

# Minutes of Meeting

Date of Meeting	March 7, 2018	Start Time	5:30 p.m.	Project Number	60552177
Project Name	Eglinton West LRT				
Location	Etobicoke Civic Centre, Meeting Room 3, 399 The West Mall, Etobicoke				
Regarding	Eglinton West LRT Community Working Group #1				
Attendees	CWG Members, City of Toronto, AECOM, Metrolinx, TTC, Councillor Representatives				
Distribution	CWG Members				
Minutes Prepared By	Tiffany Dionne, AECOM				

## 1. Overview

On Wednesday, March 7, 2018, from 5:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m., the City of Toronto, along with their partners Metrolinx and the TTC, hosted a Community Working Group (CWG) meeting for the Eglinton West LRT. The purpose of the CWG is to gather local community input and engage local residents, businesses and stakeholders on the Eglinton West LRT technical planning, design work, and evaluation process.

The objectives of this meeting were to:

- Meet the CWG Members and other CWG meeting participants;
- Review the draft CWG Terms of Reference (ToR), draft the Code of Conduct, and review and confirm roles and responsibilities;
- Review the Project history;
- Identify issues and concern related to the Project;
- Identify potential meeting topics; and,
- Appoint the CWG Chair.

The format of the meeting included a presentation with question and answer (Q&A) sessions throughout, followed by a workshop and brainstorming activity, and vote for CWG Chair. The minutes below outline the questions, comments and feedback received during the CWG meeting.

## 2. Attending

CWG Member Name		Absent
James Chapman	John DiSalvo	Mike Mattos
Joseph Lorincz	Steven Tufts	Philip Poulos
Martin Green	Margareta Shpir	
Don Charles	Christopher Solecki	
Jurij Fedyk	Frank Pallotta	
Laila Strazds	Janice Charles	

## Minutes of Meeting

Also in attendance were:

<b>Project Team Members</b>	
Mike Logan – City of Toronto	Becca Nagorsky – Metrolinx
Maria Doyle – City of Toronto	Kaya Sabag – Metrolinx
Jade Hoskins – City of Toronto	Scott Haskill – TTC
Diana Chu – City of Toronto	Eric Chu – TTC
<b>Councillors and Councillor Representatives</b>	
Dion Angelini, Council Assistant to Ward 3 Councillor Stephen Holyday	Stephanie DiNucci, Administrative Assistant to Ward 2 Councillor Michael Ford
Katie Andrachuk, Constituency & Policy Advisor to Ward 4 Councillor John Campbell	
<b>AECOM (Facilitators)</b>	
Alicia Evans	Tiffany Dionne
<b>Invited Guests/Presenters</b>	
N/A	N/A

### 3. Introduction

A short welcome was given by the Eglinton West LRT project manager, Maria Doyle. This included a brief statement that the CWG will be a forum for staff to discuss any topics or ideas related to the Eglinton West LRT that may help staff in understanding potential additional local community needs and concerns to be considered in the decision-making process. However, it would not be a political forum, and will not change past council, provincial or board decisions, in addition to not changing past technical or planning analysis.

Alicia Evans (AECOM) opened the meeting, introduced herself as the facilitator, provided an overview of the agenda and invited all attendees to introduce themselves by providing their name, the ward in which they live and/ or work, something about themselves and the group(s) they may represent and their objectives for the CWG.

The following objectives for the CWG were captured from this introduction and discussion:

- To develop a work plan;
- To ensure the voice of Etobicoke residents is heard;
- To ensure Etobicoke neighbourhoods are represented appropriately;
- To build a world class transit system that meets the needs of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) but also respects the needs of those who travel locally;
- To build a world class transit system that meets the needs of all individuals and groups (i.e., drivers, pedestrians, cyclists, transit users);
- To build the correct transit system the first time around (i.e. reflects long-term transit needs of the City and Region);

## Minutes of Meeting

- To have objective decisions emerge from the CWG discussions, rather than political decisions;
- To improve sustainable transit in Toronto;
- To ensure any extension of the Eglinton West LRT (i.e., beyond Renforth Station) is worker friendly (i.e., airport workers) and not completed in a way to appease the airport only;
- To review the logistics of the transit system, including scheduling and geographical routes;
- To educate community members and provide data regarding the growing airport and planned Regional Transit Centre (RTC); and,
- To see a more effective transit solution that enhances the Eglinton corridor which links to Highways 401, 427, 27 and to Mississauga and the airport.

### 3.1 Questions & Answers

Q1: Why is the CWG restricted to providing input on technical planning and design work? My main concern relates to the Business Case that would justify the option of tunneling underground and how we do this.

A1: The technical planning and design are inputs to the Business Case and therefore the Business Case Analysis can be discussed at CWG meetings.

## 4. Terms of Reference

CWG Members reviewed the draft Terms of Reference. The facilitator asked what the CWG Members needed from others to feel comfortable participating, to form the CWG Code of Conduct. The following answers were provided:

- One speaker at a time;
- Willingness to listen without bias/ without discounting differing opinions;
- Willingness to share information;
- Be respectful of others' ideas; and,
- When offering comments, ensure they are constructive.

The roles and responsibilities of all CWG participants were reviewed. CWG Members identified the following additional responsibilities to include in the Terms of Reference:

For CWG Members:

- Review any reports that come out of the CWG; and,
- Bring forward information from member networks.

Other comments that were provided by the CWG Members during this discussion include:

- The City Staff should clearly identify how the CWG recommendations will be reported back to Council;
- City staff should prepare a document to explain the decision making process and the relationship between the CWG, SAG, TAC and Council; and,
- Change the language in the roles and responsibilities of the CWG members to say 'encouraged' or 'invited' to share information rather than phrasing it as an obligation or shared responsibility.

## Minutes of Meeting

The CWG Members were asked to identify any groups/ individuals that are missing from the CWG.

- Members agreed that there was a lack of gender parity, no persons of colour, and that more women should be included in the CWG.

CWG Members were invited to contact their local Councillors if they have suggestions for additions to the CWG.

### *4.1 Questions and Answers*

**Q2:** Are there specifications on confidentiality for the CWG?

**A2:** Any information provided to the CWG can also be made available to the public and therefore is not confidential material. The City will try to be responsive to the CWG members, and make requested materials available if possible or appropriate. The City suggests CWG members share the information discussed at the meetings as they see fit – formally or informally. The City is hopeful that CWG members will spread the message about the Eglinton West LRT, but it is not a requirement. The City is also willing to review any specific communications that you wish to share to your associations, to ensure the message is clear and correct – thus avoiding any miscommunications.

**Q3:** Should it not be the City's responsibility to ensure proper communication is being given to members of the public?

**A3:** The City is working hard to share information with the general public but can only go so far to deliver messages. The CWG members live in the community and have social networks to help share Project information. The City is inviting CWG members to communicate Project discussions, but no one is obligated to share information with others.

**Q4:** Did City Council and Mayor Tory direct staff to develop the CWG? Will the CWG meeting minutes be sent directly to Council?

**A4:** Yes, the CWG was formed as part of Council direction. There are some restrictions on what can be formally sent to Council, so the outcome of the CWG cannot be an official report or recommendation to Council. However, the SAG is a formalized function that exists within the EWLRT, and by way of the SAG, any CWG minutes or meeting summary reports could form part of a report to Council. Local Councillors are welcome to be official observers of the CWG meetings, and as such final meeting minutes will be shared with their offices.

**Q5:** Could the CWG make contributions to the reports that are prepared by City staff? Could prepare a report? Could the CWG could put forward recommendations in their own report?

**A5:** Recommendations and direct contributions to reports to council can only be made by staff. Your feedback as part of this meeting will be heard by staff, and where possible, we will try to incorporate into our work.

If the CWG wishes to develop a report as an output of this process, that is for the group to decide. All CWG minutes and feedback will be provided to SAG members to allow it to be made part of the public record.

**Q6:** Will CWG meeting minutes be altered by the SAG, or just reviewed and channeled?

## Minutes of Meeting

**A6:** The CWG meeting minutes will not be altered after they have been reviewed and finalized by the CWG. The SAG does not have approval authority for the CWG as the SAG was developed as a way to provide the project team with advice and input from stakeholder groups. The CWG reports will be shared with the SAG as information only and as a way to ensure that CWG minutes are part of the public record.

**Q7:** What are the relationships between the CWG, SAG and Council? Could City staff provide CWG members with a document explaining the relationships between the SAG, CWG, TAC, Council and City staff?

**A7:** Yes, staff can develop this document to send to all CWG members. To provide an overview, Council requested that City staff form the CWG. SAG is a formalized community group that was developed at the outset of SmartTrack project with the intention to host detailed conversations with key stakeholders as the project evolved. SAG members come from many parts of the city whereas the CWG members are all local community members that have been endorsed by local Councillors. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is made up of technical experts that include City staff from various divisions such as Toronto Water, Transportation Services, Urban Design, as well as agencies such as Toronto Hydro and TRCA to provide technical input on the planning work being conducted for the Eglinton West LRT. TAC meeting minutes are distributed internally whereas SAG minutes are posted publically.

**Q8:** Why are some SAG members also CWG members?

**A8:** There is some overlap as some of the SAG members are also community members and are part of local resident or rate payers associations and wanted to take part in the CWG. They are able to join both groups as the SAG is more formal with the agenda set by City staff whereas CWG members develop their own agenda, creating a very different experience compared to the SAG. CWG members were nominated by local Councillors.

### 5. Project Overview

Maria Doyle (City of Toronto) presented the history of the Eglinton West LRT. Following the presentation, Alicia (AECOM) asked CWG members if there were any questions for clarification. Members also had an opportunity to ask other questions or identify issues or concerns with the Project.

#### 5.1 Question and Answer (Q&A)

**Q8:** Will the Eglinton West LRT end at Renforth Station/ the busway?

**A8:** The City is working closely with Metrolinx on the Airport Segment of the Eglinton West LRT past Renforth Station as it is seen as one complete route. As part of the original EA, two stops past Renforth Station were confirmed (Silver Dart and Convair), however the route to the airport has not yet been finalized and the stops at the airport itself have yet to be finalized.

**Q9:** Has a planning and design funding commitment been put in place for the airport segment of the Eglinton West LRT?

**A9 (provided by Becca Nagorsky, Metrolinx):** Metrolinx has committed funding for some early planning and design work on the Airport Segment of the Eglinton West LRT. There is not full funding committed for construction of the Airport Segment.

## Minutes of Meeting

**Q10:** Is the Eglinton West LRT travelling through the City of Mississauga after the Martin Grove stop?

**A10:** The boundary of the City of Toronto runs along Eglinton Ave, past Martin Grove, with the north side of Eglinton at Commerce being City of Mississauga and the south side being City of Toronto. The last stop of the Toronto Segment of the Eglinton West LRT is at the Toronto/ Mississauga border at Commerce Blvd. Past Renforth Station, the Airport Segment of the Eglinton West LRT is located almost entirely in Mississauga. (For clarity, a small portion of the alignment would pass through land west of the 427 which is part of the Airport lands, but within the City of Toronto boundary.) The Airport Segment project is being planned under the leadership of Metrolinx, in collaboration with the GTAA, Mississauga, as well as the City of Toronto and TTC.

**Q11:** The Eglinton West LRT will service the west end of Toronto and Mississauga commuters who can link from the Mississauga Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) to City of Toronto transit. This is the same concept as Vaughan transit linking to Toronto transit, with both cities helping to fund the project. Since funding is an issue, why isn't the City of Mississauga helping to fund the Eglinton West LRT?

**A11:** The inter-municipal benefits of this project are a key consideration in capital funding commitment for this project which is why City Council has requested confirmation of funding to planning, design, construction and delivery of the airport segment of this project from the City of Mississauga and the Greater Toronto Airports Authority (GTAA). This request is still outstanding as the City of Toronto has not received confirmation from the City of Mississauga or the GTAA.

**Q12:** Is the Finch LRT shown on the full map? Does the Finch expansion play into discussions regarding the Eglinton West LRT?

**A12:** The map does not include Finch Avenue, and therefore does not show the Finch West LRT line. The Finch LRT is a funded project that is currently being prepared for construction. The concept of the Finch LRT connecting to the Airport and the Eglinton West LRT has been discussed in the media but is not officially being planned at this time.

### 6. Workshop

Jade Hoskins (City of Toronto) introduced the workshop to identify potential topics that would form the work plan for the future CWG meetings. CWG members were first asked to identify their concerns and issues with the project. Using those issues and concerns, they were then asked to identify the topics that should be discussed at future CWG meetings. In table groups, CWG Members were provided with an 'Ideas Sheet' where they could write one idea at the top, with space for comments on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and concerns as well as signatures. These sheets were then placed in idea rating frames. Idea sheets with the same topic were placed together and voted on as one idea. CWG Members had the opportunity to read each of the ideas and use tokens to rate the ideas from one to five – one star holding the least importance, five stars holding the most importance and an exclamation mark for topics they did not understand. Once the voting was complete, the results were revealed. The results are attached in **Appendix 1**.

The top three discussion topics identified were:

1. How was consideration for below-grade stations or tunnelling from Mount Dennis to Martin Grove was determined?

## Minutes of Meeting

2. How the positive and negative impacts to the local community are determined and used in the decision making process?
3. How is the Initial Business Case (IBC) analysis used in the decisions making process and what are the key inputs?

These topics, and all other identified topics as listed in **Appendix 1**, will be incorporated into the work plan for future meetings. The work plan will be reviewed by CWG members.

### **6.1** *Questions & Answers*

**C1:** I would like to feel that in every CWG meeting, there is two-way communication between the City and the CWG members. Our ideas need to be valued and considered. We want to be a part of something that the community feels is the correct form of transit.

**City Response:** Agreed.

**Q13:** What if CWG members identify something that has been studied or the results of a study that may have alternative inputs or better approaches? How will the CWG input be used by the City?

**A13:** City staff are here to listen. Changes cannot always be made to all inputs. For example, in a Business Case Analysis (BCA) there are certain fixed inputs that cannot be modified, but there are some that can. Where there is potential to influence Project outcomes, alternatives or better approaches identified by CWG members will be put forward and considered.

For instance, where we have used public input was in the new enhanced traffic work. The community has a strong voice on the topic of traffic, which has been heard by the City. Typically this traffic work would be undertaken after the project concept is confirmed. However, hearing these concerns, the City has gone back to the original traffic model and worked to enhance it to help provide the community with more complete answers and analysis. When the preliminary modelling work is complete, we are happy to share this with the Group if they would like. This is an example of how we have directly changed our approach through input from the community.

The City cannot change past Council decisions, but there is an opportunity for CWG members to help staff to identify opportunities or provide insight into inputs to the planning process from this stage forward. As the Project progresses and the community has specific concerns (i.e., how is neighbourhood safety captured in the Business Case and what does safety mean?), we can bring these concerns forward immediately and include the input in the Business Case.

**Q14:** Why can't we modify the monetary value-of-time?

**A14:** As we are not the technical experts on Business Cases, we cannot answer this question completely at this time. The expert from Metrolinx would need to be present for an in-depth conversation related to the value-of-time. What we can say, in some cases the inputs are industry standards that have been determined through exhaustive peer-reviewed process and are provided externally, and which we have no direct control over. Conversely, some inputs are provided internally or are developed through the planning process and technical work, and there may be opportunity for community feedback.

## Minutes of Meeting

**C2:** The inputs and formulas used in analysis are often flawed and should be studied further.

**City Response:** We understand your concerns, however, the expert should be in the room for these discussions and the City can ensure they are present for the next CWG meeting to discuss Business Case Analysis.

**C3:** The Business Case is a good place to start. It provides an overview of what is involved to complete the studies for this Project.

**City Response:** Comment noted. With the agreement of the CWG, next meeting will be a discussion on Business Cases and how it fits into the decision making process, with a focus on the 2016 IBC.

### 7. Appointment of CWG Chair

Following the workshop, a vote was held to identify the CWG Chair. CWG members chose to vote silently/ anonymously on post-it notes. Votes were counted by City Staff. Volunteers for CWG Chair included:

- Jurij Fedyk
- Laila Strazds
- James Chapman
- Philip Poulos (not present)

After counting the vote results, Laila Strazds was appointed CWG Chair.

### 8. Meeting Adjournment

The Facilitator thanked all CWG members, Councillor representatives and staff for attending the meeting and noted that the next CWG meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 3, 2018 from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Etobicoke Civic Centre, Room 3.

No further comments or questions were raised.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

The presentation was emailed to CWG members on March 8, 2018.