussed that the concept of consent to data collection is almost useless in this context since it's impossible to get consent for every kind of data that could be collected. Instead of focusing on consent, they said the digital governance framework should instead adopt a "consumer protection" approach that makes clear and transparent decisions on behalf of citizens in their best interests.
- Waterfront Toronto's ability to use contracts. Waterfront Toronto should exercise its right to create contracts with vendors in a way that goes above and beyond federal requirements for data/privacy, creating the "LEED Platinum" of data?

## **Feedback about Intellectual Property**

Participants discussed Sidewalk Labs' Intellectual Property proposals, saying Toronto's good reputation has a high currency that we should value. They shared feedback about specific Intellectual Property proposals, including:

### **A range of opinions about profit sharing proposals**

- Some were concerned about sharing profits with Alphabet / Google, saying these companies are specialists in avoiding taxes and taking advantage of different jurisdictions' regulations.
- Others suggested sharing revenue/equity with Sidewalk Labs (instead of profits) for 50 years (as opposed to 10 as proposed).
- There were also suggestions for Waterfront Toronto to advocate for a profit-sharing model that scales depending on the size of business; for example, Waterfront Toronto could ask for a higher percentage of profits from large companies and a lower percentage from smaller companies.

### **Concerns, questions, and advice about the patent pledge proposal**

- Some felt this proposal was the best one put forward, but several were concerned about Sidewalk Lab's commitment not to assert patents against companies within Canada. "This proposal favours the incumbent," one participant said, adding the more information is needed to understand it. Questions about this pledge included:
  - Is this a simple "non-compete" agreement, or does it apply across Canada to any interested company?
  - What would the effects of this patent pledge be on smaller companies? Would they have to make all their patents available to Sidewalk Labs in order to use patents developed in Quayside?

Participants' advice, suggestions about the patent pledge proposal included:

- Ask Sidewalk Labs to drop the "within Canada" clause from this pledge. Companies need to be able to innovate outside of Canada because there aren't enough dense cities in Canada for our companies' innovations to be economically successful in Canada alone.

- The benefits of any patent agreements should be made available to all Canadian companies, especially to foster growth of smaller companies and start-ups.
- Waterfront Toronto should consider asking for a “patent pool” instead, which would give the broadest number of people most access to patents.

#### Waterfront Toronto’s evaluation, decision-making, and consultation process

Participants suggested Waterfront Toronto look to other jurisdictions for precedents on how to handle digital governance and intellectual property proposals. Participants also shared feedback about the consultation process:

- Disappointment that Waterfront Toronto organized the consultation according to the structure of Sidewalk Labs proposal, saying doing so allows Sidewalk Labs to define our process. For the second round, Waterfront Toronto should organize the consultation according to its RFP and objectives so we can better assess it through our lens.
- Waterfront Toronto should ask Sidewalk Labs to re-submit their proposal in a way that shows how it meets the criteria set out in the original RFP, with plans for anything beyond Quayside clearly marked as an appendix.
- Rather than be reactive, Waterfront Toronto should identify potential issues and/or best practices and ask Sidewalk Labs demonstrate how their proposal responses to those issues or practices.

## Feedback from the Closing Plenary

The following feedback was shared in the Closing Plenary. Responses, where provided, are noted *in italics*.

### **What lessons from other waterfront developments could apply to Quayside?**

- What kind of development is happening in Keating Channel West, and are there any key learnings from the development process?

*The lands there include the silo site (owned by a joint venture by Dream and Great Gulf) and the 3C site (owned by two local developers and a developer from the US). On the 3C site, their applications have been made, the zoning is in place, and they’re working with City. The silo site is just starting their plans. For the 3C site, Waterfront Toronto and the City were able to work through difficult issues on built form, public realm, affordable housing – it was a good process and it settled in a good place. We haven’t had that conversation on the silo site yet.*

- Early in today’s meeting Waterfront Toronto identified four objectives for Quayside. What’s your experience with those objectives being met on other waterfront development sites?

*The objectives for Keating Channel West are in a precinct plan that was done in 2010, so it pre-dates Quayside. We were looking at advanced things there, but the market and technology have moved a lot since then. In 2016, Waterfront Toronto started to look at how we could do things differently on Quayside (which Waterfront Toronto owns). So Quayside is really on the leading edge of new thinking – it’s more advanced than the previous activities.*

### **Need to consider whether innovation is feasible as 12 acres**

- We understood that this whole process is about 12 acres of land where we want innovation, affordability, and sustainability. When it comes to innovation, we selected a partner that dumped a lot of innovation on us and this innovation will need expensive infrastructure

(when we think of smart dollies, management systems, thermal grid, sewage water, etc.). Are we able to make this infrastructure economically viable in a 12 acre piece of land? It's a small piece of land, 2000 units, so we understand why they proposed another development as well.

*We have heard repeatedly in the breakout discussion rooms that whatever we do at Quayside has to integrate into the broader city. So you can deliver heated pavement at Quayside, but what is the value of heated pavement when you're only moving about half a kilometer on the Martin Goodman Trail? If you live in Quayside it could benefit you, but when you're moving by bicycle you're probably moving within a larger zone. In terms of financial viability and sustainability – the carbon reduction measures outlined in the plan have a certain amount that's achievable within the 12 acre site, shown as 85% in Sidewalk Labs' proposal. And then they've shown that on a larger geography, for a few reasons (economies of scale and access to waste heat from other processes) you can get beyond net zero to climate positive. We asked for climate positive in our objectives in our project, and that's one example of an inherent benefit of working at a larger geography.*

### **Will Sidewalk Labs be patient enough to work through multiple layers of governance?**

- So, my second question is in terms of governance. For this 12 acre piece of land we are putting 4 layers of governance: Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, Ontario, and the Government of Canada. And we have one partner who is willing to do a lot of things. Are we sure this process is going to wait while we go through the whole process of approving a concept design and a schematic design and have all these people around the table to discuss with? In terms of speed and execution, is the City of Toronto able to keep up with those innovations and the speed required for such an innovative urban development?

*I cannot speak for Sidewalk Labs. What I've read in the MIDP is reference to "patient capital". They've been here for 18 months, they do understand the process, the intricacies of what they're asking for, and how complicated some of these innovations actually are. So I put those two things together and I say to myself "they probably want to keep progressing on this". And following up on the question regarding Quayside versus the larger area, this is a proposal and that's why we're here. We're looking at the benefits and risks of all of this, and beyond the 12 acres is going to be decision-making for others (the City, the Province, etc.) because Waterfront Toronto only owns the 12 acres.*

### **Need to connect local innovations to the work at Quayside**

- The 1500 pages sounds like they threw the Jell-O against the wall and they're hoping to see what sticks. My question for Waterfront Toronto is this: have you explored what's happening in innovation spaces across Ontario and Canada? For example, I'm in Cobourg and we have Venture 13 that's just received \$4.2 million from the Federal government. You need a bigger geography for economies of scale. We could be doing things, and are doing things, in Cobourg that you aren't doing in Toronto – for example, the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative, there's currently a proposal that the government is looking for in terms of water quality and eco-health. It's a joint agreement between Canada and Ontario, and Waterfront Toronto should be providing feedback to them as well.

*Thank you for raising this – it's a particular passion of mine. The reality is that there's so much happening in local ecosystems across Toronto, Ontario and Canada. Waterfront Toronto has always had a mandate to share both its knowledge and opportunity locally, provincially, and nationally. So we're looking to tap into those networks. We've been encouraging Sidewalk Labs to understand what's happening in other centres of excellence throughout the province to see if there's a way of leveraging this as a sandbox site for other jurisdictions to try new products, new services, etc. here. We're really interested in sharing*

*our lessons learned with others as well, and we're always keen to learn about others. We do monitor the Fed Dev pieces that go out, the new funding agreements that go out, etc. We're very tapped into the local ecosystem (e.g. MaRS) and we do also need to broaden out directly with others as well.*

### **Good to see Waterfront Toronto leadership, and narrow down the next round of consultation by removing things that simply aren't going to happen**

- It is very good to see Waterfront Toronto taking control of this consultation process because in the last 18 months it's been a little unclear about the relationship between Waterfront Toronto and Sidewalk. Having an independent consultation process is good. For the next round of consultation, it would be helpful to: have a bit more information on the timeline and when things could be approved or not approved; and for Waterfront Toronto to limit what things are actually in the discussion. If there are things that are simply not going to happen, can we just take them out? Because there's so much information here, it's very difficult – even for those of us who have been here since day one – to keep on top of it. So if there are things that simply aren't going to happen or aren't on the table, take them out of the discussion so we can focus on what is on the table.

### **Concern that Sidewalk Labs would be given special treatment, and precedent that sets for other private actors to change legislation to suit their needs**

- There's a lot in the MIDP (I've gone through 700 pages so far) that suggests that Sidewalk expects to get very special treatment from governments, when it assumes there will be a school and a health facility, when there are places all over the Province that have been waiting years for these. Is Sidewalk going to be get special treatment? Have they been given any reason to think that they would? And that extends to the list of changes in federal and provincial legislation and Toronto bylaws as well. Are there any precedents for a private corporation to expect that governments would enact special legislation just to suit their site? Would this mean that every developer in the province could ask the Province to re-write the Building Code to suit their requirements? There are implications to all that. There is so much buried behind the assumption that the regulatory framework can be changed that it's really quite deceitful to allow that kind of implication to be in the MIDP without clarifying whether it's possible or not.

*No promises have been made to Sidewalk. I can't speak for the City, but I can speak on the conversations we've had with the City. They (Sidewalk) have put a proposal together that would seek some up-front permissions. For example, on the Building Code, I don't think they're asking to change the Building Code – they have to go through a parallel process with the City and officials at the provincial and federal level where they would prove out the technology to see if it can work. That may, years from now, change the Building Code. Right now we're at 6 storeys, I know that the Province is thinking about 12 storeys, and you've got two 12 storey 'asks' on the waterfront already. They are working through that parallel process. We are just seeing this – the IDEA District, the up-front permissions. I think there are probably examples around the world where you find innovation zones (they call it an IDEA District). Whether the City, the Province or the Feds would agree to that – these are all discussions that have to happen. They've been promised nothing by Waterfront Toronto, and I don't think by the governments either.*

*If there are innovations that we think are valuable and that current regulations don't allow for, is that something we want to consider? This is Sidewalk Labs' proposal and we have not agreed to make any regulatory change, so it's a question of whether we want to consider how to make these things operable or not.*

### **Need to think about data governance beyond just Quayside**

- Building on comments that focused on “beyond the geography of just Quayside” and legislative changes applying to more than just this deal, I really want to encourage Waterfront Toronto to think that way on data governance in particular. Because if you think about the bike path and just going half a kilometre on heated pavement at Quayside, when you apply that to data (i.e. what happens when you move around the city as individuals or as groups), what happens with smart cities at Quayside has to be the same thing that happens in data governance in all of the technology embedded – not just in waterfront properties but across the whole city. I really encourage you to take some leadership in moving that forward so that we don’t just do boutique deals on data governance with Sidewalk, but that we work with the City to do something that applies across the whole city.
- The second piece that’s critical is with the data trust in particular. I encourage you to push back across the table to ensure the data trust is citizen-owned or user-owned, that it acts as an advocate and a protector for citizens and their data, and that it acts as a data fiduciary which is the kind of thing that happening in Europe – that’s the long term approach to it. And ensure it includes both the transactional data and the city data. You can’t take those things apart. You don’t have the utility that others can innovate on top of if you don’t put those two kinds of data together.

### **Approach to increasing agility**

- I’d like to suggest a tweak to the process to increase agility. For example, the question of scale has come up. That could be explored with the City of Toronto and you could set up a conduit/working committee at the City of Toronto. Similarly with private developers that own other pieces of land, to see whether that’s feasible or not. If it is potentially feasible, then you can continue to explore it. If it’s not feasible at all, it gets dropped quickly. So rather than just being reactive you can reach out, fail early, and get on with things.

### **Why is Sidewalk Labs not speaking for the proposal at this consultation?**

- I was wondering about the process. When we have Waterfront Toronto staff sitting at the tables giving their interpretation of what Sidewalk Labs is trying to do. I wondered why. It seems to me that they shouldn’t be the ones to speak for the project or proposal. There should be Sidewalk Labs people there speaking.

*I’m glad you’ve raised it. We thought long and hard about this – our Swerhun team and the Waterfront Toronto team, as has Waterfront Toronto’s Stakeholder Advisory Committee that has leaders from a number of different resident associations, BIAs, and others. Much like what was raised earlier in this plenary discussion, they thought there had been too blurry a line between Sidewalk Labs and Waterfront Toronto, and that this needed to be a Waterfront Toronto-led process. The intent of this process was not to brief people on the entirety of the MIDP but to brief people on how to navigate the MIDP through the lens of a public actor – that’s what Waterfront Toronto’s responsibility is here. Sidewalk Labs has a few people who have been to every meeting to listen. If it means that we need a little more information to understand something, or in many cases a lot less information in order to understand something, then that’s the message that’s important to come from this first round of consultation. The Waterfront Toronto staff have been sensitive to not being seen as advocates for nor against the proposals coming forward. What they’re focusing on is how to think about it through the lens of a public steward.*



**Seems like the tail is wagging the dog on this. This is our fantastic piece of property. We need to be the ones leading all this. We are the dog.**

- Going forward, I'm concerned about a certain amount of exclusivity going on between parts of the City and the company where we're ending up with the tail wagging the dog. We are the dog. We are the city. We have the credence, a robust name, we're trustworthy. We also have a fantastic piece of property that no one else has – right at the foot of our city – it's an unparalleled opportunity and we should be the ones leading all this. Any of the companies that are coming in are going to be large companies – Google, Facebook – when it comes to being called to task for any foreseen or unforeseen consequences, they thumb their nose at government and say “you can't make me, I'm not attached to any particular country”. That, to me, is a very serious problem. You can look at Amazon that did a horrible competition between cities (that we were a part of) to base a headquarters. After they chose a city, they pulled out (of New York). Do we want that type of thing? This is our piece of property, this is our asset as Toronto. We have a terrible history of the federal and provincial governments coming in, offering money, then meddling, then pulling out, then trying to take the asset without paying for it. We could do all this work, and have it taken away and be left with a bill – either from the company or the country. I'm sure there are many small cities in Ontario and Canada that could say the same thing. These are my concerns.

#### **Opportunity for focused discussion on LRT?**

- When I was reading the mobility section, I thought “a lot of us have been saying that an LRT would be a good idea for 25 years”. I do appreciate that they do have some suggestions for alternative financing that may have risk attached to them, that may cost more than other means of financing, or that may be worth exploring. If I was going to be cheeky, I might suggest that Alphabet dig into its deep pockets and spend it lobbying the provincial government to persuade them of the merit of financing it. But in all seriousness, I want to congratulate you and your team – the consultation has been very well run today – and I know that consultation costs money. There may be merit in having a very focused conversation about the LRT, where we are now, how we might proceed, how Sidewalk Labs proposals may or may not help. How to move this along and activate it.

*We're working to figure out how to curate and focus the second round of consultation. The Waterfront Toronto team is already thinking that over. Where do we need to go really deep because we need to figure something out, and where don't we need to put much attention because we already have a good idea of how things might unfold (whether that's in a positive or negative way)?*

#### **Technology is about more than just data, and we should question whether innovation is what we need and want**

- The technology questions should not just be about data. The technology question is about a lot of things, but digital technology means computers, and that means machines that do things and make decisions and control things and activate things. It's not a collection of data, it's a machine. We should remember that. The technology question is about artificial intelligence, it's about machines of all kinds, and it's about processes that are happening. It's not just this one question that has been pushing aside all the other technology questions.

Innovation and technology and progress in general. Do we really need it? Do we really benefit from it? It still seems that we haven't got that as a question. It's being given as something that's already been answered rather than as a question. Which leads to a question of whether we need Sidewalk Labs at all? Because if you take innovation out it, anyone can do funding – there are lots of institutions that do that. We should question it in terms of the consequences of autonomous technology and the developments in the future of AI? Do we actually need innovation? Is that a framework? Do we have to fund universities

and research all the time and let it run away and see where it goes? If we don't need that, if this is a city block that can be developed without focusing on innovation, then why do we need Sidewalk Labs at all?

*One of the great and unique responsibilities of a public actor is to understand any particular proposal from multiple points of view. And the great burden of that public actor and governments is to try and find some common ground (if that exists) between multiple points of view. And where it doesn't exist, to try and really understand what are the consequences of moving down any particular path – and going into any direction with our eyes wide open. In that case, through a public consultation like this, it is very reasonable to say “I'm not even sure that the proposal on the table or this partnership is something we would want to go into” nevertheless, that is the focus of this consultation.*

### **Suggestions for the second round of consultations in the Fall**

- Thank-you for the quote and thank-you for your team, this has been spectacular. I appreciate the approach. I have three things that I hope you'll take as advice for the fall which I think is a big opportunity – when we all get to come back for a second round of consultation:
  1. About the framing. The next time we sit in this room it should be through the lens of what Waterfront Toronto asked for on behalf of all of us. Not what Sidewalk wants to sell us. It's nice that they have a big proposal and that they have a framework. We should use our framework for what we wanted and what the benefits are, and evaluate it based on whether it meets that or not.
  2. About the proposal itself. The question has been raised about whether this is possible inside the 12 acres. Sidewalk has kind of said that it isn't. They basically said “we won't even do it if you don't build us the transit,” etc. etc. We should go back to them and say “give us a proposal that actually meets the requirements of the RFP” and tell us if it works. And if it doesn't, then write us the proposal that says “this doesn't work financially because you're not giving us the land at a discount, you're not forgiving property taxes for 30 years, you're not letting us build the timber industry in northern Ontario, etc.” Make them say that so we can actually have that conversation as a community.
  3. About the finance. I want to put to death this idea that we need to borrow at market rates from a private company when we have three orders of government that issue their own debt. We borrow at better than market rates because we issue our own debt from our own governments. We don't need to borrow this money from them. The way we answer that question as a community is to have somebody – ideally the City of Toronto – to please run the numbers for us. Tell us, if we give them tax forgiveness for 30 years, this is what it would cost us as community, and this is what we would actually pay for the transit versus if we issued our own debt. Let us actually look at a spreadsheet. We're all smart folks, we do our own budgeting, we think about these things. Give us the numbers. Please use the time between now and the Fall to put some numbers behind this thing so we don't have to say “Well Sidewalk says the math doesn't work, and the City says whatever”. Let's actually look at the numbers and decide for ourselves.

*This is the kind of conversation we were hoping to have. The more we go, the clearer the advice is.*

*I want you to know how sincerely we're listening to what you're saying. We are going to feed all this into our evaluation. Heartfelt thank you and we appreciate that. Enjoy your weekend!*

## CHESTNUT FEEDBACK SUMMARY

### About this Feedback Summary

On Tuesday, July 23, 2019, Waterfront Toronto held the fourth of four public meetings to begin the process of reviewing and seeking feedback on the Draft Master Innovation and Development Plan (MIDP) submitted by Sidewalk Labs on June 17, 2019. Approximately 150 people participated. This meeting report summarizes the feedback they shared.

The meeting was 3 hours in length, including about 30 minutes for an overview briefing, about 1.5 hours for four concurrent breakout room discussions (including 15-20 minute more detailed presentations by Waterfront Toronto in each room), and a one hour closing plenary that included reports from each breakout room and a full-room discussion. The four breakout rooms focused on each volume of the Draft MIDP (Volume 1: The Plans, Volume 2: The Urban Innovations, and Volume 3: The Partnership) with a separate room for Digital Innovation, Digital Governance, and intellectual property. Each breakout room had between 3 and 4 smaller table discussions, and each table had a representative from Waterfront Toronto and one facilitator.

This summary was written by the facilitation team from Swerhun Inc., the firm retained by Waterfront Toronto to support its Quayside public consultation process. Swerhun works exclusively for governments, public agencies, and non-profits working to support public policy. The Swerhun team's role is not to advocate for any particular project outcome, but rather to support the delivery of transparent, constructive, and meaningful consultation processes.

The intent of the summary is to reflect the feedback shared at the meeting. There are references to "few", "some", and "many" participants expressing a certain point of view, but it's important to note that not all participants were asked to confirm whether they did (or did not) agree with any particularly point raised by the other participants. As a result, this summary is necessarily qualitative in nature.

**NOTE: The intent of this summary is not to assess the merit or accuracy of the feedback shared at this meeting, nor does the documentation of this feedback indicate an endorsement of any of these perspectives on the part of Waterfront Toronto.**

A draft of this summary was distributed to all participants for their review before it was finalized.

## About the Round One Public Consultation Process

This first round of consultation focused on orienting the public to the Draft MIDP from the perspective of Waterfront Toronto as a public steward working with the support of all three levels of government to revitalize the waterfront. To support the process of seeking public feedback, Waterfront Toronto shared the following materials:

- An *Open Letter* from Board Chair Stephen Diamond outlining Waterfront Toronto's responsibilities, confirming that Waterfront Toronto did not co-create the MIDP, acknowledging some exciting ideas and identifying early examples of concerns;
- A *Note to Reader* prepared by Waterfront Toronto based on its initial, high level review of the MIDP that provides a synthesis of what Waterfront Toronto asked for from its Innovation and Funding Partner, the response from Sidewalk Labs, where and how the Draft MIDP aligns with existing practices and what's new, where the privatization of public assets is being proposed (if at all), and financial impacts and risks.
- Waterfront Toronto's Draft Digital Principles; and
- A *Discussion Guide* providing an overview of the public consultation process.

All these materials and presentations are available at [www.QuaysideTO.ca](http://www.QuaysideTO.ca).

The public meetings were only one of several ways that the public could provide feedback during this first round of consultation. Other options included an online consultation ([www.QuaysideTO.ca](http://www.QuaysideTO.ca)), sending emails directly to [quayside@waterfrontontario.ca](mailto:quayside@waterfrontontario.ca), talking to Waterfront Toronto staff at one of seven drop-in sessions held in partnership with the Toronto Public Library, or completing a hard copy of feedback forms. A video recording of the third public meeting (held on Saturday, July 20, 2019) is available on the [Waterfront Toronto YouTube channel](#).

## Overall themes in feedback received

Participants expressed a range of perspectives on the Draft MIDP, with the vast majority raising questions and concerns about the proposal and about Sidewalk Labs (along with their sister and parent companies, Google and Alphabet). Many participants described their expectations of the type of work that Waterfront Toronto would need to complete in order to adequately evaluate the proposal. There were a few participants who made comments that were supportive of the Draft MIDP and Sidewalk Labs.

The overall themes are reflected below, followed by more detail (see Attachment) from each of the four breakout rooms and the closing plenary.

**Concern about the partner and the proposal was the overriding theme expressed by participants at this meeting**, including (but not limited to):

- Inaccessibility of the 1,500 page Draft MIDP, characterized as either a poorly conceived communications plan or an effort to overwhelm;
- Concern about Sidewalk Labs and Google (including lack of transparency around their track record of in other cities, concern they're not trustworthy, concern about their power and influence, concern about the potential for privatization and the potential threat to our democratic processes and institutions);

- Overreach of the MIDP, concern about scale, and a request for Sidewalk Labs to show if proposed innovations could be achieved at Quayside only;
- Concern about privatization, the risk to democratic processes, and risks of exclusion; and
- Concern about data collection, surveillance, and inability to get informed consent.

**Where there was receptivity expressed for the Draft MIDP, it focused on:**

- Some of the innovations, smart city technologies, and city-building techniques (accompanied by questions/concerns about financing, implementation, mitigating failure);
- The proposed draft (qualified by the need for more information);
- At least some of the proposed governance structures (accompanied by concern regarding how they would be funded, operationalized, and integrated with current structures);
- The opportunity to create a world-leading digital governance framework (centred on citizens and privacy, with a de-centralized Urban Data Trust); and
- Interest in sticking to a pilot project that focuses on Quayside only.

**Participants shared a number of specific expectations about additional work that would need to be completed before a decision could be made about the proposal, including:**

- The need to seriously consider all (including unintended) consequences and outcomes;
- The need to run scenarios comparing benefits to the Canadian economy if this was run by Canadian company (or companies) rather than a US tech giant;
- Research that puts the proposal in a global context, comparisons with other partnerships;
- The need to identify strong limits and controls on the project, identify a strong exit strategy, and avoid “situational dependency”;
- Consider the risk of not moving forward with the opportunity (figure out what Waterfront Toronto is/isn’t willing to budge on, think about how to move forward while addressing risks);
- The need for policies and regulations related to technology to be updated before any decision is made about the proposal from Sidewalk Labs; and
- The need to consider whether technology is the right solution to the challenges we’re considering.

## Snapshots from the four breakout room discussions

### Volume 1: The Plans

- Strong concerns about the Draft MIDP: including (but not limited to) the scope of the MIDP (far beyond what requested in the RFP); the privatization of public land; and personal data being obtained and/or controlled by a private actor.
- Concerns about the document itself: 1,500 page document was either poorly conceived communications plan or an effort to overwhelm citizens/readers with information; this has likely contributed to some of the mistrust/skepticism about the MIDP and elements within.
- Concerns about Sidewalk Labs and Google: Concern raised that Alphabet (including Google) have histories of acting in bad faith in other communities. Their past behaviour should be given serious consideration. Waterfront Toronto is already doing good work without Sidewalk Labs and the City has established plans for the area. Some said the City and Waterfront Toronto could and should do this without Sidewalk Labs.
- Support for creating a tech hub/sector with concerns about Sidewalk Labs and Google's involvement: Support for developing a tech hub that could help support start-up companies. Some interest in the innovations that Sidewalk Labs and Google could bring. Questions about why Toronto needs Google / Sidewalk Labs when our tech sector is already booming.
- Some support for proposed social infrastructure: specifically, the Care Collective, apps, and online technologies that would match residents to volunteer opportunities. Need for more information on how the social infrastructure would be funded (initial development and ongoing maintenance).

### Volume 2: The Innovations

- Receptive to some of the innovations and city-building techniques, however a lot of clarity is required first. Some participants were receptive to the technology and innovation that Sidewalk Labs was proposing in the MIDP. At the same time there were many concerns and questions about the financing options, how the innovations would work in real time, and the mitigation plan in case of failure.
- Some interest in proposed governance structures, with concerns about funding and integration. There was acknowledgement that the scale of innovation in the proposal could require innovation in organizational / management structures and governance. However, this was usually expressed in relation to specific functions and not as a part of the overall discussion about the current regulatory framework or broader issues of democratic representation. There was interest in:
  - How these entities would be funded and whether the revenue sources assigned to them would be sufficient to address the unknown and unanticipated eventualities associated with new technology;
  - How/if these new management governance structures would be integrated with current City structures like the TTC, Metrolinx, Parks Forestry and Recreation; and

- The level of effort and funding required to develop and operationalize these new management structures was not adequately provided for in the Sidewalk Labs proposal.

- Need for access and equity in Quayside. Participants were concerned that if people chose not to live in Quayside, or adopt the proposed technology, that they would be excluded. The proposal of bookable seating was identified as an example where community members may be excluded from the public realm if they aren't technology users, or they don't agree to their data being collected. Participants were also concerned about space allocation and how future visitors and workers would be accommodated when the plans seem to focus on residents.
- Concern about scale. Some participants asked that Sidewalk Labs provide numbers that show if the innovations being proposed could be achieved at Quayside only, or whether they had to be implemented in the IDEA District. Other participants raised the issue of return on investment, and how keeping innovations only in Quayside, such as the heated bike paths, would render them ineffective.

Concern about Sidewalk Labs as a partner and strong critique of their work:

- MIDP is an overreach from what was initially asked for in the RFP.
- Sidewalk Labs has been 'jamming things in public discourse' on social media and other outlets about this MIDP while these public consultations are happening and that should not be allowed.
- Need more clarity about Sidewalk Labs long-term goals and objectives.
- Concerns about privatization, the influence of Sidewalk Labs and Google, and the resources they have.
- Sidewalk Labs' approach, and their proposal in general, potentially pose a threat to our democratic processes and institutions.
- The real and unintended consequences of this project have not been adequately laid out by Sidewalk Labs.

Mixed perspectives on if/how to consider the proposal:

- The risk to democratic process is too high.
- Waterfront Toronto needs to seriously consider all (including unintended) consequences and outcomes of this project and whether what is being proposed is feasible (e.g. human impacts, impacts on activities in surrounding areas, impacts on the Canadian tech ecosystem). Involve external experts and residents in the evaluation.
- Stick to a pilot project at Quayside to mitigate the risks and avoid possible disaster. If Sidewalk Labs does get approval and "it doesn't go according to plan" then we (Waterfront Toronto and the public) are left with the fallout of that and "sunk costs".
- Consider the risk of not moving forward with this opportunity. Waterfront Toronto should figure out what it is/isn't willing to budge on and think about how they might move forward while addressing the risks outlined in this discussion.
- If there's any consideration of going beyond Quayside then we would need to go through this whole consultation again before that decision is made. Need strong Waterfront Toronto leadership and controls on this project.
- Concern that the basic premise of innovation is not being questioned.

**Volume 3:  
The  
Partnership**



**Digital  
Innovation,  
Governance  
and IP**

Need a strong exit strategy

- Waterfront Toronto should make sure (on behalf of the public) that this project does not “become a sword over our heads.” Concern about “situational dependency” and what happens down the line if Sidewalk Labs/Google wants to get out of this deal or we want to get out. Do we want to tie ourselves to one company? Need limits and an exit strategy.

On financing, performance benefits, profit sharing:

- Strong feeling that Sidewalk Labs should not make money from city revenue; need to understand more about how profit sharing is beneficial to the City of Toronto as well as the impact of this on local companies; mixed views on transit financing; 10% of IP revenue is not a good deal; Sidewalk Labs should not be paid for an opportunity to develop scalable urban technology.

- Strong sentiment that regulation and principles should be in place first: Our policies and regulations need to be updated to address 21<sup>st</sup> century concerns with technology before any decision is made about Sidewalk Labs. This conversation is putting the cart before the horse.
- Concern about data collection and Sidewalk Labs as a partner: Some felt strongly that Sidewalk Labs is not a trustworthy partner. Several were concerned about the potential for data collection and surveillance in Quayside, while a few said they were open to exploring smart city technology with more information and stronger regulation.
- An opportunity for a world-leading digital governance framework: Some saw this process as provoking important conversations about how Toronto could lead the world in digital governance, putting citizens and privacy at the centre of the framework and opening the door to explore de-centralized Urban Data Trusts.
- Need for public benefits and protection of Canadian businesses to be clear, including an understanding of how technologies can actually improve urban life and assurances that any businesses in Quayside would not be giving up their commercial ideas to another company just for setting up in Quayside.

# ATTACHMENT: Breakout room and plenary discussions



## Breakout room discussion on Volume 1: The Plans

There were approximately 30 participants from the public in this room who divided into four facilitated discussion groups, including two conversations about the Quayside and River District Plans; one conversation about social infrastructure; and one conversation about economic development. Participants included (but not limited to) local residents and interested citizens, students, civil servants, educators, community organizers and advocacy groups, and representatives from local unions.

### Feedback on the Plans

Generally, participants at the table were opposed to the Sidewalk Labs proposal and were not comfortable with it advancing. Comments centred on the following themes:

#### **Overall response to Draft MIDP document**

- Participants said they were overwhelmed by the size of the MIDP - “I don’t know where to begin.” They questioned if small table discussion was to focus only on Quayside (12 acres) or include all 190 acres. Also questions about how Sidewalk Labs justifies going beyond the scope and purpose as outlined in the RFP.

#### **Concerns about the process**

- Concerns were raised on the RFP process and participants asked: When the RFP was developed, did it frame the purpose and scope for Quayside only? How did 12 acres proceed over to 190 acres?
- Participants concluded that it needs to be made very clear to Sidewalk Labs that only Quayside is at the table for development. Then, based on its success at Quayside, development of adjacent lands may begin with another round of RFPs.
- Question of transparency and equitability was raised. Specifically, how would future RFP processes be equitable, undertake due diligence and be transparent when Sidewalk Labs would already be a partner? In some participants’ opinion this is an unfair process. Participants asked for more clarity on this matter.

#### **Concerns and comments about the proposal**

- Many participants were concerned about the expanded area of proposal.
- Some participants felt that the project should be built and owned by the City, so that we can derive our own benefits from it. Comment that what we are getting versus what we are giving seems outsized.
- Question around who the landlord of the rental housing would be? Participants thought it was vital that clarification be provided around this.

#### **Concerns about Google/Alphabet (and Sidewalk Labs)**

- Concern was raised about the poor history Google/Alphabet in their development strategies, urban design methods, and working relationships with cities.
- They specified the track record of walking out on professional partnerships and leaving cities with debt is prominent. With this in mind, participants want to know Sidewalk Labs’ accountability to the City, both from a public and financial perspective. This needs to be transparent in the second round of public meetings.
- Waterfront Toronto is already doing good work without Sidewalk Labs.
- Sidewalk Labs is a relatively new company. Why would we allow them to build this project given their lack of experience?
- Concern that the company(ies) have histories of acting in bad faith in other communities, and this should matter here.

- The capture of data in general is concerning, but this concern is heightened by the fact that Sidewalk Labs, an Alphabet company, is involved. How can we be an effective gatekeeper for Sidewalk Labs?

### **Housing and affordable access to all citizens**

- Participants were interested in learning more about housing and affordable access for the “ordinary working class citizen” at Toronto’s waterfront. Specifically, how and in what manner does the working class fit within the MIDP? They said, “More and more ordinary people are being driven out of Toronto’s waterfront with housing and affordable access no longer in their reach.”
- Affirmation that it’s imperative the City’s waterfront is accessible to all citizens.
- Some support for affordable housing but participants questioned Sidewalk Labs’ overall housing vision and its accessibility to all citizens.

### **Waterfront Toronto and its role**

- Waterfront Toronto’s overall vision for development of Toronto’s waterfront was an area of concern. Some participants believe that, to-date, the development of public space/green space at the City’s waterfront has been disastrous and poorly planned. Some said that Waterfront Toronto has fallen short and are not confident they can well manage this project based on its complexity and volume. Has Waterfront Toronto learned from their past mistakes? The issue was raised about the organizations’ priorities and key objectives to uphold the public’s interest.
- Private organizations, like Sidewalk Labs, are motivated by money and Waterfront Toronto “cannot be seduced” by their plans and innovation. What strategy, if any, does Waterfront Toronto have to counter-balance this?

### **Privatization of public lands**

- Some commented that “We are selling our souls to the private sector”.
- Participants want to know how Waterfront Toronto will ensure public lands are not totally privatized. “According to the Draft MIDP it already looks like Sidewalk Labs is controlling everything. It is our city, our waterfront and Waterfront Toronto has to be in control.” Participants want to know how Waterfront Toronto will mitigate this risk. Further clarification is required.

### **Concerns about innovations**

- A number of participants expressed concern that we shouldn’t let ourselves be “guinea pigs” for a multinational corporation.
- A concern around fiber optic internet proposal: Why is it needed? Who pays for it? Who owns it? What is to benefit to Toronto from this project?
- A concern about who is responsible if a proposed innovation doesn't work, or breaks down?

### Feedback about Social Infrastructure

#### **Comfortable/Supportive**

- Participants like that it’s a plan for mixed development (commercial, residential, light manufacturing).
- Participants like the idea of using apps and online technologies to match residents to volunteer opportunities, connect them to each other.
- Generally it’s interesting to see digital tools integrated into how social infrastructure would be designed and built.

#### **Less comfortable/need more info**

- Generally need more information about the feasibility of implementing these ideas.
- For the school, would Sidewalk Labs be providing additional funding to TDSB to pay for the innovations they will want to include? More information needed about Sidewalk Lab's plans for including digital innovation in the school.
- Who would be a part of the building and development process? This is important information, especially with respect to the integration of equity-seeking groups and Community Benefit Agreements
- How would the space sharing be organized? It's a new idea, would be hard to communicate it properly and make sure it works for people.
- Ability to "reserve" public space raised the concern this would create conflict over public space (between those who understand the system and those who don't).
- What is the plan for ongoing operational costs?
- Would there be staff of some kind involved in animating all of these spaces? Because there's so much new technology involved, people would need help navigating it.
- Concern about overlap with existing services in the city (for example, Toronto Public Library does a lot of space sharing and connecting residents—could Sidewalk Labs connect with Toronto Public Library so as not to duplicate?).
- The governance structure proposed is very complicated; this would be difficult for a lot of residents to navigate – could it be simplified?
- "A lot of these ideas, we already do in Toronto – could the City not just implement them ourselves?"
- More information needed about ongoing job creation as per the maintenance of social infrastructure. Who pays for the maintenance of these facilities, and would jobs be created through that process?
- Concern that the social infrastructure is not being paid for by Sidewalk Labs. Since they are benefiting from the public's data, they should have to pay for this.

### **Conditions under which people could be willing to move forward**

- More information needed about financing, partnerships and implementation plans generally.
- Some indicated that the following community and social services should be integrated into the Sidewalk Labs proposal: lots of access to green space, access to equipment and tool sharing for residents to have hobbies and do-it-yourself (DIY) things, community kitchens, community gardens, farmers' markets, an outdoor pool, and a skating rink.

### **Other**

- Sidewalk Labs should collaborate with existing services and groups (for example, the library) and make clear how they would value-add, rather than duplicate.
- Sidewalk Labs should plan even more community space.

### Feedback about Economic Development

#### **Some broadly supportive of the MIDP proposal**

- Some in favour of the MIDP, given the opportunity to create a technology hub, and support startups, notwithstanding the fact that concerns have been expressed and that there are tricky questions).
- See innovation cluster as very positive - building on booming tech scene in Toronto. More tech jobs created last year than San Francisco/New York/Seattle combined.
- The project would benefit from creation of co-working spaces for local firms; and would also benefit from more diversity than just Google HQ, by including space local startups/firms.
- Office vacancy in Toronto is very low (4%?) - so need more commercial space that this proposal offers; "if you build it, they will come".

- Urban Innovation Institute and Venture Fund are positive, but would need to be in the public interest (i.e. some guidance from government / public agencies, ensure benefit to smaller / local entrepreneurs).
- Supportive of innovation and believe Google can bring value, urban innovation, and without Sidewalk Labs the likelihood is “same boring buildings” developers have been putting up.
- Question about what the initial steps would be to live / operate retail in Quayside once built (i.e. to “co-lab”, commercial or co-working spaces once built; and to ensure local residents have access)

### **Strong Concerns about the MIDP generally**

- If Toronto is booming, why do we need Google? (i.e. big tech sector growth and job creation, lots of property development, many urban innovation institutes already - so why do we need this?).
- Concerns with the process getting to the MIDP; the unusual Waterfront Toronto RFP process, concern about political deals.
- Concerns with the “vendor”, Google / Sidewalk Labs - extensive lobbying, power asymmetry, international track record.
- Concern with why the Google HQ needs to be on Villiers, and not Quayside site.
- Concern with the affordable housing proposal - why is it premised on those costs reducing the land value? How is this any different than what any other developer would do? (though like idea of 1% revolving fund that condo buyers contribute into).
- Concern with commercial office space aspect - will there be oversupply with large amount to be built on nearby Unilever site?

### **Agreement that Sidewalk Labs need to communicate better**

- Participants were generally in agreement that Sidewalk Labs needs to better explain their proposal.
- The 1,500 page document was either poorly conceived communications plan or a “cynical effort to overwhelm citizens” / readers with information, and that this has likely contributed to some of the mistrust / skepticism about the MIDP and elements within.

## **Breakout Room Discussion on Volume 2 – The Innovations**

There were approximately 50 participants from the public in this room who divided into four facilitated discussion groups: mobility; sustainability; public realm; and buildings and housing. Participants included local residents and interested citizens, students, sustainability consultants, and other professionals. Participants had a variety of interests and expertise including urban planning, civil engineering, and more.

### Overall feedback

#### **Receptive to some of the innovations and city-building techniques, however a lot of clarity is required first.**

- Some participants were receptive to the technology and innovation that Sidewalk Labs was proposing in the MIDP.
- At the same time, there were many concerns and questions about the financing options, how the innovations would work in real time, and the mitigation plan in case of failure.

### **Some interest in proposed governance structures, with concerns about funding and integration.**

- There was acknowledgement that the scale of innovation in the proposal could require innovation in organizational / management structures and governance. However, this was usually expressed in relation to specific functions and not as a part of the overall discussion about the current regulatory framework or broader issues of democratic representation.
- There was concern about how these entities would be funded and whether the funding sources assigned to them would be sufficient to address the unknown and unanticipated eventualities associated with new technology.
- There was concern about how/if these new management governance structures would be integrated with current City structures like the TTC, Metrolinx, and Parks, Forestry and Recreation.
- There was a concern that the level of effort and funding required to develop and operationalize these new management structures was not adequately provided for in the Sidewalk Labs proposal.

### **Need for access and equity in Quayside.**

- Participants were concerned that if people chose not to live in Quayside, or adopt the proposed technology, that they would be excluded.
- The proposal of bookable space in the public realm was raised as an example where community members may be excluded from the public realm if they aren't technology users, or they don't agree to their data being collected.
- Participants were also concerned about space allocation and how future visitors and workers would be accommodated when the plans seem to focus on residents.

### **Concern about scale.**

- Some participants asked that Sidewalk Labs provide numbers that show if the innovations being proposed could be achieved at Quayside only, or whether they had to be implemented in the IDEA District.
- Other participants brought up the issue of return on investment, and how keeping innovations only in Quayside, such as the heated bike paths, would render them ineffective.

### Public Realm

### **There was support for a number of principles participants felt came through in the proposal.**

- This included creating a mixed community, having a mix of demographics, a mix of tenure and affordability, and a mix of use.

### **Participants had questions, concerns and advice relating to equity and access.**

- Participants wanted to know how access to housing would be determined, and who the developer would be that people purchase property from. There is concern about who the "public" is in the Quayside community, and there are steps that need to be taken to prevent it from becoming the Silicon Valley of the north.
- Suggestions include making it a mixed community, ensure equal access for all, and prevent income disparity.

### **Almost all participants in this small table discussion were concerned that 12 acres was not enough space to test and explore some of the innovations proposed.**

- Some participants felt that Quayside was not big enough to see a return on investment for the public realm innovations.



- The example of the heated bike paths was raised, as the path has to be long enough to be worthwhile. There is support to look at a larger area, but it has to start somewhere.

**Two participants described this as a big opportunity for Toronto.**

- These participants said it's important to outline public issues, but that the city can make it work one way or another. They think that Quayside would raise the bar for other development in the city.

**Some support for governance innovation, while highlighting potential risks involved.**

- Some participants were supportive of the innovation in governance proposed through the new bodies such as the Open Space Alliance (OSA). There was an acknowledgement of the level of effort and time that would be required to develop these new models that would be necessary to support the physical development of the site, which was seen as both a risk and a potential opportunity.
- Some participants felt that the City doesn't have a great track record of managing parks and public spaces, so the OSA was an interesting idea.

**Discussion around how to build a sense of community in Quayside.**

- Participants would like community to be embraced in Quayside, and wondered how much building and activity is needed here to create that. They would like existing communities in the surrounding area to be connected to Quayside, as there is some concern that the development would cause gentrification.
- One suggestion was to create the public realm as a 'commons' where people manage the space collectively, and to look at other examples like the park conservancy model.

**Other comments:**

- Participants need more information about logistics, detail, operations
- Hesitation about one development trying to address all the issues in the City and whether it's feasible
- Concern that OSA could run out of steam and what would happen if Sidewalk Labs leaves
- Participants liked the space programming app

Sustainability

**Participants support the development of a distributed energy model with private utilities to advance climate positive goals and promote resiliency at Quayside.**

- Someone said that ultimately the goal should be for customers to be able to generate their own energy supply and sell it.

**Many participants showed interest in the building codes and tall timber use.**

- Participants wanted to know whether Toronto has incentive to set the building code at a higher standard than the province, and if there is anything proposed by Sidewalk Labs that doesn't meet the current standard.
- Many participants were curious about the height of the timber construction and would like to know where the precedent comes from.
- Some of the group members showed skepticism at constructing very tall buildings of timber.

**More information needed about active storm water management.**

- Participants would like clarification on what the plans are to reuse and capture water to reduce GHG emissions.
- In addition, they would like to know if flood mitigation is being taken into account, and what the backup plan is in the case that green tech infrastructure fails.



**Clarification is needed on the automation and data collection tools to advance sustainability.**

- One participant wondered how nimble and responsive the system would be, in terms of heating and cooling buildings.
- Participants would also like to know where the data is going, and how it is being stored.

**Concern about the OSA and how it is managed.**

- Participants were concerned that if the OSA were to operate as an independent non-profit, it wouldn't be accountable to the government.
- One person said that if people are appointed privately, the organization would lack representation and diversity, and that the public needs may not be met.
- Another person asked if the OSA's governance structure would be similar to a Business Improvement Area (BIA).

**Concern that a private corporation would have too much control, and the importance of Waterfront Toronto and the City benefitting too.**

- While it's understood that Sidewalk Labs is providing capital investment, there is concern from many about Sidewalk Labs having too much control in the project.
- Participants felt that if the land is public, people need to pay for the services. If the City wants to raise the bar, people still pay for it because it's on public land.

**With accountability and correct circumstances, the proposed management entities could be successful.**

- Some participants said that an independent agency could make progressive changes to balance the rigidity of the City, however Sidewalk Labs and Alphabet have to be held accountable in order for it to work successfully.

**In general, participants did not expect the project to be financially self-sustainable or the sustainability plan to be globally transferable.**

- Many participants said that they, as taxpayers, would have to contribute money to sustain this.
- One person suggested that innovative business models can leverage public or private resources to make it more self-sustaining and felt that Sidewalk Labs' interest in government infrastructure investment is unrealistic.
  - The participant said that cities in emerging economies face issues that are more serious than those in Toronto. As such, even with the intention of this project being a global example for sustainability, these solutions won't be transferable.

**Conditions and questions for the governance structure of the Waterfront Sustainability Association (WSA).**

- One participant would like to know how people would be appointed to the WSA, and how the different management entities would be held accountable and allow for democratic participation. It should be transparent and accessible with how information is accessed.
- One participant voiced support, and said that small scale entities like WSA can be more nimble and less bureaucratic as long as they have a good governance model. How the entity is set up is what matters.

Mobility

**Participants have questions about the adaptability of the technology.**

- One participant asked how and on what basis technology shifts to meet the needs of the environment (i.e. curbless streets) and said that using innovative technology to meet the demand of the public realm is smart, but that there is a risk when it comes to automation and there has to be fail safe measures in place.

**Participants want to know the operating scale of the innovations within the MIDP.**

- There was some concern that what is being proposed in the MIDP is only applicable to the larger IDEA District
- Participants wanted clarity on the context of the innovations and if they're scalable from 120 acres to 12 acres and vice versa

**Desire to see evidence for the projections made in the MIDP.**

- One participant asked if there is modelling that's occurred to determine the mobility numbers and if Sidewalk Labs would be updating their activity-based model as technology continues to change.
- The participant would like to see evidence about the emissions reduction from the transit plan.

**More information needed on the LRT and how it would be financed.**

- Some participants said that Waterfront Toronto has had a longstanding aspiration to have the LRT built
- They asked how it would be built, and wondered if it isn't rolled out in time if it could stop the entire plan from moving forward.
- One participant felt that the funding model for transit proposed by SWL in the MIDP was quite sensible. It raises value and could be a win-win for the City and Sidewalk Labs.

**Discussion around real time data and mobility.**

- A participant asked about intelligent signals and dynamic curbs and would like to know if it is all digital technology or are there physical aspects too.
- The participant said that it would be interesting to use data and technology for managing cycling and pedestrian traffic as it isn't used much currently, but that it is important to consider the user's perspective and experience in all of this.

**Discussion around enforcing bookable spaces.**

- A participant wondered what would happen and who would enforce the system in the event that someone reserves a bookable space and never claims it, but someone else who didn't sign up does.

**Concern about access and equity in Quayside.**

- One participant asked what the difference is between Quayside and a gated community. A few participants expressed concern that people who don't live in Quayside or those who don't adopt the technology would be excluded.
- A condition highlighted is that people have to be at the forefront of this consideration; Quayside can't only be focused on innovation.
- The same participant didn't agree with what Sidewalk Labs has proposed as a whole. They were also very concerned about the opt-in or opt-out model, and required more information as to how it would work.

**More data could help with planning, so long as it's collected safely and accessible.**

- One participant felt that the use of more data could be helpful in the long term, as it could make for quicker/more effective decisions than is normally seen with city building. However, the proper regulation has to be in place before this is considered.

### **Concern about Sidewalk Labs' compatibility with other infrastructure.**

- A participant noted the issue of Sidewalk Labs goal of being the lead developer for Quayside
- They wondered if the amount of control would mean that other technology or services from other companies wouldn't be as compatible as it would with Google technology.

### **Suggestions for the consultation process.**

- One participant would like Waterfront Toronto to use clear and accessible language when talking about the innovations.

## Building & Housing

### **Quayside as a destination for visitors, workers, and local residents.**

- Participants said that the plans seem focused on future residents, rather than future visitors and/or workers and raised concern about whether there is any consideration or enough space to accommodate future visitors since Quayside may become a popular destination.
- *Waterfront Toronto staff shared that they are looking to create complete communities that include a mix of uses, which follows existing precinct plans that identify areas for destinations and economic development.*

### **Interest in particular details about the breakdown between the housing options proposed by Sidewalk Labs and how the affordable housing components would be subsidized.**

- Participants asked several questions of clarification regarding how many affordable rental units would be in Quayside in particular; and the particular breakdown of numbers in the "40% below-market housing program".
- Participants also discussed whether these proposals align with the requirements for affordable housing outlined by Waterfront Toronto as well as the City of Toronto.
- Participants also want to know whether Sidewalk Labs is proposing to subsidize affordable housing in Quayside or if the public would have to pay for it.

### **Quayside should provide a mix of affordable unit sizes to accommodate a range of family sizes.**

- Participants shared concerns about small unit sizes and said it is important to provide affordable unit sizes to accommodate for a range of family sizes.
- Participants were also curious about the details of shared equity ownership and efficient units.

### **General interest in more details about mass timber buildings.**

- Participants discussed how mass timber buildings could be built, and what they may look like.
- *Waterfront Toronto staff shared that the proposed buildings would have timber on the exterior and interior. Any exposed timber would be required to include a fireproof outer layer. Staff also shared that Vancouver has an 18 storey mass timber building that was quickly built in 18 weeks.*

### **Concerns about construction and manufacturing costs for mass timber buildings.**

- Participants said using creating and using new materials, such as mass timber, may be more expensive since it would require a new factory and other manufacturing/construction costs. These costs may impact the affordability of the proposed housing types, with particular concerns that it may affect affordable housing units.

- Participants also expressed concern that high construction costs and land values may affect any proposed non-profit operators' ability to purchase and manage the affordable housing units, specific concern was related to Shared Equity Units in which a non-profit is proposed to purchase units from Sidewalk Labs.
- Participants asked whether mass timber buildings are more expensive than concrete buildings.
- *Waterfront Toronto staff said the proposed approach would be to do off-site construction, which may allow for more efficient transportation of materials, and a quick assembly on site in order to minimize costs.*

### **Is creating a mass timber factory and using mass timber environmentally sustainable?**

- Participants discussed whether it is environmentally sustainable to create a new mass timber factory in Ontario to start processing mass timber.
- *Waterfront Toronto staff shared that Sidewalk Labs proposed to create a new factory in Ontario in order to catalyze the timber industry. Ontario has certified sustainable forests. Using sustainable building materials and efficiently loading trucks to reduce truck trips would contribute to sustainability efforts.*

### **Other Feedback:**

- A participant was interested in learning about whether there are any proposals that speak to sustainability related to water (water recycling and carbon capture).
- A participant commented on 5G technology and EMF harms.
- A participant expressed concern that the Sidewalk Labs proposal is below the approved zoning envelope of the site and that because of this, Waterfront Toronto is leaving possible affordable housing units on the table.

## **Breakout Room Discussion on Volume 3: The Partnership**

There were about 40 participants from the public in this room who divided into four facilitated discussions groups. The make-up of the room was diverse, including (but not limited to) interested residents, civic servants, non-profit community-serving organizations, tech and design firms, a realtor, a member of the Sidewalk Toronto Resident Reference Panel, students, journalists, an Provincial elected official (MPP), among others. Some members of Waterfront Toronto's Board also participated. The overall tone of the discussion was concern and caution, with a number of comments directed at Waterfront Toronto's review of the proposal.

### Comments on the MIDP and the public consultation

#### **The MIDP doesn't communicate well**

- The MIDP is offering too many pieces all at once. It is difficult to understand how this can actually take place.
- We need a clear, easy to understand, plain English details about what is being proposed. If Sidewalk Labs really explained the details of what is being proposed, people would be concerned and not supportive.
- At one small table discussion, a participating Waterfront Toronto board member asked: "Can people understand what is being proposed?" Responses included: "The doc is a sales pitch." "Too long." "Uses unnecessary jargon." "Unnecessarily complicated." "Feeling like there is a deliberate effort to not use clear language."
- Question to Waterfront Toronto staff person: "Have you read all 1500 pages? Is it a straightforward document?" *There's a lot of duplication, making my way through it. It's pretty repetitive. We're using the Note to Reader for the consultation.*

### **Mixed perspectives on the public consultation**

- Due to this process, the public has been engaged in important discussions about our data governance and other relevant conversations connected to the development of Toronto.
- The Note to Reader is excellent.
- The consultations (all public consultations) have a lack of legitimacy.
- The good and bad of this project will be magnified and everyone needs to be aware of that if it moves forward.

### Concern about the approach taken by Sidewalk Labs

#### **Concern about Sidewalk Labs' overreach**

- Waterfront Toronto hired Sidewalk Labs to do a planning exercise for 12 acres and they've planned for an area of 190 acres – it's an overreach that goes beyond what was asked for. Waterfront Toronto's resources are also now spread over a much larger area. Is that going to slow the process a lot? What is the opinion of Waterfront Toronto about this? What is your opinion about this? *I can't speak for all of Waterfront Toronto, but personally I think there are some exciting ideas, many would take a long time. I'm a lawyer and tend to take a conservative approach. There are a spectrum of options.*
- MIDP is an overreach from what was initially asked for in the RFP.
- Clarity wanted on why Sidewalk Labs has chosen the specific areas to start the work.

#### **Concerns and questions about Sidewalk Labs' promotion and assumptions**

- Sidewalk Labs has been 'jamming things in public discourse' on social media and other outlets about this MIDP while these public consultations are happening and that should not be allowed. Examples provide of their Instagram account.
- Concern that Sidewalk Labs says they will do one thing but not the other in the MIDP, it is a slight of hand trick. We cannot let the corporations set the table on what they will do and what they won't.
- Sidewalk Labs appears to be confident that government will cede power to it, specifically regarding the Public Administrator.
- Sidewalk Labs' anticipation that they will get government approvals in place by Q1 2020 suggests that they are making assumptions about their ability to get approvals and have governments in their pocket.
- The timelines are very aggressive. What precedent does this set for being able to move so quickly? Is Sidewalk Labs is naïve in thinking that their timelines are reasonable?
- Multiple participants stated that more clarity was needed about Sidewalk Labs long-term goals and objectives, particularly with development, with the project in order to better assess the trade-off for a pilot.
- Concern about the potential for Sidewalk Labs to offshore jobs.

### Comments on how Waterfront Toronto considers the Draft MIDP

#### **Need to question whether Sidewalk Labs is the right partner**

- "Currently we are in defense mode. Our backs feels like they're up against the wall. If we want to be the lead in the world when it comes to innovation, etc., we cannot do in defense mode. This should make us consider whether we have the right innovation partner (Sidewalk Labs) to begin with."
- Waterfront Toronto should get a read on Sidewalk Labs' long-term goals, not just for the Quayside project but in general. This is important because the relationship between Sidewalk Labs and Waterfront Toronto is still unclear from the perspective of the public and Waterfront Toronto should make sure (on behalf of the public) that this project does not "become a sword over our heads."

## **Questions and concerns about Waterfront Toronto's relationship with, and obligations to, Sidewalk Labs**

- What is the commitment of Waterfront Toronto to Sidewalk Labs and how does Waterfront Toronto continue to work in good faith? *A Waterfront Toronto representative commented that the organization is working within the Plan Development Agreement (PDA).*
- If in the future development Waterfront Toronto uses some ideas, what's Waterfront Toronto's commitment to Sidewalk Labs? *A Waterfront Toronto representative commented that there are some ideas which Sidewalk Labs would keep 100% and some that Waterfront Toronto would share.*
- Concern about "situation dependency" - what happens if down the line Sidewalk Labs/Google wants to get out of this deal or we want to get out.
- Was Waterfront Toronto aware that Sidewalk Labs was working on a bigger plan? *A Waterfront Toronto representative commented that the organization started to become aware earlier this year. Before the leak (February 2019), nothing was explicit. We were talking about the potential for scale. We spent a lot of time on Volumes 1 and 2, but Volume 3 contains the partnership plan and business plan, and it came last. As Sidewalk Labs' ideas changed, the business plan changed.*
- A participant expressed concerned that innovation and great ideas take a long time to do and things can change so much. Do we want to tie ourselves to one company?
- Questions about transparency around the initial RFP and timeline provided to submit responses.
- Can Waterfront Toronto go back to Sidewalk Labs and say that they did not deliver what was asked in the RFP and to redo it? *A Waterfront Toronto representative commented that as part of the evaluation process Waterfront Toronto will use through the feedback from these public consultations.*
- Questions about timeline of final due date of Sidewalk Labs' revised proposal and role for public to view that and provide feedback.
- What is Waterfront Toronto's negotiating ability with Sidewalk Labs and ability to revise the agreement after it is established?

## **Need limits and an exit strategy**

- What are the exit strategies? Can this be vetoed by other levels of government because of non-regulatory requirements? Appears Sidewalk Labs has been hired for the duration.
- Is it possible for it to be Quayside only? And if we say yes to Quayside, then we need to make sure that 5 years later there isn't a surprise ask by Sidewalk Labs for more.
- What is the framework for Waterfront Toronto to put "lines in the sand"? Who determines the "you can'ts"? For example, you can't have more than 1 sensor every x distance or you can't monitor inside apartment units.

## **A threat to our democratic processes and institutions**

- There were multiple comments that Sidewalk Labs' approach, and their proposal in general, potentially pose a threat to our democratic processes and institutions.
- It was noted that the risk to democratic process was too high (the sentiment was echoed by others at the table, through nodding and agreement).
- The process and consultation on the West Don Lands and East Bayfront were "brilliant" but the process for this proposal is different.

## **Need analysis of real impacts as well as the potential unintended consequences of the proposal, including (but not limited to) human impacts, impacts on activities in the neighbouring and surrounding areas, and impacts on the Canadian tech ecosystem**

- The real and unintended consequences of this project have not been adequately laid out by Sidewalk Labs. Waterfront Toronto needed to seriously consider all consequences and outcomes of this project and whether what was being proposed was feasible or had any unintended consequences (e.g. land titling system/process does not fit what Sidewalk Labs is proposing around land leasing and acquisition, and would we be adjusting entire systems to accommodate them? the proposed economic benefits may not actually be realized in the event that they cannot find enough of the types of workers that they need in the area or simply choose to outsource that work to other countries). Because of this, it appears as though Sidewalk Labs is just trying to get the go-ahead and will deal with the details of implementation later.
- In this 360 degree consideration of the proposal, Waterfront Toronto and others needed to consider impacts on the current Canadian tech ecosystem, particularly in the event that Sidewalk Labs pulls out after several years and whether or not we trust them in that regard, as well as the precedent it may set for developers in other parts of the province who want building codes changed for their own purposes.
- Waterfront Toronto needs to get more information on the positives and negative impacts on surrounding areas, particularly how would any connecting pieces be used or improved – connecting trails, dedicated water taxis, etc. What would be the impact on those current services that are accessed by surrounding areas?
- How would the services / solutions proposed for the district integrate with the rest of the city?
- The lens we have been using to date to talk about the MIDP is from through 'economic development.' We need to review this from an 'impact on humans' lens.
- Concern/need clarity about what would the City be on the hook for down the line.

#### **Involve external experts and residents in the evaluation**

- In order to deal with risks, which may or may not be fully understood or identified by Waterfront Toronto, Waterfront Toronto needs to consult as many experts as possible, representing a diversity of sectoral experience, expertise, geography and general knowledge (the participant said “everyone from farmers to City Planners”) to assess the proposal from a 360 degree angle. The opinions of City experts and officials should be given additional weight and consideration.
- Since the MIDP needs to be approved/agreed upon by both Waterfront Toronto and Sidewalk Labs, what is the breakdown of evaluation? Who from Waterfront Toronto is evaluating the technical and financial aspects of the MIDP? Is all of that at the expense of Waterfront Toronto?

#### **Consider 12 acres first**

- The concept should first be proven at Quayside before scaled elsewhere.
- A lot of land along the Waterfront is possibly very valuable; if Sidewalk Labs does get approval and “it doesn’t go according to plan” then we (Waterfront Toronto and the public) are left with the fallout of that and sunk costs. Waterfront Toronto should stick to a pilot project to mitigate the risks and avoid possible disaster.
- Why can’t we test this out in 12 acres and see if it works, then move to 190? Is Waterfront Toronto holding Sidewalk Labs to Quayside only? Is Sidewalk Labs willing to buy or lease Quayside and Villiers, or just buy?
- Concern that this is a mismatch between the agreed upon idea that this would remain a pilot and the amount and type of land being considered for use in this pilot (we are “giving up the heart and liver of Toronto”).
- Waterfront Toronto needs to clarify with the public the scope of the RFP as it relates for the desire for something that is scalable. What was Waterfront Toronto’s vision for the scalability of the initiative?

- If Sidewalk Labs is held to the 12 acres, how much of what is in the MIDP needs to stay in place, specifically the Public Administrator?
- Has Sidewalk Labs made it clear whether they intend to only develop on Quayside and Villiers or that they just want to start there? Advice was given that if that hasn't been made clear, it should be made clear to Waterfront Toronto.

### **Need to ensure involvement of residents and other local entities that haven't been considered**

- If there's any consideration of going beyond Quayside, then before that decision is made, we would need to go through this whole consultation again.
- If this is to go forward, we need to ensure resident involvement.
- Let's consider all the other local entities that can be involved in this proposal that Sidewalk Labs has not considered (current schools, housing systems, etc.).

### **Need strong Waterfront Toronto leadership**

- Waterfront Toronto should manage this process strongly. Bring diverse experts who represent the community into the decision making and oversight process.
- Need clarity on whether the proposal, if approved by Waterfront Toronto, would still have to be approved by city council and the province/ federal governments? How would the other levels of government be able to influence the process?
- This appears to be more like an experiment than a pilot or a test and experiments typically have fewer controls than tests. Waterfront Toronto needs to determine the controls for this project.

### **Consider how to move forward while addressing risks**

- The risk is apparent but we also need to consider the risk of not moving forward with this opportunity. We need to look through the lens of, "how can we harness this proposal to strengthen our democratic institutions and create less conflict of interest for future models/projects." We may miss this opportunity because of fear when we may have an opportunity to use this project to address all the things we are concerned about. Waterfront Toronto should figure out what it is(n't) willing to budge on and think about how they might move forward while addressing the risks outlined in this discussion.
- If it can be demonstrated that the governance structure remains the same as current Waterfront Toronto governance systems, then perhaps the IDEA district idea could be considered. Alternatively, we would need to establish enforceable and strong regulations.
- Waterfront Toronto would need to lead the proposed development.
- Existing oversight bodies should oversee the project and not create new bodies.

### Comments on governance proposals

#### **Questions and concerns about the Public Administrator**

- Several participants said that more information and clarity is needed about the Public Administrator and management entities.
- There were a significant number of questions about the Public Administrator, how it would function, and its role/responsibilities as well as its interactions with government, specifically, City Council. Why does Sidewalk Labs believe this approach is required? Who would appoint the Public Administrator?
- The language about the Public Administrator is very vague, and questions of whether Sidewalk Labs had discussed it at any of their public consultations.
- Sidewalk Labs proposes new administrative roles. How does that work and who are they accountable to? I don't understand it.



- Concern that the agreement and the new oversight bodies are eroding / trumping democratically accountable public actors
- A lot of concern and questions regarding the 3 new proposed agencies. Why is Sidewalk Labs not prepared to work with existing oversight bodies? Who would be sitting on these committees? How would these people be appointed? Who would run housing and how would housing partnerships be established?
- Questions about transparency. The MIDP proposes quasi-private institutional models. We already have mechanisms for governing things like housing (TCHC) and transit (TTC). Why are they proposing things where we already have democratic processes?
- Comments that the MIDP proposes a duplication of governance structures that already exists. *A Waterfront Toronto representative commented that Waterfront Toronto is able to carry out 6 out of the 8 pieces.*
- Concern about the 4 bodies that would be under the Public Administrator and how this infringes on the Canada democratic process. It creates huge layers of bureaucracy.

### **Concerns about privatization, the influence of Sidewalk Labs and Google, and the resources they have (which would be hard to fight)**

- Concern about "privatization creep". What may end up happening is that once there are all these sub-committees, they will be pressured into decisions by Sidewalk Labs/Google since they would be advising on what's needed.
- Concern about privatizing city services.
- Concern that directly elected governments have previously not been able to control corporations. The Draft MIDP proposes something new (the Public Administrator) and that will do nothing. It will be very difficult to control Sidewalk Labs. Comment that Google is a huge company with lots of money and it will be hard to fight them.
- Concern that if Google wants to 'advise' the different levels of government on ideas, then they are going to influence to have things happen in their favour.
- Concern that what is being proposed would become an "economic zone" with different regulations that would be exploitative
- "We need to think through whether Quayside would be a Vatican City of sorts."
- Sidewalk Labs has a possible conflictual relationship: they are asking for a great deal of power and public money, so how wise is it to have Sidewalk Labs take on quasi-governmental powers while simultaneously funding the project? Does that give them too much leverage or opportunity to blackmail the City of Toronto?
- There is a lot of concern about a private actor playing the role of government.

### Comments on the proposal

#### **Concern about the focus on innovation**

- "I don't like how we got to this point. Whatever friction now exists (e.g. with the letter from the Chair), Waterfront Toronto went overboard with innovation by putting the RFP out at all in the form that it did. Why are we not questioning the basic premise? Why go overboard with innovation? Where did the idea come from? Doesn't seem like this is causing any friction. The areas that are sticking out to Waterfront Toronto are really minor aspects of this whole thing."
- Can we get some sort of plan without financing and without innovation?
- The innovation strategy proposed in the MIDP is quite mundane. All are very standard fare. It is something that anyone who wants to talk about innovation would have done.

#### **Questions and concerns related to financing, performance benefits, profit sharing**

- A strong feeling that Sidewalk Labs should NOT make money from city revenue.

- I'm interested in the concept of performance benefits if Sidewalk Labs can meet targets. What types of things would we give as a bonus? And what are the repercussions of failing to deliver?
- Need to understand more about how Profit Sharing scheme is beneficial to the City of Toronto as well as the impact of this on local companies. There is also a sense that this may be used as a bargaining chip between Sidewalk Labs and Waterfront Toronto and we should not let Sidewalk Labs decide the profit sharing scheme.
- Is Sidewalk Labs trying to become a private financier of public projects?
- Is there precedence for governments paying private actors performance payments in the way that has been proposed?
- Mixed views on transit financing. Some strong views against private financing, some see that land value is already being lost because of the lack of transit availability currently.
- 10% of IP revenue is not a good deal.

### **Questions and concern related to technology and IP**

- Sidewalk Labs should only be able to make money on tech product development and revenue, and not from public revenue sources. Sidewalk Labs should not be paid for an opportunity to develop scalable urban technology.
- Has there been any discussion with respect to facial recognition being implemented there? *No.*
- Issues related to privacy and data are time delayed. They don't appear to be an issue after much later and we would only find out later the consequences. Example provided of Uber starting back in the day and now it's impact on public transit.
- Uncomfortable that what is being proposed in the MIDP sounds like people who live in that area would have to 'opt in' around the negative effects of technology/privacy, etc. We need to keep in mind about the impact of those who pass by the area.
- How would 10% revenue from IP sales be dispersed? Can it be re-invested in revitalization?
- More information is desired regarding the use of data to create IP and how Sidewalk Labs can make money from the technology developed
- Would Toronto have an exclusivity agreement with Sidewalk Labs on the technology that they develop?

### **Other**

- Interest in affordable housing and net zero goals / targets.
- MIDP offers nothing unique.
- Canada has a history of exploitation of our natural resources.

## **Breakout Room Discussion on Digital Innovations, Privacy, Digital Governance, and Intellectual Property**

There were approximately 50 participants who divided into three facilitated discussion groups. Two of the groups focused on Digital Innovations, Privacy, and Digital Governance, and one of the groups focused on Intellectual Property. The make-up of the room was diverse, including (but not limited to): residents, members of Waterfront Toronto's Digital Strategy Advisory Panel, technology entrepreneurs, members of the Block Sidewalk campaign, and others.

Several participants were in the room to listen and learn, while others were there to share feedback and concerns with Waterfront Toronto about the Sidewalk Labs Proposal. The overarching topics discussed in the room were:

## Feedback about the project overall

### **Regulation should be in place first**

- Several participants felt strongly that Waterfront Toronto should not be saying yes to technology that is not governed by a regulatory framework. Terms like “urban data” and “urban data trust” do not exist in any Canadian regulations, for example, and we shouldn’t be contemplating allowing a private corporation to define these in the absence of our own definitions. Some felt we should wait and see what kind of regulations get developed by government before making a decision on our own.
- Participants also discussed the importance of “strong first principles” around a digital governance framework, saying that its unlikely legislation will ever be able to catch up or keep pace with the rate of technological innovation. They said strong first principles around digital governance could help address the slow rate of regulatory change and said these principles should be in place at the Federal, Provincial, and Municipal levels before making a decision about Sidewalk Labs’ proposal.

### **Distrust of Sidewalk Labs / Google / Alphabet and fear of data collection**

- Some participants said they were open to exploring the idea of a smart city, but many said they did not trust Sidewalk Labs and felt Waterfront Toronto should not partner with them. They referred to Google’s track record of abandoned projects (referencing the recent Google Fibre abandonment) and poorly implemented initiatives and said Waterfront Toronto should be considering this history. Others said they felt like Sidewalk Labs was seeking us out rather than Waterfront Toronto seeking them out, potentially motivated to site Google’s headquarters in the Port Lands. A few encouraged Waterfront Toronto to hire the best experts to review the MIDP from a public interest perspective.
- Some said they were very uncomfortable with any kind of data collection in an urban environment, saying citizens effectively become tech companies’ products in these kinds of environments. Others said it’s increasingly difficult to opt out of data tracking, saying things like Bluetooth beacons and WiFi are increasingly sophisticated at tracking people, even if they’re not carrying a phone.

### **A big opportunity to get a good digital governance framework in place**

- Participants said that the market models around data are still emerging across the world and that the models we settle on will have repercussions for a very long time. We are at an inflection point, they said: people are now paying attention to this discussion and waking up to the unintended consequences of un-regulated technology. They said there is a big opportunity to put in place the kind of framework we want: one with citizen control.
- A few said there are opportunities worth exploring in what Sidewalk Labs has proposed and said we shouldn’t be afraid of things because they are new or tech-embedded. A few participants cited potential benefits to being a test bed including jobs, economic activity, and brand development. Of those willing to consider Sidewalk Labs’ proposal, some said we should adopt these ideas incrementally (rather than all at once) so we can better mitigate risks. A few said they need to better understand what the trade-offs are beyond nominal cash value, saying these are currently not clear.
- Participants suggested Waterfront Toronto look at other places and try to develop an even better regulatory framework than Europe’s Greater Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). They also said we should learn from our own local experiences (e.g. Uber and AirBNB), where our policy was reactive rather than proactive.

### **Suggestions about the Urban Data Trust**

- Participants said the Urban Data Trust should be more carefully defined, especially if “Trust” already means something under Canadian law. These definitions are important to establish early, before people get into the weeds of issues like access to data, data formats, etc.

Participants also suggested Waterfront Toronto require Sidewalk Labs to create/share more details about the Trust, including an elaboration on how different levels of government and agencies would be involved in its oversight enforcement.

- Others suggested Waterfront Toronto advocate for a de-centralized Urban Data Trust through the creation of multiple Trusts (similar to how there are multiple banks) rather than a single, monolithic entity. A de-centralized system is feasible from both a technical and policy perspective and would help put people and personal choice at the centre of data stewardship. A de-centralized system, they said, would help produce a “true smart city”: a city that is not a place of surveillance, but a place with digitally-safe and autonomous citizens.

### **Other topics discussed related to data**

Participants discussed a number of other data-related topics, including:

- Opportunities for public access to data. There should be clear mechanisms for the public to request and gain access to data gathered in a readable, useable, organized, and maintained format.
- Data collection must demonstrate public good. For each new digital initiative at Quayside, there should be a process that requires proponents to show how the collection of data would benefit the public and how it would affect the city (and even province and country) at large.
- Data breach enforcement. Participants said individuals should be held accountable for data breaches.
- No consequences for opting out. Participants said there shouldn't be consequences to opting out of data collection, such as denial of service or increased prices. Right now, insurance companies are offering incentives by tracking people's cars and/or fitness activity.
- There needs to be the neighbourhood equivalent of the “no photo” sticker distributed at the meeting, i.e. a way to identify you're not interested in being tracked.

### Feedback about Intellectual Property and partnership

Participants had questions and feedback about the Intellectual Property Proposals. Participants wanted to understand how this project would serve small and medium Canadian companies, with a few saying the Quayside project could help taking Canadian tech companies to global markets.

### **Questions and feedback about profit sharing**

- Interest in learning the rationale for sharing in 10% of the profits for 10 years.
- Desire to see a dollar figure connected to the profit-sharing proposal. Participants said this profit-sharing proposal could be a loophole for Sidewalk Labs, especially when it looks at profit (as opposed to revenue). Some said Google has a history of giving tech for free and/or reinvesting its money so that it appears to have no profit.
- Interest in learning whether the 10% applies to technologies only (i.e. not to data).

### **Question and feedback about the patent pledge**

- Some asked Waterfront Toronto look into whether we over-estimating the power of patents, saying rapid evolution of technology can render tech patents less useful. Others said that patents do not create a monopoly; being tied to one service provider does.

### **Other feedback about Intellectual Property and partnership**

- Participants said there would need to be commercial assurances that businesses are not automatically giving their innovative ideas to Sidewalk Labs and that setting up a business in Quayside does not automatically create commercial value for another company. There

needs to be a balance between collecting fair monetary compensation from Sidewalk Labs and encourage/protecting Canadian small and medium enterprises.

### **Advice for any contracts or agreements with Sidewalk Labs**

- Participants suggested Waterfront Toronto create an exit clause and/or contract review every two or five years (or at least a clause to renegotiate) in case the testbed is not working out, new technologies are developed, or macro-economic conditions change. This partnership should not be a “one-way door.” Participants also said that, as “beta testers,” Torontonians have a mechanism to upgrade to the latest and greatest technology when it’s ready rather than be stuck on the beta version. Finally, some shared concern about Sidewalk Labs paying 8% for maintaining city infrastructure in perpetuity, saying this outsources a major government responsibility.

### Feedback about the consultation process

Participants shared advice for Waterfront Toronto about the consultation process:

- Appreciation of the Note to Reader as a useful summary and learning tool. More tools like this should be available the next round of consultation.
- More clarity from Waterfront Toronto, including what has been agreed to, what roles everyone plays, and whether this is already a done deal or not.
- More definitions of key terms, including “testbed,” “urban data,” “scale,” etc.

## **Feedback from the Closing Plenary**

The following feedback was shared in the Closing Plenary. Responses from Waterfront Toronto team members, where provided, are noted *in italics*.

### **Concerns about the track record of Sidewalk Labs, their sister company Google, and their parent company Alphabet**

- Google abandoned fibre optic in Kentucky and left a mess. Does Google get to leapfrog City Council? Does it want to be responsible for social infrastructure? Are these technologies beneficial to Toronto? We already have difficulty with transit, sewage, etc. If Google HQ gets located on Villiers Island, do they become a city unto themselves? We should be instead focusing on the most pressing needs in Toronto.

### **Concern that the MIDP goes outside the 12 acre focus of the RFP**

- My point is to reinforce the sentiment. I’m confused about the process. Are we dealing with Quayside or this IDEA district? When I read the Note to Reader, which is well done, (thanks for doing this), throughout it, there’s a repeated phrase: “it is outside of Waterfront Toronto’s mandate”. This appears on just about every issue. How could this be? The person bidding should follow the Request for Proposal (RFP). The RFP says that the opportunity is the Quayside development, 4.9 hectare site on Toronto’s eastern waterfront. I walk into this room, it’s a Quayside public consultation, but everything else doesn’t deal with Quayside, instead it deals with something outside of the Terms of Reference of this project. My request to Waterfront Toronto is give us some clarity. I would love to talk about Quayside – sustainability, timber buildings, affordable housing, all the things, but every time I read something, Sidewalk Labs says it needs 200 acres. Even internet service. What is it we’re having a public consultation on? *A lot of issues were touched on there. The best place to start is the nature of the RFP. The RFP was objective based – it said these are big challenges, and it was looking for ways to address those challenges. Quayside was identified as the pilot site for that. The RFP also says that, to the extent that solutions are*

*successful in Quayside, they would be also be considered in future developments (subject to other procurement processes). Sidewalk Labs says we need to think about it at bigger scale – that it's the only way to solve these problems.*

**Need to think more broadly about the connection between this project and the Canadian GDP – and understand whether the contribution would be bigger if Canadian companies were running this rather than a US global tech giant**

- I'm hoping what comes out of this review of the proposal is a deep dive on evaluating whether this project would be good for the city, the province, and the country in terms of economic development. The Toronto waterfront provides a unique location for tech, and a strategic opportunity to transform the Canadian economic from a focus on resource extraction to high value digital. The global value of the smart city tech sector is going to be worth \$2 trillion in 5 years. That's the entire 2018 Canadian GDP. If Canadian tech companies capture a fraction of that sector, our economy would boost. The MIDP suggests that by 2040, the smart city sector could be worth \$4.2 billion to the Canadian GDP. If Canadian tech companies were leading this proposal, we would have a greater impact to the Canadian GDP. What I'd like to see is the running of some scenarios to determine what would be the benefit to the Canadian economy if a Canadian company(ies) were running this project instead of giving it to a US tech giant.

**Need research that puts this proposal in a global context, with examples of other partnerships that we can compare to the Draft MIDP proposal from Sidewalk Labs**

- To discuss the proposal without context is irresponsible and lacks transparency. We don't know the global context – we're in a bubble. We need someone who is neutral to do a good literature review that can put this proposal in the context of partnerships globally. Then we'll have options on how to think about this, with different partnership examples that fall into different categories. This should be done by the second round of consultations – not because it should be done by people without democratic oversight, but so that we have a good precis of what's happening in the global context.

**Lack of transparency around Alphabet's track record**

- Alphabet has a history of not following / abandoning global agreements. It's irresponsible to have conversations about partnerships with a company that already has violations. Their track record should be fully disclosed and on the website. Why have conversations without a credit check?

**Math in the MIDP doesn't add up**

- I'm concerned about numbers of jobs referenced in the MIDP – the math doesn't add up. Those jobs don't have to be in Canada and will not be. That has not been Alphabet's model. Where have they ever maintained that kind of employment and not collapsed the local sector as they pull out, move around? They have also inflated rents. In Silicon Valley people making \$200,000 that need a 3 bedroom apartment have trouble paying rent. There is a failure of transparency in 1,500 page report. We need to know where their numbers come from. This kind of magic math doesn't work.

**Good Jobs for All Statement (see attached)**

- I joined Block Sidewalk to lobby against Sidewalk Labs because of the issue of privacy, private control of government land, and surveillance. The Good Jobs for All Coalition has a statement about the potential for exclusion with this project. They have six concerns and a statement that I'll provide.

**What's the difference between this and a gated community?**

- My question is about the potential for exclusion. What is the difference between this proposal and a gated community? Can you rent a picnic bench, and then if an outsider wants it, you don't get access to the park? I'm not against some of the ideas, but are they exclusive to that community? How do other residents participate? What's the difference between this and a gated community? *Waterfront Toronto is committed to making a waterfront for all of Toronto. We will be doing our review with that especially in mind. We don't want a gated community on the waterfront.*

### **The question of financing should be off the table**

- I'd like to think about the financing situation. Sidewalk Labs, Alphabet – they're asking for a huge amount of authority over sites that they want to plan, build, run, and finance. All of that power is astonishing. And if we don't do what they like, they can walk away. They want to pay the piper and be the piper. It's a frightening situation. Insist in future discussions, the question of financing should be off the table.

### **Impressed by the MIDP and support for the proposal at scale**

- I'm a retired professor of in visual arts history. Toronto is an arts city. I want to say I've been impressed by Waterfront Toronto's diligence in evaluating and consulting. I'm also impressed by the MIDP proposed by Sidewalk Labs. Often, very formative ventures have come to Toronto from the outside. For example, City Hall was built by a Finnish architect, the TD Centre was a pioneering venture too. The nervousness that I feel is very typically Toronto. We export important designers and architects from Canada, too — it's a two-way road. I am somewhat persuaded by Sidewalk Labs' argument that the advanced systems they would put in place need a larger area than Quayside. It all looks very big, but the IDEA district is  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a square mile. It's a fraction of the whole waterfront. I would love to live in that area. It sounds more like a neighbourhood than many contemporary developments put up piecemeal. Would Waterfront Toronto talk to us about the risks of dropping this proposal? How much of a delay would there be if we went back to square one? *We're conducting a full risk assessment of both the positive and negative elements of the proposal. We will be moving forward with or without Sidewalk Labs. Waterfront Toronto and the community has learned a lot through the process — I don't think it would be back to square one. We wouldn't have less in terms of innovation and sustainability, we would still seek out those things. We'll report back once we've done our evaluation.*

### **Caution about big data, lack of ability to get informed consent – just because we can, doesn't mean we should**

- The public is largely unaware of technology out there that can surveil people, and they are unaware of big data capabilities. With enough data points, you can paint a real picture of who a person is. There is no real way to get informed consent if these technologies are deployed. So is it worth it? Just because these technologies are available, doesn't mean we should use them.

### **Make sure this is good for Toronto, Ontario and Canada**

- Sidewalk Labs is part of a larger corporation. This proposal is largely beneficial to Sidewalk Labs. If a Google campus comes here, there will be a lot of Google employees there – it will be by Google, for Google. When you go back for negotiations, make sure it's in the interest of Toronto, Ontario, and Canada rather than Alphabet.

### **This is about data**

- I second what he said about Alphabet in terms of its history and the surveillance society. Also, I don't think this experiment is about architecture – like the examples raised about city hall, etc. Those builders and architects did not get personal data in exchange for their work – we're being asked to give up personal, medical, financial data. This is a lab, an

experiment, and we're guinea pigs. It's good to talk about housing and transit, but I'm concerned as a commuter that my data is collected or will be collected inadvertently. I don't want that to be collected.

**We want to be part of innovation – we have to mitigate risks and come up with a constructive solution (and Google needs to earn trust and respect)**

- I think the majority of people here are against the proposal. Me, I'm quite neutral. I'm an expert on data privacy and ethics and I'm quite aware of Sidewalk Labs. My impression is that the general public is fearful because they don't understand the details of what's going on. The whole project is very large and I understand the concerns about surveillance. But what are the benefits of what Sidewalk Labs is trying to do? We want to be part of innovation, digital transformation, and this is crucial. We can't kill it because there's something that's concerning. We have to mitigate the risks and come up with a constructive solution rather than just saying "this is not going to happen, this is bad". Google needs to communicate well and earn trust and respect from residents.

**Need governments to create the strong regulatory framework, not Google lobbyists**

- I want to say that none of this should occur without a strong regulatory framework at all levels of government. Everything proposed needs to have its own set of regulations. We also need rigorous public consultation. The regulatory framework should not be written by Google lobbyists, as is currently the case. The work needs to happen at all levels of government.
- When does Waterfront Toronto receive the final plan? Is there a deadline as to when the final plan will be received? We need all of us to be looking at the same document. Sidewalk Labs fragments the discourse when negotiating with other levels of government. For this process to have legitimacy, we all need the same target – it can't be moving. When does Sidewalk Labs have to give you the final plan so the public can understand what it is? *The current MIDP is draft. Sidewalk Labs may decide to make amendments to it – through a letter or addendum. They may or may not choose to do that. We would consult the public on any changes made by Sidewalk Labs as part of the second round of consultation (so we're all evaluating one document).*
- Sidewalk Labs is part of Google and Google collects data. Is technology the right solution to the challenges we're considering? Waterfront Toronto has said there is not yet enough information to proceed to evaluation. Is this worthwhile? Are we just giving our data and information away? *There was a lot there. These are questions we take very seriously. We ask: Is technology the right solution to the problem we're trying to solve? The fourth point in the Chair's letter is there's not enough information yet to understand the solutions being proposed. We need more detail in terms of the data architecture, data proposals, etc. That trade-off / value proposition is top of mind. I encourage you to look at Waterfront Toronto's Digital Principles to see how we frame the conversation.*





## *Waterfront Development in the Public Interest?*

The Good Jobs for All Coalition represents over 30 community, labour and environmental groups in the Greater Toronto Area. Given our focus on healthy communities, a sustainable economy, strong public services, equity and decent work for all, the Coalition held a forum in December 2018 on Google's Sidewalk Lab bid. We continue to report on developments at our monthly meetings.

**Why are we so concerned?** We want to ensure the interests of the public and working people are given priority in our planning for waterfront development and innovations. As Waterfront Toronto begins a review specific to the Google affiliate's proposal, we want to support member organizations speaking out about the risks to privacy protections, low-income housing commitments and the environment. Here are some other risks:

1. **A Public Land Grab.** Any proposal must abide by the original Quayside Request for Proposals. This is a 12 acre 'experiment' not a massive 200 acre development project that cherry-picks prize public real estate. The Canadian Civil Liberties Association has filed a court challenge over the legality of even considering Sidewalk Lab's expansionist land grab. Who let the dogs out!?
2. **A Power Grab.** There is a great risk of a 'privatopia' of private and profit-driven governance, a virtual 4<sup>th</sup> level of government, accountable to no one. We see this in the suggestion of a private authority for transit and potentially other services like health care. Public services, public sector jobs and public governance must prevail. And there must be no concessions on the bylaws and regulations set by our democratic public institutions.
3. **Precarious Work.** Private development of smart city concepts and private control of technology can undermine job security and rights through subcontracting, short term contracts, etc. We need government accountability and oversight of labour protections including Toronto's Fair Wage Policy and negotiated Community Benefit Agreements.
4. **"Surveillance City"**. It's a real risk given Google's interest in the profits that will come from mining the data provided by extensive surveillance of the public. It runs the risk of exclusion including the risk of being used as a form of criminalization targeting in particular, members of marginalized communities.
5. **Phony investments and innovations.** Sidewalk Lab has no experience with large scale urban development and low income and equity in housing. They are proposing affordable housing targets well below the public need and they expect to offload some costs to the public purse through future corporate tax concessions, even though public dollars are already funding the hugely expensive Quayside environmental cleanup.
6. **Sidewalk Lab's proposal threatens to divert resources and attention** from underserved neighbourhoods, undermining our equity and anti-poverty agenda.

The Sidewalk Lab proposal poses questions and issues that impact not only the Waterfront but the whole city and in particular the workers and communities of Toronto.

**The risks are huge. All eyes should be on this proposal.**

*The Good Jobs for All Coalition (GJFA) is an alliance of more than 30 community, labour, social justice, youth and environmental organizations in the Toronto region. It was formed in 2008 to start a focused dialogue on how to improve living and working conditions in Canada's largest urban centre. For 10 years, the coalition has worked to develop strategies that affirm the values of a truly just society - healthy communities, a green economy, strong public services, equity, and decent work for all. The coalition meets monthly and is co-chaired by Tam Goosen and Carolyn Egan respectively representing community organizations and labour organizations.*

Good Jobs for All: <http://goodjobsforall.ca/about/>