EGLINTON EAST

Meeting Minutes

Project:	Eglinton East LRT 10% Design and TPAP
Subject:	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1
Date:	Thursday, December 01, 2022
Location:	Remote
Core Project Team in attendance	**David Brutto**, EELRT PM, Transit Expansion Office (TE) **Edna Cuvin**, EELRT Program Director, Transit Expansion (TE) **Adam Saddo**, Project Coordinator, TEO **Stella Gustavson**, Program Manager, City Planning **Monika Nasterska,** Transportation Planner, City Planning **Michael Robinson,** Senior Project Manager, Transportation Services **Dominic Ho**, Senior Planner, TTC **Tyrone Gan**, EELRT PM, HDR **Nick Shaw**, EELRT Deputy PM, HDR **Mahia Anhara**, EELRT Project Coordinator, HDR **Hansen Gong**, Transportation Engineer, HDR **Bruce Han**, Transit Architect, HDR
TAC members	Refer to TAC organizational list

	Topic	Action By
1	**Welcome and Introductions** • The core project team consisting of representatives from City of Toronto, TTC, and HDR (project consultant) introduced themselves. • City (Transit Expansion (TE)) explained the responsibilities of TAC members as representatives for their respective organizations and noted that if there any members who feel that their organization does not need to be a part of Eglinton East LRT (EELRT) TAC, please let City TE PM know. Otherwise, everyone will be kept engaged.	
2	**EELRT project overview** • Council Direction ○ The City (TE) provided an update on council direction for EELRT from June 2022. Noteworthy: ▪ EELRT is being designed as a distinct service, decoupled from Eglinton Crosstown ▪ The connection along Sheppard Avenue between Neilson and McCowan to the Line 2 terminus and proposed future line 4 extension is added to the core light rail project scope ▪ Conlins Yard north of Sheppard Avenue is the preferred location for EELRT MSF ▪ The distinct service concept allows for new opportunities such as shorter trains and ability to procure vehicles that can navigate steep grades along Morningside and Ellesmere	

- Project schedule
    - The project is currently in the alternatives assessment (pre-planning) phase for certain areas and moving to complete 10% design. The draft Environmental Project Report (EPR) is also underway which is required for the TPAP, expected to commence mid-2023

Questions:

- Question: TRCA asked if there is an environmental assessment consultant and will the EPR be circulated?
    - Response: HDR is the City's consultant leading the TPAP and environmental studies with some specialist support partner firms (Perkins & Will, LGL, etc.). The 25% EPR (study designs/work plans) will be circulated to relevant reviewing agencies/ministries in the new year.
- Question: Will there be Public Information Centres and public engagement sessions?
    - Response: Virtual public open houses will be held geared towards the 5 wards where the alignment passes through. The aim is to hold the first virtual open house in February. The team also has the intention of setting up pop-up in-person public consultations.
- Question: TRCA asked if alternative locations were looked at for the MSF site or the Conlins site was the only one considered?
    - Response: Another MSF site that the team looked at was at UTSC, and south of highway 401. The Conlins site was a part of the previous Sheppard East LRT EA and has a prior TPAP approval. When it became available, the site stood out as a preferred location as it can accommodate the needs of the project.
    - TRCA will have a list of requirements for the Conlins MSF site and size maybe reduced following hazard assessment.
    - TRCA noted that a 10 m setback is needed from the floodplain close to the site.
    - TRCA mentioned in the chat to add slope stability assessments to the studies required (in TRCA regulation limits)

3 **Corridor-wide topics**

- TPAP
    - The project team will be circulating the outlines of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) and TPAP report to the appropriate stakeholders as part of the 25% EPR submission
- Design criteria
    - EELRT is not only a transit project but a corridor renewal project.
    - A public realm working group will be organized with select organizations from the TAC for further focused discussion.
    - HDR is working on updating the 5% design which were informed by City-provided desired public realm dimension from 2017.
    - HDR provided a list of current guidelines and standards being considered for the public realm design and asked for input on other guidelines that should be considered.

Questions

- Question: Who will operate and maintain the LRT?
    - Response: Future phases will identify the preferred procurement and operations model. At this point in design, TTC is representing the interests of the future operator whoever that may be.
    - Follow-up question about the LRT gauge assumption
        - Response: design adopts standard Metrolinx LRT gauge, not streetcar or subway gauge.
- Question: Toronto Water asked about the location of the platform for the trains going the opposite direction, based on the cross-section on slide 28.
    - Response: The stop shown is a far side configuration, where the platform for each direction is located on either side of the intersection. This configuration uses space efficiently as platforms are placed in the shadow of the left-turn lanes on the other side of the intersection.
- Question: TRCA asked if there will be an opportunity to reduce the right-of-way displayed on slide 28.
    - Response: HDR responded that the cross-section is from the 5% design phase for the Eglinton Ave segment. Requirements are currently being refined and the 10% design process will balance factors between desired and minimum public realm dimensions. A dynamic public realm design will address the constraints along the alignment. The dimensions will differ segment to segment.
    - One of the goals of the project is to encourage pedestrian connectivity, reducing crossing distances wherever possible.
- Chat Question: May I know which group / team within Metrolinx you are working with / contacting?
    - Response: City (TE) responded that the project team is working closely with the SSE and also working with Durham-Scarborough BRT teams
    - Metrolinx (SSE) noted that information shared with their team has also been shared with GO and Crosstown teams.
- City Planning, Urban Design shared views about the public realm design.
    - Prefer landscaping to be placed between sidewalk and cycle track so that both pedestrians and cyclists can share the shade of trees.
    - Suggested the landscaping dimension can be made greater than 1.8 m for a greater natural environment.
    - Noted that prefers sidewalk dimensions greater than 2.1 m but 4 m sidewalks may not be necessary.
    - Noted to consider the impact on development parcels. Urban Design has been using the EELRT 5% design to inform development applications.

4 **Focus areas**

- The platform construction at Kennedy Station and utility relocations along Eglinton between Midland and Bimbrok will be conducted in coordination with the design of the SSE.
    - Platform at Kennedy station would impact the Don Montgomery Community Centre (DMCC) parking lot and driveway.

- Alternatives assessment is being conducted for UTSC and KLM location.
- At the Morningside/401 crossing, the City has proposed ramp normalization to MTO to accommodate the LRT & improve active transportation opportunities across the bridge without the costs of widening the bridge
- At Sheppard/McCowan station, station concepts are being developed in collaboration with MX-SSE.

Questions

- Question: City Parks, Forestry & Recreation (PFR) asked if the platform access is open from all sides and asked about plans for fencing.
    - Response: the current design is an enclosed structure to provide weather protection.
    - They are considering ways of providing a visual buffer between the transit infrastructure and the community center.
    - PFR will be engaged through the design process
- Question: MX DSBRTasked if the EELRT team will be going through an optioneering evaluation process for UTSC.
    - Response: HDR responded that they will be conducting a detailed evaluation, taking into account the issues and needs of DSBRT, UTSC, and TTC.
    - COT will share shared with MX-DSBRT team once complete
- Question: MTO asked, based on public realm requirement, if there is an intention to provide active transportation (AT) on the Morningside/401 crossing bridge and whether the current cross-section can fit in the AT.
    - Response: the proposed cross-section can fit AT on both sides but must be reduced to an MUP at its narrowest point; however, as the width of the bridge cross-section increases, more AT width and separated pedestrian and cycling facilities can be accommodated. HDR using MTO lane widths standards.
    - City (TE) noted additional discussions will be required with MTO, including City (TS) to confirm the ultimate bridge configuration for 10% design and TPAP.
- TRCA noted that for the highland creek crossing, TRCA would need a hydraulic model if the road right-of-way will change. TRCA to include these requirements in comments.
- Question: An inquiry was received about the maintenance and capital works coordination needs for the tracks crossing the MTO bridge
    - Response: City (TE) noted that it is early in the design to initiate any substantive discussion about capital works coordination, noting EA and 10% design will be complete by the end of 2023.
    - A follow-up question about the approximate timeline for construction based on phasing as this will have impact on traffic and other City projects and may introduce parallel conflict?
        - City (TE) noted there is no construction schedule estimate available, but that TE is happy to have a follow-up offline discussion which would include representation from City Infrastructure Coordination Unit(ICU).

- Community Planning informed that the three big plazas in the KLM area are owned by First Capital Realty Inc. Development is concentrated more on the south of Kingston Rd, and the first application has been submitted. It was noted that north side of Kingston Rd is more constrained for development.
    - Noted that stops should be located where there will be more development
    - Community Planning is also interested in getting more details on overall right of way for the Malvern spur, and how it interfaces with Malvern town center, since the LRT is stirring development interests in this key node.
- City of Toronto (TS) noted that on Eglinton, east of Midland, SSE construction at the Launch shaft will leave behind soft piles buried in the ground.
    - MX (SSE) added that construction timelines for EELRT and SSE within the SSE zone of influence will not overlap, and EELRT design team is aware of the end state of the SSE contracts.
- Question: PFR asked how the City will make up for the loss of parking for Don Montgomery Community Centre south of the platform?
    - Response: the project team is looking at ways to not aggravate loss of parking and would require more discussion with PFR. Project team would also coordinate with Metrolinx regard the condition SSE will leave the north parking lot in after completion.
    - The project team acknowledges the loss of parking. Mitigation/compensation will be covered under TPAP process, which can be addressed through current work
    - PF&R noted that MX-SSE originally proposed a two-story temporary parking garage structure as a SSE construction-phase mitigation measure.
    - TE said that they are happy to organize a separate conversation about mitigation and/or compensation for loss of parking.
- TRCA noted that TRCA's most significant concerns are on the Secondary Focus Areas.
- Question: TRCA asked if alternative alignments are being considered for the LRT since large section of valley and wetland would be impacted for Highland Creek?
    - Response: HDR noted that Morningside would be reduced to 2 lanes which would reduce impacts but will not eliminate it.
    - TRCA noted they would be happy to provide TAC group support. City (TE) noted they are happy to arrange a separate conversation with TRCA at the appropriate time upon receipt of initial comments.
-

5 **Next Steps**

- TAC members are asked to submit formal comments to TE (David B and Edna C) by December 15, 2022. If there are concerns with the timelines, please reach out to David.
- All comments from City Planning, TS, and TTC staff should be provided to the respective project team organizational leads as well.

Please reach out to the respective project team leads for further instruction.

- Next TAC meeting will likely be in early February, where the discussion about emerging preferred designs will be continued.
- Stakeholder Advisory Group meetings will also be held which will be geared towards BIAs, NIAs, the University of Toronto Scarborough campus, transit interest/advocacy groups, etc.
    - TE noted the project team will consider comments received and reach out for working groups or meetings further to the larger TAC and Public realm focus group
- The Project team thanks all for attending and look forward to the input of TAC members to assist moving forward this exciting project.

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise David Brutto within ten business days of the issuance of these notes. Minutes prepared by Mahia Anhara.

EGLINTON EAST

TAC#2 – Part 1 Meeting Minutes

Project:	Eglinton East LRT 10% Design and TPAP
Subject:	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2 – Southern Corridor Focus
Date:	Tuesday, February 28, 2023
Location:	Remote
Core Project Team in attendance	**David Brutto**, EELRT PM, Transit Expansion Division (TE) **Edna Cuvin**, EELRT Program Director, Transit Expansion (TE) **Adam Saddo**, Project Coordinator, TE **Stella Gustavson**, Program Manager, City Planning **Monika Nasterska,** Transportation Planner, City Planning **Michael Robinson,** Senior Project Manager, Transportation Services **Dominic Ho**, Senior Planner, TTC **Tyrone Gan**, EELRT PM, HDR **Nick Shaw**, EELRT Deputy PM, HDR **Mahia Anhara**, EELRT Project Coordinator, HDR **Hansen Gong**, Transportation Engineer, HDR **Bruce Han**, Transit Architect, HDR **James Huang,** Transit Architect, HDR
TAC members	Refer to TAC organizational list

	Topic	Action By
1	**Welcome and Introductions** • City of Toronto Transit Expansion (TE) Division senior project manager, David Brutto welcomed the committee to the meeting • The core project team consisting of representatives from City of Toronto, TTC, and HDR (project consultant) were introduced.	

2	**EELRT project overview**
	• TE provided an overview of the project scope, key features of the line, and updated schedule for this phase of the project development.
	• Environmental Project Report (EPR)
	  ○ HDR provided an overview on the scope of the EPR and team of subconsultants who will be involved.
	  ○ Overall project description and project methodologies to be completed in March.
	• Stakeholder and public engagement
	  ○ Two rounds of virtual open houses planned: one before the TPAP in Spring, and another during the TPAP in the Fall. Community pop-up events planned for spring and summer. Property owners will be notified of potential impact during the summer after the completion of the 10% design.
	  ○ The focus of the first virtual open house is to re-introduce the public to the EELRT project and inform about the changes since the 5% design phase public engagement in 2019.
	• HDR provided an overview of the comments received during TAC 1 and outlined the responses from the project team.
	• Urban Forestry asked why the arborist report is not included in the EPR and at what project phase will it be developed?	

- HDR responded that natural environment impact assessment will be carried out by LGL. More details on the rationale for not including an arborist report in this phase will be addressed in the EPR methodology report which will be shared for review.

3 **Focus areas**

- HDR presented the changes from 5% design, and presented draft 10% design wherever available, starting from Kennedy station to Morningside until West Hill CI.
  - All platforms have been reduced to 50 m from 100 m.
  - Generally, the 10% design will aim to retain the ROW requirements established during 5% design, but there maybe some exceptions.
- Kennedy Station
  - EELRT surface terminal station at Kennedy station is planned to have convenient passenger connections to the GO station, TTC Line 2 and Line 5.
  - Coordination with MX-SSE project team is on-going to mitigate a potential impact to the SSE vent shafts planned for construction. Future coordination regarding impacts to the Don Montgomery Community Centre is required.
- Midland to east of McCowan
  - At SE corner of Danforth and Eglinton, there is an under-construction townhouse development, with a short setback distance. Public realm width will have to be reduced at this location to prevent encroachment into the property.
    - There is a row of existing townhomes to the north at this location. It is possible to slightly shift the alignment to the north while respecting the north ROW limit.
  - CP noted that there is an active development application west of Oswego Rd. The City has protected for the ROW based on 5% design but advised that reducing the swing towards the south would be preferable.
  - Transportation Services asked how the bus lanes currently on Eglinton will be dealt with when the LRT is operational.
    - HDR noted that there will be 4 general traffic lanes like the existing condition. The bus lanes will be replaced by the LRT.
- Eglinton GO
  - Coordination with MX-Eglinton GO station will be required to accommodate ROW widening into the GO station.
  - CP asked to confirm if widenings will be consistent with 5% design. Also noted 3 development applications close to the GO station.
    - HDR responded that it is unlikely that widening would be more than what is specified in 5% design.
  - HDR noted that due to constrained public realm at the underpass, an alternative path for cyclists to travel could be through the proposed GO station pedestrian tunnel to reconnect to Eglinton beyond the rail bridge.
  - No issues are anticipated regarding the vertical clearance at the GO rail bridge, which is 4.6 m.
  - Three options for active transportation configuration under the rail bridge were presented.

- City ECS-BSE asked about the TTC standard for vertical clearance at the underpass.
  - HDR responded that they used ECLRT as a reference. There are precedents of TTC streetcar routes that operate with low vertical bridge clearance (e.g., 3.9 m).
  - Depending on the location of the 4th track, there maybe issues with clearance as the road grade starts to rise.
- City ECS-BSE asked about the type of modification to the foundation of the retaining wall of the bridge is proposed for option 3?
  - HDR is proposing to expand the footing of the GO rail bridge to support the increased MUP width.
  - ECS-BSE advised to not damage the existing foundation as much as possible. ECS-BSE also noted that the bridge is a MX bridge and their approval is required for any modifications.
- CP noted that there are active applications at the southwest corner of Eglinton and Mason, and northwest corner of Eglinton and Beachell St.
- TE requested comments from Metrolinx and noted that a separate meeting may be required to coordinate with the Metrolinx Eglinton GO and LSE Corridor team given the potential range of impacts to MX existing and planned infrastructure and opportunity to plan for appropriate integration between redesigned Eglinton Avenue, LRT stop and GO station.

- <u>Eglinton-Kingston</u>
  - Design priorities at Eglinton-Kington include protecting the woodlot and providing access to the apartment buildings north of Eglinton.
  - CP Urban Design noted development application at 3718 - 3720 Kingston Rd.
    - HDR noted that there may be an issue if the applicant is proposing direct access on Kingston Rd.
    - CP to follow-up with more details.
  - CP Urban Design asked about whether existing right turn channels (pork chops) will be removed
    - HDR noted pork chop removals will be investigated on a case-by-case basis.
    - CP asked to identify the potential locations for pork chop removal.
    - TTC noted that the pork chop at Eglinton and Kingston will be required for buses to turn.
- <u>Kingston Overpass and Guildwood GO</u>
  - Structural assessment of LRT loads will be conducted for the Kingston Overpass bridge. The bridge is two separate structures, making it challenging to put OCS poles in the middle.
  - Development application at 4121 Kingston Rd proposed a 3 m setback from the current property line, which is not consistent with the 5% design ROW requirements. In addition, the

underground parking garage encroaches on to current City ROW.
    - CP- Urban Design noted that OLT mediation regarding 4121 Kingston Rd has taken place recently.
        - CP Urban Design advised to connect with Tyler Hughes in Community Planning to update on status
    - City Planning Urban Design asked whether left turn lanes can be removed to accommodate sufficient widths for the boulevard
        - HDR noted that the left turns are in the shadow of the LRT platforms, so the proposed road width cannot be further reduced.
- Kingston-Lawrence-Morningside (KLM)
    - During the 5% design, the alignment at KLM was underground. In the 10% design, the alignment is fully at-grade.
    - No widening to the north of Kingston (east of Lawrence) due to a midrise building with no setback located east of Falaise. Widening to the south only, into the KLM triangle.
    - Two options are being evaluated at KLM:
        - Option 1: pocket track east of Lawrence
        - Option 2: pocket track west of Lawrence.
- South Morningside – West Hill
    - 2009 SMLRT EA showed future realignment of local roads, specifically Beath Street
        - The EELRT Project Team requested TAC to provide comments and information about the plans for the potential local road realignment, and whether the assumption should be carried forward in the 10% design.
    - The 5% design assumed 4 lanes and a portion of the LRT alignment to be below grade along Morningside. Wide portals were required.
        - In contrast, 10% design assumes 2 lanes and a fully surface alignment in this area. With the lane reduction and elimination of the portal, property impacts along Morningside has been reduced.

4 **Next Steps**

- Part 2 of EELRT TAC 2 is scheduled for March 6, when the northern segment of the alignment will be covered. The March 6 meeting will pick up from the KLM area and move north.
- TAC members are asked to submit formal comments to TAC #2 (both parts) to TE (David B and Edna C) by March 20, 2023.

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise David Brutto within ten business days of the issuance of these notes. Minutes prepared by Mahia Anhara.

EGLINTON EAST

TAC#2 – Part 2 Meeting Minutes

Project:	Eglinton East LRT 10% Design and TPAP
Subject:	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2 – Northern Corridor Focus
Date:	Monday, March 06, 2023
Location:	Remote
Core Project Team in attendance	**David Brutto**, EELRT PM, Transit Expansion Division (TE) **Edna Cuvin**, EELRT Program Director, Transit Expansion (TE) **Adam Saddo**, Project Coordinator, TE **Stella Gustavson**, Program Manager, City Planning **Monika Nasterska,** Transportation Planner, City Planning **Michael Robinson,** Senior Project Manager, Transportation Services **Dominic Ho**, Senior Planner, TTC **Tyrone Gan**, EELRT PM, HDR **Nick Shaw**, EELRT Deputy PM, HDR **Mahia Anhara**, EELRT Project Coordinator, HDR **Hansen Gong**, Transportation Engineer, HDR
TAC members	Refer to TAC organizational list

	Topic	Action By
1	**Welcome and Introductions** • City of Toronto Transit Expansion (TE) Division Senior Project Manager, David Brutto welcomed the committee to the meeting • The core project team consisting of representatives from City of Toronto, TTC, and HDR (project consultant) were introduced.	
2	**EELRT project overview** • TE provided an overview of the project scope, key features of the line, and updated schedule for this phase of the project development. • HDR provided an overview of the comments received during TAC 1 and outlined the responses from the project team. • TRCA noted that along Morningside, the LRT alignment will run close to the deep slopes of the valley. Slope stability and erosion need to be taken into consideration. • TRCA asked for geotechnical hazard assessment and terms of reference for what is planned to mitigate the erosion impacts. • City ECS-BSE asked if a geotechnical consultant will be engaged to undertake geotechnical study. Also asked if any new retaining walls will be proposed? ○ HDR responded that the team has in-house geotechnical support as well as a geotechnical subconsultant. Retaining walls will be proposed along Ellesmere.	

3 **Northern Segment - Focus areas**

- HDR presented the changes from 5% design, and presented draft 10% design wherever available, starting from Morningside-Kingston to Sheppard-McCowan.
    - All platforms have been reduced to 50 m from 100 m.
    - Generally, the 10% design will aim to retain the ROW requirements established during 5% design, but there may be some exceptions.
- South Morningside-West Hill
    - Proposed changes to the 5% design which includes:
        - 10% LRT alignment is fully at-grade alignment at Morningside. Tunnel portal no longer required.
        - Number of lanes on Morningside from Kingston to Ellesmere reduced from 4 lanes to 2 lanes
        - The LRT alignment remains in the median along Morningside. No shift to the west.
    - HDR asked TAC if assumption for local road realignments along Morningside from 2009 SMLRT EA should be carried over to the 10% design phase.
- Highland Creek Bridge
    - The LRT will be using the existing bridge and existing embankment to reduce impact to the valley.
    - TRCA asked if there will be a need for widening and embankment beyond the bridge?
        - HDR response: Amount of widening is dependent on the public realm width.
    - TRCA noted that this is a steep valley and increasing the load on the valley may exacerbate the slope stability hazard.
        - TRCA wants to know if there is a risk and how that risk will be mitigated.
        - HDR asked if it is better to widen on both sides, or widen on one side only, from a geotechnical perspective.
            - TRCA noted that the priority should be minimizing the grading on the side with steeper slopes
        - The project team will be coordinating with TRCA regarding geotechnical risks.
    - TRCA water resources noted that not widening the bridge is preferred as the HEC-RAS model would need to be updated if bridge is widened. If bridge widening is required, the analysis must be done to ensure that there is no impact to the floodplain, upstream and downstream.
    - City Transportation Services (TS) commented that using bollards as a separation between MUP and roadway is not appropriate.
        - Suggestion to use railings and to provide 0.5 m horizontal clearance from railings, based on TAC requirements.
        - Asked to ensure height of outer bridge railing follows bridge code
    - City Planning (CP) asked how pedestrians would access the sidewalk on Ellesmere Rd from the LRT platform at the centre of Morningside
        - HDR noted that pedestrian access would be from the north end of the platform. The platform would be extended until the Ellesmere crosswalk. There would be

railings on both sides along the platform for pedestrian safety.

- City Parks asked if the potential road widening will impact Morningside Park? And if any park lands will be needed.
  - The intersection at the park driveway will be signalized to allow peds to cross Morningside. Left turns from the driveway will be allowed. Requirement for NB LT lane from Morningside into Park is being investigated – generally speaking left turn will create greater impact to valley.
  - Need for park land acquisition will depend on further design development.
- City ECS-BSE asked if the aim is to maintain the approach embankment footprint.
  - HDR responded that is generally the aim. However, road widening requirements will depend on the public realm width.
- Transportation Planning asked if the bridge deck can be extended, without modification to the superstructure.
  - HDR informed that the bridge overhang width is currently at its limit. Further widening will require superstructure modification.
- TE asked if the guideway can be narrowed to provide more space for active transportation.
  - HDR is investigating if OCS poles can be moved to the sides of the bridge. HDR is also looking at the possibility of narrowing the guideway itself.

- <u>UTSC Area</u>
  - HDR provided an overview of the UTSC alignment options that were evaluated. The emerging preferred option is Option 2 - Ellesmere median. The evaluation of options was completed as due diligence considering potential opportunities presented by the distinct service concept. The detailed evaluation can be made available upon request.
  - TE noted the City will be proceeding with option 2, which is the Council-approved alignment and UTSC has agreed to the direction.
  - CP asked about the status of MX/DSBRT coordination.
    - Approved DSBRT TPAP is curbside running on Ellesmere around Military Trail
  - MX-DSBRT has seen emerging designs for EELRT, and recognized is an opportunity for DSBRT to share the LRT guideway . Some buses could use the curb lane and some buses could use the median guideway.
  - Retaining walls are proposed along Ellesmere. Their heights depend on the width of the ROW and public realm and could be as high as over 4 m.
  - ECS-BSE asked what is being retained behind the wall?
    - There are UTSC buildings close by.
  - City Planning- Transportation Planning asked if the retaining walls would have tie backs and if they do how will that be handled?
    - **HDR to investigate the requirements for retaining wall along Ellesmere.** **HDR**

- New Military Trail ROW will be 36 m, and coordination of the ROW design is ongoing in conjunction with UTSC..
- At Morningside, north of Military Trail, centre tracks for train storage are proposed. The three-track cross-section constrains the amount of space available for public realm.

- MTO
  - The LRT goes across the Hwy 401 interchange on the Morningside/MTO bridge. The LRT will lead to a realignment of the roads north and south of the bridge.
  - The EELRT project team has proposed ramp urbanization at the interchange to improve active transportation safety.
  - ROW width is limited at the bridge, leading to a constrained public realm.
    - HDR noted narrowing the travel lanes would help provide more public realm space.
  - Coordination between EELRT project team and MTO is on-going.
  - City Planning asked whether the speed of the bridge will be reduced.
    - HDR responded that the speed on the bridge should be reduced in conjunction with moving the ramp urbanization and LRT forward.
- Sheppard East LRT EA
  - The 2008 Sheppard East LRT (SELRT) EA proposed an LRT from Don Mills to Meadowvale. The SELRT design was carried forward in the EELRT 5% design, with the assumption that SELRT would be terminating at Morningside.
  - For the EELRT 10% design, SELRT design will be adapted to meet current design guidelines.
- Conlins
  - EELRT Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF) is proposed to be at the site located north of Sheppard and Conlins.
  - TRCA regulation zone is also located at the site. TRCA will be engaged as we advance the design to 10% level.
  - The layout of the MSF developed during 5% design could fit 100 - 30 m trains. EELRT requires space for 30 - 50 m trains. Revision of the Conlins MSF layout is underway.
- Malvern – Neilson Spur
  - With 4 lanes on Neilson, ROW would have to be widened by 1-4 m, leading to residential property encroachment.
  - Alternative proposal at Neilson is to reduce the number lanes from 4 to 2 lanes to retain the existing ROW and provide enhanced public realm.
  - Additional stop at Berner and Wickson is also proposed for 10% design.
  - City Planning is concerned about the impact on a midrise development at Neilson and Tapscott.
  - City Transportation Planning noted experience with process of lane reduction typically addressed through Schedule C EA, with modelling and capacity analysis.
    - TE noted that this topic can be further discussed in a separate meeting and requires input from Transportation Services.
  - City Urban Design noted that a 7 m landscaping zone is not sufficient due to the narrow width of the landscaping zone.
- McCowan/Sheppard

- At McCowan/Sheppard, the proposed EELRT terminal stop will provide a weather protected passenger connection to SSE concourse from the platform.
- City proposed to MX a 6.4 m shift of the station building's face to the north to accommodate a 45.5m ROW on Sheppard.
- Coordination with MX-SSE project team is ongoing.
- TRCA requested to avoid encroaching the bank/top of slope of the Highland Creek and to consider setback requirements as developed by Metrolinx.
- ECS-BSE noted that for retaining walls, City standards should be used instead of OPSD.
- TRCA noted that they do not allow retaining walls within TRCA floodplains.
- Two bridges along Sheppard will need to be widened
  - City Transportation Planning mentioned a floodplain remediation study taking place near the project alignment. Suggested coordinating with the study to better understand any impact of the bridge widening.
  - **City Planning to provide contact for the project team. CP**
- TS suggested considering lane reduction on Sheppard as it has lower car volumes.
- TS asked to consider providing a trail crossing east of Sheppard and Progress.

4 **Next Steps**

- TAC members are asked to submit formal comments to TAC #2 (both parts) to TE (David B and Edna C) by March 20, 2023.
- Refer to presentation deck. TE further noted that focused discussions for Malvern/Neilson and Sheppard corridor are priority.

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise David Brutto within ten business days of the issuance of these notes. Minutes prepared by Mahia Anhara.

EGLINTON EAST

TAC 3 – Meeting Minutes

Revised with post-meeting notes in red. Redistributed May 30, 2023.

Project:	Eglinton East LRT 10% Design and TPAP
Subject:	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3
Date:	Thursday, April 27, 2023
Location:	Remote
Core Project Team in attendance	**David Brutto**, EELRT PM, Transit Expansion Division (TE) **Edna Cuvin**, EELRT Program Director, TE **Adam Saddo**, Project Coordinator, TE **Steve Turco**, Senior Planner, City Planning **Monika Nasterska,** Transportation Planner, City Planning **Michael Robinson,** Senior Project Manager, Transportation Services **Tyrone Gan**, EELRT PM, HDR **Nick Shaw**, EELRT Deputy PM, HDR **Mahia Anhara**, EELRT Project Coordinator, HDR **Hansen Gong**, Transportation Engineer, HDR
TAC members	Refer to TAC organizational list

	Topic	Action By
1	**Welcome and Introductions** • City of Toronto Transit Expansion (TE) Division senior project manager, David Brutto welcomed the committee to the meeting • The core project team consisting of representatives from City of Toronto, TTC, and HDR (project consultant) were introduced.	
2	**EELRT project overview** • TE provided an overview of the project scope, key features of the line, and updated schedule for this phase of the project development. • The number of proposed stops of the LRT has been reduced. The Sheppard segment underwent a stop consolidation review recently. • There will be two major rounds of public consultation. First series of virtual open houses will begin in the end of May.	
3	**General overview of TAC #2 comments** • Since the last TAC meeting, the project team has been advancing the design criteria and principles by coordinating with two working groups: Public Realm Working Group (PRWG) and Intersections Working Group (IWG). • The PRWG provided preferred public realm configurations based on the characteristics of the corridor typology for the project. • Concept A applies to mixed use context and has the cycle track placed beside the roadway. • Concept B applies primarily to rear-facing residential contexts with lower pedestrian volumes. In this cross-section, landscaping zone is placed beside the roadway. • It was noted that at constrained locations, where full desired public realm width is not achievable, MUP would have to be proposed. These	

locations are likely short segments, beyond which separated cycle track and sidewalks will be proposed.
- Separated crossrides, according to OTM Book 18, will be designed at all intersections parallel to the LRT.
- HDR presented a map where cycling crossrides will be designed for roads and trails that cross the corridor based on existing, proposed, and under study cycling projects.
- HDR provided an overview of the comments received during TAC 2 and outlined the responses from the project team.

Questions
- TS asked whether future EELRT condition will have HOV lanes.
  - Response: The future condition will not have HOV lanes. RapidTO lanes are being reallocated to the LRT, and the remaining lanes will be for general purpose traffic.
- TS noted that the City requested MX-SSE to install traffic signals at Eglinton/Huntington and East of Eglinton Loop road, post SSE construction.
  - MX-SSE noted that it is not confirmed whether the signals will be installed. MX third party board is still assessing.
  - TE and MX-SSE to coordinate.

4 **Proposed SSE integration**
- Kennedy Station to Bimbrok
  - Cross-sections for Eglinton from Midland to Bimbrok were presented.
    - No impact to the SSE emergency exit buildings (EEBs), but the proposed ROW leads to narrower setbacks at the EEBs.
    - **MX-SSE to inform EELRT team on the acceptable setback from proposed ROW limit and EEBs.** **MX-SSE**
      - **Post meeting note:** MX confirmed that a 3 m clearance is required around EEBs.
    - MX-SSE cautioned that the EEB reference design used may not be the most recent.
  - City Urban Design (UD) noted that the setback from the building to the future ROW should not be less than 3 m.
  - No design changes to the Kennedy EELRT terminal since the last design package MX-SSE received in 2022.
  - Regarding the traffic signals request from City to MX-SSE, more discussion between City and MX-SSE is needed in light of EELRT.

- McCowan/Sheppard
  - No design changes since the last TAC meeting.

5 **Update on other focus areas**
- Malvern – Neilson Spur
  - The 5% design retained 4 lanes on Neilson, which would have to be widened by the ROW 1-4 m, leading to residential property encroachment.
  - For 10% design, lane reduction is being considered for Neilson Rd. (from 4 to 2 lanes) to reduce residential property impact. One lane per direction configuration would extend from Sheppard Ave to McLevin Ave.

- Lane reduction also provides the opportunity to fit an additional stop at Berner and Wickson. The ROW at the stop does encroach into residential property but does not impact the house.
- The terminal design at Malvern Town Centre has changed from centre platform to side platform. Property impact on the west side.

- <u>Highland Creek Bridge and Morningside embankment</u>
  - The LRT will be using the existing bridge, without widening, to reduce impact to the valley.
  - North of the bridge, the embankment would have to be widened to fit in the necessary cross-section elements. In order to avoid re-grading the embankment, HDR proposed to use MSE retaining walls, which would reduce impact on the valley.
    - **Post meeting note:** TRCA staff note that this is subject to geotechnical and stability assessments and design to confirm the feasibility, which have not been provided at this time.

  Questions:
  - ECS-BSE asked if any preliminary structural analysis of the bridge been carried out for light pole being fastened to the wall?
    - Parametric structural analysis has been conducted for LRT loads.
    - There may need to be modifications to the pier caps of the bridge to support the loads of the poles, but initial assessment shows that it is feasible.
  - City ECS-BSE noted that other types of walls should also be explored since MSE walls may preclude future vegetation and utilities.
  - City Parks, Forestry and Recreation asked if there will be a left turn lane into Morningside Park.
    - There would be no dedicated left turn lane to access Morningside Park, but vehicles can make a left turn from the travel lane.

- <u>Kingston-Lawrence-Morningside (KLM)</u>
  - Based on an evaluation process, option 1 was deemed to be the preferred alignment for the Kingston-Lawrence-Morningside area. Option 1 entails centre storage tracks north of Lawrence.
  - No widening to the north of Kingston (east of Lawrence) due to a midrise building with no setback located east of Falaise. Widening to the south only, into the KLM triangle.
  - City Urban Design asked why a storage track is required at this location:
    - KLM is the next feasible location after UTSC to accommodate this facility which TTC will be using for scheduled turn back and faulty train storage.
  - City Urban Design noted that 43 m ROW at KLM is very wide and that the project team should explore the possibility of reduced pavement.
  - Kingston-Morningside intersection would be reconfigured to remove NB and SB left turns.

- Eglinton GO
    - **For Eglinton GO rail bridge, EELRT team requested MX-Eglinton GO to provide information on location of potential 4th track for the LSE line.** This is important to know for confirming the vertical clearance for the LRT. **MX-Eglinton GO**
    - Three options for active transportation configuration under the rail bridge were presented. Option 3 is recommended since it meets safety and AODA requirements.
    - Coordination with MX-Eglinton GO station will be required to accommodate ROW widening into the GO station.
    - There would be encroachment into the Eglinton GO PPUDO due to EELRT ROW widening.

4 **Next Steps**

- TAC members are asked to submit formal comments to TAC 3 to TE (David B and Edna C) by May 11, 2023.

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise David Brutto within ten business days of the issuance of these notes. Minutes prepared by Mahia Anhara.

TAC 4 – Meeting Minutes

Project:	Eglinton East LRT 10% Design and TPAP
Subject:	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #4
Date:	Thursday, February 22, 2024
Location:	WebEx
Core Project Team in attendance	**David Brutto**, EELRT PM, Transit Expansion Division (TE) **Edna Cuvin**, EELRT Program Director, TE **Adam Saddo**, EELRT Project Coordinator, TE **Steve Turco**, Senior Transportation Planner, City Planning **Michael Robinson,** Senior Project Manager, Transportation Services Eric Chu, Head – Project Development & Planning Karim Nahed, EELRT Deputy PM, HDR Adrian Sin, EELRT Project Coordinator, HDR Hansen Gong, Transportation Engineer, HDR
TAC members	Refer to TAC organizational list

	Topic	Action By
1	**Welcome and Introductions** • Transit Expansion (TE) welcomed the committee to the meeting. • The core project team consisting of representatives from City of Toronto Transit Expansion, Transportation Services, City Planning, TTC, and HDR (project consultant) were introduced.	N/A
2	**Project Update** • TE provided an overview of the key features of the line, update on ongoing coordination, and updated schedule for this phase of the project development. <u>Questions & Comments</u> Toronto Water inquired about the timeline to complete the TPAP. • TE responded that the target launch date is Spring 2024. TS inquired if delivery agent has been confirmed yet. • TE responded that it is not confirmed yet and reiterated that the project is still at 10% design.	N/A
3	**10% Design – Overview of Refinements** • HDR confirmed no major changes to the 10% design from TAC #3. • See attached slides for details of specific changes. <u>Questions & Comments</u> City of Toronto Engineering and Construction Services (ECS) inquired about whether the type of wall along Ellesmere Road (Segment 2) is still a placeholder. • HDR confirmed that the walls are still a placeholder for space-proofing.	N/A

City Planning inquired about the justification for 15 m daylight triangles and flagged a conflict with SSE facilities at two of the daylight triangle locations along Eglinton Avenue. CP inquired about the envisioned use of space within the daylight triangles and how property acquisition would occur.

- HDR explained that 15 m daylight triangles are conservative and can be refined and confirmed that it captures the expanded public realm.
- TE responded that property would be acquired strategically and through development applications along the corridor. TE thanked CP for flagging conflict with SSE facilities.

Metrolinx - DSBRT inquired about the timeline for continued engagement with MX to finalize design for the DSBRT stop locations.

- TE stated that the City is committed to further coordination in the next design phase which will need to consider UTSC emerging campus plans as well.
- HDR confirmed that the EELRT's designed bus stop locations are similar to the existing DSBRT design.

Michael Tham (MT) inquired if traffic analysis in consideration of all the transit projects would be completed in 30% design.

- TE affirmed that detailed and multi-modal traffic analysis would be done in 30% design, but that some traffic analysis will be in the EPR that will be circulated for review.

TS inquired about the responsibility of the pedestrianization of the existing Military Trail.

- TE noted the planned pedestrianization of the existing Military Trail is not in scope for the LRT project.

MX - SSE asked how there is no impact to the ROW at McCowan Terminus given the widened platform from 9 to 10 m.

- HDR responded that the bus terminal access left turn lane (EB left) has been truncated.
- MX flagged the need for a traffic analysis for bus operations.
- TE acknowledged the need for the future traffic analysis but also noted that TTC is part of the LRT project team and has agreed on the 10% design which balances the needs of the LRT and bus operations.

CP flagged that TOC is envisioned which will result in greater pedestrian activity and asked about the suitability of an MUT.

4 **MX-SSE Integrated Terminals Coordination** N/A

- TE presented the status of the ongoing coordination process with MX, noting the progress of agreements with spatial protection at each terminal but concern remains for the Kennedy Station overbuild.

<u>Questions & Comments</u>

CP flagged concerns with customer experience regarding the proposed below grade connection between SSE and EELRT at Sheppard East Station.

- TE noted they have seen the connections and knockout panel being proposed in the recent STCP submission and will regroup with CP to verify the extent of the concerns.
- TE noted there will shortly be a request into Metrolinx-SSE for the updated CAD files at the interfaces so the designs can be properly contextualized and reviewed together.

5	**Impact Assessment Key Findings** • HDR provided a summary of Impact Assessment findings. • No significant impacts found. <u>Questions & Comments</u> ECS-BSE inquired about bridge ID 265 overtopping storm event. • HDR confirmed that it is both a regional and 100-year storm event. • ECS-BSE followed up about whether an assessment was done for ID 211. • HDR stated that for ID 211 there is no overtopping and that it will need to be replaced or widened, as noted in the EPR. • ECS-BSE requested that freeboard requirements be documented and that TRCA be further consulted. • HDR noted for further coordination with TRCA. Enbridge inquired about the engagement of utilities for potential conflicts/relocation. • TE stated that utilities would be engaged more fulsomely in the 30% design stage. The timeline for 30% design is not currently known. CP requested that a commitment be made related to the design of noise barriers to be sensitive to adjacent land use and public realm. • TE confirmed that is the intention and that any City emerging criteria for noise mitigation will also be considered.	N/A
4	**Next Steps** • TAC members are asked to submit formal comments for the EPR to TE (David Brutto, Edna Cuvin, and Adam Saddo) by **March 28th, 2024**.	TAC Members

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise David Brutto within ten business days of the issuance of these notes. Minutes prepared by Adrian Sin.

Eglinton East LRT

Date: Monday, May 15, 2023
Meeting Type: Virtual
Start time: 1:00 p.m. **End Time:** 3:00 p.m.

Project Overview:

The Eglinton East Light Rail Transit (EELRT / future Line 7) is a proposed 18-kilometre light rail transit system in Scarborough. The line will extend from Kennedy Station to Malvern Town Centre via the University of Toronto Scarborough Campus (UTSC), with a connection to the future Line 2 terminus at Sheppard Avenue and McCowan Road.

Meeting Objectives:

The purpose of this meeting was to allow representatives of key stakeholder groups along the EELRT corridor to preview the public consultation material ahead of an upcoming set of public virtual open houses. Attendees were asked to provide feedback on the functional (10%) design of the project, including the route, stops, typical design, public realm improvements, and technical details of specific Focus Areas.

Meeting Overview:

The meeting was facilitated by Aadila Valiallah (Senior Coordinator at the Public Consultation Unit). A presentation was provided in three parts by two presenters: David Brutto (Senior Project Manager at Transit Expansion) and Nick Shaw (Senior Project Manager at HDR). In part 1, David presented about the project history and overview, followed by a short Question-and-Answer session. In part 2, David presented about the project's features and benefits, and Nick Shaw (Senior Project Manager, HDR) presented about Public Realm Improvements, followed by a short break. In part 3, Nick presented about the project's 11 Focus Areas. A formal Question-and-Answer session followed the conclusion of the presentation, which allowed an opportunity for participants to ask questions and hear responses from City staff and the technical design team.

Questions & Comments

The following questions and answers were provided during the meeting. All questions have been categorized by topic.

Topic	Questions & Comments	Project Team Answer
Community Benefits	Of the 70,000+ people who will be within walking distance of EELRT, how many of those do not have access to a car?	The 70,000+ figure is based on 2041 projections. There isn't a reliable method to project future no-car households, but the project team underwent several analyses that looked at current conditions, and no-car households and transit access constraints were among the many factors that informed the 10% design.
	Will there be a community benefit agreement attached to this project, regarding local/social procurement and local	A Community Benefit Agreement or similar is something the City is working to incorporate into the project as it advances. Information about its framework and implementation will be included in future public consultation efforts.

Topic	Questions & Comments	Project Team Answer
	hiring (with attention to job creation / community wealth building for NIAs on the corridor)? And when/how will this be integrated?	
	Will the MSF create jobs, and if so, how many?	In this early phase of project design, this data is not yet available. More information will be available in future rounds of public consultation.
Design Features	Understanding that 50-metre trains allow for cost savings at KLM and Highland Creek, there's a concern about the lower capacity that these trains offer to Scarborough compared to the 90m Eglinton Crosstown trains. Can you share any ridership projection numbers compared to the capacity (people per hour per direction)?	The project team has been very cognizant of the ridership expectations in Scarborough. 50-metre trains meet expected ridership in 2041 and beyond, but the project is also designing with the potential to increase to 60-metre trains in mind. The City will consider whether the ridership projection numbers can be shared publicly and will respond accordingly. Another thing to consider is that train length is not the only factor that affects a light rail transit system's ridership. Longer trains mean that less trains can run along the route, so the team needs to balance train length with the amount of trains that can run to meet projected ridership expectations.
	Have provisions been made for transit signal prioritization (TSP) to be included in the EELRT's design?	TSP is certainly on the project team's mind. The project is too early in its development to say definitively what type of TSP that could implemented, but it will be explored as the project advances and will be brought to the community for consultation in a future phase of design.
Project Development	Is there a proposed timeline for construction?	The project is only at the 10% design, so the City doesn't have firm dates at this time. But the project is moving forward as planned. It should be noted that the project is currently not funded beyond the 10% Design and TPAP. Roughly, it would take 5-10 years to construct EELRT after council approval and a couple years of detailed design, so it could be something like 7-12 years before the line is operational.
	Is future funding for this project a priority for the City?	This is a question that can only be answered by City Council, as they are the ones who

Topic	Questions & Comments	Project Team Answer
		ultimately approve/decide which projects get funded.
	Is the Sheppard extension to McCowan/Sheppard included in the full project budget?	Yes, the Sheppard extension will be included in the City's proposed budget for the EELRT project, which will go to City Council in Q3 of 2023.
Public Consultation	Is the information presented during this meeting publicly available? If not, when will it be brought to wider community residents for feedback? In particular, what is your plan for effectively reaching marginalized residents of NIAs along the corridor with this information, to give them a chance to provide their input?	Public notices are being posted in local publications this week (week of May 15), and a digital copy was posted to the project website today (Monday, May 15). Virtual Open Houses will be held on May 30, June 1, and June 7. The City plans to send the final presentation from this meeting to all SAG representatives, who are in turn asked to share with their networks.
	Have the meeting notices been posted in the TTC shelters along the route to advise of the project and consultations?	No, meeting notices were not posted in TTC shelters throughout the project corridor, as this tactic was not part of the notification plan. The City can share the statistics of print distributions to demonstrate that a significant portion of the population will be reached.
	Is it possible to incorporate Chinese and Tamil translations into the upcoming meetings?	While it is technically possible for the City to provide interpretation during the live VOHs, interpreting multiple languages in the same meeting can be challenging. The City will evaluate their options internally and follow up with the stakeholder group accordingly.
Service	Why does the functional (10%) design only include a spur to Malvern, rather than incorporating it as part of the direct route?	The service concept for EELRT is still under development, but the most effective concept the City has explored is a 3-branch service: a full branch from Kennedy to McCowan/Sheppard, a separate branch running from Kennedy to UTSC, and one running from Malvern Town Centre to McCowan/Sheppard. Specific to Malvern, ridership studies suggest that most users would be traveling to/from Malvern Town Centre from the McCowan/Sheppard area. Further, anyone who wants to travel from the Kennedy Station area to Malvern or vice versa would most likely use

Topic	Questions & Comments	Project Team Answer
		Line 2 and connect with EELRT at McCowan/Sheppard, rather than riding the entirety of the EELRT route through Scarborough.
	For clarification, under the 3-service concept, if someone is travelling from Malvern to Kennedy Station, would they need to transfer to a different vehicle at some point along the line?	Yes. Anyone wanting to use EELRT to go from Malvern Town Centre to UTSC or vice versa would need to transfer to a different service route at Sheppard/Neilson.
	What would be the total travel time from the Malvern Stop to Kennedy Station?	EELRT's travel time from end to end is expected to be around 40 minutes. As explained above, most users riding from Malvern to Kennedy Station would take EELRT to the McCowan/Sheppard station and take Line 2 to Kennedy from there.
	Is the Markham North stop at the corner of Markham and Sheppard?	Yes, the Markham North stop would be at Markham and Sheppard, and it would look very similar in design to the Proposed Typical Intersection Design shown in the presentation.
	Is the goal of the EELRT to replace the 905 express (which goes from Kennedy Station to UTSC campus) or run in addition to it?	EELRT would replace the 905 Express bus.
Stakeholder Coordination	Was the zoo considered or consulted during the design of the project?	The City acknowledges the zoo's southwest boundary in the northeast vicinity of the proposed MSF site. Any potential impacts of the MSF on nearby land use will be considered in the impact assessment and proposed mitigation as part of TPAP. This project as directed by Council is being designed to service (including stops) Sheppard Avenue as far east as Morningside Ave. The project team will protect for the potential for future extension of service along Sheppard Avenue east of Morningside and the proposed Conlins Road MSF site.
	How will the businesses at Sheppard and Morningside be affected?	It's too early in the design to be able to identify specific impacts in any particular area, but studies will be conducted over the next few months to help give the City a better understanding of any potential impacts. The City will also look to open a dialogue with

Topic	Questions & Comments	Project Team Answer
		affected businesses throughout the design process.
Technical Design	For the Malvern Town Centre stop, do trains loop around to go back to the Sheppard portion of the line?	Just past the Malvern Town Centre stop, there would be special trackwork that allows the train to swap directions at the dead end.
Traffic Impacts	How will this project impact traffic around the Military Trail and Ellesmere zone, both during construction and once operational? How will the project affect travel time for the other buses running within that area (GO buses, other TTC bus routes, DRT etc.)?	The City is in close coordination with both Metrolinx and UTSC to ensure traffic and bus impacts are minimized during construction of both projects. More details about constructability and related impacts will be available in future phases of consultation.

Total Participants: 15

Project Team and Panelists

City of Toronto – Public Consultation Unit
Aadila Valiallah
Amanda Ratych
Stephanie Gris Bringas

City of Toronto – Transit Expansion
Adam Saddo
David Brutto
Edna Cuvin
Michael Paolucci

City of Toronto – Transportation Services
Michael Robinson

City of Toronto – City Planning
Riad Rahman
Stella Gustavson
Steve Turco

TTC
Dominic Ho
Rob Moffat

HDR
Hansen Gong
Mahia Anhara
Nick Shaw
Pierce Sprague

Councillors

Councillor Ainslie's Office (Scarborough-Guildwood) | Antonette DiNovo
Councillor Myer's Office (Scarborough North) | Ketheesakumaran Navaratnam