

**ONTARIO LINE - GO TRANSIT JOINT CORRIDOR**

**MEETING OF THE JOINT CORRIDOR DESIGN EXCELLENCE WORKING GROUP**

**Monday February 28, 2022 6pm to 8pm**

**Participants**

<b>Elected Officials</b>	<b>Community Groups/Residents</b>	<b>City of Toronto</b>	<b>Metrolinx</b>	<b>Ontario Line Technical Advisors</b>
Councillor Paula Fletcher Daryl Finlayson  MPP Peter Tabuns Rob Kaufman  MP Julie Dabrusin's office – Greg Barley	LSE CAC Shelley Kline Rosemary Waterston Catherine Riddell  Leslieville BIA Jennifer Lay  Riverside BIA Catherine Deegan  Paul Bakewich Alex Bielecki Mary Rowe Tony Whitaker	Hans Riekkö Mark Ventresca Kyle Poole Julia Murnaghan Tina Fernandes Josephine Yung David Burns Renita D'Souza Anthony Irving Shawna Bowen	Mark Clancy Malcolm McKay Katiana Moussa John Potter Andre Marois Roberto Donatelli Daniel Cicero Ben Vozzolo John Barrow	Theresa McClure Doug Jackson Celia Johnston Rachel Jorritsma Klaudia Biala

**Land Acknowledgement**

Mark Clancy shared the Metrolinx Land Acknowledgment with the group to identify that they were on the traditional territory of Indigenous Peoples.

**Safety Moment**

Mark Clancy provided a safety reminder with respect to eye concerns arising out of increased use of computer time during work hours.

**Rules of Engagement**

Theresa McClure reviewed the Rules of Engagement to be respected during the meeting.

## **Agenda**

1. Introduction
2. Noise Barrier Analysis
3. Bridge Parameters
4. Working Group Workback Schedule
5. City Presentation
6. Next Steps

Theresa McClure presented some information requested by the group in the previous meeting.

## **Engagement Approach / Technical Submission Timelines**

### Package 1 - Early Works Civil

RFP April 2022 - August 2022

Construction Start - September 2022

### Package 2 - Urban & Landscape design

RFP 2023 (TBC)

Construction Start - 2024 (TBC)

### Package 3 - January 2023 - February 2024

Construction Start - April 2024

Engagement Approach / Milestone Workback Schedule Options were presented for both the Design Competition and the Design Charette.

## **Opening Remarks**

Rosemary Waterston objected to the decision not to construct the 1.5k area in the Joint Corridor underground. She asked that the \$850 million in savings be used to mitigate the impact on the community.

Paula Fletcher stated the City was here under duress as Metrolinx had ignored the request for underground construction of the Ontario Line in the Joint Corridor area.

## **Presentation**

Theresa McClure presented the Technical Submission Timelines in three (3) packages.

### **Package 01**

RFP In-Market - April 2022 - August 2022

Construction Start - September 2022

Early Works Civil - included engineering design of retaining walls, engineering design of noise walls, three (3) GO bridge replacements at Queen, Dundas and Logan, two (2) new Ontario Line

bridges at Dundas and Logan, rail corridor grading, drainage and utilities and GO track relocations and construction.

### **Package 02**

RFP In-Market - 2023

Construction Start - 2024

Urban and Landscape Design - included noise wall screenings, bridge underpass public realm, bridge underpass lighting, bridge underpass activation, landscape and vegetation mitigation, tree planting, retaining wall mitigation and vegetated terraces and/or embankments.

### **Package 03**

RFP Issue: January 2023 - February 2024

Construction Start - April 2024

Ontario North Contract - included Riverside/Leslieville and Gerrard stations integrated with Ontario Line bridges at Queen Street and Gerrard St / Carlaw Avenue.

### **Highlights of Discussion**

Shelley Kline asked whether the materials could be changed in the design of the noise walls or just the décor.

Theresa McClure answered they were putting time in to obtain input for materials.

Paula Fletcher asked what date the RFP was to be sent out.

Theresa McClure answered April 25 was the last input date.

Paula Fletcher asked about the budget.

Theresa McClure answered they needed to develop a Terms of Reference. There was no ballpark figure yet and they would work with the community to put it together.

Theresa McClure showed a slide that addressed the difference in schedule between a design competition and a charette.

Shelley Kline suggested the community should be the jury.

Theresa McClure offered that they could work together.

Paula Fletcher reminded the group that her Motion at the City Council provided an expectation that the City be involved.

Julia Murnaghan commented that they met two (2) or three (3) times a week with the City planners in Transportation and Parks, Forestry and Recreation.

Theresa McClure added the City was a partner and they do all their planning together.

Paula Fletcher asked who would select the short list of firms

Theresa McClure explained there was a procurement process.

Shelley Kline stated they wanted to help in the selection process.

Paula Fletcher suggested some community members be on the jury.

Shelley Kline stated her view that the Corridor was multi-dimensional and had different requirements. She wanted to make sure there would not be a one size fits all approach.

Paula Fletcher suggested that the walking tour would allow a chance to discuss the different needs.

Mary Rowe suggested having a community member on the jury. She described it as a partnership and that those who lived here wanted a part in the decision making.

Shelley Kline suggested Paul Bakewich be asked to be on the jury.

Shelley Kline asked what the charette was for.

Theresa McClure answered it was similar to a design competition process. A design competition and a charette were two (2) roads to the same end. Metrolinx saw benefits in a charette. It was a basic learned in their urban planning education.

Doug added that from an engineering standpoint there were tradeoffs in the design competition and the charette.

Rosemary Waterston asked if there could be a combination of the two (2) approaches to obtain the best of both worlds.

John Potter stated the City had a mechanism known as a joint design panel in which they participated in a charette process and experts and top-line people could be involved in a charette.

Theresa McClure committed to taking all this back to the table. She suggested perhaps they could obtain the best of both processes in a hybrid approach.

John Potter noted that the process needed to be moved along.

Tony Whitaker supported the suggestion that the process needed to be moved along. He asked why a charette was not done at an earlier stage.

Theresa McClure could not answer that as she was not involved at that stage.

In response to a question about whether the competition would be international, Theresa McClure stated it would be open to them however, there were many great resources right here in Toronto. A concern about contracting with an international expert was that the process would be less interactive and there could be difficulty in meeting our timelines.

Tony Whitaker added there was a lot of talent in the City for a jury.

Theresa McClure introduced a noise expert, John Vairo, who joined on the phone. She added that discussion of materials was back on the table.

Shelley Kline stated she wanted to see the cost of the retaining wall and the noise wall. She wanted to understand what train heights were and what she would see from the west side and the east side. She wanted to see drawings to show that.

Theresa McClure answered they could work with that.

Slides were presented to show the benefits and disadvantages of reflective barriers and absorptive barriers.

Jennifer Lay asked how noise barriers worked when the buildings were higher than the wall.

Theresa McClure assured her they did take into account high rises in their mitigation considerations.

The noise modelling study was described in a slide. The maximum height was seven (7) metres and some were six (6) metres.

Shelley Kline wanted to see how the walls would cover the trains.

Tony Whitaker asked what portions went to a height of seven (7) metres as less concrete was a good thing, in his view.

Paula Fletcher noted that the specifications would have to be known before the design would begin.

Theresa McClure committed to putting that information together.

Shelley Kline disputed the Noise Modelling Study 100%. She was of the opinion that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, more than baseline levels should have been used. In her view, the study should have included what the GO trains sounded like as she was looking for higher absorption.

Alex Bielecki was also concerned about the noise analysis. He found it to be lacking the kind of method that should be used. He asked to have the raw data provided.

Theresa McClure answered they would take that back and they could prepare it.

Shelley Kline asked if this was only Ontario Line passby. She suggested there was a need to have noise modelling on six (6) tracks, not just two (2) tracks.

Paula Fletcher asked that maintenance of the walls be included in the budgeting.

### **Bridges**

Rosemary Waterston was concerned about the narrow space when turning the corner into a park.

Jennifer Lay added that safety of pedestrians had to be considered first.

Tony Whitaker asked if the bridge design as currently presented was cast in stone.

Jennifer Lay requested that all elements surrounding webbing have handrails installed.

A slide was shown to illustrate the fixed opportunities and what could be changed.

Tony Whitaker suggested that the walls could not be overlaid because they would have to be inspected and maintained.

Catherine Deegan raised a concern about mobility issues. She requested that when new sidewalks were being constructed, they be made wide enough for today's world.

Jennifer Lay asked if there was a potential to widen the sidewalks into the Metrolinx property toward the north and the south.

Rachel Jorritsma advised the right of way was about three (3) metres and was being expanded to about five and a half (5.5) metres.

### **Next Steps**

Theresa McClure noted that in the next meeting there would be:

- more information about the noise request.
- review of draft Terms of Reference
- noise study – six (6) tracks
- amended dates for designs to be finalized
- Parks presentation

The meeting closed at 8:02 p.m.