

# Chapter 8 – Consultation Process



**407 TRANSITWAY - KENNEDY ROAD TO BROCK ROAD**

**MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION - CENTRAL REGION**

## 8. CONSULTATION PROCESS

### 8.1. Overview

Consultation is an integral component of the EA process and essential to the successful completion of this study. A consultation process has been undertaken throughout the study to assist in the planning and impact assessment process for the 407 Transitway. The consultation process was designed to address the requirements for *Ontario Regulation 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings*. Consultation was initiated before the formal declaration of the project being undertaken under the TPAP in August 2014, through the mailing of initial contact letters to stakeholders. The TPAP for this project was initiated on September 1, 2016.

Consultation was conducted with government review agencies, technical agencies, local municipalities, general public, property owners and Aboriginal communities.

The consultation process included the following types of consultation activities:

- Public notices;
- Liaison with relevant agencies including regulatory agencies, municipalities, interested parties and members of the public (property owners were notified beyond the required 30 m of the project limits);
- Public Information Centres (PICs); and,
- Project website.

### 8.2. Consultation with Agencies

Notification and consultation was carried out to encourage the involvement of government agencies, technical agencies (i.e. transit authorities, utility companies, emergency medical services (EMS), etc.) and municipal staff in the Planning and Preliminary Design stages of this study. Agencies were invited to participate in the PICs, workshop and focused meetings to address specific concerns and technical requirements.

Agencies were notified of study commencement by the distribution of an initial contact letter, mailed in August 2014. Some agencies responded that after review of the study, there were no concerns and/or interests within the study area and they requested to be removed from the contact list.

Agencies were invited to attend the two rounds of PICs: PIC #1 was held on April 15 and 16, 2015 and PIC#2 was on **June 22 and 23, 2016**. PIC invitation letters were mailed on **April 1, 2015** and **June 7, 2016**, for PIC #1 and #2 respectively. A contact letter was mailed to advise agencies of the formal start of TPAP on **August 29, 2016**. The Draft EPR was distributed to members of the TRG on **April 22, 2016** for review and comment. On **December 19, 2016**, a letter of notification was mailed to inform the submission of the EPR and study completion.

The following is a list of agencies that were invited to participate in the consultation process:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC);</li> <li>▪ Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO);</li> <li>▪ Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA);</li> <li>▪ Canadian Transportation Agency;</li> <li>▪ Transport Canada;</li> <li>▪ CN Rail;</li> <li>▪ Health Canada;</li> <li>▪ Fisheries and Oceans Canada;</li> <li>▪ Parks Canada;</li> <li>▪ Environment Canada;</li> <li>▪ Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport;</li> <li>▪ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH);</li> <li>▪ Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF);</li> <li>▪ Ministry of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA);</li> <li>▪ Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC);</li> <li>▪ Metrolinx;</li> <li>▪ Infrastructure Ontario (IO);</li> <li>▪ Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA);</li> <li>▪ York Region;</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ City of Markham;</li> <li>▪ Durham Region;</li> <li>▪ City of Pickering;</li> <li>▪ Ontario Provincial Police;</li> <li>▪ York Regional Police;</li> <li>▪ York Region Public Health Services</li> <li>▪ City of Markham Fire</li> <li>▪ Durham Region EMS</li> <li>▪ Durham Region Police</li> <li>▪ City of Pickering Fire</li> <li>▪ Conseil scolaire Viamonde;</li> <li>▪ Conseil scolaire de district catholique Centre-Sud;</li> <li>▪ York Catholic District School Board;</li> <li>▪ York Region District School Board;</li> <li>▪ Durham District School Board;</li> <li>▪ Durham Catholic District School Board;</li> <li>▪ GO Transit;</li> <li>▪ Durham Region Transit;</li> <li>▪ York Region Rapid Transit Corporation;</li> <li>▪ Highway 407 ETR Consortium;</li> <li>▪ Hydro One Networks Inc.;</li> <li>▪ Enbridge Pipeline Inc.;</li> <li>▪ Rogers Cable;</li> <li>▪ Bell Canada;</li> <li>▪ Power Stream Inc.; and,</li> <li>▪ Ontario Federation of Agriculture.</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

Agency communications were undertaken as required to identify and resolve any environmental or design issues associated with the project. This consisted of discussions, meetings, correspondence and/or presentations to external committees, government ministries/agencies, municipalities, municipal politicians and interest groups. Environmental approvals-in-principle were secured in writing from external agencies, where required.

#### 8.2.1. Summary of Agency Consultation Activities

**Table 8.1** presents a summary of agency correspondence and meetings held for the study during the Planning and Preliminary Design Stages. The original correspondence received from agencies is presented in **Appendix A**.

**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
<b>M.P.</b>			
M.P. Ajax-Pickering  M.P. Markham-Unionville  M.P. Oak Ridges-Markham	Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Response received from M.P. Ajax-Pickering on September 8, 2014 inquiring about the decision made to make 19.3 km stretch of highway be subject to this study.	Information regarding the planning decision for the transitway is presented in Chapter 1 of the EPR.
<b>M.P.P.</b>			
M.P.P. Ajax-Pickering  M.P.P. Markham-Unionville  M.P.P. Oak Ridges-Markham	Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
<b>FEDERAL GOVERNMENT</b>			
Canadian Transportation Agency -Senior Environmental Officer	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Transport Canada – Ontario Region, Environmental Officer -Regional Manager, Pickering Lands Branch	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  Information request email sent on October 6, 2014 to Regional Manager, Pickering Lands Branch  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Phone conversation with Regional Manager, Pickering Lands Branch on October 6, 2014.  E-mail received on August 23, 2016 indicating that Transport Canada does not require receipt of all individual or Class EA related notifications. It requests for project proponents to self-assess if their project will interact with a federal property and require approval and/or authorization under any Acts administered by Transport Canada.	No issues or concerns identified.  The Study Team has reviewed the list of Acts that Transport Canada administers including the <i>Navigation Protection Act</i> and <i>Railway Safety Act</i> . Also, a review of the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012</i> was determined that this project does not require a federal environmental assessment process.

**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
CN Rail -Public Works Design & Construction	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Health Canada -Environmental Assessment Coordinator	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Fisheries and Oceans Canada -Fisheries Protection Program	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Parks Canada -Senior Realty Advisor -Senior Planner	Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014  TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015  PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015  Meeting held on February 16, 2016 to discuss the project progress, provide comments and the status of the Rouge National Urban Park  TRG#2 was held on April 15, 2016  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016	Response received August 27, 2014 from Senior Planner noting that it will be participating as part of the Technical Resource Group, provide background information.  A copy of the latest version of the Rouge National Urban Park Management Plan was received on October 9, 2014.  Email received on April 16, 2015 with a letter dated February 10, 2015 attached signed by the Field Unit Superintendent. It provided comments on the project's consideration for access opportunities to the Rouge National Urban Park on a couple of proposed Transitway stations such as Donald Cousens and York-Durham Line area. It also included consideration for ecological enhancements through the Park. Parks Canada requests that a meeting be set up prior to 30 percent preliminary design presentation to the TRG.  Comments on the draft EPR were received on May 27, 2016.	Response letter dated April 21, 2015 was sent to the Field Unit Superintendent to address comments received on April 16, 2015. It noted the projected ridership and future transit service along York-Durham Line were insufficient to support a station at York-Durham line. However, investigation for park access will be considered at this location since MTO lands protected for the station will remain. Parks Canada suggestion of an inter-line service from one of the adjacent stations (Donald Cousens Station and/or Whites Road) will be further assessed. MTO protected land is being considered for potential environmental compensation and any proposed ecological enhancements will be discussed with Parks Canada, TRCA and MNRF as part of this study. Stage 2 archeology to be undertaken at Detail Design. Parks Canada concerns about existing tile drainage in the corridor will also be addressed at Detail Design. A meeting with Parks Canada will be planned prior to the submission of the Draft EPR to MOECC. Parks Canada will remain informed throughout the study's progress.

**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
	<p>Meeting with TRCA, MNRF and Parks Canada on July 11, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>Meeting on July 11, 2016 to discuss comments on the draft EPR. As a follow up to this meeting, on July 19, 2016, Parks Canada provided an alternative west abutment for the transitway crossing of Little Rouge Creek. It was noted that the location would provide a sufficient amount of table land that, when combined with the natural bank down to the creek, would optimise wildlife passage for this crossing (including what slope might be required in front of an abutment to existing ground level). It also would provide sufficient space for a potential west bank trail crossing across the 407ETR/Transitway corridor. Two 60-m spans at the bridge's west end, one a lengthened existing span, and a second new span are shown. It was noted the provincial Greenbelt Plan objective gives provision to ecological connectivity between Lake Ontario and the Oak Ridges Moraine.</p> <p>Email received on October 19, 2016 indicating receipt of the responses and satisfaction of the responses.</p>	<p>A response email was sent on July 21, 2016 noting that increasing the two west spans to 60m, as proposed by Parks Canada, would imply designing a different type of superstructure of the bridge with significant cost implications. As an alternative to address Parks Canada's request, maintaining the currently designed pre-stressed concrete I-Girder bridge superstructure, the 407 Transitway team can add a 42m span at the west end of the bridge without modifying the location of the proposed piers (see attached mark-up plan in Appendix A). This will be reflected in the EPR. It was noted that the 42m is the widest span allowed for a pre-stressed concrete I-Girder type of structure.</p> <p>Response letter to comments on the draft EPR was sent on October 18, 2016.</p>
<p>Environment Canada -Manager, Environmental Assessment Section</p>	<p>Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>No comments/concerns received.</p>	<p>No issues or concerns identified.</p>
<b>PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT</b>			
<p>Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport -Heritage Planner -Team Lead, Archaeology Program</p>	<p>Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Report was submitted to the Ministry on February 3, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>Letter received July 7, 2016 in response to PIC #2 notification stating interest in archaeological resources, built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes related to this project.</p> <p>A letter received November 10, 2016 indicating review of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Report. It states that based on the information contained in the report, the Ministry is satisfied that the fieldwork and reporting for the archaeological assessment are consistent with the Ministry's 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.</p>	<p>A response letter was sent on July 11, 2016 indicating that Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Report including Supplementary Documentation, Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, and that Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports and Heritage Impact Assessment Reports for 8119 and 8042 Reesor Road Properties were prepared and available in the along with the Draft EPR on the project website. Also, it noted that a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Heritage Impact Assessment Report for one property on Old Brock Road was being conducted at the time and will be part of the final EPR.</p> <p>No issues or concerns identified.</p>

**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing -Central Municipal Services Office -Senior Planner, MSO-Central -Manager, Growth Policy	Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015  TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Response received on August 20, 2014 from Senior Planner indicated that interest in participating on this study.	No issues or concerns identified.
Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry -District Planner, Aurora District	Information request sent on August 5, 2014 to District Planner  Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  Meeting with TRCA, MNRF and Parks Canada on July 11, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Letter dated May 19, 2015 received containing background information available within the study area.  Emails sent and received on August 26, 2015 to October 7, 2015 in response to data request regarding Fish Habitat sensitivity  Comments on the draft EPR were received on May 27, 2016.  Meeting on July 11, 2016 to discuss comments on the draft EPR	A letter of notification of the availability of a draft EPR was sent on April 29, 2016. In the letter key findings on Fish and Fish Habitat, Vegetation and Vegetation Communities, Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat and Designated Natural Areas were noted. Please note that after mailing of this letter - information received from TRCA (on October 2, 2016) – It was determined that West Duffins Creek ESA is within the transtway corridor.  Responses to comments on the draft EPR were sent on December 5, 2016.
Ministry of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure -Manager, Land Use Planning -Vice President, Seaton Lands -Senior Planner, Strategic Asset Planning -Senior Policy Advisor – Cabinet Office Liaison and Policy Support Unit	Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs -Policy Advisor	Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.

TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
	<p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>		
<p>Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change -Manager, York Durham District Office -Environment Resource Planner &amp; EA Coordinator -Supervisor, Project Coordination Team #1 -Special Officer, Project Coordination Team #1</p>	<p>Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>Meeting on April 6, 2016</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>Letter received from Supervisor, Project Coordination Team #1 on September 12, 2014 with a list of Aboriginal communities to be included as part of the consultation with Aboriginal communities.</p> <p>Email received on April 14, 2015 from the Special Project Officer in response to the PIC#1 invitation letters. It asked to provide an estimate as to when MOECC would be receiving the Environmental Project Report.</p> <p>Comments on the draft EPR were received on May 27, 2016 and June 6, 2016.</p>	<p>Aboriginal contact list has been updated.</p> <p>Email response sent on April 15, 2015 providing estimate dates of the project schedule set at the time.</p> <p>A response letter to comments on the draft EPR was sent on December 5, 2016.</p>
<p>Metrolinx -Senior Advisor, Strategic Policy &amp; Systems Plan -Manager, Environmental Program</p>	<p>Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>TRG#2 was held on April 15, 2016.</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>Response received on September 5, 2014 from Senior Advisor noting new contact information, there are no concerns about this study at this time but would like to be kept informed throughout the study's progress. Expressed interested in being part of any relevant committee.</p>	<p>No issues or concerns identified.</p>
<p>Infrastructure Ontario • Manager, Land Use Planning • Vice President, Seaton Lands Senior Planner, Strategic Asset Planning</p>	<p>Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>Heritage Impact Assessment Report for 8119 and 8042 Reesor Road Properties was</p>	<p>Response received on August 12, 2014 from the Senior Planner indicating that comments will be provided on this study.</p> <p>Email received on April 10, 2015 from the Senior Planner asking if PIC materials will be available on the study website after April 16, 2015.</p> <p>Email and letter received on May 14, 2015 from the Senior Planner providing comments. It provided information on lands managed by Infrastructure Ontario in relation to the preferred station locations shown at PIC#1. It was requested that at the conclusion of the TPAP, a</p>	<p>Response email sent on April 10, 2015 indicating that PIC materials will be available after April 16, 2015.</p> <p>Email response to letter received on May 14, 2015 was sent on May 25, 2015. It noted that the PIC#1 presented the need and justification of the project, the planning alternatives and the initial recommended alternatives to the public. It informed that detailed field investigations will be conducted in the summer 2015 based on which the initial recommended alternatives will be confirmed or revised and carried forward to the TPAP. It was indicated that MTO will inform IO/MEDEI of</p>

**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
	<p>submitted to the Senior Heritage Planner on February 18, 2016 to the Manager, Heritage Projects</p> <p>TRG#2 was held on April 15, 2016.</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p> <p>Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report for 3440 Brock Road was sent on August 31, 2016</p> <p>Heritage Impact Assessment Report for 3440 Brock Road was sent on October 25, 2016.</p>	<p>confirmation that MTO is releasing its interest in the balance of lands after accounting for the Transitway requirements be provided.</p> <p>Email received on May 29, 2015 from the Senior Planner inquiring how the conceptual location of the access road over MEDEI lands on the west side of Reesor Road at Donald Cousens station was determined and will further refining of the alignment of the access road occur as the study progresses.</p> <p>Comments received on the Cultural Heritage Assessment report, Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report for the two Reesor Road properties on April 8 and 11, 2016</p> <p>Comments on the draft EPR were received on May 27, 2016.</p> <p>Comments on the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report for 3440 Brock Road were received on September 7, 2016.</p> <p>Comments on the Heritage Impact Assessment Report for 3440 Brock Road were received on December 5, 2016.</p>	<p>the land being protected for the 407 Transitway facilities upon approval of the Environmental Project Report.</p> <p>Response email sent on June 2, 2015 in response to email dated May 29, 2015 indicated that due to environmental uncertainties in the lot located between Reesor Road and the CP Havelock rail line, as well as uncertainties to a potential future GO station at that location (if GO Transit operates on the CP line in the future), the Study Team is currently re-assessing the site location of the Donald Cousens Station and its access from Donald Cousens Parkway. Examination of an alternative 407 Transitway station site in the lot located between the Donald Cousens Parkway and Reesor Road, in land currently owned by MEDEI.</p> <p>Once assessment of this possibility has been done, IO will be informed for discussion.</p> <p>A response letter to commens on draft EPR was sent on October 14, 2016.</p> <p>All Cultural Heritage Evaluation and Heritage Impacts Assessment reports were revised in response to comments received.</p>
<b>CONSERVATION AUTHORITY</b>			
<p>Toronto Region Conservation Authority -Senior Planner, Environmental Assessment Planning</p>	<p>Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015</p> <p>Meeting held on March 13, 2015 to present the study to TRCA staff.</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>TRG#2 was held on April 15, 2016.</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>Meeting with TRCA, MNRF and Parks Canada on July 11, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>TRCA information was received through September 2015 to October 2015.</p> <p>Comments on the draft EPR were received on May 31, 2016.</p>	<p>esponses to comments on the draft EPR were sent on December 5, 2016.</p>
<b>MUNICIPALITIES</b>			
<p>York Region -CAO</p>	<p>Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014</p>	<p>Response received on August 13, 2014 from the Program Manager, Infrastructure Planning providing new contact (Transportation</p>	<p>No issues or concerns identified.</p>



**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Commissioner of Transportation and Community Planning</li> <li>-Program Manager, Infrastructure Planning</li> <li>-Transportation Technologist, Transportation and Community Planning</li> <li>-Director, Long Range Planning</li> <li>-Director, Community Planning and Development Services</li> </ul>	<p>Introductory meeting with City of Markham, York Region, York Region Transit/VIVA on September 15, 2014</p> <p>TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>Meeting on March 10, 2015 to discuss comments on TRG#1.</p> <p>Meeting was held on February 2, 2016 along with City of Markham to provide update on the project status.</p> <p>TRG#2 was held on April 15, 2016.</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>Technologist) as the key contact for the Region. Requested a list of all Region staff that have been contacted via an initial contact letter.</p> <p>Emails received on August 15 and 18, 2014 from Transportation Technologist providing additional contacts to be added to the contact list.</p> <p>Response received on August 18, 2014 from the Director, Long Range Planning indicating interest in being the informed about the study's progress.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City of Markham</li> <li>-CAO</li> <li>-Ward 3 Councillor</li> <li>-Ward 4 Councillor</li> <li>-Ward 5 Councillor</li> <li>-Ward 7 Councillor</li> <li>-Ward 8 Councillor</li> <li>-Director of Engineering</li> <li>-Senior Engineer, Special Projects</li> <li>-Senior Development Planner</li> <li>-Manager, Development Central District</li> <li>Manager, Development East District</li> </ul>	<p>Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>Introductory meeting with City of Markham, York Region, York Region Transit/VIVA on September 15, 2014</p> <p>TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015.</p> <p>Meeting to review/explain the TRG #1 presentation at City's request on February 4, 2015</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>Meeting on March 11, 2015 to discuss comments on TRG#1.</p> <p>Project Team requested on April 16, 2015 zoning information on lands north of</p>	<p>Response received on August 15, 2014 from the Director of Engineering expressing interest in participating in the study and noting that background information will be provided.</p> <p>Received information to questions posed by the Study Team on November 14, 2014.</p> <p>Letter dated February 18, 2015 was received from the Senior Development Engineer containing comments on the presentation at the TRG#1 meeting held on January 28, 2015.</p> <p>Email received on April 2, 2015 with City of Markham's response to Study Team's email sent March 11, 2015. (Please see Meeting Minutes of March 11, 2015 – redtext added to the minutes)</p> <p>Letter dated April 30, 2015 was received from the Director of Engineer containing comments on the presentation at PIC#1 held on April 15, 2015.</p> <p>Various background information such as land status, drainage , zoning information received on April 17, 2015.</p>	<p>Response email was sent on March 11, 2015 addressing comments received from the City on February 18, 2015 and during the Meeting on March 10, 2015.</p> <p>Response email was sent on April 7, 2015 addressing further comments received on April 2, 2015. (Please see Meeting Minutes of March 11, 2015 – green text added to the minutes)</p> <p>Response email was sent on May 20, 2015 in response to City's letter dated April 30, 2015.</p> <p>Response letter to comments on the draft EPR were sent on October 14, 2016.</p>

**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
	<p>Copper Creek Drive in response to Ninth Line Legacy Residents concerns received at PIC#1.</p> <p>Meeting was held on February 2, 2016 along with City of Markham to provide update on the project status.</p> <p>Heritage Impact Assessment Report for 8119 and 8042 Reesor Road Properties was submitted to the Senior Heritage Planner on February 18, 2016 to the Senior Heritage Planner.</p> <p>TRG#2 was held on April 15, 2016.</p> <p>A presentation to the Development Services Committee was done on April 25, 2016.</p> <p>Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, and that Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports 8119 and 8042 Reesor Road Properties were submitted on April 19, 2016 to the Senior Heritage Planner.</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>Email received on February 22, 2016 from the Senior Heritage Planner that a review of the Heritage Impact Assessment Report for 8119 and 8042 Reesor Road Properties was reviewed and have no concerns.</p> <p>Letter from Heritage Markham Committee dated May 11, 2016 was received after the review of the reports submitted by the Study Team on April 19, 2016. It noted that Heritage Markham recommends that in the case of the designated heritage property at 8119 Reesor Road, that consideration be given to relocating the early 20th century gambrel-roofed barn out of the path of the proposed 407 Transitway as a mitigation strategy, to preserve the cultural heritage landscape of the historic William Harding House farmstead; and that the preferred location would be closer to the farmhouse. Further documentation dated May 16, 2016 was received on the Committee's conclusion.</p> <p>Comments on the draft EPR were received on May 9, 2016 from Markham Council and May 27, 2016 from City of Markham Staff.</p>	
<p>Durham Region -CAO -Commissioner, Works Department -Project Engineer/Manager, Environmental Services Design Works Department -Principal Planner, Planning and Economic Development Department</p>	<p>Information request email sent on July 2, 2014.</p> <p>Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>TRG#2 was held on April 15, 2016</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p>	<p>Email received on July 7, 2014 with information associated with the Whites Road and Rossland Road interchanges, Central Pickering Development Plan and a note that trunk sanitary sewers and water mains crossing Highway 407 and easements are within the transitway. Provided contact information for IO's consultants for information on Seaton lands.</p> <p>Information on Durham Regional Transit was received on September 4, 2014.</p> <p>Email received on February 12, 2015 from the Senior Planner providing comments based on material presented to date by the Study Team. Comments were on York-Durham Line, Whites Road, Rossland Road and Brock Road stations.</p>	<p>Response email to the comments received on February 12, 2015 was sent on February 23, 2015.</p> <p>Response letter to comments on the draft EPR was sent on October 14, 2016.</p> <p>An email sent on December 6, 2016 stated that aside of environmental constraints at the potential site and surroundings, the ridership analysis based on forecast figures and municipal and regional transportation and land use plans (including Seaton Development), do not justify a station at this location. MTO is protecting this site primarily for environmental compensation, without excluding other potential uses in the future, as being stated in the EPR. However, if any kind of infrastructure is proposed in the future at the protected site, an addendum to the TPAP will likely be required by MOECC.</p>

**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
	<p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>Comments on the draft EPR were received on May 31, 2016.</p> <p>Letter received on November 10, 2016 in response to the Study Teams' letter dated October 14, 2016. No concerns on the responses provided was noted. It was noted that the Rossland Protected Site for environmental compensation excludes the option of a future long-term option of siting a transit station at this location. Durham Region feels that this site has the potential to become an important transit node.</p>	
<p>City of Pickering -Policy Manager</p>	<p>Initial Contact Letters sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>Council Meeting Presentation on March 23, 2015 to present the study.</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letters sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>TRG#2 was held on April 15, 2016</p> <p>A presentation to the Executive Committee was made on May 9, 2016.</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p> <p>Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report was submitted on September 19, 2016.</p> <p>Heritage Impact Assessment Report for 3440 Brock Road was submitted .on December 5, 2016.</p>	<p>Response received on August 12, 2014 from the Manager of Policy and Geomatics noting that he will be the key contact for the City and will be part of the Technical Resource Group.</p> <p>Email received on January 26, 2015 from Policy Manager with comments on the study in particular, Brock Road, Rossland Road and Whites Road stations.</p> <p>Comments on the Draft EPR were receive on June 10, 2016.</p>	<p>Comments received were considered during the development of the preliminary design.</p> <p>Responses to comments received on the Draft EPR were sent on October 14, 2016.</p>
<b>FIRE, OPP, POLICE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES</b>			
<p>York Regional Police</p>	<p>Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>Response received on August 18, 2014 from the Superintendent indicating no concerns at this time but would like to be kept informed on the study's progress.</p>	<p>No issues or concerns identified.</p>

**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
York Region Public Health Services	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	
City of Markham, Fire Chief	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Response received on August 14, 2014 from the Fire Chief indicating no concerns at this time but would like to be kept informed about the study's progress.	No issues or concerns identified.
Durham Region, Director Emergency Management Office	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Durham Region, Police Service	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
City of Pickering, Fire Chief	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016	Response received on August 14, 2014 from the Fire Chief indicating no concerns at this time but would like to be kept informed about the study's progress.	No issues or concerns identified.

**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
Ontario Provincial Police -Highway 407 Detachment	TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016  Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
<b>SCHOOL BOARDS AND SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION SERVICES</b>			
Conseil scolaire Viamonde	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Conseil scolaire de district catholique Centre-Sud	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
York Catholic District School Board	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
York Region District School Board	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.

**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
	PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016		
Durham District School Board	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Response received on August 13, 2014 from the Planner indicating no concerns at this time but would like to be kept informed about this study's progress.	No issues or concerns identified.
Durham Catholic District School Board -Planning Dept.	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
<b>TRANSIT and TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATIONS</b>			
GO Transit -Manager, Environmental Programs	Information request email sent on July 18, 2014.  Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Email response received on July 22, 2014 regarding future plans at Unionville and Havelock GO lines.	No issues or concerns identified.
Durham Region Transit -General Manager	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015	Received ridership data and services plans within the study area regarding Durham Region Transit plans on September 12, 2014.	No issues or concerns identified.

**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
	<p>TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>		
<p>York Region Transit Corporation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Chief Engineer</li> <li>-Senior Project Manager</li> <li>-Manager, Service Planning, YRT/VIVA</li> <li>-Program Manager, Transit Planning</li> </ul>	<p>Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>Introductory meeting with City of Markham, York Region, York Region Transit/VIVA on September 15, 2014</p> <p>TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>TRG#2 was held on April 15, 2016</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>Received comments during meetings associated with station sites and access roads.</p>	<p>No issues or concerns identified.</p>
<p>Highway 407 ETR Consortium</p>	<p>Information request emails sent on June 19, 2014 and July 3, 2014</p> <p>Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>Emails received on June 19, 2014 and July 7, 2014 providing future plans for the 407 ETR such as widening and interchange development.</p>	<p>No issues or concerns identified.</p>
<b>UTILITIES</b>			
<p>Hydro One Networks Inc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Manager, Transmission Line Sustainment Investment Planning</li> <li>-Grid Operations Technician</li> </ul>	<p>Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>TRG #1 was held on January 28, 2015</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015</p>	<p>Response from the Initial Contact Letter was received on August 29, 2014 from the Manager of Transmission Line Sustainment Investment Planning confirming the presence of Hydro One high voltage transmission facilities within the study area. In addition, it noted the following:</p>	<p>Comments received will be taken into account during planning and preliminary design stages of the study.</p>

TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
-Senior Real Estate Coordinator	<p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>-the transmission corridor may have provisions for future lines or contain secondary land uses (i.e. pipelines, watermains, parking, etc.);</p> <p>-appropriate advance notice was requested in the event where modifications to Hydro One’s infrastructure are required;</p> <p>-new development should not reduce line clearances or limit access to Hydro One’s facilities at any time within the study area;</p> <p>-any construction activities must maintain the electrical clearance from the transmission line conductors as specified in the Ontario Health and Safety Act for the respective line voltage;</p> <p>-the integrity of the structure foundations must be maintained at all times, with no disturbance of the earth around the poles, guy wires and tower footings;</p> <p>-there must not be any grading, excavating, filling or other civil work close to the structures.</p> <p>Response letter dated September 22, 2014 was received from the Grid Operations Technician. It provided information that the study area encroaches into Hydro One’s 230,000 volt pipe type plant. It was requested that a clearance of 1 m minimum from the High Voltage underground plant be maintained.</p>	
Enbridge Pipelines Inc.	<p>Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>Email received on April 8, 2015 from the Lands &amp; ROW Administrator, Eastern Region indicating that there are no Enbridge facilities within the study area. It noted that the study area is within the Enbridge Gas distribution area and to contact Enbridge Gas for information.</p>	<p>The utility was cleared through Ontario 1 Call. A follow up locate request was sent to Enbridge to confirm the Ontario 1 Call all clear results</p>
Rogers Cable	<p>Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p> <p>TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016</p>	<p>No comments/concerns received.</p>	<p>No issues or concerns identified.</p>
Bell Canada	<p>Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014</p> <p>PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015</p> <p>PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016</p>	<p>No comments/concerns received.</p>	<p>No issues or concerns identified.</p>



**TABLE 8.1: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
Power Stream Inc.	TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016  Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Response received August 20, 2014 providing new contact and noting that there are no concerns at this time but would like to remain informed about the study's progress.	No issues or concerns identified.
<b>LOCAL/REGIONAL INTEREST GROUPS</b>			
Ontario Federation of Agriculture	Initial Contact Letter sent on August 6, 2014  PIC #1 Invitation Letter sent on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.

### 8.2.2. Technical Resource Group (TRG)

A TRG was formed for the purpose of the study to provide technical expertise and strategic input to the Study Team during various stages of the Planning and Preliminary Design. TRG members were required to review material prior to and/or after the various meetings in order to provide effective input. Presentation and agendas (including the use of visual aids to illustrate project design features), minutes (maps, drawings/figures) were prepared and provided at each meeting. The TRG members met at key project milestones providing comments on the technical reports and draft EPR for this project.

The TRG is comprised of representatives from the following agencies:

- Metrolinx;
- Parks Canada;
- York Region;
- York Region Transit/VIVA;
- Durham Region;
- Durham Region Transit;
- 407 ETR;
- Toronto and Region Conservation Authority;
- GO Transit;
- City of Markham;
- City of Pickering;
- Hydro One;
- Infrastructure Ontario; and,
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

The first TRG meeting was held on January 28, 2015. At this meeting: a description of the 407 Transitway, study objectives, purpose of the TRG, project schedule, project status, TPAP process, preliminary ridership study; environmental existing conditions, high level alignment options; station selection, evaluation and methodology, preferred Transitway configuration, and next steps were presented.

The second TRG meeting was held on April 15, 2016. At this meeting: an update of the study progress was presented providing key findings, any changes to the Transitway configuration presented at the first TRG, and next steps.

Members of the TRG were provided access to the Draft EPR for review and comment on April 22, 2016. Comments on the draft EPR were received from Parks Canada, City of Markham, City of Pickering, Infrastructure Ontario, Region of Durham, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry and Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.

**Table 8.2** presents the comments received from members of the TRG on the draft EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
PC-1	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Executive Summary Page E-2	Under “Federal Legislation” list the Rouge National Urban Park Act	Noted.	RNUP added in list.
PC-2	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016		In the list of plans, add Rouge National Urban Park draft Management Plan	Noted.	RNUP added in list.
PC-3	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Executive Summary Page E-5	Rouge National Urban Park, not “Rouge Urban National Park”	Noted.	Revised.
PC-4	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	1-Introduction Page 1-2	1.5.1.2: Under “Federal Legislation” list the Rouge National Urban Park Act. You could include Clause 4 (purpose of the park), as well as its protection of nature, culture, and agriculture.	Noted.	RNUP added in list.
PC-5	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	1-Introduction Page 1-2	1.5.2: Use the description of the Rouge National Urban Park draft Management Plan (2014) that is currently in Section 3.2.1. See notes under 3.2.1 below for appropriate text in that section.	Noted.	Text added to Section 1.5.2.12: <i>“8. The Rouge National Urban Park Act, which came into force on May 15, 2015, protects and allows for the presentation of natural and cultural resources and the encouragement of sustainable farming practices within the park area. In June of 2014, a draft Management Plan was released for public review by Parks Canada. The proposed 407 Transitway and associated facilities study are not included within the Management Plan area. However, the Management Plan should be taken into account, given that the Transitway would cross through the park area.”</i>
PC-6	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	2—Transportation Needs Page 2-1	The map with respect to Rouge National Urban Park and the proposed Pickering Airport is outdated. The boundaries of RNUP should be depicted.	Noted.	Map revised.
PC-7	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	3—Existing and Future Conditions Page 3-24, Section 3.2.1	Provide more details on the park draft management plan as it pertains to roads in the park, natural connectivity, agriculture, and trails (which are planned to cross beneath the Transitway along Little Rouge Creek). The plan is available for viewing at: <a href="http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/progs/np-pn/cnnp-cnnp/rouge/particip-involve/rouge5.aspx">http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/progs/np-pn/cnnp-cnnp/rouge/particip-involve/rouge5.aspx</a> .	Noted.	Section 3.2.1 of the EPR has been revised to add: <i>“The Management Plan is adopting an ecosystem health approach that recognizes the park’s increasingly urban surroundings and its working farms, major roads and hydro corridors. It aims for the protection, conservation, and restoration of the park’s natural, cultural and agricultural resources. One of its main objectives is “Collaboration leads to compatible land use and infrastructures abutting the park”. Therefore as an action to this objective, it has identified that participation in “provincial planning, municipal land use, and other planning and environmental processes to advance the interests of ecosystems connectivity (e.g., water quality, road ecology, minimal light pollution), farm viability (e.g., movement of farm</i>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						vehicles, roadside stands, tile drainage/salt spray), visitor experience (e.g., visitor safety/comfort, trail continuity), and cultural heritage.”
PC-8	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	4—Alternatives Page 4-1, Section 4.2 Corridor Assessment:	Provide more details on the options of distance from 407 as the Transitway crosses Rouge National Urban Park. For example, at our February 16, 2016 meeting we discussed the merits of close-in versus a standard separation with respect to the Little Rouge Creek bridge as well as the length of culverts elsewhere and the potential for daylighting between 407 and the transitway.	Noted – Daylighting is being provided between Hwy 407 ETR structures and culverts, and 407 Transitway proposed structures and culverts.	No change in the EPR.
PC-9	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	5—Preferred Alternative Pages 5-8 to 5-9, Section 5.2.3.3 Donald Cousens Station Chapter 9	The proximity of this station to Rouge National Urban Park, and its potential to provide region-wide transit access to the park, should be mentioned. In this regard, the “Access to / egress from” section on page 5-9 should mention the potential for detailed design to facilitate the linking of the station into the planned park trail network (as does page 6-6 in the Mitigation report).	Noted. Chapter 9 of the EPR has been revised addressing this comment.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: “MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Investigating potential active transportation opportunities to connect the Donald Cousens Station with RNUP”</li></ul>
PC-10	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	5—Preferred Alternative Pages 5-8 to 5-9, Section 5.2.3.3 Donald Cousens Station	The potential long-term GO station should also be mentioned, and the need for detailed design to facilitate the interchange of passengers. Parks Canada has identified these as important factors at meetings with the consultant.	There is no current plan or timeline by Metrolinx to provide service on the Havelock line. MTO is protecting land to extend the Donald Cousens Station to interface with the rail line in case GO operates on it in the future, as indicated in Chapter 5 of the EPR.	No change in the EPR.
PC-11	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 5-10, Section 5.3.1 Overpasses and Underpasses	Trail connections and wildlife crossing beneath overpasses—particularly at river crossings—should be added as a consideration determining span length and the number of spans, as should the need for the movement of agricultural machinery in Rouge National Urban Park. This is particularly the case with respect to the Little Rouge Creek crossing in Rouge National Urban Park. Here, the park’s main north-south park trail will parallel the creek and pass beneath the transitway. There may be similar cases elsewhere along the corridor beyond the park (such as the Seaton Trail along the West Duffins corridor).	Following discussions with Parks Canada, the 407 Transitway structure bridge over the Rouge River was significantly expanded to allow adequate crossing of the MUP. Parks Canada confirmed their agreement on August 25, 2016 (Parks Canada email included in the Correspondence Appendix of the EPR).  Through Detail Design and Construction, MTO will continue consultation with the Parks Canada and the City	Plates 13 and 14 have been revised to illustrate the bridge revised length.  Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: “MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adequate crossing of the multi-use pathway (MUP) under the Transitway runningway at the Rouge River valley.</li><li>• Construction staging of the Transitway through the National Urban Park (NUP) to minimize effects to the Park.”</li></ul>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
PC-12	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 5-10, Section 5.3.1 Overpasses and Underpasses	See notes under Plate 14 below for comments relating to the Little Rouge Creek crossing.	Noted.	N/A
PC-13	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 5-11, Table 5.7, Proposed structures:	Add "Farm machinery movement, Rouge National Urban Park Trail" to the Location description for Structure 5.1.7. Reesor Road.	Noted.	Text added to Structure 5.1.7 in Table 5.7: <i>"Span provides sufficient space for farm machinery movement."</i>
PC-14	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 5-11, Table 5.7, Proposed structures	Add "North-south Rouge National Urban Park Trail" to the Location description for Structure Reference 5.1.9. Little Rouge Creek.	Noted.	Text added to Structure 5.1.7 in Table 5.7: <i>"Structure provides sufficient space to accommodate RNUP trail."</i>
PC-15	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 5-18, Table 5.11, Culverts and Bridges	Culverts 19- 21 are found within the park. We would like to further examine the design of these culverts in relation to the options of daylighting between Highway 407 and the Transitway, as discussed at our February 16 meeting. The table indicates these culverts range in length from 36 to 45 metres, but it is not clear if the culverts constitute extensions of existing Highway 407 culverts or if there is an opening or provision for daylighting.	Noted. Daylighting between the Highway structures and culverts and the proposed Transitway structures and culverts is provided.	No change in the EPR.
PC-16	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 5-20, Section 5.7, Illumination	The draft Rouge National Urban Park Management Plan (2014) proposes an "Urban Star Park" designation (a standard set by the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada) in which lighting in the park is kept to a minimum, and that lighting that is used is downward casting (i.e., cut-off) only. We ask that lighting within or near the park (such as at Donald Cousins station and associated parking area) be reduced to acceptable minimums consistent with public safety and operational requirements. We would like to see a reference and a commitment to "Urban Star Park" lighting methods stated in the EPR.	Noted. Illumination is only being provided at the station locations. Donald Cousins Station illumination has minimal to no impact to the Park; however Chapter 9 has been edited to address the comment.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: <i>"MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o <i>Illumination, landscaping and other matters that may affect public safety, operational requirements, and natural conditions of the Rouge National Urban Park.</i></li></ul>
PC-17	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 5-21, Section 5.9, Landscaping Chapter 9	In discussions with the consultants, Parks Canada has previously identified the need for landscaping and vegetation to be compatible with the park. We ask that a reference to the unique conditions presented by the passage of the Transitway through Rouge National Urban Park be included, and that the landscaping be of a type supportive of the native species that Parks Canada will manage in adjacent natural landscapes in the park. The Little Rouge Creek Corridor and other stream crossings and abutting natural areas are important in this regard.	Noted. Chapter 9 has been edited to address the comment.	Same change to the EPR described for the previous comment (PC-16) applies to this comment.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
PC-18	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 5-21, Section 5.9, Landscaping	We also ask that the compensation planting that we understand is to be undertaken in the provincially-owned lands adjacent to the York-Durham Line interchange be identified in this section, and a commitment to work with Parks Canada to ensure that the restoration undertaken here is coordinated with ecological restoration efforts Parks Canada expects to implement on the immediately-adjacent Petticoat Creek corridor.	Noted. Chapter 9 has been edited to address the comment.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: <i>"MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>o Development of detailed landscaping plans and agreement on compensation ratios for lost vegetation communities (including woodlands, wetlands, and meadow marshes)."</i></li></ul>
PC-19	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 5-21, Section 5.9, Landscaping	We also note from Plate 15 that some forest cover will be lost. We ask that the EPR state that detailed tree and vegetation inventories will be undertaken in the corridor where it crosses Rouge National Urban Park, and that in keeping with the former Rouge Park policy, 11 trees will be planted for every tree lost.	Noted. Currently there is no standard compensation policy.	Same change to the EPR described for the previous comment applies to this comment.
PC-20	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate D-1, Donald Cousens Station	We are pleased to see reference to a future GO station, which recognizes a future planning initiative. In this vein, we ask that a note be added similar to that identifying a "Potential Pedestrian Walkway to the Commercial Development West of Donald Cousens Parkway" that references a connection to the park trail network east of the station.	Noted.	Note added to Plate D-1: <i>"Connection to the RNUP's trail to be included during Detail Design in coordination with Parks Canada."</i>
PC-21	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate YD-1 York-Durham Station Site	We are pleased to see the potential for a station at this location being protected. We would like to see a note referencing this site as a location for future ecological compensation from the loss of natural features on other segments of the transitway.	Noted.	Note on Plate YD-1 changed to read: <i>"Site protected for future ecological compensation."</i>
PC-22	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate 14 Chapter 5	The west abutment and fill for the Little Rouge Creek bridge intrude too closely into the valley, and provide less buffering than the existing Highway 407 bridge. This bridge crosses the park's most important wildlife and trail corridor. From a wildlife point of view, this bridge does not seem to reflect the "Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat" mitigation commitment to maintain wildlife corridors along river crossings (Table 6.7, Page 6-34, and Page 6-40 in the Mitigation report).	The 407 Transitway structure bridge over the Rouge River was significantly expanded to allow adequate crossing of the MUP. Parks Canada confirmed their agreement on August 25, 2016 (Parks Canada email included in the Correspondence Appendix of the EPR).	Plates 13 and 14 have been revised.
PC-23	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate 14 Chapter 5	An additional span on the west side of the creek is required to provide sufficient buffering from the creek, to provide for wildlife passage on the west side of the creek in the valley and on adjacent tableland behind the steep slope, to provide sufficient space for a potential pathway	An additional span has been added to the west end of the Little Rouge Creek Structure as per Parks Canada's request.	Plates 13 and 14 have been revised.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				along the west side tableland, and to provide sufficient space for the movement of agricultural equipment on the tableland. The current design blocks north-south access for any wildlife, visitor, and farm machinery movement on the tableland on the west side of the creek, movement that the current 407ETR bridges accommodate.		
PC-24	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate 14	It appears standardized span lengths may be used for larger crossings, resulting in pier locations in the Little Rouge Creek valley that are driven by girder manufacturing considerations, and not environmental conditions in the valley itself. Ideally, a fewer number of longer spans would reduce the amount of disturbance from pier construction in the valley, and avoid the placement of any piers in the creek itself.	The spans and type of structure are similar to the 407 ETR Bridge. Chapter 9 is addressing this comment.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:  <i>"MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Adequate crossing of the multi-use pathway (MUP) under the Transitway runningway at the Rouge River valley.</li> <li>o Opportunity to increase spans of the bridge over Little Rouge Creek aiming to minimize construction effects to the Valley.</li> <li>o Noise effects on Park users.</li> <li>o Construction staging of the Transitway through the National Urban Park (NUP) to minimize effects to the Park."</li> </ul>
PC-25	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate 14	There appears to be no treatment of stormwater runoff from the Transitway on both sides of the creek. Provision should be made for it.	Plates 1-28 are to illustrate the plan and profile design of the Transitway. Stormwater design should be reviewed in Appendix C: Drainage Report. The drainage details have not been included on these plates to ensure the design can be read clearly.	No change to the EPR.
PC-26	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate 15	Stormwater appears to have no treatment identified in this plate.	Plates 1-28 are to illustrate the plan and profile design of the Transitway. Stormwater design should be reviewed in Appendix C: Drainage Report. The drainage details have not been included on these plates to ensure the design can be read clearly.  There is treatment of runoff along the transitway, refer to stormwater management report and drawings.	No change to the EPR.
PC-27	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate 15	The configuration of culverts indicated in Table 5-11 is not illustrated on this plan. It is therefore not possible to understand their specific location, if there is any daylighting, and how drainage will be treated.	Plates 1-28 are to illustrate the plan and profile design of the Transitway. Stormwater Preliminary design is included in Appendix C: Drainage Report. The drainage details have not been included on these plates to ensure the design can be read clearly.	No change in the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
					Refer to drainage plans for configuration.	
PC-28	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate 15	We ask that a note be added to the plate to indicate that agricultural tile drainage will be identified, and that any tile drainage disrupted by construction will be restored to a functioning condition.	Chapter 9 is addressing this comment.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:  <i>"MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>o Agricultural tile drainage and its treatment during construction.</i></li> <li><i>o Construction staging of the Transitway through the Rouge National Urban Park (RNUP) to minimize effects to the Park."</i></li> </ul>
PC-29	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate 15	The amount of natural cover and agricultural land lost in the transitway corridor where it crosses the park should be identified.	Plates 1-28 are to illustrate the plan and profile design of the Transitway. The natural cover and agricultural land details have not been included on these plates to ensure the design can be read clearly. Please refer to Chapter 6, Tables 6-1 and 6-2.  Noted.	No change in the EPR.
PC-30	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate 16	The function of the "York-Durham Protection Site" should be stated, primarily its role as a location for compensation ecological restoration.	Noted.	Note on Plate YD-1 changed to read:  <i>"Site protected for future ecological compensation."</i>
PC-31	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Plate 16	The transitway could be shifted to the north to reduce the fragmentation of this site.	Shifting the alignment north would introduce operational restrictions and reduce line of sight safety. This was explained to Parks Canada at July 11 meeting.	N/A
PC-32	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Pages 6-6 to 6-7 Section 5.2 Footprint Impacts	Donald Cousens Station to Whites Road Station: We would like to see this section subdivided at York-Durham Line. As currently organized, it is impossible to quantify what impacts are within the corridor as it traverses the park, and it is not possible from the description to know where one is.	Noted.	Chapter 6, Section 5.2 has been revised to add a subsection for the Rouge National Urban Park stating:  <i>"The Rouge National Urban Park transverses the study area within this section. It starts east of the CP/Havelock Railway (Proposed GO Line) tracks eastward to York-Durham Line. Impacts to vegetation communities within this subsection will result in the removal of approximately 10.17 ha of vegetation communities including 1.25 ha of wetlands (SWT2b, SWT2-2b, MAM2-2a, MAS2-1e), 5.62 ha of cultural meadow (CUM1-1e, CUM1-1f, CUM1-1g, CUM1-1h), 0.14 ha of deciduous forest (FOM7-1b), 0.76 ha of coniferous forest (FOC4-1b, FOC2-2b, FOC), 2.39 ha of hedge and agricultural areas."</i>



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
PC-33	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 6-11 Rouge National Urban Park	The reference to the Park appears as little more than that. This section should document the effects of the transitway on park resources abutting the transitway and the mitigation to be implemented. To this end, we request that more specific assessment of effects from the transitway as it crosses the park be explicitly stated in the EPR. This could involve a rearrangement of material presented earlier in this document. We would also ask that instead of listing generic mitigation measures (as per Table 6.3), that specific mitigation measures specific to the park and specific issues and locations within the park be catalogued.	Noted.	Chapter 6, Section 5.2 has been revised to add a subsection for the Rouge National Urban Park stating:  <i>“The area between the CP/Havelock Railway (Proposed GO Line) and York Durham Line is part of the Rouge National Urban Park. The Management Plan indicates that all above-ground provincial, municipal, and regional infrastructure is excluded from the Park boundaries. The transitway runningway is being proposed to be located outside the boundaries of the park and efforts will be made to minimize impacts to the adjacent natural environment to support the Management Plan objectives and targets, where feasible. Watercourse crossings are required at the Little Rouge Creek, an unnamed watercourse, and Petticoat Creek. In addition, a portion of the Non-Provincially Significant Locust Hill Wetland Complex will be impacted by the runningway. During Detail Design, consultation with Parks Canada will be conducted on developing landscape plans, vegetation restoration and forest edge management plans in order to be compatible with the Park’s objectives.</i>  <i>One of the Management Plan objectives is to explore the feasibility and utility of a park shuttle that connects areas within the park with links to public transportation hubs. During detail design, discussions will be held with Parks Canada regarding future opportunities for a park shuttle to connect to Transitway Stations. “</i>
PC-34	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 6-13 Table 6.3, Vegetation and Vegetation Impacts	Overall, the “Monitoring and Recommendation” column seems to not follow through on many of the recommendations in the “mitigation” column to its left. More measures should be identified.	Noted. A review and revision of the Tables in Chapter 6 is being conducted as appropriate.	Table 6.3, Vegetation and Vegetation Impacts, Monitoring and Recommendation column has been revised to add:  <i>“A monitoring plan will be developed to immediately mitigate the spread/invasion of aggressive plant species, to ensure the newly planted material survives and fulfils the intended function and to ensure that the inadvertent spread of aggressive or non-native plant species is appropriately managed.</i>  <i>A detailed planting plan will be developed during Detail Design phase once area identified for restoration have been determined. The planting for forest and wetland habitat will be undertaken.</i>  <i>Consultation with Parks Canada will be conducted during Detail Design in regards to areas adjacent to the Rouge National Urban Park.”</i>
PC-35	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 6-13 Table 6.3,	As per the recommendation of compensation to be identified in consultation with agencies during the	Noted.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
			Vegetation and Vegetation Impacts	Detailed Design stage, we recommend an 11 to 1 natural cover compensation plan be provided for as was the past policy of the former regional Rouge Park.		<p><i>"MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>o Development of detailed landscaping plans and agreement on compensation ratios for lost vegetation communities (including woodlands, wetlands, and meadow marshes)."</i></li> </ul>
PC-36	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 6-13 Table 6.3, Vegetation and Vegetation Impacts	We also suggest that the right-of-way landscape be so designed as to enhance the extent of natural function in adjacent areas of Rouge National Urban Park, and that it function as a form of mitigation for vegetation lost in the corridor where it crosses the park, or other areas requiring mitigation.	Noted.	Change of the EPR described for previous comments also applies to this comment.
PC-37	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 6-15 Ninth Line to York Durham Line Runningway	Parks Canada very much appreciates the assurance that Donald Cousens station design will accommodate potential for a park shuttle service.	Noted.	No change in the EPR
PC-38	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 6-16 Donald Cousens Parkway Station	We ask that the text state that detailed design will incorporate a pathway link to the park.	Noted.	Note added to Plate D-1: <i>"Connection to the RNUP's trail to be included during Detail Design in coordination with Parks Canada."</i>
PC-39	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Pages 6-21 and 6-22, Table 6-4, Land Use	Rouge National Urban Park should be mentioned specifically with respect to agricultural tile drainage under "Impacts" and be included along with the Duffins Agricultural Preserve under "Proposed Mitigation Measures" and/or "Monitoring and Recommendation."	Noted.	<p>Table 6-4 of the EPR – Land Use Environmental Value/Criterion was revised, indicating in the column Potential Impact: <i>"Impact of the runningway in agricultural lands part of the Duffins Rouge Agricultural Preserve and Rouge National Urban Park and agricultural tile drainage systems located south of the runningway</i></p> <p><i>-Proposed Mitigation Measures column: "Efforts will be made during Detail Design to minimize the impacts to the agricultural lands within the Fussins Rouge Agricultural Preserve area and Rouge National Urban Park, by minimizing the footprint of the runningway (where feasible), and by avoiding or restoring any affected agricultural tile drainage systems and fencing."</i></p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
PC-40	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Pages 6-21 and 6-22, Table 6-4, Land Use	An additional mitigation measure could be that following detailed design, provincially-owned land next to Rouge National Urban Park that is identified as surplus to transitway requirements be considered for transfer to Parks Canada as an addition to the park.	This is beyond the scope of this study.	N/A
PC-41	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Pages 6-21 and 6-22, Table 6-4, Land Use	Parks Canada appreciates the reference to the park shuttle, and recommends a potential pathway link to the park from Donald Cousens station be added to the list.	Noted.	Note added to Plate D-1: <i>“Connection to the RNUP’s trail to be included during Detail Design in coordination with Parks Canada.”</i>
PC-42	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 6-36, Table 6-8 Noise and Vibration	Any impacts of noise on visitor uses in the vicinity of the transitway during construction should be noted, such as use of the north-south trail along Little Rouge Creek passing beneath the 407ETR and transitway.	Noted.	Text added to Chapter 9 – Consultation: <i>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Adequate crossing of the multi-use pathway (MUP) under the Transitway runningway at the Rouge River valley.</li> <li>o Opportunity to increase spans of the bridge over Little Rouge Creek aiming to minimize construction effects to the Valley.</li> <li>o Noise effects on Park users</li> <li>o Construction staging of the Transitway through the National Urban Park (NUP) to minimize effects to the Park.”</li> </ul>
PC-43	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 6-39, Table 6-9	Any potential impacts of construction on adjacent Rouge National Urban Park should be mentioned, including trail use in the valley, the movement of farm machinery, and other potential impacts.	Noted.	Change of the EPR described for previous comments also applies to this comment.
PC-44	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 6-47, 6.5.1 Protected MTO Sites, York Durham Line Site	The discussion focus on mitigation of impacts should be complemented by the potential for coordinating the ecological compensation to be hosted by this site with that along Petticoat Creek in abutting Rouge National Urban Park.	Noted.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: <i>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Development of detailed landscaping plans and agreement on compensation ratios for lost vegetation communities (including woodlands, wetlands, and meadow marshes).”</li> </ul>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
PC-45	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 7-1, 7.1.1. Pre-Construction	The requirement for field investigations regarding avian field species such as Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark that are noted in Document 6—Mitigation (6-9, 6-10, 6-30, 6-34) should be referenced.	Noted.	Text added to Section 7.1.1 Pre-Construction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field investigations regarding avian field species such as Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark</li> </ul>
PC-46	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 7-1, 7.1.1. Pre-Construction	Determining the extent of potentially-affected agricultural tile drainage and required mitigation strategies should be added to the list in this section	Noted.	Text added to Section 7.1.1 Pre-Construction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drainage Design (including agricultural tile drainage)</li> </ul>
PC-47	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Section 7.1.2., Construction	Page 7-2, Landscape Design Plan: We ask that a sentence be added to note the special circumstances regarding landscape design abutting Rouge National Urban Park, and that Parks Canada will be consulted in the development of the landscape plan for this part of the transitway. We also request that this section reference the compensation area on the York Durham Line site as a component of the landscape design plan, and that the design of compensation planting in this area will be coordinated with any planting that Parks Canada plans along Petticoat Creek. We ask also that in the event Parks Canada initiates restoration along the Creek prior to MTO’s initiation of the landscape plan, that MTO will be receptive to being consulted by Parks Canada.	Noted.	Text added at the end of Landscape Design Plan (under Section 7.1.2): “...in coordination with Parks Canada.”
PC-48	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Section 7.1.2., Construction	Page 7-3, Lighting: We ask that cut-off lighting be used if required in the corridor traversing Rouge National Urban Park, and in the Donald Cousens station.	Noted.	Changes to Chapter 9 indicated for previous comments related to commitment for consultation with Agencies apply to this comment.
PC-49	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Section 7.1.2., Construction	There is no reference to the maintenance of trail access across the transitway during construction. This will be a critical consideration along the primary north-south trail corridor serving visitors to Rouge National Urban Park. We ask that a new row addressing this consideration (generally, perhaps, along the transitway corridor) be added.	Noted. Provisions for maintenance of trail access is being included in section 7.1.2.	Text added to 7.1.2 as construction recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Maintaining Rouge Urban National Park trail access through construction area.”</li> </ul>
PC-50	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	9—Commitments	Given provincial jurisdiction of the corridor extending through Rouge National Urban Park, and the similar interests of the Toronto Region Conservation Authority with respect to watercourse crossings, we suggest this document include a commitment that MTO voluntarily complies with TRCA’s approval regime. Such a commitment will ensure the detailed design meets required standards designed to safeguard human health, property, and the natural environment—all key considerations for Parks Canada on adjacent lands in Rouge National Urban Park.	Noted.	Changes to Chapter 9 indicated for previous comments related to commitment for consultation with Agencies apply to this comment.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
PC-51	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 9-1, Section 9.2— Consultation	We ask that Parks Canada Agency be added to the list of external agencies to be consulted.	Noted	Parks Canada has been added in consultation list in Section 9.2.
PC-52	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Page 9-3, Section 9.3— Detail Design and Construction Issues	Identify Parks Canada Agency as the authority to be consulted with respect to species listed under the Canadian Species at Risk Act where the transitway corridor traverses Rouge National Urban Park.	Noted.	Parks Canada has been added in consultation list in Section 9.2.
PC-53	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	References	Add the following reference: Rouge National Urban Park Draft Management Plan (Parks Canada), 2014	Noted.	Added to references: <i>“Rouge National Urban Park Draft Management Plan (Parks Canada), 2014”</i>
PC-54	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix E— Terrestrial Pages 31-32 (Section 4.2.1)	The description of the loss of vegetation in the section between Donald Cousens station and Whites Road station is missing. This section includes Rouge National Urban Park.	Noted.	Appendix E – Section 4.2.1 has been revised to add a subsection for the Rouge National Urban Park: <i>“The Rouge National Urban Park transverses the study area within this section. It starts east of the CP/Havelock Railway (Proposed GO Line) tracks eastward to York-Durham Line. Impacts to vegetation communities within this subsection will result in the removal of approximately 10.17 ha of vegetation communities including 1.25 ha of wetlands (SWT2b, SWT2-2b, MAM2-2a, MAS2-1e), 5.62 ha of cultural meadow (CUM1-1e, CUM1-1f, CUM1-1g, CUM1-1h), 0.14 ha of deciduous forest (FOM7-1b), 0.76 ha of coniferous forest (FOC4-1b, FOC2-2b, FOC), 2.39 ha of hedge and agricultural areas.”</i>
PC-55	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix E— Terrestrial Pages 31-32 (Section 4.2.1)	It would be useful to break down the segments in this section so that specific impacts on Rouge National Urban Park can be quantified.	Noted.	Response to previous comment (PC-54) also applies to this comment.
PC-56	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix E— Terrestrial Page 36, Section 4.2.3.1 Compensation	The role of the York Durham Line compensation site should be identified in this section, as should the general amount and type of compensation vegetation required. The commitment to coordinate compensation planting with ecological restoration undertaken by Parks Canada along Petticoat Creek should be mentioned.	Noted.	Appendix E – Section 4.2.3.1 has been revised to add: <i>“The McCowan Road, York-Durham Line and Rossland Road Protected Sites have been identified as areas for potential vegetation compensation. The type of vegetation community for compensation will be determined during Detail Design in consultation with Parks Canada and other agencies.”</i>
PC-57	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix E— Terrestrial Page 39 (Section 4.3.1,	Again, a description of the section between Donald Cousens station and Whites Road station is missing.	Noted.	A new subsection under 4.3.1 has been added in Appendix E:

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
			Runningway Impact)			<p><i>"8.1.1.1 4.3.1.4 Donald Cousens Parkway Future Potential Station to Whites Road Station</i></p> <p><i>The relatively long section of runningway between these two stations consists mainly of cultural vegetation communities bordering agricultural lands (see Section 4.2.1.4). There are two large, forested valley crossings as well, one of which is associated with the West Duffins Creek Environmentally Significant Area. However, the runningway will not be within close proximity to this designated area. In addition, there is a small portion of the Locust Hill Wetland Complex, a non-provincially significant wetland that will be affected by the runningway to the west of York/Durham Line. The effects on the forested valleys and wetland habitats are minor as these areas have previously been disturbed by the creation of the 407 ETR corridor. Effects on all other cultural and agricultural habitats are also expected to be minor as no significant wildlife species or habitats were noted during field investigations in these areas.</i></p> <p><i>Wildlife impacts to the Rouge National Urban Park are anticipated to be minor after the implementation of mitigation measures such as forest edge management, vegetation compensation and maintaining north-south corridor passages along Petticoat Creek and Little Rouge Creek. "</i></p>
PC-58	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix E— Terrestrial Page 41, Section 4.3.4 Barrier Effects on Wildlife Passage	As stated earlier, the Little Rouge Bridge does not provide passage for wildlife on the west bank tableland; an additional span to push the west abutment back would provide for this movement, as well as for a potential trail and agricultural machinery movement.	Noted.	Change to the EPR (Appendix E) described for the previous comment (PC-57), also applies to this comment.
PC-59	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix G— Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment	Cultural landscapes should also be referenced with respect to Rouge National Urban Park. Parks Canada is in the process of identifying and assessing such landscapes as they reflect different eras of the park's human history. To this end:	Noted.	
PC-60	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix G— Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment	Section 2.1, Legislation and Policy Context should include reference to the Rouge National Urban Park Act, as well as the direction on cultural landscapes contained in the 2014 draft management plan for the park (including page 19 of the draft management plan).	Noted.	<p>Text added to Section 3.5.1 of Appendix G - Potential Impacts to Cultural Heritage Resources of the Preliminary Preferred Design:</p> <p><i>The Rouge National Urban Park transverses the study area from east of the CP/Havelock Railway eastwards to York-</i></p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<i>Durham Line. One of the objectives under the Rouge National Urban Park Act is “to protect the cultural landscapes of the park and identify its heritage values to facilitate an understanding and appreciation of the history of the region”. Further the draft Rouge National Urban Park (2014) states that one of its objectives is to “identify, conserve, and communicate the cultural heritage values of the park, including such cultural resources as building and engineering works, archaeological sites, cultural landscapes, as well as heritage values such as community values, traditions, and stories of past and present inhabitants”. The ensemble of the two heritage buildings (CHL 1, and CHL 2) on Reesor Road and Reesor Road (CHL 4) should be addressed collectively to maintain the cultural heritage character of the area. Reesor Road has been identified as having cultural heritage interest both from the Rouge National Urban Park and City of Markham’s perspective. Post-construction rehabilitation should include plantings sympathetic to the historical context of the identified cultural heritage resources and adjacent to the Rouge National Urban Park in consultation with Parks Canada.</i>
PC-61	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix G— Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Page 28 bottom to page 29 top	References to “Rouge Park” should be changed to “Rouge National Urban Park.”	Noted.	Change to the EPR (Appendix G) described for the previous comment (PC-60), also applies to this comment.
PC-62	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix G— Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Page 28 bottom to page 29 top	The paragraph should be amended to reflect the fact that the park extends east of Little Rouge Creek to the York-Durham Line; as currently written, the text implies the park does not exist anywhere east of Little Rouge Creek.	Noted	Change to the EPR (Appendix G) described for the previous comment (PC-60), also applies to this comment.
PC-63	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix G— Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment	Various pages: References to CHL 6 should be changed from “Rouge Creek” to “Rouge River.”	Noted.	N/A

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
PC-64	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix G— Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Page 37: CHL 6 (Little Rouge Creek)	The existing text should be augmented to read (new text in italics): “Post-construction rehabilitation should include plantings sympathetic to the historical context of the resource and adjacent Rouge National Urban Park, and involve consultation with Parks Canada.	Noted.	Change to the EPR (Appendix G) described for the previous comment (PC-60), also applies to this comment.
PC-65	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix G— Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Section 6.0 References	Add “Parks Canada. 2014. Draft Management, Rouge National Urban Park.”	Noted.	Change to the EPR (Appendix G) described for the previous comment (PC-60), also applies to this comment.
PC-66	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix G— Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Page 38, Conclusions	This section should reference the fact that the lands traversed by the transitway corridor between the Canadian Pacific Rail Line and York-Durham Line will be part of Rouge National Park, and that these landscapes will be protected for their natural, cultural, and agricultural value.	Noted. The EPR will include text to indicate this.	Change to the EPR (Appendix G) described for the previous comment (PC-60), also applies to this comment.
PC-67	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix G— Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Page 39, Recommendations	Given the cluster of two heritage buildings and landscapes designated under the Ontario Heritage Act and the recognition in this report that Reesor Road has cultural heritage interest, we suggest an additional recommendation that the ensemble of buildings, landscapes, and Reesor Road be addressed collectively to maintain the cultural heritage character of this area. Although Reesor Road itself in this area is not included within Rouge National Urban Park, the road forms an important visitor “spine” through the park both south of the CPR line and north of Highway 7. No other road in the park is more associated with its cultural and agricultural heritage. The City of Markham has recognized the value of retaining its landscape character in future development planned between Highway 407 and Highway 7; the short distance south of Highway 407 to the CPR line should be similarly addressed in this report.	Noted.	Change to the EPR (Appendix G) described for the previous comment (PC-60), also applies to this comment.
PC-68	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix I— Land Use Report	Parks Canada appreciates the attention given the draft Management Plan for Rouge National Urban Park issued by Parks Canada in 2014 for public discussion. The draft management plan is currently being revised.	Noted.	N/A



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
PC-69	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix I— Land Use Report Pages 28-30 (9th Line to York Durham Line	The 2014 draft management plan proposal for a north-south trail along the Little Rouge Creek should be identified in the text, and mitigation discussed.	Noted.	Appendix I – Section 5.3 has been revised to add:  <i>“The Management Plan presented plans to implement a north-south trail along the Little Rouge Creek. “</i>
PC-70	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix I— Land Use Report Page 30	Potential Future Donald Cousens Station: Reference to potential trail access from this station into Rouge National Urban Park should be added.	Noted.	Appendix I – Section 5.3 has been revised to add:  <i>“In addition, Parks Canada has identified a potential access to the north-south trail along Little Rouge Creek from this station.”</i>
PC-71	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix I— Land Use Report Page 31	MTO Property Protection at York Durham Line: The coordination of environmental compensation activities on this site with those by Parks Canada in adjacent Rouge National Urban Park should be referenced.	Noted.	Appendix I – Section 5.3 has been revised to add:  <i>“Consultation with Parks Canada will be conducted during Detail Design to address environmental compensation activities on this site.”</i>
PC-72	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix I— Land Use Report Page 35	Section 6, Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures: The impact of construction on cross-corridor trails such as the planned north-south trail in the Little Rouge Creek corridor, as well as on the movement of agricultural machinery in the park in this corridor and along north-south roads in the park traversing the transitway corridor, should be referenced.	Noted.	Appendix I - Section 6 has been revised to add:  <i>“construction activities should be staged to avoid/minimize traffic delays to residents, business owners, to maintain use of recreational and community facilities such as the north-south trail along Little Rouge Creek and movement of agricultural machinery along north-south corridors within the Rouge National Urban Park and motorists travelling within the study area to the extent possible;”</i>
PC-73	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix K— Noise Report Figure 10	The Donald Cousens station footprint west of Reesor Road differs from the location east of Reesor Road recommended in document 5 (“Preferred Alternative”) of the EPR. The noise and vibration analysis may require updating as a result.	The location of the station is west of Reesor Road. The station may be expanded east of Reesor Road if GO Transit operates on the Havelock CP rail line in the future. Both Chapter 5 and Appendix K are correct.	
PC-74	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix L— Landscape Design Report Landscape Composition: Donald Cousens Station to York Durham Line (pages 15-18)	The sub-consultant appears unaware that the lands on either side of the 407ETR/Transitway corridor are to become Rouge National Urban Park.	Noted.	Appendix L – Pages 15 has been revised to add:  <i>“This entire section of the transitway corridor crosses through lands identified as part of the Rouge National Urban Park. The national urban park’s mandate for these lands is to protect natural heritage, cultural heritage, and agricultural heritage.”</i>
PC-75	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix L— Landscape Design Report	As such, the several references to “vacant” land abutting the transitway corridor are inappropriate.	Noted.	Report was revised to add “natural regeneration lands” beside “vacant”.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
			Landscape Composition: Donald Cousens Station to York Durham Line (pages 15-18)			
PC-76	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix L— Landscape Design Report Landscape Composition: Donald Cousens Station to York Durham Line (pages 15-18)	We ask that the sub-consult rewrite this section in the context of the national urban park’s mandate to protect natural heritage, cultural heritage, and agricultural heritage. We expect the resources assessment to change accordingly in the context of these resources which form the basis of park values.	Noted.	Appendix L – Pages 15 has been revised to add: <i>“This entire section of the transitway corridor crosses through lands identified as part of the Rouge National Urban Park. The national urban park’s mandate for these lands is to protect natural heritage, cultural heritage, and agricultural heritage.”</i>
PC-77	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix L— Landscape Design Report Conclusions	As with the previous section, the conclusions do not recognize the presence of Rouge National Urban Park as a distinguishing feature along an otherwise “vacant” corridor.	Noted.	Change to the EPR indicated for previous comment also applies to this comment.
PC-78	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix L— Landscape Design Report Conclusions	Only wooded areas are highlighted in the introductory text on page 25 as having any ecological value, whereas the detailed planting prescriptions articulated on page 27 recognize a broader range of ecological restoration opportunities, such as riparian corridors and wetlands. This diversity is of particular importance where the transitway corridor traverses Rouge National Urban Park. We suggest the introductory text be amended to reflect both the larger value of landscape diversity along the corridor (including meadows), and specifically reference the park as a unique circumstance requiring a tailored approach.	Noted.	Appendix L – Conclusions was revised to add: <i>“The proposed Rouge National Urban Park site located between Donald Cousens Station and York Durham Line is a distinguishing feature along the corridor and will require special attention when landscape mitigation plans are prepared. The unique circumstances of the park will require a tailored approach to restore the local ecosystems, reflecting the biodiversity of the site.”</i>
PC-79	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix L— Landscape Design Report Conclusions	We support the ecological restoration approach highlighted in the text on page 26, and view it as complementary to the approach Parks Canada is taking in the park to restore ecosystems.	Noted	N/A
PC-80	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix L— Landscape Design Report Figures	The figures appear to depict existing landscape features but contain no information on the landscape design strategy/approach. Some indication of what is intended and where—even at a high level, would reflect the intent of the document (if its title is to be read correctly).	As indicated in the report these landscape designs are very preliminary in nature and will require a far greater level of detail once the detailed design of station facilities have been finalized. At this stage the conceptual figures provide a guide	N/A

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
					for the detailed landscape planting plans, to be developed during the Detail Design stage of the project.	
PC-81	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix L— Landscape Design Report Figures	Figures 7, 8, and 9 should reference Rouge National Urban Park and include the park boundaries.	Noted.	Figures revised.
PC-82	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix L— Landscape Design Report Figures	The “Vacant Land” reference to lands within the park referenced in Figure 9 should be replaced with “regenerating land.”	Noted.	Figure revised.
PC-83	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix L— Landscape Design Report Figures	There is no reference to what might be intended at the ecological compensation site at the York Durham Line, nor the potential role it might play in any ecological restoration along Petticoat Creek within Rouge National Park. We would like to see this area addressed in this report.	Noted.	Figures revised.
PC-84	Parks Canada	May 27, 2016	Appendix O— Property Protection Plates Appendix O	The “Transitway ROW” depicted on this plate appears to vary from the limits of the park as currently understood. In this context, the “PROTECTED ROW EXTENDED IN AGREEMENT WITH PARKS CANADA” notation identifying the property boundary widening east of Little Rouge Creek is not clear. In general, the boundary as shown on this plate appears generous, a function of what appears to be a widening beyond the planned embankments for the Little Rouge Creek Bridge and a generous separation of the transitway from the eastbound (south side) lanes of the 407ETR—perhaps to accommodate daylighting of culverts further in the park? We would like to further understand the thinking behind these property requirements.	The preliminary design of the runningway and associated footprint was developed based on a digital terrain model as opposed to actual field surveying data, which will be used during Detail Design.  Having said that, not being able to define the actual required footprint at this stage, the right of way being protected at this stage, is rather conservative.  In regard to the offsets from the 407 ETR, the right of way of the Highway needs to be respected, aside of sufficient spacing to allow for daylighting of the structures, as the comment suggests.	No change in the EPR.
MNRF-1	MNRF	May 27, 2016	Chapter 6	Impacts to Regulated Redside Dace Habitat As indicated in the notification of Draft EPR letter dated April 29th, 2016, the preferred alternative route will intersect several regulated watercourses for Redside dace habitat. Through the conceptual design and detail design process, activities that are proposed to occur within the regulated habitat of Redside Dace will be subject to review under the ESA. This will include activities such as infrastructure installation, road and bridge construction, groundwater dewatering, the construction and operation of stormwater management facilities, and activities such as the establishment and maintenance of sediment and	Noted.  The Preliminary Design of the Transitway facilities is providing sufficient openings across watercourses with Regulated Redside Dace presence to minimize or avoid effects to this habitat. The Detail Design phase will ensure this requirement is achieved.	Text added to Chapter 9:  “If activities such as infrastructure installation, road and bridge construction, groundwater dewatering, construction and operation of stormwater management facilities, and activities such as the establishment and maintenance of sediment and erosion control measures occur within or adjacent to watercourses regulated as habitat of Redside Dace, they will be subject to review under ESA.”

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				erosion control measures within or adjacent to watercourses regulated as habitat of Redside Dace.		
MNRF-2	MNRF	May 27, 2016	Chapter 6	<p>Impacts to Regulated Redside Dace Habitat</p> <p>The document entitled Guidance for Development Activities in Redside Dace Protected Habitat&lt;<a href="https://www.ontario.ca/page/guidance-development-activities-redside-dace-protected-habitat">https://www.ontario.ca/page/guidance-development-activities-redside-dace-protected-habitat</a>&gt; (March 15, 2016) provides specific direction on avoiding and minimizing impacts to Redside Dace. Implementation of much of the direction outlined in this document will likely be required throughout the 407 Transitway, where relevant, as per conditions on ESA permits or other authorizations. Of note will be specific requirements for transitway crossings of Redside Dace regulated habitat and stormwater management facilities discharging into Redside Dace regulated habitat. MNRF will have specific requirements, of which the stormwater requirements are critical given the potential impact that stormwater can have on Redside Dace and its habitat. Furthermore, transitway crossings will have to demonstrate that all technically feasible efforts to minimize impacts to Redside Dace and its habitat are applied to crossing design and construction implementation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The environmental assessment of the Transitway facilities are following the Guidance for Development Activities in Redside Protected Habitat.</p> <p>The Preliminary Design of the Transitway facilities is providing sufficient openings across water courses with Regulated Redside Dace presence to minimize or avoid effects to this habitat. The Detail Design phase will ensure this requirement is achieved.</p>	<p>Text change to the EPR Chapter 9 described in the previous comment (Comment MNRF-1) also applies here.</p> <p>Text added to Chapter 6:</p> <p>“The proposed stormwater management strategy for the 407 Transitway includes several of the best management practices discussed in Guidance for Development Activities in Redside Dace Protected Habitat (2016). In these areas, enhanced swales with bottom draw hickenbottom outlets are provided along the Transitway alignment to provide both quantity and quality control while maintaining existing overall drainage patterns as much as possible. Furthermore, all proposed wet ponds feature bottom draw outlets, and SWMF-7 at Brock Road Station will discharge to a cooling trench before flows enter Brougham Creek. This facility also provides 120 hour detention of the 25 mm quality design storm for erosion control. SWMF-6, which also discharges to Brougham Creek, will have a 3 m deep permanent pool to provide thermal mitigation. Additional mitigation measures, such as floating islands and permeable pavements, will be assessed for these facilities during detailed design.”</p>
MNRF-3	MNRF	May 27, 2016	Chapter 5 Table 5-9 Chapter 6	<p>Impacts to Regulated Redside Dace Habitat</p> <p>As it relates to stormwater management facilities, water quantity control (erosion thresholds) and water quality control (including thermal considerations of discharge water) will be subject to MNRF review and approval. MNRF guidance documents including Guidance for Development Activities in Redside Dace Protected Habitat and the SWM Pond Thermal Mitigation for Redside Dace Version 1.1 (2014, attached) should be referenced within table 5-9 of the Draft EPR and adhered to during detailed design. An average 3 meter permanent pool depth will be required for each facility to ensure that temperature of discharge water does not exceed 24 degrees celcius. Through the detail design process, other designs may be considered by MNRF where achieving a 3 meter depth is not technically feasible. Where MNRF guidance for stormwater management facilitates is implemented, an authorization (i.e. permit) under the ESA may not be required provided there is no anticipated impact to Redside Dace.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Guidance for Development Activities in Redside Dace Protected Habitat (2016) and SWM Pond Thermal Mitigation for Redside Dace Version 1.1 (2014) will be referenced in Table 5-9 in the EPR and adhered to during Detail Design. Of the seven SWM facilities proposed for this project, only two drain to Redside Dace habitats. SWMF-6, which discharges to Brougham Creek at Brock Road Station, will have a 3 m deep permanent pool to provide thermal mitigation. Due to a high groundwater table, the permanent pool depth for SWMF-7 is smaller than 3m; however, this facility will discharge to a cooling trench before flows enter Brougham Creek.</p>	<p>Section 5.4.1 Hydrologic Analysis of the EPR has been revised.</p> <p>Please also refer to Section 5.2.2.6 in the Drainage Report (Appendix C of the EPR).</p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MNRF-4	MNRF	May 27, 2016	Chapter 5 Chapter 9	<p>Brock Road SW Alternative</p> <p>The preferred alignment for this portion of the transitway is the SW alternative. This influences future alignment of the transitway between the carpool and highway 7. MNRF notes that an existing old ROW for sideline 16 includes a dysfunctional culvert and associated hydrology at this crossing in the main branch of Brougham creek, immediately downstream of the realigned Brock Road Crossing and the proposed Transitway crossing. As it currently stands, this would result in three crossings of Brougham Creek within 120 metres of stream. Recognizing the cumulative impacts of these three crossings, the inevitable failure of the sideline 16 culvert, and the potential for compensation through DFO authorizations associated with this project, it is MNRFs recommendation that either the transitway alignment be adjusted to utilize the existing sideline 16 ROW and crossing, or that the existing sideline 16 culvert be removed to minimize impacts to the hydrology and associated fish habitat in this sensitive section of Brougham Creek. This would require consultation with DFO, First Nations and TRCA which MNRF would support with input and information. Please consider the cumulative effects of the proposed preferred alternative alignment for this portion of the project. MNRF welcomes the opportunity to continue discussions in this matter with MTO, DFO, TRCA, and First Nations.</p>	The study limits for the project end at Brock Road. The runningway alignment to the east of Brock Road shows a conceptual connection with the protected ROW to the East.	<p>Text added to Section 5.1.3 – under Description of the “Runningway Alignment”:</p> <p>“Horizontal and vertical geometry between Old Brock Road and Brock Road allows for alignment flexibility east of the Study Limit. It is recommended that future Preliminary Design of Transitway section east of Brock Road assess various alignment options, including the use of Sideline 16 right of way, or the removal of the existing Sideline 16 culvert to minimize impacts to the hydrology and associated fish habitat in this sensitive section of Brougham Creek”</p>
MNRF-5	MNRF	May 27, 2016	Chapter 6 Chapter 9	<p>Brock Road SW Alternative</p> <p>MNRF also notes that a significant amount of fish habitat works are currently being done in the tributary of Brougham Creek, also known as site 7 within the 407 EA including a stream realignment with associated coldwater fish habitat features under a DFO fisheries authorization. Future works around this realignment will require increased protection and care during construction to avoid impacts to these fish habitat features.</p>	Please refer to response for the previous comment (MNRF-4).	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MNRF-4).
MNRF-6	MNRF	May 27, 2016	Section 3.1.1.	<p>Hydrogeology</p> <p>Section 3.1.1. states that there are no significant groundwater discharge areas expected within the study area. MNRF notes that there is a high likelihood that groundwater discharge areas exist in the study area due to presence of brook trout. Specifically, in the eastern portion of the study limits which are headwater areas, there are known populations of brook trout which require</p>	Noted.	<p>Text added to the Groundwater Report (Appendix M of the EPR):</p> <p>"It is recommended that the potential impacts be re-assessed along with more detailed site specific hydrogeological data at the Detail Design stage of the project and appropriate mitigation measures incorporated into the design."</p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				these groundwater upwellings for spawning. Unforeseen challenges with groundwater during construction of the Brock Rd. interchange have been well documented. As recommended within Appendix M: Groundwater Report, actual site conditions will require site specific investigations. MNRF recommends that these field investigations help to influence final design rather than occur following final design as is currently recommended within the groundwater report.		
MNRF-7	MNRF	May 27, 2016	page 6-10	Bobolink, Meadowlark and Barn Swallow As noted on page 6-10 of the draft EPR, further field investigations are required to confirm species presence for bobolink, meadowlark and barn swallow during the appropriate times. Subsequently, an authorization under the ESA (2007) may be required.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
MNRF-8	MNRF	May 27, 2016	page 4-13	Bobolink, Meadowlark and Barn Swallow Specifically, MNRF notes that table on page 4-13 for the Whites Road SW Alternative states that effects on Bobolink and Meadowlark at this site can be avoided if the species is present, based upon the current proposal for the station. For clarification, if the species is present, avoidance of their habitat is not feasible based on the current proposal. Subsequently, an authorization under the ESA (2007) may be required.	Figure 4.6 revised to address this comment.	Text change to the EPR Chapter 4 – Figure 4.6 under SW Alternative 1 Potential Species/Habitat at Risk – has been revised to read:  “Potential impacts to Bobolink/Eastern Meadowlark habitat; if confirmed, an authorization under the ESA (2007) would be required.”
MNRF-9	MNRF	May 27, 2016	Figure 2c of Appendix E	Butternut Section 3.1.6 and figure 2c of Appendix E of the Draft EPR notes that 14 butternut were found south of the transitway. Please provide the UTM coordinates for the location of those trees for our long-term species at risk datasets. It is also unclear within the terrestrial report where the field investigations occurred throughout the study area. Please include a map of the field investigation areas during 2015.	UTM coordinates are being provided.	A map showing field investigation areas is being included in Figure 2C of Appendix E.
MOECC-G1	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016		The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s Environmental Approvals Branch, Environmental Assessment Services Section, has completed its review of the draft Environment Project Report (EPR) for the Ministry of Transportation’s Highway 407 Transitway, Kennedy Road to Brock Road, Transitway (Transit Project). The review was carried out to determine whether or not the draft EPR meets the expectations set forth in the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s Guide: Ontario’s Transit Project Assessment Process and the	Noted.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				requirements set forth in Ontario Regulation 231/08, Transit Projects and Greater Toronto Transportation Authority Undertakings (Transit Regulation).		
MOECC-G2	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016		The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s Environmental Approvals Branch has prepared the following comments, pertaining to the identified sections of the draft EPR documentation, for consideration by the Ministry of Transportation when finalizing the EPR.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G3	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016		General It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s expectation that an EPR submitted to the Ministry for approval should provide a clear and detailed explanation of the environmental planning and decision-making process that was followed to arrive at the conclusions which support the selection of a proposed transit project. Any interested person reading the EPR should be able to easily follow the process used by the proponent in determining the proposed transit project, including the rationale for making certain choices and the analytical tools or information sources that were used to support the decision making process. Clarity, simplicity, completeness and precision are the objectives proponents should strive for when preparing an EPR.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G4	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016		General The Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) should be open and transparent. This is to ensure that any interested person will be able to follow the process through its various stages of planning and decision making until a proposed transit project is selected. Anyone should be able to trace the results of the TPAP, using the evaluation approaches and methodology that support the decision making process. Means of achieving transparency can include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Using appropriate, well-established and easily understood evaluation methods;</li> <li>· Making the process clear, transparent and logical;</li> <li>· Sharing complete information with all interested persons to support conclusions and recommendations at each phase in the TPAP; and,</li> <li>· Documenting the process in an easy to understand language which clearly explains the rationale for making certain choices and decisions.</li> </ul>	Noted.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-G5	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016		<p>General</p> <p>It is also the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s expectation that proponents provide sufficient information about the potential environmental effects (both positive and negative) of the proposed transit project described in an EPR in order to demonstrate that the proposed transit project achieves environmental protection. Proponents should prepare technical studies using the best available data; carefully select their assessment and evaluation methods to analyze their proposal; and, use sound scientific, engineering and planning practices in the preparation of an EPR. Consultation with the regulatory agencies, Aboriginal communities and potentially affected persons may assist the proponent in selecting appropriate analytical tools or information to be included in the planning process. Proponents should be aware that while available and published data can be used in the earlier steps in the TPAP, it is expected that there will be a transition to original field work, surveys, studies and reports for analysis and evaluation in the later stages. The level of detail will increase as the TPAP proceeds.</p>	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G6	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016		<p>General</p> <p>Each EPR is unique. As a result, the level of detail and required information will vary by undertaking or the stage in the planning process. The appropriate level of detail depends on a number of factors, such as the number of approvals required; the nature and complexity of the proposed transit project; the potential for environmental effects of the proposed transit project; and the level of public interest. The level of detail presented in an EPR should be sufficient to fulfil the requirements of the Transit Projects Regulation and assure regulatory agencies, Aboriginal communities and potentially affected persons that a proposed transit project is technically feasible, achieves environmental protection and address the problem or opportunity that prompted the TPAP.</p>	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G7	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	1	<p>Section 1 Introduction</p> <p>a) Section 1, entitled “introduction”, provides an overview of the TPAP that was carried out to address the requirements under the Transit Regulation for the proposed Transit Project. Although it is understood from the overview that the Ministry of Transportation is the proponent of the proposed Transit Project described in</p>	Noted.	<p>Text added to Section 1.1 407 Transitway Background and Status:</p> <p>“The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is the proponent of the 407 Transitway from East of Kennedy Road to Brock Road TPAP. It is uncertain at this time who will construct, operate and maintain the 407 Transitway; however, at the present time, MTO assumes responsibility for the</p>



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				the draft EPR, it is not clear how the Ministry will have charge, management or control over the construction and operation and decommissioning of the proposed Transit Project. It is suggested that consideration be given to providing an explanation about the Ministry of Transportation's roles and responsibilities during the TPAP. It is also suggested that consideration be given to explaining how the Ministry of Transportation will have charge, management or control over the implementation and operation of the proposed Transit Project described in the draft EPR.		execution of those phases of implementation. MTO would also assume any decommissioning of the facility should it be necessary."
MOECC-G8	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	1	<p>Section 1 Introduction</p> <p>b) Section 1.3, entitled "Study Area", identifies the geographical area that represents the study area in which activities associated with the construction and operation of the proposed undertaking described in the draft EPR will take place. The study area encompasses a section of 407 Transitway corridor, from west of Kennedy Road in the Town of Markham in the Region of York to east of Brock Road in the City of Pickering in the Region of Durham, including an area of 500 meters on each side of the alignment. Although it is understood that the boundaries of the EPR study area represent the area in which the proposed Transit Project will be located, it is not clear as to whether the boundaries identified adequately represent the geographical area within which the potential effects of the activities associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Transit Project are likely to occur.</p>	Noted.	<p>Text added to Section 1.3 Study Area:</p> <p>"The boundaries in which the environmental effects were identified and assessed; and the reason(s) why these areas were considered sufficient, is explained below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terrestrial: MTO Environmental Reference For Highway Design states that for all terrestrial ecosystems field investigation, the study area be defined as within the existing and proposed ROW and adjacent lands for 120 m unless a sensitive receptor located more than a distance of 120 m is likely to be adversely affected. As the majority of the anticipated impacts are footprint impacts we feel that the study area limits adequately address any terrestrial impacts.</li> <li>• Fish Habitat: MTO Environmental Guide for Fish and Fish Habitat (2013) presents minimum requirements for area of field investigation which consists of 50 m upstream and 200 m downstream of the limits of the proposed ROW. Further, the zone of detailed field investigation conducted for this study is greater than the area prescribed by the Guide. It consisted of 50 m upstream and downstream. The prescribed area for this zone by the Guide is 20 m upstream and 50 m downstream. Please note that the upstream and downstream distance is measured from the thalweg of the stream and not the straight linear distance from the proposed ROW.</li> <li>• Groundwater: the purpose of the Secondary Source Groundwater Assessment was to identify hydrogeological constraints to the implementation of the 407 Transitway and to assess potential impacts on existing groundwater resources. The 1 km corridor study area will identify any constraints and if any</li> </ul>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<p>identified requirements for future study at a later phase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property Contamination and Waste, Archaeology, Cultural Heritage: the potential impacts are footprint impacts in nature therefore the 1km wide corridor was determined to be adequate to identify any constraints for the implementation of the transitway.</li> <li>Noise: Noise Sensitive Areas were identified regardless of size and location. The study area limits covers the noise sensitive areas that will be potentially affected.</li> <li>Air: the physical boundary does not have any meaning. Impacts were assessed at a much higher regional level. A detailed description is presented in the Air Quality Report regarding the study area limits.</li> </ul> <p>The assessed boundaries are within the 500m set-back on either side of the runningway named the Study Area in the EPR.”</p>
MOECC-G9	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	1	<p>Section 1 Introduction b) In accordance with the requirements of subsection 9.(2)6 of the Transit Regulation, an EPR is to include an assessment and evaluation of the potential impacts of the preferred method of carrying out a transit project described in the EPR on the environment. In order to properly address this requirement, an EPR must define the geographic boundaries that can be reasonably expected to be potentially affected by a transit project being considered as part of the TPAP. The geographic area should be large enough to incorporate all areas that may be potentially affected, both directly and indirectly, by the proposed transit project. The geographical boundaries of the EPR study area allow interested government agencies, Aboriginal communities and members of the public to focus their attention on only those areas that are reasonable expected to be potentially affected by a transit project being considered as part of the TPAP.</p>	<p>Noted. This is addressed under comment MOECC-G8.</p>	<p>Text added to text referred in “Changes of the EPR” of previous Comment (G8): “The geographical boundaries of the study area described above, will allow interested government agencies, Aboriginal communities and members of the public to focus their attention on only those areas that are reasonable expected to be potentially affected by the 407 Transitway being proposed in the TPAP.”</p>
MOECC-G10	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	1	<p>Section 1 Introduction b) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that the boundaries of the draft EPR study area may not adequately represent a geographical area that is large enough to account for all the areas within which the potential effects of the proposed Transit</p>	<p>Noted. This is addressed under comments MOECC-G8 and G9.</p>	<p>Change described in Comments G8 and G9.</p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				Project may be reasonably expected to occur. As a result, it may be difficult for interested government agencies, Aboriginal communities and members of the public to determine whether the proposed undertaking may impact their respective jurisdictional mandates, Aboriginal rights and interests.		
MOECC-G11	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	1	Section 1 Introduction b) It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change that the boundaries of the draft EPR study area will be revised to ensure that they accurately represent the broad geographic area within which the effects and potential effects, both direct and indirect, of the proposed Transit Project being considered as part of TPAP are likely to occur. This should include providing an explanation as to how the boundaries of the study area were determined, and the rationale that supports their selection. Alternatively, if revisions are deemed not to be required, an explanation should be provided to clarify how it has been determined that the boundaries of the study area accurately represent the broad geographic area within which the effects and potential effects, both direct and indirect, of the proposed Transit Project being considered as part of the TPAP are likely to occur.	Noted. This is addressed under comments MOECC-G8 and G9.	Change described in Comments G8 and G9.
MOECC-G12	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	3	Section 3 Existing Conditions a) Subsection 3.14, entitled "Groundwater", identifies that Wellhead Protection Areas and municipal water wells are absent from the EPR Study Area; however, there is no information about any existing groundwater features within the EPR study area. Although there may not be any wells used as drinking water sources in the EPR study area, there still may be a potential for impacts to groundwater resulting from the construction and operation of the undertaking described in the draft EPR. It is therefore suggested that consideration be given to providing a description of the existing groundwater features within the EPR study area.	Noted.	Text added to Section 3.1.4 of the EPR: "Shallow local groundwater flow within the study area is expected to reflect local topography and be toward surface water features. Deeper regional groundwater flow is expected to be to the south. Based on the surficial geology of the study area, significant areas of groundwater recharge are not expected within most of the study area. A relatively higher level of groundwater recharge is likely occurring associated with the relatively sandier portions of the glacial lake sediments in the vicinity of Kennedy Road and McCowan Road. Groundwater discharge in the study area is expected to be limited primarily to the lower elevation stream valley areas, with potentially a minor component within shallow stream features in the till deposits."
MOECC-G13	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	3	Section 3 Existing Conditions b) Subsection 3.14, entitled "Groundwater", explains, that according to mapping from the Regional Municipalities of York and Durham, wellhead protection areas and municipal wells are absent from the EPR Study Area.	Noted. According to MOECC's Source Water Protection Map, there are no Source Water Protection Areas/Intake Protection Zones within the study area.	Text added to Section 3.1.4 of the EPR: "According to MOECC's Source Water Protection Map, there are no Source Water Protection Areas/Intake Protection Zones within the study area."

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				Although it is understood that there is an absence of drinking water wells in the draft EPR study area, there is no information about the existence of Source Water Protection Areas or Intake Protection Zones.		
MOECC-G14	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	3	Section 3 Existing Conditions b) It should be noted that the province of Ontario has a multi-barrier approach to protecting drinking water. The first step is protecting surface and ground water that supply municipal drinking water systems. This is called source protection; and, source water protection is to be considered as part of the TPAP. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that the description of the exiting conditions within the draft EPR study area does not adequately confirm that there are no areas of source water protection. It is therefore suggested that consideration be given to confirming and describing the existence of any Source Water Protection Areas and Intake Protection Zones that may be located within the draft EPR study area.	This is addressed under comment MOECC-G13.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G15	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	3	Section 3 Existing Conditions c) Subsection 3.4, entitled "Traffic Operations", includes a description of the potential traffic impacts of the proposed Transit Project station locations on the draft EPR study area road network. Given that the purpose of describing the EPR study area is to establish an inventory of the existing baseline environmental conditions against which the potential impacts of the proposed transit project described in the EPR will be assessed, it is not understood why an assessment of recommended station locations and associated impacts are discussed. It is suggested that consideration be given to explaining why the potential traffic impacts of the proposed Transit Project station locations on the draft EPR study area road network are being discussed as part of the description of the draft EPR study area. Alternatively, the assessment of station locations impacts should be moved to Section 4 of the draft EPR.	Noted. Please note that the complete set of Traffic Impact Studies is included in Appendix B of the EPR. Section 3.4 Traffic Operations has been removed from Chapter 3. Recommendations for traffic operations at all station accesses are included in Chapter 6.	Section 3.4 "Traffic Operations" has been revised to read: "Appendix B contains the traffic impact analysis for areas affected by the proposed Transitway stations."
MOECC-G16	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	4	Section 4 Identification of Alternatives a) Section 4.1, entitled "Rapid Transit Technology", explains that an evaluation of alternative Rapid Transit Technology was previously carried out for the entire 407 Transitway, as part of a separate TPAP; and, that Bus Rapid Transit was determined to be the preferred technology. Although it is understood that Bus Rapid	Noted.  The Environmental Assessment of the 407 Transitway Kennedy Road to Brock Road is being conducted under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), which does not require an "Evaluation of the Undertaking". Further, this was	The Final EPR of the East of Kennedy Road to Brock Road Section is being edited to include the assessment and rationale for the selection of the recommended technology.  Section 4.1 has been revised to read:

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				<p>Transit has been determined to be the preferred technology for the proposed Transit Project, there is no explanation about the rationale that supports this conclusion. It is suggested that consideration be given to explaining how it was determined that Bus Rapid Transit Technology was the preferred technology for the entire 407 Transitway.</p>	<p>already conducted in the approved 407 Transitway Central Section EA, which started as a MTO Class EA. However, the EPR has been revised to address MOECC's request.</p>	<p>“Rapid Transit Technology evaluation for the entire 407 Transitway was conducted by Parsons (formerly Delcan) as part of the Environmental Assessment for the Central Section (Highway 400 to Kennedy Road), and approved as part of the TPAP EPR filed in February of 2011.</p> <p>Five candidate technology alternatives were considered in developing a response to the need for inter-regional rapid transit in the ultimate 150 kilometre 407 Corridor.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT);</li> <li>2. Light Rail Transit (LRT); and</li> <li>3. Automated Guideway Transit (AGT).</li> <li>4. Heavy Rail Transit (e.g. subway; and,</li> <li>5. Commuter Rail.</li> </ol> <p>Each of the above candidate technologies was evaluated against four major criteria reflecting the near- and long-term needs and objectives for transit in the 407 Corridor. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit service quality including required capacity, user convenience and comfort, service speed and reliability and network connectivity/interlining;</li> <li>• Planning considerations addressing infrastructure integration and the system's support of Provincial growth and planning policies;</li> <li>• Environmental compatibility covering effects on the natural and socio-economic environment and energy consumption; and;</li> <li>• Implementation considerations including ROW property requirements, cost-effectiveness and implementation staging.</li> </ul> <p>The evaluation of the five candidate technology alternatives was conducted as part of the 407 Transitway Central Section (Hwy 400 to Kennedy Road) approved TPAP. Rationale of the evaluation and conclusions are below:</p> <p>From the evaluation, it is evident that initially, BRT would be the preferred technology for the 407 Transitway but that conversion to LRT technology in the future should be protected to respond to the anticipated growth in ridership volumes beyond the 2031 planning horizon. In</p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<p>addition to significant implementation staging flexibility to transition from operation in mixed traffic on the 407 ETR to higher speed service on a fully exclusive runningway, BRT provides capacity for the projected demand at the desired level of convenience and comfort.</p> <p>Like the other line-haul operating technologies, it offers the same benefits of network connectivity with three GO Rail lines and two subway line extensions to the corridor; and as well, being bus-based, it does not need feeder services at all stations as the vehicles are able to interline by operating on city streets or highways to reach key off-line destinations such as Pearson Airport or the 400-series highways.</p> <p>Similar to the other technologies, BRT provides a vehicle technology that is becoming increasingly more energy efficient with improved emission control. Another important advantage of the BRT system is implementation staging flexibility, allowing the opportunity to build specific segments of runningway at a time, maintaining the Transitway operation on the 407 ETR Highway along un-built or under construction segments. BRT's capital and operating costs are compatible with the size of the market for rapid transit service in the corridor compared to the other high capital investment technologies. Lastly, the runningway and station infrastructure can be shared by other transit operators providing compatible local services.</p> <p>LRT technology is recommended as a candidate technology for potential later conversion of the busway to meet the potential future increase in service demand. Unlike the Diesel Multiple Units (DMU) and Heavy Rail, the BRT alignment geometric standards do not limit alignment planning options and LRT can be implemented with adequate measures to mitigate most natural and socio-economic impacts. Conversion to automatic train operation is also feasible if east-west trip volumes in the corridor ever justified higher capacity (over 15,000 passengers per hour per direction) in the distant future."</p>
MOECC-G17	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	4	Section 4 Identification of Alternatives b) Subsection 4.3, entitled "Identification and Evaluation of Station Alternatives", provides an explanation about how alternative station sites were identified and evaluated as part of the TPAP for the proposed Transit Project. Although an outline of the evaluation of station	Noted.	<p>Chapter 4 Table 4.1 (Station Sites Evaluation Criteria) has been revised to provide evaluation criteria clarification.</p> <p>Text added to Section 4.3: "An initial evaluation was conducted following qualitative rationale by the Project Team based on the outcome of the</p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				sites and the conclusions reached have been presented in table form, there is no information about the methodology that was applied in determining a reasonable range of alternative station sites or how each station site was compared and evaluated. It is suggested that consideration be given to providing a more detailed explanation about how each alternative station location was identified and compared. In particular, it is suggested that an explanation be provided to clarify how the evaluation criteria used to identify and compare potential station sites was developed, applied and measured.		various indicators used in the criteria. The results were discussed with the MTO Senior Management. Stakeholders and the public were informed prior to finalization and revision of the conclusions.”
MOECC-G18	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	4	Section 4 Identification of Alternatives c) Subsection 4.4, entitled “Alignment Alternatives”, discusses the process that was carried out to identify and develop the preliminary horizontal and vertical alignment alternatives of the proposed Transit Project. Although the key steps in the identification and development of the preliminary alignment alternatives of the proposed Transit Project have been identified, there is no information about the methodology that was applied in determining a reasonable range of horizontal and vertical alignment alternatives or how each alternative alignment was compared and evaluated. It is suggested that consideration be given to providing a more detailed explanation about the how each alternative horizontal and vertical alignment was identified and compared. In particular, it is suggested that an explanation be provided to clarify how the evaluation criteria used to identify and compare potential alignments was developed, applied and measured.	Noted.	Section 4.4 has been revised to read: “Runningway alignment alternatives were developed linking the potential alternative station sites that were carried through the first screening of station alternatives. The alignment options were developed and assessed based on the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet the established MTO Transitway design standards;</li> <li>• Use as much land as possible that is identified in the 1998 Corridor Protection Study, or land that is Provincially owned or not considered developable;</li> <li>• Avoid impacts on private property, environmental features, current and planned infrastructure including active transportation and recreational trails;</li> <li>• Locate the station platforms as close as possible to surface transportation facilities to allow optimum passenger accessibility;</li> <li>• Maintain the runningway profile as close to existing ground as practical to reduce earthwork volumes and structure costs;</li> <li>• Not exceed desirable geometric horizontal and vertical alignment components such as curvature and grades to maximize passenger comfort, to maximize sight distances and safety, and to reduce future vehicle operation and maintenance costs;</li> <li>• Minimize adverse effects on adjacent communities and general traffic during construction;</li> <li>• Minimize effects on municipal services and utilities during construction to reduce costs, and;</li> </ul> ”

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comply with lateral and vertical provincial and municipal technical and environmental clearance standards.</li> </ul> <p>The alignment options were developed concurrently with the station site alternatives to optimize feasibility and functionality. The alignment alternatives were evaluated as part of the overall site assessments (Figures 4.2 to 4.8).</p> <p>Alternatives were identified and assessed in specific areas where constraints were critical, as described below.</p> <p><b>McCowan Road Crossing</b></p> <p>The McCowan Road Crossing presents several challenges. The presence of a large trunk sewer running under McCowan Road eliminates an underpass crossing. Horizontally, it was confirmed that Hydro One is planning to add a high voltage 500 KV line north of their existing facilities forcing the Transitway alignment further north. This northern shift, to include the clearance standards, requires the Transitway to cross all 407 ETR ramps on and off McCowan Road.</p> <p><b>Donald Cousens / Reesor Road Crossing</b></p> <p>The Donald Cousens Parkway/ Reesor Road area presented some significant challenges. The only viable station site locates the station platform on the southeast side of the interchange. Placing the station at this location, while optimizing the limited land available, requires the alignment to be located as far north as possible. The grade difference between Donald Cousens Parkway and Reesor Road is significant, requiring either a viaduct structure running above both roadways or an underpass structure at Donald Cousens Parkway and an overpass structure at Reesor Road with a steep grade between the two. With the presence of the CP Havelock rail line just east of Reesor Road, the most suitable profile includes underpassing the Donald Cousens Interchange, and bridging over Reesor Road and the rail line.</p> <p><b>Rossland Road Crossing</b></p> <p>Avoiding natural and cultural environmental features, the Seaton Development plans, and the future Rossland ETR interchange restricted the alignment options in this area.</p> <p><b>Brock Road Crossing</b></p>



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<p>In this area, the alignment options were also restricted by several constraints: i) there is only one viable station site; ii) within the vicinity of Brock Road there is a significant coldwater creek system which runs through the Brock Road Interchange area; and the alignment needs to maintain required regulated offsets from the creek; iii) a cultural heritage site is located in the southeast quadrant of the Interchange forcing a sharp northward bend in the alignment; iv) the creek system precluded any possibility of an underpass alignment at this location; v) natural environmental features east of Brock Road needed to be considered to ensure sufficient flexibility for the Transitway alignment east of Brock Road (not part of this Study).</p> <p>Alignment through Stations</p> <p>Due to the requirement for horizontal and vertical tangents at station platforms, sharper curves both horizontally and vertically were required to achieve the preferred station location and minimize impact on adjacent land uses such as environmentally sensitive areas, structures or private property. The reduction of speed adjacent to the station areas is not considered to be detrimental to the running speed of the Transitway as buses will either be coming to a full stop to allow passengers to board and alight, or will need to reduce speed to run through the station as the running speed through stations at a maximum 60km/h.</p> <p>The remaining segments did not present environmental, technical or property issues.</p> <p>Development of Alignments and Evaluation Procedure</p> <p>The alignments were developed based on achieving the best Transitway operation possible. The indicators to evaluate Transitway operation were, compliance with the established 407 Transitway Design Standards, and suitability for an efficient staged implementation of the exclusive runningway.</p> <p>The 407 Transitway Design Standards were developed as part of the 407 Transitway Central Section (Hwy 400 to Kennedy Road) project, based on three mayor goals: safety, ride comfort and optimum travel time. Suitability for efficient staged implementation was assessed based on</p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						ease of access to/from the runningway segment to/from the 407 ETR.”
MOECC-G19	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative a) Subsection 5, entitled “Preferred Alternative”, provides a description of the technically preferred Transit Project alternative that has been determined through the completion of the TPAP. It should be noted that in accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must contain a final description of the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Regulation is being sought. Therefore, in keeping with the requirements set forth in the Transit Regulation, and the expectations set forth in the Guide to Ontario’s Transit Project Assessment Process, it is suggested that consideration be given to renaming this Section “Final Project Description”.	Noted.	Title of Chapter 5 “Preferred Alternative” has been revised to “Final Project Description”.
MOECC-G20	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative b) Subsection 5, entitled “Preferred Alternative”, provides a description of the technically preferred Transit Project alternative that has been determined through the completion of the TPAP. It has been noted that the description of the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought states that the proposed Transit Project will either operate as Bus Rapid Transit Technology (using single or double-decker coaches) or as Light Rail Transit Technology (using electrified multiple-unit trains up to 100 meters in length). It is understood the that the draft EPR only seeks approval for the construction and operation of a Bus Rapid Transitway; however, the description of technically preferred Transit Project alternative seems to suggest that approval will be sought to construct and operate a Bus Rapid Transit system and a Light Rail Transit system.	Noted.	First paragraph of Chapter 5 – Section 5 has been revised to read:  “The technically preferred Transitway alternative has been planned for the operation of an intermediate capacity, regional rapid transit service provided by Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) technology. The Functional Plan and Preliminary Design was developed allowing for conversion to Light Rail Transit technology in the future. The EPR is seeking approval for the construction and operation of BRT. Should a conversion to LRT in the future be planned, MOECC will be consulted pursuant to Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation to define the assessment process that would apply.”
MOECC-G21	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative b) It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change that it be clarified that the draft EPR seeks approval under the Transit Regulation to construct and operate a proposed Transit Project that uses Bus Rapid Transit Technology. Although the draft EPR does acknowledge that the proposed Transit Project may be converted to Light Rail Transit Technology in the future, it	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G20).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				should be clear that conversion to Light Rail Transit Technology will be the subject of a separate TPAP.		
MOECC-G22	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative c) Subsection 5, entitled “Preferred Alternative”, provides a description of the technically preferred Transit Project alternative that has been determined through the completion of the TPAP. It is understood that the description of the proposed Transit Project outlines the functional requirements and design principles that support service design and that the final configuration of the proposed Transit Project is to be confirmed and assessed after the completion of the TPAP. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that the level of detail provided as part of the description of the proposed Transit Project may be inconsistent with the requirements of the Transit Regulation; and, that because the proposed Transit Project described in the draft EPR may revised after the completion of the TPAP it may be considered reasonable to assume that the proposed Transit Project that is to be implemented may be inconsistent with the description of the proposed Transit Project presented in the draft EPR.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G20).
MOECC-G23	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative c) It should be noted that the Transit Regulation exempts certain proponents of Transit Projects from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act, provided the requirements of the Regulation are met. In particular, a proponent of a transit project proceeding under the Transit Regulation is required to prepare and submit an EPR that documents the transit assessment process that was followed and the conclusions that were reached. This includes, but is not limited to, providing an explanation about how the transit assessment process was carried out; a summary about how the conclusions of the assessment process were reached; and, a description of the transit project that has been determined through the TPAP. In accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a “final description” of the transit project that is to be implemented, including a description of the preferred method of carrying out the undertaking. The final description of the transit project presented in an EPR is the undertaking that is exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation.	Noted.	The EPR has been revised, where applicable, to address MOECC concerns.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-G24	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative c) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that the approach by the Ministry of Transportation to describe portions of the proposed Transit Project at a functional level of design may be inconsistent with the requirements of Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation. Under the Transit Regulation there is an expectation that an EPR will include a final description of the transit project that a proponent proposes to implement, and that the transit project will implement as described in the EPR. It is considered inappropriate and contrary to the spirit of the Transit Regulation for a proponent to include a description of a transit project in an EPR that may be revised or changed, and is therefore likely be different from the transit project that is eventually implemented. This is because only the transit project described in an EPR is exempt from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act. Knowingly considering the implementation of a transit project that may differ from the transit project described in an EPR could be considered a violation of Section 5(3) of the Environmental Assessment Act, which prohibits proceeding with an undertaking prior to receiving approval under the Act.	Noted.	Section 5 of the EPR has been revised to clearly describe the transit project seeking environmental approval, following the Transit Regulation. Should any change to the transit project described in Section 5 be proposed in the future, MOECC will be consulted pursuant to Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation to define the assessment process that would apply
MOECC-G25	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative c) It should be noted that Section 15 of the Transit Regulation provides a process that is to be followed should a change to a transit project described in an EPR be required after the completion of the TPAP. The addendum process is intended to address the possibility that in implementing a transit project certain modifications may have to be made that are inconsistent with the description of a transit project provided in an EPR. Any changes to the description of a transit project presented in an EPR that are made without having completed the Transit Regulation addendum process will not have been exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation.	Noted.	Section 5 of the EPR has been revised to clearly describe the transit project seeking environmental approval, following the Transit Regulation. Should any change to the transit project described in Section 5 be proposed in the future, MOECC will be consulted pursuant to Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation to define the assessment process that would apply
MOECC-G26	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative c) It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's expectation that that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project will include a final description of the transit project for which approval under the Transit	Noted.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				Regulation is being sought, including a description of each of the components that are to form part of the proposed transit project that will be implemented following the completion of the TPAP.		
MOECC-G27	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative d) Subsection 5.1.1, entitled “Alignment Design Guidelines”, provides a brief summary of the design standards used to develop the horizontal and vertical runningway alignments of the proposed Transit Project. It is not understood how the identified design standards were considered during the process that was carried out to identify and develop the preliminary horizontal and vertical alignment alternatives of the proposed Transit Project. It is requested that an explanation be provided to clarify how the design standards used to develop horizontal and vertical runningway alignments were considered and incorporated into the evaluation and assessment process used to identify and develop the preliminary horizontal and vertical alignment alternatives of the proposed Transit Project.	Noted.	Chapter 4, Section 4.4 has been revised to provide an explanation of how the design guidelines were considered in the identification and evaluation of the horizontal and vertical alignment alternatives.  Chapter 5 was revised removing Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2, Alignment Design Guidelines and Criteria. This narrative was moved to Chapter 4, Section 4.4.
MOECC-G28	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative e) Subsection 5.1.1, entitled “Alignment Design Guidelines”, provides a brief summary of the design standards used to develop the horizontal and vertical runningway alignments of the proposed Transit Project. Given that the purpose of Section 5 of the draft EPR is to provide a description of the technically preferred Transit Project alternative that has been determined through the completion of the TPAP, it is not understood why the design standards used to develop the horizontal and vertical runningway alignments of the proposed Transit Project are discussed. It is suggested that consideration be given to explaining why the design standards used to develop the horizontal and vertical runningway alignments of the proposed Transit Project are being discussed as part of the description of the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought. Alternatively, the summary of design standards used to develop the horizontal and vertical runningway alignments of the proposed Transit Project should be moved to Section 4 of the draft EPR.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G27).
MOECC-G29	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative f) Subsection 5.1.2, entitled “Alignment Criteria” identifies the criteria used in the development of both horizontal	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G27).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				and vertical runningway alignments for the proposed Transit Project. It is not understood how the criteria used in the development of both horizontal and vertical runningway alignments were considered during the process to identify and develop the various preliminary horizontal and vertical alignment alternatives. It is requested that an explanation be provided to clarify how the criteria used in the development of both horizontal and vertical runningway alignments were considered and incorporated into the evaluation and assessment process used to identify and develop the preferred preliminary horizontal and vertical alignment alternatives of the proposed Transit Project.		
MOECC-G30	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative g) Subsection 5.1.2, entitled “Alignment Criteria” identifies the criteria used in the development of both horizontal and vertical runningway alignments for the proposed Transit Project. Given that the purpose of Section 5 of the draft EPR is to provide a description of the technically preferred Transit Project alternative that has been determined through the completion of the TPAP, it is not understood why the evaluation criteria used in the development of the horizontal and vertical runningway alignments for the proposed Transit Project are discussed. It is suggested that consideration be given to explaining why the criteria used in the development of both horizontal and vertical runningway alignments for the proposed Transit Project are being discussed as part of the description of the undertaking for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought. Alternatively, the identification of the criteria used in the development of both horizontal and vertical runningway alignments for the proposed Transit Project should be moved to Section 4 of the draft EPR.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G27).
MOECC-G31	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative h) Subsection 5.1.3, entitled “Runningway Alignment”, explains that the preferred horizontal and vertical runningway alignment for the proposed Transit Project and corresponding footprint are presented in the drawings on Plates 01 to 28 at the end of Section 5 of the draft EPR. Although a visual representation of the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought has been provided, there is an expectation set forth in the Guide: Ontario’s	Noted.	A narrative description of the complete runningway alignment and cross sections has been included in Section 5.1.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				Transit Project Assessment Process that an EPR include a description of the transit project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought in the form of a narrative.		
MOECC-G32	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative h) It should be noted that the description of the transit project presented in an EPR is the undertaking that is exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation. In accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a “final description” of the transit project that is to be implemented, including each component that is to form part of the Transit Project that is to be implemented following the completion of the TPAP.	Noted.	Section 5 of the EPR has been revised to clearly describe the transit project seeking environmental approval, following the Transit Regulation. Should any change to the transit project described in Section 5 be proposed in the future, MOECC will be consulted pursuant to Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation to define the assessment process that would apply
MOECC-G33	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative h) It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a final description of the Transit Project that has been determined through the TPAP, including a description of the preferred method of carrying out each component of the proposed Transit Project.	Noted.	Section 5 of the EPR has been revised to clearly describe the transit project seeking environmental approval, following the Transit Regulation. Should any change to the transit project described in Section 5 be proposed in the future, MOECC will be consulted pursuant to Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation to define the assessment process that would apply
MOECC-G34	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative i) Subsection 5.1.4, entitled “Runningway Alignment”, explains that the various typical cross sections of the runningway alignments for the proposed Transit Project are illustrated in Figures 5-1 to 5-6 of the draft EPR. Although a visual representation of the various typical cross sections of the runningway that form the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought have been provided, there is an expectation set forth in the Guide: Ontario’s Transit Project Assessment Process that an EPR include a description of the transit project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought in the form of a narrative.	Noted.	A narrative description of the complete runningway alignment and cross sections has been included in Section 5.1.
MOECC-G35	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative i) It should be noted that the description of the transit project presented in an EPR is the undertaking that is exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation. In accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a “final description” of the transit project that is	Noted.	Section 5 of the EPR has been revised to clearly describe the transit project seeking environmental approval, following the Transit Regulation. Should any change to the transit project described in Section 5 be proposed in the future, MOECC will be consulted pursuant to Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation to define the assessment process that would apply

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				to be implemented, including each component that is to form part of the Transit Project that is to be implemented following the completion of the TPAP.		
MOECC-G36	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative i) It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a final description of the Transit Project that has been determined through the TPAP, including a description of the preferred method of carrying out each component of the proposed Transit Project. This is to include, but not be limited to, providing a detailed final description of each of the cross sections of the runningway that form the Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought.	Noted	Section 5 of the EPR has been revised to clearly describe the transit project seeking environmental approval, following the Transit Regulation. Should any change to the transit project described in Section 5 be proposed in the future, MOECC will be consulted pursuant to Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation to define the assessment process that would apply
MOECC-G37	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative j) Subsection 5.2.2, entitled “Stations Design Criteria”, identifies the functional requirements and design principles that form the criteria used in the design of the proposed stations that support the proposed Transit Project, and that are to be used in the functional specifications of the final detailed design. It is not understood how the functional requirements and design principles were considered during the process that was carried out to identify and evaluate station alternatives for the proposed Transit Project. It is requested that an explanation be provided to clarify how the functional requirements and design principles used were considered and incorporated into the evaluation and assessment process to identify and develop the proposed stations of the proposed Transit Project.	Noted.  The process that was carried out to identify and evaluate station alternatives, described in Chapter 4 included station location (node), and station site alternatives for the selected nodes. The functional requirements, design principles and approved MTO Transitway Design Standards were used in the Preliminary Design of the stations.	Section 5.2.2 has been revised to read:  “Functional requirements and design principles that support the service design are described in the Table 5-1. These principles were developed with the ultimate goal of improving the transit user experience and shall be included in the functional specifications of the Detail Design”.
MOECC-G38	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative k) Subsection 5.2.2, entitled “Stations Design Criteria”, identifies the functional requirements and design principles that form the criteria used in the design of the proposed stations that support the proposed Transit Project, and that are to be used in the functional specifications of the final detailed design. Given that the purpose of Section 5 of the draft EPR is to provide a description of the proposed Transit Project that has been determined through the completion of the TPAP, it is not understood why the functional requirements and design principles that form the criteria used in the design of the proposed stations of the proposed Transit Project are discussed. It is suggested that consideration be given to	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G37).



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				explaining why the functional requirements and design principles that form the criteria used in the design of the proposed stations of the proposed Transit Project are being discussed as part of the description of the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought. Alternatively, the functional requirements and design principles that form the criteria used in the design of the proposed stations of the proposed Transit Project should be moved to Section 4 of the draft EPR.		
MOECC-G39	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative l) Subsection 5.2.3, entitled “Station Layouts”, provides a description of the preferred alternative designs for the five proposed stations of the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought. It is stated that the final configurations of all stations will be confirmed or revised after the completion of the TPAP. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that the proposed Transit Project described in the draft EPR may not be final, and that revisions may be carried out which could result in the implementation of a transit project that may be inconsistent with the description of the proposed Transit Project presented in the draft EPR.	The EPR is seeking approval of the proposed station Preliminary Designs as described in Section 5.2.3 (Station Layouts), also illustrated in Plates M1 to B3. The Detail Design phase of the project will confirm the design of all components of the undertaking. If a change to the transit project described in Chapter 5 is required after completion of the TPAP, Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation will be followed, as reflected in Chapter 9 of the EPR.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G40	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative l) In accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a “final description” of the transit project that is to be implemented, including a description of the preferred method of carrying out the undertaking. The final description of a transit project presented in an EPR is the undertaking that is exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation. It is considered inappropriate and contrary to the spirit of the Transit Regulation for a proponent to include a description of a transit project in an EPR that may be revised or changed, and therefore likely be different from the transit project that is to be implemented. This is because only the transit project that is described in an EPR is exempt from Part II of the Environmental Assessment. It should be noted that Section 15 of the Transit Regulation provides a process that is to be followed should a change to a transit project described in an EPR be required after the completion of the TPAP. The addendum process is intended to address	The EPR is seeking approval of the proposed Preliminary Design as described in Chapter 5 of the EPR. The Detail Design phase of the project will confirm the design of all components of the undertaking. If a change to the transit project described in Chapter 5 is required after completion of the TPAP, Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation will be followed, as reflected in Chapter 9 of the EPR.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				the possibility that in implementing a transit project certain modifications may have to be made that are inconsistent with the description of a transit project provided in an EPR. Any changes to the description of a transit project presented in an EPR that are made without having completed the Transit Regulation addendum process will not have been exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation.		
MOECC-G41	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative l) It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s expectation that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a final description of the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought, including a final description of each of the stations that form the proposed Transit Project that has been determined through the TPAP.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G42	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative m) Subsection 5.3, entitled “Structures”, identifies that the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought includes a total of 17 new structures. The proposed structures have been classified into four categories; watercourse crossings, arterial crossings, minor road crossings and rail crossings. A brief summary of each of the 17 structures is provided in table form. Although a proposed structure type has been identified for each of the 17 structures that form the Transit Project for which approval under the transit regulation is being sought in Table form, there is an expectation set forth in the Guide: Ontario’s Transit Project Assessment Process that an EPR include a description of the transit project will be presented in the form of a narrative.	Noted. As the comment indicates, the proposed structures have been classified into four categories; watercourse crossings, arterial crossings, minor road crossings and rail crossings, all four described in Section 5.3.1. . A summary of each of the 17 structures is provided in Table 5-7, including a description of the structure type, location and classification. MTO considers this approach to be in compliance with the Transit Regulation.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G43	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative m) It should be noted that the description of the transit project presented in an EPR is the undertaking that is exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation. In accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a “final description” of the transit project that is to be implemented, including each component that is to form part of the Transit Project that is to be implemented following the completion of the TPAP.	Noted. Chapter 5 includes a description of the transit project and its components.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-G44	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative m) It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a final description of the Transit Project that has been determined through the TPAP, including a description of the preferred method of carrying out each component of the proposed Transit Project. This is to include, but not be limited to, providing a final description of each of the structures that will form the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought.	Please refer to response for comment MOECC-G43.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G45	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative n) Subsection 5.3, entitled “Structures”, identifies that the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought includes a total of 17 new structures. The proposed structures have been classified into four categories; watercourse crossings, arterial crossings, minor road crossings and rail crossings. A brief summary of each of the 17 structures is provided in table form. It has been noted, that for water crossings, it is stated that the actual bridge spans will be confirmed during the detailed design phase that will follow the completion of the TPAP.	Noted.  All bridge information is included in Table 5-7, plan and profile plates and Section 5.3.1 of the EPR.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G46	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative n) In accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a “final description” of the transit project that is to be implemented, including a description of the preferred method of carrying out the undertaking. The final description of the transit project presented in an EPR is the undertaking that is exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation. It is considered inappropriate and contrary to the spirit of the Transit Regulation for a proponent to include a description of a transit project in an EPR that may be revised or changed, and therefore likely be different from the transit project that is to be implemented. This is because only the transit project that is described in an EPR is exempt from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act. It should be noted that Section 15 of the Transit Regulation provides a process that is to be followed should a change to a transit project described in an EPR be required after the completion of the TPAP. The addendum process is intended to address the possibility that in implementing a transit project	Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G45.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				certain modifications may have to be made that are inconsistent with the description of a transit project provided in an EPR. Any changes to the description of a transit project presented in an EPR that are made without having completed the Transit Regulation addendum process will not have been exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation.		
MOECC-G47	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative n) It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a final description of the Transit Project that has been determined through the TPAP, including a description of the preferred method of carrying out each component of the proposed Transit Project. This is to include, but not be limited to, providing a description of each of the structures that will form the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought.	The EPR is seeking approval of the proposed Preliminary Design (including structures) as described in Chapter 5 of the EPR. The Detail Design phase of the project will confirm the design of all components of the undertaking. If a change to the transit project described in Chapter 5 is required after completion of the TPAP, Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation will be followed, as reflected in Chapter 9 of the EPR.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G48	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative o) Subsection 5.3, entitled “Structures”, identifies that the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought includes a total of 14 new structural culverts. Although a proposed structure culvert type and size has been identified for each of the 14 structural culverts that form the Transit Project for which approval under the transit regulation is being sought in Table form, there is an expectation set forth in the Guide: Ontario’s Transit Project Assessment Process that an EPR include a description of the transit project will be presented in the form of a narrative.	Noted. As the comment indicates, the proposed culverts include a description of the culvert type, location and classification. MTO considers this approach to be in compliance with the Transit Regulation.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G49	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative o) It should be noted that the description of the transit project presented in an EPR is the undertaking that is exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation. In accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a “final description” of the transit project that is to be implemented, including each component that is to form part of the Transit Project that is to be implemented following the completion of the TPAP.	This comment is addressed in several responses to similar comments regarding Section 5 of the EPR.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G50	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative o) It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment	Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G49.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				and Climate Change that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a detailed final description of the Transit Project that has been determined through the TPAP, including a description of the preferred method of carrying out each component of the proposed Transit Project. This is to include, but not be limited to, providing a final description of each of the structural culverts that form the Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought.		
MOECC-G51	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative p) Subsection 5.4.1, entitled “Storm Water management and Drainage”, explains that a Storm Water Management strategy has been developed for the stations and parking areas that form part of the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that the level of detail provided about the Storm Water Management strategy may be inconsistent with the requirements of the Transit Regulation.	Noted.	The Drainage Report has been revised significantly to describe more details regarding the Storm Water Management strategy.
MOECC-G52	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative p) It should be noted that in accordance with the requirements of the Transit Regulation an EPR should identify the potential impacts that may result from the implementation of a transit project and the proposed mitigation measure that will be applied to address these potential impacts. In accordance with Section 9.1(7) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a description of any measures proposed by the proponent for mitigating any negative impacts that the preferred method of carrying out a transit project might have on the environment. This should include, but is not limited to, providing sufficiently detailed information about the assessment and evaluation of the impacts associated with the final description of a transit project; a description of the potential impacts a transit project may have on the environment as defined under the Environmental Assessment Act, which include: the natural environment; social environment; economic environment; cultural environment; and, built environment; and, a description of any proposed measures for mitigating the negative impacts identified.	This comment is addressed in several responses to similar comments to Chapter 5 of the EPR.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-G53	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative p) It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s expectation that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project will include a description of the proposed Storm Water Management Plan that will be used to mitigate the potential impacts on the existing watercourses and drainage patterns that may arise from the implementation of the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the transit regulation is being sought.	Noted.	The Drainage Report (Appendix C), and Chapter 5 have been revised to include a description of the Stormwater Management Plan being proposed for this project.
MOECC-G54	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative q) Subsection 5.10, entitled “Maintenance and Storage Facility”, explains that a maintenance yard and service yard that have received approval through separate processes under the Environmental Assessment Act have been identified to support the operation of the proposed Transit Project. It is unclear as to whether the assessment and evaluation process that was used to obtain approval under the Environmental Assessment Act for the identified maintenance yard and service yard considered the operational needs of the proposed Transit Project described in the draft EPR. It is also not clear whether the potential impacts associated with operational needs of the proposed Transit Project were considered in the assessment and evaluation process that was used to obtain approval under the Environmental Assessment Act for the identified maintenance yard and service yard.	Noted.	Text added to Section 5.10: “The main Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF) approved by MOECC in 2011 as part of the 407 Transitway Central Section (Hwy 400 to Kennedy Road) TPAP, will serve the Kennedy Road to Brock Road section of the Transitway. The assessment process used to obtain approval for this MSF considered the operational needs and associated effects of the proposed Transit Project described in this current EPR.”
MOECC-G55	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative q) It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s expectation that an explanation will be provided about how the operational needs of the proposed Transit Project described in the draft EPR were considered in the evaluation and assessment process used to obtain approval under the Environmental Assessment Act for the identified maintenance yard and service yard. It is also suggested that consideration be given to explaining how the potential impacts on the identified maintenance yard and service yard associated with operational needs of the proposed Transit Project described in the draft EPR have been identified and addressed.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G54).
MOECC-G56	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative r) Subsection 5.10, entitled “Maintenance and Storage Facility”, explains that a maintenance yard and service yard that have received approval through separate	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G54).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				processes under the Environmental Assessment Act have been identified to support the operation of the proposed Transit Project. Although it is understood that the previously approved maintenance yard and service yard will be used to support the operation of the proposed Transit Project, there is no explanation as to how these facilities will be integrated with the proposed Transit Project. It is suggested that consideration be given to providing an explanation about how the identified maintenance yard and service yard will function in relation to the operation of the proposed Transit Project.		
MOECC-G57	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative s) Subsection entitled “Maintenance and Storage Facility”, explains that in addition to the existing maintenance yard and service yard here is an opportunity for a temporary bus garage at the proposed Rossland Road Station; and, that a decision on this will be taken based on implementation timing of the Rossland Road Extension and the highway 407 and Rossland Road Interchange after the conclusion of the TPAP. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that postponing the determination of a component of the Transit Project until after the completion of the TPAP may be inconsistent with the requirements of the Transit Regulation.	The Rossland Road site is being protected for environmental mitigation purposes or for a temporary bus garage. If a temporary bus garage is proposed in the future, Section 15 of the Transit Regulation will be followed.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G58	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative s) It should be noted that the description of a transit project presented in an EPR is the undertaking that is exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation. In accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a “final description” of the transit project that is to be implemented, including a description of the preferred method of carrying out the undertaking and a description of the other methods that were considered.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G59	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative s) It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s expectation that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project will include a final description of the Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought, including each component that is to form part of the proposed Transit Project and the preferred method of carrying out each component.	Noted. As previously indicated, this transit project is not seeking approval for a bus garage at this time.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				This should include, but not be limited to, providing a final description of the proposed temporary bus garage.		
MOECC-G60	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative t) Subsection entitled "Maintenance and Storage Facility", explains that a maintenance yard and service yard that have received approval through separate processes under the Environmental Assessment Act have been identified to support the operation of the proposed Transit Project. In addition, it is explained that there is also an opportunity for a temporary bus garage at the proposed Rossland Road Station. Although it has been identified that a maintenance yard, service yard and temporary bus garage form the Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought, the draft EPR does not include a description of these proposed components.	As previously indicated, MTO is not seeking approval of either a Maintenance Storage Yard or a temporary Bus Garage in this EPR. Should it be decided to add a temporary facility anywhere on the alignment, Section 15.1 of the Transit Regulation would be followed.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G61	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative t) It should be noted that the description of a transit project presented in an EPR is the undertaking that is exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation. In accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a "final description" of the transit project that is to be implemented.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G62	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative t) It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's expectation that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project will include a final description of the Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought, including each component that is to form part of the Transit Project that is to be implemented following the completion of the TPAP. This should include, but not be limited to, providing a final description of the proposed maintenance yard, service yard and temporary bus garage.	There are multiple responses that address this comment.	As noted in applicable comment.
MOECC-G63	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative u) Subsection 5.11, entitled "Flexibility in the Design of the Proposed Footprint", explains that an assessment of existing environmental conditions and detailed field investigations covered an area sufficiently broad to minimize potential addenda to the TPAP in case of station facility expansions and/or variations in the footprint of the runningway and associated facilities. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that	Noted.	Text added to Section 5.11: "If variations to the design included in this EPR are proposed in the future, Section 15.1 of the Transit Regulation will be followed."



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				proposed manner in which refinements to the proposed Transit Project described in the draft EPR are to be carried forward may be inconsistent with the requirements of the Transit Regulation.		
MOECC-G64	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative u) In accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a “final description” of the transit project that is to be implemented. The final description of the transit project presented in an EPR is the undertaking that is exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation. It is considered inappropriate and contrary to the spirit of the Transit Regulation for a proponent to include a description of a transit project in an EPR that may be revised or changed, and therefore likely be different from the transit project that is to be implemented. This is because only the transit project that is described in an EPR is exempt from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G63).
MOECC-G65	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative u) It is understood that the final description of a proposed transit project may be subject to potential minor changes after the conclusion of the TPAP. In situations where it is contemplated that a potential minor change to the description of a proposed transit project may be required, the description of the transit project presented in an EPR must clearly identify where the change may occur and the rationale to support why the change may be considered necessary. Although it is considered appropriate for an EPR to contemplate how certain aspects of a proposed transit project may be subject to potential minor changes after the completion of the TPAP, any changes to a transit project described in an approved EPR after the completion of the TPAP are subject to the requirements of Section 15 of the Transit Regulation.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G63).
MOECC-G66	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative u) It should be noted that Section 15 of the Transit Regulation provides a process that is to be followed should a change to a Transit Project described in an EPR be required after the completion of the TPAP. The addendum process is intended to address the possibility that in implementing a Transit Project certain modifications may have to be made that are inconsistent with the description of a Transit Project provided in an	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G63).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				EPR. Any changes to the description of a Transit Project presented in an EPR that are made without having completed the Transit Regulation addendum process will not have been exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation.		
MOECC-G67	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	5	Section 5 Preferred Alternative u) It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change that an explanation will be provided in the final EPR to clarify what, if any, elements or aspects of the final description of the proposed Transit Project may be subject minor changes. This should include clearly describing the rationale that supports why a minor change may be required; and, an explanation about how the potential minor change has been considered and assessed as part of the TPAP. It is also expectation of the Ministry that should the proposed Transit Project described in the final EPR be subject to potential minor changes after the issuance of a Statement of Completion, the Ministry of Transportation will prepare an EPR addenda, in accordance with the requirements of Section 15 of the Transit Regulation. It is therefore suggested that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include an explanation about how a change to a Transit Project described in the EPR may be carried out after the issuance of a Statement of Completion; and, that the explanation should accurately reflect the requirements of Section 15 of the Transit Regulation.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G63).
MOECC-G68	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring a) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s review of the draft EPR has noted that Section 6.0 does not adequately describe or explain the methodology that was used to identify and evaluate the potential effects of the proposed Transit Project on the TPAP study area environment.	Noted.	Chapter 6: Introduction has been revised to provide a general description of the evaluation process.
MOECC-G69	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring a) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change considers the identification and evaluation of potential effects a key component of the TPAP. An EPR should clearly explain the methodology that was used to identify and evaluate potential effects of a proposed transit project for each component of the study area environment, as defined under the Environmental Assessment Act, which include: the natural environment;	Noted. Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G68.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G68).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				social environment; economic environment; cultural environment; and, built environment. The purpose of which is to ensure that the identification and evaluation of potential impacts to each component of the study area environment is undertaken in a systematic, transparent and replicable manner. It is the Ministry's expectation that the identification and evaluation of potential effects should be consistent with the principles of good environmental planning; and, the guidance set forth in the Ministry's Code of Practice for Preparing and Reviewing Environmental Assessments in Ontario (2008) and the Guide to Ontario's Transit Assessment Process (2009).		
MOECC-G70	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring a) It is advised that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a more detailed summary of the methodology that was used in identifying and evaluating the potential effects of the proposed Transit Project on the TPAP study area environment. In particular, it is suggested that an explanation be provided to clarify how the potential effects were identified and considered; how each potential effect was evaluated in order to determine its significance; how the net effects of the proposed Transit Project were assessed, evaluated and compared; and, how the consideration of stakeholder participation and consultation throughout the TPAP influenced the assessment and evaluation process.	Noted. Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G68.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G68).
MOECC-G71	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring b) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's review of the draft EPR has noted that Section 6.0 of the draft EPR does not adequately describe or explain the methodology that was used to identify and evaluate the potential mitigation measures to address the potential effects of the proposed Transit Project on the TPAP study area environment.	Noted. Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G68.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G68).
MOECC-G72	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring b) It should be noted that in accordance with the requirements Section 9.1(7) of the Transit Regulation, an EPR must include a description of any measures proposed by the proponent for mitigating any negative impacts that the preferred method of carrying out a transit project might have on the environment. This should include, but is not limited to, providing sufficiently detailed information about the assessment and evaluation of all	Noted. Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G68.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G68).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				proposed measures for mitigating the negative impacts the preferred method of carrying out the transit project might have on the environment, as defined under the Environmental Assessment Act, which include: the natural environment; social environment; economic environment; cultural environment; and, built environment.		
MOECC-G73	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring b) It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change that a proponent will prepare an EPR in accordance with the requirements of the Transit Regulation that identifies and considers all proposed measures for mitigating the potential negative impacts that a proposed Transit Project may have on the EPR Study Area. It is therefore suggested that consideration be given to ensuring that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a description of any proposed measures for mitigating any potential negative impacts the proposed Transit Project may have on the EPR Study Area environment.	Noted. Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G68.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G68).
MOECC-G74	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring c) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's review of the draft EPR has noted that Section 6.0 of the draft EPR does not adequately explain how it was determined that certain potential effects on the TPAP study area environment were concluded to result in no negative net effects. It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change that an explanation will provided to clarify how it was concluded that the proposed mitigation measure to address potential impacts to the TPAP study area environment will result in no negative net effects; and, how the proposed mitigation measure will meet or exceed all regulatory standards, guidelines and expectations.	Noted. Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G68.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G68).
MOECC-G75	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring d) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's review of the draft EPR has noted that Section 6.0 of the draft EPR does not adequately describe or explain the monitoring that will be carried out to ensure the effectiveness of the mitigation measures proposed to address the potential effects of the proposed Transit Project on the TPAP study area environment.	Noted. Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G68.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G68).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-G76	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring d) It should be noted that in accordance with the requirements Section 9.1(8) of the Transit Regulation, an EPR must include a description of the means a proponent proposes to use to monitor or verify their effectiveness of any proposed mitigation measures. A proponent must prepare an EPR in accordance with the requirements of the Transit Regulation, which should include identifying how the mitigation measures proposed to address the potential effects of the proposed Transit Project on the TPAP study area environment will be monitored. It is therefore the expectation of the Ministry that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a description of any proposed monitoring that will be carried out to ensure the effectiveness of the mitigation measures proposed to address the potential effects of the proposed Transit Project on the TPAP study area environment.	Noted. Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G68.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G68).
MOECC-G77	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring e) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s review of the draft EPR has noted that Section 6.0 of the draft EPR does not adequately identify whether or not consultation with potentially effected federal, provincial or local regulatory agencies was carried out as part of the impact assessment process.	Noted. Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G68.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G68).
MOECC-G78	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring e) A key step in the evaluation of net effects process is consultation with potentially effected regulatory agencies that may have a jurisdictional or regulatory mandate affected by the proposed undertaking. The purpose of which is to incorporate specific information or guidance from regulatory agencies on matters that may be considered provincially important. It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change that proponents will consult with any government agencies that may have a jurisdictional or regulatory mandate affected by a proposed transit project. In addition, an EPR should provide adequate details about the results of the consultation process and how the input obtained from relevant government agencies was considered during the the impact assessment process.	Noted. Please refer to response for previous comment MOECC-G68.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G68).
MOECC-G79	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	6	Section 6 Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Monitoring e) It is advised that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a brief overview of any consultation that was undertaken with relevant government agencies	Noted. Please see Chapter 8: Consultation Process.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				during the impact assessment process; a summary of the results of any consultation; and, and explanation about how the input obtained from relevant government agencies was considered during the impact assessment process.		
MOECC-G80	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	7	<p>Section 7 Implementation</p> <p>a) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s review of the draft EPR has noted that Section 7.0 of the draft EPR does not include any information about the anticipated cost or budget associated with the implementation of the proposed Transit Project. There is also no information about the anticipated commencement dates for the construction and subsequent operation of the facility. It is advised that that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a brief overview of the implementation schedule for the proposed Transit Project. The overview should include, but not be limited to, a rough estimate of the cost of implementing the proposed Transit Project; the anticipated start date of construction; a proposed schedule for construction; and, the anticipated date upon which the transit Project will become operational. It is also advised that the final EPR should include an explanation about the roles and responsibilities of any participants taking part in the implementation of the proposed Transit Project.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The cost estimate has not yet been completed. This information will be provided in the final EPR (a place holder is included in the adjacent column in the interim).</p>	<p>Section 7.2 - Project Implementation Strategy – was revised as follows:</p> <p>“7.2.1 Potential Staged Implementation</p> <p>The 407 Transitway is a Provincial transit initiative. The Ministry of Transportation continues to be responsible for the planning, design, environmental approvals and property protection for this project. Implementation of early Transitway station sites at Trafalgar Road in Oakville and Hurontario Street in Brampton were carried out by Metrolinx in cooperation with the Ministry of Transportation in support of the existing GO 407 Express Bus Service. It is likely that this process will continue for the staged implementation and operation of the 407 Transitway into the future including the Kennedy Road to Brock Road section. Key stations may be added over time with buses operating on the 407 ETR. The Big Move, Regional Transportation Plan has identified the Kennedy Road to Brock Road segment of the Transitway in Phase Three of its investment plan to be completed after 2033. Beyond this decision a specific implementation date has not been identified. A decision on the delivery mechanism will be made in the future.</p> <p>In establishing the objectives for phased implementation of the Transitway, the current availability of the 407 ETR to Metrolinx services is assumed as a baseline phase. Phasing strategies assessed are based on a combination of part or parts of the existing 407 ETR service. From this starting point, the following objectives were adopted in defining candidate phasing strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each phase implemented should not result in a significant increase in travel time through the East Section. Preferably, segment lengths should yield a travel time saving greater than the time penalty to divert from and to the 407 ETR and phase limits selected must minimize the time to transfer from 407 ETR lanes to the new Transitway;</li> </ul>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ideally, the sequence of implementation should correspond to the likely distribution of traffic congestion in the 407 ETR lanes;</li> <li>• Phase sequencing should be responsive to the zones with highest ridership potential to maximize benefits and exposure of dedicated Transitway service. Ideally, segment phasing should respond to the timing of adjacent developments (particularly UGCs) and provide access to the Transitway by all modes (local transit, park and ride, pick up and drop off, walk-in);</li> <li>• Phase sequence should be responsive to bus interlining opportunities;</li> <li>• Phase costs should result in a contract cash flow that MTO (or the funding agency) can accommodate in annual budgeting; and,</li> <li>• Construction staging associated traffic diversion and delays that arterial road users will tolerate.</li> </ul> <p>With a view to meeting the above objectives, potential Phasing Strategies being investigated include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Baseline Strategy – Cross-regional Rapid Transit Service on the 407 ETR in mixed traffic;</li> <li>• An Enhanced Baseline Strategy – Cross-regional Rapid Transit Service on 407 ETR with enhanced access to and/or additional off-line stops;</li> <li>• Bus Transit Service on newly-constructed 407 Transitway in specific segments, combined with service still operating on the 407 ETR.</li> </ul> <p>7.2.2 Cost Estimate</p> <p>Due to multiple possible variations of a staged implementation plan, and the uncertainty of construction timing, capital cost of the proposed complete Transitway facility at the time of initiating operation is not possible to estimate; however, an average cost of \$ XXX per kilometer of runningway and an average of \$ YYY per station facility (2016 CAD dollars) can be used for information purposes.”</p>
MOECC-G81	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	7	Section 7 Implementation b) Subsection 7.2, entitled “Project Implementation Phasing Strategy”, explains that the proposed Transit Project will initially be built as an exclusive, all grade separated, two-lane road and operated with buses;	Noted.  The EPR is seeking approval for a bus transitway, designed to provide the opportunity for conversion to a light rail system within the runningway and stations footprint in the future. If	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				however, the preliminary design of the proposed Transit Project has been developed to accommodate conversion to Light Rail Transit technology. It is further stated that approval of the proposed Transit Project will enable the Ministry of Transportation to pursue the conversion of the proposed Transit Project to Light Rail Transit technology. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that proposed manner in which the potential conversion of the proposed Transit Project to Light Rail Transit technology is inconsistent with the requirements of the Transit Regulation.	and when the proponent proposes a conversion, MOECC will be consulted, and Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation would be followed.	
MOECC-G82	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	7	Section 7 Implementation b) It should be noted that Section 15 of the Transit Regulation provides a process that is to be followed should a change to a Transit Project described in an EPR be required after the completion of the TPAP. It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's expectation that a proponent will prepare an EPR addenda, in accordance with the requirements of the Transit Regulation, to identify and consider any changes or differences to the description of a Transit Project presented in an EPR that may be required after the issuance of a Statement of Completion.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G83	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	7	Section 7 Implementation b) Please note that the description and evaluation of the proposed Transit Project does not adequately consider the potential impacts, mitigation measures and monitoring commitments that would be necessary to support approval for the potential conversion of the proposed Transit Project to Light Rail Transit technology.	Noted. The EPR is seeking approval for a bus transitway, designed to provide the opportunity for conversion to a light rail system within the runningway and stations footprint in the future. If and when the proponent proposes a conversion, MOECC will be consulted, and Section 15(1) of the Transit Regulation would be followed.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G84	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	7	Section 7 Implementation b) It is suggested that consideration be given to ensuring that any reference or clarification about how a change to the description of the proposed Transit Project in the final EPR accurately reflect the amending procedures identified in Section 15 of the Transit Regulation and the expectations set forth in the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's Guide: Ontario's Transit Project Assessment Process. Any reference suggesting that the current TPAP and associated EPR seeks approval for the potential conversion of the proposed Transit Project to Light Rail Transit technology should be removed.	Noted. The EPR is seeking approval for a bus transitway, designed to provide the opportunity for conversion to a light rail system within the runningway and stations footprint in the future. If and when the proponent proposes a conversion, MOECC will be consulted, and Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation would be followed.	No change to the EPR.



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-G85	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	<p>Section 8 Consultation</p> <p>a) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s review of the draft EPR has noted that Section 8.0 of the draft EPR has not been completed. In completing this Section please be advised that public consultation is required for all projects that are subject to the TPAP; and, that proponents are required to consult with any person, group, Aboriginal community or regulatory agency that may be potentially interested in the transit project. Consultation allows the proponent to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Properly identify, inform or notify persons, groups and regulatory agencies that may be potentially affected by the transit project;</li> <li>• Identify and assess the range of potential environmental impacts of the transit project; and,</li> <li>• Respond to the concerns of interested persons, groups or regulatory agencies that may be affected by some aspect of the project.</li> </ul>	Noted.	Chapter 8 has been expanded to document details of the consultation activities with agencies, Aboriginal communities and members of the public and how their comments may have influenced the project design.
MOECC-G86	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	<p>Section 8 Consultation</p> <p>a) It is the responsibility of the proponent to design and implement an appropriate consultation program for engaging any person, group or regulatory agency that may be interested in the transit project. The proponent’s consultation program must include certain matters based on Section 8 of the Transit Projects Regulation and section 3.2 of the Ministry of the Environment’s Guide: Ontario’s Transit Project Assessment Process. This includes, but is not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing information about the basis on which the transit project was selected, which includes; the assessment and evaluation of the impacts of the transit project and other methods considered; the criteria for the assessment and evaluation of those impacts; and, any studies completed with respect to those impacts.</li> <li>• Providing information about the proposed measures for mitigating any potential negative impacts of the transit project.</li> <li>• Providing information about the way the proponent intends to monitor and verify the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.</li> <li>• Discussing with Aboriginal communities any constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right that is identified as potentially being negatively impacted by the transit project.</li> <li>• Discussing with Aboriginal communities any measures</li> </ul>	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G85).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				identified by the Aboriginal community for mitigating potential negative impacts on constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights.		
MOECC-G87	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	Section 8 Consultation a) Consideration should be given to expanding upon the description of the consultation carried out during the TPAP. It is suggested that the description of the consultation process include a summary of the results of the consultation process, and an explanation as to how the input obtained from interested members of the public, government agencies and Aboriginal communities was considered during the preparation of the final EPR.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G85).
MOECC-G88	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	Section 8 Consultation a) In addition, in order to qualify for the exemption in the Transit Projects Regulation, an EPR must contain a Consultation Record that includes, but is not limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A description of the consultations and follow up efforts carried out with interested members of the public, government agencies and Aboriginal communities;</li> <li>• A list of the interested members of the public, government agencies and Aboriginal communities who participated in the consultations;</li> <li>• Summaries of the comments submitted by interested members of the public, government agencies and Aboriginal communities;</li> <li>• A summary of any discussions with Aboriginal communities including discussions of any potential impacts of the transit project on constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights, and copies of all written comments submitted by Aboriginal communities; and,</li> <li>• A description of what the proponent did to respond to concerns expressed by interested members of the public, government agencies and Aboriginal communities.</li> </ul>	Noted.	The Consultation Record has been appended to the EPR and a general overview has been included in the main body of the EPR, Chapter 8.
MOECC-G89	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	Section 8 Consultation a) It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's expectation that when the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project is submitted to the Ministry, it will include the required Consultation Record; and, that a general overview of the Consultation Record will be included in the main body of the EPR.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G88).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-G90	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	Section 8 Consultation b) Subsection 8.3, entitled “Consultation with Aboriginal Communities”, provides an overview of the Aboriginal consultation carried out during the TPAP and an identification of the Aboriginal communities that were engaged in consultation. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that there may be a lack of detail about consultation with Aboriginal communities which may not allow a determination to be made as to whether the Aboriginal consultation requirements under the Transit Regulation have been met.	Noted.	The EPR Section 8.3 has been revised to present the consultation activities conducted with Aboriginal groups in greater detail.
MOECC-G91	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	Section 8 Consultation b) Consultation with Aboriginal communities during the TPAP is intended to allow a proponent to identify and respond to concerns that may be raised by Aboriginal communities; to provide an opportunity to receive information about potential Aboriginal concerns; and, to facilitate meaningful input into the review and development of a Transit Project. In addition, Aboriginal consultation is important because it is also used to identify any duty to consult that the Crown may have in relation to constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights that may be impacted by a Transit Project, and may be relied upon by the Crown. To the extent that any Crown duties of consultation may be triggered for a particular project, the Transit Regulation sets out some of the actions and procedural aspects of consultation that proponents are required to take with respect to consultation with Aboriginal communities. It should be noted that whether or not the Crown has a constitutional duty to consult with Aboriginal communities, proponents must still engage Aboriginal communities in consultation because Aboriginal communities are also considered interested stakeholders for the purposes of consultation in the TPAP.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G90).
MOECC-G92	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	Section 8 Consultation b) Please be advised that the Transit Projects Regulation includes several specific requirements with respect to consulting with Aboriginal communities. Specifically, proponents are required to: • Contact the Director of the Ministry of the Environment’s Environmental Assessment Branch for a list of bodies that would be able to assist in identifying Aboriginal communities that may be interested in a	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G90).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				transit project; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contact those bodies and request the bodies to identify Aboriginal communities.</li> <li>• Give each Aboriginal community identified by those bodies and any other Aboriginal community that may be interested, a copy of the Notice of Commencement.</li> <li>• Request the Aboriginal community to advise the proponent in writing of the nature of any interest it may have in the transit project when giving the Notice of Commencement.</li> <li>• Ensure that the Aboriginal community is given the opportunity to participate in the consultation.</li> <li>• Discuss potential negative impacts of the Transit Project on any constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right that may be identified and the measures to mitigate these negative impacts; and,</li> <li>• Respond to concerns expressed by the Aboriginal community.</li> </ul>		
MOECC-G93	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	Section 8 Consultation b) It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s expectation that in delegating the procedural aspects of Aboriginal consultation to proponents considering projects under the Transit Regulation, proponents will make a consolidated effort to proactively engage Aboriginal communities throughout the TPAP, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following up with telephone calls and electronic mail to ensure and confirm that potentially impacted Aboriginal communities are aware of the transit project;</li> <li>• Providing Aboriginal communities with notification of consultation events such as open houses and meetings;</li> <li>• Confirming receipt of any relevant transit project documentation, and other information when requested.</li> <li>• Considering providing flexibility and the unique needs of Aboriginal communities, such as additional time to review documents, language requirements, communication styles/preferences and access to communication tools.</li> </ul>	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G90).
MOECC-G94	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	Section 8 Consultation b) If a proponent or Aboriginal community identifies that a Transit Project may have a potential negative impact on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right, the Director of the Ministry of the Environment’s Environmental Approvals Branch should be notified. This	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G90).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				is to ensure that appropriate actions are taken so that the Crown’s duty to consult, if it arises, is satisfied.		
MOECC-G95	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	Section 8 Consultation b) In order for the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change to determine whether the Aboriginal consultation requirements under the Transit Regulation have been met an EPR should include an explanation, and supporting information, to confirm that each of the Aboriginal communities that were identified as part of TPAP consultation program were aware of the transit project; and, that each Aboriginal community received all relevant transit project documentation. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that there may be a lack of detail about consultation with Aboriginal communities which may not allow a determination to be made as to whether the Aboriginal consultation requirements under the Transit Projects Regulation have been met.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G90).
MOECC-G96	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	8	Section 8 Consultation b) It is suggested that consideration be given to providing an explanation as to why each identified Aboriginal community was determined to be potentially affected by the proposed Transit Project. It is also suggested that consideration be given to expanding upon the description of the Aboriginal consultation that was carried out during the TPAP. This should include, but not be limited to, identifying the key milestones during the TPAP at which consultation with Aboriginal communities took place; identifying the consultation activities that were carried out with Aboriginal communities; detailing the results of the Aboriginal consultation activities that were carried out; and, explaining how the input obtained from Aboriginal communities was considered during the preparation of the EPR.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G90).
MOECC-G97	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action a) Subsection 9, entitled “Commitments to Future Action”, explains that the TPAP has advanced the description of the proposed Transit Project to a preliminary design level; and, further details are required to finalize detail design, planning initiatives, construction issues, permitting and subsequent approvals. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that the level of detail provided as part of the description of	Noted.	Section 5 of the EPR has been revised to clearly describe the transit project seeking environmental approval, following the Transit Regulation. Should any change to the transit project described in Section 5 be proposed in the future, MOECC will be consulted pursuant to Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation to define the assessment process that would applyText added to Chapter 9 – Commitment to Future Action:

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				the Transit Project may be inconsistent with the requirements of the Transit Regulation.		“During the TPAP, MTO has worked closely with agencies and the public to address and resolve issues or concerns identified. MTO is seeking approval for the Final Project Description as outlined in Chapter 5. If, during Detail Design, changes are proposed to the Final Project Description, consultation will be undertaken with MOECC with regard to the process to be followed under Section 15 of the Transit Regulation.”
MOECC-G98	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action a) It is understood that the proposed Transit Project, as presented in the draft EPR, represents a preliminary level of design, and the design is to be finalized after the completion of the TPAP. It is also understood that the Transit Project described in the draft EPR may be refined, and possibly vary from the description provided prior to implementation as further details are required to finalize the design based on planning initiatives, construction issues, permitting and subsequent approvals. It may therefore be considered reasonable to assume that the Transit Project that is to be implemented after the completion of the TPAP may be inconsistent with the description of the proposed Transit Project presented in the draft EPR.	Noted.	Section 5 of the EPR has been revised to clearly describe the transit project seeking environmental approval, following the Transit Regulation. Should any change to the transit project described in Section 5 be proposed in the future, MOECC will be consulted pursuant to Section 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation to define the assessment process that would apply
MOECC-G99	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action a) It should be noted that the Transit Regulation exempts certain proponents of Transit Projects from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act, provided the requirements of the Regulation are met. In particular, a proponent of a Transit Project proceeding under the Transit Regulation is required to prepare and submit an EPR that documents the transit assessment process that was followed and the conclusions that were reached. This includes, but is not limited to, providing an explanation about how the transit assessment process was carried out; a summary about how the conclusions of the assessment process were reached; and, a description of the Transit Project that has been determined through the TPAP. In accordance with Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a “final description” of the transit project that is to be implemented, including a description of the preferred method of carrying out the undertaking and a description of the other methods that were considered. The final description of the Transit Project presented in an EPR is the undertaking that is	Noted.	Text added to Chapter 9 – Commitment to Future Action: “During the TPAP, MTO has worked closely with agencies and the public to address and resolve issues or concerns identified. MTO is seeking approval for the Final Project Description as outlined in Chapter 5. If, during Detail Design, changes are proposed to the Final Project Description, consultation will be undertaken with MOECC with regard to the process to be followed under Section 15 of the Transit Regulation.”

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation.		
MOECC-G100	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action a) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that the approach by the Ministry of Transportation to describe the proposed Transit Project at a preliminary level of design may be inconsistent with the requirements of Section 9.2(2) of the Transit Regulation. Under the Transit Regulation there is an expectation that an EPR will include a final description of the transit project that a proponent proposes to implement, and that the Transit Project will implement as described in the EPR. It is considered inappropriate and contrary to the spirit of the Transit Regulation for a proponent to include a description of a Transit Project in an EPR that it knows will likely differ from the Transit Project that is to be implemented. This is because only the Transit Project that is described in an EPR is exempt from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act, and may be implemented without having to obtain approval under the Environmental Assessment Act from the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change. Knowingly considering the implementation of a Transit Project that differs from the Transit Project described in an EPR could be considered a violation of Section 5(3) of the Environmental Assessment Act, which prohibits proceeding with an undertaking prior to receiving approval under the Act.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G99).
MOECC-G101	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action a) It is the expectation of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change that the Transit Project implemented following the completion of the TPAP must not be inconsistent with the description of the Transit Project provided in an EPR. It is therefore suggested that consideration be given to ensuring that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Project include a final description of the Transit Project that has been determined through the TPAP, including a description of the preferred method of carrying out the undertaking.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G99).
MOECC-G102	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action a) The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is also concerned that proposed manner in which refinements to the Transit Project described in the draft EPR are to be carried forward after the completion of the	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G99).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				TPAP may be inconsistent with the requirements of the Transit Regulation.		
MOECC-G103	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action a) It should also be noted that Section 15 of the Transit Regulation provides a process that is to be followed should a change to a Transit Project described in an EPR be required after the completion of the TPAP. The addendum process is intended to address the possibility that in implementing a Transit Project certain modifications may have to be made that are inconsistent with the description of a Transit Project provided in an EPR. Any changes to the description of a Transit Project presented in an EPR that are made without having completed the Transit Regulation addendum process will not have been exempted from Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act by way of the Transit Regulation.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G99).
MOECC-G104	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action a) It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s expectation that a proponent will prepare an EPR addenda, in accordance with the requirements of the Transit Regulation, to identify and consider any changes or differences to the description of a Transit Project presented in an EPR that may be required after the issuance of a Statement of Completion. It is therefore suggested that consideration be given to ensuring that the final EPR for the proposed Transit Extension include an explanation about how a change to the proposed Transit Project described in the EPR may be carried out after the issuance of a Statement of Completion; and, that the explanation should accurately reflect the requirements of Section 15 of the Transit Regulation.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G99).
MOECC-G105	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action b) Subsection 9.1, entitled “Permits and Approvals”, identifies the necessary permits and approvals required for the implementation of the proposed Transit Project after the completion of the TPAP. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that not all required permits and approvals have been listed. In accordance with the requirements of Section 9.(2)9 9 of the Transit Regulation an EPR must include a description of any municipal, provincial, federal or other approvals or	Description of any municipal, provincial, federal or other approvals or permits have identified in Chapter 6. A summary is presented in Chapter 9. Other requirements, if any, will be determined at Detail Design.	No change to the EPR.



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				permits that may be required for the implementation of a transit project.		
MOECC-G106	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	<p>Section 9 Commitments to Future Action</p> <p>b) It is therefore suggested that consideration be given to ensuring that all necessary permits and approvals required for the implementation of the proposed Transit Project after the completion of the TPAP be identified and described, including any approvals or permits issued by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change. It is also suggested that consideration be given, where possible, to including an estimate as to when it is anticipated that the various additional provincial, federal and municipal permits and approvals identified may be obtained.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please note that the implementation of this transitway is uncertain at this time - a statement indicating that the permits and approvals will be obtained during Detail Design phase of the project has been included in the EPR Chapter 9.</p>	<p>Text added to Chapter 9 – Permits and Approvals:</p> <p>“During Detail Design, MTO will secure necessary permits and approvals for the implementation of the 407 Transitway including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Railway crossing agreements and pipeline crossing agreements, as required;</li> <li>• Hydro One agreements to permit construction of Transitway facilities within the hydro corridor;</li> <li>• Ontario Endangered Species Act (ESA) and Canada Species at Risk Act (SARA) Permits, as required;</li> <li>• Fisheries Act Authorization, as required;</li> <li>• Ontario Water Resources Act Permit(s) to Take Water (for locations where dewatering exceeds 50,000 liters per day);</li> <li>• Municipal permits, and</li> <li>• Any other permits and approvals from MOECC, as required.</li> </ul> <p>None of the watercourses crossed by the Transitway are scheduled under the Navigation Protection Act; therefore, approval under the Act will not be required. MTO will consult with municipalities and secure any necessary permits if required prior to construction.”</p>
MOECC-G107	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	<p>Section 9 Commitments to Future Action</p> <p>c) Subsection 9.5, entitled “Addendum Process”, explains that the Ministry of Transportation will prepare an addendum if significant changes to the proposed Transit Project occur after the Statement of Completion is issued, in accordance with Section 15 of the Transit Projects Regulation. It is also explained that if a proposed change is considered not significant, and has been considered in the EPR, the addendum process will not be required as the change would be consistent with this EPR. The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is concerned that the interpretation of the Transit Regulation addendum process is inconsistent with the requirements of the Transit Regulation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Text in Chapter 9 Addendum Process has been revised to reflect consultation with MOECC pursuant to Section 15 of the Transit Projects Regulation.</p> <p>“Should a change to the approved project be proposed in the future, MOECC will be consulted pursuant to Section 15 (1) of the Transit Projects Regulation to define the assessment process that would apply.”</p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-G108	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action c) It should be noted that in accordance with the requirements of Section 15.(1) of the Transit Regulation, should a proponent wish to make a change to a transit project that is inconsistent with the transit project described in an EPR, after the submission of a Statement of Completion, the proponent shall prepare an addendum to the EPR that contains the following information: · A description of the change; · The reasons for the change. · The proponent's assessment and evaluation of any impacts that the change might have on the environment; · A description of any measures proposed by the proponent for mitigating any negative impacts that the change might have on the environment; and, · A statement of whether the proponent is of the opinion that the change is a significant change to the transit project, and the reasons for the opinion.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G109	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action c) If the proponent is of the opinion that a change described in an addendum prepared under subsection 15 (1) of the Transit Regulation is a significant change to the transit project described in an EPR, the proponent shall then prepare a notice of environmental project report addendum in accordance with Section 15 (4) of the Regulation.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G107).
MOECC-G110	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action c) It is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's expectation that any reference or clarification about how a change to the description of the proposed Transit Project described in the draft EPR should accurately reflect the amending procedures identified in Section 15 of the Transit Regulation and the expectations set forth in the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's Guide: Ontario's Transit Project Assessment Process.	Noted.	Please refer to change in the EPR described in the previous comment (MOECC-G107).
MOECC-G111	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action c) In addition to the comments set forth above, please find attached to this memorandum comments from the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change's Central Region Office and Approvals Branch. Please refer to the following Appendices for the comments by the Ministry's Regional Office and Approvals Branch: • Appendix A: Central Region EA Technical Support	Noted.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				Section • Appendix B: Environmental Approvals Branch, Noise		
MOECC-G112	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016	9	Section 9 Commitments to Future Action c) Please note that the above comments and those attached to this memorandum, along with any comments received by other government agencies, Aboriginal communities and the public, should be considered by the Ministry of Transportation as it prepares the final EPR for submission to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change. It is the expectation of this Ministry that proponents of projects being carried out under the Transit Regulation should attempt to address or resolve any issues, concerns or formal comments raised during the TPAP.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-G113	MOECC - EAB	June 6, 2016		In closing, I would like to extend an invitation to the Ministry of Transportation to meet with Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change staff to discuss the comments on the draft EPR, and the next steps in the transit assessment process. Should you have any questions or concerns, or to set up a meeting, please feel free to contact the undersigned, at (416) 314-7106 or by e-mail at gavin.battarino@ontario.ca.	Noted. Much appreciated.	N/A
MOECC-T1	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		1. Section 1.5.2.1 “Provincial Policy Statement 2014” and Section 1.5.2.2 “Places To Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe” should reference specific policies that apply to the project and how the project adheres to these policies.	Noted.	Text under Section 1.5.2.1 has been revised to read: <i>“The 407 Transitway supports these policies by providing a Regional Rapid Transit facility that connects numerous municipalities across the GGH. This includes connections with other regional and local transit systems such as GO Transit, VIVA Rapid Transit, York Region Transit, Durham Region Transit and Toronto Transit Commission. It will directly serve regional urban growth centres like the Markham Centre and the Seaton Community, while connecting to the Richmond Hill Centre, Langstaff Gateway (in Markham) and the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre.”</i>  Text under Section 1.5.2.2 has been revised to read: <i>“The Growth Plan’s policy directions for intensification and compact urban form identify public transit as a first priority for transportation infrastructure planning to reduce reliance on any single mode by encouraging the most financially and environmentally appropriate mode for trip-making; multi-modal access to jobs, housing, schools, cultural and recreation opportunities, and goods and</i>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<i>services; and provision for the safety of system users. The proposed 407 Transitway supports these policy directives."</i>
MOECC-T2	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		2. The Greenbelt Plan (2005) should be included in Section 1.5.2, as a portion of lands in the study area are subject to this plan. Applicable policies and how the project adheres to them should be included.	Noted.	Text added to Section 1.5.2.13 Greenbelt Plan (2005) : <i>"The Greenbelt Plan identifies where urbanization should not occur in order to provide permanent protection to the agricultural land base and the ecological features and functions occurring on this landscape. It builds upon the existing policy framework established in the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and is to be implemented through municipal official plan policies and maps. It also includes lands within, and builds upon the ecological protections provided by, the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). It also complements and supports other provincial level initiatives such as the Parkway Belt West Plan and the Rouge North Management Plan.</i>  <i>The 407 Transitway crosses the Greenbelt Plan east and west of the York /Durham Town Line between Reesor Rd. and just west of Duffins Creek. The Transitway has already received Route Planning Environmental Assessment approval at this location as part of the Highway 407/Transitway Markham Road Easterly to Highway 7 East of Brock Road: Environmental Assessment Report (1997)."</i>
MOECC-T3	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		3. Section E2.3 and Section 2.3.2 state that "the study was developed based on the latest approved horizon (2031)..." This sentence is not accurate as the latest approved planning horizon is to 2041 (as per Amendment 2 to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe). Please revise this sentence accordingly.	2041 allocations, available to the municipal level, have not yet been officially published.	Text under Sections E.2.3 and 2.3.2 have been revised to read:  <i>"The study was developed based on the latest officially approved horizon (2031) at the time of this assignment. 2041 allocations are available to the municipal level only; they have not been officially publicized. All relevant findings and conclusions will be confirmed prior to Detail Design based on the official forecasts available at that time."</i>
MOECC-T4	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		4. The source for Table 2.1 is cited as the "Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, MTO". This should be cited as the "Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Ontario Ministry of Infrastructure."	Noted.	Text under the source of Table 2.1 revised to read:  <i>"Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Ontario Ministry of Infrastructure"</i>
MOECC-T5	MOECC – Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		5. Section 2.2.1.1 states that the "Growth Plan is a 25 year plan governing where growth and density will occur in the GGH through 2031 and these population and employment forecasts are driving the basis of the study." This section should note that the Growth Plan was amended in 2013 to update and extend the population	Noted.  As indicated responding to previous comment T3, at the time of the study, 2041 allocations available to the municipal level, have not yet been officially published.	Text under Section 2.2.1.1 has been revised to read:  <i>"The Growth Plan is a 25 year plan governing where growth and density will occur in the GGH through 2031 and beyond. The Growth Plan was amended in 2013 to update and extend the population and employment forecasts to 2041. At the time of this assignment, 2041 allocations were</i>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				and employment forecasts to 2041. A rationale should also be included as to why this study uses the 2031 planning horizon over the updated 2041 planning horizon. This additional information should also be included in Section 1.5.2.2.		<i>available to the municipal level only; not been officially publicized. All relevant findings and conclusions will be confirmed prior to Detail Design based on official figures at that time.</i>
MOECC-T6	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		6. Table 2.4 and its associated written summary in Section 2.3.1 are difficult to follow/ understand. A clearer description of the forecast and explanation of how the information is presented is needed. For example: a) Please clarify what is meant by “major trip interchanges”. b) Please explain what is meant by “Within Corridor”, “To/From South”, “To/From West”, “To/From North”, “To/From East”, “Through Eastbound”, “Through Westbound”. c) Please explain what is meant by “growing markets” (associated with Figure 2.5). d) Please explain what is meant by “Transit Share”. e) It is not clear where the information in Section 2.3.1, paragraph 2, is coming from. Is this information presented in Table 2.4 or Figure 2.5? f) Please reference in Section 2.3.1 that the future travel demand forecasts were developed using the Greater Golden Horseshoe Model.	Noted.  b) To/From South etc. These are standard traffic terminologies. “Through” refers to traffic traveling through the intersection in the direction noted.  c) See changes to the EPR.  d) “Transit share” means private traffic lanes shared with transit traffic.  e) See Table 2.4 of the EPR.  f) See changes to the EPR.	Text under Section 2.3 (Future Travel Demand) has been revised to read:  a) On Section 2.3.1 - “trip interchanges” replaced by “travel patterns”  b) Description of the information has been added to Notes of Table 4. to read:  “Within Corridor = traffic within study limits.”  c) In Section 2.3.1 – “growing markets” removed to avoid confusion.  f) Note added to Section 2.3.1: Future travel demand forecasts were developed using the Greater Golden Horseshoe Model.
MOECC-T7	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		7. The explanation of what is meant by “Within Corridor”, “To/From South”, “To/From West”, “To/From North”, “To/From East”, “Through Eastbound” and “Through Westbound”, would also be applicable for Table 2.8.	Noted.  Text will be edited accordingly to keep consistency. F8:F14  To/From South etc. These are standard traffic terminologies. “Through” refers to traffic traveling through the intersection in the direction noted.	Description of the information has been added to Notes of Table 9.  <i>“Within Corridor = traffic within study limits.”</i>
MOECC-T8	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		8. Table 2.6 shows the access modes for 2031 westbound AM peak period boardings and Section 2.3.2 (page 2-10) provides an associated written summary. There is no discussion regarding access modes for 2031 eastbound AM peak period. Please include this.	Forecast ridership study was based on AM peak period, peak direction as described and explained in Section 2.2.4.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T9	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		9. Section 2.3.2 (page 2-10) describes that the majority of riders entering the Transitway at Brock Road and Whites Road station will access via no-transfer services and cites buses will come from Pickering UGC, Brooklin and Oshawa. It should be noted that Figure 2.4 shows these routes as “Base Spine Services” opposed to “No Transfer Services.” Please ensure consistency in the report when referring to routes/route structure.	Noted.	Text under Section 2.3.2 has been revised to read:  <i>“– Brock Road and Whites Road – will access via no-transfer (base spine) services...”</i>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-T10	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		10. Section 2.4 discusses major westbound (peak direction) travel markets served by the transitway during the 2031 AM peak period only. While it is recognized that there will be significantly less volume travelling eastbound in the AM peak period, a discussion should still be included regarding eastbound travel markets serviced by the transitway during the 2031 AM peak period.	Forecast ridership study was based on AM peak period, peak direction as described and explained in Section 2.2.4.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T11	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		11. Table 2.8 displays travel demand information under the headings “No 407 Transitway East (Central Section Only)”, “With 407 Transitway East (Includes Central)” and “Changes due to adding 407 Transitway East”. Please clarify the following: a) What is meant by “Central Section only” and “Includes Central.” b) The information under the heading “No 407 Transitway East (Central Section Only)” in Table 2.8 is the same as the information presented in Table 2.4 under the heading “2031 AM Peak Period.” As per comment 11a above, please clarify what is meant by “No 407 Transitway East (Central Section Only)” (emphasis added). If this means Central Section of the 407 Transitway already approved from Highway 400 to Kennedy Road, then there is a discrepancy with Section 2.3.1 which states that the forecasts provided in Table 2.4 assume that there is no dedicated rapid transit on 407 east of Kennedy Road.	Noted. a) and b): Titles of travel demand scenarios have been revised to avoid confusion. b): Section 2.3.1 refers to forecast figures provided in Table 2.4 assuming no dedicated rapid transit service east of Kennedy Rd. (travelling on 407 ETR); in other words, dedicated service only on Central Section (Hwy 400 to Kennedy Rd.). There is no discrepancy.	Titles of scenarios on Table 2.8 changed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “No 407 Transitway East (Central Section only)” replaced by “407 Transitway Central Section (Highway 400 to Kennedy Rd.) only.”</li> <li>• “With 407 Transitway East (includes Central) replaced by “407 Transitway Hwy 400 to Kennedy Rd. and Kennedy Rd. to Brock Rd.”</li> <li>• “Changed due to adding 407 Transitway East:” replaced by “Changes due to adding dedicated service on 407 Transitway from Kennedy Rd. to Brock Rd.”</li> </ul>
MOECC-T12	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		12. Section 2.3.2 (page 2-11), states that “the 2100 new transit trips represent approximately 22% or one quarter of the 9 400 AM peak period boardings between Kennedy Road and Brock Road.” Based on Table 2.5, the 2031 total AM peak period boardings is 9000. Please confirm the correct number.	Noted.	“9,400” figure corrected to read “9,000”.
MOECC-T13	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		13. In relation to the proceeding comment #12, in the same paragraph, three different percentages or fractions are referenced when referring to the amount of choice or new riders (i.e. “22%”, “one quarter” and “nearly 20%”). Please confirm the correct number and be consistent.	Noted.	Figures in Section 2.3.2 adjusted for consistency.
MOECC-T14	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		14. Section 6.2.2 discusses the footprint impacts to land use. Under the “Ninth Line to York Durham Line Runningway” subheading (page 6-15 to 6-16), applicable policies from the Greenbelt Plan (2005) are listed which apply to lands between Reesor Road and York Durham Line. This subsection does not describe in enough detail how the project has adhered to the Greenbelt Plan	Noted.	Text added to Section 6.2.2 under “Ninth Line to York Durham Line Runningway”:  <i>“Potential impacts of the runningway on key natural heritage features, Little Rouge Creek, Petticoat Creek, one unnamed watercourse, and the Non-Provincially Significant Locust Hill Wetland Complex are anticipated. As per the Greenbelt Plan’s Section 4.2.1.2, the design of the</i>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				policies. Referring the reader to other sections of the report (i.e. “Vegetation and Vegetation Communities” and “Fish and Aquatic Habitat”) with respect to impacts and mitigation measures for the key natural heritage features is not adequate, as this information is difficult to identify in the other sections. Please provide more information.		<i>runningway has been proposed to minimize footprint impacts to these key natural heritage features to the extent possible. The Transitway crossing over the Little Rouge Creek will be designed to minimize impacts and mitigation measures will be provided as per best management practices in accordance with MTO/DFO/MNR Protocol for Protecting Fish and Fish Habitat on Provincial Transportation Undertakings (2013) and MTO Environmental Guide for Fish and Fish Habitat (2009). Vegetation mitigation, compensation and landscaping are planned and further discussion with Parks Canada and Infrastructure Ontario will be conducted during Detail Design.”</i>
MOECC-T15	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		15. Section 6.2.2, under the “York Durham Line to Sideline 245 Runningway” subheading (page 6-16 to 6-17), states that the “the lands between York Durham Line and east of the Duffins Rouge Agricultural Preserve are part of the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside and Natural Heritage System”. This subsection should include a discussion of applicable Greenbelt Plan policies and how the project has adhered to them (similar to the above comment).	Noted.	Text added to Section 6.2.2 under the “York Durham Line to Sideline 24” of the EPR:  <i>“The design of the runningway and the proposed Whites Road Station meet the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan’s Section 4.2 by minimizing footprint impacts and/or minimizing negative impacts to the exiting landscape. The runningway is proposed to be located closer to an existing transportation corridor, the 407 ETR and it is compatible with the proposed future community development within the area. Watercourse crossings were designed to span over them in order to minimize adverse impacts as much as possible.”</i>
MOECC-T16	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		16. The majority of the lands subject to the Greenbelt Plan fall under the Natural Heritage System of the Protected Countryside. Accordingly it would appear that Greenbelt Plan policy 3.2.2.4 applies to the project. Please discuss how the project adheres to this policy.	Noted.	Text added to Section 6.2.2 of the EPR:  <i>“Greenbelt Plan Policy 3.2.2.4 states:  Where non-agricultural uses are contemplated within the Natural Heritage System, applicants shall demonstrate that:  a. At least 30 percent of the total developable area of the site will remain or be returned to natural self-sustaining vegetation, recognizing that section 4.3.2 establishes specific standards for the uses described there;  b. Connectivity along the system and between key natural heritage features or key hydrologic features located within 240 metres of each other is maintained or enhanced; and  c. Buildings or structures do not occupy more than 25 percent of the total developable area and are planned to</i>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<p><i>optimize the compatibility of the project with the natural surroundings.</i></p> <p><i>The 407 Transitway crosses the Greenbelt Plan east and west of the York /Durham Town Line between Reesor Rd. and just west of Duffins Creek. The Transitway has already received Route Planning Environmental Assessment approval at this location as part of the Highway 407/Transitway Markham Road Easterly to Highway 7 East of Brock Road: Environmental Assessment Report (1997).</i></p> <p><i>Connectivity between key natural heritage features and key hydrological features will be maintained as Transitway structures will be spanning over these features and stormwater drainage features will be designed to maintain connectivity of hydrologic features."</i></p>
MOECC-T17	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		<p>17. Table 6.4 is missing some potential impacts discussed under Section 6.2.2. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Kennedy Road to Markham Road Runningway subheading, first paragraph</li> <li>- Marham Road to 9th Line Runningway subheading, second paragraph</li> <li>- Donald Cousens Parkway Station subheading, first paragraph</li> </ul> <p>Refer comments #45 and #46 below for additional comments related to the Tables under Section 6.</p>	Noted.	Missing information from Section 6.2.2 has been incorporated into Table 6.4.
MOECC-T18	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		<p>18. No information is provided relating to potential requirements for Official Plan Amendments due to the potential land use impacts discussed under Section 6.2.2. This should be included in the report. It is also unclear if this has been discussed with the applicable municipalities, and whether the municipalities have raised any concerns related to the described potential footprint impacts to land use and/or anticipate issues arising through processes subject to the Planning Act that could impact this project. Please provide information.</p>	More information is being provided in Section 6.2.2. Footprint effects were discussed with the applicable Municipalities at various meetings throughout the TPAP process.	<p>Text added to Section 6.2.2:</p> <p><i>"Minor amendments to the City of Markham and City of Pickering Official Plans have been identified. These amendments have been discussed with the municipalities throughout the duration of this study. No major concerns were identified from the municipalities. The areas where amendments are required are: at Ninth Line Station, Donald Cousens Station, area just east of York Durham Line, at Whites Road Station and Brock Road Station."</i></p>
MOECC-T19	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		<p>19. Section 6.3.2 should discuss the construction impacts to land use. The single statement that "construction activities are anticipated to temporarily impact socio-economic activities within the study area" is not sufficient. Please include a detailed discussion.</p>	A more detailed discussion is being provided in reference to effects during construction.	Information from Table 6.8 has been added to Section 6.3.2.
MOECC-T20	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		<p>20. The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2006, is not listed in the References.</p>	Noted.	The Growth Plan 2006 for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2006 has been added.



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-T21	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		Spills 21. The report should reference under the heading “Emergency Response Plan” in Section 7.1.2 (page 7-2), that spills or discharges of pollutants or contaminants will be reported immediately to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s Spills Action Centre, the municipality in which the spill occurred, and the person in control of the substance is known and not already aware. More information about reporting spills is available online ( <a href="https://www.ontario.ca/page/report-spill">https://www.ontario.ca/page/report-spill</a> ).	Noted.	Text under Section 7.1.2 has been revised to read: <i>“Spills or discharges of pollutants or contaminants will be reported immediately to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change’s Spills Action Centre, the municipality in which the spill occurred, and to the person in control of the substance if known and who is not already aware of the spill.”</i>
MOECC-T22	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		Spills 22. Potential impacts to the environment (e.g. soils, surface water, groundwater, fish and fish habitat etc.) from spills during construction and operation/maintenance are not identified in Table 6.7 (with the exception of groundwater) or Table 6.10.	Noted.	Table 6.7 and Table 6.10 has been revised to include potential impacts from spills during construction and operation and maintenance for the Environmental Indicators: Surface Water, Drainage and Stormwater; Groundwater; and Fish and Fish Habitat. Proposed mitigation will be presented accordingly.
MOECC-T23	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix C	Surface Water 23. Appendix C, Section 5.1 (Stormwater Management Criteria) and Section 5.2 (Proposed Stormwater Management Strategy) both state “Analysis to follow in the next submissions.” It is assumed that this means that the Stormwater Management Criteria and Proposed Stormwater Management Strategy will be included in the subsequent version for comment following the issuance of the Notice of Commencement for this project. As there are no stormwater management reports to review, TSS is not providing comments now and defer commenting until the comprehensive stormwater management plan/strategy becomes available for review. TSS cautions to the proponent that not providing this information for review at the draft phase presents a risk, as we cannot provide input early in the process on whether the proposed stormwater management approach is adequate for approval under the TPAP. TSS advises that the proponent should provide the comprehensive stormwater management plan/strategy as early in the process as possible.	Noted.	An updated Drainage Report was sent to MOECC on June 9, 2016. A further updated Drainage Report has been included in Appendix C to address comments from all Agencies.
MOECC-T24	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix C	Surface Water 24. In the interim, it would benefit the proponent to review surface water comments from TSS on the “407 Transitway from East of Highway 400 to Kennedy Road” TPAP project completed in 2011, to gain an understanding of previous issues/concerns that were	Noted.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				raised by TSS for the 407 Transitway. These comments have been included as an attachment to this memo.		
MOECC-T25	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix M, Appendix N	Groundwater 25. A Permit To Take Water (PTTW) issued by the MOECC will be required prior to any construction dewatering if the takings are greater than 50,000 L/day. The proponent will need to determine whether a PTTW will be required for any portion of construction, where deeper works may encounter permeable water-bearing units or artesian conditions. To expedite the construction process, the proponent should consider initiating a preconsultation with MOECC TSS hydrogeologists regarding the PTTWs that will be required for construction dewatering.	Noted.  The pre-construction consultation with the agencies, including the MOECC TSS hydrogeologist will take place as stated in Section 9.2 of the EPR.  Commitment to develop an Environmental Management Plan which will include dewatering procedures and management is described in Section 9.3 of the EPR.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T26	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix M, Appendix N	Groundwater 26. As part of the PTTW application, the MOECC 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, that the water quality meets the water quality criteria for the chosen method of disposal, and a groundwater depressurization assessment in the event of artesian conditions. Any potential effects should be identified, and appropriate mitigation measures should be recommended. The level of detail required will be dependent on the significance of the potential impacts.	Noted.  Commitment to develop an Environmental Management Plan which will include dewatering procedures and management is described in Section 9.3 of the EPR.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T27	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix M, Appendix N	Groundwater 27. Also part of the PTTW application, the potential effects of dewatering, construction or other activities related to the project could affect groundwater users in the area, particularly shallow wells. Numerous private wells are in the study area and may be affected, depending on the depth, type and condition of the well. The MOECC strongly supports the proponents' commitment to complete a door-to-door well survey to identify all such wells prior to construction and ensure that affected well owners will continue to have water supplies of appropriate quality and in adequate quantity, and to ensure that any work done on affected wells or any replacement wells is done pursuant to Ontario Regulation	Noted.  Commitment to develop an Environmental Management Plan which will include dewatering procedures and management is described in Section 9.3 of the EPR.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				903, Wells (pursuant to the Ontario Water Resources Act). Baseline water quality samples should also be collected from identified wells as part of the survey of groundwater users.		
MOECC-T28	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix M, Appendix N	Groundwater 28. TSS strongly supports the commitment of the development of an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) during the Detail Design phase of the project. The EMP should include, but not be limited to plans for encountering highly productive zones, dewatering interferences with surface water and groundwater users, and groundwater and surface water monitoring plans.	Noted.  Commitment to develop an Environmental Management Plan which will include dewatering procedures and management is described in Section 9.3 of the EPR.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T29	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix M, Appendix N	Groundwater 29. TSS strongly supports the recommended completion of an environmental work plan (Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and/or potential Phase II ESA) during the Detail Design phase of the project for each site with a potential for environmental contamination to determine the presence and extent of contamination.	Noted.  Phase I ESA and Phase II ESA will be conducted for sites with a potential for environmental contamination as expressed in the EPR	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T30	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Contaminated Sites 30. A Contamination Overview Study (Appendix N) was completed by Golder Associates Ltd. for the project. Potential contaminated sites listed in Table 1 have been very roughly identified based on ERIS and air photos as municipal responses were not received based on the timing and scope of the requests. Section 3.10 of Appendix N states that “if a property is not listed in Table 1, impacts to soil and/or groundwater are not anticipated based on information gathered to date. However, it should be noted that there may be issues of potential environmental concerns associated with these properties that were not evident based on the level of assessment carried out as described in this report.” As part of the TPAP a proponent must identify all potential impacts that may arise from the transit project for which approval is being sought under the Transit Regulation. Proponents must also propose and develop appropriate mitigation and monitoring measures to address all potential impacts identified. It is not clear how sites and potential impacts not flagged in Appendix N, may be identified later in this project, or what sort of triggers, contingencies, procedures, mitigation measures and/or monitoring measures might apply in the event other contamination is encountered. Currently there is not enough information	Please note that Phase I ESA and Phase II ESA will be conducted for identified sites during Detail Design. A plan of action will be determined during Detail Design if unforeseen contamination is encountered during the construction phase.  Chapters 6 and 9 of the EPR include a commitment during Detail Design to conduct Phase I ESAs and Phase II ESAs, and to develop a contingency plan in case unforeseen contamination is encountered during construction.  Appendix N is has also been revised to explain more clearly how sites and potential impacts, not flagged in Appendix N, may be identified later in the project, and/or what sort of triggers, contingencies, procedures, mitigation measures and/or monitoring measures might apply in the event other contamination is encountered	Revisions made to Chapter 6 and 9, and Appendix N regarding contamination potential.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				or commitments provided in the draft EPR to compensate for the uncertainties in the very limited Contamination Overview Study. Without detailed information and commitments that address this concern satisfactorily, this level of assessment is not considered appropriate.		
MOECC-T31	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Contaminated Sites 31. As the alignment for the transitway follows the existing 407, it is recommended that the proponent review previous environmental assessments that have been conducted for and along this portion of Highway 407, for information on more detailed assessments of potential issues in the area. Similarly, source protection plans and threat assessments may also be of interest in identifying potential sites of concern within the project area. This information can be used to further inform the study with respect to identifying potential contaminated sites, potential impacts and developing mitigation and monitoring measures at this stage.	Commitment for an Environmental Management Plan is described in Section 9.3 of the EPR.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T32	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Contaminated Sites 32. In Appendix N, nine properties within the study area were flagged for additional assessment. Section 6.1.1 of the draft EPR states that four properties were identified for potential property contamination and/or waste materials that could interfere with the construction of the 407 Transitway within the study area. It is not clear how or why the proponent screened out the other five properties that required further assessment. Please explain.	Noted.	Text added to Section 6.1.1 of the EPR: <i>“Nine properties were identified requiring further assessment for potential contamination and/or waste materials. Four of the properties require further assessment to determine whether subsurface investigations would be warranted (e.g. Phase 1 ESA) and five of the properties require subsurface environmental investigation to determine whether soil and/or groundwater impacts exist on the properties (Phase 2 ESA)”</i>
MOECC-T33	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Contaminated Sites 33. The use of the words “as applicable” when discussing commitments to conduct Phase 1 ESAs and Phase 2 ESAs weakens these commitments. It also makes it unclear when and where further assessment is proposed, what level of assessment is proposed, what standard would be applied, or if this will include any site investigation. Please firmly commit to the further assessments that are required to be completed. If flexibility is needed, please make the firm commitment that includes an acceptable disclaimer that explains/describes the situation where Phase 1 and Phase 2 ESAs may not be required.	Noted. Chapters 6 and 9 of the EPR include a commitment during Detail Design to conduct Phase I ESAs and Phase II ESAs, and to develop a contingency plan in case unforeseen contamination is encountered during construction.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T34	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Contaminated Sites 34. In relation to the proceeding comment #33, it is not	Please note that Phase I ESA and Phase II ESA will be conducted for identified sites during Detail Design. A plan of	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				clear what contingencies, procedures, mitigation measures and monitoring measures apply in the event contamination is encountered through the ESAs. This must be described in detail in the draft EPR (e.g. Section 6). A commitment should also be made to include this information in the "Excess Materials Management Plan" (see comment #39 below).	action will be determined in the event that unforeseen contamination is encountered during the construction phase.  Chapters 6 and 9 of the EPR include a commitment during Detail Design to conduct Phase I ESAs and Phase II ESAs, and to develop a contingency plan in case unforeseen contamination is encountered during construction.  Please also note that MTO has standard construction methods for dealing with contamination, which also follow BMP's.	
MOECC-T35	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Contaminated Sites 35. Under the "Monitoring and Recommendation" column in Table 6.7 for the environmental indicator "Contaminated Waste and Property", please clarify this statement: "Monitoring plan will be undertaken in accordance with the Ontario Environmental Protection Act."	Noted.	Table 6.7 of the EPR, the following sentence has been deleted:  <i>"Monitoring plan will be undertaken in accordance with the Ontario Environmental Protection Act."</i>
MOECC-T36	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Contaminated Sites 36. Under the "Proposed Mitigation Measures" column in Table 6.7 for the "Contaminated Waste and Property" environmental indicator, it discusses the generation of wastes and how it can be reused. This is not a mitigation measure to address the environmental impact stated as "disturbance of contaminated waste and/or soils during construction." This is discussing proposed measures on how to manage the generation of excess non-contaminated material. These matters should be considered separately. Additionally, it should be noted that everywhere else in the report refers to this environmental indicator as "Contaminated Property and Waste."	Noted.	The Environmental indicator in Table 6.7 has been revised to say "Contaminated Property and Waste".  Further revision to Table 6.7 includes the following:  <i>"Results of the Phase I ESAs and Phase II ESAs conducted during Detail Design and their proposed mitigation measures will be implemented."</i>
MOECC-T37	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Contaminated Sites 37. The MOECC's York-Durham District Office should be contacted for further consultation if contaminated sites are present.	Noted.	Text added to Chapters 6 and 9 of the EPR:  <i>"The Contingency Plan will include commitment to contact MOECC's York-Durham District Office if contaminated sites are encountered during construction."</i>
MOECC-T38	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Soil Management Both the draft EPR and Appendix N are largely silent on excess soil management. More clear, detailed and consistent information should be in the draft EPR. This includes, but is not limited to, the following comments:	Noted.	N/A
MOECC-T39	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Soil Management 38. Footprint Impacts: The written summary under	Noted.	Text under Section 6.3 has been revised to note that MOECC's current guidance document titled "Management

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				section 6.2.1, subheading “Physiography and Soils”, and Table 6.3 (first row) are not consistent. The written summary should include the description of the potential impact listed in Table 6.3. Additionally, it is not clear how displaced excess soil that is not considered waste will be managed. It is assumed that this excess soil will be reused, however there is no information provided on this (i.e. reuse for what purpose, what location – on site at the excavation site, on site at a different location in the study area or off site, will it require temporary storage, if needed will temporary storage sites be located on site or off site, will it be transported, etc.). It is recommended that the draft EPR consider defining criteria applicable for different scenarios (reuse, placement at depth, off-site reuse vs. disposal). Please provide details in the draft EPR where applicable.		of Excess Soil – A Guide for Best Management Practices” (2014) shall apply to displacement of excess soil, and that MOECC shall be consulted during Detail Design.
MOECC-T40	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Soil Management 39. Under “Proposed Mitigation Measures” in Table 6.3, the development of an “Excess Materials Management Plan” is referenced; however there is no reference to an “Excess Materials Management Plan” in Section 7. In Section 7 there is a discussion about the development of a “Waste Management Plan.” It is recommended that the plan to be developed be an “Excess Materials Management Plan” instead of a “Waste Management Plan”, in order to develop/document procedures for managing both excess materials that will be reused and excess materials that will be disposed of as waste. Section 7 should be revised accordingly.	Noted.	Text under Section 7.1.2 has been revised: Development of a “Waste Management Plan” replaced by “Excess Materials Management Plan”.
MOECC-T41	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Soil Management 40. In relation to the proceeding comment #39, the development of an “Excess Materials Management Plan” should be referenced in Table 6.3 as a firm commitment.	Noted.	Text under Table 6.3 and Chapter 9 has been revised to include a commitment to developing an “Excess Materials Management Plan”.
MOECC-T42	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Soil Management 41. In relation to the proceeding comments #39 and #40, the “Proposed Mitigation Measures” in Table 6.7 for the Environmental Indicator “Contaminated Waste and Property”, should also reference the commitment to develop the “Excess Material Management Plan.”	Noted.	Text under Table 6.7 and Chapter 9 has been revised to include a commitment to developing an “Excess Materials Management Plan”.
MOECC-T43	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Soil Management 42. At a minimum, it is recommended that the proponent commit to managing excess soil in accordance with the	Noted.	Text added to Sections 7.1.2 – Implementation – Construction, and 9.3 Commitments for Detail Design and Construction:

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				MOECC's current guidance document titled "Management of Excess Soil – A Guide for Best Management Practices" (2014) available online ( <a href="http://www.ontario.ca/document/management-excess-soil-guide-best-managementpractices">http://www.ontario.ca/document/management-excess-soil-guide-best-managementpractices</a> ). The draft EPR should reference this commitment where applicable (Section 6, Section 7, and Section 9.3).		<i>"Managing excess soil in accordance with the MOECC's current guidance document titled "Management of Excess Soil – A Guide for Best Management Practices" (2014)."</i>
MOECC-T44	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Soil Management 43. Construction Impacts: The written summary under Section 6.3.1, subheading "Physiography and Soils", and Table 6.7 (first row) are not consistent. The written summary should also include the description of the potential impact listed in Table 6.7 (i.e. potential for erosion during construction). Table 6.7 should also include the potential impact described in the written summary in Section 6.3.1 (i.e. displacement of soil and/or generation of excess soil – this should be the same as in Table 6.3).	Noted.	Text in Table 6.7 and Section 6.3.1 have been revised to be consistent.
MOECC-T45	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Appendix N	Soil Management 44. Section 7.1.2 should include in the list of "physical construction activities" the following sentence as applicable: Managing excess soil appropriately including reusing soil on site/off site, receiving soil from off site sources, temporary storage of soil on site/off site and/or disposing soil off site at acceptable receiving site.	Noted.	Text added to Sections 7.1.2 – Implementation – Construction, and 9.3 Commitments for Detail Design and Construction:  <i>"Managing excess soil in accordance with the MOECC's current guidance document titled "Management of Excess Soil – A Guide for Best Management Practices" (2014)."</i>
MOECC-T46	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		Process – Impact Assessment, Mitigation Measures and Monitoring (draft EPR) 45. Overall the information provided in the Tables in Section 6 which describe "Potential Impacts", "Proposed Mitigation Measures, Built-in Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations and Significance of any Potential Residual Effects" and "Monitoring and Recommendations" is not well described, is incomplete/ missing, and/or inappropriately defers to the detailed design phase. Additionally, residual effects are not clearly identified and there is no information provided about their significance. This section requires review and revisions to ensure potential impacts, mitigation measures and monitoring measures are appropriately identified, described, assessed/evaluated and documented in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08, section 9.	Noted.	Text under Chapter 6 of the EPR has been reviewed and revised to be consistent and complete and to reflect responses to comments provided by MOECC and other agencies.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-T47	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		Process – Impact Assessment, Mitigation Measures and Monitoring (draft EPR) 46. Proposed mitigation measures and monitoring measures should be presented as firm commitments, by using language such as “will” instead of “should” in the report where possible.	Noted.	Text under Chapters 6 and 9 has been revised to use language indicating firm commitments, such as “will” instead of “should”.
MOECC-T48	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Chapter 9	Commitments to Future Action (Draft EPR) 47. It is difficult to cross-reference the commitments made in Section 9.3 with the rest of the report and to have a clear understanding of what the commitment entails, who is involved, when it will be completed etc. The commitments should be better organized with more detail in order to track and monitor them easily and effectively in the future. It is recommended that each individual commitment be numbered and be presented in a table format which includes at minimum the following information: description of the commitment, phase of project to be completed (pre-construction/detailed design, construction, operation/maintenance), involvement of other stakeholders, and reference to the section that this commitment is written in the EPR.	Noted.	Text under Chapter 9 has been revised to include a commitment table containing MOECC’s suggestions.
MOECC-T49	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Chapter 9	Commitments to Future Action (Draft EPR) 48. Further to the proceeding comment #47, Section 9.3 is not a complete list of the commitments made throughout the report. Please revisit the report and ensure all commitments to future work are included in this section.	Noted.	Text under Chapter 9 has been revised to include a commitment table containing MOECC’s suggestions.
MOECC-T50	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016	Chapter 9	Commitments to Future Action (Draft EPR) 49. As part of the TPAP a proponent must describe the means proposed to be used to monitor or verify the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures. Accordingly, it would also be useful to include a Table that lists all the monitoring measures committed to by the proponent.	Noted.	Text under Chapter 9 has been revised to include a commitment table containing MOECC’s suggestions.
MOECC-T51	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		50. The list for “other related pre-construction activities” in Section 7.1.1 should include reference to further consultation efforts that have been committed to by the proponent (consultation with who? For what? etc.).	Noted.	The following has been added to the “other related pre-construction activities” in Section 7.1.1:  “Further consultation with applicable stakeholders as described and detailed in Chapter 9.”
MOECC-T52	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		51. Figures E.1 and 1.1 (same figure), labelled as both “Full 407 Transitway Study Limits” and “Highway 407	Noted.	Figures have been revised accordingly.



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				Transitway and Station Plan” are not legible. The writing should be clearly readable. The Figure could also be improved by having the municipalities clearly labelled for geographic reference, and including a map scale.		
MOECC-T53	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		52. There is a typo in the Table of Contents on page iii, where “Appendix L: Lanscape Design Report” should read “Appendix L: Landscape Design Report”.	Noted.	Typo corrected.
MOECC-T54	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		53. Sections E.1.1.1 and 1.1 state that the length of the entire 407 Transitway is 150 km while Section 4.1 states it is 160 km.	Noted.	Text under Section 4.1 has been revised to read 150 km.
MOECC-T55	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		54. Section 5.4 states that the length of the Transitway within the study limits is approximately 19.3 km, however the draft EPR states in several other sections that the length is 18 km.	Noted.	All Sections that refer to 18 km. corrected to read 19.3 km.
MOECC-T56	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		55. Section 2.2.1.1 states that “By 2031, densities in the corridor – particularly York Region – are expected to be above 80 jobs+people/hectare throughout much of the Highway 7 corridor.” Please clarify whether this should state Highway “407” corridor.	Wording is correct, it is supposed to read Highway 7.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T57	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		56. All tables in section 6 should be reviewed and updated to ensure grammar consistency. For example, is the information being provided in sentences or bullet form? Does the information require punctuation or not?	Noted.	Chapter 6 has been revised for consistency.
MOECC-T58	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		57. In Tables 6.3 and 6.4, the first two columns are titled “Environmental Value/Criterion” (column 1) and “Environmental Issues/Concerns” (column 2). The first two columns in all other tables in Section 6 are titled “Environmental Indicator” (column 1) and “Environmental Measure” (column 2). Please ensure consistency across the tables in Section 6.	Noted.	Tables 6.3 and 6.4 has been revised to be consistent with other tables within Chapter 6.
MOECC-T59	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		58. An explanation of the column headings for the Tables in Section 6 would benefit the reader.	Noted.	Text under Section 6.1 has been revised to present an explanation of the column headings found in tables in Chapter 6.
MOECC-T60	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		59. For the Tables in Section 6, it is difficult to discern which proposed mitigation measures listed under column 4 are addressing which identified potential impacts listed under column 3, and also which proposed monitoring methods listed under column 5 are for which proposed mitigation measures listed under column 4. This should be more clearly presented.	Noted.	Tables in Chapter 6 have been revised to clearly connect the mitigation measures and monitoring with the potential impacts.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-T61	MOECC - Paul Martin APEP	June 6, 2016		60. Please ensure all references to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change are abbreviated as "MOECC" and not "MOE" (e.g. Table 6.7 (page 6-31).	Noted.	EPR document updated.
MOECC-T62	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	This office was requested to review the noise and vibration specialist of the following documents - Environmental Project Report prepared by PARSONS (Draft) dated April 2016; and - Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment prepared by Arcadis dated April 2016. The following are our comments on the above noted two documents:	Noted.	N/A
MOECC-T63	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(1) Proposed Transit Stations: five stations are proposed as part of the current undertaking. These include: a) Markham Road Station; b) Ninth Line Station; c) Donald Cousens Parkway Station; d) Whites Road Station; and e) Brock Road Station. The noise emissions of all stationary and mobile noise sources within these stations should be assessed at the nearest points of reception. If the noise limits specified in Publication NPC-300 are exceeded, then appropriate noise control measures should be recommended.	As noted in Section 3.2 of the NVIA, the planned stations will consist of a canopied platform (i.e., not a building). As with the other sections of the Transitway, they are essentially bus-stops with adjacent parking lots. According to Part A, section 5 of Publication NPC-300, both transportation corridors and commuter parking lots are "not considered as stationary sources in the context of Part B and Part C" of NPC-300, and are therefore not subject to the sound level limits therein. As these sources are excluded from consideration in NPC-300, the noise from transportation through the station and from the parking lot have been assessed in accordance with MTO criteria.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T64	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(2) Possible Transit Stations: three additional stations are identified as possible stations. These include: a) McCowan Road Station; b) York Durham Line Station; and c) Rossland Road Station. If these stations are part of the current undertaking, then the noise emissions of all stationary and mobile noise sources within these stations should be assessed at the nearest points. If the noise limits specified in Publication NPC-300 are exceeded, the appropriate noise control measures should be recommended.	Potential future facilities at those three locations are not part of the undertaking seeking EA approval. Should stations be considered at these locations in the future, the addendum process would be followed under Section 15 of the EA act in consultation with MOECC per Section 9.5 of EPR.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T65	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(3) Possible Bus garage: a possible bus garage is identified at Rossland Road. If this bus garage is part of the current undertaking, then the noise emissions of all stationary and mobile noise sources within the bus garage should be assessed at the nearest points of reception. If the noise limits specified in Publication NPC-300 are exceeded, then appropriate noise control measures should be recommended.	Potential future temporary bus garage at Rossland Road is not part of the undertaking seeking EA approval.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MOECC-T66	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(4) Berm for Ninth Line Station: Figure 8 shows a berm along part of the south property line of Ninth Line Station. This berm shields point of reception POR14 from Highway 407 and Transitway. The length and height of this berm should be shown in Figure 8. Furthermore, if this berm is used in the sound level calculations, then it should be included in the recommendations section of the report. This berm should reduce the sound levels due to the "future Build" Highway 407 and Transitway as well as the proposed Ninth Line Station, to acceptable levels.	While beneficial, the berm between the station and the residential development is not a recommendation of the NVIAA. It is included as a potential berm to be considered during Detail Design phase.	Chapter 9 has been revised accordingly.
MOECC-T67	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(5) Point of Reception Height: a height of 1.2 meters above ground levels was used in the sound level calculations to represent the outdoor points of reception. In accordance with the MOECC guidelines and procedures, the height of outdoor points of reception is 1.5 meters above ground level. All outdoor sound level calculations should be based on the latter height.	As indicated in a previous response, MOECC Publication NPC300 specifically excludes transportation corridors, consequently a receptor height of 1.2 m is prescribed in the MTO Environmental Guide for Noise was adopted for assessing noise impacts from this project.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T68	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(6) Sound Level Calculations: TNM version 2.5 software was used to calculate the sound levels due to road traffic, while FTA module in the CadnaA software was used to calculate the sound levels due to Highway 407 Transitway. The currently accepted MOECC noise prediction software is STAMSON. If different software is used to support a submission for approval by the MOECC, then representative calculations (e.g. at POR13 and POR24) should be provided using both softwares that show the same results	All road-based sources (including the BRT operating on the 407 Transitway, and all Highway 407 and local road traffic for both options) were assessed in TNM 2.5 which represents the most current iteration of the STAMINA (STAMSON) methodology. FTA module in Cadna was used as reference only to model the rail source (LRT) operating on the 407 Transitway; however, if LRT is considered in the future the addendum process would be followed under Section 15 of the EA act in consultation with MOECC per Section 9.5 of EPR and the noise impact would be reassessed.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T69	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(7) Sound Barrier for POR13 Area: Figure 17 shows the locations, heights and lengths of two barriers at POR13. The height of both barriers is 3.5 metres above ground level. Sections 5.1.2 and 7.2 refer to a possible height of 5 metres above ground, while Tables 10 and 11 refer to two different lengths for the barriers, namely 400 metres and 550 metres, respectively. The height and length of the proposed barrier for POR13 should be consistent throughout the report.	The report is consistent with the height of both barriers being 3.5m. Sections 5.1.2.1 and 7.2 of the report indicate that in the Detail Design phase a height of up to 5m will be analyzed at this location.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T70	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(8) Sound Barrier for POR24 Area: Table 12 lists the calculated sound levels with a 5 metres high barrier along Highway 407 Transitway right-of-way, while Table 13 lists the calculated sound levels with a 5 metres high barrier along part of the south property line of Brock Road Station. One specific recommendation should be presented in the report for the sound barrier at POR24	Noted.  As noted, two barriers were assessed for POR24 and the results are included in Tables 12 and 13. These include a 5 m high barrier in the 407 Transitway right-of-way Table 12) and a 5 m high barrier along the south edge of the Brock Road Station parking lot (Table 13). MTO requested this	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
					information to show that the barrier along the south edge of the runningway is not feasible (as shown in Appendix K).	
MOECC-T71	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(9) "Future No-Build" Vs. "Future Build" Noise Assessment: the current assessment shown in Tables 9 to 13 is based on the difference between the future sound levels due to Highway 407. This is incorrect. The assessment should be based on the difference between the future sound levels due to Highway 407 and the proposed Highway 407 Transitway versus the future sound levels due to Highway 407.	It is not clear how the MOECC has arrived at the conclusion that the future built scenario excludes Highway 407 ETR. Future No-build means future 407 ETR traffic without the Transitway and future build means future 407 ETR traffic with the Transitway.  The assessment results in Tables 9 to 13 do in fact include Highway 407 ETR and the 407 Transitway. It should be noted that the assessment of mitigation at receptor POR13 was precipitated by the fact the removal of the existing berm in the "future built" scenario results in a significant increase in the contribution of sound from Highway 407 at this receptor, which shows that Highway 407 is included in the "future build" scenario.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T72	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(10) Section 5.1.2: a sound Barrier of 3.34 metres height is referenced in the report. If this barrier was used in the sound level calculations, then it should be included in the recommendations section of the report. Furthermore, a figure should be included in the report to show the length and height of this sound barrier.	The height of 3.34 m referred to in Section 5.1.2 is the design requirement. As indicated in the report MTO favours the height of the noise wall to be rounded to the nearest 0.5m increment; consequently heights of 3.0m and 3.5m were modelled.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T73	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(11) BRT and LRT Sound Levels: the "Future Build" sound levels are calculated initially due to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and ultimately due to Light Rail Transit (LRT). The noise analysis and assessment of both modes are incomplete. The sound levels due to the Bus Garage for the BRT and due to the Traction Power Sub-Station (TPSS) as well as the Maintenance and Storage Facility for the LRT should be included in the noise analysis and assessment.	LRT infrastructure, Bus Garage and Maintenance Storage Facility are not part of the project seeking EA approval at this stage. If these facilities are proposed in the future the addendum process would be followed under Section 15 of the EA act in consultation with MOECC.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T74	MOECC - Header Merza	June 6, 2016	Noise	(12) Sound Level Calculations: sample calculations should be included in the report for the worst case (i.e. the closes and most exposed) points of reception.	As confirmed by MTO, applied forecast traffic data on 407 ETR was subject to a confidentiality agreement. TNM does not compile a summary of the reference data and attenuation terms when executing a run.	No change to the EPR.
MOECC-T75	MOECC - Emilee O'Leary	July 18, 2016	Stormwater Management	Stormwater Management (SWM)  Section 5 of the report discusses the proposed stormwater management (SWM) strategy for the transitway. Section 5.1 (Table 5.0) outlines the SWM criteria to apply for the project, which is enhanced level of protection for quality control.	Noted.  The drainage area at each Transitway outlet is less than 5 ha, therefore construction of wet ponds are not feasible to provide quality and quantity control for the paved area of the runningway.	Text under Section 4.2.2 and Section 5.2.1 of the Drainage Report has been updated to include a detailed discussion about the proposed stormwater management strategy for the Transitway areas. Details can be found in Sub-section 4.2.2.1 as well as in Appendix D of the Drainage Report.  Text under Chapter 5 of the EPR has been revised to read:

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				<p>The proposed strategy outlined in Section 5.2 includes provision of wet ponds for the five (5) transitway stations. The ponds will be capable of providing enhanced level of water quality control. However, we understand stormwater from almost the entire transit roadway is to be treated using enhanced swales. The reason provided is that the catchment area to each outlet point is less than the 5.0 ha requirement to sustain wet ponds. It is the MOECC’s position that enhanced level of treatment cannot be achieved by swales alone, and thus the proposed strategy for these areas is not consistent the proposed SWM criteria for quality control.</p> <p>The MOECC does not object to the use of swales for stormwater treatment, however we do not agree that enhanced level of protection can be achieved and we do not support their use where a high level of treatment is warranted due to sensitivity of the receiving environment and/or where opportunity exists to consider additional measures. One solution would be to revise the SWM strategy to include additional mitigation measures (such as the use of OGS) to provide enhanced level of quality control. Alternately, MTO may provide the rationale as to why enhanced level of protection is not warranted in this instance. The report and the EPR should be revised to clearly reflect the rationale/changes.</p>		<p>Section 4.2.2 (paragraph 2): <i>“The Transitway sub-areas delineated along the alignment are shown in Figures 4.1 and 4.2 in Appendix D. The drainage area at each Transitway outlet is less than 5ha, therefore construction of wet ponds are not feasible to provide quality and quantity control for the paved area of the runningway. A treatment train approach will be implemented consisting of grassed embankments to promote sheet flow, grassed swales on both sides of the transitway and enhanced grassed swales/dry ponds located before each outlet from the Transitway. The drainage strategy for the Transitway sub-areas within each subwatershed including details related to discharge points of each swale as well as quantity control criteria are presented in Table 4.5 in Appendix D.</i></p> <p>Section 4.2.2.1</p> <p><i>Grassed swales are proposed along the entire length of the Transitway. Since the swales will follow the slope of the runningway, which in some instances is steep, segments of enhanced swales are proposed before any stormwater discharge to a watercourse or any other type of outlet. The enhanced swales would cover an approximately 50m length and are designed to have a trapezoidal cross-section, flat bottom (1m wide), 3:1 side slopes and a depth of 1.5m. The swales are proposed to have a longitudinal slope of maximum 0.2% to provide settlement of sediment and to lessen the flow velocities from upstream segments. In addition, in order to increase the time of flow in the swales and to promote infiltration at the same time, two cells were designed with a 0.5m layer of clear stone covered by 0.3m of topsoil below the invert of the swale. The enhanced swales were designed in the form of dry ponds with a formal outlet control structure to provide quality and quantity control for Transitway sub-areas. The outlet is comprised of a 100mm perforated pipe to be installed at the bottom of each swale that is further connected to a hickenbottom structure equipped with a 75 mm orifice plate. Swale details (plan view, cross-sections and longitudinal profile) are shown in SK-3 in Appendix D. The maximum volume that can be stored in an enhanced swale is calculated to be 412.5m<sup>3</sup>. The controlled discharge rate from the swale was calculated to be 0.015m<sup>3</sup>/s using the orifice equation (75mm diameter) – refer to Table 4.6 in Appendix D. For modelling purposes, it is assumed that the swale volume used is maximized, and the maximum</i></p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<p>discharge would be 0.015m<sup>3</sup>/s. Modelling results indicate that in some instances the volumes required could be less than the maximum volume provided by the swale, therefore a smaller head would result in less discharge at the outlet as shown in the results. Our approach is conservative, since we are using the minimum allowable orifice and providing more storage than required.</p> <p>Tables 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 in Appendix D show the quantity control strategy for each swale. Figure 4.1 and 4.2 in Appendix D show the location of all swales identified along the Transitway. In the instances where the volume required exceeds 412.5m<sup>3</sup> additional swales are proposed to provide the required volume (one example is ES-1 where storage required is 700m<sup>3</sup> therefore two swales ES-1a and ES-1b are designed to provide 825m<sup>3</sup> maximum storage).</p> <p>Flows generated by the 25mm Chicago 4hr event vary between (0.001 - 0.003)m<sup>3</sup>/s for each swale as shown in Table 4.5 in Appendix D. Considering the swales have a maximum 0.2% longitudinal slope, velocities in the swale are approximately 0.13m/s which is less than 0.5m/s as required by TRCA (see Table "25mm 4hr Chicago event" in Appendix D).</p> <p>Section 5.2.1</p> <p>Quantity control requirements were discussed in Section 4.2.2 of this report. In addition, 80% TSS removal is required for stormwater flows generated by the Transitway subareas. As previously noted a treatment train approach will be implemented consisting of grassed embankments to promote sheet flow, grassed swales and enhanced grass swales/dry ponds located before each outlet from the Transitway.</p> <p>Grassed swales are proposed along the entire length of the Transitway. Since the swales will follow the slope of the runningway, which in some instances is steep, segments of enhanced swales are proposed before any stormwater discharge to a watercourse or any other type of outlet. The enhanced swales would cover approximately 50m length with a longitudinal slope of 0.2% to provide settlement of sediment and to lessen the flow velocities from upstream segment. In addition, in order to increase the time of flow in the swales and to promote infiltration at the same time,</p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<p>two cells were designed with a 0.5m layer of clear stone covered by 0.3m of topsoil.</p> <p>To support our use of enhanced swales and to prove the efficiency of the enhanced swales for Transitway sub-areas, Parsons undertook a literature review (see reference materials 11 to 14 at the end of this Report). The removal efficiency of grassed swales is noted in a number of reference materials. As noted in Reference 11 (“Highway Runoff Water Quality Literature Review, MAT-92-13, MTO Research and Development Branch, April 1992”) and Reference 12 (“Highway 407 East Phase 2, Stormwater Management Plan Framework, Condition 7, EAB File EA-05-08, October 2013, revised March 2014, Final Draft) the enhanced grassed swales can achieve between 76% and 90% reduction in total suspended solids generated by highway runoff.</p> <p>Oil grit-separators (OGS) are well known for their application in urban areas where there is limited space for stormwater management facilities. They are most likely to be used in defined impervious areas where the storm runoff is concentrated and collected in a piped system. However, as also noted in reference 12 (“Highway 407 East Phase 2, Stormwater Management Plan Framework, Condition 7, EAB File EA-05-08, October 2013, revised March 2014, Final Draft) MTO has not used OGS along highways primarily due to the initial cost of the units, the relatively small drainage area that can be treated by each unit and the on-going maintenance requirements. In addition, the units provide only 50% TSS removal as indicated by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection.</p> <p>Due to the reasons listed above, the use of treatment train approach is recommended consisting of grassed embankments, grassed swales and enhanced grassed swales to provide quality and quantity control of Transitway sub-areas.”</p>
MOECC-T76	MOECC - Amanda Graham	May 30, 2016	Air Quality Report	<p>Letter Dated: May 27, 2016 from Amanda Graham (Air Quality Analyst) to Gavin Battarino (Project Officer)</p> <p>“Technical Support Comments (TSS) 407 Transitway – Kennedy Road to Brock Road Ministry of Transportation Environmental Assessment</p> <p>Appendix J: Draft Air Quality Report”</p>	<p>Following receipt of the MOECC comments on the Air Quality Report – Preliminary Study, it was agreed that a full Air Quality Impact Assessment study (AQIA) be carried out. Subsequently, a Scope of Work for the AQIA was prepared to address MOECC comments and was submitted to MOECC on June 18, 2016 for review and comment. Comments on the Scope of Work were received from MOECC on July 13, 2016. Based on the revised scope the study was developed.</p>	<p>Appendix J of the EPR includes the AQIA report.</p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				Comments 1 through 21.		
IO-1	IO	May 27, 2016		On May 14, 2015, Infrastructure Ontario (IO) provided comments in response to the proposed 407 Transitway Environmental Assessment – Kennedy to Brock Road Presentation of Preferred Options PIC #1.	It is noted that all of the IO comments contained in the May 14, letter were re-iterated in the May 27 letter.	N/A
IO-2	IO	May 27, 2016		As stated in the May 14 letter, IO is pleased that MTO is proceeding with its environmental assessment of this section of the transitway and continues to encourage MTO to consider the impacts on land value and development opportunity when selecting and designing runningway and station locations.	Noted. One of the primary goals of the study is to minimize impacts on Provincial land and recognize the Seaton Community plans and land use designations that are in place, while ensuring that the plan for the Transitway and associated facilities meet all design requirements and adequate land is protected for them.	N/A
IO-3	IO	May 27, 2016		With MTO's recent update to its proposed transitway alignment, station locations and ancillary uses (e.g. storm ponds), IO would once again like to offer the following specific comments from a real estate perspective, on behalf of MEDEI, for inclusion and consideration in your EA.	Noted.	N/A
IO-4	IO	May 27, 2016		Markham Road Station Based on the information provided in the Draft Environmental Project Report, the preferred location for the station is the southwest corner of Markham Road and Highway 407. The runningway is proposed to run along the south side of Highway 407, through the north part of MEDEI-owned lands located at the southeast corner of this intersection (Figure 1a). Plate 3 in Appendix O (Figure 1b) identifies MEDEI-owned lands located east of Markham Road and south of the runningway as 'Protected Area - Property Protection Study'. This area has significant development potential. At the conclusion of the EA, IO requests written confirmation that MTO is releasing its interest in the protected area and the balance of lands at this location after accounting for the transitway requirements including all MEDEI-owned lands outside of the runningway southeast of Markham Road and Highway 407.	This study does not address the disposition of Provincial lands that will ultimately not be required for the Transitway. This is a separate matter to be addressed by the appropriate Provincial officials.	N/A
IO-5	IO	May 27, 2016		Markham Road Station The proposed alignment of the runningway and station at this location would also affect hydro corridor lands. Hydro One must conduct a separate technical review and provide technical approval of the final design drawings for any corridor lands that may be impacted. Please ensure Mr. Tony Ierullo is consulted as it relates to this station.	Noted. Hydro One has been notified and given the opportunity to review potential impacts to Hydro One lands and facilities. Consultations with Hydro One will continue through the Detail Design and Construction phases.	No change in the EPR.



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
IO-6	IO	May 27, 2016		Ninth Line Station Based on the information provided in the Draft Environmental Project Report, the preferred location for this station is the southwest corner of Ninth Line and Highway 407. The runningway is proposed to run along the south side of Highway 407, through the north part of MEDEI-owned lands located at the southeast corner of this intersection (Figure 2a).	Noted.	No change in the EPR.
IO-7	IO	May 27, 2016		Ninth Line Station At the conclusion of the EA, IO requests written confirmation that MTO is releasing its interest in the balance of lands at this location after accounting for the transitway requirements, including the area southeast of Ninth Line and Highway 407. IO also requests confirmation, at the conclusion of the EA process that the MTO-owned site, located west of the emergency access road and south of the runningway with potential use for an MTO Carpool Lot (Figure 2b), is not required for the transitway. This site has significant development potential but appears to not be required as part of the station according to Plate 4 in Appendix O.	This study does not address the disposition of Provincial lands that will ultimately not be required for the Transitway. This is a separate matter to be addressed by the appropriate Provincial officials.	N/A
IO-8	IO	May 27, 2016		Donald Cousens Station Based on the information provided in the Draft Environmental Project Report, the preferred location for this station has been relocated from the southeast corner of Reesor Road and Highway 407 to the southwest corner. A future access road to the station is proposed to connect Donald Cousens Parkway and Reesor Road with part of the road running through privately-owned lands (owned by TACC) and another part through MEDEI-owned lands (Figure 3a).	Noted.	No change in the EPR.
IO-9	IO	May 27, 2016		Donald Cousens Station The corridor protection study area as shown on Plate 5 in Appendix O (Figure 3b) is problematic for the planned servicing alignment for the MEDEI-owned property northeast of Reesor Road and Highway 407 (8359 Reesor Road) because as suggested through consultations with MTO thus far municipal services are not permitted in the protection area. This leaves no feasible servicing options for 8359 Reesor Road as it would not be financially feasible to acquire privately-owned land (specifically land owned by TACC) to enable future servicing requirements.	Discussions have taken place between IO and MTO regarding the servicing alignment since receipt of the May 27 letter. On a May 31, 2016 meeting MTO's Project Manager of the 407 Transitway, Graham DeRose, informed Ernest Abraham of IO that servicing could not be located underneath any future Transitway infrastructure. Since then IO has developed alternatives that avoid placing any servicing within the Donald Cousens Station area.	No change in the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
IO-10	IO	May 27, 2016		Donald Cousens Station In advance of the conclusion of the EA, IO requests written confirmation that MTO is releasing its interest in the remainder of the MEDEI-owned lands on the west side of Reesor Road after accounting for any access road requirements and will work with IO to accommodate a servicing alignment through the protected area for servicing requirements for 8359 Reesor Road.	This study does not address the disposition of Provincial lands that will ultimately not be required for the Transitway. This is a separate matter to be addressed by the appropriate Provincial officials.	N/A
IO-11	IO	May 27, 2016		York Durham Line Station Based on the information provided in the Draft Environmental Project Report, the recommended option at this location continues to be no station. Plate 7 in Appendix O indicates that MTO will continue to protect the lands south of Highway 407. The runningway is proposed to run through the north portion of the MEDEI-owned lands south of Highway 407 (Figure 4). At the conclusion of the EA, IO requests written confirmation that MTO will release its interest in the balance of the MEDEI-owned lands at this location after accounting for the transitway requirements.	This study does not address the disposition of Provincial lands that will ultimately not be required for the Transitway. This is a separate matter to be addressed by the appropriate Provincial officials.	N/A
IO-12	IO	May 27, 2016		Rossland Road Station We have concerns regarding the extent of the impact along Sideline 22/Future Rossland Road.	Noted. Potential station facility at future Rossland Road has been eliminated.	No change in the EPR.
IO-13	IO	May 27, 2016		Rossland Road Station As you are aware, the planning for Seaton has been ongoing for many years. Seaton is unique in that the plan for Seaton, the Central Pickering Development Plan, was prepared under the provisions of the Ontario Planning and Development Act, 1994, and is therefore a Provincial Plan, which give it similar status to that of the Parkway Belt West Plan.	Noted.	N/A
IO-14	IO	May 27, 2016		Rossland Road Station The Central Pickering Development Plan addresses a range of matters for Seaton, including Natural Heritage, Cultural Heritage, Agriculture, Servicing, Employment, Housing, and the Transportation Network. The Central Pickering Development Plan was developed based on specific population and density targets that are to be achieved through the development of the area. The Plan includes land use and transportation schedules which identify three future Transitway Stations within Seaton and another directly west (refer to the attached Schedule 2. Land Use and Schedule 4. Transportation Network from	Noted. Potential station facility at future Rossland Road has been eliminated.	No change in the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				the Central Pickering Development Plan). These two schedules identify a station to be located at the southwest corner of Sideline 22 and Highway 407 within lands identified as the Natural Heritage System.		
IO-15	IO	May 27, 2016		Rossland Road Station The Central Pickering Development Plan requires that the City of Pickering prepare an Official Plan Amendment (“OPA 22”), including Neighbourhoods Plans, to implement the Provincial Plan. These were prepared and approved at the Ontario Municipal Board. The land use plan for OPA 22 was prepared to support the Central Pickering Development Plan policy regarding the population and employment numbers and also to directly implement the land uses through the OPA schedules. OPA 22 includes Neighbourhood Plans, with schedules and policies, for each of the six neighbourhoods in Seaton.	Noted.	N/A
IO-16	IO	May 27, 2016		Rossland Road Station The policies of OPA 22 include the need for the Transitway to be shown in the Neighbourhood Plans for Neighbourhoods 20 and 21 and the policies state that this should include space for commuter parking areas, park and ride and car-pooling areas located adjacent to the transit stations. The policies for the Neighbourhood Plans also state that the Transitway will run through Neighbourhood 21 and that there are two stations proposed in Neighbourhood 21 at Sideline 22 and Sideline 26. The land use schedules for the Neighbourhood Plans are consistent with these policies (see attached) and demonstrate that the Transitway Stations will be located in Neighbourhood 21 at Sideline 26 and Sideline 22. The station at Sideline 22 is shown to be completely within the boundaries of Neighbourhood 21 and does not extend further south into Neighbourhood 19 (N19), which is a residential area.	Noted. Potential station facility at future Rossland Road has been eliminated.	No change in the EPR.
IO-17	IO	May 27, 2016		Rossland Road Station As such, the concern that we have with the drawings that have been prepared in support of the 407 Transitway EA from Kennedy Road to Brock Road, is that the footprint of the future Rossland Road site (shown on Plate 10, attached), extends from Neighbourhood 21 into Neighbourhood 19 and directly impacts lands planned for future residential development. As discussed above, the Central Pickering Development Plan, the City’s Official	Noted. Potential station facility at future Rossland Road has been eliminated. The site is being protected for other purposes including environmental compensation to be defined and approved prior to implementation.  It was intended to remove any conflict with OPA 22.	Chapter 5 Plate R1 has been revised to remove the Transitway site from Neighbourhood 19 in OPA 22.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				Plan and the Neighbourhood Plans, all identify the transitway stations within the portions of the neighbourhoods that are employment areas and are located within Neighbourhoods 20 and 21. The stations do not extend into the residential areas. In particular, the station at Sideline 22, was planned to be located in Neighbourhood 21 (an employment area) within an area currently identified as Natural Heritage System, and not within a developable area. Transit facilities are permitted within the NHS in the Central Pickering Development Plan and in OPA 22. The location of the Future Rossland Road Protected Site would have a direct impact on the projected population numbers for Seaton because it was not previously located on developable lands. In addition, it is possible that the extension of this station area into Neighbourhood 19 could trigger the need for an Official Plan Amendment, and perhaps a corresponding amendment to the Provincial Plan (Central Pickering Development Plan).		
TRCA-1	TRCA	June 1, 2016		Staff understands that the draft EPR involves the installation of an 18 km transitway facility along the Highway 407 corridor from Kennedy Road in Markham to Brock Road in Pickering. The proposed transitway consists of a two-laned, dedicated runningway and five (5) stations along the Highway 407 corridor. It is understood that the transitway will be initially implemented as a busway with potential conversion to light rail transit (LRT) in the future.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-2	TRCA	June 1, 2016		It is further understood that all of the existing and future 407 interchanges were evaluated as potential station sites. The evaluation of the sites considered environmental effects, transitway operation, convenience to users by means of feasible transit connections, adequate vehicular and pedestrian accessibility, and constructability ease and costs. The five (5) preferred station sites are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Markham Road Station – Southwest Site</li> <li>· Ninth Line Station – Southwest Site</li> <li>· Donald Cousens Station – Southeast Site</li> <li>· Whites Road Station – Southwest Site</li> <li>· Brock Station – Southwest Site</li> </ul>	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-3	TRCA	June 1, 2016		The stations will consist of weather protected platforms, park and ride lots, public pick up and drop off, bus facilities, etc. The three (3) stations that were not	Noted.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				selected (McCowan Road, York/Durham Line and Rossland Road) were eliminated from consideration due to physical constraints, insignificant ridership, and protection of the site for future parking or environmental remediation/compensation.		
TRCA-4	TRCA	June 1, 2016		Transit Project Assessment Process As outlined in our Living City Policies ( <a href="http://www.trca.on.ca/the-living-city/public-consultations/the-living-citypolicies.dot">http://www.trca.on.ca/the-living-city/public-consultations/the-living-citypolicies.dot</a> ), when the provincial Environmental Assessment Act was approved, Conservation Authorities were directed to provide technical comment on natural resources management for applications made under the Act.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-5	TRCA	June 1, 2016		Transit Project Assessment Process In addition, through the Memorandum of Understanding on Conservation Authority Delegated Responsibilities we are also responsible for representing the provincial interest on natural hazards. Through this lens, staff has reviewed the above-noted information.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-6	TRCA	June 1, 2016		Transit Project Assessment Process While staff has no objection in principle to the project, overall, we found that the lack of detailed information made it difficult for us to provide a complete review. As such, TRCA staff is not able to confirm the potential impacts of the project on TRCA's areas of interest or to confirm the proposed mitigation methods are appropriate. Key areas of concern within TRCA's jurisdiction are provided in Appendix A and may change once a response to Appendix A has been submitted for review.	Noted. Comments and concerns listed by TRCA in Appendix A were discussed in a meeting held at TRCA on July 11, 2016. Responses to the comments, and/or indication of how TRCA's concerns are being addressed in the EPR are included in this comments/response matrix.	Various changes are being made as noted in answers to specific questions below.
TRCA-7	TRCA	June 1, 2016		Transit Project Assessment Process Again, TRCA staff is available to meet with MTO and their project team to go over the proposal and the comments provided in Appendix A. TRCA staff would support a meeting that would include Parks Canada and Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) staff in order to have a fulsome discussion on concerns related to potential impacts to the natural heritage system and hazards and options related to mitigation and compensation.	Meeting attended by TRCA, MNRF, Parks Canada, MTO and their consultants was held on July 11/16.	Minutes of the meeting are being included in the EPR.
TRCA-8	TRCA	June 1, 2016		Detailed Design Looking ahead to the design stage, please note that development activities within regulated areas for or on	Noted.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Section 9.2 :

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				behalf of the Government of Ontario (a provincial) or federal agency are exempt from the regulatory approval process under Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act. In the absence of the formal permitting process the province may voluntarily request TRCA to review and comment on detailed design activities associated with project construction, maintenance or emergency activities.		<p><i>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable agencies such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be consulted include:</i></p> <p><i>Any infrastructure located within regulated areas.”</i></p>
TRCA-9	TRCA	June 1, 2016		<p>Detailed Design</p> <p>Should you choose to submit an application for a Voluntary Project Review at the design stage, TRCA will complete a comprehensive review and provide an opinion as to whether the interests, objectives, and tests of TRCA’s permit requirements under Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act and under Ontario Regulation 166/06 – Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA): Regulation of Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses will be satisfied. This includes a review as to whether or not there will be impacts to flooding, erosion, pollution and conservation of land. Voluntary Project Review fees will be charged (TRCA fee schedule - <a href="http://www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/189184.pdf">http://www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/189184.pdf</a>), and regular TRCA review process and service delivery timelines will be followed. Once TRCA concerns are satisfied, TRCA will issue a Voluntary Project Review Letter confirming that our interests have been met, if implemented as per the submission details provided. Further to correspondence from Parks Canada dated May 31, 2016, TRCA notes that Parks Canada encourages MTO to provide commitment to follow the process.</p>	Noted.	<p>Text added to Chapter 9 - Section 9.2 :</p> <p><i>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable agencies such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be consulted include:</i></p>
TRCA-10	TRCA	June 1, 2016		<p>Detailed Design</p> <p>If the province chooses not to proceed with the voluntary review process it is requested that MTO highlight how TRCA detailed design concerns will be fully addressed in the EA in order to protect our interests of flooding, erosion, pollution and conservation of lands. We request that the provincial commitment to have these issues addressed as the project moves to detailed design and construction be recognized. However, staff understands that through the detailed design process, such commitments may not be fulfilled and thus, provincial interests related to flooding and erosion may not be addressed, and the natural heritage system may be</p>	Noted.	<p>Text added to Chapter 9 - Section 9.2:</p> <p><i>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable agencies such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be consulted include:</i></p> <p><i>Applications for a Voluntary Project Review by TRCA in situations where the Conservation Authority would like to protect their interests of flooding, erosion, pollution and conservation of lands.”</i></p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				unduly impacted. By copy of this letter to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry and Parks Canada we are advising them of our concerns.		
TRCA-11	TRCA	June 1, 2016		Detailed Design Please ensure TRCA receives one (1) hard copy and one (1) digital copy of the final EPR. The final EA document should be accompanied by a covering letter which uses the numbering scheme provided in this letter and identifies how these comments have been addressed. Digital materials must be submitted in PDF format, with drawings pre-scaled to print on 11"x17" pages. Materials may be submitted on discs, via e-mail (if less than 2.5 MB), or through file transfer protocol (FTP) sites (if posted for a minimum of two weeks).	Noted.	N/A
TRCA-12	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Water Resource Engineering General Comments 1. Please provide the VO2 hydrological modelling files.	The VO2 model has been included on a flash drive submitted with the Drainage Report.	N/A
TRCA-13	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Water Resource Engineering General Comments 2. Please provide the HEC-RAS files for the hydraulic modelling as part of the final submission.	The HEC-RAS models have been included on a flash drive submitted with the Drainage Report.	N/A
TRCA-14	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Water Resource Engineering General Comments 3. On page 6 of the report, please revise the 12h Chicago typo (should be 4h Chicago).	Noted.	Text under Section 2.3 of the Drainage Report has been revised to read:  <i>"Additionally, the design of storage facilities designed for the purpose of this study considers both storm events, 4hr Chicago and 12hr AES and comparison of modelling results is summarized in several tables in the report."</i>
TRCA-15	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Water Resource Engineering General Comments 4. a) Please clarify the number of watercourses along the Transitway corridor on page 3, is it 49 watercourses or 40? b) Please clarify number of watercourses on page 12 (it says 53, however it was previously mentioned either 49 or 40 watercourses).	Noted. a) There are 49 watercourses identified within the study limits. Section 1.1, 2.1 have been updated to reflect this change. b) Section 6 of the report is being updated to show "forty-nine (49) watercourses"	Text under Appendix A of the Drainage Report has been revised to read:  Section 1.1: <i>"The proposed transitway crosses forty-nine (49) watercourses, out of which twenty-three (23) are major branches of creeks"</i>  Section 2.1: <i>"Within the above-mentioned watersheds, 49 (forty nine) water crossings were identified along the proposed 407 TWY corridor."</i>  Section 6: <i>"As previously noted the proposed transitway crosses forty nine (49) watercourses, out of which twenty three (23) are major branches of creeks (...)"</i>
TRCA-16	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Water Resource Engineering General Comments 5. On page 7, please revise "Refer to Figure 3.3 in Appendix A" to "Refer to Figure 3.3 in Appendix B."	Noted.	Text in Chapter 6 of the Drainage Report has been revised to refer to Appendix B.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
TRCA-17	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Water Resource Engineering General Comments 6. On page 11 it states that "all stations are modelled as Standhyd assuming TIMP = 70%" while in the V02 model, the impervious percentage of the stations are modelled at 90%. Please resolve this discrepancy.	Noted.	Text under Section 5.2.2 in the Drainage Report has been revised to read:  "All stations are modelled as Standhyd assuming TIMP= 90% and XIMP=50%"
TRCA-18	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Water Resource Engineering General Comments 7. a) Please include discussions and calculations of how the quality control (80% TSS removal) will be satisfied prior to outletting to the watercourses. Please include a description of the enhanced swales for the Transitway roadway, the underground storage tank for Whites Station, and other methods. b) It is understood that the majority of calculations, tables and figures are included in the Appendices, however it is recommended to include a discussion and a tabular summary in the body of the report for each treatment swale and Transitway Station including but not limited to: i. Watershed and criteria ii. Where the pond will outlet (to ditch, tributary, creek, etc.) iii. Drainage area(s) summary for pre-development and post-development iv. Pre-development and post-development peak flow summary v. A discussion of how the untreated areas are accounted for in the proposed treatment vi. Outlet control details and controlled discharge rates vii. SWM outlet details (to ditch, tributary, creek, etc.) viii. Impacts of outletting to watercourses and proposed mitigation	a) Section 4 of the Drainage Report have been changed to include a detailed description of the enhanced swales. Section 5 of the Drainage Report has been changed because the design of the SWM in the station sites has been changed. At Whites Rd. Station, the proposed stormwater management approach for the southern parking lot was changed from an underground tank to a wet pond.  b) i) to viii). Please see change to the EPR column	a) Section 4.2.2 in the Drainage Report refers enhanced swales and quality control. Details of Whites Road Station pond are provided in Tables 5.5 a-f in Appendix E of the Drainage Report. b) Table 4.5 in Appendix D of the Drainage Report shows the details of each enhanced swale proposed along the TWY; table identifies the location of each swale, the contributing drainage area, 10-yr 12hr AES peak flows, 24mm 4hr Chicago peak flows, the discharge point of each swale as well as the quantity criteria used in the modelling.  i) Addressed in Table 4.5 for runningway ii) Addressed in Section 5 of the Drainage Report and Figures 5.1 to 5.5 in Appendix E iii) Tables 5.1g, 5.2g, 5.3g, 5.4g, and 5.5g. 5.6g. and 5.7g of the Drainage Report summarize the drainage areas for each stations stormwater management facilities. Tables 3.7 and 3.9 summarize the existing peak flows within each subwatershed along the runningway. iv) For the runningway, Tables 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12 in the Drainage Report show the peak flows for all conditions analyzed (existing post-dev condition without SWM and post-dev condition with SWM). For the stations, Tables 5.1h, 5.2h, 5.3h, 5.4h, 5.5h, 5.6h, and 5.7h provide comparisons of pre- and post-development (or allowable and post-development) peak flows for each station SWM Pond. v) Addressed in Section 5 of the Drainage Report vi) For the runningway, Table 4.6 shows the stage-discharge table for the outlet of the enhanced swales. For the stations, Outlet control details and controlled discharge rates are provided in Tables 5.1i, 5.2i, 5.3i, 5.4i, 5.5i, 5.6i, and 5.7i. vii) Outlet details of the runningway are shown in Table 4.5 in Appendix D. Name of all WCs are noted in Table 2.1 of the Report.



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						Brock Road Station is the only Station's SWM pond that discharges to a Redside Dace habitat; a discussion of the outlet details and proposed mitigation are provided in Section 5.2.2.5.
TRCA-19	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Water Resource Engineering General Comments 8. Please include a discussion on the erosion and sediment control measures that are proposed to be used during construction. Please refer to the 2006 ESC Guideline, which can be downloaded from TRCA's STEP website: <a href="http://www.sustainabletechnologies.ca/wp/">http://www.sustainabletechnologies.ca/wp/</a> . Please include ESC Plans for the Transitway and Stations (including but not limited to phasing, ESC measures preferably in a multi-barrier approach and all TRCA notes).	Noted.	Text added to Chapter 8:  <i>"The erosion and sediment control (ESC) practices to be developed during detailed design should follow the latest MTO's reference documents including the Environmental Reference for Highway Design (MTO, June 2013), the Environmental Guide for Erosion and Sediment Control during Construction of Highway Projects (MTO, September 2015), as well as the Ontario Provincial Standards for Roads and Public Works (OPSS), and the Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Urban Construction (Golden Horseshow, Dec 2006).</i>  <i>Impacts on the surrounding environment related to highway projects can be mitigated by proper erosion and sediment control measures.</i>  <i>It is recommended that a multi-barrier approach be undertaken during construction using the following measures as a minimum:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stabilize exposed soils with vegetation where possible to reduce the amount of sediments that would be conveyed further downstream to existing watercourses.</li> <li>• Implement construction phasing to limit the duration of soil exposure</li> <li>• Install heavy-duty double silt fence at each water crossing</li> <li>• Double silt fence to be supported by straw-bale</li> <li>• Install rock check dams to reduce high flow velocities in the ditches/swales adjacent to the proposed transitway.</li> <li>• Erosion and sediment control blankets for the road embankments</li> <li>• Dewatering, temporary channel diversions</li> <li>• Use erosion prevention controls and sediment control measures as necessary."</li> </ul>
TRCA-20	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Water Resource Engineering General Comments 9. For any work within a floodplain a. TRCA staff recommends MTO consider developing a	MTO has very stringent criteria for temporary works and these will be followed during construction. A safety	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				contingency plan for the safety of the construction activities proposed to be undertaken. This plan should be employed during a flood event. The contingency plan should include (but should not be limited to) a weather monitoring program to assist in observing the weather for potential flooding events, and a plan identifying how equipment and material within the valley and construction staging area will be managed during a flood event; and b. Ensure all existing grades are maintained (i.e. there is no filling).	contingency plan will be developed in the Detail Design phase to be applied during construction.	
TRCA-21	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Water Resource Engineering General Comments 10. Please ensure that the Drainage, Hydrology, Stormwater Management and Floodplain Hydraulic Report is signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer.	Noted.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-22	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Transitway Comments 11. In Table 3.11 in Appendix B, please revise the unitary storage requirement from 367 m <sup>3</sup> /ha to 307 m <sup>3</sup> /ha (Ref. Table 5.2 in the Aquafor Beech Ltd 2012 Duffins Creek Hydrology Update).	Noted.	Storage requirements have been removed from Table 3.9 since this table shows existing peak flows/allowable rates within each sub-watershed.
TRCA-23	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Transitway Comments 12. The allowable Q for catchment 35 in Table 4.6 does not match allowable Q for catchment 35 calculated in Table 3.11. Please revise this discrepancy.	Noted.	Table 3.11 from the previous submission has been replaced by Table 3.9 in the Revised Drainage Report.
TRCA-24	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Transitway Comments 13. a) Include typical swale cross section. b) Include flow rate summary and velocity calculation for each swale. An enhanced swale provides a WQ improvement if the runoff velocity is less than 0.5 m/s, with flow rate less than or equal to 0.15 m <sup>3</sup> /s using a 4h 25mm Chicago storm. Refer to Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (CVC & TRCA, 2010). c) Include swale summary chart with length, slope, U/S and D/S elevation, velocity, and flow rate. d) Please include calculations indicating how the proposed enhanced swales will meet the 80% TSS removal. If additional measures are required, please incorporate pre-treatment before runoff enters the enhanced swale in a “treatment train” approach in order to provide the requisite water quality treatment of 80% TSS removal (i.e. OGS, swale forebay, gravel diaphragm, vegetated filter strip). Refer to Low Impact Development	Noted. a) to g) Section 4 of the Drainage Report have been changed to include a detailed description of the enhanced swales.	a) Swale typical section is included in SK-3 in Appendix D of the Drainage Report b) Table 4.5 in Appendix D shows discharge control calculation for the enhanced swales; this curve was further used in VO2. Table 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 summarize volume required and release rates from each enhance swale. Discussion was added in the report in the last paragraph of section 4.2.2.1 regarding velocities for the 4hr Chicago 25mm event. c) Included in Section 4 of the Drainage Report d) Refer to Table 4.5 in Appendix D for enhanced swale details and Section 4.2.2.1 of the Drainage report. e) All swales were added in Figure 4.1 and 4.2 in Appendix D and details of each swale in term of allowable peak flows, release rates and volumes used are shown in Tables 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 in the revised Drainage Report.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (CVC & TRCA, 2010). e) In Table 4.5 in Appendix B, where is Swale no. 20A on Figures 4.1 or 4.2, and Tables 4.3 and 4.4? f) In Table 4.6 of Appendix B, please revise the second Swale no. 24 to no. 25. g) Please include the discharge control calculations for the enhanced swales.		These tables replace Tables 4.3 and 4.4 of the previous Drainage report.  f) All swales were added in Figure 4.1 and 4.2 in Appendix D and details of each swale in term of allowable peak flows, release rates and volumes used are shown in Tables 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 in the revised Drainage report. These tables replace Tables 4.3 and 4.4 of the previous Drainage report.  Discharge control calculations have been provided in the revised Report, see Table 4.9 – in Appendix D of the Drainage Report.
TRCA-25	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Transitway Comments 14. As per the TRCA Stormwater Management Criteria, we recommend 5 mm of retention volume across the Transitway development (it does not include the 5 mm initial abstraction as per Figure 4-1 in the TRCA SWM Criteria Document, 2012).	5 mm retention volume is discussed in Section 5 of the Drainage Report.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-26	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Transitway Comments 15. Please number the Petticoat subwatersheds in Figure 3.2 in Appendix B.	Noted.	Petticoat Sub-watersheds 1 and 2 have been numbered in Figure 3.2 of Appendix B of the Drainage Report.
TRCA-27	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Transitway Comments 16. Please re-number the second Petticoat subwatershed chart from “Allowable Q to 1” to “Allowable Q to 2” in Table 4.5 in Appendix B.	Noted.	Table 4.5 from the previous submission has been replaced by Table 4.7 in Appendix D of the Drainage Report.
TRCA-28	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Transitway Comments 17. Figure 4.2: a. On Figure 4.2 in Appendix B, please be consistent with labeling the chainage at the high points. b. On Figure 4.2 in Appendix B, please label the swales (e.g. Swale #21, Swale #22...) as per listing in Table 4.3 in Appendix B. c. Please label Brock Road Station on Figure 4.2 in Appendix B. d. Clearly label drainage outlets on Figures 4.2 in Appendix B.	Noted.	a) All high points are labelled the same.  b through d) Figures 4.1 and 4.2 in Appendix D of the Drainage Report have been revised to address all this comments.
TRCA-29	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Transitway Comments 18. Please provide a summary table with all VO2 modeling parameters for the original TRCA model and the Parsons model.	See Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 in Appendix B of the Drainage Report.	Text added to Section 3: Hydrological Analysis – Existing Condition of the Drainage Report:  "Input modelling parameters for each transitway sub-areas were set to match the original VO2 input parameters per TRCA."

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
TRCA-30	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016	Figure 1.1	Transitway Comments 19. On Figure 1.1, please include a large scale drawing at a readable scale.	Drawings are sized as Arch D (26" x 30"). When printed on the proper paper size, the drawing is legible.  Alternatively, the digital version of the report can be zoomed in.	N/A
TRCA-31	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016	Figure 4.1	Transitway Comments 20. Figure 4.1: a. Please include a large scale drawing at a readable scale. b. Please revise to include all labels. c. Please label swales as per Table 4.3 in Appendix B. d. Please be consistent with labelling stations. e. Enhanced Swale 5 (ES5) drainage area is listed as 0.86 in Table 4.3 and 0.85 in Figure 4.1. f. ES7 doesn't appear to be in the low point of the road. Please confirm location and how runoff will drain to swale. g. Break point between ES8 and ES9 at 5+200.00 doesn't make sense. This does not appear to be at a low point and it is not clear which areas are draining to which swale. It also appears that ES8 or ES9 is missing altogether. Labeling Swales as per Table 4.3 would alleviate this issue (see comment 2c above). h. ES10, ES13, ES15 and ES16 are missing from the figure. Please revise and label. i. It is unclear how much area is draining to each swale there are 3 separate swales that appear to be ES18. Looks like a swale prior to crossing WC#18 (Little Rouge Creek) but unclear how much of the 1.29 ha for 513-1 is draining to the first swale and how much to the other 2 swales. Please confirm and indicate on the figure. j. Please label Donald Cousens Station.	Noted.  a) Drawings are sized as Arch D (26" x 30"). When printed on the proper paper size, the drawing is legible.  Alternatively, the digital version of the report can be zoomed in.	b) Figures have been revised to include all labels as requested. c) All swales in Figures 4.1 and 4.2 are labeled according to Table 4.5 in the Drainage Report. d) HP and LP have been labeled in the figures, however the drainage area has been split at each watercourse to diminish the amount of flow being conveyed in the swales along the proposed transitway. e) Discrepancy has been corrected in Figure 4.1. f) through j)  Details of the swales are included in Table 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 in Appendix D in the Drainage Report.
TRCA-32	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Transitway Comments 21. Please revise Table 4.5 in Appendix B as the allowable existing flow (Allowable Q) does not match the existing flow to Transitway Subarea 604.	Noted.	Table 4.5 in the Drainage Report has been revised to match the existing flow.
TRCA-33	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Transitway Comments 22. Clearly label drainage outlets on Figures 4.1 in Appendix B.	Drainage outlets of the Transitway subareas are shown with thin black arrows in Figure 4.1 and 4.2.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-34	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 23. The extended detention drawdown period for the Whites Road Station and Brock Road station are 120 hours. Please revise the SWM criteria in the report and	Noted.	Table 5.0 of the Stormwater Management Criteria in the Drainage Report was revised to include 25 mm attenuation for 120 hours for the Duffins Watershed. For the Whites Road Station SWM facilities, the drawdown time of 120 hours requires very small diameter orifices of 45 mm and 52mm. Similarly, SWMF-6 at Brock Road Station would

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				the SWM design to account for a 120 hour extended detention drawdown period.		require a 52 mm orifice to meet the 120 hour detention time criteria. These small diameters do not meet the minimum 75 mm requirement. Therefore the 120 hour drawdown is not feasible at SWMF-4, SWMF-5, or SWMF-6. It was, however, met at Brock Road Station with SWMF-7 with an orifice diameter of 75 mm.
TRCA-35	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 24. It is to be noted that according to the Duffins Creek Hydrology Update Addendum (Aquafor Beech, May 2013), the unitary storages and flow rate targets that apply to the Seaton Land’s drainage area are m <sup>3</sup> /imp-ha, and L/s/imp-ha since the impervious percentage is 90% (greater than the future development area % impervious per Table 5.2 in the Hydrology Update). Since the unitary storages and flow rates targets that have been applied in the submitted report (Parsons, January 2016) are pertaining to the whole drainage area (i.e. m <sup>3</sup> /ha for storage and L/s/ha for flow rate), it is therefore a conservative assessment of the requisite storage and discharge rates.	The design is conservative; tables named “Summary of Station Drainage Areas” for each station site show the post-development impervious areas for your information however there were not considered in the calculations.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-36	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 25. Please provide the 5mm retention for each Station area per TRCA SWM Criteria (2012).	The 5mm retention volume was used as the required storage for SWMFs at Markham Rd., Ninth Ln., and Donald Cousens Parkway stations, as indicated in Table 5.8. At Whites Rd. and Brock Rd. stations, the Duffins Creek required storage exceeded the 5mm volumes and were used as the more conservative requirement.	Table 5.0 Stormwater Management Criteria was revised to include: <i>“5 mm retention for each station area, as per TRCA SWM Criteria (2012).”</i>
TRCA-37	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 26. Please label each outlet from the Station Ponds.	Noted.	Outlet labels were added to Figures 5.1 through 5.5.
TRCA-38	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 27. Please provide a drainage area tabular summary to each station pond along with the total contributing impervious area.	Noted. Drainage areas and runoff coefficients are shown on the drawing for each station.	Summary tables were added to the revised Drainage Report for ease of review (see Tables 5.1-g, 5.2-g, 5.3-g, 5.4-g, 5.5-g, 5.6-g, and 5.7-g).
TRCA-39	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 28. Please delineate the Regulatory Floodline along the adjacent watercourses on the station figures (i.e. Figures 5.4, and 5.5).	Noted.	Regulatory floodline was delineated along the adjacent watercourses on Figures 5.4 and 5.5.
TRCA-40	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 29. Please include a plan with the proposed SWM facilities with operational elevations in addition to 2 sections (length and width) through the pond.	Outlet details for each pond are included in Table 5.1e, 5.2e, 5.3e, 5.4e, 5.5e, 5.6e, and 5.7e. These tables show pond WLs, orifice sizes and elevations. The permanent water level and 100-year level are indicated on the station drawings. A sketch is included for each pond in the revised Report to show elevations of the outlet control structure; additional	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
					details and drawings will be prepared at detailed design stage.	
TRCA-41	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 30. Please label the SWM discharge outlet elevations.	Noted.	The SWM discharge outlet elevations have been added to the station drawings in the Drainage Report (Figures 5.1 through 5.5).
TRCA-42	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 31. Please include the outlet control details for each SWM facility.	Noted.	The outlet control details for each pond are included in Tables 5.1e through 5.5e in Appendix E of the Drainage Report. A detail of each outlet control structure has been added to Figures 5.1 through 5.5.
TRCA-43	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 32. Please include a discussion regarding the outlet controls as the TRCA requires details to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed measures.	Noted.	A description of each outlet control at each SWM Facility has been added to the Drainage Report. The descriptions include the size and invert elevation of all orifices and/or weirs.
TRCA-44	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 33. Please clearly identify the proposed pond outlet (ditch, creek, etc) and outfall details.	Noted.	Proposed pond outlet and outfall details, including emergency spillways and outlet pipes, have been added to the station drawings (Figures 5.1 through 5.5).
TRCA-45	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 34. Please provide a summary table with all modeling parameters for the original TRCA model and the Parsons model.	Noted.	Modelling parameters for the original TRCA model and the Parsons model are included in Tables 3.1 through 3.3 in the Drainage Report.
TRCA-46	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 35. Please provide an overflow weir and overland flow route in case there are any orifice obstructions or a storm event greater than the 100 year to provide safe conveyance for all ponds.	Noted.	The overland flow route is identified in the station figures (large dark arrows were added in the legend of each drawing). The location of the overflow weir was added to the drawing.
TRCA-47	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 36. Please confirm that the proposed outfalls from each of the SWM ponds are per TRCA SWM Criteria. As stated in Appendix E of the Stormwater Management Criteria (TRCA, August 2012), outfalls are to be placed outside the 100 year erosion limit and above the 25 year flood elevation of the receiving watercourse.	Noted. In most cases TRCA's criteria was applied. In the case of some outlets, topographical and/or design constraints do not allow to be placed outside the 100 year erosion limit.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-48	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 37. Please identify any and all overland flow routes on the SWM facility plans.	Noted.	The overland flow route is identified in the station figures (large dark arrows were added in the legend of each drawing). The location of the overflow weir was added to the drawing.
TRCA-49	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 38. Please plot floodplain on all station drawings to confirm stations are not within the floodplain, and safe access to the site.	Noted.	Regulatory floodline is now shown on all station drawings.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
TRCA-50	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 39. Please confirm there are no impacts to the designed outlet controls from the Regional flood.	The facilities are not designed to contain regional flood events, therefore the outlet controls will likely be surcharged in an extraordinary event.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-51	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Station Site Comments 40. Please clarify if “green” parking design will be implemented, including low impact developments (LIDs) for water management, plantings for shade and carbon capture, etc.	These measures will be contemplated during Detail Design phase.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-52	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Markham Road Station Comments 41. Please include modeling schematic for the Markham Station in Appendix C.	Noted.	The modeling schematic for Markham Station was added (Refer to Schematic 5.1) in Appendix E of the Drainage Report.
TRCA-53	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Markham Road Station Comments 42. There are inconsistencies with the settling length calculation (length width ratio discrepancy Table 5.1d), please confirm the length to width ratio and update the calculation accordingly. Refer to Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (MOE, 2003).	The length-to-width ratio and settling calculations were revised; refer to Table 5.1d.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-54	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Markham Road Station Comments 43. Please explain the strategy for Catchment A4 in the Post Development Conditions. Is there an overland flow route designated? Where is the drainage directed during the minor/major events? A4 appears to drain to Markham Road uncontrolled, please confirm how the post-to-pre quantity requirement.	Overland flow route is shown with large arrows on Figure 5.1.	The site runoff control was balanced. An enhanced swale was added to the portion of the road that can't reach the SWM pond, which has been designed to overcontrol flows from the station to compensate for area A4.  The overland flow route will be through A4, there will be a swale or a pipe discharging to the existing ditch to pre-development levels. The model was revised to include any updates related to this station.
TRCA-55	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Markham Road Station Comments 44. Table 5.1e cannot be properly reviewed without the outlet details to confirm the feasibility of the design. Please refer to Comments 24 and 25 requesting the pond discharge elevations and outlet control details.	Noted.	The outlet control details for each pond are included in Tables 5.1e through 5.5e in Appendix E of the Drainage Report. A detail of each outlet control structure has been added to Figures 5.1 through 5.5.
TRCA-56	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Markham Road Station Comments 45. Table 5.1-b and Table 5.1-c do not match the VO2 output included for the Post Uncontrolled and Post Controlled flows. Please revise.	Noted.	Tables 5.1-b and 5.1-c in the Drainage Report were revised to match the VO2 output included for post-development flows (both controlled and uncontrolled).
TRCA-57	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Markham Road Station Comments 46. Storage Provided (in Table 5.1-b) for the 10-year storm should be 2007 not 2054 (per VO2 output). Please revise.	Noted.	Table 5.1-b in the Drainage Report was revised with the correct storage value.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
TRCA-58	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Markham Road Station Comments 47. All Storage units should be revised from ha*m to m3 in Table 5.1-b and Table 5.1-c.	Noted.	All storage units in Table 5.1-b and Table 5.1-c in the Drainage Report were revised from ha*m to m <sup>3</sup> .
TRCA-59	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Markham Road Station Comments 48. All Storage Provided Values for the 4hr Chicago Storm do not match the VO2 output in Appendix C. Please revise.	Noted.	The storage provided values for the 4hr Chicago storm were revised to match the VO2 output included in the Appendix C of the Drainage Report.
TRCA-60	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Markham Road Station Comments 49. Tables 5.1-b and 5.1-c note the controlled flow is based on 6.55ha but the VO2 output uses 5.95ha. Please confirm and revise as necessary (both the 12hr AES and the 4hr Chicago).	Noted.	The controlled flow for SWMF-1 has been revised to 6.15 ha in Tables 5.1b and 5.1c in the Drainage Report and in the VO2 model.
TRCA-61	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Markham Road Station Comments 50. Please note that the Release Rates in Table 5.1-c are greater than the Allowable Release Rates for the 4hr Chicago. Please revise or explain.	The 4 hr Chicago is not the TRCA design storm and it is only run for MTO purposes. The site uses the TRCA rainfile and meets the criteria set out in the guidelines.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-62	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ninth Line Station Comments 51. Please explain the strategy for Catchment A2 in the Post Development Conditions. Is there an overland flow route designated? Where is the drainage directed during the minor/major events?	Noted.	The site runoff control was balanced. An enhanced swale was added to the portion of the road that can't reach the SWM pond, which has been designed to overcontrol flows from the station to compensate for area A2.
TRCA-63	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ninth Line Station Comments 52. There are errors apparent in Table 5.2-d, please review and confirm the values in the spreadsheet.	Noted.	Table 5.2-d in the Drainage Report has been revised.
TRCA-64	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ninth Line Station Comments 53. Inconsistencies with the settling length calculation (length width ratio discrepancy Table 5.2d), please confirm the length to width ratio and update the calculation accordingly. Refer to Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (MOE, 2003).	Noted.	The length-to-width ratio and settling calculations were revised (refer to Table 5.2d).
TRCA-65	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ninth Line Station Comments 54. Table 5.2-e cannot be properly reviewed without the outlet details to confirm the feasibility of the design. Please refer to Comments 24 and 25 requesting the pond discharge elevations and outlet control details.	Noted.	The outlet control details for each pond are included in Tables 5.1e through 5.5e in Appendix E of the Drainage Report. A detail of each outlet control structure has been added to Figures 5.1 through 5.5.
TRCA-66	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ninth Line Station Comments 55. The Outlet Structure – Design Discharge in Table 5.2-c does not match the values listed in the VO2 model. Please update with the correct values.	Noted.	Table 5.2-c in the Drainage Report was revised to match the values listed in the VO2 model.



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
TRCA-67	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ninth Line Station Comments 56. Please note the 100-year storm output is not included in Appendix C. Please add the 100-year storm output to Appendix C for this station.	Noted.	The 100-year storm output for Ninth Line Station was added to Appendix C in the Drainage Report.
TRCA-68	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Donald Cousens Parkway Station Comments 57. Catchment areas from Figure 5.3 do not match with schematic, VO2 model and design sheets. Figure 5.3 indicates that A1 through A4 is 3.26 ha, and the schematic, VO2 model and design sheets use 4.86 ha. Please revise and correct this discrepancy.	Noted.	The catchment areas shown in Figure 5.3 of the Drainage Report were updated to match the schematic, VO2 model, and design sheets.
TRCA-69	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Donald Cousens Parkway Station Comments 58. Please clearly illustrate the pre-development (existing conditions) boundary on Figure 5.3.	Noted.	The pre-development boundary has been added to Figure 5.3 of the Drainage Report.
TRCA-70	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Donald Cousens Parkway Station Comments 59. Figure 5.3 indicates that Catchment A-6 is to be treated by a proposed OGS prior to release. a. Please note that TRCA has taken a position parallel to the City of Toronto where by OGS units, regardless of manufacturer, as a stand-alone measure can achieve up to a 50% TSS removal. As TRCA requires 80% TSS removal, additional measures must be considered. For example, enhanced swales and plantings could be implemented downstream of the OGS unit before flows enter the watercourse. Please investigate this option further, with the understanding that LID measures required as part of the 5mm on-site retention are considered as quality treatment, and would constitute a treatment train. Please provide details how this catchment (and station) will meet the 80% TSS removal criteria. b. Please include OGS sizing calculations in the Appendix. c. Is there an overland flow route designated for this catchment? Where is the drainage directed during the minor/major events?	Catchment A-6 will now be treated by an enhanced swale. Additional LID measures to provide additional TSS removal will be investigated during Detail Design.  The overland flow route for this catchment is directed to the enhanced swale; all drainage is directed to it during the minor and major events. Refer to Figure 5.3 of the Drainage Report.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-71	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Donald Cousens Parkway Station Comments 60. Please explain the strategy for Catchment A-5 and A-6 in the Post Development Conditions. Is there an overland flow route designated? Where is the drainage directed during the minor/major events? Please confirm how the post-to-pre quantity requirement.	Noted.	Overland flow route is shown with large arrows. The site runoff control will be balanced. An enhanced swale was added to the portion of the road that can't reach the SWM pond.
TRCA-72	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Donald Cousens Parkway Station Comments 61. Inconsistencies with the settling length calculation (length width ratio discrepancy Table 5.3-d), please	Noted.	The length-to-width ratio and settling calculations were revised (Table 5.3d of the Drainage Report).

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				confirm the length to width ratio and update the calculation accordingly. Refer to Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (MOE, 2003).		
TRCA-73	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Donald Cousens Parkway Station Comments 62. Table 5.3-e cannot be properly reviewed without the outlet details to confirm the feasibility of the design. Please refer to Comments 24 and 25 requesting the pond discharge elevations and outlet control details.	Noted.	The outlet control details for each pond are included in Tables 5.1e through 5.5e in Appendix E of the Drainage Report. A detail of each outlet control structure has been added to Figures 5.1 through 5.5.
TRCA-74	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Donald Cousens Parkway Station Comments 63. The Outlet Structure – Design Discharge in Table 5.2-c does not match the values listed in the VO2 model. Please update with the correct values.	Noted.	Table 5.2-c in the Drainage Report was revised to match the values listed in the VO2 model.
TRCA-75	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Donald Cousens Parkway Station Comments 64. There are some inconsistencies between the values listed in Tables 5.3-b and 5.3-c and the VO2 output. Please revise accordingly.	Noted.	Tables 5.3b and 5.3c of the Drainage Report was revised.
TRCA-76	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Whites Road Station Comments 65. Please revise the storage required column in Tables 5.4-b1, and 5.4-c1 in Appendix C to have the storage required values listed in Table 5.5-a1 in Appendix C as the required storage is based off unitary values.	Noted.	The storage required column in Tables 5.4b1 and 5.4c1 of the Drainage Report were revised to show volumes based on the unitary values.
TRCA-77	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Whites Road Station Comments 66. Please confirm the drainage area to the north SWM facility. Figure 5.4 has a total drainage area of 3.14 ha to the north SWM facility while the VO2 model and Table 5.4 - A1 list an area of 4 ha.	Noted.	The drainage area to the north SWM facility is 3.97 ha, and the drainage area to the south facility is 3.46 ha. Table 5.4g summarizes the Whites Road station drainage areas.
TRCA-78	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Whites Road Station Comments 67. Please reverse the columns “storage provided” with “storage required” as the “storage provided” values from VO2 are in the “storage required” column.	Noted.	The storage provided and storage required columns were updated.
TRCA-79	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Whites Road Station Comments 68. Please include the design details of the underground south SWM facility (i.e. length and width cross section, outlet control detail, stage-storage-discharge calculation).	Noted.	The underground south SWM facility has been replaced by SWMF-5. Design details and calculations for this facility are included in Tables 5.5a through 5.5i in the Drainage Report.
TRCA-80	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Whites Road Station Comments 69. Please indicate what method of quality treatment for the drainage areas draining to the underground SWM facility is proposed.	Noted.	The underground south SWM facility has been replaced by SWMF-5. Design details and calculations for this facility are included in Tables 5.5a through 5.5i in the Drainage Report.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
TRCA-81	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Whites Road Station Comments 70. Please note that the 2-year and 5-year required storages according to the unitary rates are 1208 m3 and 1564 m3, respectively as per Table 5.4 – A1. The storage provided from the SWM pond for the 2-year, 5-year events are 1155 m3, and 1546 m3 as extracted from the V02 model which is 53 m3 and 18 m3 lower than what is required. As such, please revise the pond to include the proper storages for the 2-year and 5- year storm events.	Noted.	The outlet structure for SWMF-4 was revised; the storage could only be achieved by reducing the orifice to a size smaller than the minimum 75 mm diameter.
TRCA-82	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Whites Road Station Comments 71. All Storage units should be revised from ha*m to m3 in Table 5.4-C1.	Noted.	All storage units were revised from ha*m to m <sup>3</sup> in Table 5.4c of the Drainage Report.
TRCA-83	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Brock Road Station Comments 72. Please provide clarification of the rationale to include Brock Station SWM pond design in the submitted report (Parsons, January 2016) if the pond is already constructed (field verified). If there are changes proposed to the pond, please address the below comments.	Brock Road Station SWM pond design is included in this report as it will be regarded as part of this project.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-84	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Brock Road Station Comments 73. Staff has noticed a high water level present in the pond. What is the freeboard provided for the 100 year storm event?	The freeboard is estimated as 0.3m.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-85	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Brock Road Station Comments 74. What is the freeboard between the water level and the spill point towards Brock Road?	The freeboard is estimated as 0.3m. The pond spills towards the Brougham Creek via an emergency overland culvert set below the lowest point at Brock Road.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-86	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Brock Road Station Comments 75. Please revise the storage required column in Tables 5.5-b, and 5.5-c in Appendix C to have the storage required values listed in Table 5.5-a in Appendix C as the required storage is based off unitary values.	Noted.	The storage required column in Tables 5.5-b (now 5.7b) and 5.5-c (now 5.7c) were revised to show the correct storage.
TRCA-87	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Brock Road Station Comments 76. Please confirm the drainage area to Brock Street SWM facility. Figure 5.5 has a total drainage area of 13.08 ha while the V02 model and Table 5.5-a list an area of 10.24 ha.	The drainage area to SWMF-6 is 4.37 ha. The drainage area to SWMF-7 (existing pond) is 9.06 ha.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-88	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Hydraulic Crossing Comments *Please note that a proper review could not be conducted as the digital HEC-RAS file was not provided, however general comments are listed below.	Noted.	All HEC-RAS input and output files, channel cross-sections and HEC-RAS Standard Tables have been provided in the Drainage Report. For each crossing a summary table showing the water levels upstream and downstream of each structure for the existing and proposed condition was included in Appendix D of the Drainage Report. The

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						summary tables have been included in the body of the Drainage Report.
TRCA-89	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Hydraulic Crossing Comments 77. Please provide the digital HEC-RAS file including the pre-development and postdevelopment conditions for all proposed crossings.	Noted.	All HEC-RAS input and output files and channel cross-sections with water levels have been provided in the Drainage Report.  The HEC-RAS models have been added (on a flash drive submitted with the Drainage Report).
TRCA-90	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Hydraulic Crossing Comments 78. Please adjust contraction and expansion coefficients for all crossings from 0.1 and 0.3 to 0.3 and 0.5 as per HEC-RAS technical manual (i.e. 2 crossings upstream of the structure and 2 crossings downstream while accounting for full contraction and expansion).	Noted.	Contraction and expansion coefficients have been revised in the HEC-RAS model; all model output files and figures have been revised to reflect this change.
TRCA-91	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Hydraulic Crossing Comments 79. Please revise the upstream ineffective flow areas as per the HEC-RAS technical manual.	Our approach to ineffective flow areas is to set them at the opening of each structure. This provides a conservative approach; this is also recommended in Chapter 5 of the HEC-RAS Hydraulic Reference Manual.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-92	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Hydraulic Crossing Comments 80. Based on the HEC-RAS outputs included, it is unclear where the flows are derived from (i.e. previous TRCA models, revised flows, etc). Please confirm.	The flows were derived from previous TRCA models.	Chapter 6 of the Drainage Report, second paragraph has been revised to read:  <i>"A HEC-RAS analysis has been undertaken for the twenty three (23) water crossings within the study limits. A HEC-RAS model has been provided from TRCA for five (5) crossings (WC13, WC 15b, WC15C, WC18, and WC28-29); refer to existing TRCA's floodplain mapping in Appendix D. For the remaining eighteen (18) water crossings analyzed the HEC-RAS model has been created from scratch using the flows determined in Section 4, using 4hr Chicago storm distribution and the MTO IDF curves."</i>
TRCA-93	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Hydraulic Crossing Comments 81. In the HEC-RAS output, it is recommended that each watercourse be labelled with number and name (i.e. WC3 = Middle Rouge) for ease of review.	Noted.	Table 2.1 in the Drainage Report has been revised to show the name of each watercourse.
TRCA-94	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Hydrogeology Comments 82. Staff appreciates efforts to identify groundwater discharge zones along watercourse valleys and is largely in agreement with the selection of open footed structures. Please consider the possibility that groundwater discharge within the Milne Dam Conservation Area may be encountered.	Groundwater discharge zones were considered and addressed in the Groundwater Report (Appendix M of the EPR). Note that the Milne Dam Conservation Area is located north of the 407 ETR.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
TRCA-95	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Hydrogeology Comments 83. Staff appreciative efforts to identify Wellhead Protection Areas along the transitway. Please also identify Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas along the transitway.	Groundwater recharge zones were considered and addressed in the Groundwater Report (Appendix M of the EPR).	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-96	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Hydrogeology Comments 84. Staff acknowledge that recharge functions along the transitway may be impacted post-construction. At detailed design, please assess the implementation of low impact development (LID) infiltration techniques assessed through direct investigation. With regards to LID infiltration design, please see TRCA’s Stormwater Management Criteria, Appendix C Water Balance and Recharge, and in particular Section 2.3 on infiltration testing.	Noted.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: <i>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:  Assessment through direct investigation, of implementation of low impact development (LID) infiltration techniques.”</i>
TRCA-97	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Hydrogeology Comments 85. It is acknowledged that discharge functions at bridge construction locations may be impacted temporarily during construction activities. At detailed design, please provide plan view maps showing ZOI estimates in relation to natural heritage features.	Noted.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: <i>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:  Provision of maps showing ZOI estimates in relation to natural heritage feature.”</i>
TRCA-98	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Hydrogeology Comments 86. At detailed design, please provide a copy of Permit to Take Water (PTTW) applications and/or permits.	A copy of the PTTW will be provide to TRCA at detailed design.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-99	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ecology Comments 87. According to the reports, wildlife passage currently occurs along 407 at Rouge River (R4); Little Rouge Creek (R10); West Duffins Creek and tributaries (D1, D2, D3); Urfe Creek (D15), Brougham Creek (D16) and Brougham Creek (D17). TRCA understands that MTO has its own guidelines such as the MTO fish guide that are followed for these projects. TRCA respectfully requests that your terrestrial and fish reports address TRCA Crossing Guidelines for Valley and Stream Corridors and compare to the MTO standards. <a href="http://www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/214493.pdf">http://www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/214493.pdf</a> . TRCA would like to ensure that new structures at the above mentioned creek crossings are equal or larger than the 407 crossings. For example the Boxgrove culvert size at the 407 should be equal or larger at the Transitway. All	Drawings of existing structures for all 407 ETR crossings were obtained. The new structures along the proposed Transitway will have openings equal to or greater than the existing 407 ETR structures. Culverts will also have openings equal or greater than those existing at 407 ETR crossings. Wild life passages are consistent with those being previously provided by 407 ETR.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				valley corridors support wildlife connectivity and best efforts should be made to install culverts that allow for wildlife passage at each water crossing or a separate terrestrial passage be implemented within the same corridor.		
TRCA-100	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ecology Comments 88. TRCA suggests that studies are completed now to determine watercourse crossings instead of at detailed design as stated in Section 5.3.1 page 5.10 as this may affect design layout.	Ecological and hydraulic studies required for Environmental Assessments and Preliminary Design were completed to assess watercourse crossing openings. Section 5.1.3 of the EPR indicates that during Detail Design, these studies will be confirmed through review of the existing conditions at the time of that phase of the project, and through a detailed assessment of long-term channel movement.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-101	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ecology Comments 89. The Terrestrial Ecosystem Report suggests that out of 86+ hectares of vegetation removal less than three hectares are identified as requiring compensation. TRCA disagrees that the removal of shallow marsh areas will have minor impacts on the system as stated repeatedly in the Terrestrial Report and we appreciate that Environmental Project Report states in Section 6.2.1 Removal of Wetland and Forest Communities (page 6-8) “Compensation for the removal of wetland and forest communities should be provided. Compensation should be provided at a rate determined with agencies during the Detail Design phase.” TRCA would like to work with MTO to determine areas that will most benefit the surrounding natural features and enhance wildlife corridors. Please provide an additional figure that identifies wetlands, creek woodlands adjacent to development (within 120 meters) or that are to be removed due to the transit corridor and possible areas within the watershed that can be restored. We respectfully request that this is not put off until detail design as it may affect design at some stations. Please create a table and figure showing all wetland and forested areas to be removed or disturbed and show areas within the watershed that can be restored to compensate.	Noted. The Terrestrial Ecosystem Report has been revised to exclude references indicating that removal of shallow marsh areas will have minor impacts on the system. Chapter 9 being revised to include commitments in reference to this comment.	Text added to Chapter 9 -Section 9.2: <i>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable agencies such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be consulted include:</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Applications for a Voluntary Project Review by TRCA in situations where the Conservation Authority would like to protect their interests of flooding, erosion, pollution and conservation of lands.</i></li> </ul> <i>Development of detailed landscaping plans and agreement on compensation ratios for lost vegetation communities (including woodlands, wetlands, and meadow marshes).</i>
TRCA-102	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ecology Comments 90. a) SWM ponds should be located outside the natural heritage system. If not, the facility and associated grading should be located at least 10 m from the natural features and hazards, including vegetation dripline, long-term stable slope, etc. as per OPA22 of the City of Pickering Official Plan.	a) With the exception of Donald Cousens, all pond facilities have at least a 10m clearance to environmental features. In the case of Donald Cousens where the site is extremely constrained with respect to cultural heritage features and	No changes to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				<p>b) TRCA has detailed drainage information for all of the wetlands in the Seaton Community (North Road to Brock Road). Please attempt to create the predevelopment drainage as shown in the Seaton Community mapping to support the surrounding wetlands. The natural heritage system outlined in the Seaton MESP is helpful in the development of detail design to ensure that the transitway supports the function of the natural system.</p> <p>c) Please add the creek and wetland layers to figures 5-7 through 5-10 to assist with analysis.</p> <p>d) It may also benefit MTO to show areas adjacent to the Transitway that are designated for development as these may be areas where the footprint of the road can be larger with room for LID measures etc.</p>	<p>land availability, the SWM pond grading is within 10 meters of vegetation (Cultural Thicket).</p> <p>b) and c) In a meeting with TRCA held on July 11th, TRCA committed to providing the additional data referenced in the comment. Meeting minutes are being included as part of the responses. TRCA directed Parsons to GHD to obtain the required drainage information for the Seaton Area wetlands. At the time of this response, no data had been received.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
TRCA-103	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		<p>Ecology Comments</p> <p>91. TRCA suggests that at this time the transitway terminates at Brock Station until demand and layout has been determined for areas further to the east. This would avoid negative impacts to the Brougham Creek (D-16, D-17, D-18) area. This area encompasses a large valley feature and associated wetlands. Until a future station to the east is identified for construction TRCA recommends the removal of this section from the EPR.</p>	<p>The study limits of this particular section are at Brock Road. The alignment east of Brock Road shows a conceptual connection with the protected 407 Transitway right-of-way (ROW) to the east. Reference to the alignment east of the study limits is mentioned in Chapter 5.</p>	<p>Text added to Section 5.1.3 of Chapter 5:</p> <p><i>“Alignment between Old Brock Road and Brock Road Horizontal and vertical geometry allow for alignment flexibility east of Study Limit. It is recommended that Preliminary Design of Transitway Section east of Brock Road assesses various alignment alternatives, including the use of the existing Sideline 16 as recommended by MNRF, aiming to minimize ecological effects to the Brougham Creek Valley.”</i></p>
TRCA-104	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		<p>Ecology Comments</p> <p>92. The stations are necessary and TRCA appreciates the difficulty of obtaining land, but TRCA would like to see the station footprints reduced in some areas where wetlands and/or forests will be impacted by the station. Please show ELC, top of slope and meander belt of nearby creeks on drawings for stations. There is an opportunity to create a more compact, green parking facility by building a parking garage, reducing kiss and ride footprint, and underground stormwater storage in the station areas that are restricted by surrounding features.</p> <p>a) The Markham Station is shown to remove 0.13 hectares of wetland Please attempt to reduce the footprint of the Markham Station. There is opportunity to move it to the west into the future MTO car pool lot or build a parking garage. Currently the platform, bus loop, bike path and SWM pond are located within the natural feature.</p> <p>b) It is understood that the Rossland Road interchange was not selected as a station site because the west side</p>	<p>The station layouts were developed aiming to minimize effects to the natural heritage and other environmental features. It is currently MTO policy to propose surface parking at all facilities and the preliminary design followed this policy. Should demand exceed capacity in the future structured parking will be considered.</p> <p>Detail Design of the station facilities to be conducted prior to construction will review demand and station capacity required at the time of construction which at the present time is completely uncertain. Chapter 9 is being revised to address this comment. ELC is being included in current station layouts.</p> <p>a) Moving the station to the west would significantly increase the walking distance for passengers to reach the station platform from Markham Road. Natural Features affected will be compensated in a different location.</p> <p>Noted. The Rossland Road site is being protected for future environmental compensation. If a bus garage is proposed to</p>	<p>Text added to Chapter 9 - Section 9.2 :</p> <p><i>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable agencies such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be consulted include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Review of the station facilities concept layouts and preliminary design.</i></li> <li><i>• Meander belt analysis of nearby creeks to proposed Transitway facilities.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Development of detailed landscaping plans and agreement on compensation ratios for lost vegetation communities (including woodlands, wetlands, and meadow marshes).”</i></p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				<p>will be protected for a potential temporary garage and/or environmental compensation purposes. Staff also understands that a decision on the temporary garage will be based on the construction timing of the Rossland Road extension. The Rossland Road area provides an ecological net benefit as a compensation site as it will greatly increase the natural heritage system in the area.</p> <p>i. Please confirm if the temporary garage can be located at a station that is proposed to be built but will not be at capacity?</p> <p>ii. Please identify a commitment within the final EPR to compensate this area. Areas that are available for restoration should also be identified so that there is clear direction on restoration at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>iii. Please clarify whether there is an opportunity to ultimately restore this site (a) should a temporary garage not be required, and (b) once the temporary garage is removed if it is required. Also please clarify if a site plan of the temporary garage will be provided to staff for review.</p>	<p>be implemented in the future at this location, an addendum to the EA will be undertaken.</p>	
TRCA-105	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		<p>c) Please confirm where the Ninth Line SWM pond drainage connects.</p> <p>d) Donald Cousens Parkway Station has 2 to 3 headwaters features to the south of it; please ensure that predevelopment drainage patterns are maintained. The drawings appear to show drainage being captured from the unpaved areas around the station and directed into a channel or a pipe and directed to the SWM pond and then to Trib C. Please ensure that this water is not contributing to the mapped headwaters to the south of the station.</p> <p>e) Please confirm that the Whites Road Station does not interrupt the north/south or east/west natural heritage system as outlined in the Seaton Final MESPA.</p>	<p>c) Ninth line pond connects to an existing ditch just west of the proposed station site.</p> <p>d) Pre-development drainage patterns at all stations, including Donald Cousens Parkway, were maintained.</p> <p>e) Confirmed. Whites Road Station does not interrupt the north/south or east/west natural heritage system.</p>	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-106	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		<p>Ecology Comments</p> <p>93. Please show a more detail design of SWM Pond outfalls. Please note that at detail design TRCA will be looking for design that ensures that water discharge and volumes directed to the natural system will not cause erosion due to increases in quantity or velocity of water drainage.</p>	<p>Refer to DETAIL-1 and DETAIL-2 in each station SWMF figure in Appendix E in the Drainage Report.</p>	No change to the EPR.



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
TRCA-107	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ecology Comments 94. Please review TRCA’s Evaluation, Classification and Management of Headwater Drainage Features Guidelines as this will assist TRCA in evaluating the function of some of the ephemeral creeks and some of the headwater features that were not included in your studies. <a href="http://trca.on.ca/dotAsset/180724.pdf">http://trca.on.ca/dotAsset/180724.pdf</a> . TRCA can provide the data for all features within the Seaton lands so that hydrology to these headwater features can be addressed. Please show all wetlands, creeks, headwaters and identified natural features adjacent to or within 120 meters of the transitway on a map with all of the crossings and proposed grading. There are a number of features that do not appear on report figures that should be evaluated.	In a meeting with TRCA held on July 11th, TRCA committed to providing the additional data referenced in the comment. Meeting minutes are being included as part of the responses.  TRCA directed Parsons to GHD to obtain the required drainage information for the Seaton Area wetlands. At the time of this response, no data had been received.	No change to the EPR.
TRCA-108	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ecology Comments 95. Please include temperature as an additional negative impact associated with development. It is important to prevent temperature spikes in all watercourses as these spikes create a harsh environment for fish and other aquatic species. The impact of asphalt heat islands on creeks, wetlands and adjacent forests can have negative effects and change the community species composition. Aquatic ecosystems include the hydrologic regime such as water quality, quantity, temperatures, sediment loads, and seasonal and daily flow variations. All of the above items should be addressed in Section 6.2.1 of the report. TRCA encourages MTO to mitigate for the urban heat island effect by implementing green infrastructure such as green roadways, permeable pavements, LID features & green technologies.	Noted.	In Table 6.3 of the EPR, under “Surface Water, Drainage/Surface Water, Environmental Indicator” the following was added:  <i>“Potential impacts to water quality, quantity, temperatures, sediment loads, and seasonal and daily flow variations”</i>  In Table 6.3 of the EPR, under “Proposed Mitigation Measures, Built-in Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations and Significance of any Potential Residual Effects” column, the following was added:  <i>“Incorporation of green roadways, permeable pavements, LID features &amp; green technologies will be considered during Detail Design.”</i>  Paragraph added to Chapter 9 - Section 9.2, Detail Design Recommendations:  <i>“Assess the opportunities to mitigate for the urban heat island effect by implementing green infrastructure such as green roadways, permeable pavements, LID features and green technologies.”</i>
TRCA-109	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ecology Comments 96. Transitway drawings show a great deal of grading (fill) in areas that are identified as creeks or drainage features, please show all creeks, wetlands and drainage on the Drawing Set Alignment Plan and Profile Plates. Please also show the current crossings for each Highway 407 crossing.	Noted.	Plates 1 – 28 have been updated including wetland information and flood plains where available.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
TRCA-110	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ecology Comments 97. Please add wetlands and watercourse monitoring to Groundwater Section on page 6- 31 if in the ZOI for dewatering.	Noted.	Table 6.7 of the EPR was revised to include wetland and watercourse monitoring under the Groundwater environmental indicator.
TRCA-111	TRCA – Appendix A	June 1, 2016		Ecology Comments 98. Please note that the West Duffins ESA boundary is shown incorrectly on the maps and should reflect the feature.	Noted.	Updated West Duffins ESA boundary has been incorporated in all relevant maps of the EPR.
MC-1	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the 407 Transitway (Kennedy Road to Brock Road) Environmental Project Report be endorsed with the following revisions/conditions:	Noted.	N/A
MC-2	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the Transitway alignment at Kennedy Road be revised, if applicable, upon finalization of Markham Centre Mobility Hub Study and the amendment of the 407 Transitway alignment west of Kennedy Road.	The Transitway alignment at Kennedy Road would be revised as necessary, if the currently approved alignment west of Kennedy Road is modified.	N/A
MC-3	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the Ministry of Transportation provide for an additional future station at McCowan Road, and include the preliminary design of the station as part of the EA.	A site located at the southeast quadrant of the Hwy 407 ETR – McCowan Road Interchange will continue to be protected for a potential future station. The Ministry of Transportation will develop a preliminary design of the station when and if a station is warranted at this location.	No change in the EPR.
MC-4	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the Ministry of Transportation work with the City to restrict vehicular access to the Ninth Line Station through the residential neighbourhoods and resolve any traffic issues resulting from the station access from the Old Ninth Line.	Ministry staff and its consultants will continue to work with City staff through the detail design stage of the 407 Transitway to review the traffic impact study findings included in this Environmental Project Report (EPR). This will be based on actual traffic volumes and the regional/local road configuration that will exist at the time of detail design/implementation, which is uncertain at this time.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: “MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Traffic impact and proposed road network infrastructural and operational modifications in areas affected by access to station sites.</li> <li>o Development of traffic, parking, transit, cycling and pedestrian management strategies to be included in construction contract drawings. Traffic conditions will be monitored during construction to verify that all temporary traffic accommodation measures are effective.”</li> </ul>
MC-5	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	Mitigation of noise and other possible impacts to abutting residential properties at the Ninth Line Station.	Mitigation measures to deal with noise and other impacts are being addressed in this Environmental Project Report (EPR). The station design elements will be subject to best practices to minimize impacts on the adjacent residential community.	No change in the EPR.
MC-6	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the Ministry of Transportation relocate the Donald Cousens Parkway Station on the east side of Reesor Road, adjacent to the future GO service on the Havelock Subdivision rail line.	The available land east of Reesor Road alone is insufficient to accommodate the Donald Cousens Parkway Station; however, the site is being protected for a potential expansion of the Donald Cousens Station if in the future, GO Transit operates commuter service on the rail line.	No change in the EPR.
MC-7	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the Ministry of Transportation address traffic impact due to station location on Markham Road to mitigate vehicular infiltration to residential neighbourhoods.	Ministry staff and its consultants will continue to work with City staff through the detail design stage of the 407 Transitway to review the traffic impact study findings included in this Environmental Project Report (EPR). This will be based on actual traffic volumes and the regional/local road configuration that will exist at the time of detail design/implementation, which is uncertain at this time.	<p>Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:</p> <p>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Traffic impact and proposed road network infrastructural and operational modifications in areas affected by access to station sites.</li> <li>o Development of traffic, parking, transit, cycling and pedestrian management strategies to be included in construction contract drawings. Traffic conditions will be monitored during construction to verify that all temporary traffic accommodation measures are effective.”</li> </ul>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
MC-8	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That leading edge sustainable measures be implemented to address stormwater, energy conservation, protection of wildlife corridors, and bird friendly guidelines.	Comment acknowledged. These matters are indicated in the EPR.	No change in the EPR.
MC-9	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That special consideration be demonstrated regarding accessible design for people with disabilities.	The design of the 407 Transitway and its stations are subject to the Accessibility for Ontarions with Disabilities Act (AODA). The preliminary design of the station facilities and the guidelines and functional requirements for the Detail Design (Chapter 5 of the EPR), provide special consideration to accessibility for people with disabilities. Application of the AODA standards will continue to be applied through Detail Design.	No change in the EPR.
MC-10	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That in the event an ossuary is discovered, the proper Provincial protocols be followed.	Standard Provincial protocols and procedures will be followed should an ossuary be found during construction. This consideration is stated in Chapter 6 of the EPR	No change in the EPR.
MC-11	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the Premier of Ontario, Minister of Transportation, and Metrolinx be requested to accelerate the program to a 10-15 year time frame, and to consider public-private partnerships and other opportunities to fund acceleration.	Considerations on the 407 Transitway implementation timing and funding alternatives are outside the scope of this EA study.	N/A
MC-12	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That an automated state-of-the-art rail transit system be considered as an alternative to the bus transitway.	A detailed evaluation of rapid transit technologies was conducted (please see Chapter 4 of the EPR). Due to numerous physical, operational, and property considerations, a bus rapid transit system with capability to be converted to light rail transit in the future if demand warrants, was selected as the preferred alternative for the entire 407 Transitway.	No change in EPR.
MC-13	Markham Council Regional	May 9, 2016	N/A	That GO Rail commuter service be advanced on the CP Havelock line.	MTO has no jurisdiction on the Havelock Rail Line. This is a separate matter to be addressed by others.	N/A

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
	Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong					
MC-14	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the interchange ramps for all directions on the 407 ETR be protected.	The preliminary design of the 407 Transitway protects for future 407 ETR ramps along the study area.	No change in the EPR.
MC-15	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the completion of residential roads in Legacy as a result of the 9th Line station be included in the 407 Transitway budget.	The Legacy subdivision internal roads are not a component of the 407 Transitway project. Access to the Transitway station (part of this project), will be from Old Ninth Line.	N/A
MC-16	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That estimated costing of the project be provided.	Cost estimates are not part of the EA process	N/A
MC-17	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the Ministry of Transportation be requested to review the detailed station and station access design for all stations with City and Regional staff.	Ministry staff and consultants will continue to work with the City staff through the Detail Design and Construction phases of the Transitway.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: "MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Traffic impact and proposed road network infrastructural and operational modifications in areas affected by access to station sites.</li> <li>o Development of traffic, parking, transit, cycling and pedestrian management strategies to be included in construction contract drawings. Traffic conditions will</li> </ul>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						be monitored during construction to verify that all temporary traffic accommodation measures are effective.”
MC-18	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That staff report back at the detailed design stage with further details related to access requirements, financial implications, potential partnership arrangements, transit oriented development opportunities, and any required agreements between Stakeholders.	This comment is to be addressed by City of Markham staff.	N/A
MC-19	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the Ministry of Transportation provide a crossing and alternative alignment for the Rouge Valley Trail Multi-Use Path between Rouge Valley and Ninth Line at the Ministry’s cost, when the 407 Transitway is constructed.	Following discussions with Parks Canada, the 407 Transitway structure bridge over the Rouge River was significantly expanded to allow adequate crossing of the Rouge National Urban Park. Parks Canada confirmed their agreement on August 25, 2016 (Parks Canada email included in the Correspondence Appendix of the EPR).  Through Detail Design and Construction, MTO will continue consultation with the Parks Canada and the City.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:  “MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:  o Adequate crossing of the multi-use pathway (MUP) under the Transitway runningway at the Rouge River valley.  o Construction staging of the Transitway through the Rouge National Urban Park to minimize effects to the Park.”
MC-20	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the Federal Government and the Province of Ontario be requested to evaluate the feasibility of a high speed train from Windsor to Montreal; and that the Highway 407 corridor be considered as part of the route alignment for this train service.	A detailed evaluation of rapid transit technologies was conducted (please see Chapter 4 of the EPR). Due to numerous physical, operational, and property considerations, a bus rapid transit system with capability to be converted to light rail transit in the future if demand warrants, was selected as the preferred alternative for the entire 407 Transitway.	No change in the EPR.
MC-21	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.	This comment is to be addressed by City of Markham staff.	N/A
MC-22	Markham Council	May 9, 2016	N/A	That staff report back to Committee in fall 2016 prior to the Ministry of Transportation finalizing their Transit	This comment is to be addressed by City of Markham staff.	N/A

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
	Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong			Project Assessment Process study on the final study recommendations and Markham's comments.		
MC-23	Markham Council Regional Councilor Joe Li & Regional Councilor Nirmala Armstrong	May 9, 2016	N/A	That the Minister of Transportation, Minister of the Environment and Climate Change, Metrolinx, Infrastructure Ontario, Regional Municipality of York be advised accordingly.	This comment is to be addressed by City of Markham staff.	N/A
MC-24	Markham Council Regional Councilor Jim Jones	May 9, 2016	N/A	Requested copies of other EA's for the system, and requested the estimated cost of construction across to Brock Road, for a comprehensive understanding of the system. It was suggested that the proposed train station be located at the east end of the line to avoid expensive land costs, that spur lines and parking structures be considered, and that a station be added at Bayview Avenue.	This comment refers to The Transitway Central Section – Hwy 400 to Kennedy Road, which EA was approved in 2011. This assignment covers the section: East of Kennedy Rod to Brock Road.	N/A
MC-25	Markham Council Development Services Committee	May 9, 2016	N/A	Requested that Notice of the next Public Information Centre be provided at Council, as well as to residents between McCowan Road and Markham Road.	All interested parties and the general public were advised at least two weeks in advance of the next public meeting.	N/A
CM-1	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	General 1. Please refer to minutes from Council Meeting of May 3, 2016 (Attachment 'A'), as these are Council's comments on this TPAP.	Noted, addressed under Comments 1 through 25. <i>(These are the Council comments).</i>	N/A
CM-2	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	General 2. Natural Heritage Policy comments are provided in the attached memorandum dated May 13, 2016 (Attachment 'B').	Noted, addressed under Comments 41 through N54.	N/A
CM-3	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	General 3. The City has assets (storm, sanitary sewers and water mains) crossing Hwy 407 at Kennedy Rd, McCowan Road, Markham Road and 9th Line. Please advise if you require as-built drawings. Please note that the Region of York also has existing assets through the MTO corridor.	The Project team has obtained all available information from both the City and the Region regarding municipal service assets. This information was used in the assessment of alternatives and is included in the EPR.	N/A

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
CM-4	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	General 4. All references to Town of Markham shall be updated to City of Markham in the EPR.	Noted. The EPR has been revised accordingly.	Entire EPR has been updated.
CM-5	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Transportation Markham Road Station 1. The report indicates that there will be operational issues at the 14th Avenue/Markham Road intersection but noted that the future extension of Donald Cousens Parkway (“DCP”) will alleviate traffic operations at this intersection as more traffic will use DCP instead of Markham Road. As both Markham Road and DCP are under York Region’s jurisdiction, the overall findings will have to be confirmed by the Region.	Noted. Traffic impact studies to Regional and Local roads are included in Appendix B of the EPR. York Region was consulted in this regard.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: <i>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <i>Traffic impact and proposed road network infrastructural and operational modifications in areas affected by access to station sites.</i></li> <li>o <i>Development of traffic, parking, transit, cycling and pedestrian management strategies will be included in construction contract drawings. Traffic conditions will be monitored during construction to verify that all temporary traffic accommodation measures are effective.”</i></li> </ul>
CM-6	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Transportation Ninth Line Station 2. Staff continues to express concern with the proposed site access in terms of traffic infiltration. The proposed station access at the Old Ninth Line/Rouge Bank Drive intersection will lead to an increase in traffic along Old Ninth Line. This is not desirable as Old Ninth Line is classified as a local road and cut-through traffic is an ongoing issue identified by the public. As a signalized intersection, the spacing of signals along Rouge Bank Drive is also a concern. An alternative with direct signalized “full moves” driveway access on Ninth Line may be more desirable and should be investigated with the Region.	Since Old Ninth Line and the right in-out direct access off Box Grove By Pass are the only accesses to the Ninth Line Station, there should not be opportunity for traffic infiltration. A new signalized “full move” driveway on Ninth Line (Box Grove By-Pass), between the ETR eastbound off ramp and Rouge Bank Drive signals, as suggested by Staff, is not feasible due to proximity to adjacent signalized intersections on Box Grove By-Pass. The complete Traffic Analysis is included in the EPR Appendix B.	No change to the EPR.
CM-7	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	3.4.3.4	Transportation Ninth Line Station 3. The Report (Section 3.4.3.4) suggests south to west left-turn restriction at the intersection of Rouge Bank Drive/Old Ninth Line-Station Access. Please clarify if this actually refers to westbound left turn restriction.	This refers to the south to west movement. Please note that the complete Traffic Impact Studies are included in Appendix B of the EPR. Section 3.4 Traffic Operations has been removed from Chapter 3. Recommendations for traffic operations at all station accesses are included in Section 6.4.3. Table 6.12 of Chapter 6 of the EPR.	Section 3.4 “Traffic Operations” has been removed from Chapter 3 “Existing Conditions”.
CM-8	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	3.4.3.2	Transportation Ninth Line Station 4. The Report (Section 3.4.3.2) states that “the intersection volumes from the neighbourhood to the east	Noted. This was a typo error that has been corrected in the Traffic Report (Appendix B).	Traffic Report (Appendix B) was corrected to read ..... <i>“the intersection volumes from the neighbourhood to the east of the Ninth Line/Copper Creek Drive”</i> ..... .



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				of the Ninth Line/Copper Creek Drive were not scaled...as it is fully developed". However, please note that there are still ongoing developments along Copper Creek, which should be accounted for in the traffic forecasts.		Section 3.4 "Traffic Operations" has been removed from Chapter 3 "Existing Conditions".
CM-9	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Multi-use pathway (MUP) 1. The MUP crossing 407 ETR east of the Rouge River should be considered during the design of the Transitway. The MUP should also be included in the EPR in the following sections (Comment No. 35 and 36).	Following discussions with Parks Canada, the 407 Transitway structure bridge over the Rouge River was significantly expanded to allow adequate crossing of the MUP. Parks Canada confirmed their agreement on August 25, 2016 (Parks Canada email included in the Correspondence Appendix of the EPR).  Through Detail Design and Construction, MTO will continue consultation with the Parks Canada and the City.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:  "MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:  o Adequate crossing of the multi-use pathway (MUP) under the Transitway runningway at the Rouge River valley.  o Construction staging of the Transitway through the National Urban Park (NUP) to minimize effects to the Park."
CM-10	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Multi-use pathway (MUP) a. Section 6 (Impact Assessments, Mitigation and Monitoring) - to assess and identify construction and operation impacts associated with the implementation of the 407 Transitway.	Noted. Assessment of effects to the MUP and mitigation measures during construction, are addressed in Chapter 6 of the EPR.	Paragraph added to Table 6.8 of Chapter 6 to read: –  "Construction activities will be staged to avoid/minimize traffic delays to residents, business owners, recreational and community facility operators/users and motorists travelling within the study area to the extent possible;"
CM-11	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Multi-use pathway (MUP) b. Section 8 (Consultation) - to address the concerns and the action required to be taken.	Noted. MUP consultation during Detail Design and Construction of the Transitway is addressed in Chapter 9 of the EPR.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:  "MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:  o Adequate crossing of the multi-use pathway (MUP) under the Transitway runningway at the Rouge River valley.  o Construction staging of the Transitway through the National Urban Park (NUP) to minimize effects to the Park."
CM-12	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Multi-use pathway (MUP) Please refer to Council recommendation (Attachment 'A') and report to Development Services Committee report, dated April 25, 2016.	Addressed under Comments 1 through 25.	N/A

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
CM-13	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	6.2.2	Heritage Assessment In accordance with the Built Heritage Features and Cultural Heritage Landscapes in section 6.2.2, partial preservation of properties at 8042 and 8119 Reesor Road is discussed, which includes recommendation for partial preservation and possibility of relocating the cultural heritage resource to a new location on its current site. Our Heritage team recommended that consideration be given to relocating the barn out of the path of the proposed Transitway at the Heritage Markham Committee Meeting of May 11, 2016. The recommendation was approved and is included (Attachment 'C') for your records.	Noted. Commitment addressing this comment is being included in Chapter 9.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: <i>"MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o <i>Relocation of barn located at 8119 Reesor Road"</i></li></ul>
CM-14	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	Figure 4.5	Heritage Assessment We note that in the evaluation of station sites, Figure 4.5 notes expropriation and removal of residential homes. This conflicts with the recommendations.	Expropriation of the two homes is not required. Part of the property on the west side of Reesor Road will be required to accommodate the access road to the Donald Cousens station site. The property on the east side of Reesor Road is being protected for potential future expansion of the station. Both properties are currently owned by IO and will not require expropriation. Figures 4.5 – The wording in the table is being updated to properly reflect the recommendations.	Text in Figure 4.5 referring to expropriation and removal of residential homes has been removed.
CM-15	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Bulk Water Sales Station Please be advised that Markham's Waterworks Department has obtained an encroachment permit from MTO for construction of a Bulk Water Sales Station on Old Ninth Line, north of Rouge Bank Drive.	Noted. Bulk Water Sales Station will not be affected by access to Ninth Line Station.	No change to the EPR.
CM-16	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Attachment B - Natural Heritage There is considerable environmental impact as a result of this proposed transitway infrastructure. The report identifies 11 tributary crossings of the Rouge River in Markham and a total loss of 107.6 hectares of natural cover across Markham and Pickering. We note that similar scale Environmental Assessment Studies in the recent past have incorporated compensation into the EA budget (16th Avenue Trunk Sewer and Southeast Collector). We request additional information on what the compensation budget and strategy is for this EA.	The 407 Transitway EPR commits to future environmental strategies to offset the environmental impacts prior to construction. Please note that the project adheres to MTO policies and guidelines including the Environmental Reference for Highway Design, which addresses impact assessment/mitigation on environmental factors including landscape and terrestrial ecosystems. Compensation and meeting the requirements of the regulatory agencies, is being included as a commitment in Chapter 9 of the EPR.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: <i>"MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o <i>Development of detailed landscaping plans and agreement on compensation ratios for lost vegetation communities (including woodlands, wetlands, and meadow marshes)."</i></li></ul>
CM-17	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Attachment B - Natural Heritage In accordance with the City's Official Plan and environmental priorities, a no net loss approach is required to address natural heritage impacts. We are particularly interested in ensuring minimization and	Noted.	N/A

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				mitigation are appropriately addressed in the following impacts areas (Comment No. 43 through 47):		
CM-18	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Attachment B - Natural Heritage 1. Crossing the main branch of the Rouge River east of Markham Road. We note that this is identified as an area of High Sensitivity with an Opportunity for Enhancement. We are particularly concerned about potential impacts along the Rouge River and the close proximity of the residential community. The EA should contain more direction on the impact of the transitway on the features including mitigation and compensation. We also note the City's Multi-use Pathway EA included a connection across Highway 407 at the Rouge River. Please ensure that the requirements for the implementation of the MUP are addressed and that the appropriate pathway connection is secured in the design of the transitway at this location.	Noted. Chapter 6 of the EPR addresses potential impacts to the Rouge River and proposed mitigation measures.  The Transitway bridge designed over the Rouge River is longer than the 407 ETR structure and will allow for the MUP connection to be maintained. Adjustments in the MUP routing may be required during the Transitway Detail Design to optimize the MUP crossing under the Transitway structure. This is being addressed in Chapter 9 of the EPR.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:  <i>"MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Adequate crossing of the multi-use pathway (MUP) under the Transitway runningway at the Rouge River valley.</li> <li>o Construction staging of the Transitway through the National Urban Park (NUP) to minimize effects to the Park."</li> </ul>
CM-19	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Attachment B - Natural Heritage 2. The transitway crosses the Provincially Significant Cedar Grove Wetland Complex between 9th Line and Donald Cousens Parkway at 2 locations. The mapping identifies these lands as Moderate Sensitivity with Opportunity for Enhancement. The feature is shown on the EA mapping as a watercourse. The mapping should be modified to identify the PSW wetland and include the Provincial boundary mapping of the feature.	Noted.	Appendix E has been revised to include mapping delineating Cedar Grove Wetland Complex.
CM-20	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Attachment B - Natural Heritage 3. The transitway crosses the Rouge National Urban Park (RNUP). Parks Canada are currently undertaking a Trails Master Plan for the RNUP. The transitway corridor further impacts north south accessibility of the RNUP. The EA needs to identify and confirm that the requirements of Parks Canada to secure public trail across the transitway and 407 have been addressed to their satisfaction and that the transitway will not further impair north south trail access through the RNUP. The coordinator of the trails study at Parks Canada is Richard Scott at 705-742-1984 <a href="mailto:richard.scott@pc.gc.ca">richard.scott@pc.gc.ca</a>	Following discussions with Parks Canada, the 407 Transitway structure bridge over the Rouge River was significantly expanded to allow adequate crossing of the MUP. Parks Canada confirmed their agreement on August 25, 2016 (Parks Canada email included in the Correspondence Appendix of the EPR).  Through Detail Design and Construction, MTO will continue consultation with the Parks Canada and the City	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:  <i>"MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Adequate crossing of the multi-use pathway (MUP) under the Transitway runningway at the Rouge River valley.</li> <li>o Construction staging of the Transitway through the National Urban Park (NUP) to minimize effects to the Park."</li> </ul>
CM-21	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Attachment B - Natural Heritage 4. Wildlife passage needs to addressed in the design of the transitway crossing over the two major watercourse corridors (as a minimum) – Rouge River and Little Rouge Creek. TRCA and Parks Canada should be consulted	As indicated in the response to the previous comment following discussions with Parks Canada, the 407 Transitway structure bridge over the Rouge River was significantly expanded to allow adequate crossing of the MUP.	No change to the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				regarding specific wildlife crossing requirements. TRCA may also have additional comments on this matter.		
CM-22	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Attachment B - Natural Heritage 5. The York Durham Line Site (Protected) is identified on lands subject to conveyance to the Rouge National Urban Park. All landowners involved in the conveyance of lands to Parks Canada or owning public infrastructure abutting the RNUP participated in the signing of a Memorandum of Agreement Respecting the Assemble of lands for the Proposed Rouge National Urban Park. That agreement identifies additional lands that may be required for future infrastructure (this site is not identified), sets out a process for the disposal of public lands and provides for a cap on land disposal for infrastructure. This matter needs to be addressed with Parks Canada and the current public landowner of the parcel. We also note that this site contains a portion of the Locust Hill Wetland Complex and woodland vegetation. Alternative locations for this facility should be explored as part of the EA given the use of the land intended for National Park purposes and the natural heritage features on the site.	The York Durham Line site is being protected for environmental compensation and is not identified for a station or any other infrastructure facility as part of this EA. This has been discussed with Parks Canada, TRCA, MNRF and IO and is reflected in Chapters 4 and 7 of the EPR.  Public land transfers to Parks Canada and infrastructure land caps are ongoing matters between the Federal and Provincial governments and are not addressed by this EA.	No change to the EPR.
CM-23	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Attachment B - Natural Heritage The City will be looking for Mitigation and Compensation to ensure no net loss to natural heritage and hydrologic resources resulting from this infrastructure. We will require a detailed assessment of the natural heritage and hydrologic features (woodlands, wetland and stream features) being impacted and removed for the transitway. We note that the EA identifies compensation for some features but not others (page 6-7 identifies no compensation for a cedar coniferous forest but does identify compensation for a meadow marsh). The City's position is to achieve no net loss and compensation should be directed to all protected features impacted by this infrastructure.	Please note that Chapter 6 (page 6-8) of the draft EPR presented compensation measures for removal of wetland and forest communities. In addition, the requirement for a detailed planting plan will be developed during the Detail Design phase of this project once restoration areas are identified as stated on Chapter 6 (page 6 - 8).  Chapter 9 of the EPR is being revised to include the commitment.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: <i>"MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o <i>Development of detailed landscaping plans and agreement on compensation ratios for lost vegetation communities (including woodlands, wetlands, and meadow marshes)."</i></li></ul>
CM-24	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Attachment B - Natural Heritage Discussions regarding mitigation and compensation should commence before approval of the EA document. The EA identifies compensation to be addressed at the detailed design stage, but because of the large impact anticipated, the City seeks more direction on this matter prior to EA approval.	The 407 Transitway EPR commits to future environmental strategies to offset the environmental impacts prior to construction. Please note that the project adheres to MTO policies and guidelines including the Environmental Reference for Highway Design, which addresses impact assessment/mitigation on environmental factors including landscape and terrestrial ecosystems.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: <i>"MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o <i>Development of detailed landscaping plans and agreement on compensation ratios for lost vegetation</i></li></ul>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<i>communities (including woodlands, wetlands, and meadow marshes)."</i>
CM-25	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Attachment B - Natural Heritage The EA is expected to address all matters related to fisheries impacts resulting from requirements of the Federal Fisheries Act and endangered and threatened species impacts resulting from the requirements of the Endangered Species Act.	This impact assessment presented in the EPR is based on the Preliminary Design phase of the transitway. Further requirements of the Federal Fisheries Act and the Endangered Species Act will be conducted during the Detail Design phase prior to construction. Please see Chapter 9 of the EPR for future commitments.	No change in the EPR.
CM-26	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	Attachment B - Natural Heritage The transitway impacts the Provincial Greenbelt Plan area. The EA must include a section that addresses how the infrastructure policy 4.2.1 has been addressed in the EA document.	<p>Noted. Section 3.2.1 under the Greenbelt Plan subsection is being revised to include discussion regarding the Greenbelt Plan Infrastructure policy 4.2.1.</p> <p>An Environmental Assessment (EA) Study was completed in 1997 for Highway 407 and the 407 Transitway from Markham Road to Highway 7 East of Brock Road. The EA received approval prior to the establishment of the Greenbelt Plan in 2005. The EA documents the process that was followed to determine the location of the Transitway facility. The need for this transportation infrastructure was demonstrated during the EA, and a number of route planning alternatives were developed and evaluated, considering a range of factors including potential impacts on the agricultural system and natural environment.</p> <p>During this planning and preliminary design study, efforts have been made to minimize the footprint of the runningway within the Greenbelt Plan lands. The runningway is located just south of the Highway 407 alignment, concentrating urban infrastructure within one corridor. In addition, no stations have been planned within the Greenbelt Plan area. Key natural heritage features include Little Rouge Creek, an unnamed watercourse, and Petticoat Creek, and the Non-Provincially Significant Locust Hill Wetland Complex. The potential impacts of the runningway on these features, and the recommended environmental protection and mitigation measures are described in Chapter 6 of the EPR.</p> <p>The design and construction practices identified in Section 4.2.1.2 of the Greenbelt Plan will be evaluated and addressed in the Detail Design phase of the Transitway.</p>	<p>Section 3.2.1 under the Greenbelt Plan has been updated to include the following:</p> <p><i>"Section 4.2.1.1 of the Greenbelt Plan states that all existing, expanded or new infrastructure subject to and approved under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, the Environmental Assessment Act, the Planning Act, the Aggregate Resources Act, the Telecommunications Act or by the National or Ontario Energy Boards, or which receives a similar environmental approval, is permitted within the Protected Countryside, subject to the policies of this section and provided it meets one of the following two objectives: a) It supports agriculture, recreation and tourism, rural settlement areas, resource use or the rural economic activity that exists and is permitted within the Greenbelt; or b) It serves the significant growth and economic development expected in southern Ontario beyond the Greenbelt by providing for the appropriate infrastructure connections among urban growth centres and between these centres and Ontario's borders.</i></p> <p><i>An Environmental Assessment (EA) Study was completed in 1997 for Highway 407 and the 407 Transitway from Markham Road to Highway 7 East of Brock Road. The EA received approval prior to the establishment of the Greenbelt Plan in 2005. The EA documents the process that was followed to determine the location of the transitway facility. The need for this transportation infrastructure was demonstrated during the EA, and a number of route planning alternatives were developed and evaluated, considering a range of factors including potential impacts on the agricultural system and natural environment.</i></p> <p><i>During this planning and preliminary design study, efforts have been made to minimize the footprint of the runningway within the Greenbelt Plan lands. The runningway is located just south of the Highway 407 alignment, concentrating urban infrastructure within one</i></p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<p>corridor. In addition, no stations have been planned within the Greenbelt Plan area. Key natural heritage features include Little Rouge Creek, an unnamed watercourse, and Petticoat Creek, and the Non-Provincially Significant Locust Hill Wetland Complex. The potential impacts of the runningway on these features, and the recommended environmental protection and mitigation measures are described in Chapter 6.</p> <p>The design and construction practices identified in Section 4.2.1.2 of the Greenbelt Plan will be evaluated and addressed in the Detail Design phase of the Transitway.”</p>
CM-27	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	Page 3-21	<p>Attachment B - Natural Heritage Site Specific Comments:</p> <p>1. Page 3-21 of the document identifies Milne Woods ESA in Markham. The City does not recognize the ESA designation. The feature being referenced is actually the Provincially Significant Milne Park Wetland Complex.</p>	Noted.	In Sections 3.1.7, 3.1.8 and 6.2.1 of the EPR, Milne Woods ESA has been changed to Provincially Significant Milne Park Wetland Complex.
CM-28	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	Page 6-6	<p>Attachment B - Natural Heritage Site Specific Comments:</p> <p>2. The natural environment discussion on page 6-6 and the Designated Natural Areas on page 6-11 needs to recognize the Provincially Significant Wetland between 9th Line Station and Donald Cousens Parkway.</p>	Noted.	Section 6.2.1 “Ninth Line Station to Donald Cousens Station” has been updated to include reference to the Provincially Significant Cedar Grove Wetland Complex.
CM-29	Markham, City of	May 28, 2016	N/A	<p>Heritage Markham</p> <p>That Heritage Markham recommends that in the case of the designated heritage property at 8119 Reesor Road, that consideration be given to relocating the early 20th century gambrel-roofed barn out of the path of the proposed Highway 407 Transitway as a mitigation strategy, to preserve the cultural heritage landscape of the historic William Harding House farmstead; and, That the preferred location would be closer to the farmhouse; and further, That the consultation be advised of Heritage Markham's recommendation.</p>	Noted. Commitment addressing this comment is being included in Chapter 9.	<p>Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:</p> <p>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNR, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</p> <p>Potential relocation of barn located at 8119 Reesor Road.”</p>
DR-1	Durham	May 31, 2016	Section 1.5.4 Related Provincial and Regional Transportation Studies/	<p>The Region’s Central Pickering Development Plan Class EA for Regional Services, completed in June 2014, should be included as a related study for the 407 Transitway project. The description of this study should highlight the importance of this study to implement the Seaton Community in terms of establishing Regional road alignments, cross-sections and transit considerations,</p>	Noted.	The Region’s Central Pickering Development Plan Class EA for Regional Services has been included in the EPR as a reference in Section 1.5.4.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
			Projects/ Topics	along with the provision of sanitary sewer and water services.		
DR-2	Durham	May 31, 2016	Section 3.2.1 Land Use Planning Policies, City of Pickering Official Plan	It is our understanding that the by-pass is proposed to be deleted through the City of Pickering’s Official Plan Review. Further, the Region of Durham has no plans to construct a by-pass for Altona Road at the west end of Whitevale. Please verify the intent of this policy with Pickering staff as we feel it is out of date.	Noted.	EPR Section 3.2.1 revised removing mentioning of the Altona By-Pass.
DR-3	Durham	May 31, 2016	Section 3.2.1 Land Use Planning Policies, City of Pickering Official Plan	In addition, one point of correction is that Amendment 1 to the CPDP set the population forecasts of 61,000 and 30,500 jobs for Seaton by 2031, with an ultimate population of 70,000 and 35,000 jobs.	Noted.	EPR Section 3.2.1 has been revised removing the incorrect forecast figures.
DR-4	Durham	May 31, 2016	Section 4.3.3 Evaluation of Station Sites	MTO prepared a Functional Planning Study for Two New Interchanges Supporting the Seaton Lands’ Development in December 2009. Following the preparation of that study, MTO, the Region, the Seaton Landowners Group, and 407 ETR worked towards establishing locations for the Whites Road Extension (Sideline 26) and Rossland Road Extension (Sideline 22) interchanges in 2010. The locations of these interchanges established a “tie-in” point for identifying road alignment alternatives for the Whites Road and Rossland Road extensions as part of the Region’s Central Pickering Development Plan (CPDP) Class EA for Regional Services study. As part of MTO’s work in establishing the interchange locations, and the Region’s work in evaluating alignment alternatives, consideration of the feasibility and potential locations or “footprints” for the 407 Transitway stations was taken into account, including a general assessment of environmental and archaeological constraints. As such, a general footprint for the Rossland Road Extension location was identified at the southwest quadrant of the interchange, which has been carried forward and refined as part of the Highway 407 Transitway study.	Noted. All existing and future interchanges were assessed and considered for station sites and development of runningway alignment. The protected footprints as shown in the Seaton Plan have also been respected. The 407 Transitway is excluding a station at future Rossland Road Extension; however, the site is being protected for environmental compensation and/or other purposes to be evaluated and define prior to implementation phase.	No change in the EPR.
DR-5	Durham	May 31, 2016	Section 4.3.3 Evaluation of Station Sites	The Central Pickering Development Plan and the City of Pickering’s Seaton Conformity Amendment (OPA 22 to the Pickering Official Plan) have policies in place to help establish Seaton as a “transit first” community, which means that transit services are to be provided as development progresses in order to establish transit as a viable alternative to the automobile. As such, these	Noted.	No change in the EPR.

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				studies have identified the 407 Transitway stations as important locations for transit connections between GO Bus and municipal transit services (e.g., DRT and VIVA), both in advance of the 407 Transitway being constructed and afterwards.		
DR-6	Durham	May 31, 2016	Section 4.3.3 Evaluation of Station Sites	The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Region, Seaton Landowners Group and Infrastructure Ontario identifies the construction of the Whites Road Extension interchange at Highway 407 to support Phase 1 development of Seaton in 2018 (with detailed design soon underway), and Rossland Road Extension for subsequent development phase(s). As noted in the MOU, a Rossland Road Extension interchange on Highway 407 could be constructed as early as 2028. Further, the Region’s Fiscal Impact Study for Seaton, the Staged Servicing and Implementation Strategy (SSIS) prepared by the Seaton Landowners Group, and the Region’s recently completed Five Year Transit Service Strategy (February 2016) all propose future transit service on the Rossland Road extension to Highway 7 serving the Seaton community when it is substantially developed.	Noted. Response to next two comments refer to the evaluation of the potential Rossland Station	No change in the EPR.
DR-7	Durham	May 31, 2016	Section 4.3.3 Evaluation of Station Sites	With these factors in mind, a transitway station location at the Rossland Road Extension interchange should be protected for and is feasible in the long-term. While the proposal for a bus maintenance facility at this location on an interim basis would not preclude the opportunity for a future transitway station, using the lands for environmental mitigation would likely remove that opportunity. Therefore, we prefer the option to protect for a transitway station at this site, which would better achieve the policy objectives for the Seaton Community to support the provision of transit commensurate with population and employment growth as the community matures.	The analysis and evaluation of potential station sites was conducted considering various factors such as ridership forecast, proximity to adjacent stations, major environmental constraints, land availability, accessibility, future transit integration opportunities, cost/effectiveness of the investment, implementation staging considerations, among others.  As a product of the results of the assessment, this site was not selected. This was presented and discussed throughout the study with stakeholders (including the Region and the City of Pickering), and the public. The Rossland Road site is being protected by MTO for other potential uses, including environmental compensation.	No change in the EPR.
DR-8	Durham	May 31, 2016	Section 4.3.3 Evaluation of Station Sites	In terms of the evaluation, it should take into consideration future planned transit routes on Rossland Road, as well as the proximity of future development in Seaton to the transitway station.	The evaluation took into account potential ridership generated by all modes including local transit, based on information provided by Durham Transit.	No change in the EPR.
DR-9	Durham	May 31, 2016	Section 3.4.6.3 Recommendations – For the	The 1st paragraph notes that the future widening of Brock Road to six-lanes is “under consideration by Durham Region.” In fact, the status of this widening is approved	Noted.	Section 3.4 has been removed from Chapter 3 (Existing Conditions). The complete Traffic Report is included in Appendix B which has been revised to include the updated



TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
			Future Background Conditions (No Transitway) for Brock Road	under the CPDP Class EA for Regional Services as a six-lane cross-section, with curbside HOV lanes. The recommendation to use all six-lanes as general purpose lanes, if the 407 Transitway is not constructed by 2031, is not consistent with the modelling undertaken as part of the CPDP EA as it did not assume the transitway being in place either. Further, the pedestrian crossing phase at Street 20H is important for the development of Neighbourhood 20 as it would be the only pedestrian crossing between Whitevale Road and the East-West Residential Collector adjacent to the Brock Road Transitway station.		information regarding future widening of Brock Road indicating ..."Future widening of Brock Road to a six-lane cross section has been approved under CPDP Class EA for Regional Services"...
CP-1	Pickering	June 10, 2016		Brock Road: Staff have reviewed the transitway alternatives for Brock Road against the Seaton Master Environmental Servicing Plan Amendment (MESPA) and relevant Neighbourhood Functional Servicing and Storm water Reports (NFSSRs) and found that there is no opportunity to share in a City SWM facility. As such, all storm water will have to be dealt with onsite and will be privately owned and operated.	Correct. The proposed SWM facilities are not being shared with the City facilities.	N/A
CP-2	Pickering	June 10, 2016	Chapter 5 & Chapter 9	Brock Road: The preferred location of the transitway station appears to preclude a secondary recreational trail and trail heads illustrated in Neighbourhood 20: Thompson's Corners Neighbourhood Plan. Steps should be undertaken to examine how the trail linkage and associated trailheads can be accommodated.	The Transitway runningway alignment follows the only feasible right of way in this area. MTO very much supports multi-use trails. Chapter 5 and 9 have been revised to address this concern. The planned secondary recreational trail crosses the alignment just east of Old Brock Road. MTO proposes further consultation with the City during the Detail Design phase of both facilities to find a feasible solution to interface both initiatives. This is being referred in Chapters 5 and 9 of the EPR.	Chapter 5 - Sub-Section 5.1.3 , under Whites Road Station – Brock Road description of the alignment, text has been revised adding: "The Transitway alignment between Old Brock Road and Brock Road is much constrained by the presence of Brougham Creek which runs parallel to the runningway, the location of the Station, and the heritage buildings located west of Old Brock Road. The City plans to build a secondary recreational trail in this area, crossing the Transitway alignment just east of Old Brock Road. During Detail Design, further consideration will be given to find a compromised solution to interface both initiatives. Further consultation between MTO and the City in reference to this issues is being committed in Chapter 9 of the EPR." Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation "MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presence of a secondary recreational trail and trail heads planned by the City of Pickering, in the Old Brock Road area.”</li> </ul>
CP-3	Pickering	June 10, 2016		Brock Road: The SWM facility maintenance road is to be relocated such that access is from the site, not street 1.	Noted. Access to the SWM facility is from the site. City staff may have misinterpreted the pond grading as an access road.	N/A
CP-4	Pickering	June 10, 2016	Chapter 9	Brock Road: The access to Old Brock Road (Elsa Story Avenue) to be considered in future after Elsa Story has been urbanized with development and when Transitway parking expansion is being considered.	Noted. This comment has been addressed in Chapter 9.	<p>Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:</p> <p>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic impact and proposed road network infrastructural and operational modifications in areas affected by access to station sites.</li> <li>Development of traffic, parking, transit, cycling and pedestrian management strategies to be included in construction contract drawings. Traffic conditions will be monitored during construction to verify that all temporary traffic accommodation measures are effective.”</li> </ul>
CP-5	Pickering	June 10, 2016		Brock Road: A traffic report was attached for Markham Road Transit Station with the Draft EPR. Can you also provide us with a Brock Road Transit Station traffic report?	The Brock Road Transit Station Traffic Report was also included in the Draft EPR. City of Pickering Staff has been notified of this on June 15 2016 via email.	N/A
CP-6	Pickering	June 10, 2016		Brock Road: We like to let you know that South Employment Collector is currently under an EA study.	Noted.	N/A
CP-7	Pickering	June 10, 2016		Whites Road: Staff have reviewed the transitway alternatives for Whites Road against the Seaton MESPA and relevant NFSSRs and found that there is no opportunity to share in a City SWM facility. As such, all storm water will have to be dealt with onsite and will be privately owned and operated.	Correct. The proposed SWM facilities are not being shared with the City facilities.	N/A
CP-8	Pickering	June 10, 2016		Whites Road: The southwest alternative illustrates an access to the proposed transitway station site from the future collector road. The proposed access is located along the curve of this road. As the EA study and detailed design progresses, the provision of adequate sight lines and the early implementation of signals need to be addressed.	Noted. Chapter 9 has been revised to address this comment.	<p>Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:</p> <p>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</p>

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
						o Traffic impact and proposed road network infrastructural and operational modifications in areas affected by access to station sites.”
CP-9	Pickering	June 10, 2016		Whites Road: A traffic report was attached for Markham Road Transit Station with the Draft EPR. Can you also provide us with a Brock Road Transit Station traffic report?	Traffic Studies for all stations are included in Appendix B of the EPR. City of Pickering Staff has been notified of this on June 15 2016 via email.	N/A
CP-10	Pickering	June 10, 2016		Whites Road: We like to let you know that South Employment Collector is currently under an EA study.	Noted.	N/A
CP-11	Pickering	June 10, 2016		General Comments: Given that the transitway stations are located within an urban area, consideration should be given to minimizing the footprint of parking areas through the development of parking structures in the future. The study should examine the implementation and timing of parking structures at each of these locations.	At this stage, MTO is protecting sites sufficiently large to accommodate surface parking. Options such as parking structures, may be considered in the future, depending on ridership demand and other considerations.	N/A
CP-12	Pickering	June 10, 2016	Chapter 9	General Comments: Although facilities for transit and other motorized vehicles are illustrated in the conceptual designs for each of the transit station sites, facilities for pedestrians and cyclists are not shown. Through EA study and detailed design, protected pedestrian and cycling access and facilities within each proposed station site should be provided.	Chapter 5 of the EPR includes Stations functional requirements that will be met during the Detail Design of the facilities, including incorporating adequate active transportation facilities. This concern has also been addressed in Chapter 9.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: “MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:  o Development of traffic, parking, transit, cycling and pedestrian management strategies to be included in construction contract drawings. Traffic conditions will be monitored during construction to verify that all temporary traffic accommodation measures are effective.”
CP-13	Pickering	June 10, 2016	Chapter 9	General Comments: Opportunities for landscaping and screening should be identified to buffer mixed use and residential areas immediately adjacent to the proposed station sites.	Similarly to the previous comment, Chapter 5 includes landscaping as one of the components that will form part of the stations. This concern has also been addressed in Chapter 9.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation: “MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:  o Development of detailed landscaping plans and agreement on compensation ratios for lost vegetation communities (including woodlands, wetlands, and meadow marshes).”
CP-14	Pickering	June 10, 2016		General Comments: Through the EA process, consideration should be given to developing a Community Value Plan. Such a plan would identify opportunities for	Noted. Comment addressed in Chapter 9.	Text added to Chapter 9 - Consultation:

TABLE 8.2: COMMENT AND RESPONSE LOG - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

COMMENT NO.	AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED	EPR SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EPR
				gateway locations/features and the integration of commemorative signage, consistent with the standards that have been developed for the 407 East Phase 1 undertaking and the Brock Road Commuter Lot location.		<p>“MTO will continue consultation and coordination with the Municipalities and applicable stakeholders such as TRCA, Parks Canada, MNRF, Hydro One and others, during the Detail Design and Construction phases of the project. Specific issues that will be addressed include:</p> <p>Development of a signage plan consistent with the standards that have been developed for the 407 East Phase 1 undertaking.”</p>

### 8.3. Consultation with Aboriginal Communities

Consultation with the MOECC’s Environmental Assessment Branch, Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs and INAC identified potential aboriginal communities that may hold an interest in this study.

In accordance with subsection 7(4) of the Ontario Regulation 231/08, a request letter was sent on August 6, 2014 to MOECC’s Director, Environmental Assessment Branch for a list of bodies that may assist the Study Team in identifying and contacting Aboriginal communities that may be interested in this study. On September 12, 2014, a letter presenting a list of Aboriginal communities was received from MOECC. In addition, as a response to the Study Team’s contact letter, the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs sent a letter received on May 25, 2015 providing a list of Aboriginal communities that may have rights and/or interests in the study area.

The aboriginal communities that were contacted included:

- Alderville First Nation;
- Chippewas of Georgina Island;
- Chippewas of Rama First Nation;
- Hiawartha First Nation;
- Curve Lake First Nation;
- Beausoleil First Nation;
- Mississaugas of Scugog Island;
- Mississaugas of New Credit;
- Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation;
- Coordinator for the Williams Treaties;
- Huron-Wendat Nation;
- Métis Nation of Ontario;
- Toronto and York Region Métis Council; and,
- Oshawa and Durham Region Metis Council.

Aboriginal communities were invited to attend the two rounds of PICs: PIC #1 was held on **April 15 and 16, 2015** and PIC#2 was on **June 22 and 23, 2016**. PIC invitation letters were mailed on April 1, 2015 and June 6, 2016, for PIC #1 and #2 respectively.

A notification letter with information that the draft EPR was available for review and comment was distributed on **April 26, 2016**.

A contact letter was mailed to advise Aboriginal communities of the formal start of TPAP on **August 26, 2016**. On **December 19, 2016**, a letter of notification was mailed to inform the submission of the EPR and study completion.

**Table 8.3** presents a summary of correspondence with Aboriginal Communities for the study during the Planning and Preliminary Design Stages. The original correspondence received from agencies are presented in **Appendix A**.

**TABLE 8.3: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES DURING PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014  PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Letter received May 26, 2015 from the Manager, Ministry Partnerships Unit providing a list of First Nations and/or Metis communities.	Comment Noted
Alderville First Nation	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014  PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015	Letter received April 8, 2015 from the Lands and Resources Communications Officer indicating interest to be kept information of the study progress.	Comment Noted
Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014  PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Chippewas of Rama First Nation	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014  PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.

**TABLE 8.3: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES DURING PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
Hiawatha First Nation	TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016 Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014 PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015 PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016 TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Letter received April 29, 2016 noting that the 407 Transitway has little impact on the Hiawatha First Nation's traditional territory and/or rights. It was requested that they be apprised of any environmental impacts and archaeological findings arise. If any archaeological artifacts are found, Hiawatha First Nation would like to be contacted.	The letter of notification of the completion of the EPR will provide information on archaeological and environmental studies conducted as part of this study.
Beausoleil First Nation	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014 PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015 PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016 TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Coordinator for the Williams Treaties	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014 PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015 PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016 TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Curve Lake First Nation	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014 PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015 PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016	Letter received May 26, 2015 from the Chief indicating that the study area is located within the Traditional Territory of Curve Lake First Nation. Curve Lake First Nation's Territory is incorporated within the Williams Treaties Territory and is subject of a claim under Canada's Specific Claims Policy. It indicated that future correspondence be sent to the	No issues or concerns identified.

**TABLE 8.3: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES DURING PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
Williams Treaty First Nations Claims Coordinator	TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Williams Treaty First Nations Claims Coordinator. It noted that Curve Lake First Nation Council is not currently aware of any issues that would cause concern with respect to Traditional, Aboriginal and Treaty rights. Should excavation unearth bones, remains and other such evidence of native burial site or any Archaeological findings, the Curve Lake First Nation must be notified. Any new, undisclosed or unforeseen issues that may arise that has potential for anticipated negative environmental impacts or anticipated impacts on Curve Lake First Nation Treaty and Aboriginal rights are required to be notified.	
Mississauga of Scugog Island	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014 PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015 PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016 TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Mississauga of New Credit	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014 PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015 PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016 TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	Letter received on May 12, 2016 indicated high level of concern related to potential impacts to Mississauga of New Credit First Nation interests. Requested that a meeting be set up to discuss this	A meeting was held on December 1, 2016. General questions regarding the TPAP process, the transtway impacts and mitigations were discussed.
Huron-Wendat Nation Conseil de la Nation Huronne-Wendat c/o Gestion MV Management	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014 PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015	Email received on April 19, 2015 confirming receipt of the PIC#1 invitation letter. It noted that potential for Huron-Wendat heritage and archaeological sites is high within the study area. It requested shapefiles of the projected study	Email sent on May 12, 2015 providing AutoCAD files for the study as requested. It noted that the alignments and station footprints are at a preliminary stage and

**TABLE 8.3: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES DURING PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
	PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016  Meeting was held on September 27, 2016 to discuss the study.	area to determine if there are any Huron-Wendat archaeological sites.  Letter received May 19, 2016 noting the presence of numerous Huron-Wendat historical and archaeological sites within the study area. Requested to set up a meeting to discuss the study and future consultation commitments.	are subject to change.  A letter was sent on June 13, 2016 providing information on how to access electronic copies of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Report, Fish and Fish Habitat Report ,Terrestrial Ecosystem Report and draft EPR.  In the September 27, 2016 meeting the Huron Wendat Nation representatives requested to be involved in all archaeological assessments for MTO projects. No specific concerns to this study were expressed.
Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation	PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Métis Nation of Ontario -Head Office -Lands, Resources and Consultation Branch	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014  PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Toronto and York Region Métis Council	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014  PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.

**TABLE 8.3: SUMMARY OF CONTACTS WITH ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES DURING PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

AGENCY	DATE CONTACTED	COMMENTS/CONCERNS	ACTION TAKEN
	TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016		
Oshawa and Durham Region Metis Council	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014  PIC#1 Invitation Letter sent by MTO on April 1, 2015  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.
Aboriginal Relations Branch, MTO	Initial Contact Letter sent by MTO on August 6, 2014  PIC#2 Invitation Letters sent on June 7, 2016  TPAP Commencement Notification Letter sent on August 29, 2016	No comments/concerns received.	No issues or concerns identified.

## 8.4. Consultation with the Public

To facilitate the consultation process, notification of consultation activities/opportunities were provided to the public. The public was able to choose a level of involvement from one or more of the following options:

- Project website (www.407Transitway.com);
- PICs; and,
- Contacting the Study Team directly.

### 8.4.1. Public Notification

Four types of notices were planned for advertising in the local newspapers, *Markham's Economist and Sun* and *Ajax and Pickering's News Advertiser*:

- "Notice of Public Information Centre #1" published on **April 2, 2015**;
- "Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process"; published on **September 1, 2016 and September 8, 2016**;
- "Notice of Public Information Centre #2" published on **June 9, 2016 and June 16, 2016**; and,
- "Notice of Completion of Transit Project Assessment Process" published on **December 29, 2016 and January 5, 2017**.

The “Notice of Public Information Centre #1” was placed in local newspapers two weeks prior to the open houses (April 15, 2015 and April 16, 2015). The notice included a discussion of the project, the TPAP, PIC specifics (including date, time and location) and provided information on how to submit comments to the Study Team (refer to **Appendix A** for a copy of the notice).

The “Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process” was placed in local newspapers to initiate the TPAP (first published on September 1, 2016 and September 8, 2016). To meet the TPAP requirement of publishing the notice on two days, the notice was published in the same local newspapers on two consecutive weeks. Information about the project and how to submit comments to the Study Team was included in the notice.

The “Notice of Public Information Centre #2” was placed in local newspapers two weeks prior to the events (June 9, 2016 and June 16, 2016). The notice included a discussion of the project, the TPAP, PIC specifics (including date, time and location) and provided information on how to submit comments to the Study Team (refer to **Appendix A** for a copy of the notice).

The “Notice of Completion of Transit Project Assessment Process” was placed in local concurrent with the release of this EPR. The notice provided details about the study, identified locations where copies of the EPR were available for public review and identified closing date for submissions of comments and how to contact the Study Team for further information or submission of comments.

### 8.4.2. Notification to Landowners in Close Vicinity of the Transitway

Approximately 6000 copies of the PIC #1 brochure were distributed to residences, businesses, and property owners located within or in the vicinity of the study limits by Canada Post Unaddressed Mail Delivery service during the week of April 6, 2015. Additional copies of the brochure were available at the PIC (refer to **Appendix A** for a copy of the brochure).

These brochures were sent beyond the 30 m area as required by the TPAP. For the most part, property owners, approximately 500 m north and south of Highway 407, received these brochures. When a residential subdivision was present adjacent to the Highway right-of-way, the entire subdivision (over 500 m away from the Highway right-of-way) was included as recipients of these brochures.

The Notice of PIC #2 was also distributed to approximately 6500 points of call (residents, businesses and facilities) located within or in the vicinity of the study limits. The PIC Brochures were distributed by Canada Post Bulk Mail Delivery during the week of June 9, 2016.

Property owners of identified properties expected to be required for the construction of the 407 Transitway were notified of the PIC #2. Letters with a conceptual figure of the impacted area of the properties in question were mailed through registered mail service on July 17, 2016.

### 8.4.3. Public Information Centres (PIC)

#### 8.4.3.1. Public Information Centre #1

A PIC #1 was held at the two different locations:

April 15, 2015	April 16, 2015
4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.	4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Markham Museum – Main Building	Pickering Recreation Complex - Meeting Room B
9350 Markham Road	1867 Valley Farm Road
Markham, Ontario L3P 3J3	Pickering, Ontario L1V 3Y7

The purpose of the PIC was to present an overview of the existing site conditions, an examination of potential alignments and station locations, and identification of a technically preferred alignment and station locations. Project stakeholders, including First Nations and Métis communities and organizations, local service board/committee staff, elected officials, government agencies, and other interested agencies were invited by letter to attend the PIC from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. Invitations to the pre-PIC meeting (along with copies of the Notice of PIC and PIC Brochure) were mailed on April 1, 2015. The purpose of this pre-PIC meeting was to provide an opportunity for affected stakeholders to review the Detail Design study prior to the PIC and to communicate any issues or concerns to the Study Team in a candid manner.

Displays and exhibits available during the PIC included:

- scaled plans and profile showing the station locations and technically preferred alignment; and,
- various text displays describing the purpose of the PIC, introduction to the 407 Transitway, objectives of the study and needs and justification, schedule and study process, background plan and policy information, service concept, ridership study, environmental considerations, Transitway corridor and candidate station nodes, station location assessment approach and methodology, evaluation criteria, typical station elements, alignment design criteria and objectives, station site alternatives, Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy and Team Contact details, next steps, and an invitation to provide comments on the study.

A copy of the PIC display panels is presented in **Appendix A**.

A total of 39 people signed the attendance register, including 10 representatives from external agencies: Parks Canada, York Region, City of Pickering, and Durham Region. Out of the 39, 30 including five agency representatives attended the PIC event at the Markham Museum and nine including 5 agency representatives attended the PIC event at the Pickering Recreation Complex.

#### Summary of Comments Received

Comment sheets were available at PIC #1 for participants to record their issues and concerns. Participants were encouraged to complete the comment sheets at the PIC, or mail the comment sheets to the Study Team by May 15, 2015. A total of 19 comments were received by the Study Team with ten comment sheets completed at the PIC. Following the PIC, nine messages via the project website/e-mails were received by the Study Team during the comment period. Copies of the comment sheets/messages/e-mails are provided in



**Appendix A.** Nearly all comments and concerns were provided by residents of the Legacy Community located on the southwest quadrant of Highway 407 ETR and Ninth Line, very close to the proposed Ninth Line Station site, which is the only feasible site in the area. Concerns were generally related to traffic volumes, traffic safety, illegal parking on local roads and noise. The residents were informed that a traffic analysis and a detailed environmental field investigation would be undertaken through the summer and results and conclusions of the studies would be presented to the public at the second PIC or at an earlier meeting with the local residents’ association.

Letters responding to comments received during the PIC#1 comment period were sent by the Study Team on June 23, 2015. In general, the response noted that comments received were being considered and further studies were being conducted in order to refine the design of the Transitway. Results of these technical studies will be used in the Transitway design and will be presented at the next PIC. Members of the public will be kept informed of the study progress and notified of the second PIC. **Table 8.4** presents a summary of the comments received at PIC#1 and responses. As per the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, names of the members of the public were not provided.

In addition to comments above, there were comments regarding the Detail Design layouts of the 407 Transitway alignment and stations including issues related to a design charrette, railroad bed design, bike and walking trail, emergency evacuation, solar panels, etc. The Study Team will consider the feasibility of implementing these measures.

**TABLE 8.4: COMMENTS RECEIVED AT PIC #1 AND STUDY TEAM RESPONSES**

PERSON	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Person #1	<p>Problem with route for vehicular traffic – goes through our Legacy Community. Problems with it: Traffic problems already out of our area ONLY already. The chosen route for Ninth Line Station goes through one of these routes – making traffic worse for us.</p> <p>Option: Lands north of the water treatment facility on Box Grove Bypass and Rouge Bank (where Arista had sales office) is owned by city, not being used. This land could be used to create vehicular route into BRT station. This would allow people vehicular access to station via the Box Grove bypass directly, and preserve our community exit road of Rouge Bank. Also, <u>DO NOT</u> open access of Old Ninth Line to Station with this option and <u>DO NOT</u> put traffic lights at Old Ninth Line and Rouge Bank.</p> <p>2 sets of traffic lights <u>so close together</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rouge Bank &amp; Old Ninth Line (new)</li> <li>2. Rouge Bank &amp; Box Grove Bypass would be a disaster for our community in peak hours.</li> </ol> <p><u>Ninth Line Station</u></p> <p>Legacy community will not be happy with <u>access (car)</u> through Rouge Bank (Copper Creek). Ask City for triangle of land over water treatment facility to direct all traffic using Box Grove Bypass. Reasons: traffic out of Legacy community is already awful in peak times and access to station should be from a major street, NOT Legacy Community.</p>	<p>We appreciate your concern regarding adding traffic and a traffic signal to the point of access/exit to the residential subdivision (Rouge Bank). A traffic study is being conducted to assess road capacity and vehicular/pedestrian access alternatives, including an access north of the treatment plant</p> <p>Safety issues concerning proximity of the school will also be assessed as part of the traffic study.</p>
	<p><u>Concern</u></p> <p>“Phase 2” of Legacy Community too close to BRT line – NOISE??</p>	<p>A noise effects and mitigation assessment will be conducted to assess future noise impact with the addition of the Transitway facilities.</p>
	<p><u>Ninth Line and a Donald Cousins Parkway Station</u></p> <p>Why do we need Ninth Line and a Donald Cousins Parkway station? Donald Cousins Parkway has lands surrounding it that is protected green space (= no housing on that land). Why not put 1 station between 2 proposed stations? Access can be for both Ninth Line/Box Grove Bypass and 10<sup>th</sup> Line.</p> <p>Option is to put 1 station only on Copper Creek (between existing Walmart and Longo’s Plaza)</p>	<p>Other sites are being investigated to assess if there are any feasible options that have sufficient land availability to accommodate the station facility requirements. The suggested lot located between the Longo’s Plaza and Walmart is zoned for residential development. The request from the developer has been approved by both the City of Markham and the Region of York.</p>

TABLE 8.4: COMMENTS RECEIVED AT PIC #1 AND STUDY TEAM RESPONSES

PERSON	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	(beside proposed Nursing Home)	
Person #2	<p>As a resident of Legacy and a mother of young children I am extremely concerned that this project not only will impact our life style but will also impact the safety of my kids and other children in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>There are many large empty lots in the area that are close to 407 ETR, located further from residential area and closer to commercial area . Please explain the reason you selected the most well established and quite neighbourhood to build the bus terminal</p>	<p>The lots you are describing to the east of Ninth Line have been zoned by the City of Markham for residential development and are not available to be used for station facilities. The location that is selected as the preferred location has been chosen for several reasons; the lot size will accommodate all of the required station facilities, the site has been protected by the Ministry of Transportation for the purpose of a 407 Transitway station and as such will not need to be purchased. There are currently no identified environmental issues precluding the ability to use the site.</p>
	<p>You had mentioned in your previous email that kid’s safety will not be impacted. My concerns are as follows could you kindly address each?</p> <p>Russell Jarvis Dr, as the name implies, is a very narrow curvy road and this project will significantly impact the traffic. How do you expect to prevent cars from parking on the drive to drop passengers in front of the terminal? and prevent rushing drivers looking for alternative parking options from parking on the drive?</p>	<p>This concern is being investigated. The parking facilities will not be charging a fee so there will be no financial motivation for Transitway users to park on side streets. We will investigate a combination of speed control (speed bumps) and enforcement to develop an acceptable solution for the residents of the Legacy community and the local municipality.</p>
	<p>Speed limit on Russell Jarvis is 40 km/hr as it’s not only a residential street but also is a school zone street. Many kids walk on Russell Jarvis Dr. to get to and from the School and YMCA centre. What kind of security measures are considered in your project planning to ensure that pedestrians’ safety and speed limit will not be violated?</p>	<p>As mentioned above this concern will be investigated and a mutually acceptable solution will be developed.</p>
	<p>For houses surrounding the proposed bus terminal location, how would the noise impact be controlled and eliminated?</p>	<p>Throughout the summer months environmental field investigations will be taking place including a noise study. The results of this study will allow for the development of appropriate noise control measures.</p>
	<p>How would the fuel pollution impact on the neighbourhood be eliminated?</p>	<p>As part of the field studies, air quality will be assessed and a strategy for mitigation will be developed.</p>
	<p>Entrance and exit to Legacy community thru the old Ninth line is always jammed due to the layout of Box Grove Bypass. The proposed project will significantly increase the traffics especially during rush hours. How do you plan to accommodate the traffic load?</p>	<p>A traffic study is currently being performed to assess traffic impacts to the community. A proposed solution will be developed and presented to the community.</p>
Person #3	<p>On 9<sup>th</sup> Line I don’t think the residents (including myself) were expecting a large parking lot right up against their houses. Access is going to be a big issue – traffic is already very heavy in the neighbourhood. Option 2 is much preferable. Pray consider a plan “C” which puts the station on the eastside &amp; overflow predicting (much smaller lot) on the west side. Then you could have a much bigger beam to separate the houses. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment form received at the PIC held on April 15, 2015. In your comment form you expressed concerns in regards to the proposed Ninth Line Station. You have noted traffic impacts to your neighbourhood and suggested that consideration be given in locating the transitway station to the east of Ninth Line and have a smaller parking lot (overflow) on the west side of Ninth Line. Creating a station that is split across a significant roadway such as Ninth Line would represent a concern for pedestrian access as passengers parking in the overflow lot would need to cross Ninth Line to access the station facilities.</p> <p>We appreciate your concern regarding accessing the site and adding traffic to the point of access/exit to the residential subdivision (Rouge Bank). A traffic study is being conducted to assess road capacity and vehicular/pedestrian access alternatives.</p> <p>Sufficient land availability to accommodate the station facilities east of Ninth Line is a challenge. Further assessment will be carried out through the summer and results will be informed to the residents accordingly.</p>
Person #4	<p>I live in a Heritage house that will be affected by this transit corridor. When can I expect to hear how my situation will be handled? I have already met with my deputy mayor and MMP regarding this matter. I have been evicted from this house 6 times in the past for “407 USE”. It has caused very much stress to me over the years and to my husband and 4 children who have lived in this house for 23 years. I fought to save this house starting back in June ’97. You can’t imagine what this has done to me and my family.</p> <p>I expect to get a form letter back although I can hope for something more informative about my</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment form received at the PIC held on April 15, 2015.</p> <p>MTO will conduct a heritage assessment of the property during this summer. The evaluation will be reviewed upon completion of the heritage assessment, and the MTO will communicate with you accordingly.</p>

TABLE 8.4: COMMENTS RECEIVED AT PIC #1 AND STUDY TEAM RESPONSES

PERSON	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	family's future.	
Person #5	I support the SW alternative for the Markham Road station site plan.	Comment noted.
Person #6	9 <sup>th</sup> Line station → please ensure you include 14 <sup>th</sup> avenue between Markham Road & 9 <sup>th</sup> Line as part of the traffic study.	Comment noted.
Person #7	Excellent presentation – please continue to keep Markham residents informed.	Comment noted.
Person #8	Many issues surrounding the 9 <sup>th</sup> Line station alternative (One that is attached to Sub-division)	Thank you for comment form received at the PIC held on April 15, 2015.
	<p>A. TRAFFIC It should not run on old 9<sup>th</sup> Line – the light you are proposing will debilitate the community. We will not be able to get in or out of our community.</p> <p>Suggestion: Entry to the proposed parking lot should at this site come directly off the Box Grove Bypass and eliminate the lights.</p> <p>Make a larger station between Walmart and to the West of Walmart and avoid the station above altogether.</p> <p>Create an overpass from Box Grove Bypass into the parking lot/station at this site.</p>	<p>A. Traffic study is being undertaken to assess the impacts the proposed station will have to the community and potential solutions will be assessed. This option will be assessed in the traffic study.</p> <p>The MTO Team has investigated this possibility. The land referenced has already been designated for town home construction by the City of Markham. This land is not available for a station.</p> <p>The suggestion will be assessed in the traffic study.</p>
	<p>B. Community Impact</p> <p>Traffic will come to a standstill.</p> <p>Walkways from our area to the lot to increase ridership will create parking problems on our streets. They will park for free on our streets and avoid the payment in the parking lot.</p> <p>Sound barriers need to be better constructed for what already abuts the 407. Sound is easily heard right now. It needs to be enhanced to protect the community.</p> <p>Beautification of (1) The Berm (2) The Station (3) The Parking Lot.</p>	<p>B. The parking lots will not charge a fee to park and ride similar to the GO lots. Potential control measures will be discussed with the City of Markham to address concerns of commuters parking on local streets.</p> <p>A noise assessment study will be undertaken throughout the summer. The results of the study will indicate what mitigation measures may be required.</p> <p>Landscaping will be a design component of the project.</p>
	<p>C. Is there enough projected density to put so many stations close together? For instance the Box Grove Bypass was built but nobody uses it at all despite density increasing north of Highway 7.</p>	<p>C. This is a long term study that will be implemented in several stages as density and ridership demand increases.</p>
	<p>D. Business/Job Development</p> <p>Would it not make sense to eliminate this station altogether and put a much larger one West of Walmart? It would speed economic development to East Markham and get better traffic usage for the Box Grove Bypass which is underutilized.</p>	<p>D. As indicated in "A. Suggestion"; has been zoned by the City of Markham for town houses; consequently is not available for a station site.</p>
	<p>E. 2 weeks ago we met with Deputy Mayor Jarek Heath. Question was asked about this corridor. He said there is nothing going on??? Why is the city not abreast of this information? I asked whether you knew about TACC's application to enhance density from going Commercial to Residential between Longo's and Walmart. The individual had no idea. SEEMS LIKE THERE IS A LACK OF COMMUNICATION. WE NEED TO KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON.</p>	<p>E. The MTO Team has been in contact with the City of Markham staff from the outset of the project. Your question will be forwarded to City staff</p>
	<p>F. If you are going to encroach our subdivision, what will you do to ensure that our community setting does not decline? (1) Trees, shrubs, etc. (2) Sound barriers. (3) Pollution from buses and cars that are coming into the area.</p>	<p>F. Landscaping will be a design component of the project. Noise and air quality effects and mitigation will also be analyzed as part on the Environmental Assessment process.</p>

TABLE 8.4: COMMENTS RECEIVED AT PIC #1 AND STUDY TEAM RESPONSES

PERSON	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	G. Do you know about the re-application by TACC to change the designation of land between Longo's and Walmart from Commercial to High Density? How will this change where the stations will be located?	G. The new designation precludes considering a station at this location.
	H. TRAFFIC We will be blocked in the morning and evening getting into our community. We are bound by the environment. Small bridge to the South. 14 <sup>th</sup> is blocked in the morning. Only way out is to go via Box Grove Bypass. Current plans you have on your board will make it impossible to get out of our area during rush hour. Please suggest alternative plans.	H. A traffic study is being undertaken to evaluate potential impacts and proposed solutions. Alternative access solutions will be studied.
	I. Runway Size How big is it? How fast will buses be coming in for noise?	I. The runningway ranges from 12.5m between stations to 19.5m. at stations. Speed will vary from 60kph to 100kph.
	J. FLOODING CAUSED BY PARKING LOT DEVELOPMENT.	J. A stormwater management study is being undertaken for the complete facility (runningway and stations).
	K. How are you going to put 2 lands between the 407 and the most northern part of our community? Currently the backyards have the berm in them and it drops to the 407. How are you going to protect these citizens? Just a wall.	K. A noise study is being undertaken to determine impacts of the Transitway on the local community. Mitigation measures will be developed based on the results.
	L. Eliminate 9 <sup>th</sup> Line Station altogether, eliminate station to the east of 9 <sup>th</sup> Line also. CREATE A MUCH LARGER STATION BETWEEN CREEK TO THE EAST OF LONGO'S AND THE WEST OF THE CREEK LOCATED BY WALMART! WHY? Box Grove Bypass has 4 lanes already. Copper Creek is also already 4 lands. (Traffic will be better to this area and the capacity is already there).  At the moment these streets are never used. It will bring people to the area which will also create work job opportunities for the people of Markham as it will be a much better HUB. Markham created the Donald Cousins Bypass to decrease traffic congestion. At present nobody uses it. It would help if the city and your group spoke surrounding traffic capacity issues. Also, close to the Havelock Line which could be electrified to get you to Downtown Toronto. At the moment Markham's road plan has failed; this will help the plan develop.	L. The land west of the Walmart is not available for a station. It has been zoned by the City of Markham for town houses.  Your concern will be forwarded to the City of Markham. If and when the Havelock line serves passengers (GO Transit), there will likely be an intermodal station at the intersection of the Transitway and the railway line.
Person #9	Putting a transit hub in the middle of a quiet residential neighborhood vs. a commercial area across the street is counter intuitive. The proposed use of the old ninth line road to access the station will worsen an already bad traffic problem in the rouge bank - box grove by-pass area.	We appreciate your concern regarding adding traffic to the collector road (Rouge Bank). A traffic study is being conducted to assess road capacity and vehicular/pedestrian access alternatives.
	Furthermore, overflow parking will become problematic for the residents with commuters parking on streets when the parking lot is full. There is ample overflow parking already available in the commercial area. Plus, the retail shops may see an increase in shoppers given the convenience of stepping off the train/bus and getting groceries on the way to their car.	Overflow parking on the local streets is a concern that is being investigated. The parking facilities will not be charging a fee so there will be no financial motivation for Transitway users to park on side streets. We will however, investigate a combination of speed control (speed bumps) and enforcement to develop an acceptable solution for the residents of the Legacy community.
	Please consider the residents of the Legacy neighborhood when making the decision to disrupt their quiet streets and make it even more difficult for us to leave our neighborhood to run our own errands. I don't need stand that we also need to consider the environment when making these decisions. Instead of using such a large footprint of land for parking, please consider the alternative or perhaps a multi-level parking garage. Similar to the GO Centennial Station. I am sure there are many more options that I have not thought of, granted all come at varying costs. At the end of the day it comes down to priorities of the neighborhood and environment to satisfy the needs of public transit in an expanding and growing GTA.	Structured parking has excessive cost implications. If land for surface parking is available, the MTO will not consider structured parking; nonetheless, the number of vehicles and consequent traffic issues will not be less with a structured parking.
Person #10	I am a resident of Legacy at 9th line and the 407. One of my concerns is traffic congestion. During rush hours the traffic is backed up on Rougebank drive. Cannot imagine traffic joining in from the north of old ninth line and the all the pollution that will happen as idling cars wait to get out.	We appreciate your concern regarding adding traffic to the collector road (Rouge Bank). A traffic study is being conducted to assess road capacity and vehicular/pedestrian access alternatives.

TABLE 8.4: COMMENTS RECEIVED AT PIC #1 AND STUDY TEAM RESPONSES

PERSON	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>Another concern is noise from buses, traffic and parking lot.</p> <p>Third is the light pollution that will leak over into our houses and into the Rouge valley, disturbing night cycles of animals and humans.</p> <p>Four concern the walk ways that will only lead into our neighbourhood. More people will look for new parking spots on our streets. We don't have sidewalks so having more cars parked on the road adds to the danger to our children &amp; others walking.</p>	<p>Field investigations including noise, air quality and environmental studies will take place throughout the summer months. A strategy for mitigation will be developed.</p> <p>Overflow parking on the local streets is a concern that is being investigated. The parking facilities will not be charging a fee so there will be no financial motivation for Transitway users to park on side streets. We will however, investigate a combination of speed control (speed bumps) and enforcement to develop an acceptable solution for the residents of the Legacy community.</p>
<p>Person #11</p>	<p>We are writing on behalf of the Legacy Community Ratepayers' Association, which supports the Legacy community, located on the east side of Markham, Ontario. Our neighbourhood sits between Old Ninth Line and the Rouge River, just to the south of the 407 ETR and north of 14th Avenue. We are writing to you today to provide some initial feedback on the Ninth Line Station - Site Alternatives slide of the presentation made available on the 407 Transitway website. As indicated on the maps, Legacy is the residential neighbourhood directly adjacent to the preferred alternative for the Ninth Line Station. We would like to thank you for the presentation you made earlier in April, and for the detailed slides posted to the 407 Transitway website. The slides in particular are very helpful in understanding the details behind the proposed transit stops. Having reviewed the slides and solicited some preliminary feedback from our membership and residents, we have some initial concerns to share regarding the "preferred" option, using the land directly north of Legacy to serve as the Ninth Line Station. We hope that this represents the beginning of a productive dialogue. We welcome the incorporation of better public transportation in the area, but want to ensure that our community setting is preserved as the process moves forward.</p> <p>Our primary concern is with the proposed access point to the Ninth Line transit station and parking lot. Legacy already struggles with traffic infiltration, with traffic using Legacy Drive and Rouge Bank as a means for "cutting through" when traveling between 14th Avenue and Ninth Line. Apart from more traffic, we find that infiltrators have a very difficult time with the 40 km/hour speed limit in Legacy, which creates safety concerns in our child-infused, residential neighbourhood.</p> <p>As we look at the broader plan, the Ninth Line station appears to host one of the bigger parking lots compared to nearby stations, where the sole proposed access point is directly adjacent to Legacy at Old Ninth Line and Rouge Bank Drive. Looking into the future, we cannot help but envision that drivers in a hurry to leave the transit station looking to head west on 14th will follow the path of least resistance and zip right through Legacy to get there. This is a major concern. A key concept of the Box Grove Bypass was to take traffic away from existing neighbourhoods and the Hamlet of Box Grove, to lands that were yet to be developed. Accordingly, future residential development was constructed to accommodate the busy thoroughfare. The proposed access point to the Ninth Line Station parking lot works directly against this concept – traffic is directed into the heart of the existing residential area. We are also gravely concerned about the safety of Legacy residents, particularly our children. First, Legacy Public School is situated a short block to the west of the proposed access point to the transit station. Every day people walk to school from all over Legacy, and down the hill from the Box Grove neighbourhood. Second, a large (10 hectare) public park breaks ground next year just a short block to the east of the proposed access point (just above Pagnello Court). The park is going to be a major attraction for Legacy residents, increasing the pedestrian "draw" right through the transit hub intersection. Third, this intersection is one of only three ways for pedestrians to walk into or out of the Legacy neighbourhood, with this route in particular being heavy with pedestrian traffic since it leads to the busy, popular plaza and medical centre on the other side of Boxgrove Bypass. Add that all up</p>	<p>Please note that the main purpose of the consultation session was to introduce the project and present preliminary findings and conclusions of the "planning stage" of the project, in regards to alignment alternatives, potential station location sites and initial recommended sites. Public input, detailed field investigations, traffic studies and environmental impacts/mitigation assessment will be analyzed prior to defining the proposed solutions that will be carried on to the Environmental Assessment process.</p> <p>Your concern regarding adding traffic to the collector road (Rouge Bank) is understood. A traffic study is being conducted to assess road capacity and vehicular/pedestrian access alternatives to the site.</p> <p>Safety issues concerning proximity of the school will also be assessed as part of the traffic study.</p> <p>It is important to note that the vehicular access options to the station site, will not include the local streets of the subdivision.</p>

TABLE 8.4: COMMENTS RECEIVED AT PIC #1 AND STUDY TEAM RESPONSES

PERSON	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	and then insert a busy parking lot, where people rush in each morning to catch the train or bus, and rush out again in the afternoon to beat the traffic out of the lot. Many of us use the area GO stations every morning and evening, and can say through first-hand observation that pedestrian safety is the LAST thing on the minds of commuters trying to get in to or out of the transit parking lot.	
Person #12	Concerns regarding traffic and associated safety concerns in relation to the proposed Ninth Line Station.	Your concern with respect to traffic and safety within the community is being investigated. A traffic study is being conducted to assess road capacity and vehicular/pedestrian access alternatives to the site. The parking facilities will not be charging a fee so there will be no financial motivation for Transitway users to park on side streets. We will investigate a combination of speed control (speed bumps) and enforcement to develop an acceptable solution for the residents of the Legacy community. Proposed solutions will be developed and presented to the community
Person #13	Need for sound and visual barricades that will match with Legacy community's aesthetics, installation of speed bumps along Russell Jarvis Dr. to reduce high speeding traffic, mitigation to the existing traffic congestion along 14 <sup>th</sup> Avenue, and overnight parking enforcement in the community.	Please note that a noise study will be conducted which will identify what mitigation measures may be required. A traffic study will be conducted to assess impacts to the community and will allow the team to develop viable alternatives and mitigation measures. A combination of speed control (speed bumps) and enforcement to develop an acceptable solution for the residents of the Legacy community will be investigated.
Person #14	<b>Design Charette:</b> Has there been a design charette with Markham, Durham, VIVA and Go to figure how all the roads and rail lines are going to integrate together in addition to the traffic lights?	There has not been a design charrette as such; however, the 407 Transitway project team has been and will continue coordinating with the municipalities and transit agencies to discuss transit integration and design matters.
	<b>Railroad Bed Design:</b> I know that the plan was to have buses run first and then convert it to LRT lines, but in order to minimize future construction disruption I think that the railroad bed should be installed and then paved over for the buses; then when it comes time to do the LRT the asphalt can be removed and the rail lines installed.	An imbedded track bed (suitable for LRT) could be built at once; however the cost difference with a conventional asphalt pavement road structure is vast. The design of the Transitway is for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), considering provisions for a technology conversion to Light Rapid Transit (LRT). Certainty and timing of the conversion are unknown; consequently, huge investment at this time is not considered viable.
	<b>Retrofit from Bus to LRT:</b> The design should be planned out ahead of time and different logistical scenarios run in order to minimize the expense and time required to convert the transitway from a bus line to a rail line.	Please refer to response to question No 2.
	<b>Electric Lines/Trains:</b> What planning has been done to allow for the future operation of electric buses or more especially electric rail lines?	The Transitway design is making provisions for future Light Rapid Transit (LRT) which is electrified.
	<b>Parallel Bike Trail:</b> I see that there will be bicycle parking at the stations, has any thought been given to creating a bike trail parallel to the transitway, this could serve as a major biking backbone across the top of the city?	This is an interesting suggestion which feasibility from a design, operation, safety and cost perspectives may be assessed following internal discussions on the matter.
	<b>Parallel Walking Trail:</b> Similar thought for walking, but this may be making things too wide; however consideration should be made to tying some locations into park systems and local hiking trails, so that people could use the transitway to access them.	Please refer to response to question No 5.
	<b>Resilience in Case of Failure:</b> What planning has there been in terms of failure of the rail line, temporary failure of a train, a major accident or the failure of a bridge? Once the rail lines have been installed will you still have bus infrastructure in place so that buses can be used on a temporary basis?	There will be access points along the Transitway as a requirement of the design for emergency vehicle access. The preliminary design of the Transitway for LRT operation, will include failure management considerations. The type of track bed (either embedded track or tie in ballast) will be assessed and designed when and if the Transitway is converted to rail service. Embedded track also allows for vehicular operation but the cost difference with tie in ballast track is huge. Note that in emergency cases, when and if LRT operates on the runningway, buses can always serve using Highway 407.
	<b>Area Emergency Evacuation:</b> How can both the transitway and the 407 ETR be quickly converted into no charge emergency evacuation routes so that if there was a natural disaster or railway chemical spill/fire that required immediate area evacuation, they could be used?	Your question is not being assessed as part of this project.
	<b>Station Platforms:</b> Are these platforms going to be designed so that they can service both rail lines	Yes. The platforms are being designed to satisfy both sets of design criteria

TABLE 8.4: COMMENTS RECEIVED AT PIC #1 AND STUDY TEAM RESPONSES

PERSON	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	and buses and that there will be handicapped access in both situations?	
	<b>Integration with other Bus/Rail Lines:</b> Is there going to be physical links with other transit buses in the stations?	Yes. There will be.
	<b>Integrated Pass System:</b> Is there going to be an integrated fare or at least a pass system with the other methods of transit, Go and Viva etc?	That is the plan.
	<b>Control Centre:</b> Is there going to be a control center for the transitway monitoring the progress of the buses/LTR and the situation at the stations so that the passengers can be informed when the next bus/LTR is expected to arrive and maintenance can be dispatched if there are any problems?	Yes. The main control center for the Transitway will be located at the central yard at Jane Street.
	<b>Parking/Bike Racks:</b> Would like to see more details about this in the next Public Information Centre event.	This will be presented at the following PIC
	<b>Animal Bypass:</b> All the 27 river crossings should be designed to minimize the impact to animals using the river valleys as their north-south transit ways.	The project team is working with TRCA and Parks Canada to minimize its impact to the surrounding environment. River crossings will have very similar characteristics of the Highway 407 bridges over water crossings.
	<b>Native North American Plants:</b> All plants and trees that are planted along the transitway should be native North American plants; the North American Native Plant Society (www.nanps.org) may be able to recommend some people who can provide advice.	Thank you for your suggestion, it will be provided to our Landscape Architect.
	<b>Solar Panels on Station Roofs:</b> There should be solar panels on that station roofs and possibly a car canopies in the parking lot, the electric power could be used to provide snow/ice melting on the station platforms when needed and then be fed back into the grid the rest of the time.	Thank you for your suggestion, it will be provided to our Station Architect.
Person #15	I'm a resident of the Whitevale community in north Pickering and I've recently received your notice about the 407 Transitway study. I can't attend the PICs, but could you please add me to your contact list? I'm wondering if our home will be affected by the proposed BRT/LRT and I'd like to be apprised of updates by email or mail if possible.	Thank you for your email. Your property is situated outside of the project study area and is not expected to be affected by the proposed Bus Rapid Transit/Light Rail Transit facility (407 Transitway). We have added your name to our contact list and you will be kept apprised about the project as it moves forward.
Person #16	Is there a website where I can access the boards that were shown at the April 15 PIC at the Markham Museum. I am particularly interested in obtaining those regarding the Markham station for display at our Vinegar Hill Ratepayers Association meeting, representing residents from Hwy 7 south on Markham Rd. to the 407.	An automatic notice of website update was sent on April 20, 2015.
	I write again to inquire whether you can direct me to or send me a copy of the display boards regarding the proposed station at Markham Road South that were displayed at the April 15 PIC at the Markham Museum.  The purpose of this is to advise the members of the Vinegar Hill Ratepayers Association which extends on Main St South from Hwy 7 to the 407.	Please note that the display boards are available for your download on the project's website. The following link should take you to the page where PIC #1 Presentation Panels link is available. <a href="http://www.407transitway.com/KennedyToBrock/consultation.html">http://www.407transitway.com/KennedyToBrock/consultation.html</a>

### 8.4.3.2. Public Information Centre #2

The PIC #2 was held at the following two locations:

June 22, 2016 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Claremont Community Centre Lions Room 4941 Old Brock Road Claremont, Ontario L1Y 1A9	June 23, 2016 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Markham Museum Main Building 9350 Markham Road Markham, Ontario L3P 3J3
--	--

The purpose of the PIC #2 was to present the updated technically preferred alignment and stations, and impacts and mitigation measures. Project stakeholders, including First Nations and Métis communities and organizations, local service board/committee staff, elected officials, government agencies, and other interested agencies were invited by letter to attend the PIC from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. Invitations to the pre-PIC meeting (along with copies of the Notice of PIC and PIC Brochure) were mailed on June 6-7, 2016. The purpose of this pre-PIC meeting was to provide an opportunity for affected stakeholders to review the detail design study prior to the PIC and to communicate any issues or concerns to the Study Team in a candid manner.

Displays and exhibits available during the PIC included:

- scaled plans and profile showing the station locations and technically preferred alignment; and,
- various text displays describing the purpose of the PIC, introduction to the 407 Transitway, project objective, an outline of the TPAP, project schedule, background plan and policy information, corridor growth, service concept, ridership study, 407 Transitway infrastructure characteristics, preferred alignment and station configuration, preferred alternatives of each of the stations and its characteristics, protected sites and its rationale, potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures, next steps, Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy and Team contact information with an invitation to provide comments on the study.

A copy of the PIC#2 display panels is presented in **Appendix A**.

A total of 37 people signed the attendance register, including 14 representatives from external agencies: IO, York Region, City of Markham, and Durham Region. Out of the 37 people, 28 including four agency representatives attended the PIC event at the Markham Museum and nine including four agency representatives attended the PIC event at the Claremont Community Centre.

#### Summary of Comments Received

Comment sheets were available at the PIC #2 for participants to record their issues and concerns. Participants

were encouraged to complete the comment sheets at the PIC #2, or mail the comment sheets to the Study Team by July 25, 2016. A total of seven comments were received by the Study Team. Six comment sheets were completed at the PIC #2. After the PIC #2, one message via the project website/e-mails was received by the Study Team during the comment period. Copies of the comment sheets/messages/e-mails are provided in **Appendix A**.

Most of the PIC attendees were interested in reviewing and gaining an understanding of the proposed 407 Transitway. The majority of the comments received were from residents living around the proposed Ninth Line Station. The comments noted that the addition of the Donald Cousens Station will address traffic concerns at Ninth Line Station. Please note that Donald Cousens Station was revisited and added to the preliminary design as a response to comments received at the first PIC.

**Table 8.5** presents the specific responses to all formal comments received prior to, during and following the PIC #2. The responses to comments received were mailed on December 20, 2016.

Representatives of the properties identified as facing potential property impacts attended the PIC #2. Members of the Study Team explained the details of the potential impacts. After the PIC #2, a letter from representatives of one of the properties was received on August 15, 2016 and September 19, 2016. The letter noted their concerns and requested to continue with communication to address this matter. The Study Team responded on September 22, 2016 by requesting potential dates that the representatives of the property would be available for a meeting to discuss this matter. A meeting was held on October 25, 2016 to discuss the study and property interests. It was concluded that MTO will conduct further consultation during the Detail Design phase of this study to investigate in greater detail possible design refinements to avoid or minimize property impacts.



TABLE 8.5: COMMENTS RECEIVED AT PIC #2 AND STUDY TEAM RESPONSES

PERSON	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Person #17	<p>Thank you for taking into consideration the needs of the Legacy Community at the 9<sup>th</sup> Line Station. We appreciated it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It is imperative that the optional right in right out access to off the Box Grove By Pass (sic)</li> <li>2) Thanks for putting in the Donald Cousens Parkway Station in the plan. It will change the traffic scenario</li> <li>3) Please consider the burms (sic) for the community and install them and not make them optional!</li> <li>4) Still have an issue with bicycle access from Prim Rose Path as it may encourage people to park just south of the station</li> </ol>	<p>The importance of the right-in right-out access to the Ninth Line Station is noted. A berm on the south side of the Ninth Line Station is being included in the station design. Bicycle access to the station will be reviewed and discussed with the City of Markham during the Detail Design phase of the project.</p>
Person #18	<p>I believe the earth berm on 9th Line is very important. I live right across from where it is and it will mean I don't have to stare into the station or hear the noise. I also think the "optional" right-in and right-out access is important to reduce traffic on our main road – Rouge Bank Drive. It is also very important to build Donald Cousins Station to reduce congestion on Ninth Line.</p>	<p>The preliminary design of the transitway runningway will maintain most of the existing berm. Additionally, a noise barrier will be constructed on top of the berm to compensate any loss of noise mitigation due to the removal of part of the berm. Further noise analysis will be conducted during subsequent stages of the 407 Transitway project. Thank you for your comments on the right-in right-out access at Box Grove By-pass, and the implementation of Donald Cousens Station, both measures are important to minimize disturbance to the Ninth Line community.</p>
Person #19	<p>Please send me a copy of the future private lands to be required at 407 and Donald Cousens. I am looking specifically for the area located west of Donald Cousens.</p>	<p>At PIC #2, we had discussed the potential impacts to your property on either side of Donald Cousens Parkway (DCP). Since PIC #2, the design of the runningway cross section has been adjusted to avoid encroachment into parcel 030653680 located west of DCP. Impact to parcel 030653681 located east of DCP caused by the access road to Donald Cousens Station is illustrated on the enclosed drawing.</p>
Person #20	<p><i>The following comment was rephrased to assist clarity</i> <b>Preference for more green space and to release less lands for development. Transitway should be constructed as soon as possible and to advertise the transitway to the current users of the GO Bus services travelling along Highway 407 ETR. Consideration for neighbourhood bike/jogging trail along the transitway.</b></p>	<p>The usage of the lands not being impacted by the Transitway facility will be determined following the conclusion of the Environmental Assessment and falls outside the scope of the current project. The timing for construction of the Transitway depends on funding and demand. Please note that implementation of neighbourhood bike/jogging trails falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Markham.</p>
Person #21	<p>Should be light rail (electric) from day one. Best long term transit solution.</p>	<p>The Transitway is currently being planned as a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) facility with potential to be converted to Light Rail (LRT) in the future when demand warrants. The design of the facility accommodates both facilities to ease the transition whenever it occurs.</p>
Person #22	<p>Noise Study – (407 &amp; Kennedy) We are residents of Unionville community. This public session was useful but I would like to learn more about the noise barrier and noise study conducted by the panel. I live at the intersection of 407 &amp; Kennedy. My property is beside the proposed site. The 407 traffic generates enough noise when windows are left open, mostly during the non-snow seasons. Hence, noise is our major concern.</p>	<p>The noise study for this project was conducted based on the Ministry of Transportation's (MTO) requirements in the Environmental Guide for Noise and the Environmental Reference for Highway Design. The study modelling to project the future conditions of the corridor including the Highway 407 and the 407 Transitway in order to assess noise impacts. Under MTO Noise Assessment Criteria, if the change in noise levels above ambient is less than 5 dBA and if the projected noise levels with the proposed Transitway are less than 65 dBA, no mitigation effort is required. The noise study indicated that the projected sound levels with the 407 transitway implementation will remain under 65 dBA for operations either as a busway or as light rapid transit, and the incremental change is expected to be less than the MTO criteria of 5 dBA. In conclusion, following MTO's criteria, mitigation measures are not required in the Highway 407 and Kennedy Road area.</p> <p>Please note that at this point, the construction of the 407 Transitway is uncertain. When the decision to construct the 407 Transitway project is determined, the project will go through a Detail Design phase in which a noise assessment will be updated to review impacts at that time.</p>
Person #23	<p><i>This comment was received through the study website</i> Hi when will this be built? What is the status?</p>	<p>Please note that the Planning and Preliminary Design stage for this study has been completed. The study has completed the transit project assessment process (TPAP) under the <i>Ontario Regulation 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings</i>. The Environmental Project Report documenting the results of this study is now available on the project website for a 30-day review period starting December 29, 2016. Please note that the timing for construction of the Transitway depends on funding and demand.</p>