

**MATRIX OF COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT REVIEW TEAM ON
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT AND RESPONSES PROVIDED**

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/ Section	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec Section/Page #	Comments	Response	Action
1	Toronto - Transportation Services	Mark Oinonen		Need traffic management during construction, especially at hot spots like Victoria Park, Warden, Kennedy	Design issue.	2
2	Toronto - Transportation Services	Mark Oinonen		Maintain access to Golden Mile Shopping Centre	On drawing sheet.	1
3	Toronto - Transportation Services	Mark Oinonen		Provide a pedestrian crossing at the U-turn east of Pharmacy	Retain text.	3
4	Toronto - Transportation Services	Mark Oinonen		Address truck routing to/from Warden (potential truck route on Ashtonbee and Comstock)	Design issue.	2
5	Toronto - Transportation Services	Mark Oinonen		Possibly realign Sinnott to align with Thermos and move U-turn to Thermos	Retain text.	3
6	Infrastructure Ontario - Transit	Laura Games	2.1 Design Criteria	Customer Service Design and Performance Standards - 1st bullet - Has it been confirmed that service will be provided by the LRT 24 hours per day 7 days a week?	Retain text.	3
7	Infrastructure Ontario - Transit	Laura Games	2.2.1.4 Recommended Transit Method	Exhibit 18: Examples of LRT vehicles - Image of Bombardier vehicle in Toronto setting should read, "Proposed Toronto LRT Vehicle" and not "Selected Toronto Streetcar/LRT Vehicle". The vendor of vehicles has not yet been selected	Revise text.	1
8	Infrastructure Ontario - Transit	Laura Games	2.3.2.3 Special Track Work	Method of construction/Contractor for special track work should be identified in the EA draft, so as to allow Project Co. to determine this under their contract	Revise text.	1
9	Toronto Water	Candice Au	3.1.2.3 and 4.2.7 - Utilities	The impacts to the utilities should be further addressed in these sections, especially impacts on maintenance and future replacement or capital works. Also, the section indicates that the sizes of the watermains on Eglinton range from 150 mm to 600 mm, we currently have a contract underway to install a new 750 mm watermain on Eglinton to replace portions of the 600 mm.	Revise text.	1
10	Toronto Water	Candice Au	Section 4.4.5 - Stray Current	This section mainly looks at the influence of stray current from the LRT track infrastructure. What about the influence from the substations?	Retain text.	3

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
11	Toronto Water	Candice Au	Exhibit 163	This table does not show any meetings with regards to the new 750 mm watermain being installed on Eglinton. The contract is currently underway for the construction. Oscar Orellana is the contact from Technical Services who designed and is project managing this transmission watermain.	Retain text.	3
12	Toronto Water	Candice Au	Exhibit 172	#30 - Utilities - Toronto Water is not mentioned along with the other utilities companies. Approvals for water and sewer works require a significant amount of lead-time and may require various approvals to undertake (ie. MOE).	Retain text.	3
13	Toronto Water	Candice Au		Karan Singh of our Capital Programming group has been in contact with Peter Allibone with regards to this project. Karan will facilitate further input and comments from Toronto Water. He has been copied on this email, please add him to the list of contacts for future communications.	Revise text.	1
14	Environment Canada	Sheryl Lusk	Exhibit 155 - Interaction Matrix	No level of interaction has been identified between Concrete Forming (Construction Impacts) and Surface Water. With respect to works involving concrete, we wish to advise that leachate from uncured concrete is alkaline and highly toxic to fish and other aquatic life. Cured cement is also alkaline, and can impair water quality when fine concrete debris (i.e., dust and chips) enters water. Furthermore, concrete wash-water is frequently highly alkaline and has a very high content of suspended sediments. The effects of high pH on fish may include death, damage to outer surfaces like gills, eyes, and skin, and an inability to dispose of metabolic wastes. Fine sediments can clog fish gills, smother habitat, and impair feeding ability. We suggest that this potential interaction should be assigned a "strong" level of interaction, and associated mitigation measures should be made explicit within the document, similar to those related to erosion and sedimentation control and stormwater management.	Revise text.	1
15	Norman DeFraeye	Toronto -Urban Forestry	2.2.14 Wynford Stop and 2.3.2.3.34	Should be updated as per the Natural Heritage Assessment Report	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
16	Norman DeFraeye	Toronto -Urban Forestry	2.2.14 Wynford Stop and 2.3.2.3.35	Recommendation (2.2.14.5) should be 'realignment of Wynford Drive should be investigated further during detail design'.	Revise text.	1
17	Norman DeFraeye	Toronto -Urban Forestry	Exhibit 135-138	Figures should have RNFP lines and NH line	Revise text and exhibits.	1
18	Norman DeFraeye	Toronto -Urban Forestry	3.1.1.6	The second paragraph mentioning the protection of natural areas in the OP should also mention the Ravine & Natural Feature Protection bylaw as the means of providing that protection, similar to that provided in Section 5.4 in the Natural Heritage Assessment Report	Revise text.	1
19	Norman DeFraeye	Toronto -Urban Forestry	4.2.4 Potential Impacts	With respect to removal/disturbance to edge features and diminishment of area, estimates of losses will need more clarification as to what is being lost. The explanation sounds like it is simply area of land being taken for the project. This may be under-representing the actual loss, in terms of identifying removal of canopy (m ²) and number of stems, as well, and root injuries/losses (% TPZ) for trees adjacent to disturbances	Design issue.	2
20	Norman DeFraeye	Toronto -Urban Forestry	4.2.4 Potential Impacts	To say 'vegetation loss is not considered as significant' is misleading and erroneous. All losses are considered significant by the City, given the mandate of Council to double the canopy in the City.	Revise text.	1
21	Norman DeFraeye	Toronto -Urban Forestry	4.2.4.1 Mitigation	Should be updated/expanded to include final paragraph and bullets of Section 5.1.2 in the Natural Heritage Assessment Report	Revise text.	1
22	Norman DeFraeye	Toronto -Urban Forestry	4.2.5 final paragraph	Should be updated/expanded to include final paragraph and bullets of Section 5.1.2 in the Natural Heritage Assessment Report	Revise text.	1
23	Norman DeFraeye	Toronto -Urban Forestry	4.3.4	To say 'vegetation loss is not considered as significant' is misleading and erroneous. All losses are considered significant by the City, given the mandate of Council to double the canopy in the City. Taking land covered by trees and using it for construction is not a short term impact.	Revise text.	1
24	Norman DeFraeye	Toronto -Urban Forestry		Regarding mitigation to minimize disturbance, these bullets should be updated/expanded to include final paragraph and bullets of Section 5.1.2 in the Natural Heritage Assessment Report	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
25	Norman DeFraeye	Toronto -Urban Forestry	6.5 Permits and Approvals	Should add the following regarding tree permits: Trees are protected against injury or removal in the City of Toronto by a number of bylaws. In areas of the City protected by the Ravine & Natural Feature Protection bylaw, all trees are protected and grades are protected against alteration. Outside of this protected area, trees greater than 30 cm dbh on private property are protected by the Private Tree bylaw. All trees on city owned land, including streets and parks, are protected. Urban Forestry has delegated authority to issue permits. Completed applications along with supporting information, must be made to Urban Forestry. The issuance of permits may be conditional, for example, on the applicant providing for compensatory planting, to UF standards.	Revise text.	1
26	Peter Dmytrasz	Toronto- Tree Protection Plan	Exhibit 155 - Interaction Matrix	As per Jan 8 2010 workshop, include City street trees and private trees outside the RNFP regulated areas under the Park and Open Spaces category.	Revise text.	1
27	Peter Dmytrasz	Toronto- Tree Protection Plan	Exhibit 155 - Interaction Matrix	Road improvements activity under footprint impacts would strongly impact City streetscape trees and possibly private trees, with any significant changes in the current curb locations, within the Eglinton Avenue E and W City road allowances. Currently, this box is not 'S' marked.	Retain text.	3
28	Peter Dmytrasz	Toronto- Tree Protection Plan	Exhibit 155 - Interaction Matrix	Intersection improvements, Stations, Traction Power Substation, Emergency Exit Buildings, Ventilation Shafts, Portals, Work Yards, Tunnel, Bus Terminals, Cut and Cover Construction, Surface Excavation, Clearing and Grubbing, Utility Relocation, Roadwork. Building Demolition, Soil Removal and Disposal, Dewatering, Reinforcement of Existing Buildings, Heavy Equipment Operations and Maintenance, Material Import/Stockpiling, Concrete Forming, Storm Water Management and Snow Removal, activities have negative impacts on City streetscape and applicable private trees. These boxes should also be marked with an 'S' as strongly impacted.	Revise text.	1
29	Peter Dmytrasz	Toronto- Tree Protection Plan	4.2.6	Does not make any reference to City streetscape trees or applicable private trees, under this Parks and Open Space section.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
30	Peter Dmytrasz	Toronto- Tree Protection Plan	Exhibit 157	A significant number of properties in Exhibit 157 'List of Property Acquisitions' indicate road widening as the reason for Property Impacts. This is an indicator of significant curb realignments involved in this project. Others with significant negative tree impacts are: Launch Shaft and Work zone; Station, Secondary and Alternate entrances; Fire Vents; Emergency Exit Buildings, and Right turn lanes.	Revise text.	1
31	Peter Dmytrasz	Toronto- Tree Protection Plan	4.3.9 Parks and Open section.	Does not mention park tree, or City streetscape tree, removal	Revise text.	1
32	Peter Dmytrasz	Toronto- Tree Protection Plan		The bulk of the existing City trees along Eglinton Avenue West and East will likely require removal to facilitate either the surface road reconstruction and curb alignments, or the below grade station construction, including existing utility relocation. Trees On City Streets (TCS) by-law allows for such City streetscape tree removal, if it is in the interest of the public good. However, this is generally quite a contentious issue. Councillor consultation is recommended, if the project has not yet been approved by Council. This pre-Council approval scenario would also include the PDIM/Forestry Directors' sign-off with PFR General Manager notification requirement for park tree removal approval, on a park by park basis. A complete permit application, under the PTP by-law, will be required for any applicable private trees, to be injured or destroyed by proposed work well within their respective tree protection zones, as all City agencies, boards, commissions, and divisions are subject to the Private Tree Protection (PTP) by-law.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
33	Peter Dmytrasz	Toronto- Tree Protection Plan		A private arborist report will be required to provide an inventory of the existing City trees, both within and outside the Ravine & Natural Feature by-law regulated areas and applicable private trees impacted by the project, with specific recommendations on their respective protection measures or removal recommendations. Appropriate quantity, size, species and locations of the tree replacement planting, required under provisions of the TCS and PTP by-laws, must be approved by the Tree Protection & Plan Review (TPPR) office, contact Peter Dmytrasz (phone 416-394-8551), Supervisor TPPR, Etobicoke York district and TPPR lead City-wide for this project.	Retain text.	3
34	Peter Dmytrasz	Toronto- Tree Protection Plan		Tree planting must be a component of both below grade stations and surface road reconstruction, in order to achieve the required tree replacement and new tree planting noted in Official Plan policies. Below grade station support columns and retaining wall structures must be designed and constructed to facilitate adequately supported continuous soil trenches within the City road allowance. City streetscape tree planting in continuous soil trenches must be designed and constructed to accommodate the continuous soil trench details in the newly revised Streetscape Manual. In addition, utility relocation must not adversely impact or restrict replacement or new City streetscape tree planting.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:
 1 - Will comply
 2 - Design issue
 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
35	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects		TTC has committed that the LRT facilities will be positioned and configured to minimize intrusion into the parks to the extent possible. The LRT facilities will be designed to blend into their surroundings using a context sensitive solution. TTC will work with PF&R during detailed design for LRT stations to ensure that selected locations for station entrances, vent shafts, traction power substations and emergency exit buildings meet established urban design guidelines, limit intrusion into the park, and provide opportunities for enhancements of the sites and pedestrian access. PF&R staff are developing a list of guiding principles and circulation process to guide ongoing decision-making.	Revise text.	1
36	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects	p.73	Traction Power Substation is proposed for Howard Talbot Park. EPR states that Traction Power Substation will be designed to minimize stray current and voltage hazards. What are the potential risks to park users from the Substation and stray voltage? Is it safe for a Substation to be located immediately adjacent to a sports field where children will be playing? What is the mitigation plan to reduce risk?	Design issue.	2
37	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects	p.116-117	Tunnel section drawings do not include plan for Emergency Exit Building #3 which is proposed for Eglinton Park. Include the plan for EEB in Eglinton Park in final EPR.	Revise text.	1
38	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects	p.190 - Interaction matrix under footprint impacts	Table should include a 'strong' impact for the interaction between Stations/Park and Open Space. Station entrances are proposed for St. Hilda's Parkette and Howard Talbot Park.	Revise text.	1
39	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects	p.190 - Interaction matrix under construction impacts	It does not identify impacts to Parks and Open Spaces from Western Launch Site in Keelesdale Park. Table should identify all impacts from the Launch Site, including a 'strong' impact for the interaction between Tunnelling/Parks and Open Space, Material Import and Stockpiling/Park and Open Space, and Heavy Equipment Operations and Maintenance/Parks and Open Space.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
40	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects	p. 196 - table of LRT facilities within Parks	Chaplin Station - Double vent shaft is proposed for the park, not a secondary entrance.	Revise text.	1
41	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects	p.199 - table of property acquisitions under 1815-1817 Eglinton Avenue W - Main Entrance on Private Property	This is the Main Entrance to Dufferin Station that is proposed for St. Hilda's Parkette. Property should be identified as Public, not Private. Private property acquisition should continue to be investigated to lessen impact on existing parkette and compensate for loss of public parkland.	Design issue.	2
42	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects	p.199 - Table of Property Acquisitions under SW corner of Everden Ave & Eglinton Ave West – Fire Vent on Public Property	The fire vent is proposed for Ben Nobleman Park which is the SE corner of Everden Ave & Eglinton Ave West, not the SW corner.	Revise text.	1
43	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects	p. 201 - Mitigation for Property Acquisition	What is the process for partial takings of property owned by City of Toronto Divisions? Private property acquisition should continue to be investigated to lessen impact to parkland and compensate for loss of public parkland.	Design issue.	2

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
44	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects	p. 206 - Construction Impacts – Parks and Open Space	Parks, Forestry & Recreation have identified that the Western Launch Site will result in the following impacts: loss of the sports field during construction; displacement of recreational permit holders; loss of revenue generated from permitting; tree and vegetation disturbance; and potential noise, dust and traffic impacts to the rest of the park. TTC has committed to re-instating the soccer pitch after construction. In addition, TTC will be asked to satisfactorily address these impacts as an agreement to occupy the site is developed. TTC will continue discussions with PF&R to determine agreements, compensation, mitigation and restoration plans for use of Keelestone Park as Western Launch Site.	Revise text.	1
45	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects	p. 215 - Lists a November 13, 2009 Meeting with Parks, Forestry & Recreation to discuss Western Launch Site at Keelestone Park.	My understanding is that this meeting was with Capital Projects staff to discuss the potential impacts to the new York Community Recreation Centre. I don't believe the impacts to Keelestone Park were discussed with the appropriate Parks Operations and Recreation staff. Please revise the purpose of the Nov 13th meeting. A meeting with the appropriate Parks Operations and Recreation staff was held on February 1, 2010.	Revise text.	1
46	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Parks Development & Capital Projects	p. 223 - Comment Tracking Table - Impacts to property owned by Parks, Forestry & Recreation	Table does not list the fire vent for Allen Station proposed for Ben Nobleman Park or the Emergency Exit Building #3 proposed for Eglinton Park. Add these two sites in Comment Tracking Table.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
47	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Urban Forestry Tree Protection Plan		Urban Forestry Tree Protection Plan Review provided comments to the TTC during the Stakeholder Workshop held on January 8, 2010. Many of these comments have not been addressed in the Draft Environmental Project Report. Urban Forestry requests that TTC review all the comments from the Stakeholder Workshop and ensures that all comments are adequately addressed in the final EPR.	Revise text.	1
48	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Urban Forestry Tree Protection Plan		TTC should acknowledge that this project has a significant negative impact to City street trees. The bulk if not all existing City street trees will likely be removed to accommodate both the surface and below grade tracks/stations. Trees On City Streets (TCS) by-law allows for such tree removal, if it is in the interest of the public good. However this may be quite contentious and Councillor consultation is recommended, if the project is not pre-approved by Council, including the PDIM/Forestry Directors' sign-off with General Manager notification for park trees, will be required prior to any tree removals. Appropriate quantity, size, species and locations of the tree replacement planting, under provisions of both Forestry Tree Protection and Plan Review administered Trees on City Streets and Private Tree Protection by-laws; and for City road allowance planting, in compliance with details contained in the revised Streetscape Manual. Complete permit applications, under the Private Tree Protection by-law, will be required for any applicable private trees injured or destroyed, as all City agencies, boards, commissions and divisions are subject to the Private Tree Protection by-law.	Revise text.	1
49	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Urban Forestry Tree Protection Plan		At the Stakeholder Workshop on January 8, 2010, Forestry recommended continuous pit construction in conjunction with retaining wall and support column construction for the underground stations to accommodate street tree planting.	Design Issue.	2

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
50	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Urban Forestry Tree Protection Plan		In addition to the comments provided at the Stakeholder Workshop, Urban Forestry Tree Protection and Plan Review provided comment to David Veights on the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Draft Environmental Project Report Executive Summary in a letter from Peter Dymtrasz, Supervisor Tree Protection and Plan Review dated, December 31, 2009. TTC should review all the comments from the December 31 st letter and ensure that all comments are adequately addressed in the final EPR.	Revise text.	1
51	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Urban Forestry Tree Protection Plan	p. 190 - Interaction Matrix – Under Footprint Impacts	It was confirmed at the January 8, 2010 Stakeholders Workshop that City street trees and private trees, outside the Ravine and Natural Feature Protection regulated areas, fall under Parks and Open Spaces category. As such the Road Improvements activity under Footprint Impacts would definitely affect streetscape trees and possibly private trees, with any significant changes in the current curb locations, within the Eglinton Avenue E and W City road allowance. Currently this box is not marked.	Retain text.	3
52	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Urban Forestry Tree Protection Plan	p. 190 -Interaction Matrix – Under Construction Impacts	The Cut and Cover Construction, Surface Excavation, Clearing and Grubbing, Utility Relocation, Roadwork. Building Demolition, Soil Removal and Disposal, Dewatering, Material Import/Stockpiling, Concrete Forming, Storm Water Management and Snow Removal, activities will have impacts on (Parks and Open Space) City and private trees. These boxes should be marked as impacted.	Revise text.	1
53	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Urban Forestry Tree Protection Plan	p. 196 - Parks and Open Space – Potential Impacts	Section 4.2.6 does not make any reference to City streetscape trees or private trees, under this Parks and Open Space section.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
54	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Urban Forestry Tree Protection Plan	p. 197 - Exhibit 157 'List of Property Acquisitions'	A significant number of properties in Exhibit 157 'List of Property Acquisitions' indicate road widening as the reason for Property Impact. This is an indicator of significant curb realignments involved with this project. Others are; Launch Shaft and Work zone; Station, Secondary and Alternate entrances; Fire Vents; Emergency Exit Buildings; and Right turn lanes, which typically have significant negative tree impacts.	Revise text.	1
55	Jennifer Kowalski	Toronto - Urban Forestry Tree Protection Plan	P. 206 - Parks and Open Space	Section 4.3.9 does not mention park tree and City streetscape tree removal under this Parks and Open Space section.	Revise text.	1
56	Geoff Wright	Mississauga		TTC should obtain comments from MTO concerning the planned bus only ramp from Eglinton Avenue eastbound to Highway 427 southbound. This connection will be key link in future busway services to Kipling Station and transit operations will need to be maintained during LRT construction.	No comments provided.	3
57	Geoff Wright	Mississauga		While the intersection of Eglinton Avenue and Commerce Boulevard is included in the traffic analysis section of the EPR, we have previously provided you detailed comments on intersection operations. These included: - review feasibility of a westbound right turn lane - clarification on cycling lanes on Eglinton Avenue and proposed integration with existing and planning cycling infrastructure - rationale for westbound left protected phase - review north/south pedestrian accommodation	Design issue.	2
58	Geoff Wright	Mississauga	p.188 section 3.2.4.1	Please note that the Mississauga BRT project is expected to be complete by the end of 2012 (not 2011 as indicated in the EPR)	Revise text.	1
59	Geoff Wright	Mississauga	Section 6 - Commitments to Future Action	Property Acquisition - it is noted that the ECLRT project will affect several properties in the Airport Corporate Centre and the the City of Toronto, on behalf of TTC, will be required to facilitate these acquisitions.	Retain text.	3
60	Geoff Wright	Mississauga	Section 6 - Commitments to Future Action	Planning and Design Initiatives - we have reviewed the impact of the proposed ECLRT on the City of Mississauga's Official Plan and have concluded that an Official Plan amendment is required.	Retain text.	3

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
61	Geoff Wright	Mississauga	Section 6 - Commitments to Future Action	Construction Issues - please add Enersource and Region of Peel to the list of utility and service providers.	Revise text.	1
62	Donald Bevers	Toronto Police Service		Concerns regarding redirection of left turning vehicles resulting in heavy traffic. Pedestrian and motorists should be notified of the changes and the proper approach to the new rules. Signage should be clear, as people may not follow the left turn restrictions due to inconvenience.	Design issue.	2
63	Donald Bevers	Toronto Police Service		Volume of traffic is a concern in the new lanes, and north and south roadways that access Eglinton may need to be upgraded to handle additional left turning traffic.	Retain text.	3
64	Donald Bevers	Toronto Police Service	Section 4.4.7	The plans seem to indicate that at all streets without signals, left turns would be blocked and left turns would not be allowed at some of the other main signalized intersections, while other location will be provided for left turns and u-turns. The plans appear to be vague as to where left turns and u-turns will be permitted. The prohibited turning areas may affect traffic flow in the area, which is a concern.	Revise text.	1
65	Donald Bevers	Toronto Police Service		General concerns similar those that existed with the TTC St. Clair build were also brought forth. In the short-term, the concern is about traffic disruption, specifically with regard to the ability for emergency vehicles to navigate through heavier traffic during construction. In the longer-term, it is recommended that plans ensure that police vehicles can access the raised track area outside of the area of intersections, as opposed to areas prior to intersections which cannot be accessed except by driving along the track right-of-way. As with the recent St. Clair build, a mutually agreeable design and height restriction for all Emergency Service vehicles should be maintained throughout.	Retain text.	3

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
66	Donald Bevers	Toronto Police Service		As is the current practice with any new subway station designs, police input into the design of any underground stations would be recommended. The design of the area surrounding the Eglinton intersections may also need further review, as it may present a number of traffic-related access problems both for the public and the police.	Retain text.	3
67	Donald Bevers	Toronto Police Service	exhibit 114	The location of the fire vent on the property on the north side of the 13 Division police station. This location is a section of the property that has mature trees and a recently installed sign which indicates "Toronto Police Service 13 Division". At this location, there is also an emergency fire exit from the police station. The plans seem to indicate that a TTC fire vent will be very close to this fire exit. Should there be a fire in the TTC LRT line, which may spread to the police station, officer exiting from this emergency door will be exiting directly into location of the LRT fire vent. Further, the 13 Division station gas pump was recently replaced and the gas pump is located to the northeast corner of the building, approximately 25 m from the location of the fire vent. There are some concerns about the proximity of the vent and the gas pump.	Design issue.	2
68	Donald Bevers	Toronto Police Service		Concern identified is the effect of construction and traffic congestion outside of 53 Division, as the police station is located at 75 Eglinton Avenue West, on the south side of Eglinton Avenue. The only entrance to the underground garage of the police station is accessed from Eglinton Avenue.	Design issue.	2
69	Donald Bevers	Toronto Police Service		As with new development, we recommend the application of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). The Toronto Police Service is regularly involved in CPTED, which embodies the concept that the design and effective use of the built environment can lead to a reduction in the opportunity for crime through strategies of natural surveillance, natural access control, and territorial reinforcement.	Design Issue.	2

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
70	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist		This document does not describe or provide a general overview regarding the proposed stormwater management techniques as outlined in the Drainage and Stormwater Management Assessment Report	Revise text.	1
71	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist	Exhibit 155: Interaction Matrix	Throughout the body of this document, the author has indicated that impacts of the proposed LRT development on the natural environment will be minimal however, <i>Exhibit 155: Interaction Matrix</i> indicates that the “Footprint, Construction and Operations and Maintenance Impacts” will be “strong” regarding the surface water elements. Please clarify this variation, additionally, “dewatering and the tunnel construction” should also be graded as having some potential impacts on surface water	Revise text.	1
72	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist	Section 4.3.3 – Surface Water, Mitigation	Bullet # 3, Page 204: Please include that a Permit to Take Water will be required in order to undertake any dewatering that is over 50,000 L/day in order to maintain a “dry” work area.	Revise text.	1
73	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist		The pages are not in sequence starting from page 74;	Revise text.	1
74	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist	Page 12	Missing Section “#” under Exhibit 9 table;	Revise text.	1
75	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist	Page 157 - Section 3.1.2 Social-Economic Environment	Missing Exhibit “#” in third paragraph from the top of the page;	Revise text.	1
76	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist	Page 193 - Section 4.2.3 Surface Water	Third paragraph after first sentence “...100 year storm event. .LRT...”;	Revise text.	1
77	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist	Page 194	Space is need above “Aquatic” heading under Section 4.2.4.1 Mitigation;	Revise text.	1
78	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist	Page 195	Please correct “TIC” with “TTC” in the paragraph discussing Mitigation above Section 4.2.5; and	Revise text.	1
79	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist	Page 223 – Exhibit 172	Comment Tracking Table: Item #9 – extra “b” in front of Bridge.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
80	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist		As noted, dewatering at rates higher than 50,000 L/day will require a Permit To Take Water (PTTW) issued by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE). Included in the PTTW applications, the MOE requires a discussion of potential impacts to the natural environment, any risks posed to nearby structures due to subsidence resulting from construction dewatering, the potential for the movement of contaminated groundwater due to construction dewatering, and the potential impacts on surrounding waterbody features. PTTW applications should also detail the planned discharge method for the water taking and discuss how the discharged water will meet the quality criteria for the chosen discharge method. Due to the scale and complexity of the ECLRT project, the TTC is encouraged to initiate a pre-consultation process with the MOE regarding the required PTTWs for ECLRT construction dewatering	Design issue.	2
81	Christine Spedalieri	MOE- Surface Water Specialist		Please note that the recommended commitments outlined in appendix reports should also be described in the Final Environmental Project Report.	Revise text.	1
82	MOE, Air, Pesticides and Environmental Planning	Shannon McNeill	Contamination	Although at this time, the proponent is not aware of the contamination that will be present during the construction of the Eglinton LRT undertaking. However, during construction there could be the possibility of contaminated soils be exposed and thus impacting nearby receptors or pedestrians. If TTC during the design stage is aware of a contamination issue, at that time TTC should consult with the Ministry Central Region Office to discuss the requirements in dealing with contamination issues and ambient monitoring requirements, if applicable.	Retain text.	3
83	MOE, Air, Pesticides and Environmental Planning	Shannon McNeill	Contamination	It is recommended that the proponents in the Final AQA Report and in the main EA document, includes a discussion that the bus terminals will require a Certificate of Approval (Air & Noise) prior to construction and operation.	Retain text.	3

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
84	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Editorial Comments	The draft EPR requires significant editing prior to the submission of the final EPR. The Report contains numerous spelling mistakes, inconsistent formatting and includes overly technical information that would benefit from the use of more plain language. It is strongly recommended that a single editor be used to add clarity and better synthesize the information presented in the Report.	Revise text.	1
85	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea		In accordance with subsection 9(1) 5 of Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, a description of all studies undertaken in relation to the transit project, including a summary of all data collected or reviewed and a summary of all results and conclusions should be provided. Although the draft EPR includes references throughout to a number of different planning level and impact assessment studies that have been completed, as well as a list of related studies (introduction) that are being undertaken, a consolidated list should be provided in a single location.	Revise text.	1
86	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 6	In accordance with subsection 9(1) 8 of O. Reg. 231/08, if mitigation measures are proposed under paragraph 7 of the same subsection, a description of the means the proponent proposes to use to monitor or verify their effectiveness must be provided in the EPR. Neither a monitoring program, nor a commitment to develop a monitoring program have been included in the draft EPR.	Revise text.	1
87	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Introduction	Second paragraph – reference is made to the Greater Toronto Area and Hamilton. Suggest referring to the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA).	Revise text.	1
88	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Introduction	A subsection, identifying the proponents of this project, should be included with a note that the City of Mississauga through a City Council resolution has ceded their role in the process to the TTC.	Revise text.	1
89	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Introduction	Suggest using a subheading for the list of 'related studies.' A second list of supporting studies (e.g. the impact assessments and planning level studies referred to in the alternative methods section of the Report) should be provided elsewhere.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
90	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Introduction	Suggest clarifying what kinds of studies the 'related studies' are.	Revise text.	1
91	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 1	Not legible. Suggest enlarging the font	Revise exhibit.	1
92	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Introduction, page 2	Reference is made to an EA amendment. This project is not the subject of an EA. This reference, as well as numerous other references that appear throughout the report, should be replaced with the appropriate terminology.	Revise text.	1
93	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Introduction, page 2	Reference is made to a separate Kennedy Station Project that will investigate the feasibility of the Eglinton Crosstown LRT's (ECLRT) connection to the Kennedy subway station. This is not discussed elsewhere in the report and more details about this should be provided. Why is the subject study not considering the connection?	Revise text.	1
94	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.3	suggest adding further clarity to this section. This could include: 'In June of 2008, Ontario Regulation 231/08, the Transit Assessment Regulation (use full name), was made under the EAA. Under this regulation, a list of public transit projects (see Schedule 2, O. Reg. 231/08) were conditionally exempted from the requirements of the EAA provided that the requirements outlined in O. Reg. 231/08 are successfully completed.	Revise text.	1
95	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.3.1	Suggest outlining the general steps of the Transit Assessment Project Assessment (TPAP) process before offering a comparison of the differences between the TPAP and the EAA.	Revise text.	1
96	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.3.1	Page 2, third paragraph, second bullet – matters of provincial importance are referred to. The full list of matters, including cultural heritage value or interest should be referred to here and consistently throughout the Report.	Revise text.	1
97	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.3.1	Page 2, fifth paragraph – suggest prefacing the list of bullets with a short discussion on the MOE's Guide: Ontario's Transit Assessment Project Assessment, rather than just referring to the 'guide.' Furthermore, reference is made in Section 1.3.2 to an Interim Guide. Is this the same Guide? References should be consistent.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
98	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 2	The citation should refer to Ontario. Ministry of the Environment. 2009. Guide: Ontario's Transit Project Assessment Process.	Revise text.	1
99	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.3.3	Third paragraph – suggest beginning the first sentence with 'If the Minister gives notice requiring the proponent to take further steps, and within 30 days of receiving a revised EPR is of the opinion that...	Revise text.	1
100	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 3	Suggest enlarging	Revise text.	1
101	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.1.2	Suggest including reference that the Bike Plan recommends the promotion of cycling across the City....	Revise text.	1
102	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.1.3	Unclear what the relevance of this section is to the Project. Suggest adding context or removing altogether.	Revise text.	1
103	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.2	Section 1.4.2.1 should be prefaced with a short explanation that a portion of the proposed route extends within the boundaries of the City of Mississauga and a reference to a Figure that shows the relevant portions of the route.	Revise text.	1
104	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 6	Suggest delineating the boundaries of the City of Toronto and the City of Mississauga.	Revise text.	1
105	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.4	Suggest adding a short subsection that addresses the Transit Priority Statement. This sets the context for the development and use of O. Reg. 231/08.	Revise text.	1
106	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.4.1	The correct terminology when citing the PPS is the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement. Also, 'Statement' is not a common short form for the PPS.	Revise text.	1
107	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.4.1	The PPS contains numerous objectives. Suggest referring to relevant objectives and prefacing the discussion with a general statement about the intent of the PPS (e.g. broad provincial policy direction on matters related to...).	Revise text.	1
108	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.4.2	Suggest clarifying that the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) was prepared under the authority of the <i>Places to Grow Act, 2005</i> .	Revise text.	1
109	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.4.3	Last sentence – suggest clarifying that the ECLRT was identified as a Move Ontario 2020 project, which was announced by the government of Ontario in 2007.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
110	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.4.4	Reference to Regional Transportation Master Plan is made. Suggest confirming that the use of 'master plan' is accurate	Revise text.	1
111	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.4.4	Second paragraph – define LBPIA	Revise text.	1
112	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.4.4	Second paragraph – what is the Big Move #2. There isn't sufficient context for the reader to understand what this is.	Revise text.	1
113	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 1.4.4.4	Second paragraph, last sentence – suggest replacing with 'the RTP identifies the ECLRT for implementation in the first 15 year timeframe.	Revise text.	1
114	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.1.1	First paragraph, last sentence before Exhibit 8 – is the procurement process for the new LRV's completed? If so, this reference should be updated.	Retain text.	3
115	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 9	Suggest identifying which measurements apply to through lanes.	Revise text.	1
116	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 9	Reference is made to the addition of cycling lanes along portions of the ECLRT route. Are there any Class EA requirements applicable for this portion of the project?	Retain text.	3
117	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.1.4	Third paragraph, second bullet and throughout – inconsistent use of traffic lanes in 'each/both directions.' Suggest using one consistent reference.	Revise text.	1
118	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1	Second paragraph – did City Council endorse the plan?	Revise text.	1
119	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.2	Second paragraph – reference is made to 'at its peak point.' Suggest replacing with 'during peak operating conditions.	Revise text.	1
120	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.2	Fourth paragraph - Was the 'Do Nothing' option assessed both with and without transit priority measures?	Retain text.	3
121	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.2	Eighth paragraph – Suggest rewording this sentence and using similar terminology throughout, as follows: 'There are two key elements when designing transit facilities that include transit vehicles operating in reserved lanes.' Also suggest using numbers, instead of bullets for the two points following this statement as there is significant use of bullets throughout the Report.	Revise text.	1
122	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.2	Eighth paragraph, second bullet – suggest starting this bullet with 'the type of vehicle....'	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
123	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.2	Eighth paragraph, second bullet – suggest including examples of LRT vehicles and/or buses operating in a fully exclusive ROW and a partially exclusive ROW.	LRV shown. Retain text.	3
124	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.2	Ninth paragraph (bullets) – suggest replacing with numbers as three alternative transit methods are discussed.	Revise text.	1
125	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.2	Tenth paragraph – this paragraph seems out of place. Suggest relocating to the end of the alternative methods discussion.	Revise text.	1
126	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.3.1	ROW/right-of-way should be used consistently or the acronym defined and used consistently throughout.	Revise text.	1
127	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.3.1	Transit technology evaluation criteria, air quality – it is unclear how air quality is related to the City’s design objectives noted. Suggest rephrasing.	Revise text.	1
128	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.3.1	Transit technology evaluation criteria, Capacity/reliability – suggest rephrasing ‘in order to support the development aspirations of the City...’ Perhaps, ‘in order to invest in infrastructure that supports the City’s Official Plan policies and designated growth areas?’	Revise text.	1
129	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.3.2	Transit technology evaluation criteria, land use – this section is not consistent with the overview of land use as an evaluation criteria provided in the preceding section. Are transit technologies being compared for their consistency with the City’s OP or are they being compared in terms of their ability to attract development/growth? Isn’t LRT the preferred technology because the OP identifies centres and avenues as requiring higher order transit infrastructure and BRT technology has a carrying capacity that is not supportive of the transit trips forecasted?	Revise text.	1
130	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.3.2	Transit technology evaluation criteria, land use – suggest removing “school of thought” reference and rethinking this discussion altogether.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
131	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.3.3	Land use – again, based on the way the evaluation criteria is first presented, the technology should be evaluated for consistency with the City’s OP policies, the same policies that are cited for each transit technology evaluated. Growth in the City is predicated on the Growth Plan for the GGH. A certain kind of transit technology is appropriate based on its carrying capacity and the growth forecasted.	Revise text.	1
132	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.3.4	Recommended Transit Method – suggest including a small matrix that compares the two transit technologies and identifies the preferred method.	Revise text.	1
133	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.1.3.4	Recommended Transit Method – in general, it is unclear what methodology was used to evaluate the different technologies. Suggest confirming that a reasoned argument approach was used and define what comprises this approach.	Revise text.	1
134	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.2, Stage 1 and Stage 2 Reports	Suggest using a title that better relates to the information being presented. Vertical alignment perhaps?	Revise text.	1
135	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.2, Stage 1 and Stage 2 Reports	Third paragraph (bullets) – proper tense is not used through the bullet points. For example, ‘platforms were “placed” at all major intersections.’ These references should be amended to refer to platforms were placed on plans, etc...	Revise text.	1
136	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.2, Stage 1 and Stage 2 Reports	Fourth paragraph – suggest explaining in parenthesis or in a glossary what ‘tangent’ means as this may not be a term that everyone is familiar with.	Revise text.	1
137	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.2, Stage 1 and Stage 2 Reports	Fifth paragraph – suggest referring to the report ‘recommended,’ not stated.	Revise text.	1
138	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.2, Stage 1 and Stage 2 Reports	Fifth paragraph – suggest new paragraph following the end of the third sentence.	Revise text.	1
139	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.2, Stage 1 and Stage 2 Reports	Sixth paragraph – reference is made to four bridges and underpasses that were identified as being unable to accommodate the LRT ROW and two traffic lanes. Are modifications proposed?	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
140	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.2, Stage 1 and Stage 2 Reports	Seventh paragraph – reference is made to ten bridges that were not evaluated. However, only a list of three bridges is provided.	Revise text.	1
141	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.2, Stage 1 and Stage 2 Reports	Eight paragraph – what were the conceptual plans prepared for?	Revise text.	1
142	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.2, Stage 1 and Stage 2 Reports	Ninth paragraph (bullets) – a list of future considerations is provided in a series of bullets. Notwithstanding, the items listed are action items that have already been carried out.	Revise text.	1
143	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Page 24	Numerous acronyms are included that have not been defined.	Revise text.	1
144	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.2, Stage 1 and Stage 2 Reports	What are the relevant conclusions of this subsection? Suggest including a short concluding subsection. Also suggest reviewing the contents of this section for material that may not be relevant within this section of the report (assessment of alternative methods).	Revise text.	1
145	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.3.4	Last sentence – suggest rephrasing. The meaning of this sentence is not clear.	Revise text.	1
146	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.3.10	First sentence - suggest rephrasing. The meaning of this sentence is not clear.	Revise text.	1
147	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.3.10	Suggest inserting a table summarizing the findings.	Revise text.	1
148	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.3.13	Suggest referring to this subsection as conclusion.	Revise text.	1
149	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.4.1.4	Construction methodology – reference is made to a future lengthening of the underground station platforms. Is approval for the extended platform lengths being sought as part of this study? Have the impacts of the longer platforms been assessed?	No. Impacts of longer platforms were considered at a high level at the time. Retain text.	3
150	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.4.1.5	Suggest inserting a table that compares the evaluation criteria used to determine the preferred tunnel configuration.	Revise text.	1
151	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.4.1.5	Suggest referring to this subsection as conclusion or inserting a small concluding subsection at the end which states what the preferred method is.	Revise text.	1
152	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.5	Platform Width Study – suggest referring to this section as 'Platform Widths' and referring to the study as the basis for determining platform widths.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
153	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.5	Suggest adding a concluding subsection that identifies the preferred alternative.	Revise text.	1
154	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.5	Fourth paragraph – reference is made to a Master Plan study without the necessary context for the reader to understand what study is being referred to.	Revise text.	1
155	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.6	Key Challenges and Technical Constraints, third paragraph – suggest qualifying the noted traffic impacts with a statement that if the assumptions used to generate these findings are conservatively made without any commensurate improvements in traffic operations due to shifting transportation modal splits.	Revise text.	1
156	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.6	Alternatives, second paragraph – suggest specifying which left turn movements (e.g. east-west) are being removed from the signalized intersections.	Revise text.	1
157	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.6	Alternatives, second paragraph – suggest referring to Exhibits 25 through 27 at the beginning of the Alternatives subsection.	Revise text.	1
158	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.6	The subsections in this section are not numbered. Suggest reviewing the EPR for consistency in organization.	Revise text.	1
159	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibits 25 – 27	Suggest including references to the direction of travel.	Retain text.	3
160	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.7.1	This section would benefit from better organization and a more concise discussion.	Revise text.	1
161	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.7.4	Interface with Mississauga BRT/GO Transit – this section should incorporate numbered subsections to help organize the discussion of ideas and issues.	Revise text.	1
162	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.7.4	Interface with Mississauga BRT/GO Transit – reference is made to a future Mississauga BRT route extending to the Eglinton Avenue West and Martin Grove Road intersection. Suggest providing additional context here. Is this extension a part of a current/future study?	Revise text.	1
163	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibits 37 – 40	These exhibits are a good addition to the EPR, but should be enlarged.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
164	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.7.4, Page 39	A number of references are made to the Eglinton Crosstown LRT EA. References to an EA should be removed and the remainder of the document and supporting impact assessments reviewed to ensure that no other references to an EA are included.	Revise text.	1
165	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.7.5	Third paragraph – was the public consulted about the preferred alignment? Also was ‘approval’ or ‘support’ obtained from each stakeholder for the recommended route selection?	Revise text.	1
166	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.8.1	Suggest moving this subsection to the end of the evaluation criteria for the Emmet Avenue Stop (e.g. following Section 2.2.8.4).	Revise text.	1
167	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.8.5	Are there details about the pedestrian route at the east end of the Humber River Bridge improvements that can be provided here? What process will the improvements be subject to and how can people interested in the improvements get involved? Is there a conceptual plan that can be included?	Design issue.	2
168	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 43	Reference is made in a notation to the ‘end point of the EA.’ This reference should be removed.	Revise exhibit.	1
169	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.9, Jane Street LRT Interface	Suggest including a short paragraph (two or three sentences) explaining the context for consideration of alternative methods. The description included in Section 2.2.9.1 may be more appropriate as introductory information that precedes the discussion of the studies that were carried out to respond to the challenges. Other alternative method sections should be reviewed to ensure that the information is organized in a manner that is easily understood (e.g. problem definition, study parameters, alternatives considered, study findings, recommendations/conclusions).	Revise text.	1
170	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 44	Is the study area defined by the image shown in Exhibit 44 or is the study area smaller than this? Suggest highlighting the study area.	Retain exhibit.	3
171	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.9.2	JLRT not defined	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
172	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	section 2.2.9.1	Jane Street/Eglinton Avenue West intersection – section 2.2.9.1 notes that the pedestrian volumes at this intersection are forecasted to increase by 750 %. Do the sidewalks adjacent to the recommended JLRT and ECLRT stop locations provide sufficient width to accommodate the peak period pedestrian volumes?	Design issue.	2
173	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 46	This exhibit does not provide enough context. Suggest adding the location of transit signals north of Eglinton Avenue West and showing the transition of the LRT from the centre of the right-of-way to the side of the street option. How does the transition occur?	Revise exhibit.	1
174	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.9.2.3	First paragraph, second sentence – inaccurate references to Exhibits 40 and 41.	Revise text.	1
175	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.9.4 - Recommendations	Suggest outlining the benefits of Option 1 (e.g. it is the least costly, has no property impacts, maintains adequate traffic operations, etc...). There seems to be more detail here than is needed. Perhaps supplement with an evaluation matrix rather than including six bullet points. In addition, the first sentence of this section seems to infer that the only reason Option 1 was chosen was based on traffic impacts. This contradicts the reasons listed in the bullets which suggest that other factors (e.g. cost, property impacts, etc...) were also considered in the evaluation.	Revise text.	1
176	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.10, Vertical Alignment Alternatives	Suggest that this section start out with a discussion of what problems are leading to the consideration of alternative vertical alignments. See Comment 201 above.	Revise text.	1
177	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.10	First paragraph, second sentence – reference is made to social constraints without context. This reference is not repeated anywhere else in this section either. What social constraints are being referred to?	Revise text.	1
178	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.10	Fourth paragraph – properties are 'designated' under the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> , not registered. Properties may also be listed under a municipal registry as being a property or structure of historical interest. What is meant in these references?	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
179	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 51 – 56	Suggest enlarging these exhibits	Revise exhibit.	1
180	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.10.3	Suggest adding a concluding or recommendation section that discusses the material appearing in the last paragraph. Also suggest including an evaluation matrix that illustrates the alternatives, evaluation criteria and preferred alternative.	Revise text.	1
181	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.10.4	Last sentence – who is reviewing the costs and property impacts?	Revise text.	1
182	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 65	Suggest identifying in the title block that this exhibit shows the preferred alternative.	Revise text.	1
183	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 68	V/C and LOS not defined.	Revise text.	1
184	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.12, Brentcliffe/Laird Station	Suggest using bigger font for the title of each alternative method considered. Section 2 contains a lot of information and it should be visually evident where one subsection ends and another ends.	Revise text.	1
185	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 69, 70	Not clear what the purpose of these exhibits is. Suggest either removing or adding context or a map that shows the boundaries of the traffic zones noted or both.	Revise text.	1
186	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.13.1	Reference is made in the second paragraph to seven bus bays being needed until such time as the Don Mills LRT is fully implemented. It is further noted that this study (the ECLRT study) carried out an assessment of the bus bays (presumably air quality and noise impacts) based on a five bus bay requirement. Is the Don Mills LRT approved? If it has not been approved, the assessments should be carried out based on the seven bus bay requirement as there is no assurance that the Don Mills LRT will be approved or constructed in a timely manner.	Revise text.	1
187	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.13.1	Last sentence – suggest clarifying what snow melting system is being referred to. This sentence appears to be out of place.	Revise text.	1
188	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.13.7	First paragraph, last sentence – what evaluation criteria were included in the screening?	Revise text.	1
189	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.13.7	Suggest including exhibits illustrating alternatives 14, 15 & 16.	Revise text.	1
190	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.13.8	Second paragraph, second bullet – reference is made to an evaluation matrix, however it is not clear where this matrix is located. If it is exhibit no. 83, reference should be made to this.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
191	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 83	Suggest including a column that tallies the results of the evaluation and a further column that identifies the preferred alternative.	Revise text.	1
192	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.13.8	Alternative 6 is identified as the preferred alternative, however, alternative 3 scores highest in Exhibit 83. Suggest confirming the results of the evaluation.	Revise text.	1
193	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.14.3	Suggest moving this information to Section 2.2.14.	Revise text.	1
194	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.14.4	What is the base option?	Revise text.	1
195	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.14.5	Suggest discussing the criteria in which the preferred alternative was assessed. As phrased, the recommendation seems to be based on something other than the evaluation criteria.	Revise text.	1
196	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 86	The relevance of this information is not clear. Suggest adding context or removing.	Revise text.	1
197	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 87 – Section 2.2.15.1	Discusses two of the five traffic zones for which information is presented in Exhibit 87. What is the purpose of including the information about the other traffic zones?	Revise text.	1
198	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.15.2	Is Eglinton Avenue East on a downward or upward gradient in the location discussed?	Revise text.	1
199	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.15.3	Second paragraph – the material presented in this paragraph is overly technical. Suggest using a diagram to illustrate the ideas and making this discussing more concise.	Revise text.	1
200	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.2.15.6	Second paragraph – the material presented in this paragraph is overly technical. Suggest using a diagram to illustrate the ideas and making this discussing more concise.	Add exhibit.	1
201	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3	Third paragraph – what is meant by essential element requirements?	Revise text.	1
202	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3	Fourth paragraph (following bullets) – the first sentence is missing information as indicated by ????.	Revise text.	1
203	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.1	Suggest setting the context for the following sections by stating that ‘the following is a description of the individual stops/stations progressing from the west to east.’	Revise text.	1
204	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.1	The Silver Dart stop, among select others, are not illustrated in an exhibit. Suggest including an exhibit for each of the transit stops/stations.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
205	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.2	Much of the information provided in the subsections of this section, as well as those within other transit stop/station sections is repetitive. Suggest combining some of these subsections, where possible. The information should describe the undertaking and avoid unnecessarily repeating information that has just been presented in the alternative methods section.	Revise text.	1
206	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.4	Unclear what the meaning of 'jug handles' is? Suggest including in a glossary or adding clarity in parenthesis.	Revise text.	1
207	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.4	Fourth paragraph – unclear whether dual EBLT lanes are already in place. Are they proposed or existing?	Revise text.	1
208	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.4	Fourth paragraph – suggest referring to exclusive turn lanes, not dedicated turn lanes.	Revise text.	1
209	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.6	Suggest confirming the land use located at the southwest corner of the East Mall and Eglinton Avenue West.	Revise text.	1
210	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.8	Is an eastbound U-turn necessary at this location?	Revise text.	1
211	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.8	Reference is made to flat green fields which separate the roadway from apartment buildings on both sides (of the street). Suggest referring to land uses and property ownership. The flat green fields in question are City-owned boulevards. Suggest rephrasing other similar references throughout.	Revise text.	1
212	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 99	This exhibit illustrates property on the north side of Eglinton Avenue West that was acquired by the City for future transit row purposes. Was a transit north side of the street alternative alignment considered? What will this land be used for if not for transit purposes?	Revise text.	1
213	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 101	Do the U-turn signals allow for north-south pedestrian crossings?	Revise text.	1
214	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 109	Are there any safety concerns/sightline constraints for the southbound approach to the signalized intersection at the north entrance to the Keele Street bus station? If so, how will these concerns be mitigated?	Retain text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
215	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.21, Road Layout and Traffic Operations	The southbound right turn at the Dufferin Street/Eglinton Avenue West intersection is a channelized right turn lane. Also, will southbound and northbound right turns still be permitted?	Retain text.	1
216	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.23	Suggest showing a vertical profile of the ECLRT connection to the Eglinton West subway station.	Retain text.	1
217	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.27	Suggest showing a vertical profile of the ECLRT connection to the Yonge-Eglinton subway station	Revise text.	1
218	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 122	Are there conceptual drawings that could better illustrate the interface between the Eglinton and Don Mills LRTs?	Revise text.	1
219	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.34	At the Wynford Drive transit stop, a number of road closures and realignments are illustrated in Exhibit 125. What will the surplus lands be used for?	Revise text.	1
220	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.3.40	Following this section, it is unclear where the ECLRT route will terminate. Suggest adding a paragraph to this effect at the end of this section or elsewhere in the description of the undertaking.	Revise text.	1
221	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.6	Second paragraph – will the pedestrian bridge between Royal York Road and Scarlett Road be replaced with an equivalent crossing opportunity?	Yes. Revise text.	1
222	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.6.1	Other Loads, second paragraph – which appendices are being referred to?	Revise text.	1
223	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 2.3.2.6.2	What do the codes included in this section refer to?	Revise text.	1
224	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Page 77	Page number sequencing is incorrect following this page.	Revise text.	1
225	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Eglinton Avenue Plan and Profiles	A subsection that precedes the plan & profiles should be added to explain what is being presented.	Revise text.	1
226	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 3.1.1.3,	Last paragraph – suggest confirming the status of the Redside dace.	Revise text.	1
227	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 3.1.3.1	Third paragraph – the final sentence of this paragraph notes that there is a high potential for the recovery of both Aboriginal and historic, Euro-Canadian archaeological remains within undisturbed portions of the subject lands. Suggest clarifying that this conclusion was based on a Phase 1 review and that Phase 2 (discussed below) confirmed that this was not the case for the lands comprising the transit corridor.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
228	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 3.1.4.4	Is a permit from Transport Canada required for these bridge crossings?	Design issue.	2
229	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 3.2.2.2	What actions are proposed should contaminated soils be encountered? The statement made in this section is not consistent with the information present in Section 4.2.1.	Retain text.	3
230	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 3.2.2.3	Is the relocation of utilities not considered major utility construction?	Retain text.	3
231	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 3.2.4.2	Suggest referencing the benefits of the Project on future traffic operations in this location.	Retain text.	3
232	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 4	Under subsection 9(2) 7 of O. Reg. 231/08, a description of any measures proposed by the proponent for mitigating any negative impacts that the preferred method of carrying out the transit project might have on the environment must be provided in the EPR. Subsection 9(2) 8 requires that if mitigation measures are proposed under subsection 9(2) 7, a description of the means the proponent proposes to use to monitor or verify their effectiveness must also be provided. The monitoring details included in Section 4 of the EPR should be consolidated in one location (e.g. an exhibit, similar to Exhibit 4-4, which was submitted as part of Scarborough-Malvern LRT Project), should be provided.	Add exhibit.	1
233	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 4.2.1	Fourth paragraph – suggest specifying that it is the Ministry of the Environment that is being referred to.	Revise text.	1
234	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 4.2.9	Suggest specifying that it is the Ministry of Culture that is being referred to.	Revise text.	1
235	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 4	Inconsistent references to provincial statutes. Some are italicized, others are not.	Revise text.	1
236	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 4.2.9	Will the First Nations who are party to the City of Toronto's First Nation consultation protocol be contacted if human remains or archaeological resources are discovered?	Revise text.	1
237	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 4.3.2	Fourth paragraph – in regards to the groundwater monitoring and mitigation plan, whom will this be submitted to?	Revise text.	1
238	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 4.3.7	Second paragraph – reference is made to the 'guidelines.' What guidelines?	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
239	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 4.3.8	Reference is again made to an EA, which this project is not subject to. Suggest amending this reference.	Revise text.	1
240	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 4.3.8	Mitigation – suggest the arrangement of a 24 hour construction phone line that area residents and business owners can call if concerns and/or issues arise. Also suggest that a communications strategy be prepared to ensure that area residents are informed of who can be called when concerns and/or issues arise.	Revise text.	1
241	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 4.3.10	Given the concern with the rerouted left turns at select intersections and traffic impacts in general, a commitment to monitor the effectiveness of the road network changes should be made.	Retain text.	3
242	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 5.2.3	Were attempts to contact individual Aboriginal communities who were identified as potentially having an interest in the project contacted directly?	Yes. Retain text.	3
243	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 5.3.1	What concerns (generally) were raised at this meeting? Readers should then be referred to the table where the comments/concerns are summarized.	Revise text.	1
244	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 5.3.3	Suggest identifying each of the signatories to the Williams Treaty.	Revise text.	1
245	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 5.3.4	Meeting with the Airport Corporate Centre Businesses – what concerns were raised at this meeting and how have they been addressed? This same comment applies to all meetings and workshops held.	Revise text.	1
246	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Exhibit 172	Comment Tracking Table – this table should be broken into two tables, one reflecting the comments of the public and one reflecting the comments of the Government Review Team.	Add exhibit.	1
247	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 6.1	A commitment to consult with any Aboriginal communities that may be interested in this project should be made.	Revise text.	1
248	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 6.1	A commitment to contact the MCL and Aboriginal communities, where appropriate, should be made in this location. Similar wording to Section 4.2.9 should be used.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
249	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 6.2, Property Acquisition Commitment B	This commitment should specify where these lands are located.	Need to retain exact wording. Retain text.	3
250	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 6.3, Commitment F	Suggest specifying that this will occur as part of a separate study process.	Revise text.	1
251	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 6.3, Commitment G	The details of this commitment should be better articulated in earlier sections of the Report. It is not clear to the reader that a connection to the Kennedy subway station is not included in this study.	Retain text.	3
252	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 6.4, Commitment H	Are permits from the Credit Valley Conservation Authority needed?	No. Retain text.	3
253	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 6.4	Suggest adding commitments to provide a 24 hour construction telephone line for area residents and business owners to call and that a communications plan will be developed to ensure that area residents and business owners know who to call should issues/concerns arise.	Revise text.	1
254	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 6.7	Has the requirement for an Environmental Screening Report been confirmed with the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency?	Not at this time.	3
255	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 6.8.1, commitment D	What is meant by this commitment? Additional clarity is needed.	Retain text.	3
256	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea - MOE Toronto District Office comments	Contaminated property and waste	At this time, the main concern that Toronto District would have is the manner in which any contamination that is encountered during construction activities is dealt with. I have had an opportunity to have a cursory review of the "Contamination Overview Study..." which I should add is very detailed and thorough. I noted that several potential areas of concern could be encountered, including former waste disposal sites. The TDO is willing to meet with the TTC and its consultant when the time for detailed consultation on specific areas of contamination is necessary (i.e. – soil management, or mitigation measures).	Retain text.	3

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
257	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea, Water and Wastewater Unit - Approvals Section	Page 6 &7: Exhibits 5 &6:	Please update land use designation clearly indicating location of water body/water resources crossings. The drawing print quality requires improvement.	Revise exhibit.	1
258	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Page 12:	A delineated corridor for built up LRT roadway for stormwater conveyance, quantity and quality management (may be in the form of permeable pavements, filter strips or other best management practices (BMPs) e.g. Oil and Grit Separators (OGs) locations) shall be indicated and the locations thereof shall be shown on proposed cross-sections in the following pages. Please revise. The Mississauga BRT EA documents may be used for reference.	Revise exhibit.	1
259	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Page 193: Section 4.2.1:	Please change wording of the paragraph that LRT will have 'no' permanent impact on terrain. There will be impact however minimum it may be.	Revise text.	1
260	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Page 193, Section 4.2.2	See comment above. There will be impact on ground water and its movement, especially in the tunnelled sections and it has to be evaluated at the time of 'impact on water resources and stormwater management design' works. Please revise the paragraph.	Revise text.	1
261	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Page 193, Section 4.2.3	Please revise wording and re-write the whole paragraph avoiding use of 'no' at multiple locations and wording like 'will be flooded' to be revised.	Revise text.	1
262	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Pages 194,195, Section 4.2.4.1	Revise wording with 'no alteration' and spell out provision of 'best management practices' to be used to minimise effects of LRT crossings on the waterways and crossings.	Revise text.	1
263	MOE, EAAB	Jeffrey Dea	Section 4.2	Please provide a subsection in section 4.2.on groundwater, surface water and HADD 'monitoring'.	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
264	MOE, Water Resc	Kathryn Baker	Section 6	The ECLRT will require construction dewatering regardless of the construction method. Dewatering at rates higher than 50,000 litres/day requires a Permit To Take Water (PTTW) be issued by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE). Included in the PTTW applications, the MOE requires a discussion of potential impacts to the natural environment, any risks posed to nearby structures due to subsidence resulting from construction dewatering, and the potential for the movement of contaminated groundwater due to construction dewatering. PTTW applications should also detail the planned disposal method for the water taken and that water that water quality meets the water quality criteria for the chosen disposal method. Due to the scale and complexity of the ECLRT project, the TTC is encouraged to initiate a pre-consultation process with the MOE regarding the required PTTWs for ECLRT construction dewatering.	Design issue.	2
265	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Entry Pavilions	As agreed to by the Technical Advisory Committee, pedestrian entry pavilions should be illustrated in an abstract manner and should not show details of the organization of internal space including the location of stairs, escalators and doors.	Revise exhibit.	1
266	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Richview Transportation Corridor (Martin Grove Road to Scarlett Road)	The detailed design of the LRT should take into account and not preclude future transit supportive development within the corridor. Proposed left-turn signal locations should ideally also provide opportunities for vehicular access to adjacent properties as well as new pedestrian crossings for pedestrians. This latter point also applies to all half and u-turn signals throughout Eglinton Crosstown LRT corridor; they should not be designed solely for the purpose of serving rerouted traffic.	Retain text.	3
267	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Pedestrian Bridge East of Royal York Road	Is the removal of this bridge essential? Can this issue be revisited during the detailed design stage of the project.	Yes. Retain text.	3
268	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Intersection of Eglinton Avenue West /Emmett Road	A signalized full movement intersection would be more appropriate rather than the proposed restricted right in/right-out arrangement	Retain text.	3

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
269	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Bus Terminals	More detailed plans of the Keele and Wynford bus terminals should be presented and should show adjacent street conditions. A scale consistent with the plan and profile sheets would be appropriate	Revise exhibit.	1
270	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		The standard street sections shown in the report address the general functional location of the LRT, vehicular lanes, platforms, bike lanes etc. However, special consideration for pedestrian access and width of sidewalks through underpasses and across bridges need to be addressed. The minimum requirement for sidewalk widths may not address pedestrian safety or the perceived pedestrian comfort in these spaces.	Revise text.	1
271	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		Given the impact on the community during the construction process, pedestrian access and safety during construction staging needs to be further studied. Is this acknowledged in the report?	Revise text.	1
272	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		The location and appearance of substations and emergency exit buildings need to be located with the guidance of City planning and City urban designers, the building appearance should fit within its context and landscaping should be provided.	Revise text.	1
273	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		The approved width of platform for the centre platform on Sheppard LRT line is 4 metres on the Eglinton LRT line 5 to 6 metres is proposed; is this correct?	Yes. Retain text.	3
274	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		All locations for new or relocated utilities both above or below ground must be coordinated with the streetscape design.	Design issue.	2
275	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		Public Art commitment must be acknowledged in the EPR. The public art plan must be planned during the design process - not after the fact.	Revise text.	1
276	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		When and where possible TTC must work with Community Planning and Urban Design to fully integrate TTC facilities with proposed development	Design issue.	2

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
277	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		Proposed diversion roads should not sterilize potential development lands (eg. the proposed Martin Grove Road rerouted left and right turns).	Design issue.	2
278	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		The proposed main entrances and secondary entrances should be integrated within developments when ever possible rather than being free standing elements.	Design issue.	2
279	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		The proposed Fire Ventilation Shafts and the Traction Power Sub Stations should ideally be integrated within existing or new buildings where possible. They should not be free standing elements which sterilize potential development parcels.	Design issue.	2
280	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Section 1.3	In the first line "Crosstown" is misspelled.	Revise text.	1
281	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Section 1.3.1	Section 1.3.1 states that under the TPAP alternative planning solutions are not required. Therefore, why on Page 20 is there all this evaluation of subway vs. BRT etc?	To explain to the public. Retain text.	3
282	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 5	top right - delete "Opportunities for"	Revise text.	1
283	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 5	Land use text includes "Centres" this text should be move to text on pg 4 with Avenues discussion, as "Centres" are not a land use designation	Revise text.	1
284	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 5- 6	The Eglinton Corridor (dashed oval) is not accurately drawn on either page	Revise text.	1
285	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 11	Essential Elements Unique to the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Line 2 of the second paragraph should read "...a basis to begin the study"	Revise text.	1
286	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 11 -12	During the process of standardizing the cross sections for the mid block and intersection conditions for the Sheppard LRT line it was determined that at the intersections the LRT right-of way would be at a dimension of 7.38m and in the mid block portion the LRT right of way would be 7.0m Please confirm the new proposed dimensions with the Sheppard LRT team.	Retain exhibit.	3

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
287	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 12	In the last sentence add an "s" to the word park, also add the word "the "in front of area.	Retain text.	3
288	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 12	Exhibit 9, the minimum curve radius is given as "230 metres". Should this be 23.0 metres?	No. Retain text.	3
289	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 12	Section 2.1.4, the dimensions in the right hand column provide for a 3.1m boulevard at intersections, whereas the agreed standard is 3.3m. This section also says that "streetscaping features could be provided where there is sufficient space". This implies that there may be no streetscaping at some locations. We have worked to make sure that there will be streetscape elements at all intersections. This statement should be removed.	Retain text.	3
290	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 13	Exhibit 12, Identifies a Planting Bed within the ROW – it's actually a median.	Revise exhibit.	1
291	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 14	Parallel Stops, how will two 3m side by side platforms fit into a 36m right of way at an intersection?	Retain text.	3
292	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 13-19	The cross sections should show the property lines more clearly .	Revise exhibit.	1
293	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 19	The standard Transit City cross-section has bicycle lanes. A 1.7m wide sidewalk is required to meet Accessibility Design Guideline requirements.	Retain text.	3
294	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 21	Right column, Land Use heading - the discussion is not about Land Use, it is about technology, and not very useful since the piece finishes with "there is insufficient evidence to support" the conclusion - suggest omitting this	Retain text.	3
295	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 22	Left column, Land Use heading -again it is technology, not Land Use	Retain text.	3
296	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 22	Right column, graphic of LRV by Bombardier is captioned "Selected Toronto LRV" but on Page 11 in Section 2.1.1 the procurement is said to be still under way	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
297	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 24	There is reference to: " Property requirements of 3 metres on either side and above the tunnels and box structures were required." Should this say clearance rather than property?	Revise text.	1
298	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 26	Much is made of the bad impacts of cut & cover construction for the running way, but this technique will be required for the stations so care should be taken in portraying the disruption etc	Retain text.	3
299	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 27	Left column - similar to the above	Retain text.	3
300	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 27	Right column, Section 2.2.4 - first sentence after bullets "A nominal pillar thickness" - is pillar the correct term for a horizontal slice of cover?	Revise text.	1
301	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 31	Left-U-Turns, All the major intersections propose that u-turn intersections be introduced mid-block to re-route traffic movement to free-up the intersection for LRT movement.	No. Retain text.	3
302	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 31	Given that LRT stop spacing is in the order of 670 metres (versus the 350-500 metre ideal identified on Page 66 of the report) these intersections should not be solely dedicated to u-turn movements. Rather they should be full mid-block intersections to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians and potentially access to potential development blocks along Eglinton.	Retain text.	3
303	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 61	Left column, first paragraph under bullets, something missing after "key"; consider bolding the selection of Alternative 6 as it is hard to find after all the evaluation	Revise text.	1
304	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 62	Left column, Recommendation for Wynford - needs updating following the last TAC meeting, given the extensive discussion that took place;	Revise text.	1
305	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 64	Right column, under vertical alignment, second paragraph, third line- "kilometers" should be "kilometres";	Revise text.	1
306	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 66	Cross-section, Line 2 of paragraph one should read " <u>one bicycle lane in each direction</u> ".	Revise text.	1
307	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 66	Line 2 of paragraph 3 should read "Additionally, a covered <u>walkway</u>"	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
308	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 66	In 2.3.2.2.2, line 4 of paragraph 3 should read "The stairs and escalator(s) will be oriented to provide a direct line of <u>sight</u> from"	Revise text.	1
309	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 69	Confirm special track work around Don Mills, inconsistency between text on pg 69 and following images (which have no exhibit #s)	Add exhibit.	1
310	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 69	Left column after bullets - what is meant by "terminal section" and the ??? need to be addressed here;	Revise text.	1
311	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 73	Emergency Exit Buildings - add a note that the Emergency Exit Buildings and their high quality of finish and integration into development sites.	Retain text.	3
312	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 74	Pedestrian sidewalk widths on Bridges - To each of the two main bridges being discussed at Black Creek and the East and West Don River- add a note- design of pedestrian sidewalks across bridges will acknowledge their unique challenges for pedestrians and will provide adequate space with appropriate rails, splash guards and lighting to promote safe comfortable pedestrian crossings.	Design issue.	2
313	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Exhibit 98	The proposed diversion lanes should be carefully examined to establish whether or not they leave developable public lands and should also be evaluated on the basis of their potential to provide better access and integration into the surrounding local road network rather than singular purpose street elements.	Revise text.	1
314	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 74	Line 3 of paragraph one describes the green unoccupied parcel of land at Victoria Park and Eglinton as having "potential for future development". This is highly unlikely due to access and servicing problems. The piece of land has, in fact, been identified as a potential gateway feature. The reference to development potential should be removed.	Revise text.	1
315	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 78	Pharmacy stop - bike lanes are planned on Pharmacy Avenue; are they still feasible with these new U-turns?	Yes. Retain text.	3

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
316	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 78	East of Pharmacy along Eglinton there is a relatively long section of roadway where pedestrians cannot cross between retail uses. There should be consideration for a pedestrian crossing phase at the Eglinton Ave East U-Turn east of Pharmacy Avenue.	Retain text.	3
317	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 77	Section 2.3.2.3.36 Victoria Park Stop, first paragraph, please remove the words "with the potential for future development" after unoccupied green parcel. The property is designated Parks in the OP and has no potential for development.	Revise text.	1
318	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 77	Section 2.3.2.3.37 Pharmacy Stop, first paragraph, please insert the word "by" in between the words "occupied" and "an industrial development."	Revise text.	1
319	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 78	Section 2.3.2.3.38 Lebovic Stop, Road Layout and Traffic Operations should be left justified, and the word "are" between directions and at should be removed.	Revise text.	1
320	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 178, Exhibit 146	Exhibit 146, Martingrove, Widdicombe Hill and Kipling all have poor LOS – does this suggest that the diversion lanes and mid-block left u-turns are even more important in terms of exploring their opportunity to provide for movement/ integration along the corridor?	Yes. Retain text.	3
321	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 187	The list of "Future Development" sites in Scarborough is way out of date. For example, the Shoppers Drug Mart at 2751 Eglinton has been open for a couple of years, the work at the Canadian Tire (1901 Eglinton) was carried out years ago.	Add exhibit.	1
322	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 187	Future Development Plans, many of the projects listed in the Scarborough section are already constructed. Should these be removed from the list? For the most part the description look accurate, but I will take another look tomorrow.	Revise text.	1
323	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 188	GO Transit - please add a note about the Stouffville line - connection to be addressed through the Kennedy Station study	Outside of study. Retain text.	3

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
324	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 190- 192	Interaction Matrix - there will be pedestrian and business impacts from the running way due to the barrier effect on surface, at stations and stops due to wider spacing than bus stops, from cut & cover construction, from building demolition, from utility relocation, and from heavy equipment;	Revise text.	1
325	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 194- Section 4.2.4.1 Mitigation	Add - opportunities to reduce the physical extent of natural areas impacted by the LRT will be investigated during detailed design phase.	Revise text.	1
326	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 195- Section 4.2.5 Populations/Species, Mitigation	Add - Bird Friendly lighting and design will be incorporated where the LRT crosses valley and stream corridors to reduce the potential for birds to impact buildings.	Revise text.	1
327	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 226	Don Mills Bus terminal 7 bays required, study only assessed 5 bay no clear image illustrating bus terminal and impact? Perhaps Bus Terminals should be added to the text in Future commitments 6.3 a	Revise text.	1
328	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail	Page 227 Section 6.5 Permits and Approvals	Add - City of Toronto tree injury and removal permits including permits required under the Ravine and Natural Feature Protection by-law and by-laws that protect Private Tree, Street and Parks trees.	Revise text.	1
329	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		For intersections with major left turn prohibitions (Martin Grove, Kipling, Islington, Royal York, Scarlett, Jane, Victoria Park, Pharmacy, Birchmount) need to ensure that large trucks can still be accommodated or will have an alternate route to the area. A signage/routing plan for large trucks that cannot be accommodated at U-turn signals needs to be developed. In the west, this plan must include discussions with MTO to discourage eastbound traffic diverting to Eglinton to short cut congestion on the Highway 401.	Retain text.	3
330	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		U-turn signals should where feasible be located to facilitate access to existing and future development sites and provisions for pedestrian crossings should also be examined.	No. Retain text.	3

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
331	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		Where City Property is impacted it should be done in a manner that minimizes the amount of land required while retaining suitable parcels for redevelopment opportunities. (eg. Northeast corner of Eglinton and Martin Grove)	Retain text.	3
332	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		Bicycle path connections west of Martin Grove Road to Renforth (Centennial Park area) - it is not clear if the bicycle path on the south side will be continued and if the widening of the Mimico Creek structure will accommodate bicycle lanes. This also applies to the section east of Scarlett Rd - not sure how the bicycle path is being extended to Jane.	Revise text and exhibits.	1
333	Toronto - Transportation Planning	Rod McPhail		With the Wynford Stop redesign and turn restrictions in the area to the east at Victoria Park and Pharmacy, need to ensure traffic in the area will continue to operate. Commitment to work with the City of Toronto (City Planning, Transportation Services, Forestry, Parks and Recreation) to refine and develop the Wynford interchange redesign.	Retain text.	3
334	MOE, Air and Noise Unit	T.Shelvin and V.Low	Section 6.6	The noise report includes in an appendix copies of two noise and vibration protocols from 1993 which had been agreed to between MOE (then MOEE) and the TTC for two specific projects, the Scarborough LRT and the Waterfront West LRT. According to the noise report in Section 2.0, "The protocol which most directly relates to this project is the MOEE/TTC Draft Protocol for Noise and Vibration Assessment for the Proposed Waterfront West Light Rail Transit Line (November 11, 1993)". It is noted that one difference between the two protocol documents is that while the guideline limit for vibration in the Waterfront LRT protocol is 0.14mm/s, in the Scarborough LRT protocol it is 0.1mm/s, which is the same limit used in the body of the current report. The 0.1mm/s figure is also used in the (currently under development) Draft Guideline for Noise and Vibration Assessment of Transit Projects. The statement in Section 5.0 of the current noise report, "As outlined in the criteria section, the MOE/TTC Protocol upper limit for vibration levels is 0.1mm/s rms" should thus be revised for clarity, along with the passage from Section 2.0 above. Section 6.6 of the EPR" Noise and Vibration Protocols" should be	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
335	MOE, Air and Noise Unit	T.Shelvin and V.Low	Section 2.2.10	Section 2.2.10 discusses the proposal for the TTC Maintenance and Storage Facility, which would serve not only the Eglinton LRT, but also the St. Clair and Jane LRTs. The currently proposed location is on the north side of Eglinton , to the west of Black Creek Drive. While such facility would incorporate a number of potential sources of noise and vibration, it has not been addressed in the current version of the noise report, which should be revised accordingly.	Outside of study. Retain text.	3
336	MOE, Air and Noise Unit	T.Shelvin and V.Low	Section 4.4.3 - Vi	In section 5.7 of the noise report, it is stated "The vibration levels from the LRT will meet vibration criterion limit of 0.1mm/s rms at a setback of 20 m from the tracks". In section 4.4.3 of the EPR under "Vibration, Potential Impacts" is the slightly different statement that "The perceptible vibration levels expected to be caused by the LRT are slightly above the vibration criterion limit of 0.1 mm/s rms at a distance of 20 metres from the tracks". Neither report provides a listing or table of predicted vibration levels, so it cannot be determined to what extent the levels will "meet" or be "slightly above" the criterion; a revision is appropriate to bring the two reports into alignment on this point.	Revise text.	1
337	MOE, Air and Noise Unit	T.Shelvin and V.Low		The Light Rail Transit (LRT) system is assessed based on the use of train consists of two Light Rail Vehicles(LRVs). However, it is acknowledged in the report that future services will incorporate up to three LRVs per train consist. Therefore, the noise assessment should account for the future service case where the train consists will be made up of three LRVs.	Revise text.	1
338	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Mmaguir	Exhibit 9	You need to be careful with what is quoted as design speed. If you quote 80 km/h you are violating guidelines for roadside hazard setback (distance poles need to be setback from curb) TAC allows you to say that design speed equals posted speed. This issue has come up on Sheppard and Finch	Revise text.	1
339	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.1.2	Where will Section XX be placed in the document? or is this referring to the cross-sections in 2.1.4?	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
340	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.1.4	Because of how the following pages are laid out would it not be better to have the cross-section and then the word description? As it is now the farside stop description is on this page and the nearside stop description is under the farside stop cross-section	Revise text.	1
341	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.1.2	May want to add why reliability would remain poor eg parking? etc.	Revise text.	1
342	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.1.3.3	Orphaned title	Revise text.	1
343	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.3.11	EEB not previously identified in document. Should spell it out here at the first reference.	Revise text.	1
344	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.5 last paragraph	spelling "LRTt"	Revise text.	1
345	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.6	Re-routed left turns - May want to expand LRV to differentiate between LRT	Revise text.	1
346	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.6	first bullet in page 30. LRV? or are the LRV's above incorrect? Same comment for #3 Same for bullet #2 in Synchro analysis below	Revise text.	1
347	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.6 under Key Challenges	This is the first reference to ECLRT except in the index, may want to spell it out for readers	Revise text.	1
348	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Exhibit 29 - Page 33	Since there is white space at the bottom of this page should we not keep all bullets related to Royal York together?	Revise text.	1
349	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.7	Second paragraph - Exhibit 30? Not Exhibit 230	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
350	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.7.4	Third paragraph - need to be consistent airport has been referred to Pearson, Pearson International and now LBPIA, we should just stick to one way of referencing.	Revise text.	1
351	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.9	Second paragraph - This should also be done earlier with the first mention of LRV's	Revise text.	1
352	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.9.2	Regarding JLRT: again, those of us familiar with these studies will make these acronym connections quickly, we need to be mindful of others reading this documentation	Revise text.	1
353	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.9.2.3	Need correct references	Revise text.	1
354	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Exhibit 62	Missing a stop controlled at Eglinton and Keele	Revise text.	1
355	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.11.2	We seem to be able to fit an exhibit and description on one page can we not fit the description that matches the exhibit on the same page? It would make reading and referring to the exhibit much easier especially if you are reviewing this online	Revise text.	1
356	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Ppalmer	Section 2.2.13.6	First paragraph, last line - spelling	Revise text.	1
357	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Mmaguir	Section 2.2.14.5	First paragraph - Since this date is in the past , it should be updated	Revise text.	1
358	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Mmaguir	Section 2.3.1.3	First paragraph - last line, remove end quote	Revise text.	1
359	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Mmaguir	Section 2.3.1.3	Second paragraph - Analyses not analysis	Revise text.	1

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT						
Item #	Dept/	I.D.	Dwg. # / Spec	Comments	Response	Action
360	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Mmaguir	Section 2.3.1.3	Last paragraph - this is not correct.....right turn lanes are not part of the standard cross-section	Revise text.	1
361	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Mmaguir	Section 2.3.1.5	first paragraph - last line, not fair to say they will remain as is.....more accurate to say that the at-grade lane configuration will be finalized during detailed design	Revise text.	1
362	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Mmaguir	Section 2.3.2.3	need to confirm "?????"'s	Revise text.	1
363	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Mmaguir	Section 2.3.2.3.23	Under Road Layout and Traffic Operations - would be wise to mention the potential for grade separating left turns as per Councillor Mihevic (Stephanie has background)	Retain text.	3
364	City of Toronto, Transportation Services	Mmaguir	Section 2.3.3	the construction methods shown are not consistent with the proposal at the workshop on Feb11th. The " 1/3 ; 2/3 " option was shown. Maybe it should be referenced with some wording that there is much work to be done in this area and the final method will vary by physical constraint and community desire	Design issue.	2

Response to Comments:

- 1 - Will comply
- 2 - Design issue
- 3 - No action