

APPENDIX A – COMMUNICATION AND PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS



WATERFRONTToronto



Help decide the future of the Gardiner Expressway East

We invite you to join us at the third public meeting where you can comment on the results of the evaluation of the alternative solutions for the future of the Gardiner Expressway East.

The Study

Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto are jointly carrying out the Gardiner Expressway / Lake Shore Boulevard Reconfiguration Environmental Assessment (EA) and Integrated Urban Design Study. The EA will determine the future of the Gardiner Expressway East and Lake Shore Boulevard East, from approximately Jarvis Street to approximately Leslie Street. The study area for the EA is displayed on the map below.

The four alternative solutions that have been considered are:

- **Maintain** the elevated expressway;
- **Improve** the urban fabric while maintaining the existing expressway;
- **Replace** with a new above-or-below grade expressway; and,
- **Remove** the elevated expressway and build a new boulevard.

Get Involved

Interested persons are invited to participate through a series of public meetings, live webcasts, workshops and online opportunities. If you can't attend in person, you can participate and watch the meeting online at www.gardinereast.ca.

Gardiner Expressway East Public Meeting Thursday, February 6, 2014

**6:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m. at The Bram & Bluma Appel Salon, Toronto Reference Library
789 Yonge Street, Toronto (Bloor Street subway station)
Open house begins at 6:30 p.m.; presentations at 7:00 p.m.**

Please register at: www.gardinereastpublicmeetingfeb6.eventbrite.ca

For more information or to be added to the project mailing list, contact info@gardinereast.ca, or call (416) 479-0662.

To learn about the project or contribute your insights and views please visit www.gardinereast.ca.



Note: Certain disciplines will conduct investigations at a city or regional level. These areas are not defined here.

Follow us on:



Call



Information will be collected in accordance with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

building our new blue edge



RELEASE

Result of the Third Phase of the Gardiner Expressway East Environmental Assessment

Toronto – February 5, 2014 – An Environmental Assessment (EA) looking at the future of the Gardiner Expressway’s eastern portion has completed its evaluation of the four options: **Maintain** the elevated expressway; **Improve** the urban fabric while maintaining the existing expressway; **Replace** with a new expressway; and **Remove** the elevated expressway and build a new boulevard.

The analysis has produced an assessment of the four options, which can be viewed here:

<http://www.gardinereast.ca/media-gallery>

“We are now seeking further public input on the future of the Gardiner Expressway East, as we strive to find a practical and cost effective solution that will support Toronto’s vital transportation needs well into the future, while balancing a number of important city-building priorities for residents and the city,” said John Livey, Deputy City Manager for the City of Toronto.

“The EA presents us with an opportunity to decide how to deal with the significant and costly rehabilitation issues presented by this section of the Gardiner,” said John Campbell, President and CEO of Waterfront Toronto. “This is a hugely important infrastructure project and represents a big investment for the city. We have a choice about how we can make the most of this investment for generations to come.”

The Gardiner Expressway and Lake Shore Boulevard Reconfiguration Environmental Assessment and Urban Design Study, jointly undertaken by Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto, is looking at the future of the 2.4-kilometre elevated section of the Gardiner Expressway East and Lake Shore Boulevard East, from approximately Lower Jarvis Street to just east of the Don Valley Parkway (DVP) at Logan Avenue. The four options are being examined in light of the EA’s goals, passed by Toronto City Council in 2009, which are:

- **Reconnect the City with the Lake** – Any reconfiguration of the Gardiner Expressway will need to include welcoming and accessible routes to the waterfront, breaking down the physical and psychological barriers that exist today.
- **Balance Modes of Travel** – Any new configuration of the Gardiner Expressway will need to support growth and maintain an effective local and regional transportation system, including commuters and freight, and minimize the impacts by balancing alternative travel modes, including transit, cycling and walking.

- **Achieve Sustainability** – This project should advance the City of Toronto’s and Waterfront Toronto’s commitments to green, healthy and energy efficient development, and employ sustainable design solutions that can improve environmental quality and biodiversity and minimize public health risks.
- **Create Value** – The future shape of the Gardiner Expressway should act as a catalyst for good development and contribute to an integrated, vibrant and successful waterfront. It is understood that any investment in the Expressway should be financially sustainable and maximize opportunities for revitalization and enhance economic and environmental benefits.

The results of the evaluation of the alternative solutions for the future of the Gardiner Expressway East Environmental Assessment will be presented at a public information session tomorrow night. This event offers the public an opportunity to provide feedback to the project team, after which City staff will draft a formal recommendation for the consideration of City Council based on this preliminary result.

The high level concepts for each of the four alternatives were developed by the EA project team following input collected during phase one of the public consultations and further analysis of each of the options. Each concept is illustrative of what could be created, but does not represent the final design.

The high level concepts and evaluation criteria are limited to the eastern end of the elevated Gardiner Expressway, which has lower traffic volumes than the western portion of the expressway. The western portion of the highway is already undergoing extensive rehabilitation and maintenance that will ensure the current elevated configuration will remain safe and in a state of good repair.

The Public Information Meeting will be held on Thursday, February 6, 2014 from 6:30 – 9:00 p.m. at The Bram & Bluma Appel Salon, Toronto Reference Library, 789 Yonge Street, Toronto (Bloor subway). Open house starts at 6:30 p.m.; presentations to follow at 7:00 p.m. Participants are asked to please register at: www.gardinereastpublicmeetingfeb6.eventbrite.ca

People unable to attend the meeting in person can participate online by watching the live webcast at www.gardinereast.ca or join the live twitter discussions at #GardinerEast.

-30-

A media kit, including a selection of the high level concept images is available at: <http://www.waterfronttoronto.ca/newsroom>

Media contacts:

Andrew Hilton
Waterfront Toronto
ahilton@waterfronttoronto.ca
office: 416-214-1344 x263
mobile: 416-427-4613

Steve Johnston
City of Toronto
sjohnsto@toronto.ca
416-392-4391

**APPENDIX B –
SAC MEETING SUMMARY**



**Future of the Gardiner East
Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)
Meeting 13-4**

**Tuesday, February 4, 2014 | 7:00 pm – 9:00 pm
Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 308-309**

Meeting Summary

1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction

Ms. Liz Nield, CEO of Lura Consulting, began the forth Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting by welcoming committee members and thanking them for attending the session. She introduced the facilitation team from Lura Consulting and led a round of introductions. Ms. Nield also reviewed the meeting agenda and informed committee members that the purpose of the meeting was to present and discuss results of the evaluation of alternatives.

Mr. John Livey, Deputy City Manager, City of Toronto and Mr. John Campbell, President and CEO of Waterfront Toronto, also welcomed the committee members to the meeting. In their opening remarks, Mr. Livey and Mr. Campbell iterated the purpose of the SAC meeting to discuss results of the evaluation of alternatives; and asked SAC members to indicate if anything had been missed, or anything should be considered moving forward. Mr. Livey and Mr. Campbell indicated that the report would be going to Public Works and Infrastructure Committee on March 4, and Council following that date. They thanked committee members for sharing their time and expertise.

A copy of the agenda is available in Appendix A, while a list of attending SAC members can be viewed in Appendix B.

2. SAC Member Briefing

Mr. Chris Glaisek, VP, Planning and Design, Waterfront Toronto, reviewed the draft slide presentation which included:

- A summary of participant feedback heard to date and,
- A review of the results of the evaluation of alternatives.

For more information about the evaluation of the alternatives, please visit the consultation website www.gardinereast.ca.

3. Facilitated Discussion – Evaluation Criteria

SAC members provided the following feedback and advice on the material presented:

Future of the Gardiner Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
February 4, 2014 – Summary Report

Costs

- Simplify and clarify the information presented in Slide 51 (i.e. difference between blue and green columns). Consider showing the green and blue values on two different slides, or including only one or the other in the presentation. Some members said they liked that both valuations were shown and that it is important to clearly explain the difference between the two.
- Consider presenting a calculation to illustrate the value of commuting time lost (could use same valuation as Metrolinx does).
- Clarify that the cost of new ramps is included in costing for the remove option.
- Consider including a slide that shows total net cost to the City of the various options.

Peak Hour Volumes

- Explain the information presented in the slides depicting travel volumes and distribution more clearly (e.g. peak hour is 8:00 – 9:00 am; numbers are for vehicles traveling through the area, not actual volumes).
- Include information depicting the number of single vehicle occupants per hour. Compare this to number of transit users on the King or Queen streetcar lines (or on a GO train).
- Compare, or explain peak hour volume in relation to traffic over a 24-hour period to provide people with more context.
- CAA noted they have traffic counts that differ from those presented.

Distribution of Traffic

- Explain the intent of this slide (pie chart) more clearly and verify the values.
- Identify which modes are constrained – need a more transparent way of depicting them.

Evaluation Summary

- Explain the factors that were used in the evaluation to demonstrate the process was not arbitrary (e.g. emphasize the pedestrian crossing in the Remove and Replace options).
- Clarify weighting in summary slide of evaluation results. Consider how to present results more “equitably”.

Public Transit

- Include information about where and when investments in public transit will be implemented – it’s important for the public to get a sense that some of these lines may not get built, or take a long time.
- Emphasize the need for improvement in transit across all options.

Other

- Include a map showing the downtown cordons.
- Fix the view corridors for the Replace and Remove options, depicted incorrectly.
- Other the “next steps” slide, make alternatives singular – assumption should be that detailed design will be done for one alternative, not several.

4. Upcoming SAC Meeting Dates

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

Next SAC meeting: To Be Determined.



Future of the Gardiner Expressway/Lake Shore Boulevard East Reconfiguration EA and Integrated Urban Design Study

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #4

Tuesday, February 4, 2014

7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 308/309

DRAFT AGENDA

Meeting Purpose:

1. Review feedback received during Round 2 of consultations
2. Present and discuss results of the evaluation of alternatives

7:00 pm Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions

- Liz Nield, Lura Consulting, Facilitator
- John Livey, City of Toronto
- John Campbell, Waterfront Toronto

7:10 pm SAC Member Briefing: Evaluation Results and Preferred Solution

- Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting

7:50 pm Discussion

Participants will be encouraged to address the following discussion questions, as well as ask questions of clarification on the material presented.

- Thinking about the material presented, what feedback or advice do you have to improve the clarity of the presentation in preparation for the upcoming public forum?
- Thinking about the results of the evaluation...
 - What do you like? What concerns do you have?
 - What advice do you have for the project team as the study moves into the next phase – which will consider design options for the preferred solution?

9:00 pm Summary/Closing

Appendix B – List of Attendees

SAC Meeting #4 List of Attendees

Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association (GWNA)
Don Watershed Regeneration Council
Beach Triangle Residents' Association
Redpath and Toronto Industry Network
Heritage Toronto
Canadian Automobile Association (CAA)
Canadian Courier & Logistics Association
Cycling Toronto
Canadian Urban Institute
CodeBlueTO
Ontario Professional Planners Institute – Urban Design Working Group
Toronto Financial District BIA
Unionville Ratepayers Association
Toronto Urban Renewal Network (TURN)
Urban Land Institute (ULI)
Toronto Centre for Active Transportation
Walk Toronto
West Don Lands Committee
Waterfront Toronto
City of Toronto
Dillon Consulting
Lura Consulting

List of SAC members unable to attend

St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Evergreen
Transport Action Ontario
Federation of North Toronto Residents and People Plan Toronto
Professional Engineers Ontario
Greyhound
Food and Consumer Products of Canada
Retail Council of Canada
Toronto Association of BIAs
Toronto Board of Trade
Lake Shore Planning Council
South Riverdale Community Health Centre
Toronto Community Foundation
Toronto Society of Architects
Purolator Inc.
Rogers Centre/Blue Jays
Civic Action
Ontario Public Transit Association
Leslieville BIA
Film Ontario

Appendix C – SAC Questions of Clarification, Feedback and Advice

SAC Questions of Clarification

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

Q. Slide 51 – the cost line needs to be clarified. Are there not ramps needed in the remove option? This seems biased.

A. That's not what we're trying to do. The blue numbers represent the funding allocated to maintain the section east of Jarvis Street in the City's capital budget. Long-term capital maintenance budget has not been defined yet. The cost estimate is to enhance the rest of the structure.

A. Consider it as a credit it to remove. We don't have to rehab the section between Yonge and Jarvis if it is removed.

Q. Interesting to do a cost valuation of the time lost for that extra 10 minutes of commuting.

A. It's difficult to do - what is the value of time. Should it be based on household average income, or is better as opportunity cost. It requires judgement.

A. It's challenging to do. We tried to duplicate the Metrolinx study. To apply the same study to this project did not make sense because of the range of factors (e.g., vehicle operating costs, emissions, delay costs). Some people will change the way they move around due to capacity constraints. There is no real distinction between options that would change the conclusion.

Q. How you measure safety?

A. We consider a range of factors (e.g., geometry of ramps, visibility of columns, etc.).

C. Interesting to know where vehicle trips, not taking into consideration, are going and how they impact safety.

Q. First slide – amount of trips can you clarify what the numbers represent?

A. Peak hour is 8:00am to 9:00am. Volume measured in 1 hour, can be multiplied over 2-3 peak time. Pattern doesn't change. It's about where people peel off.

Q. My cordence count doesn't match these numbers.

A. They are based on screen lines, this is just volume on the Gardiner per hour.

Q. Slide on economics 51 – confused by blue and green values. Requires clearer explanation.

A. We will look for better labels.

C. Number of vehicles per rush hour slide – 5650 vehicles per hour. You could note that they are single vehicle occupants. Could compare to King and Queen street cars.

A. We could show a comparative of modal split.

Q. From a pedestrian perspective there is no significant difference between remove and improve – can you explain?

A. Several factors were analyzed (e.g. under structure, hidden by peers, crossing distance, etc.) not just the crossing distance.

C. Present the factors to show they are not arbitrary. The summary slide implies the criteria are equally weighted.

Q. Economics (revenues) – reasons not to include revenue from more valuable land over time.

A. The general uplift in land value doesn't apply to tax revenue. Tax revenue remains neutral. It doesn't fit in a discussion of this magnitude.

C. In terms of net present value – just show the blue. Or show two slides. It's hard for people to grasp net present value as a concept.

C. Formidable presentation. Terrific presentation. A huge amount of information was presented in a clear format. I didn't feel lost at any point. Something like this slide (costs) may be cause some confusion. Appreciate it.

Q. I don't have a sense of traffic over a 24 period. How many people will be inconvenienced?

A. Peak hour volumes are about 10% of 24 hour volumes. Haven't showed off peak volumes, peaks are critical. Off peak flow moves more freely. The expressway operates at less than capacity during off peak for all options no real distinction.

C. There's a need for comparison. People might draw the wrong conclusion that the world might end. Also, one of the slides is incorrect. The perspectives of replace/remove in the view corridors.

C. Presentation was great – my advice is to add a Next Steps slide. I want to know how input is going to be used.

Q. With the remove option there is potential to retrieve between 5 and 10 acres of developable land, where, on the north side?

A. It's a combination, mostly on the north side currently used by ramps. It's enough to make site developable, but it's not traditional. It is a tight space.

Q. One slide mentioned Ossington Avenue, is that in the study area?

A. Ossington Avenue was mentioned as a references for distance.

Q. Back to values and net gains. Where is the value from the private sector coming from?

A. All the money the city would recapture is from publically owned land that is undevelopable because it is currently occupied by the Gardiner infrastructure.

C. Regarding assumptions to build certain transit initiatives, show a slide about when those projects are being implemented. Important for public to get sense that some of these lines may not get built, or take a long time.

A. We're constrained by the model to 2031, that land use is beyond 2031.

A. We require transit improvements for all options, that's an important point to make.

Q. Are you going to be identifying the preferred alternative.

A. We need to continue with consultations first.

A. We have an obligation to Committee. The actual recommendation will be made public after it goes to council.

Q. The pie chart about in bound modes – emphasize the small percentage of trips. It's worth highlighting.

C. The numbers relating to walking and cycling are misleading. They are seasonal and tilted toward the local population. They are vastly different than incoming traffic which has much longer journeys.

A. The pie chart does not reflect volume or length.

C. It's a misleading slide.

A. We're not trying to mislead. The Gardiner volume is low because of the capacity constraint. This shows volume coming in from all modes.

Q. Are there other ways to measure this?

A. We looked at several ways to measure impact on travel time. This is the most effective.

Q. What happens toward Yonge street and other side of river? At some point we need to address either end.

A. The same city staff are working on other projects (Port Lands, Yonge precinct). It's something we can address directly.

Q. What are the results from the public consultation

A. We have a summary slide and report online, which will be presented to the public on Thursday.

C. I don't want to mislead you about volumes. The diagram is a distribution of traffic. It's a static shot. The intent is to show distribution of traffic as a through route. It does show that that volume is less than capacity. That's why we're considering this section.

A. I appreciate you clarifying that, because I knew that.

C. In terms of transit, you could add a point in favour of the remove option if one of the 8 lanes on Lake Shore could include an express bus service. Darken the shade of green.

Q. Which arterials will be impacted the most?

A. Richmond Street and Adelaide Street, all the typical ones would absorb displaced traffic. The 401 less so.

C. Emphasize that population downtown tripled in past 5 years.

Q. Pie chart, call out what is explicitly what is constrained. More transparent way of showing mode of transport. Shore medium long term plan of GO corridors are they compatible with remove option, or experience more pressure.

A. Also doing EA for bike facility on Rich/Adelaide. Not much of an impact, constraint is at Parliament. Bike facility is as far east at Sherbourne. Didn't affect our option.

**APPENDIX C –
QUESTIONS OF CLARIFICATION**

Future of the Gardiner East EA and Integrated Urban Design Study

Public Forum #3

**Thursday February 6, 2014 | 6:30 pm – 9:00 pm
Bram and Bluma Appel Salon at the Toronto Reference Library**

Questions of Clarification

The discussion captured during the question and answer period following the panel presentation is summarized below. Questions are noted with a “Q”, comments with “C” and answers with “A”.

Q: I don't see the actual parking situation downtown being considered. Over 20 years, if you have 2000 more cars downtown, they've got to get off the street and park somewhere. Could you consider satellite parking stations where people can park and get on a shuttle bus so we don't need as much parking downtown?

A: We will look at that in the next stage in more detail.

Q: Congestion is one of the worst problems in the GTA. You seem to be engineering for congestion by recommending tearing down the Gardiner. Of all the options, maintain it is the only option that preserves current capacity. If the objective is to maintain capacity, that is clearly the best option. If everything is down on street level with the remove option, how do you create on street parking opportunities? It makes no sense, this is a biased report.

A: On street parking is something we will look at in more detail but only in the off-peak hours.

Q: Looking at traffic volume, according to the survey there are 1200 cars passing Bay Street and Yonge Street eastbound. In 2009 studies we had 3300 cars, not 1200. Looking at University Avenue it has 2000 cars, how will you accommodate double the volume?

A: We presented through-traffic volume. We need to look at that information with you to make sure we are talking about the same thing. Through-traffic we measured comes from the origins and destinations specified.

Q: There's a context and content problem. You have overlooked climate change completely. You are trying to facilitate overdevelopment in the area. Without the barrier, it will make it much easier. You said 1500 cars per hour in rush hour going east to west. That's 25 cars per minute. You are now saying there will be a five minute delay. Has anyone figured out how much CO₂ will be emitted during that time?

A: We looked at regional and local air quality and GHG emissions. It is being considered as part of the evaluation. In the remove option, with fewer vehicles there will be less air emissions. We use the AM peak hour as the basis of our analysis.

C: All four alternatives assume that the DVP will remain in place. There was an exhibit at the Brickworks two years ago that looked at the future of the city. In that proposal, the DVP was removed, returning the value to the Don valley.

Q: The remove and replace options are partly cheaper with the assumption developable lands will be freed up and that reduces the price. With the Gardiner over the Lake Shore it is actually very efficient. Do you have tables and maps in detail showing land allocation? I am concerned about how development on the freed up land will be balanced with the need for open space and parkland if we move ahead with the remove option.

A: Yes we do. We have looked at the corridor routes in the alignments for each alternative. Getting rid of the ramps in the remove option frees up land, they are actually a bigger land hog than the expressway itself. We have the most amount of greenspace in the remove scheme. When the full evaluation criteria are released, the land allocation information will be included.

Q: There is already \$250 million earmarked for maintenance. Is that cost included in the other options? Is there a time frame where you have to spend that anyways?

A: The \$250 million is in the 10 year capital plan of the city. It is already approved. It could be used for the other options should they be preferred, but some options require additional funding. The ramp issue is one we would look at. Replacing it would require an extra amount of money.

Q: (Online Question) Can you clarify the rehabilitation maintenance program that is also happening, and how long it will take to address safety in the study area, but also over to Bathurst?

A: There is a \$650 million maintenance program. Council has asked for a report looking at options. We were asked to produce an accelerated option and we cut the timelines down. We will be presenting that material in March.