

Transportation Advisory Committee

Report

9th Meeting of the Transportation Advisory Committee

October 26, 2021

Advisory Committee Virtual Meeting - during the COVID-19 Emergency

Attendance PRESENT: D. Foster (Chair), A. Abiola, D. Doroshenko, T. Kerr, T. Khan, P. Moore, M. Rice and S Wraight and J. Bunn (Committee Clerk)

ALSO PRESENT: K. Grabowski, J. Kostyniuk, D. MacRae, A. Miller, E. Oladejo, B. Westlake-Power and P. Yanchuk

The meeting was called to order at 12:15 PM.

1. Call to Order

1.1 Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Scheduled Items

2.1 Western Road and Sarnia Road/Philip Aziz Avenue Intersection Improvements

That it BE NOTED that the presentation, dated October 26, 2021, from J. Pucchio, AECOM, with respect to the Western Road and Sarnia Road/Philip Aziz Avenue Intersection Improvements, was received.

2.2 Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive Intersection - Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

That the following actions be taken with respect to the presentation, dated October 26, 2021, as appended to the Agenda, with respect to the Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive Intersection Municipal Class Environmental Assessment:

a) the Civic Administration BE ADVISED that the Transportation Advisory Committee supports Alternative 4, Multi-Lane Roundabout, for the above-noted project; and,

b) the above-noted presentation BE RECEIVED;

it being noted that a delegation from H. Huotari, R.V. Anderson Associates, with respect to this matter, was received.

2.3 Windermere Road Improvements - Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

That it BE NOTED that the presentation, dated October 26, 2021, as appended to the Agenda, with respect to the Windermere Road Improvements Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, was received; it being noted that a delegation from K. Welker, Stantec, with respect to this matter, was received.

3. Consent

3.1 8th Report of the Transportation Advisory Committee

That it BE NOTED that the 8th Report of the Transportation Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on September 28, 2021, was received.

3.2 Public Meeting Notice - Official Plan Amendment - Masonville Secondary Plan

That it BE NOTED that the Public Meeting Notice, dated September 29, 2021, from S. Wise, Senior Planner, with respect to an Official Plan Amendment related to the Masonville Secondary Plan, was received.

3.3 Public Meeting Notice - Zoning By-law Amendment - 99 Southdale Road West

That it BE NOTED that the Public Meeting Notice, dated October 14, 2021, from A. Riley, Senior Planner, with respect to a Zoning By-law Amendment related to the property located at 99 Southdale Road West, was received.

3.4 Notice of Public Information Centre for East London Link (Rapid Transit) - Phase 1 Construction

That it BE NOTED that the Notice of Public Information Centre, from T. Koza, Division Manager, Major Projects, with respect to the East London Link (Rapid Transit), Phase 1 Construction, was received.

4. Sub-Committees and Working Groups

None.

5. Items for Discussion

5.1 Advisory Committee Pilots - Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) Comparison Document

That the attached Advisory Committee Pilots - Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) Comparison document BE FORWARDED to the Civic Works Committee for review.

5.2 Transportation Advisory Committee 2021 Work Plan

That it BE NOTED that the Transportation Advisory Committee 2021 Approved Work Plan, as at October 15, 2021, was received.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:02 PM.

Advisory Committee Pilots - SWOT Comparison

Current “At Large” Configuration

Strengths

- Terms of Reference as currently written provide clear direction and convey a strong mandate (TMP/CMP)
- AC provides a much broader and considered platform to share ideas with Council
- Fosters a sense of independent thinking
- Promotes diversity and inclusion in group representation
- Ideas may come from the “bottom up” in addition to the “top down”
- Accountable to Council (via Civic Works Committee) vs. Civic Administration
- Integrated leadership amongst Council, Staff and AC (vs. Straight-line accountability)
- The parliamentary org structure promotes order, transparency and good organizational governance
- Promotes and sustains relationship building amongst like-minded Londoners
- Meets and/or exceeds the requisite level of SMEs in the committee makeup, often organically
- Demonstrated three-year track record of success in the case of TAC
- A strong Work Plan process was developed by TAC which is outcome-driven and aligned to London Plan (Strategic Vision vs. Tactical)

Community Engagement Panel

Strengths

- In effect the CEP, as envisioned, is simply an expanded, topic-driven PIC process utilizing a more flexible, “focus-group” structure lead by the Civic Administration
- Since this approach is as yet untested, see the “Opportunities” slide for potential strengths.

Advisory Committee Pilots - SWOT Comparison

Current “At Large” Configuration

Weaknesses

- The sometimes, the overly long cycle times of the formal process often preclude expedited matters from being fully explored...TAC has learned that a strong WP process can often mitigate this risk...but not fully
- Information flows slowly and often incompletely to/from Council due to barriers inherent in the parliamentary process
- AC mandates as outlined in their TORs are not always fully respected by the Civic Administration
- The Work Plan process, while providing structure, may sometimes have the effect of stifling new idea generation on topics not aligned to strategic interests of Council vs. the needs/desires of the Public
- The “At Large” pilot was established without success criteria and metrics for proper evaluation at the conclusion of the pilot period.
- The recruitment (Striking Committee) and selection processes (Council) need to be improved and focussed on expertise/merit vs. reward/vanity

Community Engagement Panel

Weaknesses

- Work planning will not be leveraged to provide focus and alignment to the London Plan and TOR
- Maintaining two different structures (AC and CEP) may not drive the expected benefits/efficiencies
- The CEP process and structure is still not entirely clear because it remains under development
- CEPs tend to be subject-focussed and steered (Command & Control vs. Collaboration) which eliminates the opportunity for free and independent thinking/input from the community (Tactical vs. Visionary)
- The level of transparency of the process from the point of view of the public (published meeting agendas, minutes, video) has not been established and/or properly evaluated.
- The CEP model has a lack of organizational structure and mature finesse and is largely ad hoc (Tactical)
- The pilot is being undertaken without criteria/metrics for proper evaluation at the conclusion of the pilot period (same mistake as with the “At Large” pilot)
- The model lacks a robust track record of success (going operational without the benefit testing)

Advisory Committee Pilots - SWOT Comparison

Current “At Large” Configuration

Opportunities

- Continue TAC in its current AC structure (with or without CAC) and undertake a proper comparative analysis which may drive improvement opportunities and models for those Advisory Committees which will remain in place.
- Recommendations regarding refinements of the recruitment and/or selection process for remaining ACs may result
- Introduction of enhanced analytics of AC effectiveness may result and be leveraged for future iterations/pilots/improvement initiatives

Community Engagement Panel

Opportunities *

- Expand the level of diversity and inclusion of the target audience on questions/issues requiring feedback to Council
- Reduced the cycle time for feedback to Council on time-sensitive matters, though the feedback may be much narrower in scope
- Enhance community engagement and feedback (Diversity and Inclusion)

* (Untested and therefore purely theoretical)

Advisory Committee Pilots - SWOT Comparison

Current “At Large” Configuration

Threats (Risks)

- Lack of support from Council
- Time-boxing by Civic Administration
- Poor assumptions/attitudes amongst many current AC members regarding mandate, attendance, due diligence, dedication and work group participation)
- Lack of skills development and succession planning for AC members threatening process sustainability
- No process to document understanding acquired to enhance the knowledge base of ACs
- No exit interview process (Early Warning System of AC dysfunction)
- Entropy associated with competing special interests
- Conflicts of interest

Community Engagement Panel

Threats (Risks)

- Special interest group bias could become a dominant feature of this model
- Pre-qualified lists of key individuals and/or special interest groups may be employed by Civic Administration as a pre-screen (thus undermining the benefits of convening a broader audience)
- Engagement fatigue (Public)
- Negativity on the part of Council and/or Civic Administration (due to Overwork/Disinterest/Stress associated with recent Covid-19 protocols)
- Negative reaction in Traditional/Social Media