

ONTARIO LINE - GO TRANSIT JOINT CORRIDOR

MEETING OF THE JOINT CORRIDOR DESIGN EXCELLENCE WORKING GROUP

Meeting # 7

Monday March 7, 2022 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Participants

Elected Officials	Community Groups/Residents	City of Toronto	Metrolinx	Ontario Line Technical Advisors
Councillor Paula Fletcher Daryl Finlayson Rob Kaufman of MPP Peter Tabuns of office Greg Barley of MP Julie Dabrusin's office	LSE CAC Shelley Kline Rosemary Waterston Catherine Riddell Leslieville BIA Jennifer Lay Riverside BIA Catherine Deegan Paul Bakewich Alex Bielecki Mary Rowe Tony Whitaker John Vairo	Hans Riecko 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 John Barrow	Theresa McClure Doug Jackson Celia Johnston Rachel Jorritsma Klaudia Biala Jeff Fahz

Land Acknowledgement

Mark Clancy shared the Metrolinx Land Acknowledgment with the group to identify that the meeting was being held on the traditional territory of Indigenous Peoples.

Safety Moment

Mark Clancy provided a safety reminder with respect to fire safety and carbon monoxide safety.

Rules of Engagement

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

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. CAC Presentation
3. Workback Schedule
4. Bridge Cross Sections
5. Noise / Retaining Wall Heights
6. Next Steps
 1. Future Meetings
 1. City Presentation - Park Impacts and Opportuniyies
 2. Noise Study if Requested

CAC Presentation

Paul Bakewich illustrated, via a slide presentation, the CAC preference for a design competition rather than a design charette. Examples of past competitions in Toronto were shared. Their vision of the preferred method of conducting the competition over a three (3) month period from March to June 2022 was reviewed.

Theresa McClure provided the clarification that while the presentation was welcomed there needed to be adherence to Metrolinx standards for the procurement process that were in place. The criteria for selection could be open but some features of the procurement process were not negotiable.

Shelley Kline asked what the difference was between the process set out in the CAC presentation and the Metrolinx requirements.

Theresa McClure stated there were legal requirements for a procurement process. The team would have to review the presentation to see what parts of it are doable. It should be feasible to complete it during the coming week.

John Potter advised they had their first meeting with the senior procurement group this week. He added this would be Metrolinx's first design competition and they would be working on how to adapt their usual procedures.

Mary Rowe offered information that the city had done it, so she was certain it could be done within procurement rules. She suggested Metrolinx consult the city about it.

Theresa McClure asked for a copy of the presentation to be shared with her. She said they need to make sure that what comes out of the competition can be implemented. She stated that July 1, 2022 was now the new ultimate deadline.

Theresa McClure shared the new Engagement Approach with the new milestone workback schedule for a design competition. She suggested they not rush to develop the Terms of Reference but rather to spend time concepting the ideas to make sure what they wanted in the Terms was captured. The Metrolinx team would also need time to develop the budget and enough time to implement the design competition.

Shelley Kline asked what purpose a charrette would serve now that a competition was being developed.

Theresa McClure suggested the word charrette could be taken out. She was using that word to represent a workshop with the group, to hear their ideas.

Paul Bakewich asked to know the areas that could be part of the design competition.

Theresa McClure advised they wanted to ensure the right things were incorporated into the Terms of Reference.

Shelley Kline saw a charrette as being a closed process whereas a design competition would be more open and exciting for the community. It would open it up for the community to have input.

Rosemary Waterston wanted to clarify that their group hoped to deal with the T walls materials. She hoped it would be possible to move that item from the fixed engineering constraints list to the opportunities for design list.

Theresa McClure offered to take that request back to the engineering team for discussion.

Shelley Kline noted that the T walls were being used all along the entire Lakeshore East corridor in a one (1) size fits all approach. She asked if there was a section where brick or stone could be used. She added they did not like Portland cement as it was not sustainable. She said this corridor was not like the rest of the line. She hoped that in the competition there would be room for other professionals to offer their opinions and expertise.

John Potter replied they had some options in pushing the boundaries.

Theresa McClure would take the information back for discussion and present new suggestions.

Tony Whitaker suggested that archways would be a good visual effect and wanted to include some. There were already some examples of archways in the area and it would be good to extend archways into the design elements.

Theresa McClure expanded on the Terms of Reference and added in:

- Timelines
- Budget
- Jury criteria
- Judging criteria

Shelley Kline asked if “opportunities for design” meant that was the extent of what would be included into the design competition.

Theresa McClure answered that the fixed engineering constraints were not changeable. What they wanted to achieve through the design competition were the design guidelines to be handed to the contractor.

Shelley Kline advised they wanted to be able to use sustainable materials and she reiterated that they had an issue with Portland cement. They wanted to look at other materials.

John Potter said they would take that back to the team for discussion.

Rosemary Waterston asked what “programming” meant. She wondered where landscaping fit in - was programming the same as landscaping and who would be managing what - Metrolinx versus the city’s parks department.

Klaudia Biala answered that programming was more related to things such as benches and activities. Landscaping was more related to parks, terraces, trellises, screening and vegetation. All of those things were part of design and up for discussion. Metrolinx would pay for those things even though they may be in city parks.

Theresa McClure added that most of the construction would be on the Metrolinx right-of-way but some may be in parks, especially in Jimmie Simpson park, Bruce Mackie park and Magee park.

Klaudia Biala added that there might not be a need in every park but they would be placed where needed. Some might be identified as priorities.

Malcolm MacKay advised that any areas outside of the retaining wall would have to be approved by Toronto Parks and Forestry as Metrolinx had no rights outside their corridor. That meant they would have to work collaboratively together.

Tina Fernandes said they hoped to discuss and identify in a future meeting those areas along the corridor and adjacent parks where programming could be accommodated.

Catherine Riddell wanted to clarify about the walls, that if some fixed materials needed to be used in some places, they should consider how facades might be used in front of the walls.

Paul Bakewich asked for clarification about whether the design guidelines would be final or whether the builders could make changes to the design guidelines.

John Potter clarified that design guidelines meant that which would be going forward in drawings to the builders.

Shelley Kline asked if that meant the design guidelines would be what was built.

John Potter answered yes, if it met the terms set out.

Theresa McClure referred to slides 13 and 14, Technical Roll Plot, which covered the detailed engineering drawings of the corridor showing the locations of the bridges, in answer to a question raised previously by the group.

Shelley Kline asked where there would be a new Ontario Line bridge, would there be one (1) bridge for both OL and GO or two (2) bridges, one (1) for each line.

Rachel Jorritsma answered that at Dundas, Logan and Eastern they would share a substructure and have separate superstructures.

Shelley Kline explained that they were looking for more noise buffering on those bridges so more information about that would be appreciated.

Rachel Jorritsma added that the new Gerrard station would be adjacent to the existing bridges. They would only remove the wing walls. The new Gerrard station would cross the intersection.

Shelley Kline asked if the bridge would go over the Riverdale plaza.

Rachel Jorritsma advised that the No Frills would be removed. The new bridge would be adjacent to the existing bridge.

Shelley Kline stated that she was having difficulty picturing it.

Theresa McClure advised they would work on a better drawing with a clearer view of it.

Rosemary Waterston asked if pedestrians could walk under the bridge. At the Riverdale/Leslieville bridge would it look like one (1) solid bridge or would there be any light coming through between the two (2) bridges. The answer given was that it would look and feel like one (1) continuous bridge. Rosemary Waterston had the same question about the Dundas and Carlaw and Logan bridges. She wondered if there would be a gap giving exposure to light and to rain.

Theresa McClure offered to bring that back and suggested they table it until next week.

Tony Whitaker referred to the Carlaw bridge which showed a clearance of less than 5 metres and questioned how that would work.

Rachel Jorritsma explained that the new bridge would be adjacent to the current bridge and would be taller to meet current standards.

Tony Whitaker continued referring to the bridges at Gerrard and Carlaw as well. One (1) of them was only 4.1 metres high and the other was only 4.0 metres high.

It was explained those heights would change in the new bridges.

Rosemary Waterston asked about the parking problem that would be created when parking was taken away in some places.

Tony Whitaker answered that parking was not allowed currently under the bridge but was allowed on Logan Avenue without a sticker. Parking was allowed on First Avenue with a sticker. That would become a big problem when the parking was no longer available.

Theresa McClure advised that mitigation was being considered for off-street parking.

Paula Fletcher asked what all this had to do with the walls because none of it had been approved yet.

Bridge Design

Theresa McClure answered questions on bridges from the previous week. Slide 23 showed retaining wall heights. Slide 24 showed noise wall heights.

Tony Whitaker noted that noise walls were 5 metres while retaining walls were 0 -7 metres.

The answer given was that the heights had not yet been finally determined. Information would be shared when it was available.

Tony Whitaker noted if the retaining wall was reduced by 2 metres and the noise wall remained the same as before there would be a problem.

Theresa McClure agreed to come back with further information about it.

Shelley Kline asked how the noise modelling changed if the height of the noise walls were changing in specific locations. How did it affect the decibel readings. How had the plans changed and were they being redone.

Theresa McClure agreed to take those questions back to the noise team.

Rosemary Waterston asked about the bridge parapets for noise reduction as opposed to noise barriers. She was concerned about a possible blast of noise when a train hit the bridges. She emphasized the importance of good noise mitigation, as good as anywhere else on the line, at the bridges.

Theresa McClure answered that would be shown next week.

Next Steps

Theresa McClure reported she wanted to prepare the group that the city would be releasing some renderings this week. Station renderings would be announced. An announcement was planned for Thursday. It would be conceptual only and was being developed for procurement needs.

Rosemary Waterston stated she hoped they would be subject to change because of the design competition.

Theresa McClure answered that they could change based on input from the public.

At the next meeting the agenda would include:

- City presentation on parks
- Answers to tonight's questions on noise

Paula Fletcher stated that the arborist's report was a Metrolinx report rather than a city report. Metrolinx would need to make the report public.

Theresa McClure responded that she understood the arborist's report needed to be publicized by Metrolinx before anyone commented on it.

Shelley Kline added that the community needed to see report outlining the planned tree decimation, including restoration. It needed to be presented in a format that the community could understand what it was. She requested a town hall format. The community needed the context rather than just bits and pieces dribbling out, which could cause panic in the community.

Paula Fletcher advised that Metrolinx needed approval for their plan. They were requesting approval to pull out trees on city property. They needed to set out the number of trees they wanted to remove and go through the permitting process. The public had a right to know the number and location of trees Metrolinx planned to remove and the replanting plan as well. The trees were on city property. Metrolinx must take one (1) step at a time and include in the arborist's report what it was they want to remove.

Theresa McClure said after tonight they would:

- complete the arborist's report for the trees Metrolinx wanted to remove,
- take the community report and CAC recommendations for discussion with the procurement team,
- evaluate the options,
- find the best approach and get a format pinned down,
- start working on Terms of Reference, and
- look at what was important in each of the four (4) areas.

Catherine Deegan requested that Metrolinx make reference to access to all the bridges as they did on one (1) bridge at this meeting.

Theresa McClure agreed to provide information to reference bridge access.

Tony Whitaker asked for an understanding of what was meant by the noise study (if requested and which may not be needed. He asked if it included addressing six (6) tracks instead of three (3), moving from diesel to electric, and decibel levels, because those were all still of big concern.

Theresa McClure replied they were working on a detailed presentation and if the group wanted more information on the noise study that could be included.

Shelley Kline suggested the noise study be given to the CAC offline and they would review it in that way.

Paul Bakewich was concerned about the Terms of Reference not being completed by the end of April as it would delay the competition.

Theresa McClure suggested that working through Mark Clancy they could consider a shorter call later in the week to cover some issues and look through the options, so they could come closer to a refined process jointly and so they could move into implementation.

The meeting was closed at 7:45 p.m.