

# RELIEF LINE



**Relief Line Project Assessment Phase 4  
Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)  
Meeting #5**

**Thursday, March 2, 2017 | 6:00 – 8:00 pm  
Church of the Holy Trinity | 19 Trinity Square**

**Meeting Summary**

**Participants**

Craig Nichol	Advisory Committee on Accessible Transit
Ole Calderone	Corktown Residents and Business Association
Brodie Johnson	Toronto Financial District BIA
Lana MacInnes	Degrassi/Wardell Neighbourhood Group
Lindsay Wiginton	Pembina Institute
Suzanne Kavanagh	St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Sami Kazemi	South Pape Residents Association
John Wilson	West Don lands Committee
Becca Nagorsky	Metrolinx
Derek Goring	First Gulf
Colin Wolfe	Ryerson University
Mark Corner	Downtown Yonge BIA

**Project Staff**

Stella Gustavson	Program Manager, Transit Implementation Unit
James Perttula	Director, Transportation Planning
Paul Millett	Chief Project Engineer, Engineering, Construction and Expansion Section, TTC
Malcolm Mackay	Project Manager, Engineering, Construction & Expansion Group, TTC
Nish Bala	Transit Implementation Unit

**Project Consultant Team**

Nick Shaw	HDR
Mark Conway	NBLC
Nick Michael	NBLC
Jim Faight	LURA
Leah Winter	LURA

**Also Invited (Meeting minutes will be circulated)**

519 Church Street Community Centre  
BILD GTA  
Bloor East Neighbourhood Association  
Bloor-Yorkville BIA  
Cabbagetown South Residents' Association  
Cadillac Fairview  
Church of the Holy Trinity  
CodeRedTO  
Confederation of Resident and Ratepayer Associations in Toronto  
The Danforth BIA  
Danforth East Community Association  
Danforth Mosaic BIA  
Distillery Historic District  
Eastview Community Centre  
Evergreen  
Garden District Residents' Association  
Gerrard East Community Organization  
Gerrard India Bazaar BIA  
Gerrard Square  
Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association  
Greater Toronto Civic Action Alliance  
Greek Community of Toronto  
GreekTown on the Danforth BIA  
Kempton Howard Community Association  
Leslieville BIA  
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change  
Oxford Properties  
Regent Park Community Health Centre  
Riverside District BIA  
Social Planning Toronto  
South Riverdale Community Health Centre  
St. Lawrence Market Neighbourhood BIA  
The Pocket  
Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas  
Toronto Catholic District School Board  
Toronto Centre for Active Transportation  
Toronto Region Board of Trade  
Toronto Relief Line Alliance  
Toronto Women's City Alliance  
Transport Action Ontario  
TTC Riders  
Transport Action Ontario  
Urban Land Institute - Toronto  
Woodgreen Community Services  
Yonge-Bloor-Bay Business Association  
Yonge Dundas Square

## 1. Opening Remarks and Meeting Format

Stella Gustavson, Program Manager, Transit Implementation Unit, City of Toronto, welcomed participants to the fifth Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting for the Relief Line Project Assessment. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update on the Relief Line project and next steps. Ms. Gustavson provided an overview of the meeting agenda and delivered the overview presentation. Participants had the opportunity to ask questions of clarification as well as provide feedback through a full group discussion following the presentation. Participants were also able to view large maps showing the preferred alignment and station locations including the two options being evaluated in the Local Segment between Queen St and the GO Rail Corridor. Approximately 12 participants attended the meeting, representing a variety of stakeholder groups.

## 2. Questions of Clarification

A summary of the Question and Answer period following the presentation is provided below. Questions are noted with **Q**, responses are noted by **A**, and comments are noted by **C**.

**Q. Can you elaborate on what is meant by the tunnel being in the bedrock?**

**A.** The geotechnical work has identified the depth of the soft soils and where the bedrock is located. Sufficient cover over the tunnel is needed to minimize noise and vibration, as well as for structural reasons. It has been determined that a lot of the tunnelling at a depth of 10 metres would put the tunnel half in bedrock and half in soft soils, which is something to be avoided. Because of the location of the soft soils, it will be necessary to tunnel deeper through the bedrock.

**Q. Was a comparison of potential development impacts considered as part of the real estate analysis?**

**A.** Pape is largely a residential street whereas Carlaw has mix of multi-residential and commercial/industrial uses. There is more potential for new development along Carlaw. The real estate study indicates that the Carlaw option would better support real estate growth.

**Q. When comparing the construction of the two stations at Gerrard St. (Pape versus Carlaw alignment), are you looking at mined stations or cut and cover? There is a big difference in cost between the two.**

**A.** TTC standards today are for cut and cover station construction, but mining is also being considered. Cut and cover is generally less expensive than mining, but there are some spots where mining of stations may be needed. Neither the Pape nor Carlaw right-of-way is wide enough for a standard station box. TTC is looking at designing a narrower station and what design variances that type of station would require.

**C. At previous meetings we were told that the reason you couldn't go on a diagonal through Gerrard St. is because you would slow the trains down. Now we are being told that the travel time is the same. For the area west of River St. we are being told the travel time will be impacted by the location of the station. The contradictory information being presented is of concern.**

**A.** More detailed technical analysis has been undertaken to support the evaluation of both options within the Local Segment. This has provided more information that has allow for refined design, with the view of maintaining the best possible travel time.

**C. It seems as though the connectivity to Gerrard Square is not as direct as it is with the Carlaw alignment.**

**A.** Opportunities to provide good access would be developed through more detailed planning and design.

**Q. If you choose the Pape alignment and you tunnel above the sewer, will you still be in the bedrock?**

**A.** On both alignments, at Danforth tunneling would be in soft soils. The bedrock is fairly deep until get to Gerrard St. On the Carlaw alignment bedrock is encountered just north of Gerrard St while on the Pape alignment the bedrock is just south of the proposed station. The tunnel would be able to pass above the sewer on Pape but not on Carlaw because of the existing railway bridge foundations.

**C. From an accessibility perspective, if the stations are going to be deeper, more stairs and escalators will be needed.**

**A.** Although the stations would be deep, they are not the deepest in North America or around the world. As subways are built in mature cities, it becomes necessary to build them deeper to avoid existing infrastructure. It will be addressed further during the design phase.

**C. The proposed station under the Riverdale Shopping Centre (Carlaw) will be between two curves. Will this impact the gap between the train and the station platform?**

**A.** The platform would be in a straight line.

**Q. What would the connection to SmartTrack at Gerrard and Carlaw look like?**

**A.** The City and Metrolinx are working together to ensure that an interchange station with SmartTrack will be possible.

**Q. For the Pape alignment, is the assumption that you would require easements under each single-family home for the entire length?**

**A.** Yes. The easement would be for maintenance purposes only. 24 m is needed. The right-of-way on Carlaw is 20 m and Pape is 18 m.

**Q. How far does your current funding take you?**

**A.** Funding has been identified to take the project through TPAP and to start design.

**Q. What level of design you are planning on getting to before the TPAP process?**

**A.** The project will be at conceptual design for TPAP that will include station boxes and requirements for entrances and exits. Based on the geotechnical work and location of foundations and utilities, station depths have been determined. Vertical and horizontal alignment for the tunnels and the depth of the stations will be included.

**Q. How deep is the station at Broadview and Eastern Ave?**

**A.** The preliminary design depth is about 26 m at top of rail.

**Q. Do you have any new materials to review regarding the Queen and Osgoode stations?**

**A.** There is nothing new to review at this time. Further detail will be provided as part of the TPAP process.

**C. Regarding the speed of the route, we have been told that the amount of time it takes to travel from Pape to downtown is critical for people to want to change lines. Initially, we were told that Pape**

**provides a faster route. The quantitative assessment on the speed of the route does not seem as imperative as the psychological factor (i.e. having a more comfortable ride). One or two minutes' difference in the speed does not affect their decision as much as the ability to ensure they can get on the next train. I am hoping this psychological factor will be assessed further.**

**A.** The speed of the route is important. The University of Toronto did a lot of research and developed their model with that in mind. With respect to the psychological impact, there was research done on that topic as well. All we can do is use the research and results that are available. The current model is the best tool that we have and it has been refined over the years. We are looking at shifting boxes at all the stations based on issues of constructability, speed, etc. There are other alignments that do have better diversions so it is important that we maximize the diversion that we can get out of this alignment. Regarding the Sumach station, it will be difficult to build under the overpass and we are looking at options.

**C. I am skeptical of your model for the travel times. It doesn't appear to take into account when people have to wait for a second train because the first train is at capacity.**

**A.** The model does take into account the station congestion and transfer time.

**C. There is general support for the Relief Line from my neighbourhood. Our main concern is selecting a route that minimizes the need for acquisition of private properties. It appears that the Pape alignment comes with increased likelihood of requiring acquisition of single family homes. Our ask is that some clarity be brought to that. The information has been presented well. I suggest you add another slide detailing the risk of private property acquisition between the two routes.**

**Q. For developments that are underway now (e.g. Moss Park), are they going to be including the station in their design at this point?**

**A.** We have been involved and providing input on the Moss Park project. The current plans reflect space for a station entrance. They have assumed there will be an entrance at the north-west corner of the intersection. As development applications are coming in, they are being circulated to TTC and Transportation Planning staff for review and comment.

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

Public and stakeholder consultations will be ongoing in March 2017. A report is expected to be presented to the Executive Committee and Council on the recommended alignment and station locations in May 2017.

During Summer 2017, City staff and consultants will:

- Refine the station locations and prepare station concept plans
- Develop functional design for the preferred alignment
- Determine potential impacts and mitigation measures
- Prepare an Environmental Project Report (EPR).

TPAP is anticipated to commence in Fall 2017, including public and stakeholder consultation.

Ms. Gustavson thanked SAG members for their continued interest and input on the project.