
From: Dina Graser [/O=GOTRANSIT/OU=POSTOFFICE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DINA.GRASER]
Sent: 10/23/2012 10:17:30 PM
To: TomA@metrolinx.com [toma@metrolinx.com]
Subject: Re: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

Funny, I didn't see your feet hit the ground... ;-) maybe a little "over to you, alfonse" addendum?

From: Tom Aylward-Nally
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 06:15 PM
To: Dina Graser
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

I thought that constituted an principled dismount. ☺

From: Dina Graser
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 6:15 PM
To: Tom Aylward-Nally
Subject: Re: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

Climb down now my friend. You've made your points and we should leave it be. Many other more important things on the go.

From: Tom Aylward-Nally
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 06:12 PM
To: Robert Pasiak; Trina Melatti; Dina Graser
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

My opinion is that we cover off abstract claims to community benefits/efficiency/safety in the preamble para, and that the bullets should serve as specific elaborations of how we're accomplishing that --- a proof point by definition is granular. I think it just comes down a matter of preference on what works as better communication tactic, and we may just have different tastes... for me, better to describe the **what** that makes roads more efficient in plain language rather than repeat the abstract claim that we're improving efficiency, but I recognize that other people are more convinced by staying high-level.

Agree that more detail is coming in the boards, just thought the ad was a nice opportunity to punchily make the case with a block of text that we can repurpose for KMs etc.

From: Robert Pasiak
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 5:21 PM
To: Tom Aylward-Nally; Trina Melatti; Dina Graser
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

Who said anything about refusing to talk about this, that or the other? Read again -- "getting more granular at the PIC itself".

This is a newspaper ad. Can't list all of the benefits in it. Extending the Waterfront Trail is also an important benefit that brings with it major safety improvements.

From: Tom Aylward-Nally
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 5:12 PM
To: Robert Pasiak; Trina Melatti; Dina Graser
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

Yes, but like I said, the ship has sailed. It says four lanes and sidewalk right in the Operations Committee deck. It says four lanes and a sidewalk right in the Whitby staff report. Absolutely nobody from RCI had a problem with that strategically, and Garnet enthusiastically said we needed to share more about the South Blair benefits at our meeting in the library, so I don't know what's the origin of this sudden cold feet on sharing an obvious benefit of the project that we've already shared.

Even if we could un-say that, we'd need to put ***something*** on the boards we will be presenting at the PIC. Refusing to say how wide the road there will be is not an option. We're going to say four lanes there, so let's say it everywhere.

In the highly unlikely event the deal with the Town goes 100% off the rails, delaying ERMF by x years and forcing us to throw out the underpass design and go via the CTA to bill them back for 15% of the cost, the last thing we're going to have to worry about is explaining five years from now why the final underpass doesn't match what was the proposal back in 2012.

To your second point, in my opinion "improve the safety and efficiency of pedestrian and vehicular traffic flow on South Blair Street" is too technical and vague. "Efficiency of flow" isn't a really compelling proof point, but everyone gets what a wider road is. And safety is an important enough benefit it should stand alone.

From: Robert Pasiak
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 4:51 PM
To: Tom Aylward-Nally; Trina Melatti; Dina Graser
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

Tom,

Of course, that scenario is not what we are hoping for but if we don't get the Town's approval then we will have to ask them to fund anything over and above our needs - which they will almost certainly not be in a position to do. But that option may have to be tabled and discussed down the road.

As for sharing the benefit with the public, nobody said anything about not doing it. One of the objectives of the ad was to be concise and getting more granular at the PIC itself. I think that 'improve the safety and efficiency of pedestrian and vehicular traffic flow on South Blair Street' captures it sufficiently for the purpose of the ad.

Robert
From: Tom Aylward-Nally
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 4:38 PM
To: Robert Pasiak; Trina Melatti; Dina Graser
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

Robert,

Johnny just confirmed with that we're at 50% design and the structure's going to be four lanes, no going back on that front. We've already told the town via a deck that this will be a four lane structure. Our materials at the open house are going to have to show something ... we can't very well not show pictures of the design or claim amnesia as to what it we've already presented a few weeks ago.

That ship already sailed, and it's a benefit we need to share with the public.

In the unlikely event that we descend into acrimony with the town and the whole project needs to be thrown out and redesigned, delaying everything several years, yes I imagine the widening might be back up for negotiation, but we're not writing a presentation for that eventuality.

T

From: Robert Pasiak
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 4:32 PM
To: Trina Melatti; Dina Graser; Tom Aylward-Nally
Subject: Re: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

And speaking of sidewalks, if the town does not approve the traffic detour we will grade separate while keeping the traffic on south blair moving. It will take longer and the infrastructure will only serve our needs, so two lanes for vehicular traffic only (not four) and no sidewalks.

Robert Pasiak
Communications Specialist
Infrastructure Projects
GO Transit - A Division of Metrolinx
416.869.3600 ext. 5350
robert.pasiak@gotransit.com

From: Trina Melatti
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 04:16 PM
To: Dina Graser; Tom Aylward-Nally; Robert Pasiak
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

Can you advise which specifically you'd like to see? Which ones are the most important for you to see in the content? There are some I feel bind us in a way I would prefer to leave open to discussion at the PIC – i.e. the sidewalk, etc.

Please prioritize your must haves, nice to haves, etc....and Robert can determine which to accept. If we're in a place where the facts are correct, that is my most important priority given the tight timelines we're trying to meet.

Thanks,
Trina

From: Dina Graser
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 4:14 PM

To: Trina Melatti; Tom Aylward-Nally; Robert Pasiak
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

Not sure the facts are in dispute, are they? More a choice of how we present them. Tom's earlier draft had some positioning statements I thought were good, putting benefits more squarely up front. Can we take some of those on board please?

From: Trina Melatti
Sent: October 23, 2012 4:10 PM
To: Dina Graser; Tom Aylward-Nally; Robert Pasiak
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

It's not final...I asked Tom to give it a once over fact check.

From: Dina Graser
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 4:07 PM
To: Tom Aylward-Nally; Robert Pasiak
Cc: Trina Melatti
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

Can I please see the final

From: Tom Aylward-Nally
Sent: October 22, 2012 6:11 PM
To: Robert Pasiak
Cc: Dina Graser; Garnet Greatrix; Johnny Lee; Trina Melatti
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

Hey Robert,

My edits on top of Trina's and Dina's.

Tom

From: Trina Melatti
Sent: Monday, October 22, 2012 12:55 PM
To: Dina Graser; Robert Pasiak; Garnet Greatrix; Johnny Lee
Subject: RE: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

Robert,

My edits on top of Dina's to make it easier.

Thanks,
Trina

From: Dina Graser
Sent: Monday, October 22, 2012 11:21 AM

To: Robert Pasiak; Trina Melatti; Garnet Greatrix; Johnny Lee

Subject: newspapernotice_southblair_PIC

My suggestions.

I think this is all a bit text-heavy – if there is a way to shorten it that would be good.

I want to leave a little wiggle room at the PIC, as discussed, to show that alternatives on the detour were considered which is why I added the word “likely” but people can push back on me there if you think that’s not a good idea.

Tx

d