

# Summary Report: Island Working Group Meeting #1

November 20, 2025, 6:00 – 8:00 pm

Metro Hall, Room 308-309

55 John St, Toronto, M5V 3C6 and via Teams





# Contents

- About the Meeting and this Report..... 1
- Discussion Highlights .....2
- Detailed Feedback .....3
  - Toronto Island Park Projects Feedback.....3
  - Draft Terms of Reference Framework Feedback.....5
  - Other Feedback ..... 11
- Appendices..... 1
  - Appendix A. List of Meeting Participants ..... 1
  - Appendix B. Meeting Agenda .....2
  - Appendix C. Civic Lottery Composition.....3
  - Appendix D. Post-Meeting Feedback .....4

# About the Meeting and this Report

---

On Thursday, November 20, 2025, the City of Toronto's Parks & Recreation Division hosted the first Island Working Group meeting – one of three working groups created to advise on and support implementation of the Toronto Island Park Plan. The purpose of the meeting was to:

- introduce working group members to each other and the project team;
- provide updates on Toronto Island Park Plan projects and its engagement process;
- seek feedback on a Draft Terms of Reference framework for the working group, and;
- answer group members' questions.

28 of about 60 working group members participated in the meeting, with 18 attending in-person and 10 online. Tom Davidson from Deputy Mayor Ausma Malik's office also attended the meeting. Netami Stuart (Senior Project Manager, Toronto Island, Parks & Recreation), chaired the meeting and provided an overview presentation along with Nadia Galati (Senior Public Consultation Coordinator, Parks & Recreation), the working group coordinator. Ian Malczewski and Yulia Pak from Third Party Public facilitated the meeting. See Appendix A for a full list of Working Group members and participants.

The meeting began with a Land Acknowledgement and African Ancestral Acknowledgement, followed by presentations and plenary, small group, and virtual discussion. After the discussions, Netami and Ian thanked everyone for their feedback, and Ian reminded participants to provide additional feedback by December 4, saying a draft meeting summary would be shared with participants for review after the feedback deadline. See Appendix B for the Meeting Agenda and Appendix D for Post-Meeting Feedback.

Third Party Public prepared this summary and shared a draft with participants for review before finalizing it.

# Discussion Highlights

---

The following points summarize key takeaways and themes of the feedback shared during the meeting. They are meant to be read as part of the more detailed summary that follows.

**There were no major objections to the Draft Terms of Reference Framework**, though several sections need definitions and more detail to provide working group members more with clarity and comfort.

**The group's mandate and role must be communicated clearly in the Terms of Reference.** In particular, the Terms of Reference need to be clear on whether the group is an *advisory body* or a *decision-making body*. If it's a decision-making body, the Terms of Reference need to clarify the scope of what the group has authority over, what limitations there are on that scope, how decision-making will work if the group's decisions conflict with the City's direction or another group's decision, and more.

**There is a need for a transparent explanation of the composition of the group** (and the rationale for that composition). Specific topics participants wanted to see information about included the demographic targets the City set for the group, which organizations are on the group and who those organizations speak for, how many on the group are Islanders or waterfront-based and how many are not, and how the City will consider the differing levels of experience, familiarity, and impact of implementation on the different types of group member (organization representatives and civic lottery members).

**Roles and responsibilities need to be clearly documented in the Terms of Reference.** Participants were particularly interested in seeing the City consider: embedding meeting attendance requirements for working group members; clarifying that members can continue to advance work, projects, and advocacy outside of meetings; commit to sharing timely and relevant information with members in advance of meetings, and; providing updates on projects after the group has discussed them.

**Much interest in the Ferry Landings Revitalization project.** Participants were keen to learn more and share feedback about the Ferry Landing Revitalization project, especially its scope, timeline, and engagement process outside of working group meetings.

# Detailed Feedback

---

This section captures feedback shared at the meeting as well as the feedback shared in writing after the meeting. Responses from the project team, where given, are *in italics*.

## Toronto Island Park Projects Feedback

In the first half of the meeting, the City provided an overview of the Toronto Island Park Plan, including some of the projects the Island Working Group will be discussing in 2026. As part of this presentation, the City shared some detail about the Ferry Landings Revitalization project: one of the first projects the working groups will be discussing with the City in 2026. Participants had a few questions and thoughts on the Park Plan projects overall and several about the Ferry Landings Revitalization project.

### Discussion about Park Plan Projects

Speaking about Park Plan projects, participants asked:

- **Other than the Ferry Landings project, what else will the Island Working Group discuss in 2026?** *The City said that much of the work next year will focus on “Studies and Design, including Wayfinding Design, Interpretive Strategy & Island Identity, a Movement Strategy, Park Sustainability, and more.*
- **When will the City be able to show what the Park Plan priorities are for the next few years?** *In general, the City is following the prioritization of projects identified in section 5.2 of the Toronto Park Plan document. At the first meeting of all working groups in 2026 we will discuss what this means for our work in 2026.*
- **Are priority projects correlated to what projects have a budget?** *If so, will the Working Group have a role identifying priorities? The current implementation budget will be used on projects identified as priorities in the Toronto Island Park Plan.*
- **When will the Park Plan’s listed “near-term, first steps” environmental priorities be brought to the working group** (including identifying opportunities to expand, improve, restore habitat and optimizing park operations and management practices to improve naturalizing key sites)? *These seem to be missing from the list of projects the working groups will discuss in 2026. The implementation of these steps is being undertaken in collaboration with Urban Forestry and Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. We can discuss progress on the priorities identified in the “Supporting the Natural Environment” section of the plan in Spring 2026.*

Participants also expressed interest in discussing other projects, such a bridge to the park, the variety of and access to food options on the Island, affordable access for

lower-income groups, the potential for multi sports courts like pickleball and tennis at Hanlan's Point, and Island movement planning, services and facilities (like washrooms)

Finally, participants were interested in the details of projects completed on the Island since the conclusion of the Park Plan process, including the cost estimates for refreshing the Hanlan's Point tennis courts, the rationale for the decision to naturalize the tennis court area over the summer of 2025 and the cost of that naturalization.

## Discussion about Ferry Landings Revitalization

The City's presentation included an overview of the scope and planned process for the Ferry Landings Revitalization project, a landscape, architectural, and engineering design effort that will be part of the working groups' efforts in 2026. Participants had questions and suggestions about this work, including:

- **Does the Ferry Landing Revitalization project include the Ferry Docks on the mainland?** *The City said the focus of the Ferry Landing Revitalization project is on the island side, not the mainland. There is detailed planning underway to upgrade the Ferry Docks, and that work will follow the island-side Ferry Landings work.*
- **Will the ferry landings need significant new infrastructure to accommodate the new electric ferries?** *The City said that, no, the new ferries should not require significant changes to the island-side landings. Construction is underway at the mainland Ferry Docks to build charging infrastructure, but the City is not building charging infrastructure on the Island ferry landings. The slips needed to accommodate the new ferries are more or less the same size as what's needed for the current ferries.*
- **Will new ferry landings be winterized?** *The City said that winterizing ferry landings is something it will be looking at through the revitalization project in 2026.*
- **Will the design team be considering the experience of Island residents when it comes to the ferry landings?** *Sometimes Islanders get stuck in the large crowds of visitors. The City said that, yes, part of the work includes modelling crowds and that the City will be thinking about the experience of residents as part of the work.*
- **Will people who work on the Island get priority access on ferries?** *The City said that any existing agreements Island-based businesses have for priority access will continue.*
- **Is it possible the new landings will result in more visitors to the Island?** *The City said that the new landings themselves will not necessarily lead to an increase in visitors since the bottleneck to accessing the island is ferry capacity, not landing capacity. The new ferries will add some capacity, but this may have more of an impact on the number of people relying on water taxis than on the overall number of visitors to the Island.*
- **What will the working groups be discussing about the ferry landings project in its first meeting in early 2026?** *The City said that the first engagement will be*

about the “program” of each of the Island landings, focusing on “what do we need to do?” at each. The discussion will explore questions like whether the landings need buildings, vehicle access, and more.

- **Will the City have a dedicated engagement process for the Ward’s Island Ferry Landing (given many Islanders live near and use that landing)?** *The City said that, yes, in addition to working group meetings, there will be a dedicated engagement process for Ward’s that will involve Island residents.*
- **Is the City willing to tap the advice and expertise of the many great designers and artists who live on the Island to inform this project?** *They would likely be willing and excited to help. The City said that, yes, it is keen to involve Island-based artists in the process.*
- **Will Emergency Services (like Toronto Fire) have a role in the project?** *Yes, the City is convening a Technical Advisory Committee to inform the ferry landings project, and Emergency Services will be invited to participate.*
- **How is the work on new ferries being coordinated with work on the ferry landings and Ferry Docks?** *The City said that there are separate teams responsible for the landings and the new ferries, and that they meet regularly to coordinate and connect their work.*

## Draft Terms of Reference Framework Feedback

In the second half of the meeting, the City presented and sought feedback on a Draft Terms of Reference Framework for the Island Working Group, describing it as a proposed structure to documenting the mandate, roles, and “rules” of how the City and Working Group will work together. Following the presentation, participants discussed and shared their thoughts on the Draft Terms of Reference Framework.

Overall, no major objections were raised to the Draft Framework, with some saying it’s on the right track. Participants said they liked that it encouraged and supported cross-over between the three working groups (including that members will sit on multiple groups and that the City will bring all groups together periodically). A few said they liked that the City would bring many different projects to the working group for discussion.

Participants also identified things they felt were missing or priorities to include in the Terms of Reference. This feedback is summarized below, organized under the relevant section of the presented framework.

### Section 1. Project Context

- Clarify where the Island Working Group sits in the City’s broader “decision tree.”

- Describe the types of projects this group will discuss so that's clear if the group will have the opportunity to weigh in on things like future RFPs related to Island projects, operations, and business.
- Explain when the Toronto Island Park Community Advisory Committee last met, how many times it met over the Park Plan process, the reason for the gap between the last meeting and creating the Island Working Group, and what projects have been done on the Island since that group last met

## Section 2. Objective

- Describe the City's intent for this group, including to what extent the City's intent is to formalize, widen, and/or streamline engagement about the park.
- Consider adding a statement that the City intends to establish long-term relationships with working group members as implementation occurs.

## Section 3. Mandate

### Overall

This section needs to be clearer about the group's scope and any limitations on its scope, especially when it comes to describing whether and where the Island Working Group is an *advisory group* or a *decision-making body*. The clarity will likely be needed in the up-front narrative, 3.2 – *Provide informed input on Island-wide projects*, 3.3 – *Serve as a deliberative advisory body for emerging issues*, 3.4 – *Assess and advise on external proposals and new ideas*, and 3.5 – *Provide recommendations to guide project implementation*.

- If it is an *advisory group*, the Terms of Reference should be explicit about that and communicate the value of the group's decisions or recommendations in the context of other groups or bodies who also have a voice and role in decision-making. Advisory groups can be valuable components of a decision-making ecosystem as long as the City transparently and clearly communicates its mandate as such. If this group is an advisory group, it may not need a detailed Terms of Reference that has provisions for consensus thresholds, quorum requirements, and more.
- If it is a *decision-making body*, the City should be clear about what, exactly, the group has decision-making authority over (and how), what guarantee working group members will have that its decisions will be followed, and what happens if the group's decision directly opposes a project the City is planning to bring forward or conflicts with the decision of another working group.

Participants also said this section should acknowledge that not all projects on the island can and will come to the working group. Some island projects are being advanced by City (and other agency) staff, some by working group members organizations, all at

different paces and on different schedules. These projects may not be priorities for discussion with the Island Working Group, and the working group should not become a gatekeeper or obstacle to progress.

## **Up-front narrative**

- Define “informed perspectives”

## **Section 3.1 Represent the Island’s Diverse User Base**

- Define “vulnerable,” “marginalized,” and “equity-deserving.” Working group members need to understand what these terms mean and what the needs and vulnerabilities of these groups are.
- Add a commitment that the City is not just looking for *representation* of the perspectives of the park’s diverse user base (including 2SLGBTQIA+ and Indigenous perspectives), but to *incorporate* their perspectives in decision-making.
- Acknowledge that Hanlan’s Point Beach is as Canada’s oldest queer space the site of the first Pride.

## **Section 3.4 Assess and advise on external proposals and new ideas**

- Define “community values” and where these will be drawn from.

## **Section 3.7 Strengthen communication between the City and the community**

- Add a reference to strengthening relationships with cultural artists on the Island.
- Add text indicating that the group will also help improve the City’s *accountability* to the community.

## **Section 4. Recruitment**

### **Section 4.2 Composition**

- Provide details about group composition (along with the City’s rationale for that composition), including which organizations are on the group (and how many of these organizations were part of the Community Advisory Committee), their named representatives, who group members speak on behalf of, and how many on the group are Islanders and not-Islanders.
- Share the specific diversity or demographic targets the City set for the group.
- Clarify if and how the different types of group members will have different levels of influence on process and outcomes. The group includes some members selected at random through a civic lottery and some that are part of organizations who represent people who live and work on the Island and waterfront. These two groups of people

may have different levels of knowledge, familiarity, histories of community involvement and advocacy, and will be impacted differently by implementation.

*Facilitation team note: the Appendix A includes the list of participants and invited organizations, and Appendix C in*

### **Section 4.3 Eligibility**

- Explain how demographic targets relate to who is eligible to be on the group.
- Consider adding youth under the age of 18 as eligible with parent / guardian permission.

### **Section 4.4 Termination of Membership**

- Explain if and how diversity and demographic targets will weigh into processes around membership termination.
- Clarify what the “high threshold” is to terminate membership and explain on what grounds the City would terminate membership.

### **Section 4.6 Compensation**

- Clarify the amount of compensation offered working group members, including who is eligible for compensation, who is not, why, and whether there will be tiered compensation offered for participation in any sub-groups.
- One participant was concerned honoraria could add up to a substantial cost to the City that this cost could become a limiting factor in the number of meetings scheduled. If honoraria costs limit the number the meetings, the City should consider not offering honoraria or offering a one-time honorarium at the end of a working group member’s term.

### **Section 4.7 Term of Membership**

- Include a mechanism(s) to extend terms or create special types of working group members. Given the long-term lifecycle of major infrastructure and operational projects, the 2-year term limit may not be sufficient for there be a continuity of perspectives or decisions. Suggestions to address this challenge included:
  - Consider making the term limit longer (at least for the inaugural membership, given its role in informing the Terms of Reference).
  - Develop an “oversight body” comprising legacy members as part of a tiered governance approach.
  - Keep a roster of former members “in good standing” that could be re-added to the group.

- Create routes for group members to have an increased role in the group or at the City as their experience increases.

## **Section 4.8 Meeting Location**

- Include a provision stating that at least some engagement will take place on the Island, potentially outside the formal meeting process (such as through site tours or visits). Hosting events on the Island is especially important since many of the new working group members may not live on or be very familiar with it. For example, ferry landing visits could be helpful to informing the Ferry Landings Revitalization project.
- Indicate the time of day and day of week for meetings, with one participant saying weekday evenings after 6pm would be the best time to meet, followed by a weekend morning time if necessary.

## **Section 5 – Agenda-Setting Protocol**

- Identify a mechanism and process for working group members to a) contribute suggestions for agenda items and b) identify what priority issues it would like to discuss in the time available in a given meeting.
- Clarify what mechanisms members can use outside of working group meetings to share concerns or suggestions with the City (to avoid overloaded meeting agendas full of member-proposed topics).

## **Section 6 – Roles and Responsibilities**

### **Section 6.1 Responsibilities of Working Group Members**

- State expectations of (or requirements for) consistent attendance from group members, with a few saying they would be open to seeing a provision that revokes group membership if a member misses a specified number of meetings. Others said that there should be a statement that allows organizations to send an alternate representative if necessary
- Identify a mechanism for members to share updates on Island projects under their purview, potentially as part of a regular agenda item during working group meetings or by sharing info on shared website between meetings.
- Clarify who concerns are reported to, how, and how the City will provide confidentiality to a member lodging a complaint.
- Clearly state that participation in the working group does not prevent members from doing Island-related advocacy work outside of their role on the group. Members should also be able to bring the work they do to the attention of the working group.
- Allow for member organizations to send a replacement on their behalf if needed.

## **Section 6.2 Responsibilities of Parks & Recreation**

- Describe how the City will translate the group's decisions into action.
- Include a City commitment to share relevant information in a timely manner — potentially via a website or other mechanism — and to keep the group regularly updated on significant developments related to the Island. Providing Island Working Group members with access to relevant, contextual information with adequate time to review before decisions are taken (including reports, presentations, budgets, studies, previous meeting summaries and more) is key to supporting the group's deliberations. The same information should be shared with both in-person and remote participants.
- Embed a protocol describing how the City will report back on how it considered the group's feedback, including how feedback was implemented (and if not, an explanation of why not).
- Explain what mechanisms the City will put in place to ensure that Island Projects will not be significantly revamped after the group has weighed in on them, and/or a commitment to bring projects back for discussion if there is significant change.
- Consider including a RACI framework identifying who is responsible, accountable, consulted, and informed on various topics between the City and working group members.

## **Section 7. Procedures**

### **Section 7.2 Chair**

- Explain if the Chair is in charge of the governance of the group (and, if not, who is).

### **Section 7.3 Participants**

- Explain whether working group members can propose guest speakers or visitors if relevant to a given project

### **Section 7.4 Quorum**

- Identify whether quorum is required to receive honoraria.

### **Section 7.5 Code of Conduct**

- Describe what preventative measures will be taken to protect members from potentially insensitive / harmful comments during sensitive conversations.

### **Section 7.6 Meeting Format**

- Add a note explaining that there will be efforts to create connection and conversation between in-person and remote participants in hybrid meetings.

- Describe how group members can ensure their priorities are understood by the City if there are limits on connecting outside of meetings.
- Add a provision to allocate time on agendas to revisit topics previously discussed.
- Explain how meeting notes will be prepared and distributed.

### **Section 7.7 Consensus and Divergent Viewpoints**

- Clarify expectations for consensus and how the City will consider dissenting opinions and conflicting decisions.
- Explain the difference (if any) between decisions that require consensus and decisions that require quorum.
- Specify whether a majority of members adopting a “live with” position (as opposed to a “support” position) is sufficient to constitute consensus and how such decisions will be documented. One participant said that 70% is a high threshold for consensus.
- Clarify how the City will address, consider, and document differences of opinion or dissenting perspectives, especially given the group’s diversity.

### **Section 7.8 Openness and In-Camera Proceedings**

- Limit use of outside observation to maintain confidentiality and privacy.

### **Section 7.10 Other Ways of Engaging the Working Group**

- Indicate that there could be emergency situations or unforeseen circumstances that require the group’s attention and consultation.

### **Section 7.11 Coordination with Other Toronto Island Working Groups**

- Explain how the City will weigh Island Working Group decisions against Hanlan’s Point Beach Working Group decisions about projects affecting Hanlan’s, including how the City will handle situations where these groups have different opinions.
- Add a specific schedule of updates between groups over the next 2 years.

## **Other Feedback**

Participants shared other suggestions and feedback about engagement and communication with the working group and broader community, including:

- continue efforts to bring diverse perspectives and balance to the Island Working Group. Suggested additions included: YMCA counsellors, South Asian (including Sikh) community members, Indigenous community members, and African community members, youth, artists on the Island, paddlers, bird watchers, and tourists (including from the GTA and from abroad. Some said they would like

representation from people on the waterfront prioritized, while others said they wanted to see more city-wide, non-waterfront perspectives included.

- include in the Guiding Document a priority to respect the natural environment and maintain the character of the park.
- make sure there is enough time to accommodate conversation in meetings.
- interest in participating in surveys, site visits, and more than 4 meetings a year.
- interest in a communication platform between working group members.
- consider creating a website or information board (such as 4-season information booths on the islands) that are refreshed periodically with updates about what Park Projects are already happening or planned to happen soon.
- make sure there are mechanisms to communicate with the broader Island resident community on Park Projects, such as Town Halls.

# Appendices

# Appendix A. List of Meeting Participants

## City of Toronto

### **Parks, Forestry & Recreation**

Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager,  
Toronto Island – *Chair*  
Nadia Galati, Senior Public Consultation  
Coordinator – *Coordinator*

### **Deputy Mayor Ausma Malik's Office**

Tom Davidson, Director, Waterfront  
Revitalization Initiatives

## **Community Advisory Committee**

*Note that the organizations and individuals in **bold** participated in the meeting.*

## **Organizations**

### **Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association**

### **Centreville Amusement Park**

Cycle Toronto  
East Waterfront Community Association  
Friends of Cherry Beach and Outer Harbour

### **Friends of Gibraltar Point**

### **Friends of Hanlan's**

### **Gibraltar Point Centre for the Arts**

Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood  
Association

Harbourfront Community Association

### **Island Bike Rental**

### **Island Café**

Island Public / Natural Science School  
Island Yacht Club

### **Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation**

Nishnawbe Homes  
Pirate Life Theatre (Art & Water)  
Pride Toronto

### **ProtectNatureTO**

Queen City Yacht Club  
Shadowland

## Facilitation Team

### **Third Party Public**

Adrien Hall  
Yulia Pak

Sunshine Senior's Centre  
The Pirate Taxi by Water Taxi Now

### **Toronto Field Naturalists**

Toronto Island / MNCFN Friendship Group  
Toronto Island Canoe Club

### **Toronto Island Community Association**

Toronto Island Disc Golf Course

### **Toronto Island Marina**

Toronto Island SUP

### **Toronto Islands Residential Community Trust Corp**

Toronto Public Space Committee  
Trans Lobby Group Toronto Trans Coalition

### **Tree Trust Toronto Island Community Chapter**

Trinity St. Paul's centre for Faith Justice and  
the Arts

Urban Minds

### **Waterfront BIA**

### **Waterfront for All**

Waterfront Montessori Children's Centre  
Wendat Nation

William Beasley Enterprises Limited

## **Community Members and Members-At-Large**

Taner Alpaslan

**Nicole Bell**

Dorothy Du

**Sharona Freudmann**

**Elaine Glynn**

**Mohit Gogia**

**McKenna Gray**

Akshay Gupta

**Shari Hasrouny**

Anwarul Kabir

Sue-Lynn Manone-Cornfoot

**Susel Munoz**

**Laura-Maria Nikolareizi**

**Priyanka Sharma**

Faahidh Sheriff

**Peter Simm**

**Sylvia Sweeney**

**Austin Zhao**

# Appendix B. Meeting Agenda

## Island Working Group Meeting #1

Toronto Island Park Plan Implementation

Thursday, November 20, 2025

6:00–8:00pm

Metro Hall, Room 308/309

55 John St, Toronto, M5V 3C6



### Proposed meeting agenda

- 6:00 PM Acknowledgements**
- Welcome, agenda review, introductions**  
Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager, Parks and Recreation, City of Toronto  
Ian Malczewski, Third Party Public
- 6:15 Island Park Plan Updates**  
Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager, Parks and Recreation, City of Toronto
- Part 1: Process updates
  - Part 2: Updates on Island Park projects
- 6:30 Questions of clarification**
- 6:50 Break**
- 7:00 Draft Terms of Reference Framework**  
Netami Stuart, Senior Project Manager, Parks and Recreation, City of Toronto
- 7:20 Discussion**
1. Which sections from the Draft Terms of Reference Framework stuck out to you (if any), and why?
  2. Is there anything specific that you think is important to include in any of the sections? If so, what is it?
  3. What (if anything) is missing or concerning to you in the Draft Terms of Reference Framework?
  4. Do you have any other comments or advice?
- 7:55 Wrap-up & next steps**
- 8:00 Adjourn**

### Meeting purpose

To introduce Island Working Group members to each other and the project team, provide updates on the Toronto Island Park Plan projects, seek feedback on a draft Terms of Reference Framework, and answer group members' questions.

### Resources

[Toronto Island Park Plan Project Website](#)

[Proposed Toronto Island Master Plan – Working Group Tracking Tool](#)

### Written feedback

Turn this agenda over and use the space provided to share any written feedback with the project team.

## Appendix C. Civic Lottery Composition

In response to questions about the City's Civic Lottery recruitment targets and composition, the City and Third Party Public developed the following response:

### Recruitment targets

The initial selection process took place within a set of City-defined demographic variables and categories, listed below. The City's goal was to achieve proportional representation of the city-wide population within these categories to the extent possible given a recruitment target of 20 individuals. To identify targets for the demographic variables, the team drew on recent census data and other documents (like the City's Multi-Year Accessibility Plan) if census data was limited or unavailable. For categories where proportional representation would have resulted in zero group members due to them being a very small percentage of the City's population, the team rounded the target up to one (given the City's goal to prioritize perspectives that are in the minority and/or generally under-represented in engagement processes). In a few cases, the City identified a specific category as a priority, meaning their target representation on the group was slightly higher than their representation in the city-wide population. These are bolded in the list below.

*City recruitment targets: variables and categories*

- Gender (women, men, **trans woman, trans man, gender non-binary**)
- Race (White, Arab, Indigenous, Latin American, Southeast Asian, more than one race, **South Asian, East Asian, Black**)
- Age (20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50 - 64, 65+)
- Ability (living with a disability)
- Income (low income)
- Immigration (newcomer, refugee, or immigrant)
- Parenthood (parent of child(ren) under 18)
- Sexuality (**Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Queer, Two-Spirit**)

The City's application form also collected other data about applicants (like postal codes, home ownership vs. renting, and more) so that these variables could be used to inform future selections if/as needed.

### Application and selection results

In total, there were almost 190 applicants, with most of the categories above having more applicants than the targeted spaces for the category. Through the selection process, the team was able to meet the City's targets for most categories. A few of the successful applicants have either not responded or informed us they are no longer interested in participating. As a result, in the new year there will be a supplemental selection process from within the remaining applicant pool.

# Appendix D. Post-Meeting Feedback

Participants had two weeks after the meeting to submit any additional feedback for the City to consider. This feedback was summarized in the main body of the report and has been included as submitted below.

## Submission #1

Further input from Ellen Schwartzel, (Toronto Field Naturalists)

### 1. Which sections of the Draft Terms of Reference stuck out to you (if any) and why?

See #2 and #3 below

### 2. Is there anything specific that you think is important to include in any of the sections? If so, what is it?

#### Section 3 (Mandate)

Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 need to speak about the scope of IWG's input, including limitations on that scope. Many Island projects are underway; some fast, some slow, some stalled, and the projects are variously being advanced by IWG members and/or the City's interdepartmental teams. The Mandate section should make clear that IWG members will continue to advance Island projects that align with the goals of the Island Master Plan, whether or not they are top priorities for discussion at the IWG. Not every project can or should be reviewed by IWG. The IWG should not become a gatekeeping process or an alternative to progress.

#### Section 5 (Agenda-setting protocol)

IWG members need to be engaged in the agenda-setting for any upcoming year; they need to be able to contribute suggestions for agenda items, and discuss and agree on what priority suite of issues will be addressed in the time available.

### 3. What (if anything) is missing or concerning to you in the Draft Terms of Reference Framework?

**Missing:** Environmental themes missing from proposed agendas for the four 2026 meetings: when or how will the Master Plan's listed "near-term, first steps" environmental priorities be tackled? such as..

- identifying opportunities to expand, improve, restore habitat

- optimizing park operations and management practices to improve naturalizing key sites

**Missing:** a section focused on information sharing and information flow; it could be section 8, (after section 7: procedures).

**Why needed:** As discussed at the June 25/25 IWG meeting, good information flow will be critical to the success of the IWG, since the stated mandate of the IWG is to “provide informed perspectives”, and to “provide informed input on island-wide projects”.

We can't act as informed participants without access to relevant contextual information. Relevant, available information needs to be shared with IWG, with adequate time to review before decisions are taken. City staff are the stewards of much of the relevant information, in the form of (taxpayer-funded) studies, reports, presentations, budgets and proposals. To get good value out of that information, it needs to be shared among those who deliberate on proposals.

**Missing:**

Under 6.1 (Responsibilities of Working Group Members) this section should encourage Working Group members to share updates on Island projects under their purview. **How** they share updates: could either be as part of a regular agenda item during meetings, or in between meetings, by uploading info to a shared online site; possibly web-page with links to details.

Under 6.2 (Responsibilities of Parks and Recreation); “sharing of relevant information in a timely manner” should be included as a key commitment. And it follows that “enabling and supporting an information-sharing mechanism or clearinghouse” should also be a commitment. At the June 25/25 IWG, an online webpage info-sharing mechanism or clearinghouse was discussed. Where is that idea now?

**4. Do you have any other comments or advice?**

Not at the moment.

**Submission #2**

Thank you for the excellent session on November 22nd. It was very informative, and I look forward to receiving the meeting minutes as well as any feedback on the Terms of Reference. I was wondering if there was a RACI associated with the this working group allowing me to better understand who to connect with depending on the types of questions I may have.

If I understood correctly, there may be an opportunity to participate in the Hanlon Beach Working Group. If so, I would be very interested in joining, should there be capacity to accommodate me. I believe participating in both working groups would provide a more holistic understanding of the broader efforts underway to revitalize the Toronto Islands.

I look forward to your feedback. Thank you again, and I hope you have a great weekend.

Mohit Gogia

### **Submission #3**

Thank you for running the meeting the other week, I am looking forward to getting to know everyone!

Below are a few additional thoughts I had about Terms of Reference Framework

Section 4.3 - Eligibility: Youth under the age of 18 should be eligible with parent/guardian permission. Getting youth perspectives would be valuable.

Section 4.4 - Termination: On what grounds can City staff terminate a membership? In regards to a high threshold for the group to vote out a member, what constitutes a high threshold - can this be made explicit - 70% perhaps?

Section 4.8 - Meeting Location: I know it was already brought up in the meeting, but I would like to reiterate that meeting on the island would be highly beneficial when possible for certain discussions. Perhaps being able to organize less formal meetings/tours of island space between the formal seasonal meetings could help.

Section 7.7 - Consensus and Divergent Viewpoints: If consensus is 70% but more than 70% of those in agreement are only voting that they can "live with" a position, consensus can be broken or it should be documented that the consensus was a "live with" majority rather than a full support majority.

Best,

Nicole Eun-Ju Bell

### **Submission #4**

The work you have put into the plan document and the Terms of Reference are extensive and greatly appreciated. I hope only that recognizing the additional time extended from December 6, 2025 to the new January 31, 2026 meeting will allow for some additional input.

The following remarks are offered in the spirit of, and in reflection of the Mandate identified to the IWG, namely stating that The IWG is to serve as a 'deliberative advisory body for emerging issues' and to provide City staff with community input on any projects, proposals, or operational matters that may affect the Islands—whether initiated by the City, third-party partners, community organizations, or other stakeholders.

1. With respect to the original Island Plan group members and the meetings held with that group as it was constituted and active between 2020 and 2024. The following information would be useful with respect to background, transparency, and access to valuable historic knowledge:

- Please confirm when the original IWG group last met and when it was disbanded (it appears to have terminated 2024, about 1.5 years ago?)
- Please provide our current IWG with a complete list of all participants, including organizations, and their named representatives involved in the 2020-24 plan group. The list identifies only general classifications (boating groups etc...)
- Please provide us with a complete list of all participants, including organizations, and their named representatives involved in our new IWG
- Please indicate the number of meetings held with the members of the earlier committee
- Please confirm if any/all of the original participants remain, or are continuing as members of our IWG (for continuity purposes, for background and consistency, transparency) Please explain reason or thinking about the gap in time between the
- original group and the newly constituted IWG. For example:

1. why there was a 1.5 year delay in establishing our group after the termination of the initial group;

2. The specific activities/projects undertaken on the island further to oversight by the initial group and the specific activities initiated and undertaken and/or completed over the 1.5 years preceding

2. 3. 4. establishment of our current/new IWG, and who was consulted to review and approve any such activities/projects if not the original Island Plan group or the IWG as now constituted.

2. At Page 10, Toronto Island Park Plan Implementation, referring to the June 2025 meeting with the Hanlan's Beach Working Group Summary Report, although there is no attached cost confirmation, the issue of the Hanlan's Point Tennis courts were referred to. Certain information is requested to support transparency and trust:

- Although Paving was already underway for new roads by June 2025, the city informed the Hanlan's Working Group that the cost for refreshing the courts exceeded \$1million , however, those cost estimates were not appended to the meeting notes and they have not been confirmed by identification of any cost

sheets shared to date, despite a request for such costing by TICA meeting participants at a meeting with City representatives (Netami, Asmara and Tom). Those costs should be identified to the IWG as a matter of transparency and to promote and support trust with the island communities (friends of hanlans and Island residents). Please share those cost estimate reports.

- The June 2025 meeting notes specifically state that there would be NO NATURALIZATION of the existing Tennis Court area, however, subsequent to that commitment to the Friends of Hanlans, naturalization took place, in a very intense and speedy manner over the summer of 2025 following the June meeting. Please provide rationale for the decision to revoke the decision not to naturalize and please confirm total cost of the naturalization project as it was implemented.
  - Recognizing that Hanlan's Point offers few amenities, and the commitment to provide facilities for the public, please confirm if the IWG can discuss and plan multi sports courts at Hanlans, providing the public with an opportunity to enjoy basketball, pickleball and tennis with appropriate space, nets and basic equipment.
3. Please confirm where we stand with a communication platform to support communication between the various working groups as proposed via Third Party Public or using some other platform.
  4. With respect to language used in our proposed 'Terms of Reference, I would ask that we avoid opaque words with unclear meaning.
    - At Part 3: Mandate – the primary goal is stated as ensuring the ongoing implementation of the Toronto Island Park Plan, as well as other projects and operational decisions, reflect the diverse needs, experiences, and priorities of people who use, work on, or are impacted by the Toronto Islands, among other things. The needs of park visitors (including non LGBTQ2S+) to access the Hanlan's beach, any sport facility and limited or no food services at Hanlan's further belies the steps that appear to have been taken ( removing all trace of courts) between the termination of the first IWG and our newly constituted IWG.
    - Further to Part 7.11 – please add specific schedule of updates from each of the other groups operating in parallel to our IWG over next 2 years.
  5. Proposed subject matter of predetermined meetings: the focus as indicated from the meeting visual map appears heavy on Island landings versus island movement planning. Please let us review this focus and assess priority as between these activities. If there is a reason for the described focus, please specify.

6. The proposed focus of meetings seems to omit any discussion of critical services/facilities required on the island to support visitor population: Washrooms; food; and recreation. Let us review and re-assess recognizing that these are urgently required upgrades for the coming 2026/27 season.
7. Finally, I would note that section 4.6, advising of an Honoraria, was not identified in the IWG application as far as I recall. Since members have already committed to participate as IWG members absent any anticipated honoraria, the rationale for its provision is unfounded and unnecessary. It adds up to a large sum of money. Further, if the Honoraria cost is a factor limiting the number of meetings scheduled, I would propose forfeiting the honoraria in exchange for additional meetings. Alternatively, providing a meal at meetings for live attendees and/or a one-time honoraria at the end of one's term, in the amount of \$100 or so, would be a more reasonable and appropriate thank you for participation, without inhibiting the committee from meeting more regularly.

Thank you for receiving and considering my input in response to the terms of reference, planned direction and organization going forward. I look forward to your responses to these points, either directly to me and/or to the group at the next meeting. I would add that to date, I have not had specific questions answered as a member of the Toronto Island Community. I truly hope and trust that this will be remedied at this stage for myself and all others honoured to be included in the newly constituted IWG.

Sharona Freudmann