

# RELIEF LINE



**Relief Line Project Assessment Phase 4.3  
Local Segment - Stakeholder Advisory Group (LS-SAG)  
Meeting #2**

**Thursday February 23, 2017 | 7:30 – 9:00 pm  
Morse Street Junior Public School | 180 Carlaw Avenue**

## **Meeting Summary**

### **Participants**

Barb Amsden  
Marla Boltman  
David Caron  
Edyth Karwecki  
Daniel Long

Enid Moscovitch  
Rebecca Renwick  
Steve Shallhorn (for Sue Birge)  
Ron Smyth  
Samantha Spence

### **Project Staff**

Stella Gustavson – Program Manager,  
Transit Implementation Unit, City of Toronto

David Nagler – Manager, Community Relations,  
CEO’s Office, Toronto Transit Commission

James Perttula - Senior Planner,  
Transit Initiatives, City of Toronto

Paul Millet – Chief Project Engineer, Engineering,  
Construction and Expansion Section,  
Toronto Transit Commission

Nishanthan Balasubramaniam – Transit  
Implementation Unit, City of Toronto

Malcolm MacKay – Project Manager, Engineering,  
Construction and Expansion Sector,  
Toronto Transit Commission

### **Councillor’s Office**

Councillor Paul Fletcher, Ward 30

Susan Serran, EA to Councillor Fletcher

### **Project Consultant Team**

Jim Faught – Director, Community Engagement,  
LURA Consulting

Niki Angelis – Community Engagement Specialist,  
LURA Consulting

## 1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introduction

Jim Faught, Director, Community Engagement, LURA Consulting, welcomed participants to the second Local Segment - Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting for the Relief Line Project Assessment. Mr. Faught provided an overview of the meeting agenda, terms of reference, and facilitated a round of introductions.

Councillor Fletcher thanked everyone for their participation and explained the process and items that were reviewed as they pertain to the tunnel, the stations, construction of the line and the operation of the line. The Councillor reiterated the importance of the LS-SAG members' involvement at this stage and encouraged the group to provide feedback on the information presented.

James Perttula, Senior Planner, Transit Initiatives, City of Toronto, provided the results of the technical analysis that was conducted over the past several months. The findings of the technical analysis were presented to the group as well as how the findings differed between the proposed Pape Avenue and Carlaw Avenue alignments. The technical analysis includes the following activities: underground building constraints, utilities constraints, geotechnical/seismic analysis, real estate impacts and existing subway noise and vibration testing. Eight categories of criteria were selected for evaluating the two alignments. They include: choice, experience, social equity, shaping the city, healthy neighbourhoods, public health & environment, affordability and supports growth.

## 2. Discussion

Questions and discussions were encouraged during the presentation. The summary of the Question and Answer period that took place is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**.

### Technical Analysis

**Q:** Where is the underground building conflict on Pape?

**A:** 369 Pape Avenue.

**Q:** Where is the underground building conflict on Carlaw?

**A:** 181 Carlaw Avenue

**Q:** What are tiebacks? How far are they into the right of way?

**A:** Tiebacks are used to reinforce retaining walls for stability or for support of excavation during construction and typically driven into the ground at 30 degree angles. The tiebacks in this scenario are 12metres from the edge of the building property line. It is important to note that this constraint is not a "deal breaker". It is something that can be designed around. It is presented here to show you what the issues are and how they could impact the implementation, cost etc.

**C:** It is presented as though it is a problem; you should clarify the slide.

**Q:** At the Pape and Queen Station site, there is a condo under construction (SW corner); is it going to cause an issue?

**A:** The tunnel will be running by it but not factored in as an issue.

**Q:** It is safe to say that there will be many new developments in the area before the Relief Line is built; do they have to run their plans by you?

**A:** Yes, all planning applications under review go to the Team's attention before proceeding with any development.

**Q:** What does a combined sewer mean?

**A:** A combination storm and sanitary sewer.

**Q:** What is the depth of the 6' sewer?

**A:** Approximately 20m.

**Q:** Do you know how old the sewers are under Carlaw?

**A:** The sewer is old, but it is not on the current replacement list.

**Q:** How common is it to move a sewer?

**A:** It is not unusual. In any major urban project, figuring out how utilities fit is part of the planning. There is a significant budget allocated to utilities in these types of projects.

**Q:** Looking at these slides, I am concerned that having two negative points for the Carlaw alignment (for the utility constraints investigation) will create a bias to having the route on Pape Ave.

**A:** What we are currently presenting are the facts without ascribing any bias or preference. The information as a whole has been collected to make an informed decision.

**C:** I am concerned that time and cost is not factored into the presentation.

**A:** We do not have detailed costing at this time.

**C:** The way the information is presented (split screen showing Carlaw and Pape side by side) can cause the reader to compare and contrast the routes and value one over the other. It may be better to have one slide for each route so we can view the data on its own.

**C:** It also looks like it is being set up as Carlaw residents against Pape residents. We should note that during construction we will all be impacted regardless of the route.

**Q:** What does the information on the geotechnical slide mean? Are you saying that in one of the areas we are 5m closer to noise? The bedrock slide needs to be better explained; provide the benefit of the bedrock, the potential depth of the tunnel etc.

**A:** The graphic is showing you where the bedrock is, not where the tunnel will be. The bedrock also has an impact on the tunnel boring machine that requires 1.5 metres of cover. It can be said that the deeper the tunnel is, the less vibration will be felt. Vibration is also dependent on the type of material it is going through (soft soil versus bedrock). Tunnelling through either through soft soil or bedrock is possible. Bedrock is better, but soft soil is not necessarily an issue depending on the depth of the tunnel. An issue can exist if the tunnel boring machine goes through areas of mixed media (from bedrock to soft soils or vice versa).

**Q:** Is one (soil or bedrock) better or worse for noise and vibration?

**A:** The deeper you are, and in bedrock, the less noise and vibration, But that does not mean it is noisier in soft soils. Due to the high volume of questions around this slide, efforts will be made to clarify this slide. **C:** Please provide comparable noise and vibration data for Bloor/Danforth line.

**C:** Explain the decibel level for this scenario that are specific for ground borne noise and vibration.

**Q:** Does the city reduce property taxes for people living through construction?

**A:** No

**Q:** I thought the point of the “Real estate impacts” slide was to discuss the expropriation of homes due to the density of houses around the proposed Pape Station location?

**A:** Because of the level of design required; we cannot say what homes/properties will need to be expropriated.

**C:** It is important to mention what scenario could cause the expropriation of homes, since this is what is of concern to most of the people on Pape.

**C:** I have asked for the density of each street numerous times and have not received an answer. I think having those numbers available is important. It is also stated that there is more density on Pape which is not true.

**A:** When density is referenced it is referring to density around the station locations, not the entire street.

### **Evaluation of Alignment Options**

**Q:** Please clarify what “social equity needs” means.

**A:** Social equity is the measure of populations in the area and what we know about demographics - We will clarify the information on the slide.

**C:** On the Public Health & Environment slide, density is once again referenced and made to seem like Pape is denser than Carlaw. It may be better to provide information on the number of homes and residents in the area and explain that it is density around the stations that you are referencing.

**C:** It may be beneficial to define what a home is.

**C:** Define “normal” construction noise on 2<sup>nd</sup> Public Healthy & Environment slide.

**C:** With respect to noise and vibration felt on upper floors of buildings, please provide examples of complaints received (related to operation noise). Construction noise complaints felt specific to station construction. Very few to no complaints were received related to tunnelling. Other complaints have been received related to breaking concrete.

**Q:** If a tunnel were to go down Pape, would an easement be required?

**A:** There may be in some cases for subsurface easements. The box of the subway station may need easements, not the tunnel itself.

**C:** The city can require a piece of property to carry out work that would result in a temporary easement. There would be a negotiated settlement. A permanent easement is where infrastructure is permanently located on your property. This would go onto the deed of your property and the property owner would be compensated with a lump sum payment.

**Q:** With open cut construction, is there a chance that homes will need to be removed?

**A:** It is a possibility but there are also different construction methods that could be used to mitigate that. That level of detail will come out in detailed designs.

**C:** Consider factoring into the “state of neighbourhood” slide that if the station is on Pape that there is a laneway that runs between Pape and Boston that could pose security and safety concerns as people filter through the laneway.

**Q:** Would council vote on this in April?

**A:** Yes

**Q:** Will you share how you will evaluate the 8 different categories or how they are weighted?

**A:** In working through these categories we have not established a mathematical weighting. We instead are taking a reasoned argument approach that will take into consideration different contexts and assess trade-offs (costs vs. other benefits).

**C:** When a decision is made, the public will want to understand the reasoning behind it.

**C:** You should include a realistic description of construction impacts from this project.

**Q:** Will this presentation be available online?

**A:** The presentation will be refined for the public meeting and made available in the near future.

### **3. Wrap Up and Next Steps**

Mr. Perttula concluded the meeting by outlining next steps and upcoming public meetings. Upon considering all stakeholder and staff feedback, the City’s route recommendation will be submitted to Executive Committee and Council in April. In the summer of 2017, staff will refine station locations and prepare station concept plans, develop functional design for preferred alignment, determine potential impacts and mitigation measures and prepare the Environmental Project Report (EPR). In the fall the City plans to launch the formal Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and submit the EPR to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change. Further public and stakeholder consultations would also take place during this time.