

ONTARIO LINE - GO TRANSIT JOINT CORRIDOR

MEETING OF THE JOINT CORRIDOR DESIGN EXCELLENCE WORKING GROUP

Monday, February 7, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.

Participants

Community

Councillor Paula Fletcher
MPP Peter Tabuns

Lakeshore East

Community Advisory

Committee

Shelley Kline
Rosemary Waterston
Paul Bakewich

Tiverton Avenue

Community Advocate

Alex Bielecki

Riverside BIA

Celia Johnstone

First Avenue

Townhouse Condos

Tony Whitaker

City of Toronto

Hans Riecko
Mark Ventresca
Julia Murnaghan
Sakat Azak
Tina Fernandes
Josephine Yung
Richard Borbridge
David Burns
Renita D'Souza
Anthony Irving

Ontario Line

Technical Advisors

Greg Barley
Klaudia Biala
Rachel Juritsman
Doug Jackson

Metrolinx

Malcolm McKay
Mark Clancy
Katiana Moussa
John Potter
Andre Marois
Nima Nouri

Other Participants

Rob Kaufman
Kyle Poole
Catherine Riddell
Josette Chen
Mary Rowe
Theresa McClure
Jenan Nasser
Theresa McClure
Mary Breault
Catherine Deegan
Amal Mustafa
Anthony Irving
Jennifer Lay
Saikat Basak
Daryl Finlayson
Marco DiMarzio

AGENDA

Introduction

Mark Clancy welcomed the working group members to the meeting.

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.

Presentation

- Joint Corridor procurement packages
- Design excellence at Metrolinx - precedent projects
- Joint Corridor Design Principles, Process and Proposals
- Community survey results
 - Retaining walls, noise barriers and landscape design proposals
 - Metrolinx graffiti management strategies

Discussion/Next Steps

Working Group Discussion Questions

1. Do you have other ideas for how this process should work? How do you want to engage?
2. What tools and methods should be used to involve other community members?
3. Who else needs to be involved on these topics?

Areas For Input

1. Noise wall aesthetics
 - Material, pattern, opacity
2. Landscape at retaining walls
 - Tree plantings, wall vegetation
3. Underpass
 - Materials, lighting, art
4. Parks
 - Remediation, enhancements and programming
5. Art Program
6. Other

Working Group - Meeting Process

Vision - February

- Virtual stakeholder session
- Virtual public session

Design Charette - March

- 3 - 4 day in person intensive with subject matter experts
- Walking tours with subject matter experts and community
- Street interviews
- Stakeholder and public meetings

Draft Plan Presentation - March

- Virtual stakeholder session
- Virtual public session

Plan Publication - April & May

- Concurrent with community public final plan

Discussion Highlights

Paula Fletcher stated the community wants the Ontario Line to be built underground. If that is not agreed to then they want to have the city create the design. She moved a motion at city council to that effect.

Shelley Kline supported the idea of the city becoming responsible for the design.

Paula Fletcher added that it was important to know the budget for materials.

Theresa McClure advised the February 21 deadline date was vacated to allow for the engagement approach. Today she hoped the group could get agreement on who should be involved.

Paul Bakewich suggested it would be best to bring in experts before doing the walk and the interviews and before the charettes.

Paula Fletcher asked how this would fit in with the design competition. She commented that there was no joint approach yet, there was just the Metrolinx approach. There were too many Metrolinx thoughts and not enough City thoughts.

Shelley Kline stated the committee has to understand process. They have asked the City to work with them. She found it confusing to see where they were headed.

Catherine Riddell suggested it was important to earmark some key moments in order to co-create a process.

Paul Fletcher asked what needed to be completed by the April 25th date.

Andre Marois answered that by April 25th decisions needed to be made about: noise walls, landscaping, underpasses, parks and the Art Program.

Paula Fletcher added it was important to understand a clear process. She wanted to know when the tender needed to go out.

Andre Marois responded that package 1 needed to be released and the RFP would go out in April, 2022.

Shelley Kline asked about the five bridges in a reconstructed GO line and for the new Ontario line.

Andre Marois answered that reconstructed bridges would be at Queen, Dundas and Logan and the new Ontario line would have bridges at Dundas and Logan.

Shelley Kline suggested it would be impossible to do all the work necessary by April.

Andre Marois answered that the areas open for input for completion in April are the aesthetic treatments on those designs.

Shelley Kline responded the community did not want the retaining walls and the noise walls. She was feeling let down. If the decisions had already been made by Metrolinx then she wondered what was going on.

Theresa McClure advised they would need to take that back to the team. They would have to figure out how the retaining walls fit in.

ACTION: Metrolinx to take back to the team the concern about how the retaining walls fit in.

Community members expressed their frustration at the process. It was noted that it seemed that the “train had already left the station”. They suggested these meetings were a waste of time if all they were being asked to do was make choices on superficial things. They asked where the opportunity would be for the community to make a meaningful contribution to the design of the Ontario line.

ACTION: Metrolinx to take back to the team and provide additional clarity for the Committee as to how they could have more input into the design of the retaining walls.

Paul Bakewich stated it seemed that the committee input was being limited to choosing colours and other minor things. They wanted to see the designs for the bridges, the retaining walls and the noise walls.

Paula Fletcher added the important work was with regard to the fundamental design, not about lights and colours. She saw the committee’s job as determining the fundamental design. She asked how the committee could get to that place.

Theresa McClure suggested there was a need to find the definition of design excellence.

Doug Jackson explained there was less flexibility in things such as the load, vibration, noise wall height, etc. and suggested there needed to be discussion about what, beyond that, there could be committee discussion about.

ACTION: Metrolinx to provide the next meeting with information about how much flexibility there could be in further design of the walls and bridges with respect to fixed items such as height, placement, etc.

Shelley Kline stated that the things the committee could have input into should have been clearly spelled out in the Terms of Reference. It appeared that Metrolinx only wanted to talk about surface things. The community did not want the walls Metrolinx had designed. She felt the committee was just being given lip service. She had hoped this interaction would be different. The community did not want the retaining walls. She added that since \$800 million was being saved by building the Ontario line above ground, she thought the community would have a better design of the line. She wanted a clear delineation of what was and what was not on the table for discussion by the committee. She asked if a design competition was on the table.

ACTION: Metrolinx to provide the committee the scale of flexibility that exists for their input.

Paul Bakewich asked if the committee could have a look at the drawings of the retaining walls and the noise walls.

Doug Jackson answered they would look into that tomorrow.

Shelley Kline said to the Metrolinx representatives that either they wanted to really hear what the committee wanted or not. If not, the committee might as well walk away as there were better things they could devote their time to. The community wanted to talk about how to achieve livability and wanted to talk seriously about design.

Doug Jackson shared his belief that there was a balance to be found between what it takes to design and how they incorporate what the community brought up tonight.

Shelley Kline expressed frustration in that it seemed such community involvement could be achieved in other cities in the world but not in Toronto. It appeared that the kinds of decisions the committee/community expected to be involved in making had already been made by Metrolinx. She suggested that if budget was an issue, they should speak with the federal government who were willing parties. She emphasized the committee did not want the walls. The committee needed to understand how the committee would have meaningful input into the design together with Metrolinx.

Mary Rowe was concerned about the design competition. She asked Metrolinx to allow the committee to come up with the design. She thought the mechanics of a design competition would be difficult. She added they too often settled for things that mattered and she encouraged Metrolinx to delegate the design to the committee who would come up with the best design.

ACTION: Metrolinx to consider the request to have the committee come up with the design for the Ontario Line.

Paula Fletcher added that the line was being built on city property, it affected the city and the city had to be involved in the design of the project.

Marco DiMarzio stated that he felt misled. He was unclear on the purpose of the committee. Walking in parts of the city where Metrolinx had completed other projects, he thought if Metrolinx did their best on those projects, the look of the Ontario line would be abhorrent.

Tony Whitaker wanted added to the minutes that there were scheduled public meetings at the end of February and March.

Mark Clancy stated that Metrolinx would send a blast with a link to the environmental assessment report and a notice that there would be four (4) open houses. He suggested the committee may want to discuss the report.

Shelley Kline expressed her discontent with the fact that trees had already been cut down along Booth Avenue and Jimmy Simpson Park. Reviewing an arborist's report after the trees had

already been cut seemed a waste of time. She had asked to see the plans for tree removal earlier but had not been given any plans.

Rosemary Waterston added it was an insult to have the trees cut down so early in the process.

ACTION: Metrolinx to provide the committee with the tree removal schedule and the arborist's report.

In closing, Metrolinx thanked the committee for bringing their concerns to the committee.

The meeting ended at 7:54 p.m.