

Minutes of Meeting

Date of Meeting	April 3rd, 2018	Start Time	6:00 p.m.
Project Name	Eglinton West LRT		
Location	Etobicoke Civic Centre, Meeting Room 3, 399 The West Mall, Etobicoke		
Regarding	Eglinton West LRT Community Working Group #2		
Attendees	City of Toronto, AECOM, Metrolinx, TTC, Council, CWG Members		
Distribution	CWG Members		
Minutes Prepared By	Lolia Pokima, AECOM		

1. Overview

On Tuesday, April 3rd, 2018, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., the City of Toronto, along with their partners Metrolinx and the TTC hosted the second Community Working Group (CWG) meeting for the Eglinton West LRT.

The objectives of this meeting were to:

- Review and discuss:
 - the planning and decision-making process;
 - the business case analysis framework and the 2016 Initial Business Case; and
 - the proposed CWG work plan.
- Identify the long list of design options that will be reviewed through the subsequent CWG meetings

The format of the meeting included three presentations with question and answers (Q&A) sessions throughout, followed by a workshop on design options. The minutes below outline the questions, comments and feedback received during the CWG meeting.

2. Attending

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

Minutes of Meeting

Also in attendance were:

Project Team Members	
Mike Logan – City of Toronto	Becca Nagorsky – Metrolinx
Maria Doyle – City of Toronto	Kaya Sabag – Metrolinx
Jade Hoskins – City of Toronto	Scott Haskill – TTC
Brian Anders – City of Toronto	
Councillors and Councillor Representatives	
Dion Angelini, Council Assistant to Ward 3 Councillor Stephen Holyday	Stephanie DiNucci, Administrative Assistant to Ward 2 Councillor Michael Ford
AECOM (Facilitators)	
Alicia Evans	Lolia Pokima
Invited Guests/Presenters	
Matt Routley - Metrolinx	

3. Introduction

Alicia Evans (AECOM) opened the meeting, introduced herself as the facilitator, provided an overview of the agenda and invited all CWG members to re-introduce themselves.

3.1 Questions & Answers

Q1: Why is the CWG doing a workshop on potential alignments at this point?

A1: At today’s workshop, CWG members will create a long list of design options that will be carried through each of the subsequent meetings as the City explains different decision-making components such as the community benefits and cost. At the final CWG meeting, the group will go through a workshop where they will break down the long list of options into a short list of one or two recommended design options for the Eglinton West Rapid Transit line that the City will carry forward for further analysis. The objective is to identify what CWG members believe after this whole process should be studied further.

Q2: Will the design options CWG members create be limited to what has been examined up to this point?

A2: No, the design options CWG members create will not be limited to what has currently been examined. CWG members have full control of the list and determining what rapid transit option for Eglinton West they wish to explore in this process, so long as it connects Mt. Dennis and Mississauga Airport Corporate Centre, which is the objective of the project.

Minutes of Meeting

3.2 Approval of Meeting Minutes and CWG Terms of Reference

CWG members confirmed they received the minutes from the previous meeting and had no comments, questions and concerns about those minutes. The group unanimously agreed to consider the minutes final.

CWG members also confirmed they had received the Terms of Reference from the previous meeting. The Facilitator Alicia Evans (AECOM) acknowledged the submission of questions in regards to the code of conduct on the protocol expected when CWG members do not understand or believe information received is inaccurate as well as commenting through facilitators. CWG members were advised to raise their hands and alert the moderator to their concerns. The group unanimously agreed to consider the Terms of Reference final.

4. Planning and Decision Making Process

Maria Doyle (City of Toronto) presented the planning and decision-making process and explained how CWG member's input informs decision-making. The technical team was introduced with a brief description of their role in the project. Following the presentation, Alicia Evans (AECOM) asked CWG members if there were any questions for clarification.

4.1 Questions and Answers

Q3: Is there a timeline the Project team is working within in regards to reporting back to City Council?

A3: Council's direction was for the project team to work with the community and create the Community Working Group (CWG) to further define tunnelling and other design options. The timeline to report back is not fixed, but we anticipate reporting back on concept refinement early next year.

Q4: What studies are currently underway for the LRT?

A4: The City of Toronto is currently undertaking a traffic and transportation study of the Martin Grove and Eglinton area to see how traffic currently moves and identify solutions to improve traffic in the area. The City is also working on an enhanced traffic model and is focused on expanding on the original model and developing more networks. The City has recently engaged a consultant on the land use and streetscaping planning study and work should begin shortly. In addition, Metrolinx is conducting a feasibility study for the Airport segment (the alignment to the Airport was not fully defined in the 2010 environmental assessment for the Eglinton Crosstown LRT). Metrolinx is working closely with GTAA, the City of Toronto, and the City of Mississauga to determine a preferred route of the LRT into the Airport.

Q5: Is funding for the different phases of the planning process approved by Council?

A5: Funding for Phases 1 and 2 of the planning process has been approved and is in place. The City has also approved, in principle, to pay for Phases 3 and 4, Construction and Maintenance, however there is no funding allocated at this time. Final approval for Phase 3 and 4 is subject to further City Council approval. Funding and finance will be further addressed at following CWG meetings.

Minutes of Meeting

5. Business Case Presentation

Matt Routley (Metrolinx) provided a general overview of the Metrolinx Business Case Framework. Becca Nagorsky (Metrolinx) reviewed the 2016 Initial Business Case for Enhanced Rapid Transit along Eglinton West. CWG members were given an opportunity to ask the presenters questions and clarify issues or concerns regarding the Business Case Framework and 2016 Initial Business Case. General questions on Metrolinx Business Case Framework were directed to Matt Routley and more specific questions on the 2016 Initial Business Case were directed to Becca Nagorsky.

5.1 Question and Answer (Q&A)

Q6: To ensure the Business Case for a proposed project is viable, will it be compared to the existing transportation network?

A6: Yes it will. Metrolinx analyses the Business Case for a proposed project compared to business as usual (also known as a base case). This reflects the local and regional conditions that would exist in the future if the project was not undertaken.

Q7: Was Metrolinx asked to do a Business Case on a tunnel from Scarlett to Martin Grove?

A7: The 2016 Initial Business Case considered a tunnelled option. Outcomes of the Initial Business Case analysis indicated that it was not the preferred option.

Q8: Where are the goals and objectives that the design options are weighed against outlined?

A8: The goals and objectives of any Metrolinx project relate back to the goals and objectives outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). (See Q24 for more detail)

Q11: What is the process for reviewing and providing feedback on a Business Case?

A11: The specific process depends on the project in question. Currently, Metrolinx is accepting feedback on its Business Case Framework –members of the public can submit feedback or questions on the draft Business Case Guidance document by emailing businesscase@metrolinx.com.

Q12: Was the direction to examine the EWLRT given by Metrolinx or the City of Toronto?

A12: The project was initially part of the City of Toronto's Transit City projects as a section of the Eglinton Crosstown that was planned to go all the way from Kennedy into the Airport. Prior to 2010, the EWLRT was a TTC project known as the Crosstown, and an environmental assessment was done. In 2013, Metrolinx took over the project when the Province decided to take on some funding for transit and the City simultaneously wanted to reduce its spending on transit. It is a priority for the City of Toronto since it was identified in the SmartTrack program as an efficient rapid transit route to the second largest employment hub in the GTA. The City of Toronto has agreed in principle to pay for construction and fund the SmartTrack program, which includes the EWLRT.

Minutes of Meeting

Q13: If the City has agreed in principle to fund the project, but TTC will be operating, who has more say in determining the design alternatives?

A13: The City of Toronto, Metrolinx and the TTC are full partners in the EWLRT project and all design decisions have been made collectively, and will continue to be made collectively. Funding is indeed a major part of the decision-making process and will be further explained in depth at a later CWG meeting.

Q14: Is using a 60-year life cycle practical? Traffic, congestion and technological innovations may make any forecasted benefits obsolete.

A14: Forecasts are not certain. One of the perspectives Metrolinx takes in Business Cases is not to predict the future but to examine different “what if” scenarios. Metrolinx only considers Business Cases and benefit-cost ratios in comparison with other options in order to determine which option performs better in different scenarios. For instance, for different future scenarios (like a climate change future or an economic decline future), Metrolinx would forecast what these futures look like as well as recommend options that perform well against alternatives in a diversity of future scenarios.

Q15: For projects like the EWLRT that was initially started by another agency, how does the new Business Case process ensure transparency in decision making?

A15: Metrolinx’s approach to business cases and evidence-based decision making was described in a recent Board report that is available online (http://www.metrolinx.com/en/docs/pdf/board_agenda/20171207/20171207_BoardMtg_Benefits_Management_and_Sponsorship_EN.pdf). In this report, the Board directed that “all business cases, over the lifecycle of Metrolinx projects and programs above \$50 million, be publicly released prior to any relevant Board decision-making”.

Q16: Why is the lifespan of the project not listed in the Economic Case Impact?

A16: The total lifecycle cost is not limited to the initial construction cost. The capital cost, operating cost, and maintenance costs are calculated over the course of the entire life cycle of the project. The capital cost includes major renewals and rehabilitation that occur at regular intervals through the project lifecycle. All these costs are calculated throughout the entire lifespan – for this project we have determined 60 years. The lifespan depends on the asset in consideration, and 60 years is a reasonable amount of time for a large transit project.

Q17: Could you please share more information on each parameter in the Metrolinx Business Case Framework?

A17: The Metrolinx website includes two Business Case guidance documents that provide detailed information on the parameters of each of the components in a Business Case, as well as the various formulas used to generate them. Metrolinx is currently seeking feedback on the Framework and in particular wishes to make its framework comprehensible to the general public. (http://www.metrolinx.com/en/regionalplanning/projectevaluation/benefitscases/benefits_case_analyses.aspx)

Q18: Is risk assessment part of Metrolinx Business Case process?

A18: Yes risks are identified and mitigating strategies developed in each of the Strategic, Economic, Financial, and Deliverability and Operations components of a business case. Details are provided in

Minutes of Meeting

Metrolinx's Business Case Guidance

(http://www.metrolinx.com/en/regionalplanning/projectevaluation/benefitscases/2018_08_03%20Metrolinx%20Guidance%202.pdf)

Q19: In a financial business case, is a strategic case more important than a risk assessment?

A19: In most business cases, the strategic case is the most important because it provides insights on what problem the project is trying to solve.

Q20: With regards to the number of stops Metrolinx projected, which is best integrated with what already exists on the Eglinton Crosstown LRT project currently under construction?

A20: The EA approved at-grade design option with stops at major intersections and mid blocks is most similar to what will exist in the Eglinton Crosstown LRT at-grade section currently being constructed (the eastern-most section).

Q21: The Business Case shows that people coming from the east end and heading to the Airport will prefer a below-grade option with fewer stops. The projected ridership volume from the local community to Pearson Airport is low in the Business Case. Considering this, what is the rationale for rejecting the below-grade option?

A21: The rationale for not advancing the below-grade option was the high capital cost – approximately double the cost of the at-grade option. In addition, the below-grade option analyzed through the Initial Business Case assumed only three stations along the corridor and did not provide local transit access and did not address the purpose of the project, which was to address the gap in the rapid transit network between the Mississauga Transitway and the Eglinton Crosstown LRT,

Q22: Wouldn't the higher ridership observed in the below-grade scenario enable a below-grade option to be constructed?

A22 (Revised): One of the options studied in the 2016 Initial Business Case was underground with three stops along Eglinton (Jane, Kipling, and Renforth Station (Commerce Blvd.).

The reasons that the below-grade option was not carried forward as a preferred option in the Initial Business Case were the significantly higher cost and the lack of local access for both the community and north-south bus connections.

The ridership forecasting for this option was about 10-20% higher than the at-grade options with closer stop spacing. At the high end of this ridership estimate, the three stop grade-separated extension option would have caused the Line 5 Eglinton LRT to be over-capacity and would have diverted passengers from Line 2.

As Scott Haskill from TTC presented later in the meeting, the capacity of a subway is about three times larger than an LRT. Diverting passengers away from Line 2 and causing another transit line in the network to be over-capacity does not lend support to the below-grade, three-stop Eglinton LRT extension option.

Q23: We were told that the 2017 cost-benefit analysis reviewed each grade separation in isolation. Has this been re-evaluated to determine the cost-benefit analysis of grade separations at all intersections together or in combination?

Minutes of Meeting

A23: The 2016 Initial Business Case identified that providing grade separation at every stop would create an awkward passenger experience because of all the grade changes. The document also identified several intersections as potentially benefiting from a grade separation due to factors like higher volumes of left turning vehicles from the north-south arterial onto Eglinton Avenue. The project team's approach to the grade separation analysis was to examine each stop individually first to determine any well-performing stops, with the intent to piece together the most promising grade separations scenarios to create a design option. During the evaluation, the project team determined that the cost of grade separation was too high in relation to the benefits in terms of travel-time savings.

Maria Doyle (City of Toronto) noted that Metrolinx had responded to the CWG's questions on Business Cases received via email. Metrolinx's 'Responses to Questions Previously Submitted by CWG members' is found in **Attachment 1**.

6. CWG Work Plan

Jade Hoskins (City of Toronto) presented an overview of CWG work plan and how it incorporated all of the issues, concerns and topics identified by the CWG members during the first meeting. CWG members were asked to review the work plan in more detail following the meeting to provide comments and identify opportunities for input going forward.

6.1 Questions & Answers

C1: I would like to suggest that project funding is not fundamental to the design alternatives that we are looking at. It is an issue that should be addressed later on.

Response: The City provided Project funding as a general bucket for several topics; it covers intergovernmental affairs, funding, finance, cost and budgeting of projects. The City designed the framework for CWG members to collectively determine the group's current understanding of the project and as the meetings progress more information will be provided to inform future decisions.

C2: The Metrolinx speaker identified strategic analysis as the most important component in the Business Case because it informs users on what the project is and why it is being considered. Given this, shouldn't strategic fit be addressed in earlier CWG meetings?

Response: The work plan will be redesigned to ensure strategic fit is discussed at the next CWG meeting.

7. Workshop Activity – Long list of Options

As an introduction to the workshop, Scott Haskill (TTC) presented a high-level overview of transit technologies and explained that the rapid transit technology for Eglinton West would be LRT to ensure seamless integration with the Eglinton Crosstown (LRT). Maria Doyle (City of Toronto) walked CWG members through the different design options that could be included in the options examined by the CWG; including tunnelling, trenching, elevated, and at-grade designs.

Minutes of Meeting

Following the presentation, Alicia Evans (AECOM) introduced the workshop to identify design options for the Eglinton West project. CWG Members were provided with design alignment charts where members outlined which design options they wanted to consider for the EWLRT. At the final CWG meeting, there will be an evaluation session where the CWG will evaluate this long list of options to identify a short list (one or two) that the City will carry forward for further study.

The long list of options identified by the CWG members is found in **Attachment 2**.

7.1 Questions & Answers

Q24: I would like to go back to the discussion about strategies, goals and objectives. From a business/community perspective, this workshop does not follow the Business Case Framework defined by Metrolinx since there is no clear statement on what the goals and objectives are and how to identify the solutions. Without having identified the goal and objectives we have nothing to measure the design alternatives against.

A24: The City is directed by City Council on the objectives of projects. The EWLRT is part of the SmartTrack initiative. The objective of this portion is to connect the Airport Corporate Centre to the SmartTrack corridor of Mt. Dennis Station. That was the direction received from Council and that is what the City is proceeding with.

Q25: It is my understanding that the direction was based on a recommendation submitted to Council. It didn't come to Council based on business reasons but as a recommendation from the project and Council agreed to the terms.

A25: At the first council meeting after the last election, the objectives of the SmartTrack program were identified and the Western Corridor Feasibility Study considered options for connecting the SmartTrack corridor on the Kitchener Go corridor and the Mississauga Airport Corporate Centre. Two alignments were identified, one was the along the Kitchener corridor going north and the other was the Eglinton West corridor. The feasibility study determined that heavy rail was not preferable and that the LRT is the best option. The objective of the line has never changed and still aims to connect the SmartTrack corridors at Mount Dennis Station to Mississauga Airport Corporate Centre.

Q26: In regards to the workshop exercise, do we have the opportunity to influence the number of stops?

A26: Members are free to change the number of stops for their proposed design options if they have rationale for the decision. Members should take into consideration that the stop spacing for the EWLRT was determined based on the requirement to preserve local access and if any of the current stops were removed in their designs this might require parallel bus service along the corridor. Council has also already approved the stop locations.

Q27: During the process of the CWG meetings, will our insights be restricted to modifying or leaving the EWLRT at the at-grade solution or will we have the opportunity to discuss an underground option?

A27: CWG members are welcome to identify any option, above, below or at-grade, with whatever stop configuration that is preferred, for either LRT or Bus, for review and discussion during these meetings. The final meeting will provide an opportunity for members to conduct their own analysis and reduce the

Minutes of Meeting

long list of options that you identify tonight to one or two options that will be carried forward for further analysis by City Staff.

8. Meeting Adjournment

The Facilitator thanked all CWG members, Councillor representatives, the Project Team and our guest speaker for attending the meeting and noted that the next CWG meeting has been tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, May 8, 2018, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

No further comments or questions were raised.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m. however many members continued conversations with staff until 9:44 pm.

9. Parking Lot items

- Billy Bishop airport expansion forecasts
- Business case process for Scarborough Subway Extension
- Funding, financing, and costs – how are these used in a business case
- What are the different weighting factors for each business case input

10. Attachment of Additional Items

- **Attachment 1** – Handout: Responses to Questions Previously Submitted by CWG members
- **Attachment 2** – Alternate Design Options Identified in Workshop