

Input from Workshop #2 & Online Form Responding to the Panel’s Draft Case Statements

OVERVIEW	2
PRIOR/VENABLES (UNDERPASS and OVERPASS).....	3
WILLIAM	7
MALKIN NORTH.....	9
MALKIN CENTRAL.....	11
MALKIN SOUTH.....	12
NATIONAL-GRANT	13
NATIONAL-CHARLES.....	14
NATIONAL-CIVIC FACILITIES	16
GENERAL COMMENTS FOR THE PANEL	17

OVERVIEW

The following is a summary of ideas shared by the public at the April 2, 2019, Flats Arterial Community Panel Public Workshop #2, as well as through an online form for those who were unable to attend.

The Flats Arterial Community Panel cannot verify the accuracy of these statements. We encourage Panelists to consider looking for key concerns and values that underpin each statement.

During the second public workshop, attendees were asked to assess the Panel's draft case statements for each proposed route. Beginning with an overview of the Community Panel process to date, followed by a summary of the case statements, attendees then moved into small table discussions, with each table considering one of the 9 routes and answering this question:

Knowing that the Panel's mandate is to recommend an option that's best for the neighbourhood, city, and region, what does the Panel need to keep in mind in determining whether or not to recommend this route?

Attendees then considered the other route options by reviewing the work of the other tables and adding additional comments, as needed, and concluded with a large group reflection and report back.

The approximate demographic makeup of attendees of the Public Workshop is below. Demographic information was not collected from individuals providing input online.

Gender Identity	Age	What's your connection to the area?
Male: 22	<19: 1	What's your connection to the area?
Female: 24	19-24: 0	I live in the False Creek Flats area: 16
Non-binary: 0	25-34: 7	I work in the False Creek Flats area: 19
Prefer not to say: 0	35-44: 4	I live in another area of Vancouver: 31
	45-54: 9	I work in another area of Vancouver: 19
	55-64: 16	I live outside of Vancouver: 1
	65+: 11	I work outside of Vancouver: 4

PRIOR/VENABLES (UNDERPASS and OVERPASS)

Transportation Performance

- Traffic
 - The “Prior/Venables” in favour rationale fails to mention the most obvious benefit - that it eliminates the railway level crossing and the traffic snarls created by a passing train.
 - Has the City done an extensive study on where traffic and truck traffic will go once viaducts come down? How will truck traffic respond to the changes to street geometry?
 - Will increase traffic volume through a residential neighbourhood instead of diverting to already existing routes through Vancouver that already have traffic and/or have recently been upgraded to handle heavier flow.
 - Shutting down the Georgia viaducts will lead to decreased traffic coming through Prior.
 - What is long-term viability for flow on a narrow road? Is it future-proof?
- Challenge the idea that transit can only travel on arterials.
- Prior is the most direct route and less impact on Clark.
- Prior has the least impact on adjoining neighbourhoods in terms of congestion, e.g. Grandview/Woodlands.
- This street should be kept as is and not be used for the arterial route. It is narrow, heavily trafficked at present and leads to a very slow moving option from raymur to victoria, commercial to hastings or south on commercial. To add more traffic to this route would increase risk to pedestrians, pollution to residents etc. In addition, residents were confirmed this route was not on the agenda for arterial development.
- Conditions already exist; people know what to expect; traffic volumes trending downwards into downtown over the last few decades; predictability for business and hospital
- Existing route with known history and maintains public transit access for residents.
- How will east/west access be accommodated?
- Lack of access to Kiwassa.
- Safety
 - Please keep in mind the road safety audit done on Prior St in I believe 2016, which stated that Prior St is NOT suitable for an arterial roadway, since the street is not wide enough and widening the street just at the overpass does not make Prior St safe. Prior is too narrow to safely accommodate sidewalks & bikes.
 - Get the statistics on current accidents on Prior. How will increased traffic impact this?
- Calm Prior to local traffic with controlled railroad crossing.

Business

- Will destroy FreshPoint food distribution and also the Ice Cream business [Casa de Gelato] - people all over town come there for their ice cream.
- Closing of businesses
- Small business needs easy access and parking.
- From Vernon to Glen, no access for cars without impacting residents

Parks/Climate

- How will this route reduce GHG emissions in pursuit of the COV's climate change mitigation goals?
- Maintains/preserves Strathcona Park and the 2 community gardens (Strathcona Garden and Cottonwood Garden).
- Doesn't require a decision from the Park Board.
- Because Prior is too narrow for an arterial we would lose the northern edge of the park.

Community Livability

- Too close to Downtown Eastside, increased traffic, land/property value, gentrification will impact DTES
- This is one of the least acceptable solutions to the residents of this neighbourhood, (speaking as a resident since 1985), because of park access, health concerns, safety, and noise and air pollution.
- The lives of people living in this area were decimated at the construction of the viaduct, do not revisit historical mistakes.
- Disregards the Hogan's Alley community that was supposed to be restored through this project.
- Safety concerns for families, school children, and seniors (especially those in housing complexes along Prior and on Campbell) crossing the street. Enough people and pets have been killed on Prior—it's not safe!
- The contemporary data on the toxicity of vehicular pollution is not addressed at all.
- Somewhat ironic that there is this incredible concern for safety which is justifying the overpasses, yet when it comes to community safety you include an option that is totally unsafe.
- What is the City going to do about homeless individuals that will come to the area?

Cost & Constructability

- No objections from St. Paul's.
- Simplest; cheapest and the route exists there now.
- Lowest cost allows City to use funds elsewhere. Partners could be willing to fund smaller amount.
- Will the City commit funds to improve Strathcona if this option is chosen?
- Please keep in mind that this option, while the cheapest, is still a significant investment into a bad option.
- Represents further taxpayer funds spent on damaging our neighborhood.
- Railroad companies will veto larger crossings.
- Money saved would allow for upgrades/updates to other infrastructure. eg. Parks, schools, daycare, other streets, affordable housing, land bridge...
- Option most likely to have partners (ie. reduce cost)
- I think cost should not be a factor. This is amortized over many years. Look at the Canada Line as an example.

General Statements on the Prior/Venables Route

- The City report on the removal of the viaducts said there would be little to no increase in traffic on Prior Venables. The City made promises to the Strathcona Residents Association without thinking through/fully evaluating what the impacts would be (in my opinion, as a former Strathcona resident, this was done to appease them for political gain, with the consequences pushed downstream). In the early stakeholder meetings, all the stakeholders came up with the idea of re-evaluating keeping it on Prior.
- This option disproportionately affects one of the city's oldest neighborhoods with a high resident density, that is growing every day. [Further:]
 - Given that the neighbourhood has fought for literally decades for the right to safely access one of the very few green spaces on the east side and was promised that the viaducts being removed would ensure traffic calming in the area, this is not only a violation of the trust the residents put in their city, but will be met with a strong response by residents that will almost guarantee the project will be held up if not eventually cancelled.
 - Prior brings a dramatic increase in noise and vehicle pollution into an area already coping with the negative effects of drug addiction, alcoholism, poverty, homelessness, and petty crime. This is an unfair burden.
 - Lower cost in the short term does not account for the long term health costs for the high number of children and elderly residing here.
 - There seems to be no consideration for the fact that housing along Prior butts right up to the roadway. These residences already suffer from a high incidence of arson, theft, and even cars hitting them due to traffic accidents.
 - This is a real danger to Seniors in this neighbourhood.
 - Finally, Strathcona will be forever doomed as a neighbourhood park. The recklessness of driving on Prior now, the narrow sidewalks on both sides of Prior, and the speed of traffic already makes it underutilized.
- Overpass or Underpass, this option is the best for a number of reasons:
 - The commitment to downgrade Prior was a political promise made by a previous Council in advance of an election. It was not based on any review of the options and cost/benefits.
 - Prior-Venables offers the best traffic management option because it is the only option without a T intersection at Clark Drive. All of the T intersection option will make traffic on Clark Drive a nightmare.
 - There is no need to provide for bicycles on an upgraded Prior Street because there is a major - and well used - cycle route one block north on Union.
 - This option has zero impact on Strathcona Park or the current activities on Malkin or National and considerable significant additional costs to relocate National Yards/Fire Training Site and perhaps private business.
 - This is the least cost option and given the significant additional cost of the other options it should be given way more weight.
 - The case statements expect significant increases in traffic along this corridor. The original proposal and the traffic studies at the time suggested the viaduct traffic would go to 6th Ave, Pender, Hastings and Powell and that only a small amount of traffic would use Prior. Even the last modelling shown by the City indicated less, not more traffic.

Prior/Venables **Overpass-Specific** Statements

- Walkway under an overpass could improve park access
- An overpass would have to be very long which would affect the new seniors' housing highrise now being built.
- For the overpass, an 11 story seniors tower is being built currently right at Prior and Raymur. The overpass could reduce air quality for this vulnerable population and have other impacts.
- Would the overpass present barriers to residents of Strathcona wanting to use Strathcona park? I think this is very important, given the low access to green space in the neighborhood.
- Overpass for La Casa Gelato and other businesses will directly affect business and security, as overpass height provides direct access to roof of buildings and obscures view of businesses.
- The overpass is more difficult for active transportation because it is a steeper grade and requires doing uphill first.

Prior/Venables **Underpass-Specific** Statements

- Is building an underpass really as inexpensive as they estimate?
- Extend the underpass westward, perhaps as far as Hawks Ave, and extend Strathcona Park over top to better connect to the neighbourhoods to the north. This expands (retains park space) and improves connectivity.
- Make the underpass at Prior only 2 lanes! Transit, emergency [should be] priority, single occupancy vehicles not prioritized
- Underpass is more disruptive and negatively impacts local businesses and artists
- How to mitigate flooding in the face of climate change related extreme weather events?
- Can the impact to Strathcona Park be mitigated, for example, by connecting the park to Union over a sunken Raymur-Prior intersection?
- An underpass provides better connection options. The water table here is very high. I think less than 5m below finished grade, based on my memory of grades and inverts for the excavation for the seniors parkade.
- While SLIGHTLY better than the overpass, this route doesn't solve the core problem that Prior is a terrible arterial, and has too many disadvantages to support it as an option.
- I favour an underpass because it partially solves the issue of access to Strathcona Park. It would provide a street level deck from Campbell Ave. to Raymur that will significantly enhance access to the Park. And the existing light at Hawkes provides another option.
- An underpass would be slightly wider than an overpass.
- An underpass reduces the tendency for vehicles to speed downhill into the residential areas along Prior.

WILLIAM

Business

- Reduced Food Security/ increased Costs.
- Produce warehouses will move to suburbs; Increased pollution
- Positive impact on businesses not on route; Saves 15 Charles St businesses
- Keeps the greater majority of Produce Row's businesses in operations
- The produce owners on Malkin would also have difficulties with truck access. It would also destroy a number of businesses on the east side of the park

Transportation Performance

- Impacts on vehicular circulation/ volume in the area (all routes)
- There is no option that leads to a T intersection at Clark Drive that makes any sense as there is no where for the traffic to go. And the closer the intersection is to 1st Avenue, the worse it will be. Clark Drive cannot handle more traffic during rush hour, either northbound or southbound. Traffic restrictions east of Clark Drive will limit access to the light industrial area east of Clark and for residents east of McLean. We will be forced to go to Commercial Drive to get in and out of the neighbourhood. And the Grandview Woodlands plan proposes adding even more people who will have to get in and out.

Parks

- Major deficit of sports facilities already.
- Strathcona Park is 80% of all designated parkland in Strathcona and the DTES. Destroying and degrading this precious scarce green space is unconscionable. The city needs green space not more concrete and substandard replacements.
- The William option has the most environmental drawbacks: it would involve destroying trees that have been a habitat for the neighbourhood eagles for many decades (which are protected by the Province); it would bisect the park and cut off Cottonwood Gardens, making it much less usable for gardeners and destroying more trees in the process.
- Loss of fieldhouse.
- Parks Board would probably reject this option.

Community Livability

- Negative impacts on residents of Atlantic St
- This is the best option. I ride my bike to work this way and it would make this much safer and a better experience from getting between Strathcona up to the central valley greenway.
- Putting a major arterial through a park and flourishing community garden would be a real shame. This option also places the noisy road very close to a number of houses and doesn't seem safe that it's passing right next to the Strathcona park playground.
- Pulling the vehicle traffic from Prior St. and moving it south to the other side of Strathcona Park is of utmost importance to the Strathcona community. The many residents of this neighborhood would benefit greatly from being able to access the park and community gardens that are currently separated from us by a busy roadway.

(William, cont'd)

Artists

- Negative impacts on 1000 Parker Street will impact not just the hundreds of artists that work there but the arts and cultural community city-wide and provincially.
- Impact to 1000 Parker St combined with possible loss of building due to twinned tracks puts the viability of keeping this building alive. Without this artist hub the artist community in Vancouver will be gutted. Would reduce access to artist studios.
- No guarantee Beadie will keep artists after re-zoning. They will undoubtedly redevelop with market rent.

General Statements on William

- Every Flats Arterial alternative maintains the existing conflict between trucks maneuvering on Produce Row, and the diesel pollution of Cottonwood Gardens. My objectives are to maintain the economic viability and jobs of Produce Row, to retain and improve Cottonwood Gardens, to separate trucks along east Produce Row from through traffic, and to provide a renewed, congruent Strathcona Park. [Further:]
 - Both problems are solved if the south plots of the Gardens, closest to Malkin, are moved north. Particularly at the west end, closest to Hawks St., there is room to do so without having to remove mature trees.
 - The Malkin option still would have maneuvering trucks block the arterial. The William option allows trucks coming from Clark to turn south on Raymur, while through traffic continues on William to connect to lower Malkin at Hawks.
 - However, most of the park land loss is regained if Hawks is closed and becomes a bike and pedestrian corridor, instead of a 39 ft. ROW street that is, overwhelmingly, a parking lot. Closing Hawks would join the two pieces of Strathcona Park, and Strathcona Community Gardens. That's a healthier relationship than Strathcona Park has with Malkin, a strip of asphalt dedicated to diesel truck maneuvers.
 - While extending William through Strathcona Park adds vehicles on its south edge, those are vehicles that currently use Prior St. on the park's north edge. So the route change calms Prior, lowers its status to a neighbourhood connector (a key objective of many Strathcona residents) and makes Strathcona Park more accessible to the Strathcona community.
- I think options of 'threading the needle' through the cottonwood trees instead of insisting on a 'great street' solution is the best option here. The potential for dodgy areas for anti-social activities on both sides of the arterial is a concern, due to how vacant this area is after business hours.

MALKIN NORTH

Community Garden

- Green space (i.e. Cottonwood Garden) should not be permitted to be reduced by Malkin North or any route and preservation of green spaces should be enforced for quality of living and environment!
- Underserved communities
 - Cottonwood Garden has an accessible garden — we have wheelchair accessible paths, people who help people with disabilities, raised plots so people with bad backs or people in wheelchairs can Garden as well.
 - Cottonwood Gardens are vitally important to underprivileged youth.
- Drawback: Removal of 123 of the largest trees.
- Four empress trees (Paulownia) in Cottonwood Garden called “the world tree” because they sequester carbon dioxide and oxygen 11 times more than any other tree in the world. One of the most important ways we can fight climate change is to absorb carbon already in the air. We need to plant more empress trees, not cut them down.
- The case statement is unclear. It says “improved access to gardens” but the gardens will be the most impacted by this option (removal of Gardens).
- If this route is chosen it should be a precondition that there be a net increase in green space by making Hawks South into gardens, by greening parts of Prior, an alternate location for the community garden.
- Cottonwood garden is very irreplaceable. Gardeners have built the soil there over 30 years from old tofu from the warehouses and plant clippings. Additionally, the City has a bird friendly design guide line in place for all new development, that recommends, among other things, layered planting (tree, shrub, groundcover) to create bird habitat. Cottonwood is pretty much the only publicly accessible land in Strathcona that has that typology. The other parks are grass and trees. It is the only wild space, in a neighborhood with less than 6% tree cover.
- Still compromises Strathcona Park and community garden and eagle habitat. All Malkin options are too close to Strathcona community and Park and Produce Row.

Business

- Confirm and work with Produce Row to be sure that the service lane is viable, so that they may benefit from the lower congestion and improved maneuvering, access and circulation.
- Any Malkin option would be extremely difficult for produce businesses on Produce Row, would affect truck access and increase traffic congestion for both Produce Row and the new hospital. More importantly, it would put at risk produce distribution for the whole city.
- Unknown impacts on Malkin businesses.
- Charles Street - 15 businesses impacted.

Public Facilities

- St. Paul’s new hospital site has stated in previous panel presentations that they prefer Prior route to Malkin or others for ease of ambulances, site design, etc. Lives may be at stake.

Transportation Performance

- Most direct route.
- #22 has to stay on Venables/Prior this cannot be changed. If need to use the model at False Creek South bus #50 to reduce through traffic. Translink has counts for every bus stop on Venables/Prior.

Malkin North (cont'd)

Community Livability

- Negative impact on residents of Atlantic Street.
- Positive: local. Returns Prior to the community. Unites park to community. Regional: more bike lanes.
- Allows for more walkability and bike lane options, creating a better connection for Strathcona residents to the park.
- Malkin North degrades the health and air quality of all green spaces adjacent to Malkin North and therefore is not acceptable.

MALKIN CENTRAL

Transportation Performance

- This route will pose extreme challenges to fire and ambulance services as they try navigate through the congestion that will be caused by Produce Row traffic (turning trucks etc.)
- Not workable to have commuter traffic mixing with trucks delivering and picking up from Produce Row. Also dangerous once you add cyclists and pedestrians.

Business

- This route will pose severe disruption to the business operations on Produce Row as well as to businesses located on Charles (east of the rail track).
- Keep Produce Row (cannot be decentralized) with Malkin access to the businesses without impact on current traffic.
- This route affects operations of four businesses: Fresh Direct, Discovery Organic, Can Am Produce, Fresh Point.

Community Livability

- This route creates better access to sidewalks, paths, parks.
- This route will have significant negative impact on residents of Atlantic Street.

Parks/Community Gardens

- This route will result in the removal of 59 large trees.
- Leave green space. Irreplaceable ecological system in place here. Think of rising temperature of the earth. Sustain as much green space as possible regardless of cost difference. Critically important.
- When we reviewed this option with the City, it became clear that due to construction damage and over excavation, this would do damage to a good part of the garden on engineering right of way land, including trees that would be destroyed by excavation and grade change within their critical root zone.
- Still compromises Strathcona Park and community garden and eagle habitat. All Malkin options are too close to Strathcona community and Park and produce row.

General Statements on Malkin Central

- This route destroys both part of Cottonwood Gardens and Produce Row businesses and both need to be kept intact to function properly. For Produce Row to keep the synergy of businesses and provide produce citywide from a central location, and for Cottonwood Garden to keep the tree canopy which will offset the increased asphalt.

MALKIN SOUTH

Community Livability

- Negative impacts on the residents of Atlantic St. There will be 2 roads directly in front of their homes.
- This is an opportunity for local residents to have a better way of life and neighbourhood

Business

- Malkin South brings with it real risk that the food hub will break up causing the need for food warehouses outside of the city (raising food prices).
- If Produce Row can reconfigure the site then it is less of an impact.
- Produce Row probably needs a different way of transport and deliveries, but I don't think this can be imposed on them and expect them to be able to survive.

Transportation Performance

- In the future, new mobility will make it easier to serve local communities with transit. This lessens the impact of moving the bus route. If demand is there, bus/transit will be provided.
- Reduced access to transit for elderly and disabled residents.
- The arterial links the Strathcona community to the park, which is important, but at the expense of transit users.

Parks

- Malkin South would still physically impact Cottonwood Gardens with increase traffic, noise, and pollution disturbing the eagle habitat. The community don't know the details, how wide will the South option be, there is still potential for impacts on the gardens.
- Trucking food from outside the city will raise carbon emissions when Vancouver is trying to target reductions. Global warming issues should be considered.

General Statements on Malkin South

- Leave green space. Irreplaceable ecological system in place here. Think of rising temperature of the earth. Sustain as much green space as possible regardless of cost difference. I suppose this is the best option other than National as it keeps green space completely in tact but still not a very beneficial option for the long run on carbon emissions
- Same issues as Malkin North, Malkin Central, and Malkin South. The city needs to consider better alternatives, including the National/Charles route.
- Still compromises Strathcona Park and community garden and eagle habitat. All Malkin options are too close to Strathcona community and Park and produce row.

NATIONAL-GRANT

Cost/Constructability

- Other options are much cheaper. Even National/Charles option (11 tracks).
- Much of the land is already controlled by the City
- Not feasible.
- Expensive and huge span = ugly

Transportation Performance

- How well does this alignment meet the circulation/traffic/pedestrian needs of this area? I.e. too close to 1st Ave, too long, too circuitous, and how well is the 'T' intersection at Clarke understood?
- Congestion due to proximity to 1st ave.
- Apart from the T intersection at Charles any option that involves two 90 turns in this routing east makes no sense. The engineer says this will increase accidents along the route.

Business

- Consider businesses- Grant Street Business Park, as well as future business densification upwards in the area. These local businesses serve local populations, so they cannot just relocate anywhere.

Parks

- Preserves gardens/green space (air quality, enjoyability, community, biodiversity).

Public Facilities

- Fire Department - Practice space can be downgraded and as it is currently utilized by out-of-region fire fighters, which can be moved closer to the outer regions where land is cheaper. Use land to expand garden

General Statements on National-Grant

- Unclear on the best route of National options, but National is the most obvious choice for all routes. It should extend straight down National to avoid safety issues of S curve. The #22 bus route could be diverted to go south on Glen and north on Raymur and continue on prior heading west. Or consider route divergence south on William off of Clark. Green space should remain for all of land north of National including quiet residential area. Traffic in flow/out flow east of Clark must be considered.
- A preferred option over others because it benefits the most people and businesses. Strathcona has lived with the city seeing it as a cheap option for running transit corridors through. It's time the city invested a bit in keeping this neighbourhood - one of the city's most unique and irreplaceable - healthy and flourishing.
- National is better than Malkin because it's further from the park and neighbourhood. The S curve is a little strange, and the overpass is costly crossing so many tracks and coming out next to Terminal. Not the best option.
- Most expensive of all options, least attractive to partners. Most disruptive to more businesses than any other option. Least optimal for traffic dispersal on Clark.

NATIONAL-CHARLES

Cost/Constructability

- Is it buildable if the price tag is so high?
- Funding partners can put pressures or veto this option as Federal Government and CN Rail can say they do not want to fund such a high cost alignment if they can easily get something cheaper (federal does not fund land acquisition)
- The panel needs to know it is not the most expensive to build as the Port will be funding it as well [Table Facilitator Note: others from the table contested this – wouldn't the Port be funding all of them? But it might not be most expensive because it is a shorter span so they thought the cost should be clarified.]
- We should think of the high cost as just as any other negative impact. For example, the William Option could be vetoed by Parks Board.
- Look deeper for transparency particularly when it comes to the National Works Yard. Examples: what do the numbers mean under cost? What about previous comments that were made that National was going to be the route selected?
- Emphasize people's needs over money.
- Drawback #1: doesn't the 14 span bridge apply to the national grant option? Not National Charles, which crosses fewer rail tracks. This affects cost as well.

Community Livability

- We do not know the actual costs but we do know that this alignment has the least impacts for all groups and stakeholders (parks users, gardeners, local businesses, residential community, artist studios).
- This is the preferred option of the SRA!

Public Facilities

- Inconveniencing/moving Works Yard vs inconveniencing/moving gardens, businesses, etc needs to be considered. To my rather ignorant mind, moving Works Yard should be just physical and therefore easier than "destroying a garden" and starting a new one elsewhere.
- Case statement states a drawback is inefficient public services. Please note – all routes impact someone – business or people.
- National Works Yard & Fire training facility displacement is a temporary issue because they will outgrow their facilities anyway.

Transportation Performance

- S-curves are statistically more dangerous and cause more accidents to pedestrians.
- Consider the high volume of trucks for the s-curve.
- Regarding advantage #5 truck traffic: no driveways directly accessing arterial for produce delivery trucks. This would create a safer route. As trucks would turn off arterial (commonly right turn) traffic wouldn't back up onto arterial. Left turning traffic would back up on side streets.
- This option would be very far from transit for at least half of the residents of Strathcona.
- Better for traffic dispersal at Clark.

Business

- One major produce row business will have to move.
- At least 4 businesses would be interrupted and possibly one east of the railway tracks on Charles
- Fewer businesses disrupted than Grant.

National-Charles (cont'd)

Parks, Recreational Spaces, Community Gardens

- We must see anything with negative ecological impacts to be irrational. Please keep green space area north of National intact and without significant disruptions.
- We need something with the least negative impact to urban wildlife

General Statements on National-Charles

- Better access to new hospital, much less harm to the park or Cottonwood Gardens, and much less harm to Produce Row. It would preserve the integrity of Strathcona neighbourhood.
- Yes this is the best option. Fire training facility have said they want to move as they don't have enough space. Keeps Strathcona together and access to the park becomes safe. Artists are not displaced. Preserves Cottonwood Gardens. Easy access to hospital. Would need # 22 bus rerouted or a shuttle bus.
- A more extensive investigation of this option needs to happen. The City has to say what other City plans would be impacted. Obviously, any use of City funds for one project impacts another. Given the need to make the DTES a healthier neighbourhood, and green space and a healthier environment are on the list of things needed, the National options seem to at least give the neighborhood a fighting chance. This area deserves positive investment.
- Best option so far! Keeps arterial off of Strathcona Park and neighbourhood, crosses fewer train tracks, and ends up in the middle of Clark between Terminal and Venables.
- This is the route that creates a healthy beautiful neighbourhood on the east side for present and future generations. It best keeps traffic and pollution always from parkland and residential areas.
- I think that this is the best choice for the neighborhood and city. This route is worth the investment and maintains as many important community spaces as possible.
- Panelists should also know that the City has been playing residents off against each other around the Prior and William options for years, and not too subtly. In fact I don't think it's too cynical to say that the addition of the Prior street options at the last minute is a ploy to push residents who support the park and gardens but are extremely concerned about the safety of the local residents first and foremost into, into very reluctantly accepting this route despite basic opposition to it. **THIS IS WHY THE COMMUNITY WORKED FOR YEARS TO DEVISE THE NATIONAL/CHARLES OPTION THAT THE CITY HAS CHOSEN TO IGNORE IN THIS PROCESS!** It cannot be expressed enough the bad faith demonstrated by the City in this process. The impact on 1000 Parker, especially given the already massive loss of artist studio space in this area due to poor planning by the City, cannot be underestimated. Arts ARE an industry here, one which the City seems to rarely include in its calculations.

NATIONAL-CIVIC FACILITIES

Cost/Constructability

- City estimates are inflated for this route - Not as much impact/cost as estimated. City needs to cost National properly. Estimates only so looks more expensive than it may be if we had the full information. Fire Training impacts are inflated based on the high cost of land in Vancouver.
- Port Metro Vancouver and rail company BNSF are the main beneficiaries and they should pay. This route is eligible for partners funding. Port expansion and extending rail time /no interruptions are the motivations. This route is not the most expensive. It is only expensive if rail and port don't pay for the direct benefits to them.
- Expensive and huge overpass span. Crosses too many rail lines.

Community Livability

- Least impact to local community (residents, artists and businesses).
- The east-end deserves a route (National - civic facilities) that least impacts the community, businesses, environment and road safety. No matter what the cost.

Parks, Recreational Spaces, Community Gardens

- Saves the sports fields.
- Maintains Strathcona Park and community gardens.

Public Facilities

- City of Vancouver has to acknowledge that they built along National, knowing that the Port would expand.
- National Civic route - National Work Yard + Fire Training Facility + hospital can stay. They're only temporarily disrupted when the road is being built.

Transportation Performance

- This is the straighter option (no S-curve) so quicker access to the hospital for neighbourhoods east of Clark.

General Statements on National-Civic Facilities

- What else could we spend this money on other than auto-oriented infrastructure? Climate change adaptation will require significant investment in infrastructure, is it wise to spend our precious public dollars like we're still in the 1950s?
- There are many benefits to this route. I understand it is more expensive but that should not be the deciding factor when the alternatives mean bad health outcomes for neighbourhoods, loss of green space and mature habitat on the east side, potential decay of a historic neighborhood - one which will see a huge increase in population due to the need for housing health care workers.
- National is better than Malkin because it's further from the park and neighbourhood. The S curve is a little strange, and the overpass is costly crossing so many tracks and coming out next to Terminal.
- This option ought to be dropped from consideration. The Panel has to accept that displacing National Yards, the VFRS Training site, potentially the VSB facility on Clark and perhaps some private businesses does not make sense from a financial perspective. And the T intersection at Clark is problematic.

GENERAL COMMENTS FOR THE PANEL

Long-Term Vision and Cohesion in Planning

- Need a vision: What is it going to look like in 5yr, 10yr, 25yr, 50yr and even 100yrs?
- Big picture City planning is missing. City of Van has no overall view showing how these fragmented plans as approved by City, fit together. Makes it almost impossible for Panel to deal with this small portion of what was in the 2012 downtown plan. Integrate all plans so that we know what is happening around this project boundary.
- Is there a general plan for Flats area? A big picture city landscape design for this area would be good (5 to 10 years plan), especially for the arterial route through St. Paul section.
- Any route through gardens / parks will not jive with COV 'greenest city' claims.
- Indigenous lifestyle / way of life should be acknowledged and improved through the arterial road; make a statement that this is happening on unceded Indian Land.
- Involvement with First Nations Government Community is traditionally delayed to presenting recommendations GOV to GOV without asking FIRST - This process is disrespectful!

Evaluating Options

- The devil is in the details. Not enough solid facts of what each option will look like. So many uncertain variables not yet answered...can Panel be permitted more time to research?
- Lack of clarity around access to and from this route eastbound and westbound from Main St. and Clark Dr. respectively.
- Positives and negatives should be compared in a grid format (have the main routes along the top – Malkin, National, Prior, William; have key factors on the left – businesses, gardens, cost, safety). It needs to be easy to compare routes across different factors, not just the cost factor.
- I haven't heard any benefits - want more green space and more wild space. Community space and buy property to build more parks.
- Case statements of National-Civic and National-Grant are very similar. Make distinctions clearer.

Transportation Performance

- Upgrade truck route to Malkin.
- Need grade separation along whole railway line from Terminal to Venables. Overpass or underpass or a complete tunnel. If one of the non-Prior options are chosen you still need grade separation at Venables/Prior.
- I think these options succeed or fail on the basis of keeping Prior/Venables open for bus travel, as the proximity to other arterials and the distance from Hastings makes it not a good solution from a bus, public transit perspective.

Cost

- Don't be bullied by the city saying an option costs too much. Much money spent on west-wide of Vancouver, no penny pinching on Eastside. Fed project so have Fed money pay costs.
- COV needs to acknowledge they expanded on National and it was a mistake. Cost is not an issue.
- I think the reduced cost and options of cash for community amenities in the Prior or William's option make them better options.

General Comments (cont'd)

No Arterial

- No arterial option should be an option. Divert traffic from viaducts section to Terminal and North to Powell and keep everything else where it is.
- Road diets: Traffic is elastic and we should help it disappear. Reduce GHG emissions and build a car free future.
- Terminal Ave not at capacity, put the arterial there. No residences (pollution traffic). Would provide greater area without major traffic (quiet zone). Better for wildlife habitat / garden. Small overpass at Prior for local traffic.
- Large quiet zone between Terminal and Hastings is great! Buses could be small shuttles for residents.
- No arterial route at all - no traffic. Only emergency vehicles, public transit, bikes, pedestrians.

National Variations

- National Straight: More direct + easier; City of Vancouver said National is not workable, but with viaducts replaced with a grid of streets, there are options (not all traffic has to make this connection); Main through National-Station should be considered for not having an S-curve.
- Civic-Charles needs study - Mitigates problem of proximity to 1st Ave. and should be cheaper
- Consider inflow/outflow of traffic in and out of city: 12th, 16th, Broadway. Use National or Terminal.

General Statements

- Keep the viaduct or rebuild it earthquake proof.