

ONTARIO LINE - GO TRANSIT JOINT CORRIDOR**MEETING OF THE JOINT CORRIDOR DESIGN EXCELLENCE WORKING GROUP**

Wednesday February 16, 2022 6 pm to 8 pm

Participants

Elected Officials	Community Groups/Residents	City of Toronto	Metrolinx	Ontario Line Technical Advisors
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	Hans Riecko Mark Ventresca Kyle Poole Julia Murnaghan Sakat Azak Tina Fernandes Bhavana Nelliparambil Josephine Yung Richard Borbridge David Burns Renita D'Souza Anthony Irving Emilia Floro James Parakh Shawna Bowen	Malcolm McKay Mark Clancy Katiana Moussa John Potter Andre Marois Nima Nouri Amal Mustafa Roberto Donatelli	Theresa McClure Jenan Nasser Doug Jackson Celia Johnston Rachel Jorritsma Klaudia Biala

Introduction

Mark Clancy welcomed the members of the working group to the meeting. He advised the meeting would be facilitated by Theresa McClure.

Opening Comments

Paula Fletcher stated the City was here under duress. The City believes it would be better for the transit line to be constructed underground for those 2kms in the Joint Corridor. She added that design excellence was needed. She has seen the draft drawings and wanted everyone to be clear about timeline constraints. She hoped it was Metrolinx's intention to use the expertise of the City and for them to work together to achieve the best product possible.

Shelley Kline stated that all members of the group have the same goal. She reminded the group that the community lives in the area and the hope was that they could create an integrated, exciting design and regenerate the community for the future.

Land Acknowledgement

It was acknowledged that the meeting was taking place on the traditional territory of Indigenous Peoples, including the Anishnabeg, the Haudenosaunee and the Wendat peoples.

Discussion

Theresa McClure noted they have worked with and co-ordinated with the City over the past year. The February 21 deadline is off the table. Joint Guidelines will be developed. April 25 is the new date for initial roll-outs through to September 22.

Paula Fletcher asked for clarification on the identified dates. She wanted clarity on what goes out on February 21 and what goes out on April 25. She found the steps to have fuzzy lines and added that the fuzzy lines have to be eliminated. She believes February 21 does matter as there are still items that have a February 21 deadline.

Peter Tabuns noted that there was a problem with the working group only being allowed to provide input on minor things such as choosing colours, because the community was very concerned and wanted to ensure that the most effective sound dampening material was used.

Theresa McClure spoke to the noise barrier performance being 60 decibels during the day and 55 decibels at night.

Shelley Kline said that degree of noise mitigation had not been met. She asked that the group be made aware of the full range of options for noise materials.

Rosemary Waterston stated they want the analysis. They want the best noise mitigation on the walls and on the bridges.

Andre Marois stated the RFP was to go out on April 25 and that ideally by February 21, the inputs would be in place to finish the RFP. They are building more into April 25.

Paula Fletcher asked Malcom MacKay if there were possibly walls with more absorptive, more noise dampening capacity.

Theresa McClure advised they would bring forward information about the choices being more light or less noise.

Malcolm MacKay explained that acrylic was chosen as the best solution because it would provide more light.

Paula Fletcher advised that she saw the area along the parks to be very important for the committee to have input.

Malcolm MacKay stated that Toronto Parks and Forestry would be involved and he committed to bringing back a host of options.

Theresa McClure added they would come back with the analysis.

Shelley Kline wanted to see the noise wall options. She said the committee wanted to see noise mitigation over light. The community is trying to protect seniors who live along the corridor and they want to look at other options for noise mitigation.

Paul Bakewich asked if the installation could mitigate noise but also let light in.

Rosemary Waterston asked if there could be different noise walls in different parts of the corridor.

Theresa McClure stated that would be covered in the presentation.

Catherine Riddell asked if tunneling could be used or an enclosure be built in the area that goes by the high rises.

Andre Marois said they did consider that, but it involved many engineering challenges.

Paula Fletcher said there was a strong need for a conversation with the folks at Community Housing at the table.

Presentation

A presentation was provided by the City Urban Planners, Amelia Floro, Shawna Bowen, and Hans Riekkö.

Discussion

Shelley Kline stated it would be wonderful if they had setbacks and space as referred to in the presentation, but in Riverside and Leslieville they are only feet away from the walls. With no light, greenery would not grow and she asked how that fact could be mitigated.

Hans Riekkö suggested there may be some slides showing how solutions could be varied across the corridor according to differing needs. He suggested different solutions could be used in different parts of the corridor with community input.

Renita D'Souza added Shelley Kline's comments were well grounded and she thought there was room to do something very good.

Rosemary Waterston commented positively about the presentation.

Theresa McClure spoke about next steps. She stated they wanted to work with the group to co-create the design. The possibility of a design competition was still on the table. They want to co-develop design guidelines. At the next meeting they want to talk about the charrelle and the design process.

Rosemary Waterston asked about the bridge design and the station designs.

Theresa McClure responded that the designs of the bridges were set.

Rosemary Waterston asked if the group could see the bridge designs.

ACTION: Metrolinx to come back with bridge designs.

Theresa McClure noted that the City was an equal partner going forward.

Paula Fletcher asked for a work back from April 25 to the next meeting so the group could focus on the hard core engineering. She stated there was not a high level of trust, and a high degree of clarity from Metrolinx was needed. She asked for specs for the noise walls and to see the budget.

Paul Bakewich asked to have the group look at the other elements going into the bridges.

Theresa McClure agreed the group could look at different designs at the next meeting.

Paula Fletcher asked that the group needed to discuss everything that is included in the April 25 deadline.

Andre Marois commented that the bridges are in the April 25 RFP.

Theresa McClure suggested that the walking tour be done as part of engagement.

Shelley Kline stated that having walked the tour she saw it through the eyes of the community. She sees that as a jumping off point.

ACTION: Metrolinx to have the team ready to conduct the walkabout.

Paul Bakewich asked if the design competition was still on the table.

Theresa McClure confirmed it was on the table but it was not the only option for the path forward.

Rosemary Waterston stated there was a tight time frame to allow for a design competition. She added that for previous projects, such as the junction and the UP Express, she thought they were examples of what would not be wanted in the Joint Corridor project. She suggested two (2) tours, one to show what they would not want and another to show what they would want in the Joint Corridor project.

Paula Fletcher was of the view that when they received the workback they would have a better understanding of the time frame; then it would be known if it was possible to have a design competition. She added that it was vitally important to know the hard core engineering dates so they would know when different things would need to be completed. She asked that the workback be provided to the group ahead of the next meeting date.

John Potter answered he would like to see that happen.

Rosemary Waterston suggested it would be fine if more than one (1) tour was held in order to accommodate differing schedules of the participants.

Theresa McClure differed and stated she believed it would be better to have everyone on the walk together.

John Potter agreed a tour with everyone together would be most effective.

A date for the next meeting was to be set following the meeting.

The meeting ended at 7:48 p.m.