

Date: March 17, 2016 **Project:** Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class EA Study

Location: 22nd Floor **Toronto PO #:**

City Hall **MMM Project #:** 3216026-000

Time: 9:30 am to 11:30 am **Author:** Heather Templeton, MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone	City Project Manager, Transportation Services
Edward Presta	Transportation Services
Kate Nelischer	Public Consultation Unit
Sun Wai Lee	Bridges, Structures and Expressways
Saikat Basak	Cycling Infrastructure & Programs
Jennifer Renaud	Community Planning
Mary MacDonald (part-time)	Heritage Preservation Services
Scott Roberts	MMM
Heather Templeton	MMM

Distribution: Attendees

Purpose: Start-up Meeting to discuss the study, expectations, schedule, budget and next steps.

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Introductions & Project Team Members	
1.1	The meeting attendees introduced themselves and their role in the study.	
1.2	S. Roberts and H. Templeton provided a brief introduction of the study.	
1.3	L. Zappone confirmed she is the main contact for the City of Toronto (City) and noted that all project-related communications (e.g., meeting notices, agendas, minutes, etc.) are to be sent to Lorna and she will distribute to the City Team accordingly. Lorna also confirmed that Scott, Project Manager, and Heather, Deputy Project Manager are to attend all meetings.	
1.4	L. Zappone noted that she is to be included on all project-related emails/correspondence between specialists and City project team staff. S. Roberts requested that both Heather and Scott be copied on all emails.	
1.5	S. Roberts noted other key consultant project team members include: Doug Dixon and David Cerullo will be leading Bridge Engineering; Dave McLaughlin, Active Transportation; Unterman McPhail Associates, Cultural Heritage; and Mark Langridge, DTAH, Bridge Architect.	
1.6	S. Roberts inquired about the status of the agreement. Lorna noted that it may be ready in approximately a week; Scott noted an award letter can suffice as initial approval for MMM to begin work.	City

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
2.0	Study and Expectations	
2.1	<p>Consultation & EA Process</p> <p>L. Zappone noted the two communities within the study area: to the north - South Rosedale Residents Association; and to the south – Bloor East Neighbourhood Association (BENA). Lorna noted that Rosedale is very active and she has reached out already.</p> <p>L. Zappone noted that consultation will be an important component to this study and the City is considering extending the overall schedule from 12 months to 14 months to ensure the right approach.</p> <p>MMM provided an overview of the approach to consultation presented in their proposal and consistent with the RFP including two PICs: PIC 1 will outline the undertaking itself, the pedestrian and cycling analysis summary, the problem being addressed, the major constraints and issues, the proposed alternative design concepts in order to facilitate the selection of a preferred alternative; and PIC 2 will present the analysis and evaluation of the alternatives, the selection of and the functional design of the technically preferred alternative.</p> <p>All discussed opportunities for enhanced consultation approaches – Heather noted that holding an open house meet and greet in advance of PIC 1 has been successful in past studies with very engaged communities, but is not included in the scope for this study. Mary offered to facilitate an introductory study area walk in coordination with the local heritage community group; Kate noted that Jane’s walk is coming in May and timing may be good to coordinate.</p> <p>City to discuss and confirm approach to public consultation with the study area Councillor: Kristyn Wong-Tam (Ward 27).</p>	City
2.2	<p>Cycling & Pedestrians / Accessibility</p> <p>S. Basak asked if the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will include staff from pedestrian/accessibility, in addition to staff from Cycling Infrastructure. Lorna to confirm.</p> <p>S. Basak noted the study area includes existing cycle tracks on Bloor Street and Sherbourne Street; cyclists presently are not permitted on the bridge but the study is to review, along with the need for AODA improvements, opportunities/demand for connections to the Rosedale Valley and Bayview Avenue multi-use trails.</p> <p>MMM noted the scope of work in the RFP and their proposal includes a review of existing pedestrian and cyclist conditions as well as to identify safety and accessibility concerns within the study area.</p>	L. Zappone
2.3	<p>Bridge Engineering</p> <p>S. Wai Lee and H. Templeton provided a brief overview of the bridge inspection and emergency repairs completed by MMM in 2014, and the resulting MMM recommendations in a letter to the City stating that based on the repair works completed and the evaluation findings, the estimated remaining life expectancy of the bridge is 5 to 10 years (i.e. replace between 2020 to 2025), and until replacement, a detailed visual inspection is recommended every 12 months with focus on certain details/members. The last visual inspection was completed in Summer 2015 and the next is planned for</p>	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<p>Summer 2016.</p> <p>S. Wai Lee noted that his department will receive the annual visual inspection report and will share if needed. Sun also noted that the existing bridge environment is not ideal for weathering steel, as it is humid and can accelerate corrosion, noting that the last rehab was in 2001, which was not long ago.</p>	
2.4	<p>Community Planning</p> <p>J. Renaud notes that the Rosedale Valley lands fall under the jurisdiction of TRCA. Jen also noted the community to the south St. James Town is undergoing a Community Improvement Plan process.</p>	
2.5	<p>Heritage</p> <p>M. MacDonald provided an overview of the cultural heritage scope, noting that the existing bridge is listed on the City inventory and located within the Rosedale Heritage Conservation District. Key considerations in the heritage evaluation will include: a high standard of information to justify replacement and in the event of replacement compatibility with surrounding environment and with heritage district guidelines. The existing cultural heritage review will be important information to be included in PIC 1.</p> <p>Consultation will include MTCS, but the focus will be with South Rosedale Heritage Committee; our team may reach out/offer meetings to present/review heritage work and findings. Mary noted that a presentation to Heritage Preservation Committee is needed if council approval is required under the heritage act.</p> <p>MMM noted that Unterman McPhail Associates will be carrying out the cultural heritage work for this study.</p>	
2.6	<p>Construction Staging</p> <p>S. Roberts provided an overview of possible construction staging options in the event of a bridge replacement with temporary shifts in the road and trail to allow for staging areas, noting differences in staging with 1 crane versus 2 cranes. MMM asked if the option of closing bridge for the duration of construction is an option. The City noted that it is a possible option as it was closed for four months to complete the rehabilitation in 2014/2015.</p>	
2.7	<p>Engineering Survey and SUE</p> <p>L. Zappone indicated that City survey staff would like to arrange pre-work meeting with MMM surveyors to discuss the scope of work presented in the RFP. Shawn Hodgson, MMM Engineering Survey to provide availability</p> <p>S. Roberts noted that in past experience with the City, the SUE process entails: 1) digital files of existing utilities provided by City (SUE Level D); 2) field survey of all above ground features (SUE Level C); and 3) survey for all sub-surface features (SUE Level B), and update utility plans accordingly.</p>	MMM/City

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
3.0	Schedule	
3.1	L. Zappone noted that the City is considering extending the overall schedule from 12 months to 14 months, if needed, to ensure the right approach to consultation. Lorna to advise if the schedule is to be extended.	
3.2	MMM asked if the bridge work is programed. The City confirmed that there are no funding commitments at this time for detail design and/or construction; however, the earliest construction could occur is 2018/2019, as about one year for design is needed, but will depend on EA Recommendations. L. Zappone noted that the key date at this time is the Public Works Committee Final Presentation.	
3.3	All discussed Notice of Study Commencement and PIC #1 timeline options: June or September 2016. The City noted that meetings will be planned with the two area councillors to discuss/confirm the approach; the City to advise MMM when date confirmed.	City
3.4	S. Basak noted that the team may need to present to City Design Review Panel. MMM also noted a possible need to present to Heritage Preservation Committee. The possible timing and sequencing of these meetings in relation to PIC 2 and ESR Filing will need to be considered in the overall project schedule.	MMM/City
3.5	<p>K. Nelischer noted that the City standard PIC communications and preparation timelines are approximately 6 to 8 weeks lead time to advertise notices, and MMM needs to ensure these are considered in the overall schedule when setting the dates for PIC 1 and 2. Kate confirmed the timelines included in the RFP are accurate.</p> <p>Kate noted that for a June PIC, late-June PIC can be problematic and early June is preferable.</p> <p>The City is concerned that holding PIC 1 in September may delay the overall study schedule. Lorna will discuss timing options for PIC 1 with the Councillors when they meet; Councillor Wong-Tam had previously expressed interest in holding the PIC this Spring.</p>	
4.0	Next Steps	
4.1	The City is planning a meeting with the two area councillors for April to discuss approach to consultation and timing, as well as key community concerns/interests. City to advise MMM once meeting date is set.	City
4.2	MMM to review project schedule and present timing options for PIC #1 to the City for discussion (June vs Sept) ensuring PIC communications and preparation lead time is adequate.	MMM
4.3	Weekly project manager calls (30 min) are planned for Thursdays at 2:00 p.m. Lorna requested Kate attend. MMM to send out recurring meeting notices, include Kate.	MMM

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
4.4	<p>E. Presta noted that project team meetings can be scheduled as needed and don't always need the consultant.</p> <p>Project Team (PT) Meeting PT #1 is planned for April 21st at 9:30 a.m.</p>	City
4.5	<p>The City noted that TAC Meetings will be held at key milestones. TAC #1 Meeting, planned for late April, is to present the study overview, schedule, problems and opportunities, and pre-PIC #1 activities. The City noted that consultant project manager is to prepare and give the presentation at the meeting.</p>	
<p>Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.</p>		

Date: May 13, 2016
Location: 22nd Floor, East Tower
 City Hall
Time: 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Project: Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge
 Class EA Study
Toronto PO #: 6043136
MMM Project #: 3216026-000
Author: Jay Goldberg,
 WSP|MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone	City Project Manager, Transportation Services
Jason Diceman	Public Consultation Unit
Fiona Chapman	Transportation Services, Pedestrian Projects
Lara Tarlo	Engineering Planning, Urban Design
Tabassum Rafique	Transportation Services, Traffic Planning
Eddy Lam	Transportation Planning
Saikat Basak	Cycling Infrastructure & Programs
Mary MacDonald	Heritage Preservation Services
Scott Roberts	WSP MMM
Heather Templeton	WSP MMM
Dave McLaughlin	WSP MMM
Jason Neudorf	WSP MMM
Jay Goldberg	WSP MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Saikat Basak	Transportation Services
Jeffrey Dea	Transportation Services
Jennifer Renaud	City Planning
Jamie McEwan	City Planning
Sun Wai Lee	Engineering & Construction Services

Purpose: Project Team Meeting PT#2 to discuss the overall study schedule including TAC meetings and PIC 1, existing conditions work and scope, and approach to the alternative solutions and evaluation per the issued agenda.

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting PT#1 (March 17,2016)	
The outstanding action items from PT1 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT1 were discussed at PT2 as documented under the corresponding agenda item.		
1.1	Item 1.6 - MMM inquired about the status of the agreement. City provided the agreement on April 19, 2016.	
1.2	Item 2.1 – City to discuss and confirm approach to public consultation with Councillor Kristyn Wong-Tam (Ward 27). The proposed consultation plan has been confirmed with Councillor Wong-Tam to include a Community Heritage Walk in June 2016, Notice of Study Commencement and PIC #1 September 2016.	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
1.3	Item 2.2 – S. Basak asked if the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will include staff from pedestrian/accessibility, in addition to staff from Cycling Infrastructure. Fiona Chapman, Transportation Services, Pedestrian Projects, included in Project Team.	
1.4	Item 2.7 – L. Zappone indicated that City survey staff would like to arrange pre-work meeting with MMM surveyors to discuss the scope of work presented in the RFP. Teleconference held on April 28 th , City accepted proposed approach to field survey, and field work completed the week of May 9, 2016.	
1.5	Item 3.3 – All discussed Notice of Study Commencement and PIC #1 timeline options: June or September 2016. The City noted that meetings will be planned with the two area councillors to discuss/confirm the approach; the City to advise MMM when date confirmed. See Item 1.2 above.	
1.6	Item 3.4 – S. Basak noted that the team may need to present to City Design Review Panel. MMM also noted a possible need to present to Heritage Preservation Committee. The possible timing and sequencing of these meetings in relation to PIC 2 and ESR Filing will need to be considered in the overall project schedule. The Project Team will review timing in the fall after PIC #1.	
1.7	Item 4.1 – The City is planning a meeting with the two area councillors for April to discuss approach to consultation and timing, as well as key community concerns/interests. City to advise MMM once meeting date is set. See Item 1.2 above.	
1.8	Item 4.2 – MMM to review project schedule and present timing options for PIC #1 to the City for discussion (June vs Sept) ensuring PIC communications and preparation lead time is adequate. See Item 1.2 above.	
1.9	Item 4.3 – Weekly project manager calls (30 min) are planned for Thursdays at 2:00 p.m. MMM to send out recurring meeting notices, include Public Consultation Unit. The weekly calls are planned for 10 a.m. Thursdays.	
2.0	Study Schedule	
2.1	<p>L. Zappone confirmed that there will be two TAC meetings before PIC 1. The Project Team reviewed potential dates for the TAC meetings, given that PIC 1 is scheduled for end of September 2016. The first TAC meeting was tentatively scheduled for June 23, 2016 to introduce the study, review existing conditions information, including data collection and results of the active transportation survey, and the problem and opportunity statement, and project schedule.</p> <p>The second TAC meeting was tentatively scheduled for August 11, 2016, to review the draft PIC 1 displays. Lorna to confirm with Project Team and send out TAC #1 and #2 Meeting Notices.</p>	City/LZ
2.2	L. Zappone confirmed that the Notice of Study Commencement would be distributed with the Notice of PIC 1, in September 2016. MMM provided a draft PIC 1 calendar, based on a PIC 1 date of September 28, 2016, and highlighted	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<p>the key dates for providing the draft and final versions of the Notice and PIC displays.</p> <p>The Project Team discussed the key dates as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 2 – MMM to provide draft Notice for Project Team review • August 5 – MMM to provide draft displays for Project Team review • August 9 – City Project Team to provide comments on draft Notice • August 11 – MMM to review draft displays with TAC • August 15 – City to provide final Notice to City Communications • August 18 – City/TAC to provide comments on draft displays • August 26 – MMM to provide final draft materials to City for circulation • September 9 – MMM to provide finalized displays to City for publishing <p>J. Diceman to confirm schedule meets PCU standards, and whether the first ad publication date is September 8 or 15, and if two publication ads are necessary, recognizing the other forms of notification.</p>	City/JD
3.0	Existing Conditions	
3.1	<p>D. McLaughlin discussed the scope of the active transportation data collection, noting that MMM will do a count of the pedestrians/cyclists at the bridge. MMM will provide details on the count locations and data to be collected by the end of May 2016.</p> <p>L. Tarlo requested MMM also count the pedestrians/cyclists on the ravine trail underneath the bridge, even though that was not in the original scope.</p> <p>L. Zappone confirmed the additional count. L. Tarlo also noted that the local community has previously inquired about a connection from Bloor Street, down to the ravine trail adjacent to Rosedale Valley Drive. City requested MMM review the accessibility of such a connection, L. Zappone confirmed that the design of such a connection is not within the scope of this project; however, a conceptual connection would be considered part of the Accessibility of the pedestrian bridge.</p> <p>D. McLaughlin inquired if the City wants to examine the feasibility of an accessible connection between the Glen Road Bridge and Bloor Street, in addition to the stairs. All acknowledged the challenges, and noted that a review of need and feasibility will be required. J. Diceman noted that there will need to be an FAQ composed to address access to/from the ravine, which also addresses the broader network connections and destinations. F. Chapman suggested MMM assess at a high level the feasibility of a pedestrian ramp on the north side of Bloor to the bridge crossing for the design options, but not the south side. Bike rails on the stairway north of Bloor should be considered if a pedestrian ramp is not considered feasible.</p>	WSP MMM
3.2	<p>D. McLaughlin inquired if the City has existing/historical pedestrian/cyclist counts on the bridge, Sherbourne Street north of Bloor Street, or Bloor Street by the existing bridge/tunnel (traffic volumes on Bloor Street as well at this location). That data would be helpful to supplement and compare with the MMM counts. City to check data records for any existing pedestrian/cyclist</p>	City/SB

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	counts in the study area.	
3.3	<p>D. McLaughlin noted that MMM included an intercept survey in the scope and asked city staff if a different form of survey that avoided interviews might be more appropriate. Typical information collected includes: age, demographics, type and frequency of use, origin and destinations, etc.</p> <p>J. Diceman suggested in place of the intercept survey that an online survey. The city has found these generally get good feedback from a larger number of participants, and MMM could hand out 'post-cards' while collecting counts on the bridge that has the link address to the survey. A link to the survey could also be provided on the City website and a sign posted on the bridge. It was agreed to go with the online survey instead of the intercept survey.</p> <p>MMM to provide input to City on information required for the survey and potential survey questions by end of May 2016, and provide good photographs of the bridge for the Post Card.</p> <p>City to create survey and post online and provide sign on bridge by early June, so that survey will run for a few weeks prior to the first TAC meeting on June 23, 2016 and the Community Heritage Walk.</p>	<p>WSP MMM</p> <p>City/JD</p>
3.4	<p>H. Templeton noted that there was scope in the RFP for collision data collection, and inquired if the City is aware of any existing issues at the adjacent intersections, or at the entrance to the bridge, and the clarify the goal of the collision analysis. The City confirmed that the collision review is only required for the area on Bloor Street between Parliament Street and Sherbourne Street to review any history of pedestrian/cyclist/vehicle conflicts. City did not specify any existing issues, but noted that there is a planned development in the parcel just west of Parliament Street and Bloor Street, which has a planned intersection and pedestrian crossing approximately 160 m west of Parliament Street on Bloor Street. City to provide any Traffic Impact Study or associated studies regarding any development in proximity to the study area. MMM to provide updated Data Request to City.</p>	<p>WSP MMM & City/LZ</p>
3.5	<p>WSP MMM reviewed the scope of the Natural Heritage component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two (2) field surveys will be conducted, one in Spring and Summer • Letters will be mailed to TRCA and MNRF within the next month • Key natural heritage features and functions will be identified and used to provide input to evaluation of alternatives and the final Design Concept. 	
3.6	<p>WSP MMM reviewed the scope of the Phase 1 Environmental Sensitivity Assessment (ESA) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will complete a comprehensive review of all available records, a site interview and site reconnaissance; and • Will complete a comprehensive evaluation of potential sources of contamination. 	
3.7	<p>WSP MMM reviewed the scope of the Cultural Heritage investigation as follows:</p>	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R. Unterman will research and complete a summary history of the Study Area including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Collecting historical mapping and aerial photographs, ○ Reviewing historical government records, ○ Reviewing previous Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports on the structure if available, ○ Reviewing the bridge construction history at the site, and ○ Contacting the local municipal heritage planner. • Will identify the cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) and built heritage resources (BHR) that may be displaced or disrupted by the undertaking • Will prepare the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) 	
3.8	<p>WSP MMM reviewed the scope of the Bridge Engineering as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Conditions Summary will be based on previous work done by MMM on the recent bridge rehabilitation, and annual visual inspection reports, • Will provide input into Alternative Solutions Development and Evaluation and selection of preferred, and • Will develop bridge design alternatives and input into evaluation of the preferred alternative solution. 	
3.9	<p>M. MacDonald noted that the Community Heritage Walk is planned to be held in early to mid June. It will be between 1 and 1.5 hours, and will probably be during the week, based on attending Councillor schedules. Key community stakeholders will be invited to the walk, which will be a good opportunity to gain personal background/histories of the bridge from the participants. WSP MMM and Unterman McPhail to provide input to City on historical content for the Walk with the City.</p>	WSP MMM & City/LZ
3.10	<p>D. McLaughlin inquired as to the status of the graffiti at the tunnel entrance, and inside the tunnel, and if it is considered street art by the City. City to confirm with the City's Beautiful Streets project.</p>	City/LZ
4.0	Approach to Alternative Solutions & Evaluation	
4.1	<p>H. Templeton reviewed the draft Problem and Opportunity Statement provided at the meeting. The Project Team provided feedback, and the key discussion points are summarized as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Statement should mention the possibility of replacing the bridge, that is part of the alternative solutions, • It should have a balance between the structural concerns of the deteriorating bridge, and the cultural heritage aspects of the bridge, and • It does not necessarily need to focus on the bridge structure as a heritage component, but the crossing itself, and the goal of this project to maintain that crossing. <p>Project Team to further refine Problem and Opportunity Statement to publish</p>	WSP MMM & City/PT

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	on City website.	
4.2	H. Templeton reviewed the draft criteria for the alternative solution evaluation, including; bridge engineering, transportation planning, socio-economic, natural environment, heritage, and cost. City noted that heritage should be presented second, under bridge engineering, and that socio-economic should be after natural environment. City also noted that Urban Design should be included as a separate criterion. MMM noted the key criteria for urban design will vary for the alternative solutions as compared to the bridge design alternatives, and will revise accordingly.	WSP MMM
5.0	Other Business	
5.1	City noted that there may be public criticism for not including the tunnel in the study area. L. Zappone acknowledged and indicated that a recent inspection report on the tunnel indicates it is in good condition. J. Diceman to include an FAQ on the tunnel.	City/JD
5.2	D. McLaughlin inquired if there were any fatalities from the bridge, as that may be a public safety concern which could impact the design. City to provide input.	City/LZ
5.3	J. Diceman noted that PIC displays should be designed to be very visual with minimal text, i.e., be readable on a smartphone, as that will increase the public engagement and response.	
5.4	MMM provided draft TAC presentation displays to the City on May 6, 2016 and will continue to revise per comments received from City.	City/PT & WSP MMM
5.5	MMM to provide CV for Katherine Jim, who will be replacing H. Templeton as the Deputy Project Manager.	WSP MMM
6.0	Next Meeting (PT#3 June 9, 2016)	
6.1	Next meeting is scheduled for June 9, 2016 9:30 a.m. The agenda will be finalized and circulated a week in advance.	WSP MMM & City/LZ
Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.		

Date: June 9, 2016
Location: 22nd Floor, East Tower
 City Hall
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Project: Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge
 Class EA Study
Toronto PO #: 6043136
MMM Project #: 3216026-000
Author: Jay Goldberg,
 WSP|MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone	City Project Manager, Transportation Services
Lara Tarlo (part-time)	City Planning - Urban Design
Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning
Jennifer Renaud	City Planning - Community Planning
Sun Wai Lee	Eng. & Const. Services - Transportation Infra/Bridges & Structures
Scott Roberts	WSP MMM
Heather Templeton	WSP MMM
Jay Goldberg	WSP MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Urban Design/Heritage Preservation Services
Saikat Basak	Transportation Services - TIMs/Cycling Infra. & Prog.
Tabassum Rafique	Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt
Fiona Chapman	Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects
Jason Diceman	Policy, Planning, Finance & Administration - Program Support/Public Consultation
Jeffrey Dea	Transportation Services - TIMs/Infrastructure Plan.
Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning
Ann Khan	Transportation Services - Traffic Operations
Lukasz Pawlowski	Transportation Services
Alex Shevchuk	Parks, Forestry & Recreation

Purpose: To discuss the upcoming TAC meeting and consultation items including the online survey and Community Walk Shop, provide an update on the current field work, and review the problem and opportunity statement, per the issued agenda.

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting PT#2 (May 13, 2016)	
The outstanding action items from PT2 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT2 were discussed at PT3 as documented under the corresponding agenda item.		
1.1	Item 2.1 – L. Zappone sent out invitations for the TAC #1 meeting for June 23, 2016, and TAC #2 is tentatively planned for August 11, 2016. City will send out the invitation for TAC #2 once the date is confirmed.	City/LZ
1.2	Item 2.2 - J. Diceman to confirm the PIC schedule meets PCU standards, and whether the first ad publication date is September 8 or 15, and if two publication ads are necessary, recognizing the other forms of notification.	City/JD

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
1.3	<p>Item 3.1 – WSP MMM provided details of the pedestrian/cyclist count locations to the City on June 8, 2016.</p> <p>The Project Team discussed clarifying the scope of an assessment to provide a connection from the bridge down to the ravine multi-use trail. H. Templeton noted that such an assessment would entail assessing the need of a connection (including a broader survey of users), and an assessment for the appropriate location of that connection along the Rosedale Ravine (i.e., the best connection location may not be at the Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge). L. Zoppone to review the ongoing Toronto Ravine Strategy to see if the strategy speaks to trail connections within ravine systems. The City confirmed that although a connection will not be provided as part of this study, it should consider not precluding a connection down to the valley in the development, evaluation of alternatives and the preferred design.</p>	City/LZ
1.4	<p>Item 3.2 – City to provide data records for any existing pedestrian/cyclist counts in the study area, as well as any collision data on Bloor Street. J. Renaud noted that there would be some recent reports with this information on the City's St. James Town community website. WSP MMM to review.</p>	City/SB & WSP MMM
1.5	<p>Item 3.3 – WSP MMM provided draft survey questions to the City on May 26, 2016, and additional photographs of the study area. Additional discussion regarding the online survey is noted below, under Item 3.3.</p>	
1.6	<p>Item 3.4 – City to provide any traffic impact studies or associated studies regarding any development in proximity to the study area.</p> <p>WSP MMM provided updated Data Request List, and L. Zappone noted that they have received various items from the list which will be provided to WSP MMM.</p> <p>S.W. Lee to provide structural drawings of the tunnel, if available.</p>	City/LZ & SWL
1.7	<p>Item 3.9 – WSP MMM and Unterman McPhail to provide input to City on historical content for the Community Walk Shop with the City.</p>	WSP MMM
1.8	<p>Item 3.10 – J. Goldberg noted that on a recent site visit he noticed that the graffiti/street art was tagged as part of the St. James Town Art City project.</p>	
1.9	<p>Item 5.1 – City to draft FAQ for consultation events, including the Community Walk Shop.</p>	City/JD
1.10	<p>Item 5.2 – D. McLaughlin inquired if there were any fatalities from the bridge, as that may be a public safety concern which could impact the design. L. Zappone noted that she has contacted the Toronto Police for study input, and will provide any feedback received.</p>	City/LZ
2.0	TAC #1 Meeting (June 23, 2016)	
2.1	<p>WSP MMM presented an updated version of the draft TAC #1 presentation, which was revised per City comments provided on June 7, 2016. WSP MMM to update the presentation based on discussions at this meeting for the next</p>	WSP MMM

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<p>Weekly Call. The key updates are summarized as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background & Context - updated to reflect recent input from S.W. Lee regarding the history of the bridge dating back to 1887. • Study Process and Schedule – updated wording and schedule per City’s comments. WSP MMM to add separate slide for Schedule which will include going beyond the EA to add the planned timelines for detailed design (2017/2018) and construction (2018/2019). • Key Study Stakeholders – J. Renaud suggested adding Upper Jarvis Neighbourhood Association. • Existing Conditions – H. Templeton noted that additional slides will be inserted as background information becomes available, including Bridge, Active Transportation, Cultural Heritage and Natural Heritage. • Problem and Opportunity Statement – was refined with input from the Project Team. 	
3.0	Consultation	
3.1	<p>L. Zappone noted that the City will confirm the official title of the Community Walk Shop. H. Templeton agreed to change the title as it currently portrays that it is strictly a heritage event, which may deter stakeholders from attending. J. Renaud suggested Community Walk Shop.</p>	City/LZ
3.2	<p>L. Zappone noted that the name of the project will be changed to Glen Road / Rosedale Valley Bridge EA, so as not to confuse with the other Glen Road Bridge to the north. City to confirm.</p>	City/LZ
3.3	<p>The Project Team discussed the online survey which will be conducted to gain information on the bridge users’ travel patterns, as well as general comments and interest in the bridge. L. Zappone noted the City is finalizing the study post cards to be handed out to the public, directing them to the project website and online survey.</p> <p>L. Zappone noted that the pedestrian/cyclist count, to be conducted by WSP MMM (Dave M.), should not be delayed, if the information cards are not finalized on time. H. Templeton noted that the count is planned to be conducted next week, and they will at least require the Letter from the City as an authorization to conduct the counts. City to review draft letter provided by WSP MMM.</p>	City/LZ
3.4	<p>L. Zappone inquired how the counts would be conducted based on the Ped. and Cyclist Location Map. J. Goldberg noted that the individual at Count Location #1 would be counting individuals coming from the tunnel to the subway or continuing to Glen Road, and Count Location #2 (on Bloor Street, south side) would count individuals going to and from the staircases leading to the tunnel and bridge.</p> <p>WSP MMM to provide clarification to Lorna and Saikat on the pedestrian/cyclist data collection plan, and confirm which dates the counts will be conducted.</p>	WSP MMM

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
3.5	The Project Team discussed the Community Walk Shop planned for June 27, 2016. L. Zappone noted that the City will confirm a venue for the Community Walk Shop, and are still discussing how the event will be programmed. H. Templeton noted that R. Unterman will be able to attend the event, per City's request. City to confirm invitee list and send out invitations.	City/LZ
4.0	Fieldwork / Data Collection	
4.1	H. Templeton noted that the field investigations are underway. A survey of the area has been conducted, and the Ecology team has started their initial field work.	
5.0	Draft Problem and Opportunity Statement	
5.1	Discussed under Item 2.1.	
6.0	Other Business	
6.1	WSP MMM noted that they will revise the Study Schedule per comments received at the Weekly Call on June 1, 2016, to include the key TAC review items, and will provide to City.	WSP MMM
6.2	J. Renaud noted that she will find the dates for the St. James Town Community Fest in August, and will advise if she could distribute PIC #1 flyers for this study, if available in time.	City/JR
7.0	Next Meeting (PT#4 July 14, 2016)	
7.1	Next meeting is scheduled for July 14, 2016 9:30 a.m. The agenda will be finalized and circulated a week in advance.	WSP MMM & City/LZ
Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.		

Date: July 14, 2016
Location: 22nd Floor, East Tower
City Hall
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Project: Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge
Class EA Study
Toronto PO #: 6043136
MMM Project #: 3216026-000
Author: Jay Goldberg,
WSP|MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone	City Project Manager, Transportation Services
Jeffrey Dea	Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning
Jason Diceman	Public Consultation
Lara Tarlo (part-time)	City Planning - Urban Design
Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning
Saikat Basak (part-time)	Transportation Services - Cycling
Jennifer Renaud (part-time)	City Planning - Community Planning
Tabassum Rafique (part-time)	Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt
Scott Roberts (part-time)	WSP MMM
Heather Templeton	WSP MMM
Jay Goldberg	WSP MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Sun Wai Lee	Eng. & Const. Services - Transportation Infra/Bridges & Structures
Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Fiona Chapman	Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects
Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning
Ann Khan	Transportation Services - Traffic Operations
Lukasz Pawlowski	Transportation Services
Alex Shevchuk	Parks, Forestry & Recreation

Purpose: To recap the TAC Meeting #1 and the Community Walk-Shop, provide an update on the online survey and pedestrian/cyclist counts, and review the PIC Calendar, outline of displays, and alternative solution assessment, per the issued agenda.

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting PT#3 (June 9, 2016)	
The outstanding action items from PT3 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT3 were discussed at PT4 as documented under the corresponding agenda item.		
1.1	Item 1.3 – L. Zappone and WSP MMM reviewed the ongoing Toronto Ravine Strategy website, noting that there was no discussion on trail connections within ravine systems. The City confirmed that although a connection will not be provided as part of this study, it should consider not precluding a connection down to the valley in the development of evaluation of alternatives and the preferred design.	
1.2	Item 1.4 – City noted there are no data records for existing pedestrian/cyclist	City/LZ

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<p>counts in the study area. MMM to review the area development application studies that are available on the City's website.</p> <p>City to provide collision data available for Bloor Street.</p>	WSP MMM
1.3	<p>Item 1.6 – L. Zappone to provide MMM with the available development applications, including area traffic impact studies.</p> <p>City provided data files from the Data Request List on a CD June 23, 2016</p>	
1.4	Item 1.9 – City to draft FAQ for consultation events.	City/LZ/JD
1.5	Item 1.10 – L. Zappone noted that she has contacted the Toronto Police for study input, and will provide any feedback received.	City/LZ
1.6	Item 6.2 - J. Renaud noted that she will find the dates for the St. James Town Community Fest in August, and will advise if she could distribute PIC #1 flyers for this study, if available in time.	City/JR
2.0	TAC #1 Meeting (June 23, 2016)	
2.1	<p>WSP MMM provided the TAC #1 Meeting Minutes to the Project Team on July 13, 2016. H. Templeton provided a brief recap of the TAC #1 Meeting, noting the introductory meeting was a good opportunity to meet the broader study team and key stakeholders (i.e., TRCA). Key actions noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project Team to discuss sending an early letter to MTCS to introduce the study, rather than waiting for the Notice of Study Commencement in September. The City requested MMM draft a letter for review. • Presentations to Design Review Panel and Heritage Preservation Panel, potential dates and timing within the study process were discussed, and discussed further under Item 5.1 below. 	WSP MMM
3.0	Recap of Community Walk-Shop (June 27, 2016)	
3.1	<p>H. Templeton provided an overview of key community comments heard during the Walk-Shop, noting that the bridge seemed to be well used, particularly by residents north of the bridge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing the bridge should not be considered an option. • The new bridge should have a simple design that does not obstruct the view. • There is apparent criminal activity at the tunnel and bridge entrance and any bridge improvements should look at ways to deter this activity. • New bridge should be designed for both pedestrians and cyclists, but should force cyclists to slow down when entering the bridge. • The bridge itself does not necessarily have heritage value, but the crossing does. 	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
3.2	<p>The Project Team discussed how this project could provide recommendations for improvements to the south approach to the bridge, which includes the stairs and the tunnel. All acknowledged that the stairs and tunnel are not within the scope of this EA, but recognized there may be a need to address the safety concerns being raised by the community. J. Dea noted that if improvements to the tunnel and/or stairs are needed they may ultimately be included in the detail design and construction and it would be preferable for the EA to at least include some type of high level recommendations that could then provide direction to the City to move ahead with a detailed design. The City (L. Zappone and L. Tarlo) to discuss further.</p> <p>WSP MMM to review with Dave McLaughlin (AT), Shannon Baker (Landscape Architect) and Mark Langridge (DTAH) their scope for this EA Study and what sort of improvements could be reviewed through the CPTED process (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design).</p>	City WSP MMM
3.3	<p>H. Templeton provided an overview of the Pedestrian and Cyclist Count Results and Analysis Draft Memo, which summarized the counts conducted by WSP MMM on June 22 (6:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.) and June 25 (10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.). Key results from the analysis are noted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of 823 trips were observed over 11 hrs (75 users per hour on average) • The AM and PM weekday periods indicate a peak travel direction southbound (toward the subway and downtown) in the morning and northbound (from the subway and downtown) in the evening, consistent with expectation given the primarily residential character of the surrounding neighbourhood on the north side. • More than 50% of all trips were heading to or from Glen Road (south of Bloor Street). • People heading to or coming from the west on the north side of Bloor accounted for about a quarter of all trips. • 80% of the observed users were pedestrians; 20% were cyclists and 90% of them were riding over the bridge (rather than walking their bikes). • A few strollers and mobility device users were observed, though these did not constitute a significant proportion of users. 	
3.4	<p>H. Templeton noted some of the comments received during the pedestrian/cyclist count:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People really like the bridge and want assurance that it will stay; • the view and natural beauty is particularly appreciated; • People are concerned about security, and want better lighting, cameras, etc; • People are very concerned about temporary closure of the bridge • People liked the current aesthetic and preferred not to have a “modern” look if the bridge were replaced 	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<p>Some observations during the counts included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A substantial number of trips (perhaps 30-40%) appeared to be recreational. • The staircases are frequently used as seating, likely as it is a nice shaded area. • A lot of regular users were observed (i.e. people we saw multiple times in our observations) but also a surprising number of people who appeared to be there for the first time. 	
3.5	<p>T. Rafique asked if the new crosswalk, as part of the 6 Glen Road development application, could change the pedestrian/cyclist travel patterns. H. Templeton noted that its possible, but would expect it be primarily used by the condo residents, MMM review the transportation assessments. J. Renaud noted that there will also be storefront shops along Bloor Street, which could attract pedestrian/cyclist traffic.</p> <p>J. Goldberg noted that he has downloaded all of the reports from the 6 Glen Road development application, but will also set up a file sharing folder for L. Zappone to provide any additional background transportation study reports directly.</p>	WSP MMM
3.6	WSP MMM to send the Pedestrian and Cyclist Count Results and Analysis Draft Memo to the Project Team.	WSP MMM
3.7	<p>The Project Team noted that there are plans for intersection improvements to the Bloor Street and Parliament Street intersection in 2017, and to the Bloor Street and Sherbourne Street intersection in 2019. These improvements could also influence the pedestrian/cyclist traffic in the area, and should be noted as part of Relevant Area Projects in the PIC Displays and ESR for this EA.</p>	City WSP MMM
4.0	Online Survey – Initial Results	
4.1	<p>J. Diceman provided an overview of survey responses received to date (Snapshot July 13, 2016):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide variety of demographics provided responses; similar to that of the surrounding area • Vast majority of respondents were from Rosedale • Majority of respondents use the bridge very frequently (4-7 times a week) • Majority of respondents walk or bicycle across the bridge; while a minority cross with a stroller or mobility device. • When asked ‘why do you cross at Glen Road, rather than Sherbourne Street or Castle Frank?’, many responded for convenience, but it is likely a close split between convenience and enjoyable, based on comments from the ‘other’ category, and that people could only choose one answer. Many also noted that it is safer than using the stairs or taking Bloor Street/Sherbourne Street. 	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
4.2	<p>J. Renaud inquired what will be the boundaries of the study notices distribution. J. Diceman noted that they have not designated an area yet, but it is usually bounded by major streets around the study area. To the south, the boundary will likely be St. James Avenue, or possibly Wellesley St.</p> <p>L. Tarlo noted that based on their previous work in the area, it may be beneficial to translate the Notice into other languages, as English/French are generally not the first language of many residence. The City to review the consultation protocols and review possible arrangements to translate the notice or parts of it to other languages.</p>	City/JD/LZ
5.0	Consultation	
5.1	<p>The Project Team discussed the plan to present to the Design Review Panel (DRP). L Zappone noted that the indicated they prefer to have drawings of the presented at the meeting. H. Templeton noted that the Project Team will not have drawings of the design alternatives to present until after PIC 1, and suggested that the Project Team present to DRP, the design alternatives and preliminary preferred before PIC 2, and the design of the preferred alternative following PIC 2, including community input. L. Zappone noted dates for presenting to the DRP are Oct. 4, Nov. 4, Nov. 23, and Dec. 15. H. Templeton noted that November dates would be preferred.</p>	City/LZ WSP MMM
5.2	<p>The Project Team discussed plans to present at the Heritage Preservation Board (HPB). H. Templeton suggested the timing of a HPB be coordinated with the DRP Presentation. H. Templeton to R. Unterman and DTAH to review the need, timing and key discussions items for the HPB and DRP.</p>	WSP MMM
5.3	<p>The Project Team discussed the PIC 1 Calendar. The following are the key dates, including agreed revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 3 – MMM to provide draft Notice and Displays for Project Team review • August 11 – TAC #2 Meeting to review PIC #1 materials • August 15 – City to review PIC #1 material with area Councillors • August 19 – City/TAC to provide comments on draft displays • August 24 – Final Notice to Communications • August 26 – MMM to provide Final Draft Displays to City • September 7 – Notice submitted for printing, flyers, news ad, bulk mail • September 9 – MMM to provide Final Displays to City to publish online • September 14 – PIC material uploaded to City project website • September 15 – Ad published in local papers 	
5.4	<p>H. Templeton noted that the currently scheduled Project Team PT#5 Meeting on September 8 may not be required, as PIC materials will be finalized by this stage, but may hold a teleconference if needed to finalize any PIC logistics.</p>	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
5.5	WSP MMM to send Outlook invitation for PIC #1 to the Project Team.	
6.0	Existing Conditions Update	
6.1	H. Templeton noted that R. Unterman is still in the process of requesting information from Toronto Archives through the City. WSP MMM to send follow up email to M. MacDonald for a status update.	WSP MMM
6.2	See Item 3.3 for a review of the Active Transportation Counts Results.	
6.3	H. Templeton noted that a draft Structural Memo has been completed reviewing the existing conditions and providing a recommendation for replacing the bridge structure. The Memo is currently being finalized and will be provided to the City for review.	WSP MMM
7.0	Assessment and Evaluation of Alternative Solutions	
7.1	<p>WSP MMM provided a draft PIC outline for discussion. Below is a list of the key items noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Planning and Policy Context boards will provide brief descriptions of the documents' relevance to this project, and hard copies of the documents may be provided at a reference table. • E. Lam suggested including relevant area projects on a plan to illustrate locations of ongoing and completed projects. • J. Diceman noted that the Summary of Feedback Received to Date should also include information from the survey results. • H. Templeton noted that the Design Concept board may be 1 or 2 with sample images of types of bridges that may be considered. • J. Diceman suggested that there could also be a panel discussing awareness of the tunnel's need for improvements but that it is outside the scope of this study. To be discussed further. 	City WSP MMM
7.2	<p>WSP MMM provided draft tables of the Alternative Solutions, Alternative Solution Evaluation Criteria, and Assessment of Alternative Solutions as they may be presented at the PIC. H. Templeton noted that these tables are still being drafted, and will be provided for review as part of the draft PIC Displays in August.</p> <p>L. Zappone requested that the evaluation address each of the specific evaluation criteria.</p> <p>J. Diceman noted that there could be two versions of the assessment table, one with detailed text, and one with a visual depiction and summary bullets. He also noted that there could be a separate board focussing on each alternative, if that would be more legible.</p> <p>L. Zappone noted that overall, this is the general direction that should be followed, as all of the information in the tables will be used as part of the Environmental Study Report.</p>	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
8.0	Other Business	
8.1	L. Zappone noted that the Corporate Security Unit will be attending TAC #2, and may provide some design input which could help to reduce illegal activities on the bridge and tunnel.	
9.0	Next Meeting (TAC #2 August 11, 2016)	
9.1	Next meeting, TAC #2, is scheduled for August 11, 2016 9:30 a.m. The agenda will be finalized and circulated a week in advance.	WSP MMM & City/LZ
Meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.		

Goldberg, Jay

From: Goldberg, Jay
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2016 10:00 AM
To: lzappon@toronto.ca; Jason Diceman (jdiceman@toronto.ca) (jdiceman@toronto.ca)
Cc: Roberts, Scott; Jim, Katherine
Subject: Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class EA - PT Meeting Teleconference Notes - September 6

Categories: 3216026 - Glen Road Ped. Bridge

Subject	Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class EA - PT Meeting Teleconference
Date and Location	Tuesday, September 06, 2016 2:00 PM - 3:00 PM, Teleconference
Attendees	Jim, Katherine; lzappon@toronto.ca; jdiceman@toronto.ca; Roberts, Scott; Goldberg, Jay
Message	This teleconference is to be taken in place of the Sept 8, 2016 Project Team Meeting. Toll Free: 1-877-385-4099 User ID: 5244890

Notes

PIC Preparation:

- MMM waiting for some comments from City Staff on the PIC displays from Mary, Tabassum, Saikat and Lara.
- MMM to send final displays on Monday.
- Jason advised: Ad will be in the paper Sept 15, therefore need PDF by Sept 14. Flyer to Canada post by this Friday Sept 9. Sept 12 is the absolutely latest for the final displays.
- Three main avenues of notification: email to those on public list (Tues Sept 13), Canada Post flyers notification area, ad in newspaper.
- Notification of agencies will be done by City – City will confirm internally regarding logistics and will be following the new practice (Lorna and Jason). Jason will forward package to the Project Team for the consultation summary.
- Jason noted there is no concern with PIC space – 200 person capacity, there will be sufficient room for panels 27 panels only.
- MMM to bring roll plans of the displays on 2x3 foot and the City will bring easels, sign in sheets, comment sheets, etc. for the setup.
- MMM to print Natural Env panel and Alt. Solution assessment on bigger panel.
- Jason will send a logistics package to all attendees. Staff responsible for the displays will be there by 4pm. Core team by 5pm for briefing.
- City Reference material – City will bring, MMM to bring technical references. South Rosedale study, heritage study: Richard won't be at the PIC but Mary will be there and Mary will be able to explain heritage as it applies to city policies.
- Comment form questions to be finalized by Jason in consultation with Lorna (by Wed, Sept 7)
- Webpage content Jason will review with Lorna.

Site Visit Sept 7:

- Will look at how the contractor may access the valley and site for construction.
- Potential impact will be known when the structure type has been determined. The general footprint will be determined. E.g. Segmental and concrete Steel Truss would have more impact.

Others:

- Jason removed the sign for the survey – survey is offline now.
- MMM provided the updated Slide 13 on Friday, Sept 2

Date:	October 13, 2016	Project:	Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class EA Study
Location:	22 nd Floor, East Tower City Hall	Toronto PO #:	6043136
Time:	9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.	MMM Project #:	3216026-000
		Author:	Jay Goldberg, WSP MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone	City Project Manager, Transportation Services
Jason Diceman	Public Consultation
Lara Tarlo	City Planning - Urban Design
Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning
Jennifer Renaud	City Planning - Community Planning
Tabassum Rafique	Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt
Scott Roberts	WSP MMM
Katherine Jim	WSP MMM
Jay Goldberg	WSP MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Jeffrey Dea	Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning
Saikat Basak	Transportation Services - Cycling
Sun Wai Lee	Eng. & Const. Services - Transportation Infra/Bridges & Structures
Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Fiona Chapman	Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects
Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning
Ann Khan	Transportation Services - Traffic Operations
Lukasz Pawlowski	Transportation Services
Alex Shevchuk	Parks, Forestry & Recreation

Purpose: To recap PIC #1 (September 28, 2016), provide an update on the online survey and comments received to date, review the scope to be considered with the addition of the pedestrian tunnel, and the next steps in the assessment of alternatives (pedestrian bridge and tunnel).

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting PT4/TAC (August 11, 2016) and PT5 (September 6, 2016)	
The outstanding action items from PT4 and PT5 are noted as follows. PT5 was a small teleconference with the core Project Team to review final comments of the PIC Displays, and was held on September 6, 2016. Formal Minutes were not produced for PT5.		
All actions items from PT4 and PT5 related to PIC 1 were completed.		
1.1	Item 1.2 – City provided collision data to WSP on October 13, 2016. WSP will review as part of the traffic assessment.	
1.2	Item 1.5– The Project Team conducted a site walk with representatives of the	City/LZ

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	Toronto Police Services, and City Corporate Security Staff on September 6, 2016. City to provide WSP with the Risk Security Assessment when available.	
1.3	Item 2.1 – The Project Team to discuss sending an early letter to MTCS to introduce the study, rather than waiting for the Notice of Study Commencement in September. The City requested MMM draft a letter for review. MMM provided an updated draft MTCS letter to the City on September 19, 2016 for review.	City/LZ WSP MMM
1.4	Item 3.2 – The addition of the pedestrian tunnel is discussed in Item 4.0 below.	
1.5	Item 3.6 - WSP MMM sent the Pedestrian and Cyclist Count Results and Analysis Draft Memo to the Project Team on July 15, 2016.	
1.6	Item 5.1 – City to confirm dates for the Design Review Board and Heritage Preservation Board presentations.	City/LZ
1.7	Item 6.1 – Additional information from City Archives was not considered pertinent to the cultural heritage assessment, and further investigation is not required.	
1.8	Item 6.3 – WSP MMM to provide the Structural Memo to the City for review.	WSP MMM
2.0	Recap of PIC #1 (September 28, 2016)	
2.1	<p>The City noted that they were very pleased with the PIC, including the displays, last minute changes, public turn-out, and public feedback.</p> <p>J. Diceman noted that, in general, the project was well received and appreciated by the public. 73 participants signed in at the PIC, 12 hard copy comment forms submitted at the PIC, and 42 online responses. Councillor Tam-Wong attended the PIC as well.</p>	
3.0	PIC #1 Comments Received to Date (mail-in and online)	
3.1	<p>Based on the online comment sheet, 90% of the responses were in favour of the Project Team’s recommendation to replace the bridge in the same location. Many comments suggested to keep the design of the new pedestrian bridge as “simple” as it is now.</p> <p>There seems to be less focus on the actual structure type, and more on the design.</p> <p>One area where public opinion diverges is the accommodation of cyclists on the pedestrian bridge; to provide separate or mixed facilities with pedestrians.</p> <p>The public liked that the tunnel and approaches are now included in the study, and the main improvement should be lighting in and surrounding the tunnel.</p> <p>L. Tarlo added that there were some comments regarding the accessibility of the bridge and tunnel from Bloor Street (i.e. steep and shallow stairs).</p> <p>J. Diceman to provide a summary report by October 31, 2016.</p>	City/JD

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
4.0	Update on Project Scope and Studies	
4.1	K. Jim noted that the Project Scope has been updated to include the pedestrian tunnel. The Project Team will assess alternative solutions and designs for the tunnel and approaches. This is discussed further in Item 5.0.	
4.2	WSP MMM to provide the draft Archaeological Report to the City for Review.	WSP MMM
5.0	Next Steps	
5.1	<p>WSP MMM discussed the potential bridge design concepts moving forward. S. Roberts noted that, based on high level screening, the Arched bridge type will not be carried forward due to the cost and that it is an imposing design, where the public prefers a simple unimposing design. The Box Truss will also not be carried forward because of the public's preference (and comments received to date) for a simple, undisturbed view from the bridge.</p> <p>The three bridge types to be carried forward are Inclined Leg, Concrete Steel Truss, and Segmental.</p> <p>The Project Team will look at the cross-section alternatives for the bridge and tunnel, including separating cyclists and pedestrians, or a mixed use (multi-use path). WSP MMM will review whether provision for cyclists on the bridge and in the tunnel is recommended.</p>	
5.2	<p>The assessment of tunnel planning solutions will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Do Nothing ii. Aesthetic Modifications of Existing Tunnel iii. Structural and Aesthetic Modifications of Existing Tunnel (including modifying existing entrances, flaring, possible heightening) iv. Remove and Rebuild Tunnel <p>The City noted that the assessment will need to look at the potential gains (i.e. benefits to the community) in rebuilding the tunnel compared to the costs.</p>	
5.3	WSP MMM to provide a summary of the methodology for the Bridge and Tunnel components of the assessment up to PIC 2.	WSP MMM
6.0	Other Business	
6.1	The Project Team discussed opportunities for scheduling another consultation event with a smaller working group (e.g. those who participated in the walkshop in June 2016), to review potential design details for the bridge and tunnel. Project Team to further review ultimate detail of design options, or noting design limitations for detail design.	City/ WSP MMM
6.2	City inquired to the status of the Arborist Report. WSP MMM to review.	WSP MMM
6.3	City noted that the Project Schedule is set for having PIC 2 in February 2017. The City also inquired if there were any efficiency that could potentially wrap up	WSP MMM

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	the project about a month early. WSP MMM to review.	
7.0	Next Meeting (PT7 November 10, 2016)	
7.1	Next meeting, PT#7, is scheduled for November 10, 2016 9:30 a.m. The agenda will be finalized and circulated a week in advance.	WSP MMM & City/LZ
Meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.		

Date: November 10, 2016
Location: 22nd Floor, East Tower
 City Hall
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Project: Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge
 Class EA Study
Toronto PO #: 6043136
MMM Project #: 3216026-000
Author: Jay Goldberg,
 WSP|MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone	City Project Manager, Transportation Services
Jason Diceman	Public Consultation
Saikat Basak (part-time)	Transportation Services - Cycling
Jennifer Renaud (part-time)	City Planning - Community Planning
Scott Roberts	WSP MMM
Katherine Jim	WSP MMM
Max Nie	WSP MMM
Kyle Yusek	WSP MMM
Jason Neudorf	WSP MMM
Jay Goldberg	WSP MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Jeffrey Dea	Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning
Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning
Tabassum Rafique	Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt
Lara Tarlo	City Planning - Urban Design
Sun Wai Lee	Eng. & Const. Services - Transportation Infra/Bridges & Structures
Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Fiona Chapman	Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects
Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning
Ann Khan	Transportation Services - Traffic Operations
Lukasz Pawlowski	Transportation Services
Alex Shevchuk	Parks, Forestry & Recreation

Purpose: To recap PIC #1 (September 28, 2016), provide an update on the online survey and comments received to date, review the scope to be considered with the addition of the pedestrian tunnel, proposed cross-section and bridge types for the pedestrian bridge, and the next steps in the assessment of alternatives (pedestrian bridge and tunnel).

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting PT#6	
The outstanding action items from PT6 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT6 which were discussed at PT7 are noting in the relevant sections below		
1.1	Item 1.2– The Project Team conducted a site walk with representatives of the Toronto Police Services, and City Corporate Security Staff on September 6, 2016. City to provide WSP MMM with the Risk Security Assessment when available.	City/LZ

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
1.2	Item 1.3 – The Project Team discussed sending an early letter to MTCS to introduce the study, rather than waiting for the Notice of Study Commencement in September. The City requested MMM draft a letter for review. MMM provided an updated draft MTCS letter to the City on September 19, 2016 for review. Comments from the City are pending.	City/LZ WSP MMM
1.3	Item 1.6 – City to confirm dates for the Design Review Board and Heritage Preservation Board presentations.	City/LZ
1.4	Item 1.8 – WSP MMM provided the Structural Memo to the City for review on November 1, 2016.	
1.5	Item 3.1 – City provided a consultation summary highlighting the comments received from PIC #1 on October 12, 2016.	
1.6	Item 4.2 – WSP MMM provided the draft Archaeological Assessment Report to the City for review on October 19, 2016.	City/LZ
1.7	Item 5.3 – WSP MMM provided a summary of the methodology for the Bridge and Tunnel components of the assessment up to PIC 2 on October 28, 2016.	
1.8	Item 6.1 – The Project Team discussed opportunities for scheduling another consultation event with a smaller working group (e.g. those who participated in the walk-shop in June 2016), to review potential design details for the bridge and tunnel. Project Team to further review ultimate detail of design options, or noting design limitations for detail design.	City/ WSP MMM
1.9	Item 6.2 – City inquired to the status of the Arborist Report. WSP MMM to review.	WSP MMM
1.10	Item 6.3 – City noted that the Project Schedule is set for having PIC 2 in February 2017. The City also inquired if there were any efficiencies that could potentially wrap up the project about a month early. WSP MMM to review.	WSP MMM
2.0	Recap of PIC #1 (September 28, 2016) and Comments Received to Date	
2.1	All comments received have been documented in the Consultation summary provided to the Project Team. The Consultation summary will be included as an appendix to the ESR. There were no new significant comments to discuss since the last Project Team Meeting on October 13.	
3.0	Study Schedule and Design Alternatives Assessment Methodology	
3.1	WSP MMM provided a methodology and schedule for the assessment of bridge and tunnel alternatives leading to PIC 2. Both the bridge and tunnel design concepts are planned to be displayed at PIC 2. The Tunnel will be evaluated, in terms of the alternative solutions and alternative design concepts, under criteria similar to the bridge assessment, including Technical, Cultural, Transportation Planning, Socio-Economic,	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	Design, and Cost.	
4.0	Bridge Design Concepts, including Typical Cross-Section for Active Transportation	
4.1	<p>WSP MMM reviewed four bridge types with two different cross-sections. The Project Team discussed the four bridge options and cross-sections and the following is a summary of the key items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The four bridge options included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steel girder with two inclined steel legs - Similar to the existing structure, but has increased access costs and complexity ○ Steel girder with two vertical concrete piers – low access costs for the pier foundations and opportunity to incorporate finishes to the concrete piers, but steel has long term maintenance needs ○ Post tensioned concrete box girder with two vertical concrete piers – low access costs for the pier foundations and opportunity to incorporate finishes to the concrete piers, and low long-term maintenance needs, but may require significant formwork or on-site precast equipment ○ Steel prefabricated truss with two vertical concrete piers – low access costs for the pier foundations and opportunity to incorporate finishes to the concrete piers, but wider section would require deeper trusses which would block pedestrian views, steel would require long term maintenance and would likely be a custom design. • WSP MMM outlined the pros and cons for each alternative, and will follow-up with a revised Memo to outline the issues discussed. • The two cross-section options reviewed for each bridge type included a 4.5 m and 7.5 m wide deck. The former includes a 3.5 m multi-use path and 0.5 m clearance from the hand-rail on each side; the latter includes a 3.5 m multi-use path with 2 m pedestrian zones on each side (also account for viewing opportunities / stopping areas on the bridge). • The City inquired what the typical recommended bridge width is for this type of facility. City asked WSP MMM to review the cross-section recommendations with respect to the City’s Multi-Use Path Design Guide; a pedestrian bridge similar in nature generally range between 4.5 m to 5.0 m in width. WSP MMM to review design guide and provide a recommended cross-section, and will forward the updated bridge cross-sections to the City. 	<p>WSP MMM</p> <p>WSP MMM</p>

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
5.0	Tunnel Scope Update	
5.1	<p>WSP MMM noted that a preliminary site investigation was carried out. The tunnel it is currently 3m x 3m which is the minimum width and height for a bidirectional multi-use pathway for pedestrian/cyclist tunnel (i.e. not substandard). Although a slightly wider passage would increase the clear-zone and improve pedestrian comfort, the current space is considered to be sufficient to allow a cyclist to pass a pedestrian or oncoming cyclist at a slow speed. Signage requiring cyclists to yield the right-of-way to pedestrians is recommended.</p> <p>The City noted that as cyclists are entering zones where there is a lot of crossing pedestrian traffic (at the TTC entrance and the north-side staircase), the Project Team should consider whether cyclists should be discouraged from riding through the tunnel.</p>	
5.2	<p>WSP MMM noted that the existing conditions information is currently being compiled for the tunnel assessment, including obtaining as-built drawings from TTC. Once the information has been received, the team will move forward with the planning solutions assessment, to be provided at the next Project Team meeting.</p>	
6.0	Other Business	
6.1	<p>WSP MMM provided the Addendum/Project Scope Change Letter and Fee Estimate to the City. City discussed options to reduce the overall fees of the additional scope. WSP MMM to provide revised Letter and Fees.</p>	WSP MMM
7.0	Next Meeting (PT8 December 8, 2016)	
7.1	<p>Next meeting, PT#8, is scheduled for December 8, 2016 9:30 a.m. The agenda will be finalized and circulated a week in advance.</p>	WSP MMM & City/LZ
Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.		

Date: December 8, 2016
Location: 22nd Floor, East Tower
City Hall
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Project: Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge
Class EA Study
Toronto PO #: 6043136
MMM Project #: 3216026-000
Author: Jay Goldberg,
WSP|MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone	City Project Manager, Transportation Services
Jeffrey Dea	Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning
Tabassum Rafique	Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt
Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning
Lara Tarlo	City Planning - Urban Design
Jennifer Renaud	City Planning - Community Planning
Raj Mohabeer	WSP MMM
Katherine Jim	WSP MMM
Max Nie (Teleconference)	WSP MMM
Kyle Yusek (Teleconference)	WSP MMM
Jay Goldberg	WSP MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Jason Diceman	Public Consultation
Saikat Basak	Transportation Services - Cycling
Sun Wai Lee	Eng. & Const. Services - Transportation Infra/Bridges & Structures
Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Fiona Chapman	Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects
Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning
Ann Khan	Transportation Services - Traffic Operations
Lukasz Pawlowski	Transportation Services
Alex Shevchuk	Parks, Forestry & Recreation

Purpose: To review progress of the bridges assessment of alternatives, and update on the tunnel scope

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting PT#7 (November 10, 2016)	
The outstanding action items from PT7 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT7 which were discussed at PT6 are noting in the relevant sections below		
1.1	Item 1.1– The Project Team conducted a site walk with representatives of the Toronto Police Services, and City Corporate Security Staff on September 6, 2016. City to provide the Risk Security Assessment when available.	City/LZ
1.2	Item 1.2 – The Project Team discussed sending an early letter to MTCS to introduce the study, rather than waiting for the Notice of Study Commencement in September. The City requested MMM draft a letter for review. MMM	City/LZ WSP MMM

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	provided an updated draft MTCS letter to the City on September 19, 2016 for review. Comments from the City are pending.	
1.3	Item 1.3 – City to confirm dates for the Design Review Board and Heritage Preservation Board presentations.	City/LZ
1.4	Item 1.6 – WSP MMM provided the draft Archaeological Assessment Report to the City for review on October 19, 2016.	City/LZ
1.5	Item 1.8 – The Project Team discussed opportunities for scheduling another consultation event with a smaller working group (e.g. those who participated in the walk-shop in June 2016), to review potential design details for the bridge and tunnel. Project Team to further review ultimate detail of design options, or noting design limitations for detail design.	City/ WSP MMM
1.6	Item 1.9 – City inquired to the status of the Arborist Report. WSP MMM noted that they had received it from their specialist and will review the report before sending it to the City.	WSP MMM
1.7	Item 1.10 – City noted that the Project Schedule is set for having PIC 2 in February 2017. The City also inquired if there were any efficiencies that could potentially wrap up the project about a month early. Study schedule is discussed in Item 4.1 below.	
1.8	Item 4.1 – MMM provided a revised memo outlining the structure types and cross-sections on November 16, 2016. The revised memo's cross-sections were based on the City's Multi-Use Path Design Guide.	
1.9	Item 6.1 – WSP MMM provided a revised draft Addendum Letter to the City on November 15, 2016.	
2.0	Bridge Design Alternatives	
2.1	WSP MMM noted that the revised bridge cross-sections were based on the City's Multi-Use Path Design Guide. The cross-section includes a 3.6 m multi-use trail, and a 0.6 m buffer on each side (4.8 m clear width). The buffer provides clearance for cyclists from the railing, as well as a space for pedestrians to stop along the bridge, without impeding the traffic.	
2.2	<p>WSP MMM outlined the advantages and disadvantages of the structure types. A draft assessment and evaluation of the bridge types was also provided and discussed with the Project Team. The assessment evaluation criteria included bridge engineering, cultural environment, transportation planning, urban design, socio-economic environment, and natural environment.</p> <p>Based on the bridge engineering criteria, including cost, Alternative 2: steel girder with two vertical concrete piers, provides a good balance in terms of cost and constructability. This alternative also has relatively less impacts to the natural environment since the construction can be accommodated by conventional methods, limiting impacts to the surrounding area during</p>	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<p>construction.</p> <p>The City inquired if there could be additional detail on the operation and maintenance costs for each of the bridge types. WSP MMM will follow up.</p>	WSP MMM
2.3	<p>The evaluation of the cultural environment was similar for all alternatives, in that the bridge is recommended to be replaced; however, the cultural significance of the crossing will be maintained.</p> <p>This City noted that there could be some cultural significance in maintaining the existing structure type, material, etc. when considering the view from Rosedale Valley Road. WSP MMM to expand this item for the evaluation.</p>	WSP MMM
2.4	<p>City noted that the evaluation should include a statement that the alternatives do not preclude a future connection to Rosedale Valley Road.</p>	WSP MMM
2.5	<p>WSP MMM noted that the Urban Design criteria will be completed by identifying the opportunity for rail treatments, visual impact on and below the structure, that it has a 'simple, clean, light' design, etc.</p>	WSP MMM
3.0	Tunnel Scope Update	
3.1	<p>WSP MMM to update and provide the Addendum Letter to the City.</p>	WSP MMM
4.0	Other Business	
4.1	<p>WSP MMM provided a revised calendar leading to PIC 2 for discussion. The following summarizes the key dates in 2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January 26 - PT#9 – review bridge and tunnel assessments and draft outline for PIC #2 • February 16 – PT #10/TAC #3 • End of February – City to review PIC #2 material with City Councillor • March 10 - Final PIC displays to City • March 29 (tentative) – PIC #2 <p>A meeting with local Stakeholders may be scheduled prior to PIC #2. This will be confirmed.</p> <p>The overall schedule will be dependent on the advancement of the tunnel assessment.</p> <p>City requested an updated project schedule (Gantt Chart) including the additional tunnel scope of work.</p>	WSP MMM
5.0	Next Meeting (PT9 January 26, 2017)	
5.1	<p>Next meeting, PT#9, is scheduled for January 26, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. The agenda will be finalized and circulated a week in advance.</p>	WSP MMM & City/LZ
Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.		

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Date:	January 31, 2017	Project:	Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class EA Study
Location:	22 nd Floor, East Tower City Hall	Toronto PO #:	6043136
Time:	2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.	MMM Project #:	3216026-000
		Author:	Jay Goldberg, WSP MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone	City Transportation Services - Project Manager
Jason Diceman	City Public Consultation
Jeffrey Dea	City Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning
Tabassum Rafique	City Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt
Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning
Lara Tarlo	City Planning - Urban Design
Sun Wai Lee	City Transportation Bridges & Structures
Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Raj Mohabeer	WSP MMM
Katherine Jim	WSP MMM
Max Nie	WSP MMM
Kyle Yusek	WSP MMM
Jay Goldberg	WSP MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Saikat Basak	City Transportation Services - Cycling
Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Fiona Chapman	City Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects
Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning
Ann Khan	City Transportation Services - Traffic Operations
Lukasz Pawlowski	City Transportation Services
Alex Shevchuk	City Parks, Forestry & Recreation

Purpose: To review progress of the bridges and tunnel assessment of alternatives

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting PT#8 (December 8, 2016)	
The outstanding action items from PT8 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT8 which were discussed at PT9 are noted in the relevant sections below. The PT#8 Minutes were not reviewed at PT#9 due to time constraints.		
1.1	Item 1.1– The Project Team conducted a site walk with representatives of the Toronto Police Services, and City Corporate Security Staff on September 6, 2016. City to provide the Risk Security Assessment when available.	City/LZ
1.2	Item 1.2 – The Project Team discussed sending an early letter to MTCS to introduce the study, rather than waiting for the Notice of Study Commencement in September. The City requested MMM draft a letter for review. MMM provided an updated draft MTCS letter to the City on September 19, 2016 for	City/LZ WSP MMM

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	review. Comments from the City are pending. City agreed to hold sending letter until Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Reports can also be provided.	
1.3	Item 1.3 – City to confirm dates for the Design Review Board and Heritage Preservation Board presentations.	City/LZ
1.4	Item 1.4 – WSP MMM provided the draft Archaeological Assessment Report to the City for review on October 19, 2016.	City/LZ
1.5	Item 1.6 – City inquired to the status of the Arborist Report. WSP MMM noted that they had received it from their specialist and will review the report before sending it to the City.	WSP MMM
1.6	Item 3.1 – WSP MMM provided a signed copy of the Addendum Letter to the City on January 30, 2017.	
1.7	Item 4.1 - City requested an updated project schedule (Gantt Chart) including the additional tunnel scope of work.	WSP MMM
2.0	Tunnel Solutions Assessment and Update	
2.1	<p>WSP MMM provided a draft Tunnel Solutions Assessment Table for four alternative solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do Nothing • Rehabilitation and Aesthetic Modifications • Rehabilitation and Minor Structural Modifications (flaring south and possibly north access to tunnel) • Rehabilitation and Major Structural Modifications (remove and rebuild) <p>The Project Team reviewed the assessment table and key issues for each alternative solution. WSP MMM also provided draft concept designs for each of the alternatives.</p> <p>The following is a summary of the key discussion points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing tunnel is about 55 years old and will likely require rehabilitation in the upcoming years. • A box concrete structure is generally designed to have a 75 year life span, which could be extended to 100 years with regular rehabilitation and maintenance. • Structural modifications will include staging requirements along Bloor Street, increasing the duration and costs. • The Major Structural Modifications include removing and rebuilding the tunnel, which could be in the same location as the existing tunnel, or shifted to align with the bridge structure. The latter option would provide good sightlines between the tunnel and the bridge, but would impact both staircases up to Bloor Street. • The Project Team discussed the issues with impacting the staircases 	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<p>including the need to replace them with AODA compliant accesses, including new staircases and ramps. WSP MMM reviewed conceptual ramp configurations at the north and south accesses, noting the large areas required and potential impacts to the natural environment (i.e. tree removal).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSP MMM noted that there are alternate accessible routes via Howard Street and Sherbourne Street. Modifications to the stairs and construction of ramps were not included in the overall cost estimates provided in the table. WSP MMM noted that the existing tunnel meets minimum height and width standards for multi-use trails. 	
2.2	City requested the bridge and tunnel design should be considered as “one piece” and superimposing the concept on an aerial image would help to better understand the potential impacts.	WSP MMM
2.3	City to review issues regarding the AODA accessibility and impacting the staircases.	City
2.4	In general, a major realignment of the tunnel would not be preferred. However, a slight shift in the alignment as part of the tunnel should be considered. The City will have to understand all the trade-offs in order to identify a preference for the tunnel solution.	
3.0	Bridge Design Alternatives Assessment	
3.1	<p>WSP MMM provided an updated version of the Bridge Type Design Alternatives Assessment Table, based on comments received at PT8, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing additional details on the maintenance costs for the bridge structures Providing additional assessment on maintaining the heritage value of the structure 	
3.2	<p>The Project Team discussed the assessment of the bridge type alternatives. The following is a summary of the key discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City inquired if there was an option to realign the bridge with the tunnel, or flaring or providing a joint in the bridge to create some sightline from the bridge to the tunnel. WSP MMM noted that the Alternative 1: Steel Inclined Legs, which is the same structure type as the existing bridge, may require a larger girder cross-section, to be in accordance with current bridge design standards. WSP MMM re-iterated that all bridge types provide the same cross- 	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<p>section, with a 3.6m multi-use pathway and 0.6m buffers on each side. Total width between railings would be 4.8m, which is wider than the existing bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSP MMM raised three concerns with Alternative 4: a 75-year design life is not anticipated; there are some technical issues with joints in a multi-span structure with a concrete deck; and difficulty contacting fabricators to confirm costs. MMM WSP is continuing to look into this Alternative. City noted that if maintenance vehicles will be maintaining the bridge, the bridge width and structural capacities will need to accommodate those vehicles. City noted that the replacement bridge should not be designed as a single load path structure, and should be designed with some redundancy. City requested bridge drawings which identify the differences between the existing and proposed bridge types. WSP MMM noted that based on the current assessment, Alternative 2: Steel girder with two vertical concrete piers is preferred. <p>City to review and provide comments on the preferred option.</p>	<p>WSP MMM</p> <p>City</p>
4.0	Project Schedule and Calendar	
4.1	<p>WSP MMM reviewed potential timelines to PIC 2 which depend on the preferred tunnel solution. If the tunnel solution does not include removal/replacement of the tunnel, PIC 2 could be scheduled for April 2017; if the tunnel solution does include removal/replacement of the tunnel, additional analysis, and designs work associated with the tunnel would be required, which could add 1-2 months to the project schedule.</p>	
5.0	Other Business	
5.1	No other business was discussed.	
6.0	Next Meeting (PT10 February 16, 2017)	
6.1	<p>Next meeting, PT#10, is scheduled for February 16, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. The agenda will be finalized and circulated a week in advance.</p>	<p>WSP MMM & City/LZ</p>
Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.		

Date: February 16, 2017
Location: 24th Floor, East Tower
 City Hall
Time: 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Project: Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge
 Class EA Study
Toronto PO #: 6043136
MMM Project #: 3216026-000
Author: Jay Goldberg,
 WSP|MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone	City Transportation Services - Project Manager
Jason Diceman	City Public Consultation
Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning
Lara Tarlo	City Planning - Urban Design
Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Mary MacDonald (part-time)	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Raj Mohabeer	WSP MMM
Katherine Jim	WSP MMM
Kyle Yusek	WSP MMM
Jay Goldberg	WSP MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Jeffrey Dea	City Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning
Sun Wai Lee	City Transportation Bridges & Structures
Tabassum Rafique	City Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt
Saikat Basak	City Transportation Services - Cycling
Fiona Chapman	City Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects
Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning
Ann Khan	City Transportation Services - Traffic Operations
Lukasz Pawlowski	City Transportation Services
Alex Shevchuk	City Parks, Forestry & Recreation
Max Nie	WSP MMM

Purpose: To review progress of the bridges and tunnel assessment of alternatives

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting PT#9 (January 31, 2017)	
The outstanding action items from PT9 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT9 which were discussed at PT10 are noted in the relevant sections below.		
1.1	Item 1.1– The Project Team conducted a site walk with representatives of the Toronto Police Services, and City Corporate Security Staff on September 6, 2016. City to provide the Risk Security Assessment when available.	City/LZ
1.2	Item 1.2 – The Project Team discussed sending an early letter to MTCS to introduce the study, rather than waiting for the Notice of Study Commencement in September. The City requested MMM draft a letter for review. MMM provided an updated draft MTCS letter to the City on September 19, 2016 for review. Comments from the City are pending. City agreed to hold sending letter until Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Reports can also be provided.	City/LZ WSP MMM

Item	Details	Action By
1.3	Item 1.3 – City to confirm dates for the Design Review Board and Heritage Preservation Board presentations.	City/LZ
1.4	Item 1.4 – WSP MMM provided the draft Archaeological Assessment Report to the City for review on October 19, 2016.	City/LZ
1.5	Item 1.6 – City inquired to the status of the Arborist Report. WSP MMM noted that they had received it from their specialist and will review the report before sending it to the City.	WSP MMM
1.6	Item 1.7 - City requested an updated project schedule (Gantt Chart) including the additional tunnel scope of work.	WSP MMM
2.0	Develop Bridge and Tunnel Alternative Solutions	
2.1	<p>R. Mohabeer discussed the progression of the EA Study in terms of the recent addition of the tunnel scope, and that the bridge and tunnel alternatives need to be reviewed together, as a unit, in order to achieve a unified design for the study.</p> <p>K. Jim reviewed how the bridge and tunnel solutions evaluation fit into the overall EA Process. At PIC 1, the Project Team assessed the alternative solutions for the bridge and identified the preferred solution was to remove and replace the bridge in the same location.</p> <p>Now that the tunnel is included in the scope, we are still in Phase 2 of the EA Study where the alternative solution for the tunnel will have to be evaluated (whereas the bridge replacement is being carried forward in all the tunnel alternative solutions). In order for the City to make an informed decision on the preferred tunnel solution, some of the design work is being carried forward to fully understand the implications and potential impacts associated with the tunnel replacement options.</p> <p>The Alternative Solutions for the bridge and tunnel include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative 1 – Do Nothing (replace bridge in same location; no tunnel improvements) • Alternative 2 – Aesthetic Modifications (replace bridge in same location, with aesthetic improvements to the tunnel) • Alternative 3 – Structural Improvements on Existing Alignments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alternative 3a – Replace Bridge on Existing Alignment with Flaring Tunnel on One or Both Sides ○ Alternative 3b – Replace Bridge in Same Location and Reconstruct Wider Tunnel • Alternative 4 – Structural Improvements on New Alignments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alternative 4a – Replace Bridge on Existing Alignment; Replace Tunnel to Match Bridge Alignment ○ Alternative 4b – Replace Tunnel on Existing Alignment; Replace Bridge on New Alignment 	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alternative 4c – Replace Bridge and Tunnel on New Alignments (match north end of bridge to south end of tunnel) ○ Alternative 4d – Replace Bridge and Tunnel on New Alignments (pivot alignment around connection on north side of Bloor St.) 	
2.2	<p>Lorna advised that through discussion with Public Realm, AODA must be considered should the existing stairs be impacted. In general, the only conditions when AODA may be exempt are when a project is: 1) technically impossible or 2) undue hardship to the City.</p>	
2.3	<p>WSP MMM prepared high level drawings for some of the above noted alternatives for discussion with the City. The following is a summary of the key discussion points. It should be noted that the labelling on the drawing will have to be updated to match the numbering of the alternative solutions noted above.</p>	
2.4	<p><i>3a) Replace Bridge on Existing Alignment with Flaring Tunnel on One or Both Sides (labelled as Alt. 3-B on drawing)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flare on south side of tunnel increases sightlines to/from tunnel and TTC entrance • Flare on north side could provide for additional landing area and opportunity for public art and potential benefit to the sightlines • Maintains sightline from Glen Road south of Bloor Street, through tunnel • Does not improve sightlines between tunnel and bridge • Existing stairs will not be impacted • Minimal utility impacts • Replacement of tunnel will be at a later date (i.e. at the end of the service life of the tunnel) • Minimal capital costs 	
2.5	<p><i>3b) Replace Bridge on Existing Alignment and Reconstruct Wider Tunnel (labelled as Alt. 3-C on drawing)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tunnel would be replaced with a wider concrete structure, and would align with the east wall of the existing tunnel, and ‘widened’ to the west. • Provides more comfortable experience for tunnel users, with added capacity • Bridge could be flared at south end to match width of widened tunnel; this would increase sightline distance between the bridge and the tunnel. Flaring the bridge may reduce the associated heritage value of the new bridge. • Improves sightline from Glen Road south of Bloor Street, through tunnel • Existing stairs will not be impacted; • Moderate impacts to utilities on west side of tunnel 	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
2.6	<p><i>4a) Replace Bridge on Existing Alignment; Replace Tunnel to Match Bridge Alignment (labelled as Alt. 3-D on drawing)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tunnel would be shifted slightly to the east • Provides an unobstructed sightline between the bridge and tunnel • Sightline from Glen Road south of Bloor Street, to tunnel is reduced • Results in need to replace staircases on both sides of Bloor St; requires the addition of a ramp or elevator on at least one side of the tunnel to satisfy AODA requirement. • Would require redesign of landing areas at each end of tunnel • Increases distance between TTC entrance and tunnel entrance • Would impact the most utilities on both sides of tunnel • Property impacts to area immediately adjacent to the new tunnel location 	
2.7	<p><i>4b) Replace Bridge on New Alignment; Replace Tunnel on Existing Alignment;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A drawing of this alternative was not provided at the meeting • This alternative would align the new bridge alignment with the existing tunnel alignment. • It would shift the north end of bridge to the east and would require additional property. The existing landing area (north end) would be shifted, and located closer to the entrance to the driveway for 1A Dale Drive. That is also an area where the valley slope is quite steep. During a previous site visit, WSP MMM structure staff noted that there is limited ability to shift the north end of the structure due to constraints in the valley. • This alternative will not be carried forward. 	
2.8	<p><i>4c) Replace Bridge and Tunnel on New Alignments (match north end of bridge to south end of tunnel) (labelled as Alt. 4 on drawing)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides an unobstructed sightline between the bridge and tunnel; may limit sightline from Glen Road south. • Does not require replacement of staircases; accessible access provided via Glen Road/Howard Street • WSP MMM to revise the landing area north of the tunnel to provide better connection from stairs to bridge and tunnel. 	WSP MMM
2.9	WSP MMM to update the bridge/tunnel alternatives based on discussions at the meeting.	WSP MMM
2.10	<p>The following is a summary of the City and WSP MMM additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sightlines should be reviewed at three key locations: on the bridge looking south, at the south end of the tunnel, on Glen Road looking 	WSP MMM & City

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<p>north, and coming out of the TTC Station. These may be shown in the revised drawings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The criteria by which the alternatives will be evaluated to be further refined as part of the assessment. • Bridge design alternative were presented at the last Project Team Meeting (Jan 31, 2017). It was noted that the inclined legs steel bridge would best match the existing structure. City confirmed that the preferred bridge type is the inclined steel legs, to preserve the heritage value of the existing bridge design. City inquired what aspects of the bridge structure would be altered and by how much, due to current bridge design standards. WSP MMM noted that either the depth of the steel girders would be increased, or an additional girder would be required. An additional girder would be preferred as this would add redundancy to the structural design. WSP MMM to provide cross-section, plan, and profile drawings of the bridge/tunnel alternatives. • WSP MMM noted that due to the conflict point south of the tunnel, between pedestrians coming from the tunnel, stairs, and TTC entrance, it is likely that cyclists would not be allowed to cycle through the bridge and tunnel. City to review internally. 	
3.0	Project Schedule and Calendar	
3.1	Project Schedule and Calendar was not discussed at the meeting	
4.0	Other Business	
4.1	No other business was discussed.	
5.0	Next Meeting (PT11 March 9, 2017)	
5.1	Next meeting, PT#11, is scheduled for March 9, 2017, but the Project Team discussed rescheduling to March 23, to be confirmed. City requested that meeting materials be distributed to the Project Team a week prior to the meeting to allow the City to review.	WSP MMM & City/LZ
Meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.		

Date: March 23, 2017
Location: 22nd Floor, East Tower
City Hall
Time: 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Project: Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge
Class EA Study
Toronto PO #: 6043136
MMM Project #: 3216026-000
Author: Jay Goldberg,
WSP|MMM Group

Attendees:

Jeffrey Dea	City Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning
Lorna Zappone	City Transportation Services - Project Manager
Jason Diceman	City Public Consultation
Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning
Lara Tarlo	City Planning - Urban Design
Raj Mohabeer	WSP MMM
Katherine Jim	WSP MMM
Kyle Yusek	WSP MMM
Jay Goldberg	WSP MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Sun Wai Lee	City Transportation Bridges & Structures
Tabassum Rafique	City Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt
Saikat Basak	City Transportation Services - Cycling
Fiona Chapman	City Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects
Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning
Ann Khan	City Transportation Services - Traffic Operations
Lukasz Pawlowski	City Transportation Services
Alex Shevchuk	City Parks, Forestry & Recreation
Max Nie	WSP MMM

Purpose: To review progress of the bridges and tunnel assessment of alternatives

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting PT#10 (February 16, 2017)	
The outstanding action items from PT9 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT9 which were discussed at PT10 are noted in the relevant sections below.		
1.1	Item 1.1– The Project Team conducted a site walk with representatives of the Toronto Police Services, and City Corporate Security Staff on September 6, 2016. City to provide the Risk Security Assessment when available.	City/LZ
1.2	Item 1.2 – The Project Team discussed sending an early letter to MTCS to introduce the study, rather than waiting for the Notice of Study Commencement in September. The City requested MMM draft a letter for review. MMM provided an updated draft MTCS letter to the City on September 19, 2016 for review. Comments from the City are pending. City agreed to hold sending letter until Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Reports can also be provided.	City/LZ WSP MMM

Item	Details	Action By
1.3	Item 1.3 – Dates for Design Review Panel: May 18, June 8, July 18. Dates for Toronto Preservation Board: April 20, May 18, June 22, August 24.	
1.4	Item 1.4 – WSP MMM provided the draft Archaeological Assessment Report to the City for review on October 19, 2016. City provided comments on December 7, 2016. WSP MMM to update the Report per City’s comments as well as include the additional tunnel scope.	WSP MMM
1.5	Item 1.6 – City inquired to the status of the Arborist Report. WSP MMM noted that they had received it from their specialist and will review the report before sending it to the City.	WSP MMM
1.6	Item 1.7 - City requested an updated project schedule (Gantt Chart) including the additional tunnel scope of work.	WSP MMM
2.0	Review Bridge and Tunnel Alternative Solution Assessment	
2.1	<p>WSP MMM reviewed the bridge and tunnel alternative solutions, as revised per comments from PT10. The following summarizes the revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Alternative 3A: Replace Bridge on Existing Alignment with Flaring Tunnel on One or Both Sides</i> – no change. • <i>Alternative 3B: Replace Bridge on Existing Alignment and Reconstruct Wider Tunnel</i> – no change. • <i>Alternative 4A: Replace Bridge on Existing Alignment; Replace Tunnel to Match Bridge Alignment</i> – this alternative was revised to shift the tunnel to the east and align with Glen Road, and keep the bridge on the existing alignment. As this alternative impacts the staircases on either side of Bloor Street, AODA compliant ramps were introduced on this drawing. • <i>Alternative 4B: Replace Bridge on New Alignment; Replace Tunnel on Existing Alignment</i> – not carried forward for assessment as the bridge’s north landing area would have significant property and constructability impacts. • <i>Alternative 4C: Replace Bridge and Tunnel on New Alignments (match north end of bridge to south end of tunnel)</i> – revised landing area at south end of bridge to provide adequate connection from bridge to staircase. (Subsequently relabelled as Alternative 4B) 	
2.2	<p>WSP MMM provided a revised bridge and tunnel assessment table and summary table for discussion. As noted in Item 2.1, some of the previous Alternatives were not carried forward, the following is a revised list of the Bridge and Tunnel Alternative Solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do Nothing: No improvements to bridge or tunnel • Alternative 1: Replace bridge in same location; no tunnel improvements 	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative 2: Replace bridge in same location and aesthetic modifications to tunnel • Alternative 3A: Replace bridge on existing alignment with flare openings to tunnel • Alternative 3B: Replace bridge in same location and reconstruct wider tunnel to the west • Alternative 4A: Replace bridge on existing alignment; replace tunnel and shift to the east to match the Glen Road alignment • Alternative 4B: Replace bridge and tunnel on new alignments 	
2.3	<p>WSP MMM provided a sightline assessment of the above Alternatives, by illustrating the sightline of each alternative from five different positions along Glen Road, the tunnel, and the bridge. Alternatives 1, 2, and 3A maintain the existing sightlines. Although Alternative 3A flares the tunnel accesses, this did not improve the overall sightlines. Alternative 3B provided moderate improvements to the sightlines. Alternative 4A reduce sightlines between the bridge, tunnel, and Glen Road South. Alternative 4B provided the overall best sightlines between the bridge, tunnel and Glen Road.</p>	
2.4	<p>WSP MMM reviewed the Bridge and Tunnel Assessment Table. The key discussion points were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. City to determine whether AODA access ramps are required for all alternatives, or only if triggered by impacting the staircases. ii. City to determine if bridge and tunnel should be designed as part of the cycling network. iii. City to review if there are any agreements with 541 Bloor Street East (apartment complex in the southeast quadrant of Bloor Street / Glen Road south) as to their parking area, which was noted to be on City property. iv. WSP MMM to provide high level renderings of bridge structure types with view from Rosedale Valley Road, to illustrate potential cultural heritage impacts. City Heritage staff noted that the view of the bridge from Rosedale Valley Road is an important heritage element. v. WSP MMM to revise the cost assessment to provide a total net present cost for each alternative, (based on a 75 year life cycle plan). vi. WSP MMM to review alternative accessible routes. vii. WSP MMM to revise bridge and tunnel assessment table for next meeting. 	City & WSP MMM
3.0	PIC Schedule	
3.1	<p>Detail Project Schedule and Calendar were not discussed at the meeting. The next project milestone is PIC 2 tentatively in June.</p>	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
4.0	Other Business	
4.1	No other business was discussed.	
5.0	Next Meeting (PT12 April 13, 2017)	
5.1	Next meeting, PT#12, is scheduled for April 13, 2017. City requested that meeting materials be distributed to the Project Team a week prior to the meeting to allow the City to review.	WSP MMM & City/LZ
5.2	Project Team scheduled a Workshop for March 30, 2017 to review outstanding issues related to the bridge and tunnel (see Item 2.4 i and ii)	
Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.		

Date: April 13, 2017 **Project:** Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class
Location: 23rd Floor, East Tower **Toronto PO #:** EA Study
City Hall **MMM Project #:** 6043136
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. **Author:** Jay Goldberg,
WSP|MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone City Transportation Services - Project Manager
Jason Diceman City Public Consultation
Eddy Lam City Planning - Transportation Planning
Lara Tarlo City Planning - Urban Design
Raj Mohabeer WSP|MMM
Jay Goldberg WSP|MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Jeffrey Dea City Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning
Mary MacDonald City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Ragini Dayal City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Sun Wai Lee City Transportation Bridges & Structures
Tabassum Rafique City Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt
Saikat Basak City Transportation Services - Cycling
Fiona Chapman City Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects
Jamie McEwan City Planning - Community Planning
Ann Khan City Transportation Services - Traffic Operations
Lukasz Pawlowski City Transportation Services
Alex Shevchuk City Parks, Forestry & Recreation
Katherine Jim WSP|MMM
Kyle Yusek WSP|MMM
Max Nie WSP|MMM

Purpose: To confirm the bridge and tunnel preferred alternative solution, review potential design concept alternatives, and review schedule for PIC 2.

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting PT#11 (March 23, 2017)	
The outstanding action items from PT11 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT11 which were discussed at PT12 are noted in the relevant sections below.		
1.1	Item 1.1– The Project Team conducted a site walk with representatives of the Toronto Police Services, and City Corporate Security Staff on September 6, 2016. City to provide the Risk Security Assessment when available.	City/LZ
1.2	Item 1.2 – The Project Team discussed sending an early letter to MTCS to introduce the study, rather than waiting for the Notice of Study Commencement in September. The City requested MMM draft a letter for review. MMM provided an updated draft MTCS letter to the City on September 19, 2016 for review. Comments from the City are pending. City agreed to hold sending letter until Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Reports can also be provided.	City/LZ WSP MMM

Item	Details	Action By
1.3	Item 1.3 – Dates for Design Review Panel: May 18, June 8, July 18. Dates for Toronto Preservation Board: May 18, June 22, August 24.	
1.4	Item 1.4 – WSP MMM provided the draft Archaeological Assessment Report to the City for review on October 19, 2016. City provided comments on December 7, 2016. WSP MMM to update the Report per City’s comments as well as include the additional tunnel scope.	WSP MMM
1.5	Item 1.6 – WSP MMM provided the revised Draft Arborist Report on March 24, 2017 for City review.	City/LZ
1.6	Item 1.7 - City requested an updated project schedule (Gantt Chart) including the additional tunnel scope of work.	WSP MMM
2.0	Minutes of Workshop Meeting (March 30, 2017)	
2.1	<p>A summary of the key discussion points at the Workshop are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team confirmed that the bridge/tunnel is not part of the cycling network, but cyclist should be considered in the design as they occasionally use the bridge without dismounting. The 4.8 m cross-section was confirmed as the preferred. • City confirmed that AODA compliant access should be considered for all alternatives. This will be reviewed as part of the design concepts for the preferred alternative. • Project Team discussed an alternative to connect the bridge directly to Bloor Street. The following is a list of the key discussion points regarding this concept: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The bridge would require a stepped profile to be AODA compliant (a landing area would be required after a 0.45m change in elevation, similar to AODA compliant ramps). ○ It would remove a direct connection to the subway entrance and Glen Road south of Bloor Street, which was the main movement found as part of the pedestrian survey count. ○ Would require a pedestrian signal across Bloor street. ○ This alternative was not carried forward. WSP MMM to draft a design concept for record purposes. <p>Additional details regarding the Workshop Meeting are provided in the Minutes for that meeting.</p>	
3.0	Review Bridge and Tunnel Preferred Alternative Solution	
3.1	WSP MMM provided an updated Bridge and Tunnel Assessment Table with summary notes confirming the preferred alternative solution. Alternative 3B, maintaining the existing bridge and tunnel alignment, and widening the tunnel to the west, was confirmed as the preferred alternative solution.	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<p>Alternative 3B addresses the existing security issues associated with the tunnel by providing additional lighting, and a more comfortable environment with a wider tunnel. Based on the sightline assessment, the additional tunnel width provides some enhancement to the sightlines between the tunnel, the bridge, and Glen Road. Widening the tunnel to the west minimizes the potential utility impacts. This alternative could be combined with Alternative 2 as part of a “phased approach”. See Item 3b.</p> <p>Although Alternative 4B provided the best sightlines; it also creates spaces where there would be poor visibility. Additionally, by realigning the tunnel away from the north staircase, a “jog” is created between the bridge/tunnel and staircase. The increase in cost from Alternative 3B, would not justify the potential improvements.</p>	
3.2	<p>The City noted that there could be adjustments to the design of Alternative 3B to create a more comfortable space on the north side of Bloor Street, for pedestrians to sit or look-out, and not be in line with the cross-traffic. These adjustments will be considered further by the Project Team for Alternative 3B.</p> <p>City inquired if the bridge replacement would impact the staircase north of Bloor Street. WSP MMM noted that the structural team mentioned that although the bridge abutment was adjacent to the staircase, it would not likely impact the stairs. WSP MMM to further review and confirm.</p>	WSP MMM
3.3	<p>WSP MMM provided a present value chart indicating different scenarios for implementing Alternative 3B. The scenarios ranged from replacing the tunnel at present time (most expensive), to providing some aesthetic modifications now and delaying the tunnel replacement to the future (from a delay of 5 years up to 45 years). The more the tunnel replacement is delayed, the less expensive the present value becomes.</p>	
4.0	Review Bridge Preferred Design Alternative	
4.1	<p>Project Team confirmed that the steel inclined-leg bridge alternative is still preferred.</p> <p>City to review bridge type rendering drawings with Mary M. and provide comments. City requested that the renderings be updated to include the bridge type and cost information.</p>	WSP MMM/ City/LZ
5.0	Review Tunnel Design Options	
5.1	<p>WSP MMM noted that the next phase in the EA, the Project Team will review design concepts related to Alternative 3B, including AODA ramp configurations and assessment (including elevator alternative), and any minor adjustments to the current Alternative 3B design.</p>	
6.0	PIC Schedule and Outline	
6.1	<p>City provided a draft schedule for PIC 2, assuming a PIC date of June 28. The following is a list of the key delivery dates:</p>	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 10 – proposed outline of key content • May 24 – complete draft materials (panels) for City review • May 31 – Notice sent to Communications for approval • June 7 – Finalized materials delivered to City to public online • June 14 – Public notice issued • June 21 – Materials optimized for City review • June 28 – PIC 2 (actual date to be confirmed) 	
6.2	City noted that the potential date to meet with Design Review Panel is June 8, prior to the PIC. City to confirm.	City/LZ
7.0	Other Business	
7.1	No other business was discussed.	
8.0	Next Meeting (PT13 May 11, 2017)	
8.1	Next meeting, PT#13, is scheduled for May 11, 2017. City requested that meeting materials be distributed to the Project Team a week prior to the meeting to allow the City to review.	WSP MMM & City/LZ
Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.		



PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES – PT#13

JOB TITLE	Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class EA Study		
CLIENT	City of Toronto	PROJECT NO.	16M-01410-01
DATE	11 May 2017	TIME	9:30 A.M. to 11:30 A.M.
VENUE	City Hall, East Tower, 22 nd Floor Boardroom		
SUBJECT	To review bridge and tunnel alternatives and assessment approach, AODA strategy and concepts, urban design elements, and schedule to PIC 2.		
AUTHOR	Jay Goldberg, P.Eng., WSP		
ATTENDEES	Lorna Zappone	City Transportation Services - Project Manager	
	Jason Diceman	City Public Consultation	
	Tabassum Rafique	City Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt	
	Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning	
	Lara Tarlo	City Planning - Urban Design	
	Mark Langridge	DTAH	
	Katherine Jim	WSP	
	Kyle Yusek	WSP	
	Jay Goldberg	WSP	
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus:		
	Jeffrey Dea	City Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning	
	Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services	
	Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services	
	Sun Wai Lee	City Transportation Bridges & Structures	
	Saikat Basak	City Transportation Services - Cycling	
	Fiona Chapman	City Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects	
	Leah Wannamaker	City PF&R, Urban Forestry/Tree Protection & Plan Review	
	Emily Caldwell	City CP, Community Planning	
	Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning	
	Ann Khan	City Transportation Services - Traffic Operations	
	Lukasz Pawlowski	City Transportation Services	
	Alex Shevchuk	City Parks, Forestry & Recreation, Dev. & Capital Projects/Plan. Design & Dev.	
	Max Nie	WSP	

MEETING NOTES

MATTERS ARISING

ACTION

1.0	MINUTES OF LAST MEETING PT#12 (APRIL 13, 2017)	
	The outstanding action items from PT12 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT12 which were discussed at PT13 are noted in the relevant sections below.	
1.1	Item 1.1- The Project Team conducted a site walk with representatives of the Toronto Police Services, and City Corporate Security Staff on September 6, 2016. City to provide the Risk Security Assessment when available.	City/LZ
1.2	Item 1.2 - The Project Team discussed sending an early letter to MTCS to introduce the study, rather than waiting for the Notice of Study Commencement in September 2016. The City requested MMM draft a letter for review. MMM provided an updated draft MTCS letter to the City on September 19, 2016 for review. City agreed to hold sending letter until updated Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Reports (i.e. including the tunnel) are provided. See Item 1.4	City/LZ WSP
1.3	Item 1.3 - Dates for Design Review Panel: September 15. Dates for Toronto Preservation Board: September 28 and October 26.	
1.4	Item 1.4 - WSP provided the draft Archaeological Assessment Report to the City for review on October 19, 2016. City provided comments on December 7, 2016. WSP provided the updated CHAR and Archaeological Assessment Report (i.e. including the tunnel scope) to the City on May 10, 2017, for review.	City/LZ
1.5	Item 1.6 - WSP MMM provided the revised Draft Arborist Report on March 24, 2017 for City review. The Report was circulated internally for review and comment.	City/LZ
2.0	REVIEW PREFERRED BRIDGE/TUNNEL ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION AND PREFERRED BRIDGE/TUNNEL DESIGN ALTERNATIVE	
2.1	L. Zappone provided a brief update on the meeting with Councillor Wong-Tam (May 3, 2017).	City
2.1.1	The Councillor noted that consultation about the tunnel solution to date has been appropriate, and suggested a high level update regarding the preferred tunnel solution be posted on the project's website prior to PIC 2. City preparing the the update material for posting.	
2.1.2	The Project Team will need to confirm the AODA strategy for the project; noting that the proposed replacement of the bridge and tunnel would not directly impact the staircases and therefore would not trigger AODA requirement. . The City will review internally the AODA strategy to determine appropriate level of consideration is undertaken and to identify further/next steps. The PIC will be postponed until September 2017 to ensure sufficient time to review the matter.	
2.1.3	Project Team presentation to the Design Review Panel (DRP) will also be deferred to the next meeting on July 18 (tentative); there are no DRP meetings in August. Material presented to the DRP would be uploaded to the project website prior to the presentation to ensure the public has an opportunity to view the material prior to the DRP meeting.	
2.1.4	City will n update the website in the next couple weeks, to summarize the progress of the study, followed by another update prior to the presentation to DRP.	
2.2	WSP provided a summary/overview of the project's assessments and preferred bridge and tunnel design, as they will be portrayed at PIC 2. In this way, the assessment of the bridge and	

MEETING NOTES

<p>tunnel parallel each other in terms of the alternative solutions and design alternatives (see Items 2.2.1 to 2.2.4 below). WSP provided the revised tunnel assessment tables to the City for review.</p> <p>2.2.1 Alternative Solutions for the Bridge included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Do nothing – Rehabilitate the existing bridge – Replace bridge in same location (preferred) – Replace bridge in new location <p>2.2.2 Alternative Solutions for the Tunnel included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Do nothing – Aesthetic improvements – Replace and widen structure (preferred) <p>2.2.3 Bridge Design Alternatives included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Steel girder with inclined legs (preferred) – Steel girder with concrete piers – Concrete box with concrete piers – Steel truss with concrete piers (not carried forward) <p>2.2.4 Tunnel Design Alternatives included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Replace and widen tunnel to west (preferred) – Replace and widen tunnel to align with Glen Road – Replace and widen tunnel on new alignment (match north end of bridge to south end of tunnel) 	<p>City/LZ</p>
<p>2.3 City noted that based on the bridge assessment table, the incline leg alternative did not seem to have the highest score. This reflects the fact that the cultural heritage component carried more weight than other alternatives. WSP to review bridge design alternative assessment to ensure criteria and methodology reflects the CHER findings adequately.</p>	<p>WSP</p>
<p>3.0 AODA CONSIDERATIONS</p>	
<p>3.1 City reviewed the AODA options presented previously by WSP, including providing a ramp on the north or south side of Bloor Street.</p> <p>3.1.1 A ramp on the south side requires multiple switchbacks, and creates a large ramp structure. It also impacts a residential parking lot of 451 Bloor Street (although still within the City right-of-way), and potentially impacts the access to that property and the ability to maintain the right-of-way.</p> <p>3.1.2 A ramp on the north side, east of the bridge, also requires a very long run and a switch back, and would require a significant structure built on the slope of the valley.</p> <p>3.2 A new alternative was presented to the Project Team which provides a westbound pathway from the bridge/tunnel connection on the north side of Bloor Street, towards the Sherbourne Street intersection. The pathway would serve as a connection to the bridge and could be designed as a “ravine trail” rather than an AODA ramp. The pathway would have more flexibility in its design, for example, providing a 5% slope (or less), and could be integrated into the ravine. WSP to review high level design considerations for the pathway, including elevations, connection points, and potential tree impacts. City to provide additional topographic data, as available.</p> <p>3.3 City will follow up internally regarding the pathway concept such as maintenance and operation, design requirements (width, railing, etc.), timing of implementation, integration with other City initiatives, etc. It is recognized that the pathway work could be considered a</p>	<p>WSP & City/LZ</p> <p>City/LZ</p>

MEETING NOTES

	separate project beyond the Glen Road Bridge EA and that the design of the tunnel and bridge would not preclude future implementation.	
4.0	URBAN DESIGN	
4.1	Mark Langridge (DTAH) provided a presentation of the existing urban design conditions and context. He reviewed potential themes in terms of design and materials for the railing, deck, and lighting. He also provided a preliminary 3D rendering of the bridge and tunnel to gain a better understanding of the sightlines. DTAH will continue to develop the 3D renderings of the bridge and tunnel and provide material for the DRP presentation. WSP noted that many of the urban design elements will not be decided during the EA stage, a range of design options will be presented at the DRP and PIC 2. Additional consultation will be held during detailed design.	WSP / City
4.2	Through further review as part of the urban design aspect, it was noted that a slight shift in the angle (~1.7°) of the bridge could provide better sightlines between the bridge and tunnel. WSP noted that the EA is recommending to replace the bridge and tunnel on the same alignment, to reduce utility impacts. The minor shift in the bridge can be accommodated without significant impact to construction methodology and impacts. Further refinement to the alignment of the bridge and tunnel may be explored during detail design.	
4.3	M. Langridge also reviewed the angle of the inclined legs with the Structural Team, and was able to adjust the angle so that it more represented the style of the existing bridge structure. The new design would also reduce the span length of the bridge, which provides some cost saving (5-10%).	
4.4	There was some discussion about the proposed cross-section on the bridge and tunnel. It was agreed previously that the bridge and tunnel would be at a width of 4.8 m based on the City multi-use path design guide (3.6 m pathway plus 0.6 m buffer on either side). However, currently, the bridge and tunnel are not part of the City's cycling network, and cyclists are to dismount when traveling on the bridge and tunnel.	
4.5	Some noted that with the increased width of the future bridge and tunnel (4.8m), cyclists may be less willing to dismount.	
4.6	While the City does not have any current plan to change the bylaw to allow active cycling on the bridge and through the tunnel, the design of the structure should not preclude allowing cycling on the bridge/tunnel in the future; especially given the design life for the bridge / tunnel will be up to 75 years.	
4.7	The potential to reduce the width of the bridge and tunnel was discussed. It was agreed that DTAH will prepare preliminary renderings of reduced cross section(s) less than 4.8 m to assist with future discussion. WSP to review alternate cross-section widths per City's design guidelines. Further discussion with the City's cycling and pedestrian groups will be required.	
5.0	PIC SCHEDULE	
5.1	L. Zappone noted that based on discussions with the Councillor, see 2.1 above, PIC 2 is postponed to September 2017.	
5.2	City noted that based on a PIC in mid-to-late September, the first draft PIC material will be required by early August. The schedule leading to PIC 2 will be reviewed as the study progresses, taking into consideration the unconfirmed date to present to DRP.	
5.3	Tentative date for DRP presentation is July 18. The next available date is mid-September, which may be too close to PIC 2 if it were to be held in mid/late September. Material presented at DRP would also need to be made available to the public prior to the meeting.	
6.0	OTHER BUSINESS	

MEETING NOTES

6.1	WSP noted that the geotechnical borehole investigation is underway, and should be completed by May 12. The subsurface soil investigation would also be gathering sample after the boreholes were completed. Preliminary findings is expected to be available in early June.	
7.0	NEXT MEETING (PT14 JUNE 8, 2017)	
7.1	Next meeting, PT#14, is scheduled for June 8, 2017. City requested that meeting materials be distributed to the Project Team a week prior to the meeting to allow the City to review.	WSP & City/LZ

These minutes are considered to be accurate recording of all items discussed. Written notice of discrepancies, errors or omission must be given within seven (7) days, otherwise the minutes will be accepted as written.



PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES – PT#14

JOB TITLE	Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class EA Study		
CLIENT	City of Toronto	PROJECT NO.	16M-01410-01
DATE	June 8, 2017	TIME	9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
VENUE	City Hall, East Tower, 22 nd Floor Boardroom		
SUBJECT	To identify preferred cross-section alternative, AODA strategy and concepts, urban design elements for DRP, and schedule to PIC 2.		
AUTHOR	Jay Goldberg, P.Eng., WSP		
ATTENDEES	Lorna Zappone	City Transportation Services - Project Manager	
	Emily Caldwell	City CP, Community Planning	
	Fiona Chapman (part time)	City Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects	
	Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services	
	Tabassum Rafique	City Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt	
	Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning	
	Lara Tarlo	City Planning - Urban Design	
	Leah Wannamaker	City PF&R, Urban Forestry/Tree Protection & Plan Review	
	Katherine Jim	WSP	
	Max Nie	WSP	
	Kyle Yusek	WSP	
	Jay Goldberg	WSP	
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus:		
	Jeffrey Dea	City Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning	
	Jason Diceman	City Public Consultation	
	Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services	
	Sun Wai Lee	City Transportation Bridges & Structures	
	Saikat Basak	City Transportation Services - Cycling	
	Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning	
	Ann Khan	City Transportation Services - Traffic Operations	
	Lukasz Pawlowski	City Transportation Services	
	Alex Shevchuk	City Parks, Forestry & Recreation, Dev. & Capital Projects/Plan. Design & Dev.	

MEETING NOTES

ITEMS

ACTION

ITEMS	ACTION
<p>1.0 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING PT#13 (MAY 11, 2017)</p> <p>The outstanding action items from PT13 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT13 which were discussed at PT14 are noted in the relevant sections below.</p>	
<p>1.1 Item 1.1- The Project Team conducted a site walk with representatives of the Toronto Police Services, and City Corporate Security Staff on September 6, 2016. City to provide the Risk Security Assessment when available.</p>	City/LZ
<p>1.2 Item 1.2 - The Project Team discussed sending an early letter to MTCS to introduce the study, rather than waiting for the Notice of Study Commencement in September 2016. The City requested MMM draft a letter for review. MMM provided an updated draft MTCS letter to the City on September 19, 2016 for review. City agreed to hold sending letter until updated Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Reports (i.e. including the tunnel) are provided. See Item 1.3</p>	City/LZ WSP
<p>1.3 Item 1.4 - WSP provided the draft Archaeological Assessment Report to the City for review on October 19, 2016. City provided comments on December 7, 2016. WSP provided the updated CHAR and Archaeological Assessment Report (i.e. including the tunnel scope) to the City on May 10, 2017, for review.</p> <p>City noted that they have no additional comments on the CHAR.</p>	City/LZ WSP
<p>1.4 Item 1.6 - WSP MMM provided the revised Draft Arborist Report on March 24, 2017 for City review. The Report is being circulated internally by the City for review and comment.</p>	City/LZ
<p>1.5 Item 2.2.1 - City to prepare material for project update on City's website</p>	City/LZ
<p>1.6 Item 2.3 - WSP to review bridge design alternative assessment table to ensure criteria and methodology reflects the CHER findings adequately.</p>	WSP
<p>1.7 Item 3.2 - WSP generated high level cross-sections of Bloor Street and the valley for consideration, to be discussed with the Project Team.</p>	
<p>1.8 City is following up internally regarding the AODA strategy or pathway concept such as maintenance and operation, design requirements (width, railing, etc.), timing of implementation, integration with other City initiatives, etc.</p>	City/LZ
<p>2.0 REVIEW BRIDGE CROSS-SECTION OPTIONS</p>	
<p>2.1 Based on discussions at the previous Project Team Meeting, WSP provided 3 cross-section concepts for the bridge, including 3.9m, 4.2m and 4.8m widths. Each of the concepts included a multi-use path of varying widths (in the center), and 0.6m buffers on each side.</p> <p>WSP discussed these options with Dave McLaughlin (WSP), Active Transportation Specialist. Dave noted that due to the variety of pedestrian and cyclist usage, the 4.2m or 4.8m concepts should be considered. The 4.8m (i.e. 3.6 m multi-use path with 0.6 m buffer on each side) concept would provide space for all types of users to move comfortably along the bridge. The 4.2m (i.e. 3.0 m multi-use path with 0.6 m buffer on each side) concept would provide sufficient space for all users, but with less buffer between slower and faster moving users. Dave M. also noted that the multi-use path portion of the bridge should not be less than 3.0 m to ensure users comfort and not to preclude the accommodation for cyclists on the bridge in the future should the policy changed.</p>	

MEETING NOTES

ITEMS		ACTION
	<p>WSP noted that the City had requested to design the bridge structure with a third girder for redundancy (in order to provide a double path loading system). The 4.8m concept could accommodate three girder with adequate space. While the 4.2m concept would still be able to provide for three girders, it would have minimal distance between girders. WSP also noted that this type of bridge does not technically require a third girder based on the standard Ministry guidelines. There are other options to provide redundancy for the bridge.</p>	
2.2	<p>City requested the estimated cost of the 4.8m bridge with a third girder.</p>	WSP
2.3	<p>City noted that based on input from Cycling, Pedestrian, Heritage and Urban Design departments, there is no practical differences between the 4.2m and 4.8m concepts. City's Pedestrian department staff preferred the 4.8 m option. WSP noted that the cost of the 4.2m and 4.8m concepts was approximately be \$7.0M and 7.8M, respectively.</p>	
2.4	<p>City confirmed that the preferred concept moving forward was the 4.8m concept, as it would provide the most opportunity for future development and users over the life span of the bridge.</p>	
2.5	<p>WSP to finalize the draft assessment table for the bridge type alternatives and provide to the City for review.</p>	WSP
3.0	DRP PRESENTATION PREPARATION AND NEXT STEPS	
3.1	<p>City confirmed that the Project Team will present to the Design Review Panel (DRP) on July 18.</p>	
3.2	<p>City noted that this would be a significant opportunity to gain input on the urban design aspects of the study which would be carried forward into detail design.</p>	
3.3	<p>The Project Team noted that there may be limited flexibility in the bridge design as the replacement bridge will have to meet cultural heritage requirements. Therefore, when presenting to the DRP, the areas to focus on could be the "transition" areas between the bridge / tunnel to Glen Road (i.e. the public realm): for example, south access to the tunnel, landing area between tunnel and bridge, north access to bridge, and connections to Bloor Street.</p>	
3.4	<p>WSP to provide draft DRP presentation early next week for discussion. City to circulate draft presentation internally for review.</p>	WSP
4.0	PIC SCHEDULE	
4.1	<p>City noted that the PIC will be scheduled for September 25 or 26. City to provide updated PIC schedule with material delivery dates. City noted that draft materials would be circulated starting early August 2017.</p>	
4.2	<p>WSP will prepare a calendar leading to PIC 2.</p>	WSP
5.0	OTHER BUSINESS	
5.1	<p>WSP noted that the Geotechnical and Subsurface Investigation completed their borehole work and are in the process of the laboratory work/testing. Preliminary draft reports will be provided mid to late June.</p>	
6.0	NEXT MEETING (PT15 JULY 13, 2017)	
6.1	<p>Next meeting, PT#15, is scheduled for July 13, 2017. City requested that meeting materials be distributed to the Project Team a week prior to the meeting to allow the City to review.</p>	WSP & City/LZ

MEETING NOTES

These minutes are considered to be accurate recording of all items discussed. Written notice of discrepancies, errors or omission must be given within seven (7) days, otherwise the minutes will be accepted as written.



PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES – PT#15

JOB TITLE	Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class EA Study		
CLIENT	City of Toronto	PROJECT NO.	16M-01410-01
DATE	July 13, 2017	TIME	9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
VENUE	City Hall, East Tower, 22 nd Floor Boardroom		
SUBJECT	To identify review the Design Review Panel presentation and schedule to PIC 2.		
AUTHOR	Jay Goldberg, P.Eng., WSP		
ATTENDEES	Lorna Zappone	City Transportation Services - Project Manager	
	Jason Diceman	City Public Consultation	
	Emily Caldwell	City CP, Community Planning	
	Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning	
	Heather Templeton	WSP	
	Katherine Jim	WSP	
	Jay Goldberg	WSP	
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus:		
	Jeffrey Dea	City Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning	
	Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services	
	Sun Wai Lee	City Transportation Bridges & Structures	
	Saikat Basak	City Transportation Services - Cycling	
	Fiona Chapman	City Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects	
	Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services	
	Tabassum Rafique	City Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt	
	Lara Tarlo	City Planning - Urban Design	
	Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning	
	Ann Khan	City Transportation Services - Traffic Operations	
	Lukasz Pawlowski	City Transportation Services	
	Alex Shevchuk	City Parks, Forestry & Recreation, Dev. & Capital Projects/Plan. Design & Dev.	

ITEMS

ACTION

1.0	MINUTES OF LAST MEETING PT#14 (JUNE 8, 2017)	
The outstanding action items from PT14 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT14 which were discussed at PT15 are noted in the relevant sections below.		

MEETING NOTES

ITEMS

ACTION

1.1	Item 1.1- The Project Team conducted a site walk with representatives of the Toronto Police Services, and City Corporate Security Staff on September 6, 2016. City to provide the Risk Security Assessment when available.	City/LZ
1.2	Item 1.2 - The Project Team discussed sending an early letter to MTCS to introduce the study, rather than waiting for the Notice of Study Commencement in September 2016. The City requested MMM draft a letter for review. MMM provided an updated draft MTCS letter to the City on June 28, 2017 for review.	City/LZ
1.3	Item 1.3 - WSP provided the draft Archaeological Assessment Report to the City for review on October 19, 2016. City provided comments on December 7, 2016. WSP provided the updated CHAR and Archaeological Assessment Report (i.e. including the tunnel scope) to the City on May 10, 2017, for review. City noted that they have no comments on the CHAR which can be finalized. City to confirm any comments on the Archaeological Report.	City/LZ WSP
1.4	Item 1.4 - WSP MMM provided the revised Draft Arborist Report on March 24, 2017 for City review. The Report is being circulated internally by the City for review and comment.	City/LZ
1.5	Item 1.5 - City updated the study website with information on the Design Review Panel (DRP) presentation on July 14, 2017. The DRP presentation to be uploaded to the website following the presentation.	City/JD
1.6	Item 2.2 - WSP reviewed the estimated cost of the 4.8m bridge with a third girder to be approximately \$9.0M.	
2.0	BRIDGE TYPE ASSESSMENT REVIEW	
2.1	WSP provided the City with an updated Bridge Type Assessment and Evaluation Table on June 28, 2017. The updated table reflected the City's comments to expand on the cultural heritage impacts to accurately portray the unique heritage value of the existing structure. WSP noted that although incline-leg alternative has slightly more constructability issues, cost, and potentially slightly natural environment impacts due to construction methodology (mostly along the slopes of the valley), it is still preferred as it would most preserve the heritage value of the structure. City inquired if the natural impacts of the alternatives could be further defined in terms of temporary and permanent impacts, and a quantitative difference between the three alternatives. WSP to review the table and revise per City comments.	WSP
3.0	DRP PRESENTATION PREPARATION	
3.1	WSP provided the updated draft DRP Presentation to the City on July 12, 2017. The Project Team reviewed the draft presentation in detail, and revisions were addressed at the meeting. WSP to finalize revisions to the presentation post meeting and provide to the City for a final review.	City/LZ WSP
4.0	PIC SCHEDULE	
4.1	WSP provided an updated PIC 2 Calendar for discussion, based on the timeline provided by City Consultation. The Project Team confirmed that PIC 2 is tentatively scheduled for September 26, 2017 from 5:30 pm to 8 pm.	
4.2	PIC materials will be finalized by September 8 to be published the following week.	

MEETING NOTES

ITEMS

ACTION

4.3	PIC materials will be reviewed by the Project Team and TAC at the next Project Team Meeting scheduled for August 29, 2017 (in the afternoon).	
5.0	NEXT STEPS	
5.1	Based on the comments that will be received from DRP, WSP will finalize the assessment and design and will provide to the City for review end of July.	
5.2	Assessment tables, final design and plans, and Draft PIC displays will be provided to the Project Team and TAC for review by August 14, and discussed at the following Project Team Meeting/TAC #2 on August 29, 2017.	
6.0	OTHER BUSINESS	
6.1	WSP noted that the Geotechnical and Subsurface Investigation completed their borehole work and are in the process of the laboratory work/testing. Preliminary draft reports will be provided mid to late June.	
7.0	NEXT MEETING (PT16/TAC AUGUST 29, 2017)	
7.1	Next meeting, PT#16/TAC Meeting, is scheduled for August 29, 2017. City requested that meeting materials be distributed to the Project Team a week prior to the meeting to allow the City to review.	WSP & City/LZ

These minutes are considered to be accurate recording of all items discussed. Written notice of discrepancies, errors or omission must be given within seven (7) days, otherwise the minutes will be accepted as written.



PROJECT TEAM MEETING MINUTES – PT#16

JOB TITLE	Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class EA Study		
CLIENT	City of Toronto	PROJECT NO.	16M-01410-01
DATE	October 11, 2017	TIME	1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
VENUE	City Hall, East Tower, 22 nd Floor Boardroom		
SUBJECT	To review comments for the PIC 2 displays and schedule for ESR filing.		
AUTHOR	Jay Goldberg, P.Eng., WSP		
ATTENDEES	Lorna Zappone	City Transportation Services - Project Manager	
	Jason Diceman	City Public Consultation	
	Eddy Lam	City Planning - Transportation Planning	
	Vicki Shi	Toronto Water	
	Heather Templeton	WSP	
	Jay Goldberg	WSP	
DISTRIBUTION	As above plus:		
	Jeffrey Dea	City Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning	
	Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services	
	Sun Wai Lee	City Transportation Bridges & Structures	
	Jason Brander	City CP, Community Planning	
	Saikat Basak	City Transportation Services - Cycling	
	Fiona Chapman	City Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects	
	Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services	
	Tabassum Rafique	City Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt	
	Lara Tarlo	City Planning - Urban Design	
	Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning	
	Ann Khan	City Transportation Services - Traffic Operations	
	Lukasz Pawlowski	City Transportation Services	
	Alex Shevchuk	City Parks, Forestry & Recreation, Dev. & Capital Projects/Plan. Design & Dev.	
	Katherine Jim	WSP	

MEETING NOTES

ITEMS	ACTION
1.0 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING PT#15 (JULY 13, 2017) AND TAC #3 (AUGUST 29, 2017)	
The outstanding action items from PT15 are noted as follows. Other action items from PT15 which were discussed at PT16 are noted in the relevant sections below. Action items from TAC #3 are noted in that meeting's minutes.	
1.1 Item 1.1- The Project Team conducted a site walk with representatives of the Toronto Police Services, and City Corporate Security Staff on September 6, 2016. City to provide the Risk Security Assessment when available.	City/LZ
1.2 Item 1.2 - Project Team to send the updated CHAR to MTCS for review once it has been initially reviewed by the City. WSP to provide updated CHAR to City.	WSP
1.3 Item 1.3 -WSP provided the updated CHAR and Archaeological Assessment Report (i.e. including the tunnel scope) to the City on May 10, 2017, for review. City to provide any comments on the Archaeological Report.	City/LZ
1.4 Item 1.4 - City provided comments on the Draft Arborist Report to WSP on Sept. 5, 2017. WSP to review comments and revise accordingly.	WSP
1.5 Item 1.5 - City uploaded the DRP presentation to the project website following the presentation on July 18, 2017.	
1.6 Item 2.1 - WSP updated the Assessment and Evaluation Tables and distributed them to the Project Team and TAC on July 21, 2017. The Tables were reviewed and revised per comments received at TAC #3 on August 29, 2017.	
2.0 PIC #2 (OCTOBER 24, 2017)	
2.1 WSP provided the last version of the PIC displays on September 29, 2017. City provided comments on the PIC displays, and noted that additional comments will be provided from the City's Director. WSP to finalize once final comments provided by City.	City/LZ
3.0 TECHNICAL MEMOS 1 AND 2	
3.1 WSP provided an updated version of Technical Memo 1, and first draft of Technical Memo 2 to the Project Team on October 4, 2017. WSP received comments from TRCA, City Bridges & Structures, Toronto Water, and Toronto Ravine and Natural Feature Protection (RNFP).	
3.2 WSP noted that the Technical Memos will form the bulk of the Environmental Study Report (ESR).	
3.3 Jason D. noted that the Consultation chapter of the ESR will be based on the City's Consultation Report, to be provided following PIC #2.	
3.4 Vicki S. inquired if there had been any impacts associated with the water table based on the Hydrogeological Assessment. WSP noted that the Hydrogeological Assessment Report is currently being reviewed internally, and will inquire if there are any associated impacts.	
3.5 Vicki S. noted that there may be impacts to the water utilities along Bloor Street during the tunnel construction, and there are restrictions as to when/if those lines can be closed. Vicki S. to include	

MEETING NOTES

ITEMS	ACTION
these in formal comments on the Technical Memos. WSP noted that information on the constructability and timing will be incorporated into the Functional Design Report.	
3.6 Lorna Z. inquired if the preliminary cost estimate will be further defined in an appendix of the ESR or the Functional Design Report. WSP noted that typically the preliminary cost estimates are summarized in the ESR based on the major items, and provided with additional breakdown in the appendix.	
4.0 SCHEDULE	
4.1 Project Team discussed the schedule leading to PIC #2. Once the PIC displays are finalized they will be uploaded to the project website.	
4.2 Project discussed schedule for Draft ESR and Functional Design Report. WSP to update the Calendar so that the ESR and Functional Design Report will be finalized at the same time. Project Team to reschedule the Project Team Meeting #17 to November 16 or 23 so that the Team can discuss initial comments on the draft reports before finalizing.	
5.0 OTHER BUSINESS	
5.1 No other business discussed.	
6.0 NEXT MEETING (PT17 NOVEMBER 23, 2017)	
6.1 Next meeting, PT#17 is scheduled for November 23, 2017. City requested that meeting materials be distributed to the Project Team a week prior to the meeting to allow the City to review.	WSP & City/LZ

These minutes are considered to be accurate recording of all items discussed. Written notice of discrepancies, errors or omission must be given within seven (7) days, otherwise the minutes will be accepted as written.

Date:	June 23, 2016	Project:	Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class EA Study
Location:	22 nd Floor, East Tower City Hall	Toronto PO #:	6043136
Time:	1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.	MMM Project #:	3216026-000
		Author:	Jay Goldberg, WSP MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone	City Project Manager, Transportation Services
Jason Diceman	Policy, Planning, Finance & Administration - Program Support/Public Consultation
Lara Tarlo (part-time)	City Planning - Urban Design
Eddy Lam (part-time)	City Planning - Transportation Planning
Jennifer Renaud	City Planning - Community Planning
Leah Wannamaker	Parks, Forestry and Recreation - Ravine and Natural Feature Protection
Katie Nikota	Park Planning and Development
Jeffrey Dea	Transportation Services - TIMs/Infrastructure Plan.
Shalin Yeboah	Major Capital Infrastructure Coordination
Tabassum Rafique	Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt
Norman DeFraeye (part-time)	Parks, Forestry and Recreation - Ravine and Natural Feature Protection Supervisor
Ragini Dayal (part-time)	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services
Daniel Brent (part-time)	TRCA
Scott Roberts	WSP MMM
Heather Templeton	WSP MMM
Jay Goldberg	WSP MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Mary MacDonald	City Planning - Urban Design/Heritage Preservation Services
Saikat Basak	Transportation Services - TIMs/Cycling Infra. & Prog.
Fiona Chapman	Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects
Jamie McEwan	City Planning - Community Planning
Sun Wai Lee	Eng. & Const. Services - Transportation Infra/Bridges & Structures
Alex Shevchuk	Parks, Forestry & Recreation
Ann Khan	Transportation Services - Traffic Operations
Lukasz Pawlowski	Transportation Services
Bill Merry	Eng. & Const. Services. – Eng. Support Services/ Eng. Surveys
Mary-Ann George	TTC
Dave McLaughlin	WSP MMM – Active Transportation

Purpose: To introduce the study, present the study process, schedule, existing conditions data collected to date, problem and opportunity statement, alternative solutions and next steps.

Item	Details	Action By
1.0	Study Purpose and Overview	
1.1	All attendees introduced themselves, their organization/department, and interest in the study.	
1.2	WSP MMM reviewed the study purpose, which is to address the deteriorated condition of the Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge, and provided an overview of the study area. A brief background and context of the bridge was also provided, highlighting the historical timeline of the bridge dating back to 1887, and the existing bridge being built in 1929. The bridge is part of the South Rosedale Heritage Conservation District.	
2.0	Study Process and Schedule	
2.1	<p>WSP MMM noted that the project is following the Schedule C, Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process. The Project Team is currently in the initial phases of the study, carrying out data collection of the existing conditions, drafting the problem and opportunity statement, and developing alternative solutions.</p> <p>A pre-consultation event will take place on June 27, a Community Walk Shop, to introduce the study to leaders of local community and stakeholder groups, and obtain early input on the existing bridge and the study. The Notice of Study Commencement will be sent out with the Notice of Public Information Centre (PIC) #1 in September 2016.</p> <p>PIC 1 is schedule for late September, PIC 2 is planned for early 2017, and the study is planned to be completed by late Spring 2017.</p> <p>Following the completion of this study will be detailed design (2017/2018) and construction (2018/2019).</p> <p>The Consultation Plan also includes an ongoing public survey which will be available on the City project webpage until the end of summer.</p>	
2.2	<p>WSP MMM presented the list of key stakeholders. J. Diceman noted the following stakeholder group changes for the Walk Shop invitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apartments associations at north end of bridge (The Somerset-1A Dale Avenue and 40 Glen Road) • Added Toronto Heritage Association • Removed Bloor-Yorkville BIA and Avenue Bloor (ABC) Residents Association, as they are not in proximity to the study area <p>J. Renaud noted that the St. James Town Community Centre is not a formal association at this time, but are trying to formalize as a group. “The Network” has been involved in the St. James Town Community Improvement Plan (CIP), and has also initiated a safety audit including Glen Road South up to Bloor Street.</p>	
3.0	Existing Conditions	
3.1	WSP MMM reviewed the existing condition of the bridge structure:	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built in 1973 – a steel inclined leg structure with timber deck. • Single load path structure; does not have redundancy for load carrying capacity if one member fails. • Three (3) spans totalling 107 m in length. • Previous rehabilitation was completed in 2001, as part of routine maintenance. • Based on a routine inspection in 2014, the structure was closed for emergency repairs. The repairs are a temporary holding strategy, and annual inspections are recommended until the long term solution completed. • Emergency repairs were completed in 2015 and the bridge was re-opened. 	
3.2	<p>WSP MMM reviewed the cultural heritage of the bridge based on preliminary research completed to date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been a bridge crossing at this location since the 1880's. • The existing bridge was constructed in 1974. • In 2003 the bridge was included in the South Rosedale Heritage Conservation District. <p>The Project Team is continuing to research heritage value of the bridge, and preparing the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER). R. Dayal noted that the bridge is designated under Part 5 of the Heritage Act, which was initiated by the local community as part of the South Rosedale Heritage Conservation District designation process.</p>	
3.3	<p>WSP MMM reviewed the natural heritage existing conditions of the study area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Rosedale Valley is located in Lower Don River Sub-watershed. • The Ravine Lands regulated by TRCA. • A former watercourse that ran through the ravine was piped underground in the early 1900s and no aquatic features currently exist within the study area. • Existing designated features include portions of the City's Natural Heritage System and a proposed expansion of the Rosedale Valley Environmentally Significant Area (ESA). • Based on the surveys conducted to date, no issues or sensitivities have been identified from an ecological perspective. 	
3.4	<p>WSP MMM reviewed the active transportation data being collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counts of existing pedestrian and cyclist use will take place on June 22 and 25, 2016. • An online survey will be published to understand how people are using the bridge in terms of their trip origins and destinations. • Recent transportation studies from development applications and collision records within the study area will also be reviewed. 	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
4.0	Problem and Opportunity Statement	
4.1	The Problem and Opportunity Statement was reviewed. J. Diceman noted that the statement is still in draft form and will be revised, if needed, based on public input up to PIC 1.	
4.2	<p>WSP MMM reviewed the Alternative Solutions being considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do Nothing – to close and remove the bridge at such time the condition requires. • Rehabilitation – has few overall impacts, retains the existing bridge, but may not be a long term solution. • Replacement – in its current location, but would likely require closing the bridge during construction. • Replacement in different location – primary advantage is to keep the existing bridge open during construction. <p>The alternatives will be evaluated considering a range of environmental factors including: bridge engineering, heritage, transportation planning (active transportation), natural and social environments, cost, and urban design.</p> <p>The Project Team will review the detailed evaluation criteria, and the assessment and evaluation with TAC in August, prior to PIC 1.</p> <p>J. Dea asked why has this bridge been listed? Is the heritage value in the bridge or the crossing? When is the CHER expected to be completed? WSP MMM noted that key contributing factors to the heritage value will be documented in the CHER to be completed by the end of July 2016.</p> <p>J. Dea also suggested the Project Team send a letter to Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS), along with a copy of the CHER early in the study process, and not wait until the Notice of Study Commencement in September.</p>	Project Team
4.3	R. Dayal inquired why the bridge was corroding faster than expected; what is the status of other similar structures? Or is this unique? WSP MMM noted that these questions will be addressed through the structural engineering review of the existing bridge and in the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER).	Project Team
5.0	Next Steps	
5.1	<p>WSP MMM reviewed the next steps in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete Inventory of Existing Conditions • Evaluation of Alternative Solutions • TAC #2 Meeting (August 11, 2016) • Prepare for and hold PIC #1 September 2016 • Develop and Evaluate Bridge Design Alternatives • Functional Design of Preferred Alternative • Prepare for and hold PIC #2 late-January 2017 • File ESR late-Spring 2017 	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
5.2	WSP MMM noted there have been discussions for presenting to the Design Review Panel either before or after PIC 1 with the recommended alternative solution. The City to review potential dates, and timing within study process.	City/ L. Zappone
5.3	The City noted that the Project Team will also need to present to Preservation Board. A memo needs to be provided to the Board a month before the meeting, so that it can be included in the Agenda. City to review potential meeting dates, and timing within study process.	City/ L. Zappone
Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.		

Date: August 11, 2016
Location: 22nd Floor, East Tower
 City Hall
Time: 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Project: Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge
 Class EA Study
Toronto PO #: 6043136
MMM Project #: 3216026-000
Author: Jay Goldberg,
 WSP|MMM Group

Attendees:

Lorna Zappone	City Project Manager, Infrastructure Planning
Jason Diceman	Program Support/Public Consultation
Mary MacDonald	Heritage Preservation Services
Eddy Lam	Transportation Planning
Jennifer Renaud	Community Planning
Tabassum Rafique	Traffic Planning
Titus Joseph	Traffic Safety
Leah Wannamaker	Tree Protection & Plan Review
Scott Roberts	WSP MMM
Heather Templeton	WSP MMM
Katherine Jim	WSP MMM
Jay Goldberg	WSP MMM

Distribution: Attendees, and the following:

Jeffrey Dea	Infrastructure Planning
Saikat Basak	Cycling Infrastructure & Programming
Fiona Chapman	Public Realm / Pedestrian Projects
Ann Khan	Traffic Operations
Lukasz Pawlowski	Traffic Planning
Roger Browne	Traffic Management Centre / Traffic Safety
Jamie McEwan	Community Planning
Ragini Dayal	Heritage Preservation Services
Sun Wai Lee	Transportation Infrastructure / Bridges & Structures
Bill Merry	Engineering Support Services
Alex Shevchuk	Planning Design and Development
Norman DeFraeye	Tree Protection and Plan Review
Katie Nikota	Parks, Dev. & Capital Projects
Shad Hussain	Water Infrastructure Management
Shalin Yeboah	Major Capital Infrastructure Coordination
Mary-Ann George	TTC
Daniel Brent	TRCA
Dave McLaughlin	WSP MMM – Active Transportation

Purpose: To review the first draft of the PIC #1 displays.

Item	Details	Action By
	WSP MMM provided the first draft of the PIC #1 displays (attached) to the Project Team on August 4, 2016 for review, and requested that all comments on the displays be provided by August 19.	City

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	The Final PIC #1 displays will be submitted to the City on September 9 to be published online beginning September 14, two weeks prior to the PIC scheduled for September 28.	WSP MMM
	WSP MMM walked through each of the slides, providing background information, and discussion points. A summary of the key comments and discussions is provided below.	
1.0	Purpose and Study Area (Slides 1 – 3)	
1.1	No comments on Slides 1, 2 and 3 - Welcome sign, noting that all information is also available on the City’s website, as well as the purpose of the study and study area.	
2.0	EA Process and Schedule (Slides 4 – 6)	
2.1	Slide 4 provides a high level description of the EA process, and where the Study is now within the process. WSP MMM noted the graphic may be adjusted to maximum the font size with the space available.	
2.2	<p>Slide 5 provides a list of relevant City plans and policies, including graphics relating to them, and a brief description of how the plans specifically relate to this Study.</p> <p>J. Diceman noted that The Walking Strategy should be added.</p> <p>M. MacDonald noted that she will provide edits to the wording of the South Rosedale Heritage Conservation District Plan. She also noted that the Official Plan could reference its policies on preserving heritage resources.</p> <p>L. Zappone noted that the Ravine Strategy should be added.</p> <p>WSP MMM to ensure all acronyms (i.e., AODA) are also written in full.</p>	City/MM WSP MMM
2.3	<p>Slide 6 provides a plan of the surrounding planning and development projects in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>J. Diceman suggested adding a sentence to each project box and referring viewers to “see City website for related information”</p> <p>J. Goldberg to request information on the Bloor St. and Parliament St. intersection improvements from S. Basak, and add to this plan.</p> <p>J. Renaud confirmed the plan should also include the St. James Town Improvement Plan.</p>	WSP MMM
3.0	Existing Conditions (Slides 7 – 14)	
3.1	<p>Slide 7 provides a description and pictures of the existing structure’s span and type, and notes the two most recent structural works.</p> <p>H. Templeton noted that the pictures may be changed to be better quality.</p>	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	L. Zappone noted to describe the 2014 inspection as a “routine” inspection. T. Rafique suggested noting the existing bridge width and height.	WSP MMM
3.2	<p>Slides 8 and 9 discuss the Cultural Heritage of the bridge, noting the first record of the bridge in 1884, the construction of the current bridge, and it being included within the South Rosedale Heritage Conservation District, as well as historical pictures of the original bridge and an 1884 map illustrating the crossing.</p> <p>WSP MMM to add additional information from the Draft Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER), once available, which will clarify the heritage value of the bridge and/or the crossing. This will inform the discussion on Heritage criterion in the assessment of alternatives.</p>	WSP MMM
3.3	Slide 10 illustrates the active transportation facilities within and around the study area. J. Diceman noted the plan currently focuses on cycling facilities and suggested revising the title or illustrating sidewalks in the figure.	WSP MMM
3.4	<p>Slide 11 illustrates the results of the pedestrian and cyclists counts which were taken on June 22 and 25.</p> <p>WSP MMM to clarify the description of ‘Users Headed To/From – Glen Road (54%)’; does this include Glen Road north or south of the bridge, or both?</p>	WSP MMM
3.5	Slide 12 illustrates the results of the Natural Heritage investigation, noting the associated natural heritage policies, and observed wildlife and vegetation. J. Diceman suggested that the figure be revised to be more public friendly, minimizing the technical language, summarizing the text and increasing the font. L. Zappone suggested to focus in on the study area.	WSP MMM
3.6	No comments on Slide 13 – Land Use.	
3.7	<p>Slide 14 provides figures of the existing infrastructure including the approaches, approach gates, railings and illumination.</p> <p>M. MacDonald suggested separating this slide into two; one focusing on the bridge’s infrastructure, and the other noting the approaches which are not the focus of this study.</p> <p>L. Zappone noted to move these slides up to just after Slide 7 – Structural.</p>	WSP MMM
4.0	Problem and Opportunity Statement (Slides 15)	
4.1	No comments on Slide 15.	
5.0	Consultation to Date (Slides 16 – 17)	
5.1	Slide 16 and 17, provided by J. Diceman, summarize the comments received to date from the Walk-Shop and the online survey. J. Diceman to provide any	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
	<p>updated information on the online survey once it closes on August 20, 2016.</p> <p>L. Zappone noted that “Other comments?” should be changed to “Sample of Comments”.</p>	WSP MMM
6.0	Assessment and Evaluation of Alternative Solutions (Slides 18 – 23)	
6.1	<p>Slide 18 begins the discussion of the alternative solutions, by providing a description of each alternative.</p> <p>L. Zappone suggested removing the reference to ‘life expectancy’ for the Rehabilitation alternative.</p>	WSP MMM
6.2	<p>Slide 19 and 20 provide a high level description of the evaluation criteria for the alternative solutions. H. Templeton noted that the Transportation Planning graphic will be changed from a car to illustrate more active transportation.</p> <p>L. Zappone noted to write out the CPTED acronym.</p>	WSP MMM
6.3	<p>Slide 21 provides the detailed assessment of the alternative solutions for the evaluation criteria. H. Templeton reviewed the key elements in the assessment for each alternative solution.</p> <p>M. MacDonald noted that the Heritage assessment may change based on the results of the CHER.</p> <p>E. Lam suggested to revise the ‘\$’ signs by removing the dash, and starting the Do Nothing with one, and then adjusting others relative to.</p> <p>The City commented this table is quite text heavy and suggested shorting bullets to simplify if possible, and/or combining with Slide 22.</p>	WSP MMM
6.4	<p>Slide 22 provides a graphical representation of the evaluation from Slide 21. J. Diceman suggested including a few key words describing the assessment, along with the graphical representation, or combine with a simplified version of the table on Slide 21.</p>	WSP MMM
6.5	<p>No comments on Slide 23 which reiterates the recommended solution.</p>	
7.0	Considerations for Design Concepts (Slides 24 – 25)	
7.1	<p>Slide 24 illustrates potential structural types which will be considered for the new bridge. H. Templeton noted that some of the pictures may be replaced with City of Toronto local pedestrian bridges. The Cable Stayed option will be removed, as it would not likely be considered due to the span length, cost and the context area (this type of structure is usually used in gateway areas, where the whole bridge is seen, whereas in this study area most of the view of the bridge is obstructed by trees).</p>	WSP MMM
7.2	<p>Slide 25 illustrates the aesthetical design concepts relating to the structure.</p>	

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.

Item	Details	Action By
7.3	<p>WSP MMM to re-work Slides 24 and 25 to better communicate the key evaluation criteria and the key design elements.</p> <p>J. Diceman noted that the public will be most interested in the design concepts moving forward, and the Project Team should plan to receive comments relating to the public's preferences in the design.</p> <p>M. MacDonald noted that the public will also be interested in the structure type, as that would have an impact on the aesthetic view of the bridge from Rosedale Valley Road.</p> <p>L. Zappone suggested that Slides 24 and 25 be part of the 'Next Steps', and that the Project Team can plan to have another workshop to discuss the design concepts in detail. K. Jim suggested that that Workshop could be held together with PIC #2. The Preferred Design Alternative will be presented at PIC #2, at which time the Project Team can present the different architectural and landscaping opportunities, on which the public will have opportunities to provide input.</p>	WSP MMM
8.0	Next Steps (Slides 26)	
8.1	No comments on Slide 26.	
9.0	Other Business	
9.1	City to discuss survey questions to be provided with the PIC #1 material.	City/LZ/JD
9.2	T. Joseph to review if there is any data on collisions between cars and pedestrians in the study area on Bloor St. between Sherbourne St and Parliament St.	City/TJ
9.3	M. MacDonald to review Toronto Archive Documents for any relevant information regarding the bridge. MMM to resend information requested by R. Unterman.	City/ WSP MMM
9.4	M. MacDonald confirmed to hold sending the Notice of Study Commencement letter to Ministry of Tourism, Sport and Culture (MTCS) until the Draft CHER and Stage 1 Archaeological Report are available to be included.	WSP MMM
9.5	Project Team Meeting #5 to be rescheduled as a teleconference on September 6, 2:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.	
9.6	August 18 Weekly Call to be rescheduled to 2:00 - 2:30 p.m.	
9.7	August 25 Weekly Call is cancelled.	
9.8	L. Zappone noted that future TAC meetings will be scheduled for 2 hours.	
Meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.		

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.



TECHNICAL AGENCY COMMITTEE #3

JOB TITLE	Glen Road Pedestrian Bridge Class EA Study		
CLIENT	City of Toronto	PROJECT NO.	16M-01410-01
DATE	August 29, 2017	TIME	9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
VENUE	City Hall, East Tower, 21 st Floor Boardroom		
SUBJECT	To review the assessment of alternatives and technically preferred alternative for PIC 2.		
AUTHOR	Jay Goldberg, P.Eng., WSP		
ATTENDEES	Lorna Zappone	City Transportation Services - Project Manager	
	Jason Diceman	City Public Consultation	
	Emily Caldwell	City CP, Community Planning	
	Ragini Dayal	City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services	
	Tabassum Rafique	City Transportation Services - Traffic Planning and ROW Mgmt	
	Nicholas Trevisan	City Ravines and Natural Features Protection	
	Daniel Brent	TRCA	
	Bruna Peloso	TRCA	
	Rob Gillard	TTC	
	Heather Templeton	WSP	
	Katherine Jim	WSP	
	Jay Goldberg	WSP	
	DISTRIBUTION	As above plus:	
Jeffrey Dea		City Transportation Services - Infrastructure Planning	
Sun Wai Lee		City Transportation Bridges & Structures	
Saikat Basak		City Transportation Services - Cycling	
Eddy Lam		City Planning - Transportation Planning	
Roger Browne		City Traffic Management Centre / Traffic Safety	
Jaime Aldana		Toronto Water	
Jeffrey Peck		City Facilities Management	
Shalin Yeboah		City Major Capital Infrastructure Coordination	
Fiona Chapman		City Transportation Services - Public Realm/Ped. Projects	
Mary MacDonald		City Planning - Heritage Preservation Services	
Lara Tarlo		City Planning - Urban Design	
Jamie McEwan		City Planning - Community Planning	
Ann Khan		City Transportation Services - Traffic Operations	
Lukasz Pawlowski		City Transportation Services	
Alex Shevchuk		City Parks, Forestry & Recreation & Capital Projects/Plan. Design	

ITEMS	ACTION
<p>1.0 STUDY UPDATE</p>	
<p>1.1 Lorna Z. provided a study update noting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – This EA study was initiated in early 2016 to address the deteriorating condition of the bridge. – The pedestrian tunnel was added to the scope of the study based on consultation with the public, to address security in and surrounding the tunnel. – PIC 1 was held in September 2016 and recommended replacing the bridge in the same location, and will also consider the needs and potential improvement of the tunnel. – Since PIC 1, the Project Team has assessed the bridge type alternatives and tunnel solutions and widening alternatives. – The Technically Preferred Alternative has been presented to the City’s Design Review Panel (July 2017), who generally accepted the preferred design. – PIC 2 is scheduled for October 2017 to present the Technically Preferred Alternative for the bridge and tunnel design to the public. The Environmental Study Report is planned to be filed by end of 2017. 	
<p>2.0 REVIEW RECOMMENDED PLAN AND PIC #2 DISPLAYS</p>	
<p>2.1 WSP provided the latest version of the draft PIC 2 displays and reviewed the project background information and consultations, the EA process and study status, a recap of the bridge alternative solutions and assessment from PIC 1, the tunnel alternative solutions and assessment, summarize the bridge and tunnel design alternatives and assessments, the Technically Preferred Alternative, and next steps.</p> <p>2.2 A summary of the key comments are noted as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Note more clearly that rehabilitation of the bridge can only be a temporary solution; suggest to add figure of bridge corrosion. ii. City noted that there is someone who has claimed to be in the family of the original bridge’s architect, who may have additional information on the heritage value of the bridge. The City (Jason Diceman) has the contact information. WSP to review with Heritage Specialist Richard Unterman. iii. TTC noted that as the tunnel is located on top of the TTC Sherbourne Station, there will need to be a technical review by TTC to ensure loading capacities etc. City/WSP to review tunnel location in relation to the TTC subway. TTC will provide contact information. iv. TTC noted that the space in front of the TTC Sherbourne Station Entrance and the tunnel could be enhanced with urban design features. v. TRCA noted that they understand the potential impacts to the natural features in the valley. These are considered, however, to be acceptable under the current conditions and requirement to replace the bridge. vi. City-RNFP noted that a Tree Preservation Report should be undertaken due to the potential impacts to trees in the valley during construction. vii. WSP to update capital costs of bridge in the detailed assessment table. viii. City-Community Planning to provide comments on the illumination strategy based on the Bird-Friendly Guidelines. ix. TTC inquired if an additional rendering could be made to highlight the TTC entrance. WSP to review. 	

MEETING NOTES

ITEMS

ACTION

ITEMS	ACTION
3.0 NEXT STEPS	
3.1 WSP to revise PIC displays based on comments received.	
4.0 NEXT MILESTONES FOR 2017	
4.1 PIC #2 – October 2017 (tentatively October 24, 2017)	
4.2 Toronto Preservation Board – October 2017	
4.3 Review ESR and Technical Memos – October/November 2017	
4.4 Finalize ESR – November/December 2017	
4.5 Review Functional Design – December 2017	

These minutes are considered to be accurate recording of all items discussed. Written notice of discrepancies, errors or omission must be given within seven (7) days, otherwise the minutes will be accepted as written.