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INTRODUCTION

Background

The City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto are jointly carrying out the Gardiner Expressway/Lake Shore Boulevard East Reconfiguration Environmental Assessment (EA) and Integrated Urban Design Study.

In 2008, City Council authorized a partnership between the City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto to examine the potential reconfiguration of the easterly portion of the Gardiner Expressway between Jarvis Street and Logan Avenue. The Gardiner East EA and Urban Design Study was formally initiated following the approval of the study Terms of Reference by City Council and the Minister of the Environment in 2009 and proceeded until mid-2010. It was resumed in 2013 and is scheduled for completion in 2015.

The Study Area defined in the 2009 Terms of Reference has been expanded in three directions:

- to include the area between Jarvis Street west to Yonge Street to allow for the transition from an at- or below grade roadway to the above grade Gardiner Expressway.
- to include some land north of King Street to capture the impact of potential changes to the Richmond-Adeelaide Don Valley Parkway (DVP) ramps.
- to include some land east of Logan Avenue at Lake Shore Boulevard to ensure that any issues related to the existing at-grade segment of Lake Shore Boulevard can be addressed.

This is consistent with the Terms of Reference language that reads “The Study Areas will be confirmed in the EA and will need to consider the alternatives to be examined and the geographic extent of the potential project effects (negative and positive).” The revised Study Area is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Gardiner East EA Study Area
The EA is examining four alternatives:

![Conceptual Renderings of the Alternatives](image)

Figure 2: Conceptual Renderings of the Alternatives

Five goals were identified to guide the project’s development, and can be found in the approved Terms of Reference:

1. Revitalize the Waterfront
2. Reconnect the City with the Lake
3. Balance Modes of Travel
4. Achieve Sustainability
5. Create Value

As illustrated in Figure 3, four evaluation lenses – Urban Design, Transportation & Infrastructure, Environment and Economics – continue to provide the structure for the evaluation of the alternatives in the EA, along with constructability and timing considerations.

![Evaluation Lenses](image)

Figure 3: Evaluation Lenses

**Purpose of the Gardiner East EA Consultations**

As outlined in the Terms of Reference, public consultation is an important component of the Gardiner East EA and Urban Design Study. The City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto recognize the importance of engaging stakeholders and the public to provide opportunities for feedback throughout the EA, while ensuring consultation activities comply with Ontario’s *Environmental Assessment Act*. 
The objectives of the consultation process are to:

1. Generate broad awareness of the project and opportunities for participation throughout the EA process.
2. Facilitate constructive input from consultation participants at key points in the EA process, well before decisions are made.
3. Provide ongoing opportunities for feedback and input, and for issues and concerns to be raised, discussed, and resolved to the extent possible.
4. Document input received through the consultation process and to demonstrate the impact of consultation on decision-making.

The Gardiner East EA and Urban Design Study includes five rounds of public consultation to ensure multiple opportunities for participation as part of an inclusive and transparent consultation process. Core components of the consultation program have included: three well-attended public meetings; online consultation via webcasts of the public meetings, social media and surveys on the consultation website; and meetings of the project’s Stakeholder Advisory Committee, which includes representatives of over 30 community, business and transportation organizations. Round 1 of consultation took place in May/June of 2013 and focused on ideas for the future of the Gardiner East and engaged over 1,000 participants through face-to-face and online engagement. Round 2 featured discussion and feedback on the four alternatives and draft evaluation criteria and engaged over 1,500 participants in October 2013. Summary reports on feedback received during Round 1 and Round 2 are available on the project website – www.gardinereast.ca.

Most recently, Round 3 of the consultation process occurred between February 4th and 20th, 2014, and focused on the results of the evaluation of alternatives. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee met on February 4th to review and provide feedback on the evaluation results. A public meeting was held on February 6th at the Toronto Reference Library, with over 250 participants at the meeting and another 50+ watching the webcast and participating online. Hundreds of people either completed an online survey on the project website or weighed in via Twitter to provide their feedback on the evaluation results.

**Report Contents**

This report provides a description of the consultation and engagement activities undertaken as part of Round Three of the Gardiner East EA and Urban Design Study, as well as a summary of the feedback received from the consultation activities. Section 2 provides an overview of the consultation process, the various consultation approaches used to reach and engage different audiences, and the communication and promotional tactics used to encourage participation.

An overview of the feedback received is included in Section 3, along with a compilation of the comments and suggestions that emerged from the consultation process. Next steps in the EA and Urban Design Study process are outlined in Section 4.
ROUND THREE CONSULTATION PROCESS OVERVIEW

To fulfill the objectives of the consultation strategy in the approved Terms of Reference, a comprehensive approach targeting key stakeholders and the general public through a wide variety of communication, promotional and engagement tactics was adopted. A range of consultation activities was utilized to provide multiple opportunities for public participation as part of an inclusive and transparent consultation process.

The purpose of Round Three of the consultation process was to:

1. Provide a refresher on the EA process and approved Terms of Reference;
2. Report on the feedback collected during Round Two of the consultation process;
3. Present the results of the evaluation of alternatives; and
4. Obtain feedback on the results of the evaluation of alternatives.

Communication and Promotional Tactics

Project Website
The project website (www.gardinereast.ca) continued to serve as a portal for all information and engagement activities during Round Three of the consultation process. The website includes a comprehensive overview of the study, relevant documents and resources, information about consultation events and opportunities to provide feedback, including an online survey. The project website also includes links to City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto webpages which contain additional background information about the EA and Urban Design Study.

Social Media
Twitter and Facebook were used as promotional tactics during Round Three of the consultation process to increase awareness about the Gardiner East EA and Urban Design Study and to encourage broad participation. The Twitter handle @GardinerEast and Facebook page facebook.com/GardinerEast were embedded in various communication materials and consultation resources to generate additional followers. Tweets and Facebook updates were used to advertise the Public Forum and opportunities to participate via the project website. They were also integrated during the Public Forum to provide real-time updates and to engage off-site participants. Participants were also encouraged to ask questions or share comments through either social media service. The project hashtag #gardinereast was also used on all tweets to promote and track discussion.

Public Notice/Invitation/Media Coverage
Public notices, media briefings, and invitations were utilized to promote stakeholder and public awareness of Round Two consultation activities:

- An e-mail invitation was sent to over 6,600 subscribers (industries, professional organizations, community associations, transportation groups, numerous individuals, etc.) on Waterfront Toronto’s extensive contact list database;
- Existing communications channels of the City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto (websites, Councillor distribution lists, Waterfront Toronto e-newsletter) were used to promote details about the upcoming Public Forum;
- A media briefing was hosted by the City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto at City Hall on Wednesday, February 5, 2014 generating significant media coverage;
- A News Release about the Public Forum and online engagement opportunities was issued by the City and Waterfront Toronto which, combined with the media briefing, resulted in substantial media coverage of the project and Public Forum;
- An e-blast was used to inform e-mail subscribers to the project’s website about online opportunities to submit comments and feedback.

**Media Advertising**
As per mandatory provisions for public notice concerning EAs, a formal notice was published in the Toronto Star on January 23, 2014 about the upcoming Public Forum. Public notices were also posted in the following community newspapers: Beach/Riverdale Mirror, East York Mirror, North York Mirror, City Centre Mirror, Etobicoke Guardian and Scarborough Mirror.

**Facilitator’s Office**
A “one-window” point of contact for the project, with dedicated phone, fax and email connections continued to facilitate communication with stakeholders and the public during Round Three. The “one-window” customer service centre provides basic information about the project in response to inquiries and will continue to serve as a focal point for receiving questions and comments and providing responses throughout the study. The contact details for the Facilitator’s Office are listed below:

Facilitator’s Office  
505 Consumers Road, Suite 1005  
Toronto, ON M2J 4V8  
P: 416-479-0662  
E: info@gardinereast.ca

Copies of the public notice and media briefing used to generate awareness of and promote participation in the Round Three consultation process can be found in Appendix A.

**Consultation Resources**
A number of resources were developed to facilitate participation throughout Round Three of the consultation process. These resources were made available on the project website and at the Public Forum. An overview of each resource is provided below.

**Discussion Guide**
A Discussion Guide was developed to summarize information about the Gardiner East EA and Urban Design Study in one convenient package. The Discussion Guide contained key background information about the EA, including the project goals, evaluation lenses and study process and timeline. It was intended to provide consultation participants with a tool to learn about the EA and Urban Design Study
and provide feedback. The enclosed feedback form was designed to capture comments, concerns and advice to the project team based on the results of the evaluation of alternatives. The Discussion Guide was provided to participants at the Public Forum, and an online version was posted for comment on the project website.

**Overview Presentation**
A presentation was developed to provide an overview of progress on the Gardiner East EA and Urban Design Study and present the results of the evaluation of alternatives. The presentation was delivered at the Public Forum and made available on the project website shortly after the public session.

**Public Forum Panels**
Twenty-six panels were displayed at the Public Forum to provide attendees with an overview of the project as well as more detail about each alternative solution and evaluation process.

Copies of the consultation resources described above are available on the project website – [www.gardinereast.ca](http://www.gardinereast.ca).

**Consultation Activities**
The following consultation activities were implemented to ensure broad participation from key stakeholders and members of the public during Round Three of the consultation process.

**Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting**
During this phase of consultation, one meeting of the project’s SAC – which is comprised of representatives of approximately 40 key interest groups and community associations – was held on February 4, 2014 at Metro Hall. The purpose of the meetings was 1) to invite feedback on the overview presentation in preparation for the Public Forum, and 2) to present the results of the evaluation of alternatives. The meeting format consisted of a presentation followed by interactive discussion.

A summary of the Round Three SAC meeting, along with a list of participating organizations on the SAC, can be found in Appendix B.

**Public Forum**
A Public Forum was held on February 6, 2014 at the Bram and Bluma Appel Salon at the Toronto Reference Library to share progress on the project to date and obtain feedback on the results of the evaluation of alternatives. Approximately 215 people signed in at the Public Forum, with an estimated 250 people in attendance. The meeting format was designed to encourage as much discussion as possible through a number of different methods:

- **Discussion Guide** – The Discussion Guide (described above) was distributed to participants to provide basic information about the project and encourage feedback. Participants were able to provide comments by completing a feedback form in the Discussion Guide and handing it in.
A part of participation.

February 2014.

Parallel Online Engagement

Gardiner summary

An overview presentation was given by a panel of representatives from the City of Toronto, Waterfront Toronto, Dillon Consulting and Perkins + Will focusing on the results of the evaluation of alternatives.

Questions of Clarification – Following the presentation, participants were given the opportunity to ask questions of clarification regarding the results of the evaluation of alternatives presented. Questions were also taken from individuals participating online or through social media.

Discussion Session – Approximately half an hour was provided for small table discussions about the results of the evaluation of alternatives. At each table, a facilitator from the City of Toronto or Waterfront Toronto led discussions and recorded participant feedback on a table reporting form. The comments collected during the small table discussions were reported back to the larger group at the end of the session.

A summary of the Questions of Clarification raised at the Public Forum can be found in Appendix C.

Online Engagement

Parallel to the face-to-face consultation activities, online options were also available to facilitate broad participation. An overview of the tools used to encourage online participation is provided below:

- Live Webcast – The Public Forum was broadcast live on the internet through the project website to enable participation across the City and beyond.
- Recorded Webcast – A video of the webcast is available on the project website as a record of the event, and to enable participation by individuals who could not attend the Public Forum.
- Online Consultation – The project website included a Participate Online page featuring an online survey designed to capture feedback on the results of the evaluation of alternatives. The online consultation tool was based on the feedback form in the Discussion Guide and allowed the participants to review the same information that was presented at the Public Forum and provide feedback on their own time.
- Social Media – Twitter and Facebook were used to complement face-to-face discussions during and after the Public Forum. Tweets and Facebook posts were integrated during the event to provide real-time updates and to engage off-site participants. Participants were also encouraged to ask questions or share comments through either social media service. The project hashtag #gardinereast was used on all tweets to promote discussion.
- Email – A dedicated project email address – info@gardinereast.ca – provided stakeholders and the public with another channel to direct questions and submit feedback. Staff at the Facilitator’s Office ensured email communications were promptly addressed and recorded for reporting purposes.

Over 1,300 people participated in this phase of the consultation process between February 4th and February 20th, 2014. The following table summarizes the number of participants by consultation activity:
SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

Feedback on the Results of the Evaluation of Alternatives

The purpose of Round Three of the consultation process was to obtain feedback on the results of the evaluation of alternatives. Participants were asked the following questions to generate discussion and feedback:

Thinking about the results of the evaluation of alternatives...

- 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?
- Other comments?

Public Forum participants provided their feedback through facilitated small group discussions and/or by completing and submitting a comment form in the Discussion Guide, while online participants submitted comments through an electronic version of the Discussion Guide available on the project website. In total, 303 hardcopy and online feedback forms were completed and submitted by the February 20th deadline for comments. In addition, a number of comments were also submitted by email or letter to the Facilitator’s Office or members of the project team.

A summary of the feedback received through facilitated small group discussions, email, voicemail, the webcast chat room, Twitter and Facebook is presented below and organized by discussion question. The summary provides a high-level synopsis of recurring comments, concerns and/or recommendations from consultation participants.
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The following points highlight the key themes which emerged in the review of all submitted feedback. ¹

- The majority of consultation participants (approximately 60%) expressed support for the remove alternative. The benefits cited by those who favour the remove alternative include: cost-effectiveness; creation of opportunities for future public (e.g., parks and greenspace) and private redevelopment (e.g., commercial and residential buildings); improved accessibility to the waterfront; and the opportunity to enhance public transit and alternative modes of transportation. Concerns expressed in relation to this alternative included reliance on assumed transit investments, the development of high-rise condos on freed up land and the loss of traffic capacity.

- Participants also expressed support for the maintain (approximately 12%) and improve (approximately 4%) alternatives. Those who favour these options cited the need to keep existing highway capacity, mitigate pollution from idling vehicles, and maintain the movement of goods and services. Concerns were also expressed about the potential for traffic displacement with the remove option.

- There was also support for the replace alternative (approximately 3%) with those who support this option citing safety as a key benefit.

- Approximately 20% of participants provided general feedback on the evaluation results and/or advice to the project team and did not express clear support for any of the alternatives.

- Nearly all participants indicated that investments in public transit should be prioritized, secured and implemented as soon as possible, particularly if the Gardiner Expressway east of Jarvis is removed. Participants expressed concern about removing the elevated highway if long-term transit assumptions in the study are not realized.

A more detailed summary of feedback – including representative comments from consultation participants – is provided below under each discussion question:

1. **What do you like?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION RESULTS – GENERAL FEEDBACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-lens approach to the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The evaluation process has been thorough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation criteria and methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Assessment and consultation process to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The structure and process used to develop a sound concept for what is a very complex project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I like the structured evaluation – it clearly shows the areas where each alternative is superior or inferior, based on the assumptions used in the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The well thought out and generally unbiased evaluation of the various options for the perspective of varied stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The evaluation results point in the direction of a clear answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information presented on existing travel modes, times and comprehensive inclusion of various factors used to guide-decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percentages are indicative of the distribution of responses for completed feedback forms and online surveys, but should be viewed as approximate.
1. **What do you like?**

- Research and analysis completed to date (e.g., case studies, traffic modeling, etc.).
- Public debate/discussion about this issue.
- I am pleased to see that the fate of the Gardiner is being addressed in a methodical manner and with public consultation.

**MAINTAIN**

**a) Transportation and Infrastructure**

- Prefer option that the Gardiner Expressway can be maintained.
- Preserves vehicle capacity.
- Only option that does not significantly increase congestion.
- I like the maintain option – it’s the best option taking into account transportation, cost and the environment.
- I’m in favour of the ‘maintain’ option. The current layout allows traffic to bypass downtown entirely, traffic that will move on to city streets in the absence of the Gardiner connection to the DVP. This will lead to greater particulate and CO2 emissions and greater congestion, all of which need to be reduced. A widened Lake Shore Boulevard will also be just as much of an obstacle to pedestrians seeking to walk to the lake as the current arrangement, probably even more.
- Looked at holistically, pedestrians benefit just as much as drivers from good road infrastructure. Less gridlock means a happier commute, whether you are on foot, in a TTC vehicle, on a Go Bus or in a car. We also all benefit when goods can reach the market in an efficient fashion and when ambulances and fire trucks can reach their destination quickly.
- The Gardiner Expressway does a great job of efficiently moving traffic in, out and around the city.
- Maintain what is there so at least everyone who uses this route to get to work every day can keep doing that.

**b) Urban Design**

- The Gardiner Expressway provides shelter from the weather (e.g., sun, rain, snow etc.).
- I like the Gardiner Expressway the way it is!
- Keep the Gardiner and maintain it. The Port Lands are an important opportunity for Toronto's future development. The entry to The Port Lands via the Gardiner will play an important part in opening this new area for Toronto.
- The Gardiner has not proven to be any barrier to the redevelopment of the area immediately south of Union Station. In fact, looking at travel patterns of new residents and employers that locate next to the Gardiner suggests access to the Gardiner is an attractive feature based on their origin-destination commuting pattern data.

**c) Environment**

- Maintaining the Gardiner Expressway East as well as improving it, over the long term would be the best option for the City of Toronto.
- Maintain and improve with the surface turned into total greenspace, park and bike/jogging lane.

**d) Economics**

- It is realistically the least expensive option in the short run as well as the long run.
- It’s the best option for the majority of people who use this area.
- The Gardner provides some utility today, certainly far more than a local, ground-level road can
1. What do you like?

provide. Leave and maintain it, or spruce it up if you must.
- The maintain option is the most cost effective option and should incorporate some aesthetic improvements without making any changes to the road configuration.

**REPLACE**

a) Transportation and Infrastructure
- Elegance of the replacement option which allows the continued separation of higher speed traffic from pedestrian, cycling and slower local traffic as well as enabling the flow of goods and services.
- I like the replace alternative because it improves on what is already there by bringing the Gardiner up to current highway construction standards while still maintaining road capacity.

b) Economics
- I like the replace idea! The cost should be absorbed by making the replacement an electronic toll road. It provides the best compromise of all ideas and tax payers don't get stuck footing the whole bill.
- Despite the high cost of this option, I feel being cheap when building a fundamental piece of infrastructure is not wise.

**IMPROVE**

a) Transportation and Infrastructure
- Improve option allows iconic Toronto infrastructure to be maintained – the elevated expressway provides good views of cityscape.
- It's clear that what we have now is not sustainable, but because of the volume of traffic the Expressway handles, it's clear that it's needed.
- The Gardiner is a vital and necessary part of the city transportation infrastructure. It is a huge asset to the city because it keeps traffic out of nearby residential neighbourhoods. It contributes to the prosperity and livability of the city.

b) Urban Design
- For better or worse, the city needs the Gardiner in order to handle the volume of traffic. However, the Gardiner needs to be improved so that it blends into its surroundings and the space below it is more friendly and usable.
- I liked consideration being given to improving the appearance underneath the Gardiner as I think it is vital to maintain the highway. I think adding trees wherever possible should be the priority.

**REMOVE**

a) Transportation and Infrastructure
- The remove option is preferred if transit is improved.
- Opportunities for pedestrians and cyclists.
- As Toronto becomes denser, we need to focus less on personal vehicles and provide more public space for interacting and alternative modes of transportation.
- Least used section of the Gardiner Expressway will be affected.
- Traffic patterns will easily adapt if the freeway is removed.

b) Urban Design
### 1. What do you like?

- Remove is the best option to improve connectivity with the waterfront and create a more liveable city.
- Removal will result in an enhanced quality of life, better access to the Lake, more public space and increased value of land.
- The only sensible solution is to remove the Gardiner. It's a major barrier to waterfront development and north/south access to the waterfront. It will be a barrier as long as it remains in place.
- Benefits to public realm, public health and waterfront revitalization.
- Best option for creating a livable city, and will help connect the Port Lands to the city.
- I 100% support the removal option for the future of the Gardiner in the studied area – I like the public benefits, improved connectivity to the waterfront and the fact that this project would ultimately pay for itself through land sales and future property taxes.
- Enhances the public realm while revitalizing downtown/waterfront.
- Creates a true city landmark.
- Creates opportunities for residential and commercial development and green space (e.g., trees).
- Removal releases a lot of land that can be used for park space and re-development.
- Dramatically improves the streetscape and creates urban greenspace.
- That the goals and the secondary plans are well respected under the ‘remove’ option.
- Provides interesting opportunities to repurpose lands adjacent to the corridor, including redevelopment of existing land for higher-value uses.

### c) Environment

- New development will allow people to work and live in the same place.
- Environment impact of this option benefits First Nation and local history.
- Environmental benefits, treed boulevard, low cost and less traffic disruption during construction.

### d) Economics

- It is clear from all the information presented that only the "remove" option is viable cost-wise, contributes to improving the economy, and has benefits across all categories being considered.
- I like the removal option best because it provides a sound, long term solution.
- Removal of the Gardiner Expressway east of Jarvis would provide Toronto and its citizens many benefits at lower financial cost than all the other proposals.
- Least cost and best public realm opportunities.
- City can recoup costs through the sale of freed up land.
- Long-term investment that negates future costs of maintaining the elevated expressway.
- Effectively addresses the four project goals, most balanced alternative when considering the “evaluation lenses” and is the most fiscally responsible option.
- Most appealing, cost-effective and smartest option in the long-run.
- Removal is the best cost/benefit of the four options.
- Removal is the cheapest option.
- Definitely like the 'remove' option and do not like any of the others from point of view of costs, barrier, design, time of construction, etc.
- Removing the Gardiner Expressway East will increase the land value of adjacent properties and offset the cost of demolition.
**1. What do you like?**

- Removing the Gardiner Expressway East will save millions of dollars that can be re-invested in other city priorities (e.g., public transit).
- Appears to produce the lowest ongoing maintenance costs over the 100 year period.
- I have read all of the background and I am strongly in favour of the 'remove' option. With new development, this would pay for itself in a few years.
- The long-term benefits of the remove alternative will outweigh the short-term costs of traffic and construction.

**2. What concerns do you have?**

**EVALUATION RESULTS – GENERAL FEEDBACK**

- Lack of information that would allow people to make a more informed decision.
- Analysis should present how many people, not vehicles, benefit from each alternative.
- Deliberate lack of relevant data on the section of Gardiner being studied (i.e., traffic volumes during AM and PM peak).
- How was equity addressed during the evaluation process?
- No option seems to consider TTC integration – what if transit improvements don’t occur?
- Need to include analysis for PM rush hours even if they are less busy.
- Need to include an analysis of traffic diversion and mode share change.
- Don’t think traffic modeling is accurate.
- Travel times are not realistic.
- Assumptions used to determine traffic times and other impacts are not realistic.
- Traffic control strategy during construction and post-construction not communicated alongside each Gardiner option.
- Reliance on assumed improvements and investment in public transit (e.g., DRL, GO Transit).
- Not enough analysis has been done on where traffic from the DVP will go (e.g., 2,700 vehicles (2010 O/D) onto Lake Shore Boulevard, and other local streets, during the AM peak).
- Lack of analysis of how the flow of people and goods would be affected throughout the day (e.g., impact on 401, etc.).
- Evaluation results biased toward the remove alternative – wary of the traffic modeling and believe the traffic delay times will be significantly higher than projected.
- Cost figures do not consider that ongoing maintenance will be required until the recommended alternative can be implemented.
- The life cycle costs should have been shown as an annual average over 100 years.
- The use of a discount rate is misleading without revealing what the rate is.
- There is no technical information to back up many of the ratings in the evaluation matrix cells. At least, not provided to the public. Until such time each cell in the matrix can be backed up with a technical argument and/or relevant data, the matrix should be deleted from the presentation.
- Too much emphasis placed on development, pedestrians, and cyclists – keep the status quo.
- I think the analysis appears to have been done by a team that wants to tear down the Gardiner as it is quite biased towards this option.
- Presentation of financial and economic costs.
- I am not comfortable with the results matrix. The primary reason for having the Gardiner is for the movement of people (cars) and goods (trucks). These reasons get only two lines on the matrix. Other lenses are separated into more criteria than seem to be necessary, e.g., having
2. What concerns do you have?

both regional economics and local economics as separate items, or the split within the Urban Design lens. I believe we need a weighting method to address the relative importance of the criteria. Also, some of the assignments of preferred, moderately preferred and least preferred appear arbitrary. There may have been criteria used for these assignments but these are not clear to me.

- There are no alternatives that are presented (for the option of removal of the Gardner) if the relief line is not built. There should be alternatives incorporated into the plans.
- Factoring in maintenance of greening the waterfront area (planting trees) was not incorporated thoroughly discussed in the option of tearing down the Gardner, leading to some misleading data that is presented.
- Climate change (e.g., extreme weather, flooding, etc.) has not been adequately addressed in the study.

**MAINTAIN**

a) Transportation and Infrastructure
- If we maintain, it is more difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to access the Lake.
- Maintain option does not solve the problem.
- Safety – the expressway has been poorly maintained.
- The structure as it stands is consistently falling apart.
- My big concern is that there is no "maintain and delay" option - the best option would be to repair then visit the alternative solutions.

c) Environment
- Pollution.

d) Economics
- Billions of dollars spent on any option to keep the eastern portion of the Gardiner is a poor use of scarce resources and potentially valuable waterfront, for the very small improvement in the commutes of a very small number of people.
- The waste of money maintaining the structure. It was neglected for too long to be fixed.
- It’s too expensive to maintain and it’s ugly.
- Affordability of maintaining elevated highway.
- If we maintain/improve, we will be stuck with very high maintenance costs.
- Concerned that the Gardiner Expressway East will not be removed and resources (e.g., time and money) will be wasted on maintaining blighted infrastructure.

**IMPROVE**

a) Transportation and Infrastructure
- The "improve" option would reduce the width of the Gardiner – this is pointless.
- The "improve" and "replace" options both reduce the number of lanes on the Gardiner. I see no benefit to this, as the elevated structure will continue to exist. If the Gardiner is to continue to exist it should remain fully functional. The lane reductions will reduce its capacity and hamper traffic flow, without providing significant benefits in other areas.
2. What concerns do you have?

**REPLACE**

e) Economics

- The replace option would be the biggest waste of resources and opportunity.

**REMOVE**

Transportation and Infrastructure

- Until Toronto has a fast and extensive public transit system, which is years off, the Gardiner has to stay up, providing the southern end of Toronto's ring road.
- What will the impact be on nearby arterial roads?
- Adjacent rail corridor creates a barrier to future development options.
- Premature to consider alternatives other than maintain until transit improvements can be confirmed – those projects must be completed before major alterations are made to the Gardiner Expressway.
- Must be greater consideration for truck traffic/movement of goods.
- Can’t reduce capacity – i.e. fewer lanes than there already are on the Gardiner.
- If capacity on the Gardiner is reduced, how will it impact the flow of traffic in local neighbourhoods?
- What will the speed limit be if the Gardiner is removed?
- Concern about Increased traffic on Richmond East.
- Concern about parking capacity.
- Not a good idea to have on-street parking – increases congestion.
- Eight lanes of traffic is not pedestrian friendly.
- Increasing transit capacity is essential.
- Need to consider the impact of ramp removals.
- It is certainly concerning that the preferred option for this transportation project is “least preferred” with regard to the movement of both people and goods.
- I am worried that a new road will be a repeat of the road that replaced the eastern extension, east of the DVP. That road is MUCH too car oriented and hostile to pedestrians. Little effort was made to slow traffic or build a tree sheltered wide pedestrian space.
- The currently proposed boulevard does not have the capacity to carry the traffic and local streets are not able to absorb that traffic. Transit in the GTA is not yet able to offer an alternative to driving during off-peak hours and weekends when the GO trains are not running.
- Removal should go hand in hand with an improved public transit.
- Congestion and slower commute times if the Gardiner Expressway is removed.
- Pedestrian and cyclist safety – consider bridges to facilitate crossing over new roads.
- Concern about the potential for worse traffic problems in a congested area.
- How traffic will be handled during demolition/construction?
- Not convinced enough is being to keep people moving – suggest transit corridor in the middle of the grand boulevard.
- Future development will lead to more local traffic and traffic lights, negatively impacting east-west flow in the south end of the city. Lake Shore Boulevard must remain a major arterial road.
- Grand boulevard would be noisy, hard to cross and will impede traffic flow.
- The remove option is totally dependent on a new streetcar line along Queens Quay and a Downtown Relief subway line. Neither of those dependencies are confirmed. To remove the Gardiner without those in place would cause total gridlock in the city.
2. What concerns do you have?

- Reduction in vehicular capacity – creates an artificial confrontation between retaining road network capacity and improving the streetscape for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Impact on traffic congestion during construction.
- Requires all proposed transit plans to be implemented to be successful.
- The commute times are going to increase considerably – it already takes much longer than 20 minutes to get from Victoria Park/Kingston Road to Union Station. Toronto commute times are already among the longest in North America. This is a metropolitan city which is growing exponentially which means there should be decisions made to decrease commute times.
- Pedestrian barriers - how can this be overcome to make the corridor easier to cross north-south (perhaps tunnels under it every 100-200 m).
- The Grand Boulevard would have to be 5 lanes in each direction to handle the existing traffic.
- That the 'road' created by the preferred removal option will become a STROAD, therefore we need to aim for a complete street and not a road for rapid traffic only. University is a good example.
- In the Preliminary Evaluation Results chart, the Remove option appears to be uniquely detrimental to the Movement of Goods - that is almost a show-stopper for me. I cannot support the Remove option until Movement of Goods is bright Green.
- Rail corridor is a barrier.
- Impact on through traffic.
- That traffic will be backed up causing problems for pedestrians and cyclists, making the street unpleasant. I think some other road improvements will be necessary to address this.
- Ensuring signal timing allows crossing.
- Lack of transit if the Gardiner is just torn down.
- It is crucial that additional transit lines be in place *before* the implementation of any alternative that reduces the number of traffic lanes available.
- If this stretch of the Gardiner is demolished, the Parkway will become akin to the Allen at Eglinton Avenue, with a massive backup as traffic flows off to streets.
- I think the conclusion that removing the elevated highway is preferable for pedestrians is simply incorrect. Crossing an eight lane road is not better for pedestrians than a quicker crossing of a narrower one.
- I am terribly concerned about the lack of expressway function from the removal option.
- I would prefer that the vehicles stay on the Gardiner and off of our local streets.
- I'm concerned that the movement of goods could be restricted but I suggest delivery of goods to the downtown core should be done overnight as happens in many cities outside of North America, e.g., Shanghai or small historic towns like Heidelberg in Germany.
- It is well and fine to consider the four neighborhoods that are adjacent to the Gardner, but what about all the other neighborhoods that are beyond the downtown core and the people that live in them and have to commute to their jobs in the downtown core. That is a lot of people in an area significantly larger than the four neighborhoods where the commute is already significantly shorter and the availability of public transit significantly more abundant.
- Delivery vehicles rely on efficient movement of goods from distribution centres outside of the core. Removal of highway capacity will negatively impact efficiency and would lead to increased costs and further impact businesses negatively.
- I don't see the future 8-lane road being less of a barrier. With an elevated expressway one can provide underpasses at any point and use the land below as parkland. (I'm thinking here of the New York solution but I may be incorrect on this point.) With an 8-lane road one will be able to
2. What concerns do you have?

- Cross only at signal-controlled intersections, and hopefully get across during one changeover. Perhaps this can be addressed by pedestrian overpasses or underpasses, but these may present difficulties for those with mobility challenges.
  - The tunnel below the railway berm is dark and low. It is not a friendly transition. On a bike, these underpasses are dangerous. They need to be improved, especially when the project’s goals are considered. If the Gardiner is removed, the current proposals for the Lake Shore raise red flags for those on foot / bikes. The boulevard as it is now configured is unpleasant to cross. This is true for many reasons, but the width is a big problem.
  - 6,500 GO Bus riders use the eastern portion of the Gardiner Expressway every day (2013) - 70% of all GO Bus riders use the Union Station bus terminal (2013) – replacing the Eastern Gardiner with an 8-lane boulevard could mean substantial increases in travel time for these transit users, making the service for suburban bus riders far less attractive. The City of Toronto and the province have made significant investments in bus shoulder lanes on the Don Valley Parkway to speed up buses using this route. These time savings may be undone for many bus riders if the Eastern Gardiner is replaced by a congested surface route.
  - Congestion is the largest quality of life problem facing the GTA in the foreseeable future. Even if all the proposed transit projects built (e.g. downtown relief line), there will continue to be a need for some high capacity roadways. Any proposal to reduce the capacity of the Gardiner Expressway is simply wrong - the congestion problem outweighs factors.
  - Pedestrian traffic and high speed automobile traffic do not mix well.
  - Lessening the hostility felt by pedestrians requires less traffic, less lanes, slower traffic, quieter traffic, shorter light cycles, one stage crossings, and some form of protective barrier for those waiting to cross.
  - I am concerned that the DVP will not be connected to anything. Highways need to be complete as well as well streets.

Urban Design

- Tearing down the Gardiner from Jarvis to the DVP is a terrible idea. It ignores the fact that the six-lane Lake Shore is a huge barrier for pedestrians to move north to south, and is and will continue to be an inappropriate road to run through future residential neighbourhoods. It'll just attract more big-box shopping plazas to the east end and bring even more traffic.
- Need height restrictions on new development to maintain views of the lake.
- If removed, concerns with how development occurs – i.e. do not want row of condominiums that create a barrier to the Lake.
- I'm very concerned about the attitude that the Gardiner somehow separates or disconnects the city from the lake. This notion is pure nonsense and has no credence. The at-grade rail corridor and Lakeshore Blvd separate the city from the lake, not the elevated Gardiner.
- I'm concerned that people are only focusing on the Gardiner's ugliness, and how it separates the city from the lake, and therefore want it gone.
- Concerns that an at-grade boulevard will be as much of a barrier as the elevated expressway.
- Design of the boulevard suggested by the remove option – need to ensure access for cars and pedestrians, cyclists and public transit.
- More traffic will be forced onto local roads increasing the risk of accidents with cyclists and pedestrians.
- Effectively removing the Gardiner (East) should be done in parallel with significant investments in public transportation and traffic management methods (particularly for freight) in order to
2. What concerns do you have?

mediate the negative impacts on drivers and the local economy.
- The railway corridor is as much of a barrier to the waterfront as the Gardiner Expressway.
- Future development resulting in a wall of high-rise condominiums.
- How freed up land will be integrated into existing neighbourhoods.
- The remove alternative will lead to the creation of a “stroad” (e.g., Kingston Road, Eglinton Avenue East, etc.) – not pleasant to walk next to and can be more difficult to cross the Gardiner/Lake Shore corridor.
- Real barrier is the railway corridor.
- Freed up land will be redeveloped as high-rise condominiums.
- Do not overdevelop – keep land for parks, transit improvements, bike lanes, etc.
- The land there is all landfill, and not too stable, so any considerations for the number of people that could be housed in the area on freed-up lands have to be scaled to what is doable on the site.
- Care must be taken to build a community with street level amenities and NOT more big box stores or other infrastructure which does not fully engage pedestrians and cyclists. I am concerned that a vibrant neighbourhood will not appear due to bad planning and/or hijacking by big business of the design surrounding the street, not so much the street design itself.
- The real issue regarding "reconnecting the City with the Lake" is not the Gardiner, but the wall of condos that block access and views.
- Removing it will not open access to the lake that was destroyed with a wall of condos.

Environment
- Climate change and resilience have not been considered – concerns about flooding.
- There will be a significant reduction of traffic noise, particularly along the waterfront, if it is at ground level.
- The evidence that is presented about the reduction in carbon levels are based on the assumption that a relief line will be built, and currently, there are no concrete plans to have the relief line built, as it is still in talks.
- Remove option increases idling and GHG emissions (adding 10 minutes to travel times).
- Ensuring there is a sufficient tree canopy along the new boulevard.
- Carbon emissions and congestion will increase significantly.
- Will lead to more traffic congestion on the DVP and more greenhouse gas emissions from idling.
- Toronto already suffers from pollution generated by, among other things, vehicles idling at traffic lights. The proposed replacement would exacerbate this by adding additional stops at signalized intersecting streets.

Economics
- Businesses will suffer during construction.
- Need a more holistic approach to funding – Waterfront Toronto cannot rely on selling real estate.
- Destroying a means by which traffic (commercial and commuter) can flow around the city has a significant economic cost in terms of time and money. Have you accounted for this economic cost in your evaluation?
3. What advice do you have for the Project Team as the study moves into the next phase?

**EVALUATION RESULTS – GENERAL COMMENTS**
- Provide a measure to weigh the evaluation criteria because they are not all equal.
- Better transparency in the numbers being used.
- Consider legacy aspect of the decision – has repercussions for future generations.
- Removal option requires more justification and explanation as it is the most contentious.
- The Project Team needs to focus on providing information and suggestions that will minimize the perception that congestion will be worse with the removal of the expressway (e.g., experience of cities like NYC and San Francisco).
- Put more emphasis on the number of people who travel the Gardiner at various times of day and compare this to ridership on either the King Street or Queen Street streetcars. The numbers on the chart don’t mean as much to someone seeing them flash by quickly as a vision of the people the expressway actually serves compared to transit.
- Forget the irrelevant AM rush hour eastbound data and stick with what is relevant, namely AM westbound and PM eastbound.
- The only thing the transportation demand charts show is that automobile access to downtown has been at capacity since 1975 and that is a reason businesses have moved out of downtown. You should be looking at better ways to get people downtown instead of reducing capacity.
- The AM Peak Hour flow metric appears incomplete. It would be more meaningful to me to see the total annual flow expressed as average daily volume by hour over 24 hours. That should be shown as current, and estimated for each of the options to 2031. From the AM Peak Hour flow I don’t get any sense of whether that peak is very much larger than any other hour, or perhaps only 1% larger than any other hour. It also does not represent at what rate the AM Peak Hour flow is flowing - is it at or above the speed limit, or at one third the speed limit? I’m sure there are clearer and more informative ways to illustrate this concept.
- Complete transparency in your numbers.
- Please stop looking at short-term options, what you are proposing has very long-term effects, you can’t simply remove one portion of the Gardiner and expect that the traffic problems will solve themselves.
- Your graph of transportation modes shows a steady increase of cycling and walking up to the present but your future projection is flat. I suspect this should be re-evaluated.
- Weigh the criteria, not all of the evaluation criteria are equal and stronger consideration should be given to some over others (e.g., traffic flow).
- Your analysis shows that maintain will have the largest auto capacity in 2031! This should be given prominence in the report and extra weight in the matrix.
- I would hope that the team has considered weighting the evaluation criteria to reflect the opinions of the various stakeholders.

- **Transportation and Infrastructure**
  - A holistic approach including public transit is the only way we will solve this issue.
  - Ensure the preferred alternative is not implemented until the assumed investments (e.g., transit) are underway.
  - Maintain the Gardiner Expressway East until the planned transit relief is in place, and then remove it.
  - Maintain the Gardiner completing essential repairs while developing an integrated road and
3. **What advice do you have for the Project Team as the study moves into the next phase?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>provide more information about the safety impacts of each alternative (e.g., pedestrians, cyclists).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider travel times and the economy more realistically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the next presentation, please include a detailed study of the temporary re-routing arrangements through the city, of east-bound traffic, and show exactly which roads/neighbourhoods will be impacted, and what mitigation measures will be taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also ensure that people understand the need for expanded transit, including a relief subway line into downtown, is necessary for any of the proposed solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the first priority should be to address the repair backlog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highlight that most of the traffic from the Gardiner/DVP exits before traveling on the 2.4 km under study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on integrating rapid public transit on the new Lake Shore Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that removal does not add traffic. The existence of this infrastructure induces car trips. Removal will reduce traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto needs to start prioritizing modes of transit other than cars -- this city is too crowded to continue to be a drivers-only place. Take the savings and invest in more subways and bike paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under no circumstances should the grand boulevard be more than 8 lanes (plus a turning lane where needed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why not treat Lakeshore as separate east/west, with development in the middle, so that it is less of a gauntlet and more like a destination in between?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remove the Gardiner Expressway when the Downtown Relief Line (DLR) is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider pedestrian bridges across Gardiner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider LRT/RT along Lake Shore corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider park-and-ride facility to transit on Lake Shore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>downtown relief line up to Don Mills to replace DVP commuter capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need more certainty about future transit investments before final decision can be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve Go Transit, as many users of the Gardiner East are from the 905 area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan in concert with TTC expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need for an integrated long-term vision for roads and public transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>further emphasis on projections regarding the modal splits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider transit integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if transit is needed anyway, build the transit first and reduce traffic, if that works, then we can have a meaningful conversation about tearing down the Gardiner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please emphasize walking and cycling and transit as the premier modes of transportation downtown and remove auto infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that having transit in place before replacing or removing the Gardiner is the most important consideration for the entire project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>show how traffic won't actually be that bad, and in the end everyone, including drivers, will benefit. And everyone will benefit from greater mixed use of our infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the future of Gardiner and other expressways should be coordinated with building more subways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a more detailed study of transportation impacts of any change to the Gardiner would be appreciated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>What advice do you have for the Project Team as the study moves into the next phase?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For the removal of the Gardiner, perhaps having a dedicated streetcar lane, instead of an eight lane road way might help to alleviate the traffic congestion that will ensue as a result of the tear down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Toll highway if it remains an expressway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider replacing traffic lights with roundabouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider speed limit reductions if the Gardiner is removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Look at how we can minimize delays for the remove option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider a tunnel or channel system with green roof or development above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Present examples of a “complete street” for the remove option in the design stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emphasize alternative routes available to drivers (e.g. ramps to the DVP from Adelaide, Dundas and Queen).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An eight lane boulevard is not enough capacity to replace 12 congested lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify how traffic flow through the study area in relation to other heavily used corridors and with improved public transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximize the flow of traffic along Lake Shore Boulevard to Jarvis Street with as few interruptions in flow as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure no parking on Lake Shore Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a large underground parking lot where the DVP ends that is connected to transit so that DVP and Gardiner users can transfer to continue their journey downtown via transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projected travel times must include a factor the accounts for a reduction in incoming volumes. This has to be a function of additional regional transportation - a MUST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Look at tolling and parking charges as tools to reduce/shift vehicular demand to offset the impact of the removal option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include more information on the alternative modes of moving people (e.g., TTC, GO Transit) to get people out of cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The change in capacity, accompanied by improvements in transit and bike/pedestrian infrastructure which then increases the possibility for commuters to switch modes, will have a beneficial impact on automobiles by removing the number of cars on the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Really clarify that this is only about one short section of the Gardiner that is under used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• While parks are certainly important to the local area's future, putting parklands between two directions of speeding, &quot;highway-feel&quot; traffic is not ideal, and certainly not conducive to stimulating regular use of such green spaces, which might risk such lands being used for less desirable uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 8 lanes can work, but the details are key.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disney and Universal Studios are good examples of companies that have effectively managed large flows of traffic on their real estate and have done so without creating environmental impacts or eye sores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replacing the Gardiner with a new well-designed, lower-impact structure is perhaps the only way to achieve the political will to put Tolls on the road. The tolls could offset the capital and operating cost disadvantages of the new structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roadway reconstruction should take account of possible future infrastructure needs and uses (e.g., higher order transit, road tolling systems, district energy systems, higher environmental standards). Consider a design that makes possible a future buried subway and/or buried Gardiner Expressway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make sure goods movement is addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **What advice do you have for the Project Team as the study moves into the next phase?**

- Please think very clearly about how the interests of downtown residents are weighed against the interests of long distance commuters.
- Please think very clearly about the various positive and negative multipliers that will be associated with every one of the options.
- Integration with existing plans and enhancing commitment to public transit options should be emphasized, and moneys gained by selling land redistributed directly to enhancing public transit with more lines and interconnections between services. And please make neighbourhood connectedness and vibrant beauty a priority.
- The study team should first consider the amenity value of the area over which the present Gardiner runs and should avoid being swayed by present needs of vehicles since society is changing, vehicles are changing, transit has to be a major contributor in Toronto. Maintaining the elevated Gardiner is primarily a solution oriented to a car culture which we already know is not sustainable in its present form.
- Consider possibly adding a transit lane on the Gardiner.
- Need to hammer the point home congestion will increase no matter what option is chosen
- Ensure the public is made aware of the challenges at the beginning so there are no ‘surprises’ occurring.
- Develop more robust travel time projections and a more detailed breakdown of construction staging.
- Address the traffic issue, but also bring attention to the alternate public transit improvements that are already in the planning and need to be planned for that will mitigate this as a concern.
- A wider boulevard with eight lanes needs to be planned so that the midway-point is in itself a destination, reducing the sense that there is a kind of gauntlet to run for those not in vehicles or on transit. Whatever alternative is considered, the implications for the adjacent areas could be more directly illustrated, including opportunity costs / economic impacts. It would also be helpful to have a sense of how improved transit would be properly funded and integrated into a project timeline, given this city's historic struggle to accomplish such goals in a timely and consistent fashion.
- We cannot solve city-wide problems of gridlock with any of the options for this small section of the Gardiner. What we can do is set up the right conditions for the revitalization of the Lower Yonge, East Bayfront, Keating and Port Lands precincts.
- The increased travel times must be addressed through design and traffic management to reduce the inconvenience as much as possible.
- Incorporate overhead walkways for all non-motorized methods of transportation, including wheelchairs, to access the lakeshore from the city; much like the one at Roncesvalles and those in Chicago’s north side.
- Let congestion happen – people will figure it out.
- Look at a parking tax to reduce car demand.
- Find short-term solutions in the interim to improve the experience of the Lake Shore.
- Need to consider that people from all over Southern Ontario use the Gardiner Expressway as a through route – ensure alternate options are available for regional users.
- Improving the city's transportation infrastructure is a must, but it must be done with urban design and feasibility in mind.
- Build for the future, not for car using baby boomers. Younger people are choosing not to drive
### 3. What advice do you have for the Project Team as the study moves into the next phase?

- Extend it to the 401, as was planned and paid for way back in the 1950s early 60s.

**b) Urban Design**

- As the project moves from conceptual to detailed engineering and planning, make sure that local communities are even more involved in the details.
- I think it is a real challenge, balancing the rejuvenation so desperately needed in the local area with the demands of such a sprawling city. We want to be sure all of Toronto’s needs are respected.
- Consider Lake Shore Boulevard as a barrier as well.
- Thoughtful design of the boulevard with state-of-the-art computer-controlled traffic signals could alleviate some of the concerns relating to traffic flow and congestion.
- New development should be provided to service the new communities (mixed-use).
- Provide renderings of where things would go – i.e. parks, businesses, residential development, etc.
- Prioritize height restrictions and green space for redevelopment of freed up land.
- I like driving this stretch of the Gardiner for its quick but spectacular views of the city, but I think that the actual feel of walking in this neighbourhood would be greatly enhanced. Perhaps these views can be recaptured with viewing platforms/raised parkettes that reclaim some small portions of the Gardiner.
- Clearly detailed ideas of proposed land use in different options (e.g. clearly show land for possible green space/parks, land for condos, land for business/mixed use etc.) will help give public an idea of what potential new space could look like. Make sure lots of parks and green space provided.
- It has become obvious west of Yonge Street that a barrier free waterfront is not a prerequisite to good waterfront revitalization and development. The City and the Lake can be "reconnected" with or without the Gardiner in place.

**c) Environment**

- Think about the long-term health and wellbeing of the city and its residents.
- Provide more details about the environmental benefits of each alternative.
- Focus on sustainability.
- Prioritize planning for climate change.
- More focus on greening initiatives.
- To expand the east Gardiner by 2 lanes, eliminate the underlying section of Lakeshore Blvd., and use the recovered lands for outdoor entertainment purposes: specifically, a complex of tennis courts, playing fields, volleyball courts, outdoor rinks, and accompanying business amenities (cafes, bars, shops, etc.).
- Plan for increased weather extremes as a result of climate change.
- Make more green space for public use whenever possible.
- Please think of future generations’ health and social and cultural vitality.
- Focus on health benefits of removal.

**d) Economics**

- Ensure experienced project managers with proven success at bringing projects in on time –
3. **What advice do you have for the Project Team as the study moves into the next phase?**

   Those in charge must be accountable to delays and cost over-runs as there will be major disruption.
   - What needs to be done next is a proper cost/benefit analysis as an academic economist understands it.
   - Any new construction techniques for rebuilding that would minimize maintenance costs?
   - Use tax payer’s money to maintain and operate the existing expressway in the most efficient and effective ways.

**Other comments?**

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

- Concerned that city council will disregard the EA process and feedback and turn the study into a political issue.
- Concerned that city council thinks it’s easier to maintain a deteriorating piece of infrastructure regardless of the cost.
- Concerned that politics will interfere with evidence-based decision-making.
- Fear of change will lead to the replacement option instead of considering what experts and evidence recommend.
- That this will be turned into an election issue by councillors.
- Politics will contribute to uninformed decision-making.
- Inertia by council to make a bold decision, lack of leadership.
- Too many resources being spent on multiple studies over the years leading to more inaction.
- The election - bad timing? Widespread misinformation would be harmful to informed decision making.
- Do not be afraid to recommend the “remove” alternative.
- Concern that this decision is being made in the absence of a broader public transit strategy.
- The EA goals are too narrow – need to think about broader Regional Transportation Plans.
- Need to develop a vision for the whole Gardiner Expressway rather than for just a small portion.
- Waterfront Toronto is in a conflict of interest.
- Process seems democratic and not biased.
- City Council needs to make a decision and get moving.
- Make the results of the study an election issue.
- Have a referendum on the Future of the Gardiner. Too much money and too many taxes are involved not to do this.
- The study is highly speculative – consider refocusing the costs over a 50 year life cycle.
- Broaden the scope of the project to include the Gardiner Expressway west of Jarvis to avoid repeating this process in the future.
- Thank you for your excellent and hard work.
- Concerned that Toronto will end up with another failed transit situation (e.g. Scarborough subway/LRT).
- Failure to examine the full length of the Gardiner Expressway at this time is a mistake.
- In years to come, the Gardiner East project will have been long forgotten. Its legacy will be a function of sound planning and engineering and accurate information given to the politicians as well as the general public.
- Congratulations on a truly intelligent, factual and broad analysis. Also really good options for
Other comments?

- participation and being information as citizens.
- The study is too narrow in scope and does not benefit the city or solve congestion issues in the city.
- Continue to engage people in consultations about the future of the Gardiner Expressway. Consider paying for advertising – many people remain uninformed.
- People should get to vote on this.
- ensure co-ordination among the various agencies and governments
- Scrap this study and study the solution for the entire Gardiner. Integrate the study with transit studies. Create a study that aims to improve the movement of goods and people in/out/ across the city.
- Please keep up the good work and continue to involve the community. We need to come up with a solution that addresses the needs of the entire region.
- Make sure public education on the issues that inform the decision is paramount.
- I feel strongly that a public meeting should be arranged in Scarborough, at a location / time convenient to affected commuters. Really important that there is inclusion on this one, so that it isn't used to divide the city. We need more holistic / embracing process.

TIMING

- Speed up the decision process, and begin to move forward with the needed repairs and the overall improvements, and plan.
- It is going to take too long to implement any of the options – tied up with politics, engineering, planning, etc. This needs to happen as soon as possible.
- Concerned about how long it will take to implement the remove alternative and improve public transit.
- A main concern is timing. We cannot wait too long to tackle this project, or buildings will shoot up around this section of the Gardiner, making it impossible or extremely costly to remove it.
- Design a process that is less political and more consultative.
- EA study is moving to slow.

TUNNEL

- Willing to pay higher taxes to tunnel the Gardiner.
- Consider replacing the entire Gardiner Expressway with a tunnel.
- Bury the entire length of the Gardiner Expressway and add a toll fee.
- Learn from Boston’s experience with the “Big Dig”.
- Only option is to tunnel.
- I would love to see an underground alternative such as a tunnel, replacing the whole elevated portion of the highway.
- What an amazing thing it would be if the entire Gardiner was buried, with a bike, pedestrian, and transit superhighway above.
- Reconsider building a tunnel.
- Remove it and make a toll tunnel to Spadina Avenue.
- Consider a stacked tunnel with subway and cars.
- The elevated portion of the Gardiner should eventually be replaced by a bored tunnel running under the Exhibition Grounds to reach Lakeshore then travel under Lakeshore to Jarvis where it can surface to meet the eastern boulevard.
- Remove, or even better replace the entire Gardiner Expressway with a tunnel.
Other comments?

- Remove & Replace with a tunnel. Why is this not even an option?

TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

- Use the reconfiguration of the Gardiner East as a test/demonstration project for new technologies (e.g., geothermal roadway heating to eliminate salt use, combining transportation and electricity grid infrastructure, noise mitigation methods, low energy lighting, public art, etc.).
- It would be great to use this opportunity to incorporate innovative materials, consider minimizing light pollution, and design buildings that use renewable energy.
- Please consider sustainable building materials to minimize the impact on the environment!
- Geo-thermal heating of roadway to reduce salt usage.

NEXT STEPS

The feedback received during Round Three of the Gardiner Expressway / Lake Shore Boulevard East Reconfiguration Environmental Assessment and Integrated Urban Design Study will be used to inform and shape the next phase of the EA and related consultation activities. The next round of consultation will take place in Spring 2014.

For more information please visit: www.gardinereast.ca.