



SPECIAL GENERAL ISSUES COMMITTEE REPORT 16-026

10:30 a.m.

Tuesday, October 25, 2016

Council Chambers

Hamilton City Hall

71 Main Street West

Present: Mayor F. Eisenberger, Deputy Mayor D. Skelly (Chair)
Councillors T. Whitehead, T. Jackson, C. Collins, S. Merulla, M. Green,
J. Farr, A. Johnson, D. Conley, M. Pearson, B. Johnson, L. Ferguson, R.
Pasuta, J. Partridge

**Absent with
Regrets:** Councillor A. VanderBeek – Personal

THE GENERAL ISSUES COMMITTEE PRESENTS REPORT 16-026 AND RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS:

1. Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project Update (PED16199) (City Wide) (Item 5.1)

That Report PED16199, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project Update, be received.

2. Hamilton Street Railway (HSR) Fare Integration (PW16066) (City Wide) (Item 6.1)

That Report PW16066, respecting Hamilton Street Railway (HSR) Fare Integration, be received.

3. Possibility of adding the LRT A-Line at the same time as building the B-Line (7.2)

That staff be directed to communicate with Metrolinx to determine the possibility of adding the LRT A-Line at the same time as building the B-Line and report back to the LRT Sub-Committee.

4. LRT Project Not to Negatively Affect Hamilton's Allocation of Provincial Gas Tax Revenue or Future Federal Infrastructure Public Transit Funding (Item 7.3)

That the Province of Ontario be requested to commit that the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project will not negatively affect Hamilton's allocation of Provincial Gas Tax Funding or Future Federal Infrastructure Public Transit Funding.

5. General Manager of Finance & Corporate Services or Designate to Attend LRT Sub-Committee Meetings (Item 7.4)

That the General Manager of Finance & Corporate Services or his designate be directed to attend all LRT Sub-Committee meetings.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL:

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

The Committee Clerk advised of the following changes to the agenda:

1. DELEGATION REQUESTS

- 3.5 Brian Smiley
- 3.6 Roger Stermann, Spectrum Scanning Services
- 3.7 Frances Murray, Durand Neighbourhood Association
- 3.8 Mark Rejhon, Hamilton LRT Citizen Advocacy
- 3.9 Eric Gillis
- 3.10 Ryan McGreal, Hamilton Light Rail
- 3.11 Angela Dinello
- 3.12 David Capizanno
- 3.13 John-Paul Danko
- 3.14 Chris Parkinson, Hamilton Blue Dot Group
- 3.15 Tanya Ritchie, Hamilton Guesthouse

- 3.16 David Wu
- 3.17 Adrian Duyzer
- 3.18 Sean Hurley
- 3.19 Ken Watson
- 3.20 Mark Powell, Mark Powell and Associates
- 3.21 Dr. Lynda Lukasik
- 3.22 Mary Louise Pigott
- 3.23 John McGreal
- 3.24 Viv Saunders
- 3.25 Ute Schmid-Jones
- 3.26 Hugh MacLeod

2. GENERAL INFORMATION / OTHER BUSINESS

8.1 Written Submissions respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) Matter

The written submissions listed below are available on the City's website and are not included in the printed agenda:

8.1.1017 Petition: Why Hamilton Needs to Say "No" to LRT

This petition contains the signatures of 414 residents.

8.1.1018 Physicians Practicing Family Medicine and Other Specialties in the City of Hamilton

8.1.1019 Keith Black, Resident

8.1.1020 Nathan Czorny, Resident

8.1.1021 Bev Wagar, Resident

Immediately following approval of Item 4 – the Delegation Requests, the order of the Agenda for the Special General Issues Committee, respecting the Light Rail Transit matter, was amended, to read as follows:

- (i) Staff Presentation (Item 5) (With no questions of staff until after delegations have been heard).
- (ii) Delegations (Item 4) (With no questions to the delegates until all delegates have been heard).
- (ii) Discussion Items (Item 6)
- (iv) Motions (Item 7)
- (v) Private & Confidential (Item 9)

The agenda for the October 25, 2016 Special General Issues Committee meeting was approved, as amended.

The Rules of Privilege were waived to allow for the public release and discussion of Item 9.1, respecting the Legal Opinion on Motions with respect to Light Rail Transit (LRT).

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

(c) DELEGATION REQUESTS (Item 3)

(i) Carol Lazich, Gilberts Big & Tall (Item 3.1)

The delegation request submitted by Carol Lazich, Gilberts Big & Tall, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(ii) Milena Balta (Item 3.2)

The delegation request submitted by Milena Balta, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(iii) Atillio DiFiore, Principal, Hamilton Biomedical Engineering Consulting / CSO Atwill Medical Solutions (Item 3.3)

The delegation request submitted by Atillio DiFiore, Biomedical Engineering Consulting / CSO Atwill Medical Solutions, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(iv) Craig Burley, Barrister & Solicitor (Item 3.4)

The delegation request submitted by Craig Burley, Barrister & Solicitor, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(v) Brian Smiley (Item 3.5)

The delegation request submitted by Brian Smiley, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(vi) Roger Stermann, Spectrum Scanning Services (Item 3.6)

The delegation request submitted by Roger Stermann, Spectrum Scanning Services, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(vii) Frances Murray, Durand Neighbourhood Association (Item 3.7)

The delegation request submitted by Frances Murray, Durand Neighbourhood Association, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(viii) Mark Rejhon, Hamilton LRT Citizen Advocacy (Item 3.8)

The delegation request submitted by Mark Rejhon, Hamilton LRT Citizen Advocacy, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(ix) Eric Gillis (Item 3.9)

The delegation request submitted by Eric Gillis, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(x) Ryan McGreal, Hamilton Light Rail (Item 3.10)

The delegation request submitted by Ryan McGreal, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xi) Angela Dinello (Item 3.11)

The delegation request submitted by Angela Dinello, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xii) David Capizanno (Item 3.12)

The delegation request submitted by David Capizanno, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xiii) John-Paul Danko (Item 3.13)

The delegation request submitted by John-Paul Danko, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xiv) Chris Parkinson, Hamilton Blue Dot Group (Item 3.14)

The delegation request submitted by Chris Parkinson, Hamilton Blue Dot Group, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xv) Tanya Ritchie, Hamilton Guesthouse (Item 3.15)

The delegation request submitted Tanya Ritchie, Hamilton Guesthouse, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xvi) David Wu (Item 3.16)

The delegation request submitted by David Wu, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xvii) Adrian Duyzer (Item 3.17)

The delegation request submitted by Adrian Duyzer, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xviii) Sean Hurley (Item 3.18)

The delegation request submitted by Sean Hurley, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(ixx) Ken Watson (Item 3.19)

The delegation request submitted by Ken Watson, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xx) Mark Powell, Mark Powell and Associates (Item 3.20)

The delegation request submitted by Mark Powell, Mark Powell and Associates, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xxi) Dr. Lynda Lukasik (Item 3.21)

The delegation request submitted by Dr. Lynda Lukasik, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xxii) Mary Louise Pigott (Item 3.22)

The delegation request submitted by Mary Louise Pigott, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xxiii) John McGreal (Item 3.23)

The delegation request submitted by John McGreal, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xxiv) Viv Saunders (Item 3.24)

The delegation request submitted by Viv Saunders, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xxv) Ute Schmid-Jones (Item 3.25)

The delegation request submitted by Ute Schmid-Jones, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(xxvi) Hugh MacLeod (Item 3.26)

The delegation request submitted by Hugh MacLeod, respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) matter, was approved.

(d) PRESENTATION (Item 5)

(i) Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project Update (PED16199) (City Wide) (Item 5.1)

Paul Johnson, Director of LRT Project Coordination, introduced the presentation respecting Report PED16199, Light Rail Transit.

Mark Conway, of N. Barry Lyon Consultants, provided the first presentation respecting the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) A and B Lines: Real Estate Investment Impact Analysis (shown as Appendix "B" to Report PED16199). The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Introduction
- o Hamilton's Real Estate Market is Trending in the Right Direction
- o Downtown Hamilton Already Attracting High-Density Investment
- o Forecasted Growth is Expected to be Strong
- o When does transit impact the real estate market?
- o Expected Real Estate Impacts of the LRT – Residential
- o Expected Real Estate Impacts of the LRT – Retail and Services
- o Expected Real Estate Impacts of the LRT – Office
- o Hamilton is Well Positioned to Benefit from LRT
- o Development Feasibility Along the LRT Corridor
- o Likely Development Forms Across the LRT Corridor
- o Proactive Planning Approach
- o Hamilton is Positioned for Success

The presentation, respecting the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) A and B Lines: Real Estate Investment Impact Analysis (shown as Appendix "B" to Report PED16199), was received.

Paul Johnson continued by providing the staff presentation respecting the Light Rail Transit Project Update that included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Light Rail Transit (LRT) Timeline
- o Project Schedule
- o Major Updates
- o Proposed Operations Maintenance and Storage Facility (OMSF) Location
- o Proposed Operations Maintenance and Storage Facility Site Run-in Track
- o Site Features
- o Typical Operations Maintenance and Storage Facility Functions
- o Eglinton Crosstown Operations Maintenance and Storage Facility
- o Waterloo LRT – Operations Maintenance and Storage Facility Interior
- o Utilities
- o Utilities – Ongoing Work
- o How will traffic work?
- o Where will traffic go?
- o Moving People
- o Preliminary LRT Ridership (B-Line)
- o Pedestrian Connection to Hamilton GO Centre
- o Environmental Studies
- o Property Acquisition

- o LRT Risk Assessment
- o Public Information Centre Highlights

The presentation, respecting Report PED16199 Light Rail Transit Project Update, was received.

Dennis Fletcher, Steer Davies Gleave, was present to answer questions of Committee.

Copies of the presentations are available on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca or through the Office of the City Clerk.

For disposition of this matter, please refer to Item 1.

(e) PUBLIC HEARINGS / DELEGATIONS (Item 4)

- (i) Mary Aduckiewicz, of R. Denninger Limited; Troy Thompson, of Thompson Pawnbroker; and, Wolgan Schoen, Matheos Kucuqi and Sonja Pichler, Black Forest Inn (Item 4.1)**

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o We support the Light Rail Transit project for Hamilton.
- o Concerns, specifically the route of King Street versus Main Street and why one (1) was chosen over the other.
- o As affected businesses in the proposed construction area, we believe that the cost benefit analysis of the Main versus King route should be done before further work continues.
- o Respectfully requesting that Committee direct the LRT staff group to complete the Cost Benefit Analysis of King Street versus Main Street, prior to awarding the tender.

A copy of the presentation is available on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca or through the Office of the City Clerk.

For disposition of this matter, please refer to Item 1

(ii) **Cheryl St. James spoke on behalf of Carol Lazich of Gilberts Big & Tall (Item 4.2)**

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o I am a strong supporter of improved public transportation who believes we need increased funding to enhance our transportation system.
- o I am advocating for the best possible public transportation plan that \$1B can buy and the current plan does not seem to be it.
- o The current LRT plan is a poor plan. We can do better.
- o If there is no GO, there is no LRT. The Hamilton plan is very disconnected and, as a result, we are now burdened with an inconvenient transportation system.
- o Our plan is a streetcar plan – a vehicle that travels on streets on metal tracks.
- o LRT should have dedicated stand alone routes like in Charlotte, North Carolina that Metrolinx highlights as a success.
- o The current Plan will not increase ridership levels.
- o LRTs are less flexible than buses.
- o LRTs require larger and high density populations for success.
- o Metrolinx wants to implement a transportation system with minimal information and lack of verified studies.
- o City Revenue Implications
- o A project of this magnitude that will impact the city for decades to come deserves to have the mandate of the people.

A copy of the presentation is available on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca or through the Office of the City Clerk.

For disposition of this matter, please refer to Item 1.

(iii) Milena Balta (Item 4.3)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Milena and her husband operate BBM Business Systems at 755 King Street East for 30 years.
- o We service office equipment – mostly business to business and are also the service centre for some manufacturers and have customers bringing small office equipment to our business.
- o Biggest issue is receiving the goods that we sell – we have daily Purolator delivers, often between 30 to 60lbs. We also receive large copiers and MFPs on skids, from freight trucks with a tailgate – the only access is through our front door from the street.
- o We do believe in planning the community's future, but the plan has to be sound and have a positive effect on everyone in our community.
- o The LRT will cause traffic jams, extra driving within the city to get to the North or South of King. This will increase emissions and does not support the green initiative.
- o In ten years the millennials will be married, have mortgages, children and will be living in the suburbs.
- o Hamilton needs smart transit, green buses and the latest technology.
- o We have to go to the Province and address our needs in order to get the right funding for Hamilton.

A copy of the presentation is available on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca or through the Office of the City Clerk.

For disposition of this matter, please refer to Item 1

(iv) Atillio DiFiore, Principal, Hamilton Biomedical Engineering Consulting / CSO Atwill Medical Solutions (Item 4.4)

Not in attendance when called upon.

(v) **Craig Burley, Barrister & Solicitor (Item 4.5)**

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o What is the cost to our economy of LRT project delays?
- o The purpose of this brief analysis is to ask the simple question of what a two-year delay to the LRT project (as contemplated by the proposal to subject the project to a “question” at the next municipal election, late October 2018) would cost the municipal economy. This is not a discussion of the wider economic benefits of the project, only the projected expenditure by Metrolinx. The same analysis regarding time value applies to those benefits.
- o \$1 billion has been allocated by the Government of Ontario for the project under Moving Ontario Forward.
- o Those amounts will be spent on capital expenditures for the project:
 - Some of this expense will be for LRVs (Light Rail Vehicles). Some of that will come back to Hamilton.
 - The rest I am assigning to project expense inside the municipal boundaries.
- o LRV estimates for the project are for 14 Bombardier Flexity Freedom vehicles. Acquisition cost for the same order for Waterloo in 2013 was \$92 million for all costs. I used an estimate of \$125 million for Hamilton.
- o Therefore the remaining “Hamilton-local” expenditure will be \$875M.
 - This expense has, like all expenses, a time value.
 - Time value represents the current benefit of spending money now, into our long-suffering economy.
 - The delay to the project (for nothing can be expended in advance of a public vote on the project) represents a time-value cost.
- o The MTO “discount rate” used to calculate Net Present Value of transport infrastructure is 4% per annum.

- The same number is useful to provide a present-value or time-value calculation.
- Assuming all non-vehicle project costs would be spent on the same timeline but two years later, the value of 4% per year for two years is 8.16% of the Hamilton expenditure, or \$71.4 million.
- o Cost to Hamilton's overall economy (project expense alone) of a 2-year referendum delay, is \$71,400,000.

A copy of the presentation is available on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca or through the Office of the City Clerk.

For disposition of this matter, please refer to Item 1

(vi) Brian Smiley (Item 4.6)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o I am a patient advocate and deal with physically handicapped mentally challenged individuals every day; escorting them to their appointments.
- o I have concerns regarding the navigation of LRT stops.
- o Many are unable to walk more than a few blocks from their homes to an existing bus stop without help.
- o In the core, most people can find a bus stop within 3 – 4 blocks from their home
- o The current LRT plan will isolate the elderly, infirm or people with children who will have to walk more than double the distance to get to an LRT stop.
- o Toronto Transit Commission is recommending no more than 250 - 300 meters between stops. We are asking our citizens to travel double that distance – 800 meters. Almost the length of four football fields.

(vii) Roger Stermann, Spectrum Scanning Services (Item 4.7)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Will the proposed Metrolinx Hamilton LRT be like the Region of Waterloo's LRT (see photos) or like the Official Metrolinx Hamilton LRT Artists renderings with respect to the support towers for the catenary lines? The poles will be 150 meters apart.
- o The artists rendering for the Hamilton LRT does not show any of the poles or that many of the trees will be removed.
- o Do you know that this is what you will be getting? What version will we really be getting?

A copy of the presentation is available on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca or through the Office of the City Clerk.

For disposition of this matter, please refer to Item 1

(viii) Frances Murray, Durand Neighbourhood Association (Item 4.8)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Reiterate support for LRT further to letter of May 16, 2016.
- o We need to pursue a vibrant neighbourhood for the Durand neighbourhood and a vibrant neighbourhood cannot exist in a vacuum – we need a vibrant city to go with it.
- o We need to aspire to be a world class city.

(ix) Mark Rejhon, Hamilton LRT Citizen Advocacy (Item 4.9)

Unfortunately, although Mr. Rejhon was in attendance and prepared to provide his presentation, the assistance he required was not available, therefore he was not able to provide his presentation before Committee.

However, the closed captioned notes in his presentation are shown below:

- o Many residents have worked hard to advocate the LRT.
- o We truly feel in our hearts, and truly believe that the upcoming LRT is good for the long-term future of City of Hamilton.
- o We looking forward to seeing the LRT implemented.

Council – November 9, 2016

- o Let's keep the LRT on track.

A copy of the presentation is available on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca or through the Office of the City Clerk.

For disposition of this matter, please refer to Item 1

(x) Eric Gillis (Item 4.10)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Providing the perspective of someone who has spent two decades using public transit.
- o Our transit system is currently not great and is frustrating.
- o Watching over crowded buses go by you when they are already full.
- o Guessing at which time your bus will arrive at its stop as the schedule is only a suggestion.
- o We cannot just throw more buses at the problem.
- o Let's build this LRT.

(xi) Ryan McGreal, Hamilton Light Rail (Item 4.11)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Speaking on behalf of Hamilton Light Rail – Citizen Advocacy Group.
- o LRT is often referred to as a once in a generation opportunity.
- o If we do not move forward with the LRT we will lose a decade of momentum, an incalculable amount of good will, and it will send a message that the City of Hamilton does not keep its commitments

(xxii) Angela Dinello (Item 4.12)

Ms. Dinello was not present when called upon.

(xiii) David Capizanno (Item 4.13)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Why is LRT the right decision for Hamilton?
- o I am currently not from Hamilton, but lived here for 10 years – in Wards 1, 2 3, 11 and 14 – live in London now.
- o Took the bus to go everywhere.
- o People who take bus are not being represented properly.
- o We need to work together to achieve a common goal.
- o In favour of LRT.

(xiv) John-Paul Danko (Item 4.14)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o I am structural engineer and a small business owner in Hamilton and I live on the mountain with family – not near the LRT corridor.
- o I haven't used public transit in 15 – 20 years and probably will never use public transit.
- o However, LRT is a simple decision – what is your vision for the future of the city?
- o What does Hamilton have to do to draw students/young people to stay or move into our city?
- o What can each of you (members of Council) do to make LRT better?
- o In favour of LRT.

(xv) Chris Parkinson, Hamilton Blue Dot Group (Item 4.15)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Every member of Council previously (except Councillor Skelly) voted to provide a healthy environment.

Council – November 9, 2016

- o We found out 4 days ago that Hamilton has the worst air quality in Ontario.
- o You pledged to support and protect the environment, including air quality and you have done that
- o You have increased bike lanes and traffic calming measures, and have invested in more walkable streets - very forward thinking
- o You responsibly thought to have this first stage of LRT to be paid for by the Province.
- o The progressive Blast network vision sends a message that Hamilton understands the future – that future is electric.
- o We need to attract the industry, innovation and entrepreneurs that will fuel the greatest economic opportunity – the conversion of fossil fuels to renewable electric.
- o Please keep up the good work – Hamilton’s future is, indeed, electric.

(xvi) Tanya Ritchie, Hamilton Guesthouse (Item 4.16)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Owners of the City’s only backpackers’ hostel. We welcome travellers from all over the world.
- o Both personally and professionally in favour of LRT.
- o We have only 10 beds, yet we welcome thousands of guests from all over the world – 137 different countries coming to stay in Hamilton.
- o Most arrive by plane or train and need to be able to get around. They travel all over the city to see our sites.
- o With these travellers comes thousands of dollars that are spent in our city.
- o For this reason, I ask you all not only to move forward on the first stage of the project – the B Line, but with the BLAST network as well.

(xvii) David Wu (Item 4.17)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Grew up in GTA and chose to move and work in Hamilton a little while ago.
- o Millennials want to live – affordable downtown living with parks amenities, things to do and transit availability.
- o LRT would take a huge amount of cars off the street in Hamilton, highways.
- o The population of Hamilton is growing – if not done now it will affect future residents of the city.
- o One third of downtown is parking lots – we would like to see more parks, etc.
- o Make Hamilton a destination rather than a stop off.
- o The long-term pros of LRT far outweigh the short term cons.

(xviii) Adrian Duyzer – Yes to LRT (Item 4.18)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o I am the owner of software design and development company in Hamilton.
- o My wife and I both grew up here, went to college and university here and by the time I was 25, most friends from university had moved away.
- o Our family is here and we wanted to stay.
- o My business partner and I decided to create a prosperous future here in Hamilton.
- o Many former Hamiltonians are coming back.
- o Walkable streets, 2-way conversions, tax breaks for development in downtown, and LRT in Hamilton are what are attracting others back.
- o It is important to attract and retain an educated workforce.

- o Killing LRT would be devastating to Hamilton businesses and to our reputation.

(ixx) Sean Hurley – Yes to LRT (Item 4.19)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o I live in Crown Point and my mother lives on Park Row North near Cannon and she supports the LRT.
- o I work at McMaster – Hamilton plans to be a city friendly to aging.
- o I am the target market for HSR – tried to take bus, but has given up on it.
- o The reasons are reliability and capacity
- o If you cannot count on transit to get you where you need to go on time, it's not worth it. Which is why I support LRT

(xx) Ken Watson – No to LRT (Item 4.20)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o I would like to commend Metrolinx on its ability to market itself as the only mass transit system.
- o I am here to suggest that there is an alternative to the LRT, with no street construction and it would be finished before the LRT.
- o We need to envision shared road usage. LRT does not share the road and I am calling on Council to study the impact of the other forms of transportation.

A copy of the presentation is available on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca or through the Office of the City Clerk.

For disposition of this matter, please refer to Item 1.

(xxi) Mark Powell, Mark Powell and Associates (Item 4.21)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o I am an advocate for LRT – it's a big deal and affects everyone in different ways.
- o I think we need it, I think we needed it a long time ago.
- o Listen to your residential constituents.
- o Commercial interests, especially along King Street – they will be affected and they could go out of business - it's huge for everybody.
- o I'm glad it's coming, but keep in mind that it will affect everyone differently.

(xxii) Dr. Lynda Lukasik – Yes to LRT (Item 4.22)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Environment Hamilton is supportive of LRT.
- o You have to build a system that will work and is easy to use.
- o Active transportation is like cycling or walking or buses to move people around the city.
- o Provincial and federal gas tax monies are needed to invest in the HRS system so that by the time we are ready for LRT, we have a good integrated system.
- o Environment Hamilton is supportive because it is fully accessible, and there air quality issues in Hamilton (fine particulate matter - highest of any city in Ontario).
- o We need to get people out of their cars and onto public transit.
- o Public transit and LRT are a common good

(xxiii) Mary Louise Pigott (Item 4.23)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Let's Move Hamilton Forward with LRT.
- o All of the scenery our company builds is shipped across the world and are able to compete across the world because of the strong talent we have here in Hamilton.
- o We are in support of LRT, and are concerned with mixed messages we have heard from Council.

(xxiv) John McGreal (Item 4.24)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Would like to address the proposal of the LRT B-Line from the original plan voted on by Council in 2014 to Premier Wynne's government for 100% funding for the LRT B-Line from Eastgate Square / McMaster. Presently, B-Line transit hub is at University Plaza, Dundas.
- o In the Provincial announcement of May 26, 2015, full funding of \$1B for LRT from Queenston Traffic Circle / McMaster and suggestion of an A-Line (LRT) spur link to James St. GO Station / Waterfront would be provided, if the monies are available within the \$1B budget.
- o Many people were surprised at this change from City Council's approval for the Eastgate/McMaster LRT.
- o Was Council aware of this change?
- o Did Council vote on this new proposal?
- o If so, why wasn't an announcement made to the General Issues Committee.
- o I suggest Metrolinx / City should renegotiate the original Plan to Eastgate Square / McMaster and put an A-Line LRT in Phase 2.

A copy of the presentation is available on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca or through the Office of the City Clerk.

For disposition of this matter, please refer to Item 1.

Council – November 9, 2016

(xxv) Viv Saunders (Item 4.25)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o How will it affect our taxes?
- o Forecast Population Growth
- o Urban Transit Levies when Development Occurs
- o Assessment Growth
- o A 6 Tier Urban Transit Levy Tax System for a 2 Tier Service
- o Impact of Not Addressing Urban Transit Area Rating

(xxvi) Ute Schmid-Jones (Item 4.26)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Own and operate a small business in Hamilton.
- o When remove step-up access, we will remove the lag time in transit service.
- o I am personally invested in LRT as it allows me to access family and friends.
- o LRT in Hamilton will be a great mobility equalizer.

(xxvii) Hugh MacLeod, The Staircase (Item 4.27)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o Staircase Theatre is one block away from a new LRT stop.
- o Past street interruptions have been devastating to our business
- o We do support LRT, but today we should be planning on how to help these businesses during the construction of LRT.
- o Let's get some tax payer money in the game.

- o The LRT is a long term project; it is for our children's children.
- o LRT will be bumpy and there will be many challenges, but I think it's worth it.

(B. Johnson/Pearson)

That the Rules of Order be waived to allow for Dennis Martin to address the General Issues Committee on October 25, 2016 respecting the Light Rail Transit matter.

CARRIED

(xxviii) Dennis Martin (Item 4.28)

The presentation included, but was not limited to, the following:

- o The LRT studies that I have been able to find are based on: (a) the Transit Master Plan of 2007; and, (b) Places to Grow, the Ontario Act passed in 2005.
- o The 2007 Plan's goal was to increase annual transit rides per capita from 40 up to between 80 and 100. Looking at the past 10 years, total ridership has increased from 21,165,302 in 2006 to 21,906,762 in 2015; an increase of only 3.5%.
- o Taking a longer look at 30 years, ridership has decreased from 31,482,000 in 1996 to 21,906,762 in 2015; a 30% decrease.
- o You only have to look at what has happened to manufacturing in Hamilton to explain the decrease. International Harvester, P&G, Firestone, and Westinghouse are gone and Stelco (almost gone).
- o Do you not think that the LRT will be will be another tax payer white elephant.

A copy of the presentation is available on the City's website at www.hamilton.ca or through the Office of the City Clerk.

For disposition of this matter, please refer to Item 1.

That the citizen presentations, Items 4.1 to 4.28 respecting Light Rail Transit, be received.

(f) MOTIONS (Item 7)

(i) Reaffirming the Acceptance of the One Billion Dollar Investment in Infrastructure and Public Transit Investment from the Province of Ontario (Item 7.1)

The Motion, respecting the Reaffirming the Acceptance of the One Billion Dollar Investment in Infrastructure and Public Transit Investment from the Province of Ontario, was withdrawn.

Councillors B. Johnson, J. Partridge and D. Skelly wished to be recorded as OPPOSED to the withdrawal motion above.

(g) GENERAL INFORMATION / OTHER BUSINESS (Item 8)

(i) Written Submissions respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT) Matter (Item 8.1)

8.1.1017 Petition: Why Hamilton Needs to Say “No” to LRT

This petition contains the signatures of 414 residents.

8.1.1018 Physicians Practicing Family Medicine and Other Specialties in the City of Hamilton

8.1.1019 Keith Black, Resident

8.1.1020 Nathan Czorny, Resident

8.1.1021 Bev Wagar, Resident

The correspondence respecting the Light Rail Transit (LRT), Items 8.1.1 to 8.1.1021, was received.

(h) PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL (Item 12)

(i) Legal Opinion on Motions with Respect to the LRT (Item 9.1)

Item 9.1 respecting The Legal Opinion on Motions with Respect to the Light Rail Transit (LRT), was received.

(i) ADJOURNMENT (Item 13)

There being no further business, the General Issues Committee, was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

D. Skelly, Deputy Mayor
Chair, General Issues Committee

Stephanie Paparella
Legislative Coordinator
Office of the City Clerk