

Future of the Gardiner Expressway/Lake Shore Boulevard East Reconfiguration EA and Integrated Urban Design Study Stakeholder Advisory Committee - Meeting 15-7

Tuesday, July 21, 2015 | 6:30 – 8:30 pm
Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 310

Meeting Summary

1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction

Ms. Liz Nield, CEO, Lura Consulting, began the seventh Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting by welcoming committee members and thanking them for attending the session. She introduced the facilitation team from Lura Consulting and led a round of introductions. Ms. Nield reviewed the meeting agenda and reminded SAC members that on June 11, 2015 Toronto City Council approved the "hybrid" option as the preferred alternative for the Gardiner East Environmental Assessment (EA). She explained that the purpose of the meeting was to present and obtain input on the high-level design alternatives prepared by the EA team.

Mr. John Livey, Deputy City Manager, City of Toronto, also welcomed SAC members to the meeting. In his remarks, Mr. Livey emphasized the importance of the SAC in helping the project team better understand community issues and stakeholder perspectives. He noted that the high-level design alternatives for the preferred alternative are a work in progress and that input from SAC members will help the EA team refine the options in advance of the report to the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee (PWIC) in the Fall.

Chris Glaisek, Vice President, Waterfront Toronto, also addressed the SAC committee and thanked them for attending the meeting. Mr. Glaisek noted that the project team is focusing on developing a preferred alignment for the hybrid option at Council's direction. As part of the process, the EA team will be drawing on information from technical studies and feedback from stakeholders and the community, as well as exploring public realm and urban design opportunities.

The meeting agenda is attached as Appendix A, while a list of attending SAC members can be found in Appendix B.

2. SAC Member Briefing

Don McKinnon, Project Manager, Dillon Consulting, presented a summary of the work completed to date in the current EA phase and an overview of the high-level design alternatives of the hybrid option, covering the following topics:

- June City Council decision
- Purpose of the meeting
- Design constraints and considerations
- Alternative design options
- Public realm opportunities
- Discussion

3. Facilitated Discussion

The following provides a summary of the recurring themes and ideas discussed by SAC members on the material presented. More detailed accounts of the discussion can be found in Appendix C (Q & A) and Appendix D (notes from breakout sessions on alternative designs). Appendix E includes written comments from SAC members following the meeting.

General Comments

- Consider integrating elements of the “Viaduct” and updated First Gulf design options in the high-level design alternatives prepared by the EA team (i.e., alignment close to the rail corridor, ramp locations).
- Consider a two-lane expressway in each direction without any ramps or connections east of Jarvis Street.
- Lower the height of the Gardiner Expressway, if the rail spur will be removed.
- Evaluate the high-level design alternatives of the hybrid option utilizing the criteria used in earlier phases of the EA.
- Ensure re-development opportunities in the Port Lands are not negatively impacted.
- Study examples from other jurisdictions (e.g., Paris and Ohio).
- Integrate urban design and public realm improvements in the design alternatives (e.g., bridge with architectural significance).

Option 1: Council-Reviewed Hybrid

- Consider the negative impacts of locating the on/off ramps at Cherry Street (e.g., attract traffic, affect the surrounding road network, decrease the value of private and public land).
- Consider the quality and quantity of developable sites; this option decreases opportunities for re-development.
- Consider a no-ramp option.
- Consider opportunities for public realm improvements (e.g., playground under the expressway).

Option 1A: Revised Hybrid with Realigned Ramps

- Consider the physical and psychological impacts of the proposed on/off ramps on opportunities for re-development, access to the waterfront and local viewsheds.
- Consider opportunities for programming, commercial and architectural design to animate the public realm surrounding the elevated expressway.

Option 1B: Revised Hybrid with Westbound On-Ramp Only

- Clarify the rationale for adding the on-ramp; it would negatively impact circulation at the Jarvis Street off-ramp and on Cherry Street, decrease opportunities for re-development and make Villiers Island less desirable.
- Consider including an off-ramp east of the Don Roadway.
- Consider public realm improvements on the water’s edge (e.g., waterfall).
- There was varying opinion regarding access to the water’s edge associated with this option
- Consider the impact of this option on Queens Quay (e.g., alignment and importance in the local street network).

Option 2: Realigned Hybrid with 70km/h Link

- Strongly support the movement of infrastructure away from the Keating Channel, increasing development and public realm opportunities.
- Consider moving the on/off ramps east of Cherry Street or revise the option to remove the on/off ramps.

Option 3: Realigned Hybrid with 60km/h Link

- Identified as the "superior" hybrid option.
- Strongly support the movement of infrastructure away from the Keating Channel in this option, increasing opportunities for re-development and public realm improvements.
- Consider relocating the on/off ramps within the lanes of the Gardiner Expressway.
- Consider the trade-offs of stacking Lake Shore Boulevard beneath the Gardiner Expressway (e.g., noise pollution, efficient use of land, etc.).

Option 4: Rail Flyover with 80km/h Link

- Move the Gardiner Expressway and Lake Shore Boulevard north, closer to the rail corridor.
- Lower the design speed of the Gardiner/DVP connection to bring it closer to the rail corridor.
- Maintain different alignments for Lake Shore Boulevard and the Gardiner Expressway (i.e., do not stack them).
- Consider the visual and physical impact of the height of the elevated expressway to accommodate the rail corridor.
- Consider removing both the on/off ramps from the design and rely on the Jarvis Street ramps to accommodate traffic volumes.
- Consider merging the re-developed Gardiner Expressway with the existing structure west of Cherry Street.

4. Next Steps

Next SAC meeting: September 2015



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

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #7

Tuesday, July 21, 2015

6:30 pm – 8:30 pm

Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Room 310

AGENDA

Meeting Purpose

- On Thursday, June 11, 2015 Toronto City Council approved the "hybrid" option as the preferred alternative for the Gardiner East Environmental Assessment. The project team has developed high-level design alternatives. SAC members will be given an opportunity to review and provide comments on each of the design alternatives as well as on public realm opportunities in a workshop format.

6:30 pm **Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions**

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

6:40 pm **SAC Member Briefing: Project Update and Next Steps**

- Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting

7:00 pm **Discussion**

Thinking about the following components: 1) alignment of infrastructure elements; 2) development opportunities; and 3) public realm, please review each of the initial design alternatives and discuss:

- What do you like about the initial design?
- What, if anything, concerns you, why?
- What refinements, if any, would you like to see explored?
- Constructability and cost considerations

8:00 pm **Report Back**

8:25 pm **Summary/Closing**

8:30 pm **Adjourn**

Appendix B – List of Attendees

SAC Meeting #7 List of Attendees

Beach Triangle Residents' Association
Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association
St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Federation of North Toronto Residents Association / People Plan Toronto
Unionville Ratepayers Association
West Don Lands Committee
South Riverdale Community Health Centre
Transport Action Toronto
Toronto Urban Renewal Network
Urban Land Institute
CodeBlueTO
Civic Action
Toronto District Financial BIA
Corktown Resident & Business Association
Toronto Industry Network

Invited Guests:

Councillor McConnell's Office
Toronto Region Conservation (TRCA)
Castlepoint Numa
First Gulf

Appendix C – Questions and Answers

A summary of the discussion is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**. Please note this is not a verbatim summary.

Q. Could you please clarify the relationship between the work conducted as part of the environmental assessment (EA) process and the work directed by City Council?

A. The high-level design alternatives for the hybrid option are part of the EA process. It is the step in the EA when we refine the design of the preferred alternative before submission to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC). We will likely adopt a two-step approach in terms of reporting to PWIC and City Council to allow for more consultation before submitting the report to the MOECC.

Q. Will any new designs be evaluated against the same criteria matrix used earlier in the EA process?

A. Yes, we intend to use those criteria as the basis for evaluation in this phase of the EA.

Q. [Referring to Option 1B] Is there potential for a shorter eastbound ramp than what is currently there?

A. Yes, and that is the kind of feedback we are looking for in the breakout sessions.

Q. [Referring to Option 2] There are only two lanes for each travel direction – how will this affect traffic?

A. It's the same as today.

Q. The Gardiner Expressway and Lake Shore Boulevard are mostly parallel to each other. Where do they branch off?

A. They branch off at Munition Street.

Q. For Options 2, 3, and 4 what is the timeline for demolition and construction?

A. We have not prepared construction phasing at this point in the process, but it is something that we will be working on in the months ahead.

Q. Have you considered expanding the Don Roadway where it connects with the Don Valley Parkway (DVP) in any of these options? The signalized intersection can be a pinch point at times and may worsen as development plans south of the Keating Channel are implemented.

A. It's certainly something that we can explore as we refine the design alternatives, potentially by adding more lanes.

Q. The perceived blight of the elevated structure could be addressed by raising the rail spur and lowering the Gardiner Expressway alongside Lake Shore Boulevard. Is this feasible?

A. In theory it is possible, but that is an idea that can be further discussed during the breakout sessions. Also, the long-term future of the rail spur is unknown at this time – it may not be needed.

Q. Why has there been no information presented about the tunnel option discussed by Council?

A. The tunnel option was screened out early in the EA process as part of determining the Replace option. The reasons for doing so are documented in the 2014 report to Council.

C. A fifth criterion should be added to the study to ensure that future development proposals, particularly in the East Bayfront community, consider the impact of urban design and development constraints (i.e., do not build a wall of condos).

Q. Is there a real estate development component to this study?

A. Yes, absolutely it is part of evaluating the economic benefits component of the EA work.

Q. [Referring to the “viaduct” option] Could you explain the cross-section?

A. The cross-section depicts the viaduct option fitting within the columns and below the elevated Gardiner Expressway to provide a sense of scale.

Q. Will you be taking into consideration the impact of the conditions on the north side of the Keating Channel (i.e., the expressway alignment) on the south side of the Keating Channel/Villiers Island?

A. Yes, definitely.

C. There are certain elements of the options that were not discussed in the breakout sessions that could be incorporated as the design alternatives are refined. For example, the viaduct option has some interesting features (e.g., bringing the alignment closer to the rail corridor). The way the ramps are considered in the updated First Gulf proposal was also very interesting.

C. If you are looking for a politically viable option that would appeal to Councillors in both downtown and Scarborough ridings, consider a two-lane expressway in each direction without any ramps or connections east of Jarvis Street.

C. The opportunity to lower the height of the Gardiner Expressway, if the rail spur will be removed, would be welcomed.

A. Yes, the expressway does not need to be as high as it is today if there is no railway to accommodate.

Q. How far west will the public realm improvements be considered?

A. Public realm improvements will be considered up to Jarvis Street – we are still working within the scope of the EA.

C. Is it possible for you to circulate the materials from tonight’s meeting so we can share them with our respective organizations?

A. We are still early in the design process. We will be in a better position to release materials in September when they are packaged with the report to PWIC.

Q. When you report to PWIC, will you be including an evaluation of the options in relation to the study goals and criteria?

A. We could do a high level evaluation using the criteria from earlier phases of the EA, but we need to refine the criteria for this phase of EA. The intent is to present the trade-offs of each design alternative to ensure committee members understand the key differences between them.

Q. You mentioned the criteria will be adjusted, can you explain this further?

A. The criteria that were used in the evaluation of alternatives will be used as a starting point to develop the criteria to assess the hybrid options.

Q. Is the report to PWIC in September for informational purposes or to receive further direction?

A. At this point, the report is intended for their information and input, we are not asking for a recommendation. We will also be reporting on other elements directed by Council (e.g., tunnel option, road pricing, etc.).

Q. Why will the design alternatives presented this evening be subject to different criteria than what was used earlier in the EA process?

A. We are at a working at a different level of detail in this step of the EA, compared to earlier phases of the EA. The criteria that we will use to evaluate the hybrid options will be at least as detailed (or even more detailed) than the criteria used to evaluate the alternative options.

Q. Is it possible to do a side-by-side comparison using the existing criteria?

A. Not exactly, as the criteria will change due to the limited variation among the hybrid options. For instance, most of the variation in the options presented this evening is east of Cherry Street, whereas there was considerable variation in the alignments of the alternatives considered in previous phases of the EA.

Q. Will fewer options be presented to PWIC than the four or five presented this evening?

A. Not necessarily, we haven't heard anything to suggest that.

Appendix D – Notes from Facilitated Breakouts

Option 1: Council Reviewed Hybrid

- The location of the on/off ramps at Cherry Street will attract traffic, affect the surrounding road network and negatively impact public and private lands in the precinct.
- Look at the quality and quantity of development; this option has less desirable sites for re-development / decreases opportunities for re-development
- Consider a no-ramp option.
- Consider the impact of tall buildings north of Lake Shore Boulevard on sites to the north.
- Consider the impact of putting a playground under the expressway.
- There is no improvement to the East Bayfront community.
- Clarify how residents will be able to access the new street connection to the Unilever site.
- Lake Shore Boulevard is two-sided for only two blocks.

Option 1A: Revised Hybrid with Realigned Ramps

- The location of the ramps impacts re-development opportunities (e.g., parcels trapped between the ramps).
- The elevated expressway and on/off ramps create a barrier to the waters' edge and affect opportunities to animate it.
- Consider programming, commercial and architectural design (e.g., lighting) opportunities as part of the EA along the edge of the Keating Channel.
- The elevated expressway and on/off ramps will have a negative visual impact on Villiers Island.
- This option removes pressure on Jarvis Street over Option 1A.
- Consider impacts to landowners (i.e., constructability and implementation).
- Consider the area west of Cherry Street in the design alternative.
- Include infrastructure for events when building it.
- A benefit is no overhead structure above Lake Shore Boulevard.
- The new street/intersection that is part of the Unilever site is not ideal.
- This option is similar to the original hybrid.

Option 1B: Revised Hybrid with Westbound On-Ramp Only

- This option would worsen conditions at the Jarvis Street off-ramp.
- Consider including an off-ramp east of the Don Roadway.
- Consider an artistic or architectural design feature at the water's edge (e.g., waterfall).
- Retaining a ramp connection has a negative impact on the water's edge.
- This option increases access to the water's edge, consistent with Lower Don Lands Master Plan.
- Clarify the rationale for adding the on/off ramps.
- This option impacts Lake Shore Boulevard and future re-development opportunities.
- This option will incur a negative impact on Cherry Street and make Villiers Island less desirable.
- This option is better than the original Council approved hybrid, but still negatively impacts the surrounding area.
- Queens Quay will become a much more important main street.
- Queens Quay should have a stronger prominence.
- Queens Quay doesn't have to dip down in this option.

Option 2: Realigned Hybrid with 70km/h Link

- SAC members liked this Option more than Option 1 but less than Option 3 as it moves infrastructure away from the Keating Channel, increasing development and public realm opportunities.
- SAC members expressed concerns about the on/off ramps; some suggested the ramps should be moved further east away from Cherry Street which is the gateway to the Port Lands, while others suggested looking at this option without any on/off ramps.
- Concerns were also expressed that the ramps in this option will bring more traffic to the Keating Channel area.

Option 3: Realigned Hybrid with 60km/h Link

- SAC members repeatedly identified Option 3 as the "superior" Hybrid option as it moves infrastructure away from the Keating Channel creating the greatest amount of developable land while preserving access to the water's edge.
- There was a request to move the on/off ramps inside the Gardiner Expressway lanes, rather than outside them.
- There was varying opinion whether Lake Shore Boulevard should be located beneath or adjacent to the new expressway east of Cherry Street; noise pollution was cited as more of a problem when the roads are stacked on top of one another even though this alignment consumes less land. Implementing a lower design speed was suggested to reduce the effect of noise pollution.
- SAC members expressed concerns about how drivers will adjust to the lower ramp speeds; they recommended slowing down traffic well before the ramps to allow for safe transition to/from the DVP.
- There is a desire to consolidate and move all infrastructure as far north as possible to free up and animate the water's edge.
- SAC members suggested undertaking an economic cost-benefit analysis for this option, along with land value and value uplift calculations, to determine whether the extra capital costs are worthwhile.
- Some SAC members questioned why this slow design speed is being examined when the Remove alternative was not considered viable for the same reason.

Option 4: Rail Flyover with 80km/h Link

- SAC members suggested moving the Gardiner Expressway and Lake Shore Boulevard north, closer to the rail corridor, similar to the independent scheme put forward by the Bedford/Millward/DTAH group.
- SAC members noted that the elevation of the Gardiner Expressway/DVP connection over the railway corridor will have a significant visual and physical impact on the surrounding area, particularly on Corktown Common Park.
- Feedback suggested lowering the design speed of the Gardiner/DVP connection to 60 or 70 km/h.
- Consider removing both the on/off ramps from the design and rely on the Jarvis Street ramps to accommodate traffic volumes.
- Comments noted that Lake Shore Boulevard is better when moved out from under the Gardiner Expressway.
- SAC members advised against merging the redeveloped Gardiner Expressway with the existing structure right at Cherry Street.

- SAC members expressed concerns that the new on/off ramps west of Cherry Street will cause traffic congestion as currently experienced at the Jarvis Street/Lake Shore Boulevard on/off ramps.
- Feedback indicated that the alternative requires heavy infrastructure for a potentially high cost without much benefit.
- SAC members feel there are good parcels for development along the Keating Channel.
- Comments indicate that the design of the on/off ramps in this Option is better than the design in the original Hybrid Option.
- Feedback suggested locating the on/off ramps on the inside of the Gardiner rather than the outside.
- The westbound on-ramp could use the space south of the rail corridor for a cloverleaf ramp design.
- Some SAC members commented that this is the best option but also the most expensive and complex.
- Make the new elevated Gardiner Expressway an iconic piece of infrastructure.

Other comments:

- Ensure that any option selected considers overall impact on potential Villiers Island and Port Lands uses.
- Study examples from other jurisdictions (e.g., Parisian highways are now being converted to pedestrian promenades, Cleveland Ohio Highway I90 Lakeshore Expressway which features an L turn managed by lights and rumble strips).
- Create a signature architecturally pleasing bridge similar to the Prince Edward Viaduct to mitigate the effects of the infrastructure.
- Widening the rail bridge would reduce the costs of flyover options and could improve flood conveyance.

Appendix E – Additional Written Comments from SAC Members

Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association

- A point I tried to make during the table discussions but which didn't get into the reports is that the context for on and off ramps needs some thought. They don't exist in empty space but have an effect on surrounding streets. It wouldn't be acceptable to have them directing traffic through fine-grained local neighbourhoods.
- Could future reports and presentations include estimates of traffic levels over 24 hours as well as during rush hours? It would be valuable for people to know how many vehicles and/or people would be the beneficiaries of whatever the various options would cost.
- Again, please do not leave East Bay Front, i.e. west of Cherry Street, out of consideration. The continued presence of the expressway risks encouraging the sort of development that everyone hates farther west.
- It would be useful to SAC members to receive the report of the meeting ASAP, while the details of the presentations are reasonably fresh in our minds. As well, any material that can be posted for circulation to members of the associations we represent would be very valuable.

Unionville Ratepayers Association

At the Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting on Tuesday, July 21, there was a lot of interest in tightening up the curve between the DVP and the Gardiner – to open up more developable land to the south. The down side is the reduced speed limit on the curve (50 kph posted, 60 kph design), which will require deceleration zone, rumble strips and signs.

As an FYI – there definitely are precedents across the GTHA for even lower speeds connecting two expressways. For example, from the 407 to the 404, at least two of the connectors have 30 kph limits, with no rumble strips. I'm sure other such cases exist. So don't be afraid to push the speed envelope downward on the connector!

CodeBlueTO

It is important that the EA continues to search for solutions that will best satisfy the stated goals of the process:

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

Transportation engineering decisions must be informed by these goals. If these criteria become subservient to the engineering the EA runs the risk of becoming irrelevant and will not have fulfilled its mandate.

All alternatives developed through the EA process must go through the same rigorous review and be compared to the same criteria. The results of this analysis should be clearly presented in every report cycle.

In light of Council direction to examine options for an elevated ramp connection between the Gardiner East and the Don Valley Parkway we would like to emphasize some principles derived from the EA goals. The recommended alternative should:

1. Create a viable Keating Precinct with well-portioned building blocks, access to the Keating channel, and a strong relationship to the Don River mouth.
2. Include a viable Keating Channel north-side promenade.
3. Reinforce Cherry St. as the principal multi-modal transportation entryway into the Port Lands.
4. Improve the trail/open space connections to the Don Greenway (north/south) and Lake Shore Pathway (east/west).
5. Complement the restored Don River Mouth configurations.
6. Improve north-south connections through the study area creating safe, attractive, complete and integrated streets for all modal users.
7. Improve the quality of East Bayfront development sites.
8. Treat the roads in the study area as a network when discussing the movement of vehicles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians.
9. Include project costing that is comprehensive in the analysis of the economic benefit in the study area and adjacent Villiers Island. This analysis should be based on the commercial value of developing the land, potential tax revenues, and jobs created/supported. The direct and indirect revenues for the City as a result of any proposed solution should be included in the present value analysis.

SAC #7 was largely spent reviewing notional concepts for elevated ramp connections between the Gardiner East and the Don Valley Parkway and how they affected developable land in the Keating Precinct. Our concerns related to all of the concepts:

1. The need for additional ramps to connect the Gardiner East with Lakeshore Blvd. has not been demonstrated.
 - The identified peak hour vehicle count westbound on the Gardiner east is 4500. If the Logan ramps are removed, this would be reduced to 2,700. The westbound peak hour traffic on Lakeshore Blvd. is 700. This would increase to 2500 if the Logan ramps are removed. Even if Lakeshore were reduced to two through lanes in the study area it would have plenty of capacity to handle this vehicle load. It was previously reported that 21% of vehicles entering the study area from the north and east travel beyond downtown. Using this statistic, 378 of the additional 1800 travelling westbound on Lakeshore Blvd. would be using the first available ramp onto the Gardiner. In conjunction with the intersection improvements previously noted, the westbound ramp at Jarvis St. should be capable of handling this load without constructing ramps at Cherry St.
2. The role of Lakeshore Blvd. has not been reassessed.
 - If Lakeshore Blvd. is designed primarily as a vehicle conveyance instead of a complete street with viable development on both the north and south sides its design parameters will have to be adjusted. The EA has thus far identified that a total of four lanes in each direction on the combined Gardiner East/Lakeshore Blvd. is sufficient to carry vehicular

traffic at peak hour. If the elevated ramp connection is kept, this would indicate that two through lanes on Lakeshore Blvd. is sufficient.

- If Lakeshore Blvd. is treated as a “collector” for the Gardiner East, its alignment will need to be reconsidered.
 - Queen’s Quay may have to be designed as the main or high street of the East Bayfront and Keating Precincts.
3. None of the options presented contemplates improvement to conditions in the study area to the west of Cherry St. This leaves half of the EA study area with an unfulfilled mandate.
 4. Consolidating all intensive arterial road infrastructure as far north as possible along the railway corridor will yield an option that will more closely meet the goals of the EA.
 5. The role of Cherry St. as a welcoming multi-modal gateway the Port Lands is very important and has not been considered.

None of the alternatives presented adequately addresses the goals of the EA. Particular concerns include:

1. The impact of options 1 a/b/c on the Keating Channel Precinct, the north side of Villiers Island, and Cherry St. is overwhelmingly negative and does not fulfill any of the evaluation criteria.
2. Given the significance of Cherry St. and the Lakeshore/Cherry intersection as a Gateway to the Port Lands and the principal connector to the city core, placing ramps at Cherry St. impairs the quality of that connection by adding infrastructure is not consistent with the goals of the EA nor does it support the goal of extending the City into the Port Lands.
3. The impact of the “Flyover” option 4 on views from Corktown Common needs to be assessed.

We suggest that further study and refinement of the alternatives is needed. Specifically:

1. All alternatives should be presented with a option that removes all Cherry St. ramps.
2. All alternatives must address the study area between Jarvis and Cherry St.
3. Alternative 3 should be designed with the lowest possible connecting ramp speed to minimize its footprint and impact on the vicinity.
4. “Flyover” alternative 4 should contemplate going over the storm water treatment plant. It should also have an additional option at the lowest possible connecting ramp speed to minimize its footprint and impact on the vicinity.
5. The Viaduct and First Gulf proposals should be seriously considered and measured in the same evaluation matrix as the staff generated alternatives.
6. Analysis of travel times should not be limited to vehicles but include transit passengers, bicycles, and pedestrians expected to be travelling through the study area. Projections should be based on realistic expectations of future traffic levels and modal splits not on the pattern of late 20th century habits.