

ECLRT EPR Addendum			
Technical Stakeholder Comment-Response Table, December 5, 2013			
Reviewer	Section	Comment	Response ¹
MOE – EAAB Lorna Zappone November 27 th , 2013	General	The EPR Addendum was reviewed by ministry staff of the Environmental Approvals Branch, Environmental Assessment Services (EAS) Section, and technical reviewers in the Environmental Approval Services Section, and the ministry Central Region office, Technical Support Section, Toronto District Office (TSS/TDO). Comments from EAS Section are provided below. Attached for your consideration you will find noise and wastewater-related comments from the Environmental Approvals Services Section as well as TSS/TDO comments.	No response required.
	Section 6 – Consultation Process	The EPR Addendum must contain a consultation record that includes a description of consultation carried out with interested persons, including Aboriginal communities. Provide the missing information, including any subsequent consultation undertaken with the Chippewas of Rama.	Please see responses below re: Section 6.
		The EPR Addendum indicates that the draft EPR Addendum was circulated to interested stakeholders in January 2013 and the Notice of EPR Addendum was published October 18, 2013. It is not clear that consultation has been undertaken with Aboriginal communities identified by the ministry in an e-mail dated December 12, 2012, as section 6.8 of the EPR Addendum reflects consultation activities in June and November 2012,	A standalone summary will be provided to outline the Aboriginal consultation. In addition, a copy of the February 14, 2013 comments from Chippewas of Rama will be provided.

¹ Note: Section numbering refers to the final EPR Addendum.

ECLRT EPR Addendum			
Technical Stakeholder Comment-Response Table, December 5, 2013			
Reviewer	Section	Comment	Response ¹
		<p>only.</p> <p>Provide details of consultation undertaken with Aboriginal communities since November 29, 2012. Additional details about consultation requirements under O.Reg. 231/08 can be found in section 9(2)10.</p>	
		<p>Further, in accordance with O.Reg. 231/08 and the TPAP, the EPR Addendum is to include copies of all written comments submitted by Aboriginal communities. The EPR Addendum, section 6.8, indicates that the Chippewas of Rama submitted a comment on February 14, 2013, however a copy of that submission has not been included.</p>	<p>A copy of the February 14, 2013 response from the Chippewas of Rama First Nation will be provided.</p>
	Appendix K	<p>Issues raised by stakeholders during the review of the draft EPR Addendum are presented in a comment response table found in Appendix K of the EPR Addendum. This comment response table was provided to the ministry for review and comment in April 2013. The ministry, EAS Section and TSS/TDO, provided comments about outstanding concerns in an e-mail to the proponent on April 25, 2013. The e-mail has not been included in the consultation record, nor have the outstanding concerns been addressed.</p> <p>Provide the comments contained in the ministry's April 2013 correspondence, including the proponent's response to the outstanding issues, in the comment response table being prepared to document all incoming comments, and the</p>	<p>Comments from April 25, 2013 correspondence addressed below.</p>

ECLRT EPR Addendum			
Technical Stakeholder Comment-Response Table, December 5, 2013			
Reviewer	Section	Comment	Response ¹
		proponent's response, submitted during the EPR Addendum 30-day review period.	
		<i>[comments from April 25th, 2013]</i> <i>Item No. 60 – Ensure all relevant details on the bus terminal are included in the final Addendum.</i>	Metrolinx believes that all relevant details regarding the bus terminal are included in the EPR Addendum. The bus terminal is not a standalone feature; it is an integral part of the LRT undertaking.
		<i>Item No. 277 – Provide written information on the similarities in operating costs before the appearance of Table 2-3 if it is not to be included in that analysis.</i>	Revisions will be made to reflect the removal of "Operating Costs" as criteria in the assessment of bus terminal alternatives.
		<i>Item No. 423 – The location of the proposed bridge over Black Creek is unclear. Provide a figure in the final Addendum which illustrates this.</i>	The proposed LRT bridge over Black Creek is illustrated in Figure 3-7F of the EPR Addendum.
		<i>Item No. 604 – Identify and cross reference where the clarification is provided.</i>	Section 7.2 of the EPR Addendum states that "the preliminary property requirements identified in Section 5.3.7 [of the EPR Addendum] will be confirmed during the detailed design phase of the study".
		Also, provide a cross-reference location in the EPR Addendum where items 176, 177 and 180 in the comment response table have been addressed. For example, the ministry requested a definition of 'base case' and 'ultimate', as used in the EPR Addendum.	The identified items will be addressed as follows:
		<i>Item No. 176 - It is unclear how/when assessment factors listed in 2.1.1.3 were considered in the determination of the 11 alignment options.</i>	All 11 alignment options were developed in accordance with the guiding principles discussed in Section 2.1.3, and the short-list was

ECLRT EPR Addendum			
Technical Stakeholder Comment-Response Table, December 5, 2013			
Reviewer	Section	Comment	Response ¹
			subsequently evaluated as described in Section 2.1.4.
		<i>Item No. 177 - Was a separate evaluation of the 11 options undertaken using criteria listed in 2.1.1.4? Where is the evaluation table? Provide a description of the 'base case'.</i>	<p>An assessment table of the 11 alignment options was not prepared. The options were screened based on the pass/fail criteria identified in Section 2.1.4, and those alternatives carried forward were subsequently assessed as described in Sections 2.1.4 and 2.1.5.</p> <p>The definition of “base case” will be clarified. “Base case” is in reference to the ECLRT plan presented in the 2010 EPR.</p>
		<i>Item No. 180 - Table 2-1: are the criteria the same as in 2.1.1.3 and 2.1.1.4? Define 'ultimate'.</i>	<p>The criteria for 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 are not the same. As noted above, 2.1.3. addresses the guiding principles and 2.1.4. addresses the criteria used to evaluate the short-listed options. This will be clarified.</p> <p>The definition of “ultimate” will be clarified. “Ultimate” is in reference to Phase 2 of the ECLRT.</p>
	Concluding Remarks	<p>Responses to the ministry’s comments, above and in the attachments, and comments submitted by other stakeholders during the 30-day review period are to be incorporated into the final EPR Addendum in a table format, where appropriate, including revisions to Table 5-5 to reflect clarifications/additions related to commitments. All other changes and/or clarifications are to be addressed in errata pages which are to be appended to the final EPR Addendum.</p> <p>The errata, EPR Addendum comment response</p>	Noted. The requested documentation will be provided to MOE and relevant files posted to the project website.

ECLRT EPR Addendum			
Technical Stakeholder Comment-Response Table, December 5, 2013			
Reviewer	Section	Comment	Response ¹
		table, and Table 5-5, including any revised pages, should be posted on the project website as soon as possible. The ministry requires four paper copies of the errata, comment response table, and any revised pages. The ministry also requires one black-line and one final paper copy of the entire EPR Addendum, including the appendices, as appropriate, for the public file.	
MOE – EAAB – Noise and Vibration Thomas Shevlin November 5, 2013 (received November 27, 2013)		While one of the purposes of the Addendum is to provide greater detail on plans for the Maintenance and Storage Facility (“the MSF”) at the former Kodak site, the Addendum provides little or no information on potential noise sources resulting from LRT vehicle maintenance activity. Transit maintenance shops typically include noise sources including grinding, welding and general metalwork as well as paint booths etc. While these activities typically occur inside closed buildings, doors must be open at least some of the time to allow vehicle passage, and windows might also be open depending upon whether the facility is sufficiently air conditioned. The Addendum addresses neither the sources nor the issue of open windows and doors. It is reasonable to assume that there will be some interest in these issues expressed by nearby residents as plans develop.	<p>The noise assessment was undertaken for the representative Black Creek MSF layout. This facility is in an early stage of design, and a detailed assessment of potential noise impacts will be undertaken in the detailed design phase. Regardless, the design of the facility includes features which minimize the potential for noise from these sources to affect surrounding residences. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air conditioning for maintenance buildings is planned, and the bay doors will generally be kept closed. While doors may be briefly open for vehicle movements, for the majority of the time they will provide screening of indoor noise levels. • Strategic building placement to minimize noise impacts. <p>As a result, maintenance activity noise radiated from bay doors is anticipated to be insignificant compared to noise from LTR vehicles moving outdoors.</p>

ECLRT EPR Addendum			
Technical Stakeholder Comment-Response Table, December 5, 2013			
Reviewer	Section	Comment	Response ¹
			<p>Once the design progresses to a sufficiently detailed point, an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) will need to be obtained from the MOE. A detailed Acoustic Assessment Report will be submitted at that time, which will include a more detailed assessment of maintenance noise and outline any additional required mitigation measures.</p> <p>The mitigation and ECA information noted above will be added to Section 5.4.2.3 and Table E-1/5-5. The requirement for the ECA will also be noted under Section 7.5 (Permits and Approvals).</p>
		<p>While the Addendum in Appendix D, Section 6.1.2 addresses various noise sources associated with the LRT vehicle storage operations at the MSF, it does not allow for the impulsive sound emissions from car coupling, which for this type of vehicle is likely to be an infrequent but still occasional event. The Addendum does not consider the possible frequency of such impulsive noise events.</p>	<p>The LRT cars will not be uncoupled / coupled on a daily basis. That is to say, once an LRT “set” of cars is made, it generally stays together, unless heavy maintenance activities require them to be uncoupled.</p> <p>Under MOE Publication NPC-205 requirements, such coupling / uncoupling impulsive noise would therefore be considered infrequent (less than 20 impulses in a 20 minute period), and a 100 dBAI limit would apply. Under the new Publication NPC-300 requirements, infrequent impulses (1 per hour) would have an 80 dBA daytime / 75 dBAI night-time sound level limit.</p> <p>In conclusion, noise from coupling / uncoupling of LRT cars is expected to be infrequent, and will not</p>

ECLRT EPR Addendum			
Technical Stakeholder Comment-Response Table, December 5, 2013			
Reviewer	Section	Comment	Response ¹
			result in excesses of the applicable guideline limits.
		The Traction Power Substation which, according to the Addendum, will be required to provide electrical power to the MSF, has not been assessed for noise emissions in the Addendum or Appendix D. There is also the possibility of other Traction Power Substations being located along the right-of-way in the Study Area which have not been considered either.	The Traction Power Substations (TPSSs) that will be used by the project are specified to have a maximum sound level emission of 63 dBA at 3 m (equivalent to a sound power level of 80.5 dBA) ² . As such, the TPSS units are expected to be insignificant sources of noise in comparison to other operations at the MSF, and compared to vehicle noise along the right-of-way. Regardless, noise from the TPSS units will be included in future acoustic assessments for the MSF, conducted in support of the required Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA). This will be addressed in Sections 5.4.2.3 and 7.5, and in Table E-1/5-5, through the commitment to conduct a more detailed Acoustic Assessment Report as part of the ECA for the MSF site.
		Table 5-1, Interactions matrix, should under Noise & Vibration /Socio-Economic Environment column, have the items Maintenance and Storage Facility, Traction Power Substation, and Ventilation Shafts checked off for inclusion.	Table 5-1 will be revised accordingly to reflect a weak level of interaction.
		It is noted that henceforth the applicable MOE noise guideline for stationary sources will be NPC-300, which will form the basis for future Noise Environmental Compliance Approvals; the Addendum refers to the former noise guidelines.	Corresponding references will be updated accordingly (i.e. all references to NPC-205 will be revised to NPC-300).

² J. E. Coulter Associated Ltd., Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Proposed Eglinton Crosstown Light Rail Transit, Toronto Transit Commission, dated 2010, p 19.

ECLRT EPR Addendum			
Technical Stakeholder Comment-Response Table, December 5, 2013			
Reviewer	Section	Comment	Response ¹
MOE – Wastewater Comments Nov 2013 – Don Cross (received November 27, 2013)	General	<p>This is a further update to my previous review of January 2013 and October 2013:</p> <p>After it was pointed out that the following comment had apparently not been addressed in the final Environmental Project Report Addendum (EPRA); namely, "There is no mention of a monitoring and reporting plan for the effluent from SWM facilities within the BCMSF which is part of the storm water management report for the site", I took another look at the Report Addendum and I have added the following clarification:</p> <p>My original observation was that "There should be a monitoring and reporting plan established for the effluent from the SWM facilities within the Black Creek MSF as part of the storm water management report for that site."</p> <p>Whereas it appears that the EPRA does not specifically acknowledge a "monitoring and reporting plan for the effluent from SWM facilities within the BCMSF", <u>a monitoring and reporting plan</u> will very likely be a requirement imposed by the MOE in the Terms and Conditions of the Environmental Compliance Approval issued for the SWM facilities for the BCMSF site. Of course, this is highly dependent on the specifics of the SWM facilities proposed for the site and the need for appropriate checks and balances required to protect the environment from the activities</p>	Noted. No response or revisions required.

ECLRT EPR Addendum			
Technical Stakeholder Comment-Response Table, December 5, 2013			
Reviewer	Section	Comment	Response ¹
	<p>This is an update to my previous review of January 2013.</p>	<p>proposed on the BCMSF site.</p> <p>The review was based on the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eglinton Crosstown Light Rail Transit - Transit Project Assessment Process Environmental Project Report Addendum, Jane Street to Keele Street and Eglinton Black Creek Maintenance and Storage Facility, dated October 2013, prepared by MMM Group. <p>The response to the MOE comments from my previous review of this file, below, have been noted or addressed appropriately, and there are no further wastewater comments related to implementation of this project. DRC October 23, 2013</p>	<p>Noted. No response or revisions required.</p>
<p>MOE – TSS TDO Comments November 2013 – Jamila Dhanji (received November 27, 2013)</p>	<p>Potential Contamination</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On Page E-27 under "Potential Contamination", the proponent states that "Prior to construction, Metrolinx will require the contractor to submit the name, location and type of licence of the designated soil disposal sites." <p>Matters concerning the movement of contaminated soil are of interest to the ministry particularly of the volume that is being proposed by this project. Please request that Metrolinx provide the names of these designated sites, when known, to the District Manager of the Toronto District Office as it would be helpful for compliance</p>	<p>Revisions will be made to indicate that the names of designated sites, when known, be shared with the District Manager of the MOE's Toronto District Office. This will be noted in Table E-1/5-5.</p>

ECLRT EPR Addendum			
Technical Stakeholder Comment-Response Table, December 5, 2013			
Reviewer	Section	Comment	Response ¹
		purposes, if required.	
MTCS Comments – November 18 2013 – Paula Kulpa	General Comments	The Ministry is pleased to see that our comments dated October 9, 2013, regarding the additional heritage reports submitted by Metrolinx to the ministry, are reflected in the mitigation recommendations included throughout the final report. These recommendations relate to all of the revisions listed above.	Noted. No response required.
		Each time reference is made in the Addendum to the potential discovery of human remains, it incorrectly states that the this must be reported to the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Government Services. The Registrar of Cemeteries is within the Ministry of Consumer Services. This should be corrected throughout the document.	Reference to Ministry of Government Services will be updated to Ministry of Consumer Services as appropriate.
	Section 4.3.2 Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes	This section notes that the Cultural Heritage Assessment Report prepared for the 2010 EPR was updated to reflect changes to the ECLRT alignment. Table 4-3 on pages 4-18 and 4-19 presents all of the cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources in the area considered in this addendum. With the exception of Kodak Building No. 9, this table only recognizes whether or not the site has been recognized by the City as a heritage property, and not whether additional technical studies have been completed to determine whether the sites are of cultural heritage value or interest as per Ontario Regulations 9/06 and 10/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act. Since cultural heritage evaluation reports, or CHERs, have been completed for the Eglinton Avenue West at former Kodak site	Revisions will be made to Table 4-3 to indicate that Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports (CHERs) have recommended the properties have cultural heritage value under Ontario Regulation 9/06 and <u>not</u> under Ontario Regulation 10/06. The CHER recommendations are subject to review by the Metrolinx Heritage Committee.

ECLRT EPR Addendum

Technical Stakeholder Comment-Response Table, December 5, 2013

Reviewer	Section	Comment	Response ¹
		retaining wall (1966), the Eglinton Avenue West at former Kodak site road bridge (1965) and the Bank of Nova Scotia building (1151 Weston Road at Eglinton Avenue West), this information, along with the findings of those studies, should also be included in the table.	
	Table 5-1: Interactions Matrix	Currently under “Footprint Impacts”, it indicates that only Bridge/Culvert Improvements and the Stations will have “interactions” with or impacts on cultural heritage landscapes or built heritage resources. The assessment of alternatives for the Bus Terminal (Table 2-2) and the consideration of constraints for the Black Creek Maintenance and Storage Facility (page 2-28) indicate that in each case, the preferred alternative will have some level of impact on Kodak Building No. 9. As such, Table 5-1 should be revised to reflect this for both the “Maintenance and Storage Facility and the “Bus Terminal”.	Table 5-1 will be revised to reflect a moderate level of interaction.
	Section 5.5.2 Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes	The subsection on Mitigation measures for construction impacts (page 5-52) incorrectly references Table 5-5, when it should reference Table 5-4.	References will be revised accordingly.

**ECLRT EPR Addendum
Public Comment-Response Table, December 20, 2013**

Reviewer and Date	Comment	Proponent's Response
<p>Local Property Owner, Toronto, Ontario</p> <p>18-Nov-2013</p>	<p>I am the representative for the property at [REDACTED] to which you had sent a letter (dated October 16, 2013) stating that the property would be required for your transit project.</p> <p>Please note that this property is currently not for sale and is in active as a residence for close family members and by myself to facilitate a long term construction project (aircraft construction). I hope you can alter your plans to eliminate your need for this property and retain road access to it.</p> <p>Please address any further interest in [REDACTED] directly to myself.</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter of November 18, 2013 (copy attached) regarding the Notice of Environmental Project Report Addendum for the Eglinton Crosstown Light Rail Transit (ELCRT) Project (copy attached). Your letter expresses concern about the proposed acquisition of your property located at [REDACTED] and the closure of Keelestdale Drive at its intersection with Eglinton Avenue West.</p> <p>We have identified the need to acquire the property at [REDACTED] in the Addendum as a result in the change to the alignment of the light rail transit (LRT) line. Whereas the LRT would have been located on surface in the centre of Eglinton Avenue West as shown in the original Environmental Project Report (EPR) in the vicinity of [REDACTED] the revised alignment as shown in the Addendum consists of an elevated track along the northern side of Eglinton Avenue West over Black Creek Drive that transitions into an underground track below the Canadian Pacific Railway crossing. This transition section results in a vertical clearance between the LRT and Keelestdale Drive that does not meet minimum height requirements (i.e., the height between the LRT and Keelestdale Drive is too short to permit the safe passages of vehicles). Consequently, Keelestdale Drive must be closed, which results in severing access to properties located on that street (such as [REDACTED], which, in turn, requires acquisition of properties on the street.</p> <p>The profile shown toward the bottom of attached graphic labelled Figure 3-7f from the Environmental Project Report Addendum provides an illustration of the vertical configuration of the track alignment in the area of [REDACTED] and may provide further clarification. It is our preference at Metrolinx to arrive at a negotiated settlement with you with respect to the purchase of the property. Since June 2012, we began and will continue to pursue the acquisition of this property through a mutually beneficial negotiated settlement. It is our understanding that the latest offer that was presented to your real estate agent, [REDACTED], as of December 2, 2013 for your review. In the event however, that a negotiated settlement is not achievable, we will then be required to utilize applicable legislation to acquire the property in order to maintain the project schedule.</p>

ECLRT EPR Addendum
Public Comment-Response Table, December 20, 2013

Reviewer and Date	Comment	Proponent's Response
		<p>We would be happy to provide further information on the project and the property acquisition process and to answer any questions you may have. Please direct any questions or requests for further information related to the property acquisition process to:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Corina James Project Manager Property Acquisition Unit Metrolinx Rapid Transit Implementation 55 John Street, 7th Floor Toronto, ON M5V 3C6 Phone: (416) 392-3855 E-mail: cjames3@toronto.ca</p> <p>Any questions or requests for further information related to the EPR Addendum may be addressed to me at:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">David Veights, AICP, PMP. Environmental Assessment Manager Metrolinx Rapid Transit Implementation 5160 Yonge Street, Third Floor Toronto, ON M2N 6L9 Phone: (416) 228-9339 E-mail: david.veights@metrolinx.com</p> <p>Sincerely, David Veights, AICP, PMP Environmental Assessment Manager Rapid Transit Implementation</p> <p>Aconex # 093706-4T-TPP-LET-000185</p>

**ECLRT EPR Addendum
Public Comment-Response Table, December 20, 2013**

Reviewer and Date	Comment	Proponent's Response
		<p>Attachments:</p> <p>Attachment 1 – Letter Dated November 18, 2013 Attachment 2 – Letter Dated October 16, 2013 Attachment 3 – Figure 3-7f from the EPR Addendum</p>
<p>Local Resident</p> <p>20-Oct-2013</p>	<p>I visited the Library in Mount Dennis to read the Report Addendum on the Crosstown LRT. Reading the public comments I was disappointed to see a comment I had made both in person at the public meeting last year and in writing had not been included. While it was not strictly an environmental matter it does go to the heart of this transit project namely getting people off the roads and onto transit.</p> <p>My concern is with the excessive walking distance between the LRT and buses at the Mount Dennis Terminal. Much of the touted travel time savings will be lost getting between the two modes of transit. The priority has been given to automobiles by placing a drop-off/pickup area between the two as well as a small parking area. These should both be relocated elsewhere and the two areas brought closer together to reduce walking distance.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment regarding the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Environmental Project Report (EPR) Addendum.</p> <p>The connections shown in the EPR Addendum and previously at Open Houses are part of a station concept developed to demonstrate the functionality of the station and to assess the environmental effects of the project. During the development of the concept, we attempted to move the station as far to the east as possible to minimize the walking distance, but the horizontal and vertical requirements for the special trackwork at the connection to the Maintenance and Storage Facility restricted any further movement to the east. Moreover, as part of our Mobility Hub planning effort, having a station within close proximity to the Weston Road/Eglinton Avenue West intersection reinforces its prominence as the focal point of the Mount Dennis neighbourhood by providing convenient walk access to the Weston Road commercial area. From these perspectives, we feel the concept as shown in the Addendum is acceptable.</p> <p>One of the goals of Metrolinx with respect to the Mount Dennis Station is to make the connection between all modes as “seamless” as possible. During the design phase, Metrolinx will be seeking innovative and imaginative ways from the selected contractor to improve the transfer, and community consultation will be part of the process. Our focus will be on how to maximize the passenger experience and convenience at Mount Dennis Station so that it can truly become the Mobility Hub that Metrolinx, the City of Toronto and the community hope it will become in the future.</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Project.</p>
<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>Before I decide whether or not to respond to the invitation to submit an objection to the identified change to the transit project, please clarify:</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment sent on October 22, 2013 to the Minister of the Environment (copy attached) with a copy to me regarding the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Environmental Project Report Addendum. Your comment asks if</p>

**ECLRT EPR Addendum
Public Comment-Response Table, December 20, 2013**

Reviewer and Date	Comment	Proponent's Response
22-Oct-2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the funding approval for the Scarborough subway affected the "funding limitations" alluded to with respect to the decision to "defer the section from Weston Road to Pearson International Airport?" 	<p>the recent funding approval for the Scarborough subway has affected the funding availability for the section of the Eglinton Crosstown LRT from Weston Road to Pearson International Airport. The Ministry of the Environment has requested Metrolinx to respond.</p> <p>The decision by the Province to defer the section of the Eglinton Crosstown LRT from the Weston Road area to Pearson International Airport was made more than three years ago (in May 2010) as part of announcement of the "5 in 10 Plan", in which five transit projects in the GTA would be constructed within 10 years. Included in the "5 in 10 Plan" was the first phase of the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Project from the Weston Road area to Kennedy Station. A lack of sufficient funds prevented the section to the Airport from being included in the Plan, and thus, that section was deferred to a subsequent phase. Since May 2010, only the first phase of the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Project has been advancing through the planning, design and construction phases of project implementation.</p> <p>A second project to receive funding in the "5 in 10 Plan" was the conversion of the Scarborough RT to LRT technology, with an LRT extension to Sheppard Avenue. However, recent consultation with the City of Toronto resulted in a decision to revise the project such that a subway would be constructed in Scarborough in lieu of the conversion of the Scarborough RT to LRT with extension project. The provincial share of funding for that proposed subway is from the funds initially assigned to the Scarborough RT conversion to LRT with extension project. No additional provincial funds are being provided to the proposed subway project. Further, no funds from the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Project, either from the currently funded phase or from a future phase, are being redirected to the proposed subway project.</p> <p>A copy of this response is being sent concurrently to the Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Project.</p>
Local	I am currently living in the community of Mount Dennis,	Thank you for your interest in Metrolinx's proposed Addendum to the Eglinton

**ECLRT EPR Addendum
Public Comment-Response Table, December 20, 2013**

Reviewer and Date	Comment	Proponent's Response
<p>Resident 2-Nov-2013</p>	<p>which I have called home for over 30 years. I am writing to you with concerns I have regarding the most recent Eglinton Crosstown LRT alignment plan and the Notice of Environmental Project Report Addendum that was sent to my home recent.</p> <p>As stated in the Environmental Report Addendum, the LRT is now planned to be built above ground, as opposed to below ground, through my community (from Weston Road to Jane Street – Phase 2). During Phase I, the LRT is only planned to be built as far west as Weston Road. As a result, more cars and more buses from the west side of the city (not only Eglinton buses, but buses from other nearby routes, such as the crowded Jane bus), must pass on Eglinton in order to access not only the end of the LRT line, but also the new stations on the GO Train line and the Air Rail Link line at Weston Road, too. Also, there is a plan to reduce the road to 2 lanes on either side of Eglinton Avenue, which when combined with the gridlock (and air/noise pollution), will choke Mount Dennis.</p> <p>Both Metrolinx and the TTC understand this stress, and they attempted to solve this problem in Phase 2 (building the LRT from Weston Road to Jane Street). While this relieves the stress on the LRT line (Passengers and buses from the west side of the city don't need to go all the way to Weston Road to access the LRT), the stress on the GO Train and Air Rail Link lines aren't relieved at all. Since the LRT is running above ground (as planned), the lanes on Eglinton will have to be reduced, resulting in the prevention of left turns into the high-rise condos and apartments at 3559 and 3561 Eglinton Avenue West. In addition, valuable green space will be lost as properties are expropriated and land is used to build the separate</p>	<p>Crosstown Light Rail Transit (LRT) project. I welcome your comments on this project.</p> <p>On November 2, 2013, you submitted an objection to the changes to the Eglinton Crosstown LRT project which is following the transit assessment process under Ontario Regulation 231/08 - Transit Projects and Greater Toronto Transportation Authority Undertakings (Transit Regulation).</p> <p>I am taking this opportunity to inform you that I have issued a Notice to Allow a Change to a Transit Project in Accordance with an Addendum (see attached).</p> <p>Prior to issuing this notice, I have given careful consideration to the project documentation, and to the issues raised in your objection relative to the provisions of the Transit Regulation. Under the Transit Regulation, I am permitted to issue a notice allowing the proponent to change the transit project in accordance with the Addendum, subject to conditions or a notice that requires further consideration of the changes described in the Addendum, including consultation with specified persons. However, I can only issue one of these two notices, if I am of the opinion that the proposed changes to the transit project may have a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural or heritage value or interest, or a negative impact on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right. Based on my review of the project documentation and the issue you raised, I do not hold that opinion.</p> <p>My consideration of the issue raised in your objection is summarized below.</p> <p>In your objection you raised concerns about impacts to air and noise pollution resulting from potential increases in traffic in the Mount Dennis neighbourhood west of Weston Road, if certain sections of the LRT are constructed aboveground. The proponent has advised that, in accordance with the proposed Environmental Project Report Addendum, the extension of the LRT between Weston Road and a point about 360 metres east of Jane Street, is planned to be constructed underground which will mitigate the air and noise impacts from</p>

**ECLRT EPR Addendum
Public Comment-Response Table, December 20, 2013**

Reviewer and Date	Comment	Proponent's Response
	<p>road for the LRT. As cars become stuck in gridlock, and LRT trains continue to run above ground, all these negative effects will lead to an increase in air and noise pollution, as well as continuing to choke Mount Dennis. In the past, the residents of my community strongly supported the idea of burying the LRT underground through Mount Dennis until Jane Street. This will solve all of our problems.</p> <p>The distance from Weston Road to Jane Street on Eglinton is only about several hundred metres, compared to the whole LRT line. Metrolinx is supposed to build this underground during Phase 1. But they aren't. They plan to do this in the second phase, not even underground, but above ground. This is not right. As a taxpayer and resident in Mount Dennis, I object to this Environmental Project Report.</p>	<p>traffic.</p> <p>I am satisfied that this issue has been adequately addressed by the proponent.</p> <p>I am of the opinion that any potential negative impacts to matters of provincial importance and/or Aboriginal rights have been addressed by the work done to date by the Metrolinx, or will be addressed in future work that is required to be carried out.</p> <p>Metrolinx must implement the project in the manner it was developed and designed, as set out in the Environmental Project Report Addendum, including the errata letter dated December 6, 2013. They must also obtain any other permits and approvals required to proceed with the construction and operation of the project.</p> <p>Again, I would like to thank you for participating in the transit project assessment process under the Transit Regulation and for bringing your concerns to my attention.</p>
<p>Local Resident</p> <p>5-Nov-2013</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this. I'm very pleased to see real progress being made on construction at last.</p> <p>I think the Addendum Report does a good job of identifying and evaluating different options. However, I think I can offer a few suggestions from the perspective of a local resident who frequents the area on foot, bicycle and by car, that I believe would be significant improvements.</p> <p>1) Figure E3-b. I would like to suggest that the tunnel portal and Eglinton (mis-labeled as Jane) Eastbound U-turn location, be relocated about 100m further west, to just west of the entrance ways to Fergy Brown park on the north and the soccer fields/tennis courts and Topham</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments regarding the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Environmental Project Report (EPR) Addendum. We have reviewed your comments and are providing the following responses:</p> <p>Response to Item #1: The proposed LRT tunnel portal east of Jane Street has been positioned to mitigate the potential for flooding. The intersection of Eglinton and Jane Streets is located within the Eglinton Flats, which is within the flood plain and regulated area of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). The proposed tunnel portal has been set sufficiently uphill from the intersection to ensure that the portal is above the 100-year storm flood elevation. We recognize that this may not be the optimal location from a pedestrian connectivity perspective, but the design must ensure that the LRT tunnel is protected from flooding to the extent feasible. Please note that this location is in the part of the project identified as Phase 2, which is not currently funded and is not under active consideration and implementation at this time.</p>

**ECLRT EPR Addendum
Public Comment-Response Table, December 20, 2013**

Reviewer and Date	Comment	Proponent's Response
	<p>pond on the south. This would greatly facilitate pedestrian foot traffic between the two parks. My wife and I do this walk quite regularly and the current plan would force us to make a significant detour. Also, crossing Eglinton on foot at this location can often be a challenge.</p> <p>It seems to me that if there is to be a traffic signal to facilitate the U-turn, this could be integrated with a pedestrian crossing. This would also simplify vehicular traffic into and out of both parks. Finally, having the line below grade for a longer distance would reduce the amount of noise carrying into the parks on both sides. Hence, this one change will result in several significant improvements.</p> <p>2) Figure E3-E. I would like to suggest that a walkway and bicycle path be added in between the proposed maintenance and storage facility and the CPR/GO railway corridor. This would connect Ray Avenue to the proposed passenger pickup/dropoff area. It would open up a faster and more convenient pedestrian/bicycle route for residents living north of Ray Avenue, including those in the newer development, south of Trethewey Drive, at the north end of Industry Street. It would also provide better accessibility for TTC and Canada Post employees at the Ray Avenue and Industry street facilities. It would also divert some bicycle traffic off Weston Rd.</p> <p>You could actually take this second suggestion one step further and add a second vehicle road along the same route to get to the proposed passenger drop off. This should also ease the traffic on Eglinton and Weston Rd. In the future, when the bus terminal is shrunk or eliminated, it would provide access to an enhanced parking area.</p>	<p>Regarding the potential for a pedestrian crossing at this location, while it would be feasible to introduce a full pedestrian crosswalk at this location, the need for a signalized pedestrian crossing was not identified through the development of the concept or consultation process. Should the City be interested in introducing a pedestrian crossing at that location, Metrolinx will work with the City to further investigate the potential for such a crossing.</p> <p>Response to Item #2: The MSF site layout presented in the EPR Addendum represents an ultimate 162-vehicle storage facility and consumes the majority of the available property. This is a representative plan used for the purposes of the impact assessment, and during the detailed design phase of the project there will be opportunities for the design team to revisit site layout. The critical element here, however, is the function of the MSF to serve the LRT line to its maximum efficiency and effectiveness in a safe manner, and any pedestrian movements must be maintained away from the operation of the MSF.</p> <p>In its long-term vision for the MSF site, Metrolinx identified the need to protect for a future road that would extend northward toward Todd Baylis Boulevard and/or Industry Street in our Mobility Hub Study, which can viewed on the Crosstown website. Complete with sidewalks on both sides of the street, the connection was identified to provide additional accessibility to the bus terminal, LRT station and GO station and to facilitate potential redevelopment of the bus terminal when the LRT is extended toward the Airport. While the implementation of this connection is subject to a future study and is currently not funded, we will require our designer to protect for such a connection during the design of the MSF.</p> <p>Response to Item #3: Noted. Consistent with the other proposed stations throughout the Eglinton Crosstown LRT facility, the concept presented in the EPR Addendum includes no Park and Ride facilities at the Mount Dennis LRT Station; the parking capacity provided adjacent to the station is exclusively for short-term, passenger pick-up/drop-off use. Given the physical requirements for the MSF facility, property availability, and site access constraints, the notion of providing a significant Park and Ride capacity at this site is not feasible. With</p>

**ECLRT EPR Addendum
Public Comment-Response Table, December 20, 2013**

Reviewer and Date	Comment	Proponent's Response
	<p>3) As a general comment, I think that there should be an effort made to provide more car parking to encourage people to use the GO and LRT lines. Look how much parking there is for the employees at the proposed maintenance facility! By comparison, I can't see anything for commuters. Isn't it ironic that we encourage employees of the LRT maintenance facility to drive to work rather than avail themselves of the very transit system they maintain? I don't even see a way for employees at the facility to walk from the buildings to the new LRT or GO stations! Surely this has to be changed!!!!</p>	<p>respect to the employee parking area, many employees will be expected to arrive in the very early hours of the morning, prior to LRT service beginning. Therefore, a significant amount of parking capacity is required so that employees have a place to park when they arrive. For MSF employees that do arrive or depart from work during transit service hours, there will be an employee-only access gate on the south side of the MSF that will connect directly to Mount Dennis station, so that employees are encouraged to ride public transit if they are able.</p> <p>A copy of this message is being sent concurrently to the Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Project.</p>
<p>Local Property and Business Owner 14-Nov-2013 (received 18-Nov-2013)</p>	<p>This is to advise you that I am a tenant and property owner of [REDACTED]</p> <p>My property and company operations are directly across the street facing the proposed Metrolinx maintenance and storage facility.</p> <p>I have a very deep concern that the noise and particularly the vibration from the light rail vehicles and added traffic will affect my very sensitive and extremely expensive manufacturing equipment.</p> <p>As such, I object to this proposed installation. I would formally like to have a dialogue with someone senior of your facility to assure me that this installation will not harm my facility, the property value and the environment.</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in Metrolinx's proposed Addendum to the Eglinton Crosstown Light Rail Transit (LRT) project. I welcome your comments on this project.</p> <p>On November 14, 2013, you submitted an objection to the changes to the Eglinton Crosstown LRT project which is following the transit assessment process under Ontario Regulation 231/08 - Transit Projects and Greater Toronto Transportation Authority Undertakings (Transit Regulation).</p> <p>I am taking this opportunity to inform you that I have issued a Notice to Allow a Change to a Transit Project in Accordance with an Addendum (see attached).</p> <p>Prior to issuing this notice, I have given careful consideration to the project documentation, and to the issues raised in your objection relative to the provisions of the Transit Regulation. Under the Transit Regulation, I am permitted to issue a notice allowing the proponent to change the transit project in accordance with the Addendum, subject to conditions or a notice that requires further consideration of the changes described in the Addendum, including consultation with specified persons. However, I can only issue one of these two notices, if I am of the opinion that the proposed changes to the transit project may have a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to</p>

**ECLRT EPR Addendum
Public Comment-Response Table, December 20, 2013**

Reviewer and Date	Comment	Proponent's Response
		<p>the natural environment or has cultural or heritage value or interest, or a negative impact on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right. Based on my review of the project documentation and the issue you raised, I do not hold that opinion.</p> <p>My consideration of the issue raised in your objection is summarized below.</p> <p>In your objection you raised concerns about impacts noise and vibration from the LRT vehicles and traffic on your manufacturing equipment. A noise and vibration impact assessment was completed in support of the Environmental Project Report Addendum. The project-specific Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Report can be found in Appendix D of the Environmental Project Report Addendum. This report outlines the applicable guidelines followed for the noise and vibration impact assessment. Also, in a December 6, 2013 errata letter to the Environmental Project Report Addendum, the proponent has committed to undertaking further noise studies, implement identified mitigation measures and monitoring requirements related to noise impacts, prior to implementation of the changes to the transit project.</p> <p>I am satisfied that this issue has been adequately addressed by the proponent. However, if you continue to have concerns regarding potential impacts to your facility, Metrolinx would be glad to meet with you. Please contact Mr. David Veights, Environmental Assessment Project Manager at Metrolinx by phone at 416-228-9339 or e-mail at david.veights@metrolinx.com.</p> <p>I am of the opinion that any potential negative impacts to matters of provincial importance and/or Aboriginal rights have been addressed by the work done to date by the Metrolinx, or will be addressed in future work that is required to be carried out.</p> <p>Metrolinx must implement the project in the manner it was developed and designed, as set out in the Environmental Project Report Addendum, including the errata letter dated December 6, 2013. They must also obtain any other permits and approvals required to proceed with the construction and operation</p>

**ECLRT EPR Addendum
Public Comment-Response Table, December 20, 2013**

Reviewer and Date	Comment	Proponent's Response
		<p>of the project.</p> <p>Again, I would like to thank you for participating in the transit project assessment process under the Transit Regulation and for bringing your concerns to my attention.</p>
<p>Local Resident 27-Nov-2013</p>	<p>I know I missed the cut of date for all concerns we might have on the new Metrolinx and its impact on the environment.</p> <p>On November 7th I did send a query to the Crosstown info but did not get an answer in what I thought was a timely fashion so I resent this note putting everyone's name on it that I felt had a vested interest in our neighbourhood wether their riding or financial funding.</p> <p>I have spoken to Nicole from the Crosstown and she did explain about the funding and she did provide me with some very interesting reading via the link she included. And I appreciate her help.</p> <p>But I thought you should know also as the green space I am concerned about is a lovely spot. Living in York South for so many years the disappearing of green space for high density living is common place here where green space for children and families are almost non existent.</p> <p>I wanted to bring attention to someone who needs to know about our tree's and that lovely park.</p> <p>Again I know I am late with this but I wanted to be heard. I discovered the cut off date in the info Nicole sent along and not on the Crosstown/Metrolinx update I received at the door.</p>	<p>Thank you for your November 27, 2013 letter of concern to the Minister of the Environment about Metrolinx's proposed Addendum to the Eglinton Crosstown Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project. I am pleased to reply on behalf of the Minister.</p> <p>In your letter, you raised concerns regarding the changes to the Eglinton Crosstown LRT project which is following the transit assessment process under Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Greater Toronto Transportation Authority Undertakings (Transit Regulation). In particular you raised concerns about the loss of green space and trees as a result of the proposed changes to the Eglinton Crosstown LRT project. The proponent has advised that in support of City of Toronto bylaws, a tree inventory will be required for the locations where trees are likely to be impacted. Mitigation, restoration or compensation measures will be identified following the tree inventory and will be based on detailed site assessments undertaken during the detail design phase of the project. Where the City of Toronto does not have authority, all works must be completed in accordance with applicable legislation including, but not necessarily limited to, the Fisheries Act, Migratory Birds Convention Act, Endangered Species Act and Species at Risk Act. Further, there will be opportunity for some compensative plantings to offset some vegetation removals required for the project. Plans for the naturalization of property will be developed during the detailed design phase of the project.</p> <p>This information is included in Section 5.3.4 and Section 5.3.6 of the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Environmental Project Report (EPR) Addendum. In addition, a Natural Environment Assessment memo is appended to the EPR Addendum as Appendix B.</p> <p>As per the Transit Regulation, the Notice of EPR Addendum was published on October 18, 2013. Members of the public had a 30-day review period in which to</p>

**ECLRT EPR Addendum
Public Comment-Response Table, December 20, 2013**

Reviewer and Date	Comment	Proponent's Response
	<p>Thanks for taking the time.</p>	<p>submit objections to the Ministry of the Environment. The 30-day review period ended on November 18, 2013. After this date, the Minister of the Environment (Minister) had 35 days to issue a notice either allowing the proponent to proceed with the transit project in accordance with the EPR Addendum, allowing the proponent to proceed with the transit project in accordance with the EPR Addendum subject to conditions, or requiring the proponent to conduct further work and submit a revised EPR Addendum. The Minister issued a Notice to Allow a Change to a Transit Project in Accordance with an Addendum on December 12, 2013 (see attached).</p> <p>Prior to issuing this notice, the Minister gave careful consideration to the project documentation, and to the issues raised relative to the provisions of the Transit Regulation.</p> <p>Should you have any further questions regarding potential impacts to green space and trees and mitigation measures and commitments for future work by Metrolinx, please contact</p> <p>Mr. David Veights, Environmental Assessment Project Manager at Metrolinx by phone at 416-228-9339 or e-mail at david.veights@metrolinx.com.</p> <p>Should you have further questions regarding the Transit Project Assessment Process, please contact Lorna Zappone, Special Project Officer of the Environmental Approvals Branch, at 416-314-7106 or by e-mail at lorna.zappone@ontario.ca.</p>



Chippewas of RAMA
First Nation

A Proud Progressive First Nation Community

5884 Rama Road, Suite 200

Rama, Ontario L3V 6H6

T 705.325.3611 F 705.325.0879

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF

February 14, 2013

Metrolinx
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3

Attention: David Veights, AICP, EA Project Coordinator

**Re: Environmental Project Report Addendum under the Transit Project Assessment
Process for the Eglinton Crosstown LRT – Open House January 31, 2013**

Dear Mr. Veights:

As a member of the Williams Treaties First Nations, Rama First Nation acknowledges receipt of your letter of January 24, 2013, which was received on January 30, 2013.

A copy of your letter has been forwarded to Karry Sandy-McKenzie, Barrister & Solicitor, Coordinator for Williams Treaties First Nations for further review and response directly to you. Please direct all future correspondence and inquires, with a copy to Rama First Nation, to Ms. Sandy-McKenzie at 8 Creswick Court, Barrie, ON L4M 2J7 or her email address at k.a.sandy-mckenzie@rogers.com. Her telephone number is (705) 792-5087.

We appreciate your taking the time to share this important information with us.

Sincerely,

Chief Sharon Stinson Henry

c: Council, Rama First Nation
Jeff Hewitt, General Counsel
Karry Sandy-McKenzie, Coordinator for Williams Treaties First Nations
Chief Roland Monague, Portfolio Chief for Williams Treaties First Nations