

**From:** David Veights <David.Veights@metrolinx.com>  
**Sent:** March-26-13 9:11 AM  
**To:** Kulpa, Paula (MTCS) (Paula.Kulpa@ontario.ca)  
**Cc:** Scott Bowers; Andrew Shea; Mike Poskin; Elise Croll; Katie Bright  
**Subject:** Eglinton Crosstown LRT EPR Addendum - Response to Comments  
**Attachments:** EPRA Comments Table\_2013\_Master\_Formal Responses to Comments - MTCS.pdf

Good morning Paula.

Thank you for the comments from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport on the Draft Addendum to the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Environmental Project Report. We have reviewed the comments and are sending you the attached table that shows our planned response to each comment from the Ministry.

Please also note that going forward, Metrolinx has decided to divide the Addendum into two separate reports, one covering the section from Jane Street to the West Tunnel Portal and the other section covering the Laird Drive to Don Valley Parkway section. The current effort will focus on the Jane Street to the West Tunnel Portal, and a revised draft addendum for that section is underway. We anticipate a Notice of Environmental Project Report Addendum to be issued in early June 2013. We will advise you of the schedule for the Laird Drive to Don Valley Parkway section at a later date.

Thank you again for your comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

David R. Veights, AICP  
EA Project Coordinator  
Metrolinx Rapid Transit Implementation  
5160 Yonge Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
North York, ON M2N 6L9  
☎ (416) 228-9339  
f. (416) 228-9272  
e. [david.veights@metrolinx.com](mailto:david.veights@metrolinx.com)

**Review Comments Spreadsheet**  
**Rapid Transit Implementation**

\* Actions:  
 1 = Will comply  
 2 = Discuss, clarification required  
 3 = Not applicable because .....

\*\* Status:  
 O = Open, not resolved  
 P = Pending incorporation in design  
 C = Closed, implementation complete



<b>Review Code:</b>	<b>Document Name:</b>	<b>EPR Addendum</b>	<b>Revised By:</b>
<b>Designer:</b>	<b>Contract Name:</b>	<b>EA Services for Eglinton-Scarborough Crosstown</b>	<b>Revision Date:</b>
<b>% Completion:</b>	<b>Contract No:</b>	<b>ECL4-5</b>	<b>Revision Number:</b>

Item No.	Discipline	Reviewer Name	Reviewer ID	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)	Action 1 / 2 / 3* (Designer)	Status O / P / C** (Reviewer)
	MTCS	Paula Kulpa		General	<p>Kodak Building No. 9, 3500 Eglinton Avenue West</p> <p>The addendum report indicates that both a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) and a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) report have been completed for this building, however, the ministry has not seen a copy of either report. The addendum then states that an evaluation of the property's cultural heritage value or interest against the criteria included in Ontario Regulations 9/06 and 10/06, will occur after Metrolinx acquires the property. This evaluation should have occurred at the EA and planning stage, and would be what is documented in the CHER. This evaluation and the HIA are necessary steps in identifying the existing environmental conditions, analyzing impacts, and developing mitigation measures. Additionally, the addendum states that Metrolinx has recently initiated a study to assess the requirements for restoring the building, indicating that Metrolinx will be responsible for its on-going management and stewardship. As a provincial heritage property under the control of Metrolinx, a strategic conservation plan will be required, as per provision C1 of the Standards and Guidelines.</p>	<p>As noted in Table 4-1, the CHER addresses both Ontario Regulations 9/06 and 10/06. It was determined that Building No. 9 meets criteria set out in O. Reg. 9/06 only. Therefore, it is a provincial heritage property but is not of provincial significance. Under section C.1 of the Standards and Guidelines, a Strategic Conservation Plan is required. However, at this time, we are uncertain of the proposed future use of the building. In order to stabilize the property and protect the heritage attributes from deterioration in the short term, Metrolinx has drafted an Interim Maintenance Plan. Once the CHER, HIA and Interim Maintenance Plan are finalized, they will be forwarded to MTCS. We hope that the Metrolinx Heritage Committee will be in place at this time to evaluate the final CHER and CHER Recommendation. If not, MTCS will be consulted. Following a determination of the future use of the structure, a Strategic Conservation Plan will be prepared.</p>		
	MTCS	Paula Kulpa		General	<p>Retaining wall, 1966 Eglinton Avenue West at former Kodak site</p> <p>The report indicates that the retaining wall will be removed and that a Cultural Heritage Documentation Report (CHDR) be prepared for the resource, including photographs and a brief historical background on its construction. Prior to documentation of the resource, a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report should be prepared, so that the cultural heritage value or interest of the resource is evaluated and the heritage attributes identified, as this would guide the documentation of the resource.</p>	<p>A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) will be completed in advance of the CHDR. The CHER will address Ontario Regulations 9/06 and 10/06. These commitments have been reflected in the EPR Addendum.</p>		

	MTCS	Paula Kulpa		General	<p>Bank of Nova Scotia, 1151 Weston Road at Eglinton Avenue West</p> <p>The report indicates that this building will be removed, and that the City of Toronto may require an HIA. Similar to Kodak Building No. 9, the cultural heritage value or interest of this property should be evaluated against the criteria in Ontario Regulations 9/06 and 10/06 as part of the EA and planning process. As stated above, this evaluation is required in order to understand the existing environmental conditions, analyze impacts and develop mitigation strategies, including why demolition was the preferred option. The preparation of this report should not wait until acquisition by Metrolinx. Additionally, the Standards and Guidelines also have requirements related to preparing an HIA for those buildings proposed for demolition (provision F4).</p> <p>MTCS would like to review copies of the additional technical heritage documents prepared for the above three properties, prior to the Addendum being finalized in order to understand their cultural heritage value or interest and the analysis of negative impacts. We may have additional comments on these studies.</p>	A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) will be completed and will address Ontario Regulations 9/06 and 10/06. In addition, a HIA will be completed prior to construction. These commitments have been reflected in the EPR Addendum.		
	MTCS	Paula Kulpa		General	<p>MTCS supports the commitment to consult with the City of Toronto's Heritage Preservation Services regarding the impacts of the Mount Dennis Bus Terminal design, in addition to the long-term plans for the rehabilitation</p>	Feedback noted.		
	MTCS	Paula Kulpa		General	<p>The ministry also supports the commitment to prepare a plan to lessen the vibration impacts to built heritage resources that may be impacted during the construction phase.</p>	Feedback noted.		
	MTCS	Paula Kulpa		General	<p>Additionally, prior to finalizing the Addendum, Metrolinx should confirm with the City whether or not a Heritage Permit will be required for the construction work that will take place in the parking lot at the Ontario Science Centre. If a permit is necessary, this should be included in the list under section 7.5 Permits and Approvals.</p>	The need for a Heritage Permit will be confirmed and reflected as appropriate in Section 7.5.		

**From:** David Veights <David.Veights@metrolinx.com>  
**Sent:** March-26-13 9:09 AM  
**To:** Zappone, Lorna (ENE)  
**Cc:** Scott Bowers; Andrew Shea; Mike Poskin  
**Subject:** Eglinton Crosstown LRT EPR Addendum - Response to Comments  
**Attachments:** EPRA Comments Table\_2013\_Master\_Formal Responses to Comments - MOE.pdf

Good morning Lorna.

Thank you for the comments from the Ministry of the Environment on the Draft Addendum to the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Environmental Project Report. We have reviewed the comments and are sending you the attached table that shows our planned response to each comment from the Ministry.

Please also note that going forward, Metrolinx has decided to divide the Addendum into two separate reports, one covering the section from Jane Street to the West Tunnel Portal and the other section covering the Laird Drive to Don Valley Parkway section. The current effort will focus on the Jane Street to the West Tunnel Portal, and a revised draft addendum for that section is underway. We anticipate a Notice of Environmental Project Report Addendum to be issued in early June 2013. We will advise you of the schedule for the Laird Drive to Don Valley Parkway section at a later date.

Thank you again for your comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

David R. Veights, AICP  
EA Project Coordinator  
Metrolinx Rapid Transit Implementation  
5160 Yonge Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
North York, ON M2N 6L9  
☎ (416) 228-9339  
f. (416) 228-9272  
e. [david.veights@metrolinx.com](mailto:david.veights@metrolinx.com)

# Review Comments Spreadsheet

## Rapid Transit Implementation

**\* Actions:**  
 1 = Will comply  
 2 = Discuss, clarification required  
 3 = Not applicable because .....

**\*\* Status:**  
 O = Open, not resolved  
 P = Pending incorporation in design  
 C = Closed, implementation complete



<b>Review Code:</b>	<b>Document Name:</b>	<b>EPR Addendum</b>	<b>Revised By:</b>
<b>Designer:</b>	<b>Contract Name:</b>	<b>EA Services for Eglinton-Scarborough Crosstown</b>	<b>Revision Date:</b>
<b>% Completion:</b>	<b>Contract No:</b>	<b>ECL4-5</b>	<b>Revision Number:</b>

Item No.	Discipline	Reviewer Name	Reviewer ID	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)	Action 1 / 2 / 3* (Designer)	Status O / P / C** (Reviewer)
60		Lorna Zappone		General - Organization and Presentation of Material	The 15-bay bus terminal is absent from the title pages and project description.	The bus terminal is an integral part of the MSF and LRT.		
61		Lorna Zappone		General - Organization and Presentation of Material	The addendum presents information about the proposed changes inconsistently throughout the document making it difficult to follow. For example, chapter 3 sets out the changes by operations plans, design criteria, and then by locations; Chapter 5 organizes the changes, singly, by environmental feature, the range of impacts and geographic location.	The addendum report has been reorganized to provide a consistent presentation of information.		
62		Lorna Zappone		General - Organization and Presentation of Material	It is recommended that the proposed changes listed in 1.3 be cross-references to the specific locations in the Addendum where details are presented, the ensure all components are presented (e.g. Black Creek Stop removal is not discussed.)	Cross references have been added.		
63		Lorna Zappone		General - Organization and Presentation of Material	Addendum content as described in 1.2 is different in 1.5.1 and Chapter 2.	Section 1.2 and 1.5.1 have been revised to ensure consistency.		
64		Lorna Zappone		General - Organization and Presentation of Material	As the BCMSF was not proposed in the ECLRT EPR is it unclear how the connecting track alignment between the LRT and the BCMSF is being considered as a new and separate component. Provide clarification.	The connecting track between the mainline and the BCMSF is part of the new BCMSF. Clarification will be provided in the revised document.		
65		Lorna Zappone		General - Organization and Presentation of Material	Provide details about the location of the additional passenger tunnel connections under the GO Rail and Canadian Pacific Railway corridors.	Details regarding the location of the passenger tunnels have been added to Section 3.4.2, and illustrated in Figure 3-7e.		
66		Lorna Zappone		General - Organization and Presentation of Material	To improve the comprehension of the proposed changes and the potential impacts and the process undertaken for assessment and evaluation of impacts and the results Chapter 4 and 5 require re-organization.	The addendum report has been reorganized to provide a consistent presentation of information.		
67		Lorna Zappone		General - Clarification	The proposed changes to the ECLRT in this addendum are referred to as the current configuration of the ECLRT. Provide clarification that the summary of components is the list of proposed changes (1.3 Study Scope).	The second sentence in the first paragraph will be revised to state: The following is a list of the proposed changes:		
68		Lorna Zappone		General - Consultation	As only a proposed table of contents was included in the draft addendum the ministry is unable to comment on consultation requirements at this time.	Noted. A complete table will be included in the final version.		
69		Lorna Zappone		General - Consultation	Ensure the final EPR Addendum contains sufficient summary of information about the consultation activities undertaken for the proposed changes, including the stakeholders consulted, the comment/response tables and details about how issues were taken into consideration and the identification of any outstanding issues.	A sufficient summary of consultation will be included in the final EPR Addendum.		
70		Lorna Zappone		General - Consultation	Ensure the consultation undertaken for the review of the draft addendum, including the results, is documented in the final EPR Addendum.	The consultation undertaken for the review of the draft EPR Addendum, including a comment-response tracking table, will be included in the final EPR Addendum.		
71		Lorna Zappone		General - Accuracy, Consistency in References and Terminology	It is imperative to reference facilities, streets, and natural features, etc, in a consistent manner. For example, it is at times unclear if reference is being made to Black Creek, or Black Creek Drive, etc.	Noted. Metrolinx is revising the document so that references are clearer.		
72		Lorna Zappone		General - Accuracy, Consistency in References and Terminology	The Eglinton-Scarborough Crosstown LRT is mentioned on page 2-23. Is this the same project as the ECLRT?	Yes they are the same, all reference to Eglinton-Scarborough will be removed and replaced with ECLRT.		
73		Lorna Zappone		General - Accuracy, Consistency in References and Terminology	3.4.3 Bus Terminal cross-references section 1.4.4 yet this section does not exist.	Reference to 1.4.4 has been revised to 1.4.3		

74		Lorna Zappone		General - Accuracy, Consistency in References and Terminology	Ensure all reference points are included in maps and figures (e.g. West Don River Valley, Black Creek and Keele Street - page 4-19; and Brian Peck Crescent and Sutherland Drive - Page 4-22)	Noted.		
75		Lorna Zappone		General - Table of Contents	Providing a list of all subsections for 2.1.1 through 2.1.4 will enable the reader to easily identify the location of details pertaining to a particular proposed change.	The subsections have been added to the Table of Contents.		
76		Lorna Zappone		General - Table of Contents	Providing a list of all subsections under 4.1.1 through 4.14 will enable the reader to more easily locate details pertaining to the existing conditions.	The subsections will be added to the Table of Contents.		
77		Lorna Zappone		General - Table of Contents	Ensure page numbers are not repeated (e.g. Table 5-1 and Range of Potential Impacts are both identified as being located on page 5-1)	Report page numbering revised.		
78		Lorna Zappone		General - Table of Contents	Change title of .3 to 'footprint impacts' to ensure consistency with the identified categories of environmental effects on 5.1.)	The heading has been revised.		
79		Lorna Zappone		General - Appendicies, Figures, Reports and Tables.	Ensure adequate summaries of appendicies are provided in the relevant sections of the addendum; refrain from simply repeating the details provided in the appendicies.	The text will be revised so that the summaries are adequate.		
80		Lorna Zappone		General - Appendicies, Figures, Reports and Tables.	Several maps and figures are illegible or do not contain relevant information to appreciate the points of discussion (e.g. Figure 1-4 through 1-6; Figure 205, etc.).	Relevant figures will be reproduced at a larger scale in the final EPR Addendum.		
81		Lorna Zappone		General - Appendicies, Figures, Reports and Tables.	Ensure all features have been identified in the legend (e.g. Figure 3.7a).	The legend will be updated		
82		Lorna Zappone		General - Appendicies, Figures, Reports and Tables.	It is difficult at times to follow the information presented in the tables due to the way in which they have been oriented (see Table 5-1 and 5-7).	Tables 5-1 and 5-7 will be reformatted/reoriented.		
83		Lorna Zappone		General - Appendicies, Figures, Reports and Tables.	Provide details about the inprogress status of Table 5.1, including when the table will be presented as final.	Table 5-1 is a work in progress and will be completed prior to finalizing the EPR Addendum. Table 5-1 will reflect details provided in the factor specific sections within Chapter 5. The final table will not include any text in blue.		
84		Lorna Zappone		General - Appendicies, Figures, Reports and Tables.	The header should be repeated at the top of each page of Table 5-7.	The header for Table 5-7 will be repeated at the top of each page.		
85		Lorna Zappone		General - Appendicies, Figures, Reports and Tables.	Table 5-7 should include a summary of footprint impacts and land use impacts.	Table 5-7 will be reviewed and updated to reflect impacts, mitigation and monitoring/future work/contingency outlined in Chapter 5.		
86		Greg Washuta		General	There are two former landfill located in the study area: A former landfill is located south of Eglinton Avenue and east of Thomas Elgie Drive; and a former landfill is located at the southeast corner of Black Creek Drive and Eglinton Ave.	No revision required as this information is reflected in the draft EPR Addendum and the appended Contamination Overview Studies.		
87		Greg Washuta		General	The first landfill was used for the disposal of domestic and commercial waste. The second landfill was used for the disposal of concrete debris and comestic waste. Section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act requires the ministers approval for the use of lands previously used for the disposal of waste in order to protect health and welfare of the general public from potential hazards relating to these lands. An approval under Section 46 of the EPA is applicable to lands that have been used for waste disposal purposes. Metrolinx should verify whether Section 46 of the EPA would be applicable at these sites.	The former landfill located at the southeast corner of Black Creek Drive and Eglinton Avenue was closed over 25 years ago. As a result, approval under Section 46 of the EPR is <u>not</u> applicable at this site. This information will be reflected in the EPR Addendum.  The former landfill south of Eglinton Avenue and east of Thomas Elgie Drive was closed less than 25 years ago and as a result Section 46 of the EPA <u>is</u> applicable.		
88		Greg Washuta		General	Fore the area near these former landfill sites, various factors will have to be considered such as ground and surface water contamination by leachate, surface runoff, differential ground settlement, soil contamination, hazardous waste, attraction of animals and insects and landfill generated gases. The production and migration of landfill gas should warrant additional attention.	Noted.		

89		Dan Delaquis		General	Dewatering at rates higher than 50,000 L/day requires a PTTW be issued by the Ministry. PTTW applications for long term construction dewatering 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 quality meets the water quality criteria for the chosen disposal method. Due to the scale and complexity of the ECLRT project, Metrolinx/TTC is encouraged to continue initiating pre-consultations with the Ministry prior to submitting PTTW applications for longer term ECLRT construction dewatering efforts.	Noted.		
90		Don Cross		Wastewater:	The Addendum states that sewer discharge approvals are required from the City of Toronto and Toronto Region and Conservation. This includes all sanitary sewers (City of Toronto Only) and storm sewers and stormwater management facilities.	Noted.		
91		Don Cross		Utilities:	The Addendum identifies "an extensive system of minor storm sewers and combination storm/sanitary sewers along Eglinton Ave" (Page 5-23) and storm and sanitary sewer municipal services and other utilities (pages 4-23 to 4-26) that need to be considered and accommodated in the detailed design of the project.	Additional utility information will be added.		
92		Don Cross		Receiving Water Bodies:	The two main rivers in the area (The Black Creek/Humber River and the Don River, page 4-1) will convey surface water from the project to Lake Ontario. The Addendum states (page 7-3) that storm water management approvals are required from the City of Toronto, Toronto Region Conservation and the MOE. Mitigation measures for water quality and erosion protection (pages 5-16 to 5-17 and 5-37 to 5-38), including erosion/sedimentation control measures during construction (pages 7-2 to 7-3), are identified.	Noted.		
93		Don Cross		Water Quality Control:	Stormwater run off from the BCMSF, and all other stormwater run off from the project will require enhanced level water quality control and erosion protection (pages 5-16 to 5-17). Reference is made to providing a stormwater drainage and management system (SWM) for the BCMSF (page 5-16) consistent with the Toronto Green Development Standard. It is acknowledged in the Addendum that an Approval (Environmental Compliance Approval) will be required for water quality treatment of all run off, including from the Black Creek MSF (pages 5-16 and 7-3). Oil and grit separators are proposed for water quality treatment for stormwater run off discharging to the Black Creek/Humber River and the Don River.	Noted.		
94		Don Cross		Oil and Grit Separators (OGS):	According to the City of Toronto guidelines, OGS devices, operating alone at their original design capacities, are capable of achieving a TSS removal efficiency of 50%. Enhanced Level water quality control proposed for the project requires a TSS removal efficiency of 80%. As per the City of Toronto Guidelines for OGS installations: oil and grit separators are recommended as a pre-treatment device only or may be used as part of a multi-component (treatment train) approach to achieve Enhanced Level water quality control.	Noted.		
95		Don Cross		Water Quality Control:	The Addendum states that since the increase in impervious roadway areas due to the project is "insignificant" when compared to the total drainage areas of the Black Creek/Humber River and Don River, no specific techniques to reduce the quantity and rate of run-off are proposed (page 5-16). Water quantity control for the Black Creek MSF will be addressed in the SWM report for the site as part of detailed design.	Noted.		
96		Don Cross		Groundwater:	The Addendum refers to a soil and Groundwater Management strategy required prior to construction (pages 5-15, 5-36 and 7-2). The Addendum identifies that a PTTW from the MOE is required if dewatering exceeding 50,000 L/day is required during construction (pages 7-3). An approval would also be required from the MOE for any dewatering operation outletting to the Black Creek/Humber River and/or to the Don River (page 5-37)	Additional approval requirements will be added.		

97		Don Cross		Spills Contingency and Pollution Prevention	The Addendum identifies a "comprehensive environmental controls and methods plan" (pages 5-38 to 5-39) to address spills or discharges of pollutants during construction. There should also be a spill contingency and pollution prevention plan established for the on-going operations within the Black Creek MSF as part of the stormwater management report for that site.	Requirements for the preparation of an on-going operations plan will be added.		
98		Don Cross		Monitoring and reporting:	The Addendum identifies monitoring requirements for the project related to wastewater by noting that the City of Toronto collects and analyses water samples from storm sewer outfalls and in the rivers to determine, trace, and correct the discharge of pollutants to the sewer systems (page 5-17). There should be a monitoring and reporting plan established for the effluent from the SWM facilities within the BCMSF as part of the storm water management report for that site.	Monitoring requirements will be added.		
99		Don Cross		General	The Addendum appears to identify and address the environmental impacts and issues related to wastewater for the proposed project. Because the project covers two areas, namely, the west section draining to the Black Creek/Humber River watershed, and the east section draining to the Don River watershed, the Addendum tends to jump back and forth between the two areas and can be somewhat difficult to follow. Studying the Addendum does require careful attention to which area is being discussed.	The addendum report will be reorganized to provide a consistent presentation of information.		
100		Don Cross		General	Reference is made to "Certificate of Approval for Air Quality" (page 7-3). This should now be updated to Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA), and this term (ECA) should also be used for any required wastewater and noise approvals.	Reference to the new standards will be updated.		
102		Lorna Zappone		1. Introduction	1.1 Study Purpose: refer to Ontario Regulation 231/08 and the Transit Projects Assessment Process guide to address inaccuracies about the process and the requirements (see also 1.5).	With respect to 1.1, the second sentence in the first paragraph will read : Subsequently, a Statement of Completion was issued that signified the completion of a process carried out...  With respect to 1.5, the fourth bullet will read: 30-day Public Comment Period. A fifth bullet will be added that will read: 35-day Period for MOE to review the public comment record.		
105		Lorna Zappone		1. Introduction	1.2 Background: Identify the future conditions to be presented in Chapter 4	Text revised to note future "2031" conditions.		
173		Lorna Zappone		2. Background Studies and Major Functional Design Options	The title of this section does not clearly represent the information presented.	Title will be revised accordingly.		
174		Lorna Zappone		2. Background Studies and Major Functional Design Options	Identify the referenced background studies.	The title of the background studies have been added.		
176		Lorna Zappone		2.1.1 West Section	It is unclear how/when assessment factors listed in 2.1.1.3 were considered in the determination of the 11 alignment options.	The evaluation was contained in the Jane to Keele Study and will be summarized in text to show the assessment.		
177		Lorna Zappone		2.1.1 West Section	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'.	The evaluation was contained in the Jane to Keele Study and will be summarized in text to show the assessment.		
178		Lorna Zappone		2.1.1 West Section	A figure with the short-listed alternatives would be helpful.	Noted.		
179		Lorna Zappone		2.1.1 West Section	It is not possible to read the details of the two options presented in Figure 2-4.	The exhibits for the two options will be revised.		
180		Lorna Zappone		2.1.1 West Section	Table 2-1: are the criteria the same as in 2.1.1.3 and 2.1.1.4? Define 'ultimate'.	The criteria used in Table 2-1 will be described.		
181		Lorna Zappone		2.1.1 West Section	The rationale for recommending option 11 over 10 must be made clear, particularly as both options are ranked identically in table 2-1.	Additional detail will be added to make the rationale clearer.		

182		Lorna Zappone		2.1.1 West Section	Figure 2-5, the proposed plan, needs to be presented at a magnification that allows for the details to be easily read.	Figure 2-5 has been reproduced at a larger scale for the final document.		
237		Lorna Zappone		2.1.2 East Section	Provide clarification about the need to relocate the tunnel launch site.	Comment refers specifically to LRT - East Section. This will be addressed during the preparation of a separate Addendum covering the LRT - East Section.		
238		Lorna Zappone		2.1.2 East Section	Provide details about the key challenges and constraints	Comment refers specifically to LRT - East Section. This will be addressed during the preparation of a separate Addendum covering the LRT - East Section.		
239		Lorna Zappone		2.1.2 East Section	It is unclear why Option 2 is ranked 'best' for construction duration when it is the longest at 33 months.	Ranking revised.		
240		Lorna Zappone		2.1.2 East Section	It is also unclear how the additional 1.5 km of tunneling required for option 2 does not result in an increased cost over the base case.	Comment refers specifically to LRT - East Section. This will be addressed during the preparation of a separate Addendum covering the LRT - East Section.		
255		Lorna Zappone		2.1.3. BCMSF	It is identified that the BCMSF is to accommodate a 15-bay bus terminal in Phase 1. Provide clarification that this is a temporary facility. Identify when implementation of the BCMSF is anticipated and provide details about how it will be undertaken, in consideration of the temporary bus terminal.	The bus terminal will require 15 bays on opening day of the LRT line. The size of the terminal may be reduced over time as the LRT line is extended west. As of now, until phase 2 is scheduled to commence, the bus terminal is needed for the foreseeable future. Also, there will always need to be a bus terminal at this location.		
274		Lorna Zappone		2.1.4 Mount Dennis Bus Terminal	Identify the criteria used to assess the options and where the assessment can be found.	Criteria used to assess the bus terminal options are discussed in Section 2.1.1.4		
275		Lorna Zappone		2.1.4 Mount Dennis Bus Terminal	It is not possible to understand the bus movement described in 2.1.4.3 in the level of detail provided in Figure 2-10	Figure 2-10 has been revised to be more clear.		
276		Lorna Zappone		2.1.4 Mount Dennis Bus Terminal	Identify the existing station or describe the location of the future GO Rail station being referenced.	The location of the potential future GO Station will be added.		
277		Lorna Zappone		2.1.4 Mount Dennis Bus Terminal	Operating costs are absent from the comparative analysis table (2-3)	The difference in operating costs between the alternatives is expected to be marginal and therefore not included.		
404		Greg Washuta		Section 3.6.5, Page 3-23	The report indicates that the Kodak building on site and the space around it along the north side of Eglinton Ave could "either be used for future development, or a bus station, if desired." Please note that any change in land use to a more sensitive land use (i.e., parkland, residential or institutional land use) would require a Record of Site Condition (RSC) for the affected property. This would require remediation of the property to the Ministry's Site Condition Standards (SCS) (i.e., Soil, Ground Water and Sediment Standards for Use Under Part XV.1 of the Environmental Protection Act, dated April 15, 2011), or submission and approval of a Risk Assessment (RA) for the property.	As part of the purchase of the former Kodak Lands from Metrus, Metrolinx completed a RSC and noted that remediation will be required on the site. The statement allows for future development, if desired by Metrolinx. Since this section was completed, Metrolinx has expressed desire to use the existing Kodak Building in the station design for the bus terminal and LRT station.		
405		Greg Washuta		Section 3.6.5, Page 3-23	A RA May identify Risk Management Measures (RMMs) that would be applicable to the site. The use of these RMMs may require the issuance of a Certificate of Property Use (CPU) for the property if the RA is accepted. A Certificate of Requirement might be required to be registered on-title to ensure that any person with an interest in the property is made aware of the requirements for the implementation and management of the RMP. This requirement would be included in the CPU. In order to ensure that copies of the risk assessment are available for any person with an interest in the property including the Ministry, a requirement to maintain and provide a copy of the RA documents would be included in the CPU.	The potential for RMMs to be identified and potential for issuance of a CPU will be reflected in the EPR Addendum.		

413	Greg Washuta		Section 3.6.7, Page 3-24	The Kodak property has been identified to contain contaminants at concentrations in ground water and soil above the Ministry Site Condition Standards. Metrolinx will have to ensure that any storm water that may come into contact with contaminants in soil and ground water and is directed into the Storm Water Management (SWM) system for the BCMSF will not cause an adverse effect on off-site human and ecological receptors. In addition, any discharges to surface water bodies will require an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) under Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act.	Additional text will be added.		
416	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	Descriptions of the proposed changes do not align with those presented earlier in the addendum (e.g. consolidation of the Weston and Black Creek LRT stops, realignment between Brentcliffe and Don Valley Parkway, Mount Dennis bus terminal is missing).	Text will be updated to ensure consistency within the report.		
417	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	Identify the specific studies in Chapter 2.	The first bullet will be changed to read: The feasibility studies described in <b>Chapter 2</b> ;		
418	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	Cross-reference where in the Addendum the design criteria can be found.	Cross-reference added.		
419	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	Provide a brief summary of the design principles that factored into the development of the proposed changes.	The summary is included in the original EPR. The details will be repeated in the Addendum.		
420	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	As the BCMSF was not proposed in the ECLRT EPR it is unclear how the connecting track alignment between the LRT and the BCMSF is being considered as a separate component. Provide more detail about the location of the additional passenger tunnel connections under the GO Rail and the Canadian Pacific Railway corridors.	The connecting track between the mainline and the BCMSF is part of the new BCMSF. Clarification will be provided in the revised document.		
421	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	Is the Weston Launch Shaft pictured in picture 3-7g a new component? Provide details.	No. This shows the existing launch shaft that is under construction. It is providing context for the map.		
422	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	Provide an image to support the description of movement along Eglinton (see 3.4.5). Is the West Launch Shaft the Weston Launch Shaft?	Figure 3-7a to 3-7g show the alignment being proposed for both the LRT and Eglinton Ave. The changes in the road and traffic are described in 3.4.5. The reference to the West Launch Shaft is correct. There is no proposed launch shaft at Weston Road. The note in the figure has been revised to clarify.		
423	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	Provide additional details about the proposed new bridge of Black Creek. (3.4.6)	The structure will be defined through detail design.		
424	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	Figure 3-10 described in 3.5.1 does not match the figure provided on 3-21.	Comment refers specifically to LRT - East Section. This will be addressed during the preparation of a separate Addendum covering the LRT - East Section.		
425	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	It is not clear if the stops and stations described in 3.5.2 are a change from the EPR.	The stops are not a change, the change to the stops / stations is the removal of Leslie Stop. Additional text will be added.		
426	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	Provide clarification as to the relevance of including Figure 3-10 here.	The intent was to confirm that the bus terminal layout from the original EPR was not being changed.		
427	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	Identify the location/name of the existing tunnel shaft.	The name for the previously approved Brentcliffe launch shaft will be added.		
428	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	Is Figure 3-10 a relevant example for the proposed staging plan for the construction of the LRT west of Mount Dennis Station?	The cross reference will be revised, figure 3-11 is the proposed staging west of Weston Road.		
429	Lorna Zappone		3. Update of the Project Description	It is impossible to read the details presented in Figure 3-11.	The graphic will be reprinted at a larger size.		

485		Lorna Zappone		4. Existing Conditions	The correct category for noise is socio-economic environment (see Table 5-1)	Noise has been moved to a subsection under Section 4.1.2 (Socio-Economic Environment). For consistency, Table 5-1 will be revised to reflect the following headings: Natural, Socio-Economic, Cultural, Transportation.		
486		Lorna Zappone		4. Existing Conditions	The correct category for Contaminated soil is natural environment (see Table 5-1)	Noise has been moved to a subsection under Section 4.1.1 (Natural Environment). For consistency, Table 5-1 will be revised to reflect the following headings: Natural, Socio-Economic, Cultural, Transportation.		
487		Lorna Zappone		4. Existing Conditions	It is strongly recommended that this section be reorganized to present a more cohesive description of the existing environments, by proposed change/location.	The report has been reorganized.		
488		Lorna Zappone		4. Existing Conditions	The study area depicted in Figure 4-2 requires clarification.	Revisions made to Figure 4-2 to clarify that the graphic is illustrating the "natural environment study area"		
489		Lorna Zappone		4. Existing Conditions	The study area depicted in Figure 4-3 does not encompass the proposed tunnel launch shaft site, in its entirety. Provide clarification.	Comment refers specifically to LRT - East Section. This will be addressed during the preparation of a separate Addendum covering the LRT - East Section.		
490		Lorna Zappone		4. Existing Conditions	Page 4-1 indicates that there are five sections in the study area description to follow but only four sections are described. Provide clarification.	Text corrected to refer to four sections		
491		Lorna Zappone		4. Existing Conditions	Identification of land use designations applicable to the east and west sections as presented in 4.1.2.1 and 4.1.2.2 is incomplete.	Land use information derived from City of Toronto Official Plan.		
492		Lorna Zappone		4. Existing Conditions	Identification of the land use designations for the BCMSF needs to be provided.	Discussion of the MSF site land use designation is provided in Page 4-20.		
493		Lorna Zappone		4. Existing Conditions	It is unclear why a discussion about the Official Plan Amendment for the York Community Centre to be constructed in the southeast corner of Black Creek Drive and Eglinton Avenue is included here as this facility is not a component of this undertaking. Provide clarification.	The reference to the Community Centre will be removed.		
494		Lorna Zappone		4. Existing Conditions	Illustrate the institutional areas as discussed on page 4-23 in figure 4-6.	The figure will be updated.		
506		Greg Washuta		Section 5.3.1, Page 5-6	Please note that the Ministry has posted a Best Management Practices document for soil management at sites that are not subject to Ontario Regulation 153/04 as amended (i.e., sites that do not have a Record of Site Condition). This document was posted on November 19, 2012 under EBR Registry number 011-7523. It is suggested that Metrolinx use this document when dealing with excess soils at locations along the Eglinton LRT corridor. Metrolinx will be expected to manage excess soil on their property so that discharges to the natural environment do not cause or may cause an adverse effect. An adverse effect is defined in the Environmental Protection Act.	As part of the purchase of the former Kodak Lands from Metrus, Metrolinx completed a RSC and noted that remediation will be required on the site. Commitments will be made to ensure mitigation measures meet all regulations.		
509		Greg Washuta		Section 5.3.1, Page 5-14	The report indicates that "for areas where spills were documented to have occurred within the study area, during construction of the above ground ECLRT sections, soil testing for petroleum hydrocarbons (PHCs) will be completed along the road right-of-way where removal from the road shoulders and road right of ways (i.e. excess material) is required. If presence of PHCs is confirmed, contaminated soils will be removed from these areas." It should be noted that if a spill occurs during construction and the spill extends outside of the ROW, then the Ministry's Spill Action Centre should be notified forthwith.	Noted. Commitments through the EMP will ensure the contractor is aware of this procedure.		

510		Greg Washuta		Section 5.3.1, Page 5-15	<p>There are two references to ground water being managed in accordance with the MOE's Guideline for Use at Contaminated Sites in Ontario dated 1997. This document contains references to Tables A to F for ground water and soil standards.</p> <p>As a result of advances in knowledge, including improvements in procedures for developing criteria, such as the CCME protocols, and due to feedback from external stakeholders and Ministry staff, there was a need to review the standards and update them with current science. External stakeholders and Ministry staff had identified issues with the 1997 criteria and the subsequent 2004 standards related to: The use of outdated toxicity data and lack of transparency; the need to address additional exposure pathways; the lack of consideration of certain receptors for some contaminants (terrestrial); impractical/unrealistic settings for commercial/industrial land use; cross-media transfer of metals (leaching into groundwater) not adequately considered; degradation to vinyl chloride over time not adequately considered; models and settings for contaminant transport which do not represent best practice and are not transparent; models for human health exposure which are not consistent with practices in other jurisdictions; and background standards which may be inequitable for some land uses.</p> <p>As a result, significant modifications were made to the standards development process, and as part of a regulatory amendment package, a new set of standards was passed into law which took effect on July 1, 2011. These new standards are referred to as the "Soil, Ground Water and Sediment Standards for Use Under Part XV.1 of the Environmental Protection Act, dated April 15, 2011.</p>	Reference to the new standards will be added.		
511		Greg Washuta		Section 5.3.1, Page 5-15	<p>If restoration of contaminated groundwater is anticipated at various sites, the use of the Ministry's 2011 SCS is suggested in order to assess whether the groundwater quality has been restored to an effective level so as not to cause an adverse effect on human and ecological receptors. The document entitled "Records of Site Condition a Guide of Site Assessment, the Cleanup of Brownfield Sites and the Filing of Records of Site Condition" dated October 2004 refers to the site remediation. In addition, the "Guide for Completing Phase Two Environmental Site Assessments under Ontario Regulation 153/04", dated June 2011 refers to confirmation sampling and analysis of groundwater to determine if groundwater remediation is effective or not. Reference to these two documents and the 2011 MOE SCS would be more appropriate.</p>	Reference to the documents will be updated.		
514		Greg Washuta		Section 5.3.3, Page 5-16	<p>As noted previously, possible contamination from soil and ground water from the Kodak Site may occur. This should be considered during design of the Surface Water Management System at the site.</p>	Detailed design of the MSF site will address SWM requirements further.		
515		Dan Delaquis		5-17	<p>Please correct/clarify on page 5-17 whether or not the following sentence should read: "An on-site stormwater management pond is projected (not "protected") for on the MSF site to control both water quality and quantity of stormwater discharge before the connection to municipal storm sewer network."</p>	Text revised to read "protected for within the current design of the BCMSF to control ...		
516		Greg Washuta		Section 5.3.3, Page 5-19	<p>Construction of an Emergency Exit Building (EEB) will occur in the right of way between Brentcliffe Road and the West Don River (EEB 4). It should be noted that the extent of a former landfill in the area has not been confirmed. Potentially, landfill gas may be an issue at this EEB. Landfill gas venting and alarm systems may be needed for this building.</p>	Noted. Further investigation will take place during detailed design.		
517		Greg Washuta		Section 5.3.3, Page 5-34 and 5-38, Mitigation Measures	<p>For the management and disposal of contaminated material, the following would apply: MOE site condition Standards; O. Reg. 347 as amended; Soil BMP draft document.</p>	Noted. Will be included as part of the commitments for mitigation measures.		

518		Greg Washuta		Section 5.3.3, Page 5-44	Metrolinx has indicated that air monitoring of crystalline silica, total dust and other contaminants will be conducted to determine the effectiveness of dust control measures. Air monitoring will be conducted prior to construction and/or demolition activities, during construction and/or demolition activities and after construction and/or demolition activities. Trigger levels should be established and contingency measures should be provided before the start of any construction and/or demolition activities.	Text will be added to explain that the air monitoring plan will outline the approach to adaptive management in response to findings from air quality monitoring.		
519		Greg Washuta		Section 5.3.3, Page 5-61	Reference in this table is to the Ministry Guideline for Use at Contaminated Sites in Ontario. Please see the above comments related to page 5-15.	Table 5-7 will be reviewed and updated to reflect impacts, mitigation and monitoring/future work/contingency outlined in Chapter 5.		
520		Greg Washuta		Section 5.3.3, Page 5-66	For brownfield sites, the reference is management of the site will be in "accordance with the Ontario Regulation 153/04 and Ontario Regulations 511/09 once it comes into force." Regulation 511/09 which is an amendment to O.Reg. 153/04 is already in force. Therefore, the reference should be just to Ontario Regulation 153/04 as amended from time to time.	This revision will be made to Table 5-7 and corresponding text within Chapter 5.		
576		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	It is strongly recommended that this section be re-organized to present a unified assessment and evaluation of potential impacts for all environmental features and the identification of mitigation measures and monitoring requirements, as applicable in all impact categories (footprint, construction, and operations and maintenance), for each proposed change.	The report has been reorganized.		
577		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Only changes to the potential impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and recommended monitoring activities presented in the ECLRT are to be presented in the Addendum.	Noted; the text will be reviewed and revised accordingly.		
578		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	The proponent is to assess and evaluate the potential impacts the proposed changes may have on the environment. For clarity, replace society with environment.	Text will be revised accordingly.		
579		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	It would be more appropriate for monitoring to appear later in this chapter as such requirements are determined after the assessment of impacts and evaluation of effects.	The report will be reorganized.		
580		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Identify where in the Addendum the details about the changes to the 2010 EPR monitoring plan can be found.	A cross reference will be added.		
581		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Provide clarification about baseline monitoring as it applies to the proposed changes in the Addendum.	Clarification will be added.		
582		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Will an effectiveness monitoring report be prepared on an annual basis, as is proposed for implementation monitoring?	An annual report will be prepared but will not include monitoring of effectiveness of mitigation measures; they will be monitored individually by Metrolinx and their subconsultants.		
583		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Have contingency measures been identified? Where detailed in the Addendum?	A cross reference will be added.		
584		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Table 5-1: Provide clarification/rationale for ranking that appears in different font.	The final versions of Table 5-1 will not include any text in blue.		
585		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Environmental factors and facilities/activities should be consistent with the descriptions/terms used throughout the Addendum (e.g. see chapter 4 and 5).	The document has been reorganized to ensure consistency among the factors and facilities/activities.		
586		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Provide clarification why electromagnetic interference and stray current appear in the table but are not discussed in the existing conditions section.	EMI and Stray current are directly related to the operation of the LRT and do not exist as existing conditions		
587		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Noise should appear under socio-economic environment.	For consistency, Table 5-1 will be revised to reflect the following headings: Natural, Socio-Economic, Cultural, Transportation. When using these headings within the report noise will appear under Socio-Economic Environment.		

588		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Contaminated Soil should appear under natural environment.	For consistency, Table 5-1 will be revised to reflect the following headings: Natural, Socio-Economic, Cultural, Transportation. When using these headings within the report contaminated soil will appear under Natural Environment.		
589		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Why does the east and west sections appear twice under terrain and soils?	The section presents impacts for east and west sections, and mitigation measures for east and west sections. Will be addressed through reorganization.		
590		Lorna Zappone		5. Impact Assessment, Mitigation, and Monitoring	Identify whether or not there are potential impacts to parks and open space in the east section.	The only impact to parks and open space in the east is the construction of the EEB's, additional text will be added.		
591		Lorna Zappone		6. Consultation Process	Ensure summary of comments, including how issues have been addressed, are presented in table format for all consultation activities (see general section above).	A sufficient summary will be included in Chapter 6.		
603		Lorna Zappone		7. Commitments and Future Work	Ensure identification of all commitments and future work for each of the impact categories: footprint, construction, and operations maintenance (e.g. soil and groundwater sampling, soil test for PHCs, etc.)	Chapter 7 will be reviewed to ensure that factor-specific commitments to future work are noted.		
604		Lorna Zappone		7. Commitments and Future Work	It is unclear if the details required for finalizing property requirements, etc. have been supplied. Provide clarification.	Clarification provided.		
605		Lorna Zappone		7. Commitments and Future Work	Identify circumstances that would trigger a need for additional noise and vibration studies.	The trigger will be determined based on the results of subsequent noise and vibration studies relative to the noise and vibration protocol.		
606		Lorna Zappone		7. Commitments and Future Work	Identify how the proposed changes and new facilities may affect timeframes for construction and operation of the ECLRT.	Additional information regarding timeframes will be added.		

**From:** David Veights <David.Veights@metrolinx.com>  
**Sent:** March-26-13 9:13 AM  
**To:** 'Beth Williston' (BWilliston@trca.on.ca)  
**Cc:** Scott Bowers; Andrew Shea; Katie Bright; Mike Poskin; Caroline Mugo (CMugo@trca.on.ca)  
**Subject:** Eglinton Crosstown LRT EPR Addendum - Response to Comments  
**Attachments:** EPRA Comments Table\_2013\_Master\_Formal Responses to Comments - TRCA.pdf

Good morning Beth.

Thank you for the comments from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) on the Draft Addendum to the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Environmental Project Report. We have reviewed the comments and are sending you the attached table that shows our planned response to each comment from TRCA.

Please also note that going forward, Metrolinx has decided to divide the Addendum into two separate reports, one covering the section from Jane Street to the West Tunnel Portal and the other section covering the Laird Drive to Don Valley Parkway section. The current effort will focus on the Jane Street to the West Tunnel Portal, and a revised draft addendum for that section is underway. We anticipate a Notice of Environmental Project Report Addendum to be issued in early June 2013. We will advise you of the schedule for the Laird Drive to Don Valley Parkway section at a later date.

Thank you again for your comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

David R. Veights, AICP  
EA Project Coordinator  
Metrolinx Rapid Transit Implementation  
5160 Yonge Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
North York, ON M2N 6L9  
☎ (416) 228-9339  
f. (416) 228-9272  
e. [david.veights@metrolinx.com](mailto:david.veights@metrolinx.com)

## Review Comments Spreadsheet

### Rapid Transit Implementation

\* Actions:  
 1 = Will comply  
 2 = Discuss, clarification required  
 3 = Not applicable because .....

\*\* Status:  
 O = Open, not resolved  
 P = Pending incorporation in design  
 C = Closed, implementation complete



<b>Review Code:</b>	<b>Document Name:</b>	<b>EPR Addendum</b>	<b>Revised By:</b>
<b>Designer:</b>	<b>Contract Name:</b>	<b>EA Services for Eglinton-Scarborough Crosstown</b>	<b>Revision Date:</b>
<b>% Completion:</b>	<b>Contract No:</b>	<b>ECLE4-5</b>	<b>Revision Number:</b>

Item No.	Discipline	Reviewer Name	Reviewer ID	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)	Action 1 / 2 / 3* (Designer)	Status O / P / C** (Reviewer)
50	TRCA	TRCA		General	TRCA staff note that the increase in impervious area is small (0.34ha) compared with the total drainage area of the Black Creek Catchment at the Eglinton Ave Bridge crossing (5310ha). Also, the increase in impervious area is small (0.35ha) compared with the total drainage area of the Humber River Catchment at the Eglinton Ave Bridge crossing (81,930ha).  Quantity control measures are recommended by TRCA water resources staff, as per the City of Toronto's Wet Weather Flow Management Guidelines.	These will be addressed through detailed design.		
51	TRCA	TRCA		General	Please show the West Don Regional Floodline on all applicable drawings (both plan and profile views).	The regional floodline will be illustrated on relevant figures in the report.		
52	TRCA	TRCA		General	Low impact development techniques should be implemented where possible to address erosion and water balance impacts.	These will be addressed through detailed design.		
53	TRCA	TRCA		General	With respect to surface water quality control, TRCA has adopted the City of Toronto's Guidelines for oil grit separators (OGS) which recognizes that OGS devices are only capable of achieving a TSS removal efficiency of 50%. Therefore, OGS devices are recommended by TRCA water resources staff, as part of a multi-component approach to achieve an Enhanced level of quality control.	Noted.		
54	TRCA	TRCA		General	TRCA staff note that at the detailed design stage we will need to review detailed erosion and sediment control drawings and the design report. Staff requests that a multi-barrier erosion and sediment control (ESC) plan and report be developed.	Erosion and sediment control drawings will be distributed for review during detailed design.		
55	TRCA	TRCA		General	Staff request preparation of an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) at the detailed design stage of the project for monitoring and mitigation of any negative impacts to aquatic habitat that may result from discharge of groundwater to watercourses. A commitment to undertake on an EMP for this project should be made in the addendum document. TRCA will forward its "Interim TRCA Technical Guidelines for the Development of Environmental Management Plans for Dewatering, February 2013" in the near future. Staff requests this document be included as one appendix in the Addendum document.	Metrolinx is currently developing an EMP for the project. This can be included in the EPR Addendum if available. Commitments in the addendum will be consistent with the EMP.		
56	TRCA	TRCA		General	EMP should provide details on monitoring locations, parameters, frequency, triggers, mitigation, reporting and communication protocols. EMP should also mention the roles, responsibilities and qualification of the monitoring team. Staff request consultation with TRCA at the of EMP preparation stage.	Metrolinx is currently developing an EMP for the project. This can be included in the EPR Addendum if available. Commitments in the addendum will be consistent with the EMP.		

224	TRCA	TRCA		Table 2-1	<p>LRT West Section (Jane Street to Keelesdale) - Evaluation of Options Flood risk should have been considered in the evaluation of options. Twelve different options were evaluated in the Draft Report for the West Section (Jane Street to Keelesdale) of the Eglinton LRT. All of these options cross the Regional Floodplain associated with the Black Creek valley either (a) underground, (b) at grade within the existing road right-of-way, (c) at grade not within the existing road right-of-way, or (d) elevated.</p> <p>In terms of flood risk, the alignment of the proposed LRT over the Black Creek valley is the key issue, and the flood risk associated with a, b, c, and d are not equal. For example, crossing Black Creek underground or at grade within the existing road right-of-way would cause no increased flood risk.</p> <p>Further, the Draft Report does not include information to indicate that an increased flood risk (associated with any of the alternative options) can be mitigated. Table 2-1 contains one row dedicated to general environmental impacts, and all of the options were assessed to be equal.</p> <p>The evaluation of options should have identified specific environmental impacts, for example flooding, surface water quantity, or surface water quality.</p>	A technical memorandum documenting the stormwater management analysis will be prepared and circulated to TRCA for review, and upon finalization, will be included as an Appendix in the final EPR Addendum.		
225	TRCA	TRCA		Table 2-1	<p>At this stage in the EA process, TRCA water resources staff suggests that the flood risk associated with the preferred design is assessed at the earliest time possible. The next three comments refer to the analysis/information that is required by TRCA to demonstrate that the flood risk can be mitigated. TRCA would like to understand the flood risk as soon as possible so that the increased flooding at the Black Creek crossing does not become an issue further along in the design process resulting in increased costs and delays.</p> <p>a) LRT West Section (Jane Street to Keelesdale) - Preferred Design</p> <p>A detailed hydraulic assessment is needed for the Black Creek crossing to demonstrate that safe passage of flood flows is not impeded and that there will be no increase in flood risk to adjacent, upstream, and downstream properties.</p> <p>b) Structural abutments or piers should be located outside of the Regional Floodplain to minimize obstruction to water flow. Where abutments or piers are proposed within the floodplain, the structure shall be designed so that overtopping or flanking can occur with minimum damage. Further, abutments should be located outside the meander belt width or outside the 100 year erosion limit of Black Creek.</p> <p>c) The Regional Floodline should be shown on all applicable drawings on both plan and profile views.</p> <p>d) The Draft Report does not contain enough information to determine whether grading works are proposed within the Black Creek regional storm flood plain; however, where grading is proposed within the regional storm flood plain a cut/fill balance analysis is needed to demonstrate that flood conveyance and storage volumes are maintained.</p>	A technical memorandum documenting the stormwater management analysis will be prepared and circulated to TRCA for review, and upon finalization, will be included as an Appendix in the final EPR Addendum.		

368	TRCA	TRCA		Figure 3-7i	<p>In regard to the various options for elevated segments that bring the line above grade over the Black Creek watercourse to at least the entrance to the Mount Dennis LRT Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF), the track will be supported by piers / pillars with foundations set in competent soils.</p> <p>Figure 3-71 depicts conceptually the pier foundations. At this stage of the EA, little has been presented regarding the expected geology and groundwater conditions at the foundation footings.</p> <p>Further geotechnical investigations must be undertaken to determine if groundwater control measures are required for their construction.</p>	Preliminary geotechnical information will be provided to TRCA.		
381	TRCA	TRCA		Section 3.4.5	<p>The underground portion of the western segment under Mount Dennis may encounter groundwater although no preliminary geotechnical information has been presented. If the LRT line is constructed using the cut-and-cover methodology, dewatering and/or depressurization may be required. Further geotechnical investigations would be required to assess soil and groundwater conditions and evaluate possible groundwater dewatering requirements.</p> <p>Due to industrial activities in the area, potential treatment of contaminated groundwater may be needed during construction. The geotechnical field work should also be performed so that groundwater samples can be obtained and chemically analyzed for contaminants. Pre-treatment of pumped groundwater may be required prior to discharge to the natural environment.</p>	Preliminary geotechnical investigation indicates the majority of the station will be constructed above existing water levels. Additional geotechnical investigation will be completed to determine dewatering requirements and treatment of groundwater prior to discharge.		
386	TRCA	TRCA		Section 3.5	<p>In regard to the launch shaft at Don Mills, existing borehole information suggests that the tunnel invert elevation is situated higher than reported groundwater level in the lower water-bearing sand formation. Supplemental drilling should verify the soil and groundwater levels at the Don Mills launch site and evaluate whether groundwater control measures are required during construction.</p>	Additional geotechnical investigations will be completed and information will be provided to TRCA when available.		
387	TRCA	TRCA		Section 3.5	<p>There is potential for dewatering in Emergency Exit Buildings (EEBs), Cross Passages (CPs), and Station Box locations, and emergency dewatering may be required from tunnel constructions. Staff request details on the dewatering rate, duration, discharge locations and outfall locations at the watercourses when they are available.</p>	Additional investigations will be completed and information will be provided to TRCA when available.		
388	TRCA	TRCA		Section 3.5	<p>Staff request details of groundwater dependent sensitive natural features (example watercourse, vegetation, etc.) that may be located within the zone of influence (ZOI) resulting from construction dewatering in Emergency Exit Buildings (EEBs), Cross Passages (CPs), and Station Box locations.</p>	January 31, 2013 Hydrogeological Investigation completed by Coffey to be reviewed and any impacts will be identified and mitigated.		
439	TRCA	TRCA		Section 4.1.1.4	<p>The existing conditions section of the addendum should be revised to identify the existing wetland. As there is a significant permanent pool associated with this wetland, it should also be considered as an aquatic habitat feature in section 4.1.1.4.</p>	Comment refers specifically to LRT - East Section. This will be addressed during the preparation of a separate Addendum covering the LRT - East Section.		
444	TRCA	TRCA		Section 4.1.1.5, 3rd paragraph and Section 4.1.1.6 2nd paragraph	<p>staff disagree with the statement that there are no natural heritage features recorded in the west section of the study area. Clarification should be provided as to what the screening through MNR did or did not specifically identify. We would agree that there are no ANSI's designated by MNR in the study area.</p>	Text will be revised to clarify that this refers to the lack of PSWs, ANSIs and ESAs in the context of MNR records. Text will be added to address local features.		
447	TRCA	TRCA		Figure 4-1 Natural Environment Mapping	<p>West Section does not in fact provide any ELC mapping as suggested. Revision is needed.</p>	Reference has been added to refer to the 2010 ELC mapping available in the appended natural environment memo. Vegetation communities are shown for the MSF site.		

448	TRCA	TRCA		Figure 4-2	Figure 4-2 should be revised to show the limit of lands inventoried, and specify which lands are the "MSF lands" as identified in the detailed descriptions that appear to include lands below the top of bank.	Revisions will be made to Figure 4-2.		
449	TRCA	TRCA		Figure 4-3	There is a significant wetland and woodland area located to the south/southwest of the proposed tunnel alignment and Don Mills station/extraction shaft. The Addendum does not identify the wetland feature as potentially affected by the works. The study area should be expanded to the south to identify natural features potentially affected. The study area and mapping provided in figure 4-3 is not sufficient. The detailed community descriptions provided for the East Section are in fact descriptions for the West Section. Revision is needed.	Comment refers specifically to LRT - East Section. This will be addressed during the preparation of a separate Addendum covering the LRT - East Section.		
453	TRCA	TRCA		Section 4.1.1.7 Designated Natural Areas	this section should be revised to identify the existing wetland and forested area immediately south of Eglinton as ecologically sensitive areas. While not identified as Provincially Significant by MNR, the area is significant in the local context and needs to be identified as such. Expansion of the study area in this location is needed, given the potential for impacts to these features due to the change in both vertical and horizontal alignment for the LRT.	Text revised to clarify that this refers to the lack of PSWs, ANSIs and ESAs in the context of MNR records. Text will be added to address local features.		
456	TRCA	TRCA		Section 4.1.1.9 Noise and Vibration	should include mention of the potential for impacts to breeding birds and other wildlife that are associated with the West Don Valley lands, including the woodlands and wetlands.	Comment refers specifically to LRT - East Section. This will be addressed during the preparation of a separate Addendum covering the LRT - East Section.		
469	TRCA	TRCA		Page 4-25, second-last bullet, and page 4-26, first 3 bullets	reference Etobicoke Creek, and appears to be an error. Should be revised.	Text has been revised.		
482	TRCA	TRCA		General	Staff requests clarification for the proposed horizontal alignment as it is not clear why the alignment cannot be located closer to Eglinton Ave east of the Don River Crossing, which would appear to reduce potential implications to natural features located to the south.	The alignment cannot be moved closer to Eglinton Avenue East due to conflicts with the footings for the bridge over the West Don River and the bridge carrying CP Rail over Eglinton Avenue East. This statement will be clarified in the EPR Addendum.		
500	TRCA	TRCA		Table 5-1	Table 5-1 is identified as "in progress." A final table should be provided. It is staff opinion that there are significant potential negative ecological impacts related to construction that need to be reflected in the table as "strong" interactions that will need to be subject to additional assessment and mitigation. The most significant issues are the permanent loss of woodland areas in the west section, and impacts to the wetland and associated woodlands in the east section related primarily to potential direct and indirect groundwater and surface water interactions, as well as potential for direct habitat losses due to construction related access issues.	As noted, Table 5-1 is a work in progress and will be completed prior to finalizing the EPR Addendum. Table 5-1 will reflect details provided in the factor specific sections within Chapter 5.		
535	TRCA	TRCA		Page 5-36	On page 5-36, a water quality target of 5ppm total suspended solids is specified for dewatering discharge. Staff request clarification as to the source of this criterion, as well as the time lag (12 hours post start of dewatering) and the geotechnical engineering direction. Staff expect that dewatering will meet or exceed all applicable standards for discharge into surface waters (directly or indirectly via storm sewers) or the sanitary system. If this is the intent, then staff recommends that this be stated more generally.	This commitment is found in the original EPR. Applicable standards will be met.		

543	TRCA	TRCA		Section 5.4.4 Ecosystems and wildlife	<p>as the greatest areas for potential impact are also located within areas regulated by TRCA, this section should include that a permit from TRCA will be sought as mitigation and any additional mitigation, restoration or compensation required based on detailed site assessments undertaken during the detailed design phase, will be addressed at that time. The bullet lists provided in the text should not preclude additional mitigation and compensation as may be necessary to minimize impacts. The statement regarding silt fence placement is not considered appropriate at this level, and staff would recommend that the commitment to design and implement a comprehensive, responsive and proactive erosion and sediment control strategy for all construction associated with the ECLRT project.</p>	Text revised.		
558	TRCA	TRCA		Table 5-7	<p>Staff recommends the following revisions/additions/corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Include the proposed valley wall alterations under Terrain and Soils</li> <li>b. Include temporary construction related dewatering under Groundwater</li> <li>c. Include dewatering discharge during construction under Surface water</li> <li>d. Include as mitigation, the use of low impact development techniques under Surface water</li> <li>e. Recommend that the total area anticipated to be lost be identified for context, and that the restoration and compensation plans are prepared to the satisfaction of TRCA and Urban Forestry (RNFP), under Terrestrial Ecosystems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Potential impacts associated with Valley Wall alterations, and mitigating measures have been included under the impact assessment discussion for Designated Natural Areas and Parks.</li> <li>b. Temporary construction related dewatering will be addressed under Groundwater</li> <li>c. Temporary construction related dewatering will be addressed under Groundwater</li> <li>d. Low impact development techniques have been added as mitigation under Surface Water</li> <li>e. Additional clarification/information will be added re: area lost and associated commitments for restoration/compensation plans.</li> </ul>		
607	TRCA	TRCA		Appendix B, Access Route	<p>Based on the topographical conditions between Black Creek Drive (to the east) and the former Kodak Site (to the west), the intended access road starting just north of Eglinton Avenue West and west of Black Creek Drive will have to run almost parallel to the toe of the slope. Further to the north and west, the road will be approaching the slope gradually and under a very acute angle, such that the change in altitude should determine an acceptable longitudinal slope for traffic purposes.</p> <p>Staff understands that changes in alignment in the west section are driven by the stated need for grade separation between LRT and Eglinton to meet operational requirements for access to the Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF). LRT must operate in a protected right-of-way.</p> <p>From a geotechnical perspective, the access road should follow the former draw feature identified by prior studies. Staff is concerned that the access road itself will also have significant impacts to the valley wall. Geotechnical investigations during detailed design are required to confirm required setbacks or construction mitigation techniques.</p>	<p>Only tracks are proposed to access the MSF site north of Eglinton Ave. No access road is being accommodated for directly from Eglinton into the MSF. Photography Dr is identified as the main point of vehicular traffic. Keelesdale Dr will be closed.</p>		

608	TRCA	TRCA		Appendix B, Access Route	<p>Ecology staff is concerned with the preferred option which relates primarily to the location of the lead tracks to and from the MSF as they will involve significant placement of engineered fill and complexly remove the existing forested valley wall, a condition that was not considered within any of the alternatives considered (all options were located either west or east of the forested slope). Only options 10 and 11 looked at utilizing the lands east of the tablelands (shaded as blue in figures 2-1 to 2-3). It does not appear as if the ecological implications of the preferred option were considered.</p> <p>While the extent of impact will be assessed during detailed design, TTC's commitment to compensate for valleyland and vegetation losses within TRCA regulated areas will need to be addressed, and the cost implications of this should be understood.</p>	Metrolinx confirms the commitment to compensate for lost valley land and vegetations.		
609	TRCA	TRCA		Appendix B, Access Route	<p>While retaining walls are proposed to reduce the width of fill placement. The geotechnical investigation should consider not only the stability of the slope and the valley wall, but also factor in the costs associated with construction on engineered fill that could increase long-term maintenance expenses. The geotechnical investigations should be written in consultation with a qualified ecologist so that the impact upon wildlife habitat is also considered.</p>	Noted.		
610	TRCA	TRCA		Appendix B, MSF	<p>Bus terminal design concept 1b appears to provide for the relocation of the MSF lead tracks to the west of the existing forested valley wall.</p> <p>Based on the evaluation matrix in Table 2-3, there appears to be no differentiation of options 1a or b, both of which are identified as "requiring mitigation for construction in TRCA regulated land." Further, this caveat is not applied to options 2 or 3, which may also require a TRCA permit, pending identification of the regulation limit.</p> <p>The preferred bus terminal option, in association with the preferred MSF lead arrangement appears to result in significant impact to the adjacent forested slope, and to TRCA policies, and does not appear to be fully rationalized. Additional explanation for the preferred option is requested.</p>	Noted. Table 2-3 has been revisited and clarified reflecting the most current design alternatives.		
611	TRCA	TRCA		Appendix B, MSF	<p>The proposed MSF site layout identifies several areas where development is located at or beyond the staked top of bank, which is not consistent with TRCA policies, and will impact on existing forested areas and slopes. While compensation and mitigation is identified as intended to achieve TRCA approval, staff request that further effort to minimize adverse impacts to slopes and existing natural cover be undertaken at the detailed design.</p>	This will be addressed in detailed design.		
612	TRCA	TRCA		Appendix B, MSF	<p>Once the elevation of the plateau associated with the former Kodak Site is attained, both engineering and ecological issues will decrease significantly and connectivity to the surrounding communities will need to be assessed.</p>	Noted.		
613	TRCA	TRCA		Appendix B, MSF	<p>With respect to surface water quantity and quantity control, please provide preliminary design calculations to demonstrate that the site is large enough to accommodate the proposed stormwater management facility. In addition, please indicate where the stormwater facility will outlet.</p>	Preliminary SWM calculations will be added.		
614	TRCA	TRCA		Appendix B, MSF	<p>TRCA staff note that at the detailed design stage, we will need to review the proposed low impact development techniques.</p>	Will comply		
615	TRCA	TRCA		Appendix B, MSF	<p>TRCA staff note that at the detailed design stage we will need to review detailed erosion and sediment control drawings, including the design report.</p>	Noted.		

616	TRCA	TRCA		Appendix B, TRCA Lands	<p>Section 2.1.1.2 identifies lands reserved for “re-development” located between Black Creek Drive and the proposed Maintenance and Storage Facility. These lands are located within the Black Creek Valley and are within the floodplain, at least in part.</p> <p>a) The public information materials prepared as part of the Mount Dennis Mobility Hub study identify this area as “TRCA Lands” and suggest “re-development” of the area as parkland, which TRCA would support. The re-development potential of these lands in any other use is limited, and may not be supported under current TRCA Policies.</p> <p>b) Clarification of the type of “re-development” for which the lands were being “protected” through the Addendum planning process is requested. TTC/Metrolinx property ownership within the MSF area should be identified within the Addendum to clarify property-related impacts that affect the alternative and preferred alignments.</p> <p>c) The addendum document should include provision for these lands to be redeveloped as parkland, to provide compensation for the construction of the MSF access ramp on the valley wall, as noted in the covering letter associated with this table.</p> <p>d) It should be noted that the lands identified as “TRCA Lands” are not owned by TRCA; it is our understanding that they are owned by TTC/Metrolinx.</p>	Noted. Text will be revised/clarified as appropriate.		
-----	------	------	--	------------------------	---	---	--	--

## Andrew Shea

---

**From:** David Veights <David.Veights@metrolinx.com>  
**Sent:** August-28-13 8:06 AM  
**To:** Andrew Shea; Katie Bright  
**Subject:** FW: Reponse to TRCA Comment

Good morning Andrew and Katie.

Please see the response below from TRCA regarding the valley lands at the MSF site and document accordingly in the EPR Addendum.

Thanks.

David

**From:** Caroline Mugo [mailto:CMugo@trca.on.ca]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 27, 2013 12:31 PM  
**To:** David Veights  
**Cc:** Beth Williston  
**Subject:** Reponse to TRCA Comment

Hello David,

Thank you for your email.

Please note that TRCA staff have no concerns with Metrolinx committing to retaining the natural state of the lands.

TRCA is pleased to continue working with Metrolinx towards improving the natural quality of the MSF lands.

Regards,

### Caroline Mugo

Planner I  
Environmental Assessment Planning  
Planning and Development  
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority  
5 Shoreham Drive | Toronto, ON M3N 1S4  
☎ 416.661.6600 x5689 | 📠 416.661.6898 | ✉ [cmugo@trca.on.ca](mailto:cmugo@trca.on.ca)

From: David Veights <[David.Veights@metrolinx.com](mailto:David.Veights@metrolinx.com)>  
To: "Caroline Mugo ([CMugo@trca.on.ca](mailto:CMugo@trca.on.ca))" <[CMugo@trca.on.ca](mailto:CMugo@trca.on.ca)>,  
Cc: Sampson Ho <[Sampson.Ho@metrolinx.com](mailto:Sampson.Ho@metrolinx.com)>, Paul Cecchetto <[Paul.Cecchetto@metrolinx.com](mailto:Paul.Cecchetto@metrolinx.com)>, Grant Wood <[gwood@pivotalprojects.com](mailto:gwood@pivotalprojects.com)>, Bruno Marchio <[bmarchio@pivotalprojects.com](mailto:bmarchio@pivotalprojects.com)>, Andrew Harper <[Andrew.Harper@metrolinx.com](mailto:Andrew.Harper@metrolinx.com)>, Jamie Bennett <[Jamie.Bennett@metrolinx.com](mailto:Jamie.Bennett@metrolinx.com)>, Stephanie Rice <[Stephanie.Rice@metrolinx.com](mailto:Stephanie.Rice@metrolinx.com)>  
Date: 08/02/2013 12:46 PM  
Subject: Reponse to TRCA Comment on

---

Good afternoon Caroline.

This message is in response to our conversations (most recently on Wednesday and again this morning) regarding the Eglinton Crosstown LRT EPR Addendum relative to the MSF Site. We are in the final stages of preparing the final draft addendum and I want to clarify the response to the comment received from TRCA regarding the valley lands along Black Creek Drive.

TRCA requested Metrolinx to consider *"a commitment to for the parkland redevelopment of these flood plain lands as compensation for the construction of the access ramp on the valley wall be made in the EA Addendum document, and addressed during both the detailed design of the Project, as well as in the on-going Mount Dennis Mobility Hub Study, and that the compensation be planned and implemented to the satisfaction of TRCA"* as contained in the TRCA cover letter transmitting comments on the draft EPR Addendum. A copy of that letter and a copy of Metrolinx's response to the comments are attached for reference.

The commitment as presented by Metrolinx Staff is to naturalise the valley lands as compensation and commit to retaining the natural state of the lands and not create "parkland" where the public would have access. As discussed with TRCA staff at meetings on April 5, 2013 and April 23, 2013, Metrolinx Staff has shown the need to potentially provide a storm water management pond in the valley lands. Additionally, the MSF site will need perimeter fencing for security reasons. Therefore, our commitment is to naturalize the area but to be clear, we cannot support public access to the lands if that is what is meant by "parkland" as included in the cover letter. Rather, the commitment will be to continue to work with TRCA to identify appropriate measures to improve the natural quality of the MSF lands within the TRCA regulated area (additional plantings, etc.) and to include provisions that restrict future development of those lands.

Please also note that the Mt. Dennis Mobility Hub Study has also identified a potential future road that would connect Photography Drive will Todd Baylis Boulevard. While that road is not included as part of the assessment of the Eglinton Crosstown LRT EPR Addendum, Metrolinx desires to protect for such a road in the future – a portion of that road would traverse TRCA regulated lands – and will address the impacts of such a road whenever the need to construct such a road arises.

Let me know if you have any questions.

David R. Veights, AICP, PMP  
EA Project Manager  
Metrolinx Rapid Transit Implementation  
5160 Yonge Street, Suite 300 Mailbox 90  
North York, ON M2N 6L9  
☎ (416) 228-9339  
f. (416) 228-9272  
e. [david.veights@metrolinx.com](mailto:david.veights@metrolinx.com)

[attachment "CFN 47124- Addendum to the original EPR for the LRT segment from Jane St....docx" deleted by Caroline Mugo/TRCA]  
----- Message from David Veights <[David.Veights@metrolinx.com](mailto:David.Veights@metrolinx.com)> on Tue, 26 Mar 2013 13:12:56 +0000 -----

<b>To:</b>	"Beth Williston' ( <a href="mailto:BWilliston@trca.on.ca">BWilliston@trca.on.ca</a> )" < <a href="mailto:BWilliston@trca.on.ca">BWilliston@trca.on.ca</a> >
<b>cc:</b>	Scott Bowers < <a href="mailto:SBowers@mrc.ca">SBowers@mrc.ca</a> >, Andrew Shea < <a href="mailto:AShea@mrc.ca">AShea@mrc.ca</a> >, Katie Bright < <a href="mailto:KBright@ecoplans.com">KBright@ecoplans.com</a> >, < <a href="mailto:CMugo@trca.on.ca">CMugo@trca.on.ca</a> >
<b>Subject:</b>	Eglinton Crosstown LRT EPR Addendum - Response to Comments

Good morning Beth.

Thank you for the comments from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) on the Draft Addendum to the Eglinton Crosstown LRT Environmental Project Report. We have reviewed the comments and are sending you the attached table that shows our planned response to each comment from TRCA.

Please also note that going forward, Metrolinx has decided to divide the Addendum into two separate reports, one covering the section from Jane Street to the West Tunnel Portal and the other section covering the Laird Drive to Don Valley Parkway section. The current effort will focus on the Jane Street to the West Tunnel Portal, and a revised draft addendum for that section is underway. We anticipate a Notice of Environmental Project Report Addendum to be issued in early June 2013. We will advise you of the schedule for the Laird Drive to Don Valley Parkway section at a later date.

Thank you again for your comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

David R. Veights, AICP  
EA Project Coordinator  
Metrolinx Rapid Transit Implementation  
5160 Yonge Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
North York, ON M2N 6L9  
☎ (416) 228-9339  
f. (416) 228-9272  
e. [david.veights@metrolinx.com](mailto:david.veights@metrolinx.com)

[attachment "EPRA Comments Table\_2013\_Master\_Formal Responses to Comments - TRCA.pdf" deleted by Caroline Mugo/TRCA]

***\*\*PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE\****

*Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:*

*The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend this communication to the sender and delete it permanently from your computer system.*

*Thank you."*



## NOTES OF MEETING

**PROJECT:** Eglinton Crosstown LRT EPR Addendum  
**SPECIAL MEETING:** City of Toronto – EPR Comments/Responses  
**FILE NO.:** 3212006  
**DATE:** March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013 **TIME:** 9:00am  
**PLACE:** City of Toronto Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Toronto  
**PRESENT:** David Veights Metrolinx  
 Scott Bowers MMM  
 Hans Riekko City of Toronto – City Planning  
 Tim Laspa City of Toronto – City Planning  
 Garvin Tom City of Toronto – City Planning  
**PURPOSE:** To review Metrolinx’ responses to the City’s comments on the draft Environmental Project Report Addendum for the ECLRT – West Section, circulated in January 2013.

On January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2013, Metrolinx distributed a draft Environmental Project Report (EPR) Addendum for the Eglinton Crosstown LRT project to the project Technical Advisory Committee (including staff from the City of Toronto) for review/comment. In response to comments submitted by the City of Toronto following their review of the draft EPR Addendum, Metrolinx arranged a meeting on March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013 to discuss the City’s comments and present how the comments would be addressed in the revised EPR Addendum.

The following table summarizes the comments submitted by the City, and Metrolinx’ responses to those comments reflecting the outcome of the discussions at the meeting.

# Review Comments Spreadsheet

## Rapid Transit Implementation

\* Actions:  
 1 = Will comply  
 2 = Discuss, clarification required  
 3 = Not applicable because .....

\*\* Status:  
 O = Open, not resolved  
 P = Pending incorporation in design  
 C = Closed, implementation complete

<b>Review Code:</b>	<b>Document Name:</b>	<b>EPR Addendum</b>	<b>Revised By:</b>
<b>Designer:</b>	<b>Contract Name:</b>	<b>EA Services for Eglinton-Scarborough Crosstown</b>	<b>Revision Date:</b>
<b>% Completion:</b>	<b>Contract No:</b>	<b>ECLE4-5</b>	<b>Revision Number:</b>

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
19	EMS	General	All stations should have Public Accessible Defibrillators, located in strategic areas.	This is a detail that will be addressed in detailed design.
20	EMS	General	MSF should have Public Accessible Defibrillators located in strategic areas.	This is a detail that will be addressed in detailed design.
21	EMS	General	Toronto EMS recommends that appropriate safety/extraction plans be created for all sections of the ECLRT, especially elevated portions of the route as there are no current applications of this model in the City of Toronto.	This is a detail that will be addressed in detailed design.
22	EMS	General	Consider Public Accessible Defibrillators inside the LRT trains.	According to our Vehicle Engineering Team, defibrillators are not planned to be included in the vehicles.
23	EMS	General	Emergency services should be consulted and notified of all road closures and lane reductions prior to constructions work.	It is our understanding that EMS is typically notified whenever permits are issued by the City that affect lane closures (such as Road Cut Permits).
24	City Planning	General	Eglinton Avenue cross-section needs to be incorporated in EPR Addendum - we cannot have 2 EA's showing different recommendations	The EPR Addendum will show a four-lane cross-section between the West Launch Site and Weston Road
25	City Planning	General	The existing approved EA alignment should be carried forward as the base case for assessing the new alternatives	Metrolinx believes the base case is the existing condition. However, Metrolinx is committing to work with the City of Toronto to address specific issues related to public realm, bike lanes, pedestrian environment and walking distances to stations and stops.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
26	City Planning	General	Protecting for future building frontage along the north Side of Eglinton should be explored - can revisions to track work allow for increased lot depth?	Metrolinx has reviewed this request and will be unable to support this change because it will result in the need for the demolition of the Kodak Building. Moving the LRT further to the north appears to have impacts on private property in the Mount Dennis neighbourhood and potentially to the baseball diamond in Coronation Park.
27	City Planning	General	Is the plan still to phase the Eglinton Crosstown LRT such that the West Section (from Weston Road to Jane Street) would be considered a subsequent development phase with no time frames attached? The EPR does not address the impacts of the new (future) portal west of Weston Rd and impacts to Eglinton Ave cross-section to Jane St.	A discussion of the construction staging for the Weston-Jane section, and associated impacts will be included in Section 5.4.10.
28	City Planning	General	Reference is made to a Jane-Keele Report in determining the preferred alternative. This report should be included in the addendum and made available for staffs review.	The Jane-Keele Report will be provided to the City under separate cover.
29	Fire Services	General	Conditional support is provided by Fire for the proposed EPR Addendum subject to design or other technical modifications to meet specific Divisional requirements.	Noted.
30	Transportation Services	General	The segment of Eglinton Avenue between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive is six lanes wide. Eglinton Avenue is four lanes to the east and west of this 650 m long segment. Metrolinx has altered their previously approved LRT plans such that converting two of the lanes to space for a median LRT is no longer required. The TTC's original 2010 Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Eglinton Crosstown Light Rail Transit (LRT) line for the Black Creek – Weston (Mount Dennis) segment recommended a cross-section including four general traffic (through) lanes, two bicycle lanes, and two LRT lanes along Eglinton Avenue.	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.
31	Transportation Services	General	A decision is required on the Eglinton Avenue cross section:- whether the existing six-lane configuration should be retained, or - planning should proceed on the basis of the previously-approved four-lane section, or - if one of many possible modified cross-sections making alternative use of existing pavement width would serve future road users more effectively.	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
32	Transportation Services	General	Transportation Services staff recommend further exploration of options resulting in a clear recommended cross-section for accommodating all road users and through and turning traffic, both at and west of Black Creek Drive.	The approved EPR showed a four-lane cross-section that was endorsed by the City prior to receiving Minister's Notice in 2010.
33	Transportation Services	General	Eglinton Avenue is a Major Arterial with multiple and heavy demands on it in the vicinity of Black Creek Drive and Weston Road. Transportation Services recognizes that a four-lane Eglinton Avenue operation (reduced from the current six lanes) in this segment has considerable merit from a planning perspective, but it does not appear that enough work has been done by Metrolinx or TTC (or the City) to date to say that – in the absence of the median LRT line - simply eliminating the outside two lanes and converting them to non-road space is the appropriate or best consequential action.	Detailed traffic analysis was undertaken during the preparation of the original EPR to justify the reduction of road capacity from six lanes to four lanes. The only difference here is that the LRT is grade separated from traffic, which should be an improvement. Further analysis regarding the bus movements will be shared with the City.
34	Transportation Services	General	The new draft EPR Addendum does not explicitly address the cross-section of Eglinton Avenue between Jane Street and Black Creek Drive, which was originally to be modified to accommodate surface LRT, but is not within the immediate scope of the LRT project due to the line no longer being at-grade.	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.
35	Transportation Services	General	It is important to clarify the planned Eglinton Avenue cross-section west of Black Creek Drive before Metrolinx's EPR Addendum is approved.	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.
36	Transportation Services	General	The EA consequences are worth considering; maintaining the existing six lanes and simply designating curb space for the passenger pick-up and drop-off area is a pre-approved EA action and need not require any further approvals or documentation on Metrolinx's part, while altering the curb lines to reduce the through lanes will require explanation, consideration of alternatives, and incorporation in the current EPR Addendum (or leaving it to the City to address as an expansion to the scope of the Eglinton Crosstown EA study).	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
37	Transportation Services	General	In particular, it needs to be determined whether a six-lane cross-section allows for a continuous cycling link. In preliminary discussions, Metrolinx has demonstrated that a multi-use path on the north side of the street could be accommodated in their current plan. However, the rail bridge is a constrained area where this facility may not fit with a sidewalk. A path on the north side of Eglinton would, however, obviate the need for a bicycle lane on the south side.	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.
38	Transportation Services	General	Before signing off on the "recommended plan" for four lanes it would be appropriate to have the curb lanes assessed in terms of the most functional and beneficial combination of:- Pedestrian space / sidewalks- Boulevard / landscaping space- Bicycle lanes or paths- Passenger pick-up and drop-off (PPUDO)- Bus stops (noting that TTC has yet to provide a bus routing / bus stop requirements plan)- Short-term parking- Turn lanes (including double left(s)) at Eglinton / Black Creek- Intersection approach queue storage These uses may vary over the length of the segment under consideration, and they may differ in the eastbound and westbound directions. No such plans have been drawn up to date. Alternative plans should be drawn up for the TAC's consideration, and a process to reach a single recommended plan should be defined.	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.
39	Transportation Services	General	Conceptually, we would see merit in considering some variant of the following road configuration: Westbound 1) approach to Black Creek: two through lanes plus left and right turn lanes (and tapers) and a bicycle lane 2) Black Creek to rail structure: two through lanes plus indented curbside space signed for bus stop, taxi stand, and/or PPUDO; two-way bike path plus sidewalk to the north. 3) under rail structure: two through lanes plus two-way bike path plus sidewalk 4) rail structure to Weston Road: two through lanes plus bus stop (at main station entrance) plus taxi stand, two-way bike path and sidewalk along with right turn and left turn lanes at Weston intersection 5) west of Weston Road: two lanes	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
40	Transportation Services	General	Eastbound1) approach to Weston Road: two through lanes plus left and right turn lanes (and tapers); no bicycle lane because two-way bike path provided off-street on north side of Eglinton2) Weston Road to rail structure: two through lanes plus indented far side bus bay to serve primary LRT station entrance3) at rail structure: two through lanes plus wide sidewalk4) rail structure to bus intersection: two through lanes plus taper to right turn bus storage lane5) bus intersection to Black Creek Drive: two through lanes plus developed (or at least protection for) double left turn lanes and a developed right turn lane6) east of Black Creek Drive: two through lanes plus a bicycle laneThe City's current Crosstown EA addresses the roadway to the east, and will design to accommodate road users including motorists, buses, pedestrians, and cyclists.	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.
41	Transportation Services	General	The recent design changes proposed for the Eglinton Crosstown LRT line are being addressed through Metrolinx's East and West EPR Addenda, but there is a notable gap in the current report when it comes to the cross-section of Eglinton Avenue west of Black Creek Drive. The previous EA from 2010 included a four-lane cross-section plus LRT and bicycle lanes. Since LRT is no longer proposed to be at-grade, there is no need to designate two lanes for transit. There must be clear direction and a plan collaboratively developed with the City for this section of Eglinton before the EPR Addendum is approved – either to maintain the existing six-lane cross-section, to adopt a four-lane cross section per the 2010 EA approval, or as is being recommended to explore other options with alternative uses for the curb lane, also considering bicycle facilities in either alternative that would connect to those east of Black Creek Drive (currently being studied as part of the City's Eglinton Avenue EA).	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.
42	Technical Services (Design & Construction - Linear Infrastructure)	General	For Information:The Eglinton Crosstown Draft EPR Addendum did not address the issues of the future Black Creek Drive and Eglinton Avenue West - grade separation as per the memo from Stephen Schijins (dated Dec. 12, 2012).Metrolinx has to include the provision of the future grade separation of Black Creek Drive and Eglinton Avenue West in their EPR Addendum for the span arrangements of their proposed elevated structure (north of Eglinton Avenue West) across Black Creek Drive.	Noted. City Planning staff have indicated to Metrolinx that the future grade separation need not be protected for in the e-mail message from Tim Laspa to Mark Ciavarro dated February 1, 2013.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
43	Technical Services (Design & Construction - Linear Infrastructure)	General	The report identified the design of stormwater management for the MSF will comply with City's guidelines and requirements but noted the need for stormwater management for works associated LRT contained in this addendum are negligible and therefore no control will be necessary. However, the requirements for stormwater management should be assessed for the LRT project as one entity rather individually at one section. In addition, the proposed road grade changes, specifically at the intersection of Black Creek Drive and Eglinton Avenue West, need to be assessed and reviewed for impact to the drainage and stormwater management.	if possible, the Stormwater management for the MSF and the LRT mainline will be combined. There are no proposed grade changes of Black Creek Drive and Eglinton Avenue West.
44	Technical Services (Design & Construction - Linear Infrastructure)	General	A reminder to the proponent that any surface segments of the LRT track and structure cannot be located in the same alignment directly above the City's sewer and watermain infrastructure. Sufficient separation clearances must be provided between the LRT and City's sewer and water infrastructure to ensure unimpeded accesses by City staff during maintenance of the infrastructure and without impacting the LRT operation. Sewers and Watermain may require relocation which could have significant cost implication and therefore should form part of the analysis in determining the feasibility of the design options.	The proposed alignment modifications to the Eglinton LRT in either the West or East sections do not appear to introduce any conflicts with the City's existing sewer and water infrastructure. Sections 5.3.6 and 7.3 will be modified to include the commitment to confirm any impacts to municipal services during the detailed design phase of the project, and to design any required relocations in compliance with the City's access requirements.
45	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Urban Forestry)	General	In keeping with City objectives relating to naturalisation, canopy expansion, and forest renewal, Urban Forestry (UF) supports the expansion of parkland into the floodplain portion of the lands in the NW corner of Black Creek Drive and Eglinton Avenue. UF is interested in seeing the existing forest cover in this area improved, and open areas renaturalised. UF needs to be consulted with respect to any proposed plans to re-purpose this portion of the site.	Consultation will continue with UF during subsequent phases of the project.
46	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Urban Forestry)	General	The City's Ravine & Natural Feature Protection by-law extends through much of the West Section and the MSF lands (the south east portion of the Kodak site). All trees in RNFP are protected against injury and removal, and all grades are protected against alteration. As such, UF permit is required for any tree removals or injuries. The issuance of a permit will be conditional upon UF being satisfied that tree protection measures will be provided for features not permitted to be injured or removed, as well as compensation (replacement planting) for features being permitted to be injured or removed, including loss of protected area.	Section 7 of the report will reflect the commitment to obtain the necessary permits from Urban Forestry, City of Toronto for subsequent phases of the project.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
47	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Urban Forestry)	General	The City's Private Tree by-law, Street Tree by-law, and Parks by-law provide for tree protection outside of the Ravine and Natural feature Protection area. Under these by-laws, all trees on city owned lands (including road allowances & parks) and all trees 30 cm and greater on private property are protected against injury and removal. Permits are required from UF.	Section 7 of the report will reflect the commitment to obtain the necessary permits from Urban Forestry, City of Toronto for subsequent phases of the project.
48	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Parks Development)	General	The preferred alignment swings the LRT north out of the Eglinton Avenue ROW as an elevated transitway and skirts the south edge of Keelesdale Park North. The amount of parkland needed as a property acquisition to accommodate the LRT needs to be confirmed and existing protocols with TTC and Metrolinx for dealing with property issues, (i.e. replacement / compensation for parkland, need to be followed).	The amount of property required is insignificant (less than 0.1ha - SB), and does not impact sports fields. The loss of park land will be mitigated.
49	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Parks Development)	General	If the preferred alignment affects the operation of the baseball diamond and other park functions, these will have to be mitigated through design or through compensation or replacement of the facilities and programming (e.g. permitted use by sports groups).	The current alignment does not impact the baseball diamond or park operations.
<b>Chapter 1</b>				
76	City Planning	Page 1-5 (Section 1.4.1)	Supporting studies are not included in the EPR Addendum, including: transportation impact study, parking study for MSF facility and Kodak Building 9, and pedestrian/bicycle circulation and connection study to the facility.	Section 2.1.3 will be revised to include a preliminary level-of-service traffic analysis for the key intersections (Eglinton Avenue at Weston Road, Black Creek Drive, the No Frills site access, and Black Creek Drive at Photography Drive) in the LRT West Section study area, under both a 4-General Purpose Lane (GPL) and reiterated in Section 5.3.11. The potential for traffic impacts associated with the proposed MSF site will be added to Section 5.3.11.
<b>Section 2</b>				
110	City Planning	Page 2-1 (Section 2.1.1.1)	There needs to be more detailed discussions of why new LRT alignment options have been proposed and explored and why the LRT alignment in the approved 2010 EPR is no longer a suitable option. The discussion regarding the reasons for the changes need to quote or provide a reference to supporting documentation justifying the need for ATC. This could include technical reports or reference to a Metrolinx board decision.	Section 2.1.1.1 will be modified to include more detailed discussion on the need for ATC.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
114	City Planning	Page 2-1(Section 2.1.1.2)	3rd Bullet - What lands east of Kodak have been reserved for redevelopment? 4th Bullet – The cost of re-grading the Kodak lands to a lower elevation "likely" to be cost prohibitive. Was this option given serious consideration?	This is a statement from the Jane-Keele Study. It will be removed from the EPR Addendum.
127	City Planning	Page 2-3(Section 2.1.1.3)	Option 4 - Clarification is required. The report says "traffic lanes would have to be taken to accommodate the LRT ROW resulting in a reduction in the road capacity of Eglinton Avenue." Does this refer to traffic lane reductions beyond what was already approved with the 2010 EPR? If not, it should be noted that a reduction to four lanes was already justified.	The quote is from the Jane-Keele Study, and simply notes that the cross-section would be reduced. The text will be modified to state that a four-lane cross-section was already justified.
140	City Planning	Page 2-7 & 2-8(Section 2.1.1.4)	Criterion 4 -The criterion should state "must not significantly impact Eglinton Avenue road traffic capacity beyond the capacity reduction already approved with the 2010 EPR". The reduction in road capacity has already been justified.	Agreed. Text will be modified.
147	City Planning	Page 2-13(Table 2-1)	The criterion used in table appears to have been done at a high level to arrive at the preferred alternation (option 11). Weighting assigned to each criterion unknown. Numbers for each criterion would provide a better comparison among the alignment options. What are the station depths? Estimated construction duration? The preliminary cost estimates? How many property takings would be required under each alignment option?	No weights were assigned to each criterion.
149	City Planning	Page 2-14(Section 2.1.1.5)	The track alignment recommendation does not provide a clear and detailed answer for why Option 11 is superior to Option 10. It is unclear from the text how the evaluation was performed to arrive at the recommended alternative. Was the evaluation process quantitative or qualitative? The evaluation methodology and weighting assigned to each criterion needs to be transparent.	The text will be revised. Option 11 is superior to Option 10 in that the roadways will need to be raised in order for the LRT to pass below (the raising will cause impacts to property development), and LRT will remain in the floodplain.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
150	City Planning	Figure 2-5	<p>The EPR Addendum appears to modify the previously-approved street cross-section in the study area. The revised scheme largely reverts to the existing condition, except for the introduction of a bus-only signalized intersection west of Black Creek Drive. The revised scheme is inconsistent with the City's vision for Eglinton Avenue and that of the Mount Dennis Mobility Hub Study. It precludes the introduction of bicycle lanes and public realm improvements. The proposed plan should show the previously-approved street cross-section (modified to account for the removal of the LRT right-of-way at grade).</p>	<p>As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.</p>
164	City Planning	Page 2-21(Section 2.1.3.1)	<p>MSF identified as requiring 162 LRV's (54 vehicles @ 3 cars per vehicle). Initial operations will be with 2 cars per vehicle or 108 LRV's. Can the MSF be phased to reduce the impacts and help achieve other City Building objectives? If full build out of MSF is not required until line is extended to Airport, then bus terminal will be reduced which may provide increased flexibility. Clarification required - Is the McCowan Yard still proposed to be used for LRV vehicle storage for the Eglinton Crosstown LRT given that the line is now separate from the Scarborough RT? Our understanding was that there would be no direct connecting tracks at Kennedy Station allowing for these vehicle movements.</p>	<p>The full capacity required for the MSF site must be protected for in order to be implemented upon funding availability, therefore, regardless of the initial capacity required, no interim development will be allowed on site. Regarding the bus terminal, see response to #168 (below). McCowan will not be used for LRT storage.</p>

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
168	City Planning	Page 2-21(Section 2.1.3.1)Page 3-2(Section 3.2.2)	Bus terminal requirements for 15 bays needs to be further assessed and alternatives that are less land consumptive explored. All alternatives take the need for 15 bays as a given – can this be reduced through sharing of bays by less multiple routes that have less frequent service? Also, 9 of the 15 bays are identified for articulated buses – is this in accordance with TTC Service Planning's requirements for 2020?While the EPR Addendum shows the ultimate built out of the vehicle capacity requirements and building facilities, can it clarify the conditions under which the facilities and mobility hub capacity will be phasing-in? This can provide room for alternative short term benefits like parking, or the movement of the bus bays and passenger pick-up/drop-off areas for the accommodation of amenity space and the improvement of the public realm.	The text in Section 2.1.4 will be modified to clarify that the bus terminal capacity requirement was determined (and repeated confirmed) by TTC's Service Planning group, and reflects the short-term service plan (i.e. prior to the westerly extension of the LRT). Upon implementation of Phase 2 of the Eglinton LRT project (extension of the LRT westerly), the bus terminal capacity requirement will be reduced, and will introduce potential to downsize the bus terminal. Metrolinx has met with TTC Service Planning numerous times regarding the capacity of the terminal; the response continues to be a requirement of 15 bays. If the City wishes to pursue this matter, Metrolinx will be happy to participate.
171	City Planning	Page 2-21(Section 2.1.3.2)	Metrolinx has committed to retaining Kodak Building 9, but, the building is poorly integrated with the preferred alternative, has no parking or loading. The current placement of the bus bays, the passenger pick-up/drop-off area and other facilities sterilizes Kodak Building 9. Without providing convenient pedestrian connections to the building, parking, and public amenity space around it, the building cannot provide for any public or private uses.	Metrolinx will consult with the City during the Mobility Hub Study to determine the best reuse of the Kodak Building. As the LRT is extended and the required number of bus bays is reduced at the bus terminal, opportunities will arise to improve public amenity space and parking around the building.
176	City Planning	Page 2-21(Section 2.1.3.3)	Alternative designs considered for MSF should be identified in the EPR Addendum. It is unclear how the recommended design was determined to be the best option.	The design shown in the EPR Addendum is a concept. ProjectCo (the designer/builder) will develop the final yard configuration.
190	City Planning	Page 2-24(Section 2.1.4.3)	Is the south property for the proposed bus terminal owned by the City of Toronto or the Toronto Transit Commission? There are conflicting notes in the discussion of the different alternatives.	The property on the south side of Eglinton Avenue is owned by the City of Toronto. The text in Section 2.1.4.3 will be revised to reflect the correct ownership.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
196	City Planning	Page 2-29(Section 2.1.4.4)	For transparency purposes, the EPR Addendum needs to explain how the evaluation criteria were selected, weighted, and scored.No planning criteria in the list of key factors used for evaluation. The evaluation of MSF indicates traffic analysis was undertaken for alternatives – this information is not included in addendum.	Information on the selection of evaluation criteria will be added along with traffic analysis for the MSF (Bus terminal).
198	City Planning	Page 2-29(Section 2.1.4.5)	There needs to be a discussion about how the assessment of alternatives resulted in a recommendation, making reference to the evaluation in Table 2-3.	Text will be revised to better describe the rationale for selection of Option 1a.
200	City Planning	Page 2-30(Table 2-3)	Factors used to evaluate MSF alternatives are very high level.What are the impacts and costs of new structure over Eglinton to accommodate preferred option (1a)?It is unknown what are the impacts of the new signalized intersection on Eglinton Avenue (to access bus terminal) and the impacts of directing all passenger pick-up/drop-off operations to Photography Drive / Black Creek Drive?	Section 2.1.3 will be revised to include a preliminary level-of-service traffic analysis for the key intersections (Eglinton Avenue at Weston Road, Black Creek Drive, the No Frills site access, and Black Creek Drive at Photography Drive) in the LRT West Section study area, under a 4-General Purpose Lane (GPL), and reiterated in Section 5.3.11. The potential for traffic impacts associated with the proposed MSF site will be added to Section 5.3.11.
201	City Planning	Page 2-30(Table 2-3)	This table appears to contain a number of errors based on our preliminary review:- Confirm that Alternative 3 is actually Alternative 2b as per the previous drawings. The comments that follow assume that this is a labelling error, and that Alternative 3 is in fact Alternative 2b.- Property requirements: According to the drawings provided, the design for Alternative 2b does not require the same amount of land or 55 parking spaces from the No Frills site, as shown in the table.- Bus access/egress: According to drawings and the descriptions of the alternatives earlier in the report, Alternatives 1a and 1b require a new signalized intersection at Eglinton Avenue, contrary to the text in the table. They should therefore have the same score as Alternatives 2a and 2b.	Noted. Table 2-3 will be revised and updated to reflect the revised alternative numbering and design modifications.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
202	City Planning	Page 2-30(Table 2-3)	Table appears to contain a number of errors based on our preliminary review (continued):- Potential for traffic impacts: According to drawings earlier in the report, Alternatives 1a and 1b do not show a right-in/right-out scheme, but rather a signalized intersection just like Alternatives 2a and 2b.- Capital cost: This should use the same evaluation outcomes as other criteria (poor, fair, good) to facilitate comparisons and summarization of criteria.- Cultural impacts: Alternative 1b should be scored ""poor"" due to the lack of access to Kodak Building 9.	Noted. Table 2-3 will be revised and updated to reflect the revised alternative numbering and design modifications.
<b>Section 3</b>				
211	City Planning	Page 3-2(Section 3.2.2)	There is only a minimal summary table showing proposed buses at the Mount Dennis bus terminal. A description of changes to each bus route and a map showing the new bus route alignments should be included.With so many bus routes being diverted to the Mount Dennis Bus Terminal, what are the impacts to ridership and headways?	A description of the proposed bus route modifications will be added to Section 3.2.2.
215	City Planning	Page 3-3(Section 3.3.1)	The second paragraph indicates LRV "may be" controlled by Automatic Train Operation (ATO). The whole reason for the EPR Addendum was for ATO, so, this should be changed to "will be".	Text in section 3.3.1 will be revised to be more definitive regarding the future implementation of ATC.
221	EMS	3.3.3.1	Where ROW curb and running surface is mountable, ensure height of cantenary wires and cantilever poles are appropriate for emergency vehicle heights. Curb height and design should agree with Waterfront Toronto project.	As a matter of policy, Metrolinx has determined that none of the areas of LRT being addressed under this EPR Addendum will be accessible to EMS vehicles.
229	EMS	3.3.4	All elevators should be large enough for paramedics with emergency equipment. This includes an EMS patient stretcher in the full flat position. TTC has the required specifications regarding elevator size. Stairwells for emergency access during power disruptions are appropriately sized to accomodate exiting patrons & entering emergency personnel.	This is a detail that will be addressed in detailed design.
230	EMS	3.3.4	Entrances to stations should have a City of Toronto municipal address, which should be referred to when requesting emergency services. The entrance with elevator access should be the primary response location. We recommend designated stairs for emergency responders entering. Also consider stairwells to be appropriately sized to accomodate exiting patrons and entering emergency personnel. Stations should have designated staging areas for various emergency response vehicles, with appropriate turning radius.	This is a detail that will be addressed in detailed design.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
231	EMS	3.3.6	Emergency Exit Buildings should have a City of Toronto municipal address, which should be referred to when requesting emergency services to this location. We recommend designated stairs for emergency responders entering. Also consider stairwells to be appropriately sized to accommodate exiting patrons and entering emergency personnel.	This is a detail that will be addressed in detailed design.
246	City Planning	Page 3-11(Section 3.4.3)	Reference is made to Section 1.4.4 outlining the two phased approaches to implementation, but no such section exists in the EPR Addendum. A bus routing plan should be developed and shown, indicating which bus routes will use each bus bay in the bus terminal. The description of the access refers to right-in/right-out access. As noted before, this is inconsistent with the descriptions provided in other parts of the report and in the drawings. Also, the figure reference should be to Figure 3-8.	Text will be revised to reflect the corrected reference of Section 1.4.3.
247	City Planning	Page 3-12(Section 3.4.4)	Passenger pick-up/drop-off facility should be reviewed for design, size and integration with Building 9 to achieve a more compact design. Are 45 spaces needed especially given the long route to get to and from the facility for vehicles? How was the 45 short term parking spaces determined? Was it a matter of how many spaces can be accommodated within the available space?	The proposed PPUDO was sized to fit within the available parcel of land.
248	Toronto Water	Figure 3-7c	The LRT tunnel under Weston Road and Georgetown GO tracks will conflict with Mt Dennis CTS trunk sewer. Utility conflicts will need to be addressed.	The Mt. Dennis Station conflicts with an existing watermain, we are unaware of a conflict with a trunk sewer, additional information will be requested from City of Toronto.
249	City Planning	Figure 3-7d	The proposed location of the secondary entrance is shown within the Eglinton Avenue road allowance and this entrance should be contained within the MSF lands. The secondary entrance is also in an area that the Mount Dennis Mobility Hub Study is proposing as a green space connection. The currently-proposed location for the secondary entrance for Mount Dennis Station severely obstructs the public realm along Eglinton Avenue. The secondary entrance should be relocated from the public sidewalk to a location underneath the aerial structure where it can provide a direct connection from the street to the east end of the LRT platform, without the need to direct pedestrian routes through a complex system of concourses and passageways. For a mobility hub, numerous pedestrian secondary entrances should be provided. We need to provide easy and numerous pedestrian access point to the mobility hub from the north side of Eglinton Avenue, as well as the south side of Eglinton Avenue (over and/or under Eglinton Avenue). Perhaps explore a pedestrian bridge alongside Photography Drive.	The issues regarding a secondary entrance is being addressed through the site plan review process.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
250	City Planning	Figure 3-7d	The alignment for the elevated guideway should be shifted north to achieve space for building development to drop and front onto Eglinton Avenue and protect for the development of future retail buildings or a covered pedestrian walkway along the north side of Eglinton Avenue, west of Black Creek Drive. This could include extending the station box easterly and constructing it so that it could accommodate future development over the approach to the station platform where the track is exposed to Eglinton Avenue as currently proposed. This would require a minimum dimension between the property line and the LRT alignment of 12 metres.	Metrolinx has reviewed this request and will be unable to support this change because it will result in the need for the demolition of the Kodak Building. Moving the LRT further to the north appears to have impacts on private property in the Mount Dennis neighbourhood and potentially to the baseball diamond in Coronation Park.
251	City Planning	Figure 3-7e	Can the pick-up/drop-off be made easier and less circuitous for people? For a mobility hub, the pick-up/drop-off should be more convenient. Can a road connection also be evaluated from Black Creek Drive? For a mobility hub, multiple transportation modes, access nodes, and ease of movement are necessary.	A shorter route to the PPUDO would likely impact bus operations. This project does not preclude the ability for a proponent to implement a road connection through a later separate study.
252	City Planning	Figure 3-7e	The proposed MSF should have building prominence on Industry Street as there is no building frontage on Industry Street and the parking area is within 10 metre top of bank. There should be no parking directly in front of the building between the main entrance and the sidewalk. Moving the proposed MSF buildings alongside Industry Street would help to minimize the impact of parking. Parking could be consolidated on one side of the building, or the parking lot could be split into two separate lots to accommodate this. What are the green items shown on the drawing along Industry Street (not noted in the legend)? Median strips? Landscaping? Where does the ramp / driveway from the east employee parking lot lead to? Does it connect with Industry Street? Is it for use by employees only?	Metrolinx will commit to consultation with the City during the development of performance specifications and during the commercial period to address these concerns.
253	City Planning	Figure 3-7e	The layout of the MSF yard should protect for the future construction of the road through the site connecting Photography Drive to Todd Baylis Boulevard, consistent with the alignment in the Mobility Hub Plan, when the bus terminal is demolished in Phase 2 of the Eglinton Crosstown LRT project.	This project does not preclude the ability for a proponent to implement a road connection through a later separate study.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
254	Toronto Water	Figure 3-7e	The Mt. Dennis ECLRT node contains a ECLRT station, GO station, Bus Terminal, and the ECLRT Storage and Maintenance facility (MSF) and as such is captured by three (3) major review processes being:- EA amendment- Site Plan Approval- Mobility Hub design under Transportation The EA and amendment state that stations shall comply with WWFM guidelines while ROW will not. Toronto Water has repeatedly requested for WWFM guideline compliance for ROW work when imperviousness is increased. ECLRT project team responses to these requests have yielded unsuccessful results to date. The MSF is a huge stoned surface marshalling yard with massive infiltration potential and would have more than enough capacity to ameliorate imperviousness increase for the entire project both Station and ROW. This comment was supplied to the pre-submission meetings and should be raised as an EA amendment and Mobility Hub issue as well.	This will be further discussed with the City.
256	Toronto Water	Figure 3-7f	Piers for the elevated LRT structure over the Black Creek watercourse and Black Creek Drive appear to conflict with the Black Creek STS and the proposed Keele Relief Trunk Sewer.	Utility relocation conflicts will be identified.
259	EMS	3.4.4	Elevators and stairwells to/from tunnel should be large enough for paramedics with emergency equipment. This includes an EMS patient stretcher in the full flat position. TTC has the required specifications regarding elevator size. We recommend later discussion regarding municipal addressing of affiliated building entrances and parking areas.	This is a detail that will be addressed in detailed design.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
269	City Planning	Page 3-15(Section 3.4.5)	The road modifications proposed in the original 2010 EPR should be retained as mitigating measures (see further comments on mitigation below), despite no longer being required for the implementation of the LRT right-of-way in this section. The approvals obtained in 2010 to reconfigure the road were in support of other planning policy objectives and should not be rescinded through this amendment simply because they are no longer required for the LRT. Also, it should be noted that this section of Eglinton Avenue is subject to the Mobility Hub Study public realm plan, not Eglinton Connects. It is prudent and appropriate for the EPR Addendum document to include intersection improvements at Eglinton Avenue and Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. These intersections and the way they are treated are key public realm success factors for an urban mobility hub. The Eglinton Avenue cross section needs to be re-examined. Is there any way that vehicles going to the passenger pick-up / drop-off area can use the Eglinton Avenue access? Having vehicles use Photography Drive via Black Creek Drive seems to be a very long and circuitous route.	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. This addendum will address public realm between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. It appears, though, that to allow mixed traffic to reach the PPUDO by using the same routing as buses reaching the terminal would create traffic impacts.
270	Transportation Services	Page 3-15(Section 3.4.5)	Section 3.4.5: States that "...there is no opportunity to modify the Eglinton Road [sic] cross-section under this project through the study area. The ultimate cross-section for Eglinton Avenue, through the study area, will be determined through the City of Toronto's current "Eglinton Connects" study..."Currently, the City's EA for Eglinton (aka "Eglinton Connects") does not extend west of Black Creek Drive and does not address this question.	As stated in the Response to Comment #24, Metrolinx has agreed to a four-lane cross-section between Weston Road and Black Creek Drive. Metrolinx is further committing to work with the City to further define the pedestrian and cycling elements on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.
274	City Planning	Page 3-16(Section 3.4.6)	The discussion needs to refer to the bridge design as a "light and airy structure".	The aesthetic treatment of the structure will be determined through the detailed design phase of the project. Metolinx will commit to working with the City regarding aesthetic treatments.
282	City Planning	Page 3-17(Section 3.5.1)	The alignment is shown in Figure 3-9, not Figure 3-10.	The reference will be revised to reflect Figure 3-9.
289	City Planning	Page 3-22(Section 3.6.1)	A phased option for MSF should be evaluated to explore alternatives.	The EPR Addendum will address the maximum footprint to assess the maximum potential impact.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
290	City Planning	Page 3-24(Section 3.6.6)	Parking for 400 vehicles is identified as being feasible for the MSF. What is required to support the short and long term requirements?	The 400 vehicle parking capacity is the anticipated requirement for the ultimate site development.
293	EMS	3.6.5	MSF should be accessible by emergency responders. This includes vehicular access and access by staff with emergency equipment. Designated staging area with the required turning radius for responding emergency vehicles is recommended.	This is a detail that will be addressed in detailed design.
<b>Section 4</b>				
303	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Urban Forestry)	Page 4-5(Section 4.1.1.5)	The Addendum states: 'As the Kentucky Coffee Tree identified north of the proposed works is not on federal lands, SARA does not apply.' The species is protected, regardless of ownership of lands. The intent and meaning of this statement should be made clear.	SARA does not apply; however, the ESA does. The text will be clarified.
321	City Planning	Page 4-29 to 4-31(Table 4-1)	Item 8: Kodak Building No. 9 (3500 Eglinton Avenue West) is not included on City of Toronto Inventory of Heritage Properties as a Listed building and should be removed from the table. Omitted from the table is 2700 Eglinton Avenue West (former City of York Municipal offices). This property is Included on City of Toronto Inventory of Heritage Properties as a Listed building and should be added to the chart.	Table 4-1 will be revised to <u>remove</u> reference to Kodak Building No. 9 being included on the City of Toronto Inventory of Heritage Properties as a Listed building.  2700 Eglinton Avenue West has not been included in Table 4-1 as it is outside of the study area for this EPR Addendum.
<b>Section 5</b>				
330	City Planning	Page 5-1(Table 5-1)	Appears to be a page number error. This should be page 5-4 and not page 5-1.	Page numbering revised
331	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Urban Forestry)	Page 5-1(Table 5-1)	It is not clear what the difference is between the blue and black classifications. The table is identified as 'in progress'. UF will require another review of the Table when it is completed, as it appears many interactions for Terrain and Soils, and Ecosystems and Wildlife have not yet been noted.	As noted, Table 5-1 is a work in progress and will be completed prior to finalizing the EPR Addendum. Table 5-1 will reflect details provided in the factor specific sections within Chapter 5. The final table will not include any text in blue.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
338	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Urban Forestry)	Page 5-18(Section 5.3.4.1)	The statement 'The overall limited capacity of the wildlife habitat and the type of species supported by these isolated patches of vegetation reduces the significance attributable to the loss' is misleading and contradictory to the Ravine & Natural Feature Protection bylaw, as it suggests that only high quality habitat should be considered worthy of protection. UF requests such dismissive statements be deleted in this and all subsequent locations. All of the area within the Ravine & Natural Feature Protection bylaw is regarded as worthy of protection, as the supply of natural and naturalised lands in the city is very limited, and all have the capability of being enhanced.	This was not intended to suggest that only high quality habitat will be considered worthy of protection. Requested edits will be made.
339	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Urban Forestry)	Page 5-18(Section 5.3.4.1)	Section 5.3.4.1: The meaning or value of the environmental protection measure "Natural Environment Features MSF Lands" is not obvious. An explanation of this measure should be provided so UF can evaluate it. Mention is made of the need to obtain a permit from UF under the Ravine & Natural Feature Protection bylaw. It should be noted that, outside of the Ravine & Natural Feature Protection bylaw area, permission from UF will be required to injure or destroy any tree in any road allowance, in a park, or on an adjacent property, under other city tree bylaws, whether in a natural area or manicured/landscaped area. The issuance of a permit will be conditional upon UF being satisfied that tree protection measures will be provided for features not permitted to be injured or removed, as well as compensation (replacement planting) for features being permitted to be injured or removed.	Additional detail will be added.  As noted in a comment re: Natural Environment Existing Conditions, Impact Assessment and Mitigation Recommendations, the City of Toronto does not have authority to issue permits where there is provincial or federal interest. Jurisdiction will be clarified in reference to permit requirements.
340	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Urban Forestry)	Section 5.3.4.1	Terrestrial impacts are expected, including loss of 1.8ha of "vegetation" associated with the MSF. This is a significant loss within the urban context, however it is unclear from the description provided on page 5-19 what areas are included in this assessment as they are not clearly delineated in the referenced figure 4-1 (or figure 4.2). Figures 4-1, 4-2 and 4-3 should be revised, or additional figures provided, to clearly identify natural areas being directly lost/impacted. On page 5-20 of this section, paragraph 2 should also identify the need to address City of Toronto Ravine Protection bylaws for the development associated with the MSF and lead tracks, where the greatest tree and ravine area losses are anticipated.	Additional detail will be added.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
348	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Urban Forestry)	Page 5-42(Section 5.4.4)	Section 5.4.4: The construction impacts relating to Ecosystems and Wildlife have not been revised to address the MSF lands. This revision should be provided to UF for review. The first paragraph on page 5-42 states that 'trees or shrubs will be replaced with the identical species and girth, and a modified restoration plan will be determined.' This is not in keeping with UF practice. This line should simply indicate: Failing or failed trees and shrubs will be replaced with species and numbers to the satisfaction of UF. This correction should also be made to the appropriate section of Table 5-7.	Requested edits will be made.
353	EMS	5.5.5	If the ROW curb and running surface is mountable, ensure height or cantenary wires and cantilever poles are appropriate for emergency vehicle heights. Curb height and design should agree with Waterfront Toronto project.	As a matter of policy, Metrolinx has determined that none of the areas of LRT being addressed under this EPR Addendum will be accessible to EMS vehicles.
354	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Urban Forestry)	Natural Environment Existing Conditions, Impact Assessment and Mitigation Recommendations	The following comments relate to the LRT West Section and Black Creek MSF, based on the Eglinton Crosstown LRT – West Section, Natural Environment Existing Conditions, Impact Assessment and Mitigation Recommendations, Dec 21/12, MMM Group: The Impact Assessment indicates that the removal of the Black Creek stop and the provision of one underground stop will reduce impacts to terrestrial habitat, although the development of the Black Creek MSF will result in greater losses to vegetation. The MSF site was not previously assessed.	No revisions required. Comment provides context for the following comment.
355	Parks, Forestry & Recreation (Urban Forestry)	Natural Environment Existing Conditions, Impact Assessment and Mitigation Recommendations	The MSF will require the removal of 1.8 ha of naturalised vegetation. As well, the previously identified impacts for the LRT have changed as a result of finding significant species. The Impact Assessment indicates the need to obtain a permit from UF under the Ravine & Natural Feature Protection bylaw. It should be noted that, outside of the Ravine & Natural Feature Protection bylaw area, permission from UF will be required to injure or destroy any tree in any road allowance, in a park, or on an adjacent property, under other city tree bylaws, whether in a natural area or manicured/landscaped area. The issuance of a permit will be conditional upon UF being satisfied that tree protection measures will be provided for features not permitted to be injured or removed, as well as compensation (replacement planting) for features being permitted to be injured or removed. Proposed injuries or removals of significant species will require approvals under applicable legislation. The City of Toronto does not have authority to issue permits where there is provincial or federal interest.	Additional detail will be added to the main EPR Addendum and appended natural environment memos.  As noted, the City of Toronto does not have authority to issue permits where there is provincial or federal interest. Jurisdiction will be clarified in reference to permit requirements.

Item No.	Discipline	Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #	Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)	Response & Details (Designer)
Section 6				
Section 7				
Appendices				