

Section 7 - Communication and Consultation Process

7. Communication and Consultation Process

This chapter documents the communication and consultation activities that took place for the Scarborough Subway Extension (SSE). An extensive communication and consultation program was undertaken for the SSE in order to meet and exceed the requirements of Ontario Regulation 231/08 and to inform the community and seek feedback on various aspects of the Project.

The consultation and communication program was broken into four formal rounds of communication and consultation - three as part of preliminary planning and one under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP). This Chapter has been organized such that **Section 7.3** provides a summary of consultation that occurred during preliminary planning (also identified as Phases 1 to 3) while **Section 7.4** focuses on the details of consultation that occurred during the TPAP.

The City of Toronto and Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) were committed to engaging stakeholders, property owners, agencies, Indigenous communities and the public in a transparent, collaborative, inclusive and authentic manner throughout the Project. A variety of communication, information-sharing and consultation tools and events were used to ensure easy and accessible participation in the Project, and to gather meaningful feedback. A [Public Consultation Plan](#) outlining the communication and consultation program was developed at the beginning of the Project and was shared with stakeholders and members of the public to gather input during early stages of preliminary planning of the SSE.

The consultation program was initiated in January 2015 and continued through to the submission of this Environmental Project Report (EPR).

7.1 Approach to Communication and Consultation

Community input was integral to this Project; as such, the City of Toronto and TTC were committed to engaging the community in a way that embraced the following principles:

- Inclusiveness – engaged the widest possible audience through multiple consultation opportunities;
- Timeliness – offered early and ongoing opportunities for participation well before decisions were made;
- Transparency – records of all consultation activities were made available to the public;
- Balance – provided opportunities for diverse perspectives and opinions to be raised and considered;
- Flexibility – adapted as required to meet the needs of participants; and,
- Traceability – demonstrated the impact of participant input on decision making.

The extensive communication and consultation program included a number of in-person and online tools and activities to make it easy for the community to get involved and provide feedback. Clear, easy-to-understand and engaging information and content that focused on the key messages and technical aspects of the SSE was incorporated into each of the tools. These included:

- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) were developed to address questions about the Project and specific aspects of each phase.
- A variety of advertising was used to notify the community about activities and consultation opportunities during each phase, including:
 - Notifications and information on the following websites: City of Toronto, TTC, www.scarboroughsubwayextension.ca, reliefline.ca, toronto.ca/smartrack;
 - Advertisements in the following local and traditional newspapers: 24 Hours, Metro, The Scarborough Mirror, Etobicoke Guardian, Beach-Riverdale Mirror, East York Mirror, Sing Tao, (Chinese newspaper) Ming Pao (Mandarin) Corriere Canadese (Italian), Sol Portuguese (Portuguese), El Popular (Spanish), Philippine Reporter (Tagalog) and Thamilar Senthamarai (Tamil newspaper);
 - Advertisements posted on Pattison One Stop (TTC subway stations);
 - Emails and electronic newsletters sent to the Project email list;
 - Fliers distributed to schools in Scarborough;
 - Posters distributed to all Toronto libraries, community centres and public buildings such as Civic Centres;
 - Postcards distributed at Scarborough Centre Station; and,
 - Media releases to the City's media release mailing list.
- E-newsletters were used to inform those on the Project contact list about Project activities and consultation opportunities.
- The Project website was developed and regularly updated to provide useful information about the Project, including invitations to consultation opportunities. www.scarboroughsubwayextension.ca
- Online consultation was provided through the Project website, giving community members the opportunity to provide comments and feedback online and through social media (Twitter).
- Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) meetings were held to provide SAG members the opportunity to review the results of the preliminary analysis of corridors and provide feedback on potential alignments.
- An interactive workshop was held for SAG members to inform the corridor analysis.
- Public meetings were held within the Study Area and across Toronto, giving the public an opportunity to discuss the Project with the Study Team and provide comments.
- Formal notifications were distributed during the TPAP (see **Section 7.4**).

Communication and Consultation Process

By offering numerous opportunities for involvement in the Project, many comments were received to inform the recommendation of the preferred alignment and station location.

Details of each of the online and in-person tools and activities, as well as documentation of the extensive public feedback during preliminary planning, can be found in the Phase Consultation Reports:

- [Phase 1 Public Consultation Report](#)
- [Phase 2 Public Consultation Report](#)
- [Phase 3 Public Consultation Report \(February/ March 2016\)](#)
- [Phase 3 Public Consultation Report \(June 2016\)](#)

The consultation activities that were undertaken and the feedback that was received during the TPAP are documented in **Section 7.4**.

7.2 Types of Stakeholders Consulted

The communications and consultation program included outreach to a number of different people and groups, including:

- General Public – included people from Scarborough and across the City of Toronto;
- Directly Affected Property Owners;
- Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) – included representatives from the City’s transportation planning and community planning groups, TTC, Metrolinx among others (see **Section 7.3.4** for a list of TAC members);
- Government Review Team (GRT) – included municipal, provincial and federal agencies that may have a potential interest in the SSE (see **Section 7.3.5** for a list of GRT agencies);
- Indigenous Communities (see **Section 7.3.6** for a list of Aboriginal Indigenous Communities); and,
- Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) – included individuals from organizations representing a broad range of stakeholder interests (community / neighbourhood, businesses, institutions, professional interest and transit-oriented groups) (see Section 7.3.7 for a list of SAG members).

7.3 Consultation During Preliminary Planning

This section provides a summary of consultation undertaken during the preliminary planning of the SSE, by stakeholder type.

7.3.1 General Public

There was a strong presence of public opinion and input throughout preliminary planning, both in person at the public meetings as well as online and via phone / email. Between January 2015 and June 2016, nearly 800 people attended the 21 public meetings and have expressed keen interest and feedback. In addition to public meetings, the City of Toronto also maintained a strong online presence, and has a phone line and email address available to gather public input related to the SSE. The following sections provide an overview of the

format and attendance of these consultations, as well as a summary of the feedback received. As noted above, further details regarding the consultation and communication program undertaken during preliminary planning and the extensive public feedback received are provided in the [Phase 1, Phase 2, Phase 3 February/ March 2016](#), and [Phase 3 June 2016 Public Consultation Reports](#).

7.3.1.1 Public Meetings

Public meetings were held throughout the preliminary planning phases to provide an opportunity for the public to learn about and provide their feedback on various aspects of the study. **Table 7-1** provides a summary of the public meetings held between January 2015 and June 2016.

Table 7-1: Summary of Public Meetings

Phase	Date and Time of Consultation	Venue	Format
1	January 31, 2015 10AM - 12:30PM	Jean Vanier Catholic Secondary School	The format of the events included a presentation by the Director of Transportation Planning. The presentation was followed by a question and answer (Q&A) session, after which attendees were invited to carry on the conversation with Study Team while viewing the information boards. At the meeting, attendees were also invited to provide their thoughts and ideas related to key questions posed at multiple points throughout the Open House. Attendees posted multiples comments directly on information boards and maps, or used the Discussion Guide provided to give their feedback.
	February 2, 2015 7PM - 9PM	Scarborough Civic Centre	
2	June 13, 2015 9:30AM - 12:30PM	Burnhamthorpe Collegiate Institute	During this phase, eight public consultation events were held to provide information and gather feedback about four key interrelated transit projects in the City of Toronto – SmartTrack, GO Regional Express Rail, Relief Line and the Scarborough Subway Extension. The public meetings followed an interactive Open House format. At the beginning of the event a presentation was provided by a representative of the City of Toronto. The presentation was followed by a Q&A session, after which attendees were invited to carry on the conversation with Study Team while viewing the information boards. At the meeting, attendees were also invited to provide their thoughts and ideas related to key questions posed at multiple points throughout the Open House. Attendees posted multiples comments directly on information boards and maps, or used the Discussion Guide provided to give their feedback.
	June 15, 2015 6:30PM - 9:30PM	Estonian House	
	June 17, 2015 6:30PM - 9:30PM	Spring Garden Church	
	June 18, 2015 6:30PM - 9:30PM	Archbishop Romero Catholic SS	
	June 20, 2015 9:30AM - 12:30PM	Hyatt Regency Hotel	
	June 22, 2015 6:30PM - 9:30PM	Winston Churchill Collegiate Institute	
	June 24, 2015 6:30PM - 9:30PM	Scarborough Civic Centre	
	June 25, 2015 6:30PM - 9:30PM	Riverdale Collegiate Institute	

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-1: Summary of Public Meetings

Phase	Date and Time of Consultation	Venue	Format
3 (February / March 2016)	February 20, 2016 6:30PM - 8:30PM	Jean Vanier Secondary School	Seven public consultation events were held to provide information on transit planning across Toronto. Metrolinx co-hosted these public meetings with the City of Toronto, presenting information about GO Regional Express Rail (RER) including electrification, and fare integration. Following the presentations, participants had the opportunity to ask questions of clarification as well as provide feedback.
	February 20, 2016 9:30AM - 11:30AM	Richview Collegiate	
	February 24, 2016 6:30PM - 8:30PM	Metro Toronto Convention Centre	
	February 25, 2016 6:30PM - 8:30PM	Riverdale Collegiate Institute	
	February 27, 2016 9:30AM - 11:30AM	Scarborough Civic Centre	
	March 9, 2016 6:30PM - 8:30PM	Lakeshore Collegiate	
	March 22, 2016 6:30PM - 8:30PM	Nelson Mandela Park Public School	
3 (May/ June)	May 31, 2016 6:30PM - 8:30PM	Scarborough Civic Centre	Four public consultation events were held to provide information and gather feedback on key transit projects in the City – SmartTrack / GO (RER), Relief Line, Waterfront Transit “Rest” and the SSE (including Eglinton East Light Rail Transit (LRT)). The public meetings followed an interactive Open House format. At the beginning of the event a presentation was provided by a representative of the City of Toronto. The presentation was followed by a Q&A session, after which attendees were invited to carry on the conversation with Study Team while viewing the information boards. At the meeting, attendees were also invited to provide their thoughts and ideas related to key questions posed at multiple points throughout the open house. Attendees posted comments directly on information boards and maps, or used the Discussion Guide provided to give their feedback.
	June 1, 2016 6:30PM - 8:30PM	Metro Toronto Convention Centre	
	June 2, 2016 6:30PM - 8:30PM	Riverdale Collegiate Institute	
	June 4, 2016 9:30AM - 11:30AM	York Humber High School	

7.3.1.2 Online Consultation and Social Media

Alongside the public meetings, online consultation was used to gather public input related to the components of the preliminary planning. Online consultation added flexibility for those who could not attend the public meetings and engaged a larger interested audience. Information materials displayed at the public meetings (described in **Section 7.3.1.1**) were posted on the Project website and were followed by simple survey questions that allowed interested parties to comment on them. The surveys were developed using FluidSurveys and used the same set of questions asked in the Discussion Guides. **Table 7-2** summarizes the format and uptake of the online consultation that took place for each phase.

Table 7-2: Online Consultation and Social Media

Phase	Date of Consultation	Responses	Format
1	January 31 to February 13, 2015	82	In Phase 1, online consultation was used to gather public input related to the components of this phase, including the draft study process (i.e., Draft Terms of Reference), draft consultation process (i.e., Draft Public Consultation Plan), draft Evaluation Criteria and potential corridor options and station location areas. Information materials for each of these were posted on the website and were followed by simple survey questions that allowed the community to comment on them.
2	June 9 to July 3, 2015	192	In Phase 2, online consultation was used to gather public input related to the components of this phase, including the inventory / existing conditions maps, preliminary evaluation of the corridors, short listed corridors and potential alignments and station concepts within each of the short listed corridors. Interactive maps for each of these were posted on the website and were followed by simple survey questions that allowed the community to comment on them.
3	May 30 to June 13, 2016	Six online responses 27 Tweets documented	In Phase 3 (June 2016), online consultation was used to gather public input related to the preferred corridor and preferred alignment. A description of the optimized transit plan for Scarborough and the evaluation table were followed by simple survey questions that allowed the community to comment on them. A Twitter conversation related to the City’s integrated transit planning was hosted on June 1, 2016 with Jennifer Keesmaat (City of Toronto’s Chief Planner). Using #TransitTO, Twitter users submitted their questions and comments regarding the City’s transit plan, and engaged in a live discussion with Jennifer.

7.3.1.3 Phone and Email

The public were also encouraged to phone ((416) 338-3095) or email (scarboroughsubwayextension@toronto.ca) with their comments. **Table 7-3** provides an overview of the public’s participation over the phone and email for each phase.

Table 7-3: Phone and Email Responses

Phase	Date of Consultation	Responses
1	January to March, 2015	84
2	June to July, 2015	52
3	March to June, 2016	47
3	June 2016 – April 2017	10

Communication and Consultation Process

7.3.1.4 Summary of Feedback Received from the General Public

Table 7-4: Summary of Feedback Received from the General Public

Phase	Summary of General Public Feedback for Each Phase
1	Affordability, connectivity to other stations and the community, and the way the SSE supports growth were at the forefront of the discussions during the public meetings. The Scarborough Town Centre, the Scarborough General Hospital, University of Toronto Scarborough Campus, and Centennial College were identified as key station locations that would insure connectivity to major community facilities. A summary of public comments received by the Study Team during Phase 1 can be found in Appendix C-1 .
2	During Phase 2, the evaluation of the original nine corridors and the identification of the three short listed corridors (Midland Corridor, McCowan Corridor, and Bellamy Corridor) were discussed in detail. While the public identified pros and cons for each of the short-listed corridors, the McCowan Corridor was the most favoured, specifically because it would provide direct access to the Scarborough Hospital and Scarborough Town Centre. Many also commented that McCowan is their preferred corridor because it would serve many, reach the most destinations in Scarborough, has the potential to reduce traffic in the area, would provide an opportunity for a fourth station (at Eglinton Avenue and Danforth Road), and seemed to be the most logical. A summary of public comments received by the Study Team during Phase 2 can be found in Appendix C-2 .
3 (February / March 2016)	During the Phase 3 February / March 2016 consultation, the one-stop subway extension approach was introduced. Feedback regarding this approach was mixed. Those in favour were pleased with the lower expected costs and quicker travel time to Scarborough Centre Station, as well as the addition of the Eglinton Crosstown East LRT. Those not in favour expressed concerns regarding reduction in stations – particularly the lack of connection with the Scarborough General Hospital. A summary of public comments received by the Study Team during Phase 3 can be found Appendix C-3 .
3 (May / June 2016)	In May and June, 2016, the results of the evaluation of the one-stop express subway to the Scarborough Town Centre – including the McCowan Corridor and preferred alignment – were presented. Two main areas of concern were identified in the feedback regarding the McCowan Corridor: the public wanted clarification regarding why the McCowan Corridor was chosen, and subway impacts as they relate to noise and vibration. Within the preferred McCowan Corridor, a preferred alignment was identified through Project assessment. The public wanted to understand why the preferred alignment would have such a high cost when stops are being eliminated. In addition, ridership was discussed and the public was updated on the new transit lines, and the latest ridership numbers for the express subway. for a summary of public comments received by the Study Team during Phase 3 can be found in Appendix C-3 .

7.3.2 Directly Affected Property Owners

7.3.2.1 Residential Property Owners

The preferred alignment includes residential property impacts due to the tunnel and buffer, emergency exit buildings (EEBs) and / or traction power substations (TPSSs) proposed on or under the property. The TTC initially consulted with impacted residential property owners in May 2016 to advise of property impacts and determine if homeowners with the tunnel beneath their homes would want to stay. If the property owners did

not want to stay, the TTC would look at using those homes for a tunnel construction site location. TTC also consulted with homeowners where a portion of their property would need to be acquired for EEBs. Further details on the feedback received during the consultation with the residential property owners can be found in the [Phase 3 Public Consultation Report \(June 2016\)](#).

In November 2016 the tunnel construction site location was moved based on consultation with the Stanwell Drive community. The tunnel construction site was moved north to Town Centre Court and McCowan Road. On December 6, 2016, TTC's Third Party Director and Senior Community Liaison Officer (CLO) met with Councillor Glenn De Baeremaeker and the condominium group for 61 Town Centre Court. The condominium and town homes will be across the street from the proposed tunnel construction site location. TTC and City staff met with this property owner again in March 2017.

The following **Table 7-5** summarizes the format of the consultations that took place with the residential property owners.

Table 7-5: One-on-One and Residential Property Owner Meetings

Phase	Date of Consultation	Attendance	Format
3	May 20 – 29, 2016	12 residential property owners or tenants	TTC's Community Relations Officer went out to all impacted residential property owners to hand deliver and explain the property requirements needed for the preferred alignment. The Community Relations Officer also updated contact information and explained that one-on-one meetings would be arranged the following week.
3	May 26 – 31, 2016	All impacted residential property owners 15 residential property owners, three members of SAG, The Star (one), CBC News (two)	TTC's Third Party and Property team and City of Toronto Real Estate met with the residential property owners for one-on-one discussions. The residential property owners on Stanwell Drive were shown possible options for a tunnel construction site location. The outcome of these one-on-one consultations was that the majority of the residential property owners on Stanwell Drive wanted to stay in their homes even with the future tunnel below. On May 31, 2016 one of the prearranged meetings with a residential property owner was also attended by The Star newspaper and CBC news. The residential property owner had invited the impacted residential property owners on the street and the media to the one-on-one meeting.
3	May 30, 2016	5 residential property owners	TTC's Third Party and Property group and City of Toronto Real Estate held one-on-one meetings at Scarborough Civic Centre.
3	June 13, 2016	40 – 45	A local meeting hosted by Councillor Glenn De Baeremaeker (Ward 38, Scarborough Centre) was held at the Scarborough Civic Centre for Stanwell Drive residents only. The meeting was held to update the residents on the SSE preferred alignment and provide an opportunity to ask TTC and City staff questions about their neighbourhood impacts and the Project.

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-5: One-on-One and Residential Property Owner Meetings

Phase	Date of Consultation	Attendance	Format
3	December 6, 2016	10	TTC's Third Party Director and Senior CLO met with Councillor Glenn De Baeremaeker and the condominium group for 61 Town Centre Court. The Project and tunnel construction site area were introduced and noise, vibration and construction impacts were discussed. Milestone dates and next steps were identified.
3	February 21, 2017	1 residential property owner	TTC's CLO went out to all impacted residential property owners to hand deliver letters advising of upcoming meetings where deputations could be made as well as a public meeting. During this event, the CLO spoke to one homeowner.
3	February 28, 2017	3 residential property owners / tenants	TTC's CLO went out to all impacted residential property owners to hand deliver letters confirming property impacts which would be considered during the March City Council meeting. During this event, the CLO spoke to three residential property owners / tenants.
3	March 1, 2017	2 residential property owners	One-on-one meetings were held with two residential property owners to discuss property impacts and the next steps in the Project. Both TTC and City staff were present to answer questions related to the Project and property acquisition.
3	March 2, 2017	2 residential property owners	TTC and City staff held one-on-one meetings with two residential property owners to discuss property impacts and the next steps in the Project.
3	March 2, 2017	16 residential property owners / tenants	Councillor Glenn De Baeremaeker hosted another meeting for residents in the Stanwell Drive area where TTC and City staff provided an update on the project and answered Project-related questions regarding the tunnel impacts, noise and vibration and property acquisition.
3	March 27, 2017	1 residential property owner	TTC and City staff met with one of the residential property owners to discuss property impacts and the next steps in the Project.

7.3.2.2 Commercial Property Owners

The preferred alignment includes subsurface or partial property impacts on several commercial / institutional property owners, all of which were engaged by TTC in May 2016 to advise of property impacts and initiate meetings to discuss the potential impacts and answer questions. Some of the owners attended the public meeting on May 31, 2016 and met with TTC and City Real Estate staff then, while others called to set up one-on-one meetings with staff.

One full property is required along the preferred alignment for the one of the proposed TPSSs. Once the preferred location was identified, TTC and City Real Estate staff sent a letter to the property owner and met with them individually to discuss the property requirements and impacts.

Lastly, the new Scarborough Centre Station is proposed primarily on Scarborough Town Centre lands. City Planning, in concert with TTC, has engaged the property owners to gain feedback on the proposed station location. TTC and the City will continue to meet with the owners as the Scarborough Centre Station design is further refined.

7.3.2.3 Municipal, Provincial and Federal Property Owners

There are several properties impacted by the Project which are under municipal, provincial or federal jurisdiction. All of the appropriate authorities have been engaged to obtain feedback and will continue to be engaged throughout the TPAP and property acquisition process. Several of these authorities are also engaged as members of the Government Review Committee.

The preferred alignment runs under the Scarborough and Rouge Hospital property and an EEB is also proposed on this property. Meetings with the hospital have occurred and will continue once the property acquisition process begins. The hospital is also engaged as a provincial authority on the Government Review Committee.

A portion of the bus terminal impacts the federal Service Canada property in the Scarborough Centre area. This property owner has been engaged to communicate property impacts and obtain feedback on the proposed impacts. This property owner will continue to be engaged as the design for the bus terminal advances.

7.3.3 Technical Advisory Committee

The TAC was established in the early stages of the preliminary planning phase in order to facilitate communication between the Study Team and key stakeholders. Meetings were held between these groups throughout the preliminary planning phase to consult on key recommendations during this phase. Members of the TAC include:

- City of Toronto:
 - City Planning – Transportation;
 - City Planning – Community Planning;
 - City Planning – Urban Design;
 - Transportation Services;
 - Parks, Forestry & Recreation;
 - Economic Development and Culture;
 - Real Estate;
 - Water & Wastewater;
 - Economic Development and Culture;
 - Deputy City Manager's office;
 - Toronto Building;
 - Legal Services;
- Metrolinx;
- Toronto Hydro; and,
- Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA).

A total of eight TAC meetings have been held to date. A summary of these meetings is provided in **Table 7-6**.

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-6: Summary of TAC Meetings

Meeting	Date	Location	Attendance	Summary of Topics Discussed
1	November 21, 2014	Toronto City Hall	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project and Study Area were introduced. ▪ Long and short list of alternatives and evaluation criteria were identified. ▪ Milestone dates were discussed.
2	March 6, 2015	Toronto City Hall	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revisions to the Evaluation Criteria presented at TAC meeting #1. ▪ Full draft assessment and evaluation of corridor alternatives presented. ▪ Revisions of the corridors. ▪ Assessment results and rationale for the three most promising corridor alternatives (Midland-McCowan, McCowan, and Bellamy). ▪ Additional details regarding the potential issues / challenges and benefits of these corridors.
3	March 24, 2015	Metro Hall	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Methods to evaluate advantages and disadvantages of corridor alternatives considered. ▪ Relative measures of significance discussion. ▪ Fare Integration studies being completed. ▪ Hospital ridership being studied. ▪ Community Planning is concerned that some corridors (i.e., Midland) were evaluated unfairly due to close proximity to SmartTrack.
4	May 26, 2015	Toronto City Hall	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All comments from TAC have been addressed. ▪ Sheppard Avenue East: bus terminal integration. ▪ Scarborough Centre: considering alternative station layout. ▪ General comments about platform criteria, and terminals.
5	July 23, 2015	Toronto City Hall	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ McCowan Corridor options for stations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sheppard Avenue East: Option 5 was chosen and discussed, Canadian Tire land development related to station; – Scarborough Centre: Major focus on walking distance and connectivity, a station with split GO and TTC bus terminal was chosen (Option 5 with split GO and TTC bus terminal was chosen); – Lawrence Avenue East: Mitigation for impacts to the hospital were discussed, meeting with Hydro One Networks Incorporated (HONI) took place to discuss the creek; and, – Eglinton-Danforth: Option 2 was chosen as it had a good connection between the bus terminal and platform. ▪ Kennedy Station should be part of the conversation for parking. ▪ SSE construction to start in 2018 and completed in 2023.

Table 7-6: Summary of TAC Meetings

Meeting	Date	Location	Attendance	Summary of Topics Discussed
6	November 18, 2015	Toronto City Hall	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contamination has been taken into consideration with underground tanks. ▪ Sheppard Avenue: Preferred station alternative (#5) presented. ▪ Lawrence Avenue: Hospital is concerned how their operations and traffic flow on site will be impacted. ▪ Scarborough Centre: Challenges outlined; limited opportunities to change layout and design.
7	April 18, 2016	Toronto City Hall	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Direction from Council on March 31, 2016 to remove the Bellamy corridor and 'Smart Spur' from further consideration. ▪ Further examine the express subway options along the SRT, Midland and McCowan Corridors. ▪ Update on the Scarborough Centre Transportation Master Plan and its role in planning around the station. ▪ Developing a cost estimate for a Lawrence East Station rough-in. ▪ Improvements to the TTC bus network north of Highway 401 and connections to Scarborough Centre.
8	January 31, 2017	Toronto City Hall	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council reporting and path forward. ▪ Update on the alignment for the SSE and the station design. ▪ Update on the outcome of the recent value engineering workshop and third-party cost and risk review. ▪ Upcoming public and stakeholder consultations.

7.3.4 Government Review Team

GRT meetings were held to update agencies on Project status, to seek advice, provide comments and ask questions related to the Project. Meetings were held at key milestones during the Project.

The Government Review Team consisted of the following agencies:

- City of Toronto;
- Conseil Scolaire de district Catholique Centre-Sud;
- Conservation Ontario;
- Environment Canada, Great Lakes and Corporate Affairs;
- Greater Toronto Airports Authority;
- HONI;
- Infrastructure Ontario;
- Metrolinx / GO Transit;
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs;
- Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration;
- Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services;
- Ministry of Education;
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing;
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF);
- Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC);
- Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport;
- Ministry of Transportation (MTO);
- TRCA;
- Toronto Catholic District School Board; and,
- Toronto District School Board.

Communication and Consultation Process

In addition to the GRT meetings described in **Table 7-7**, the Study Team has met with several agencies on an individual basis on multiple occasions throughout the planning phase to share Project information and seek guidance on key aspects of the Project. For example, in late-2015, AECOM heritage specialists (retained by the TTC for this Project) consulted directly with the City of Toronto Heritage Preservation Services.

Table 7-7: Summary of Government Review Team Meetings

Meeting	Date	Location	Attendance of Government Agencies	Discussion Summary	Format
1	May 24, 2016	City Hall, 100 Queen Street West	3	<p>Representative from MOECC guided the Study Team on how to address construction methods, and potential impacts certain methods may have over others. The discussion focused on the comparison between tunnel boring: single large diameter bore versus twin tunnel bore, and the cost savings between options.</p> <p>Question raised were regarding the timing of issuing the Notice of Commencement for the Project. The MOECC would like a copy of the draft report and all supporting documents (i.e., Local Air Quality Assessment report).</p> <p>As it relates to communications and consultation, the MOECC wanted to ensure Indigenous Engagement has occurred. They also wanted a list of all parties who have been contacted throughout the process, and a table outlining all the issues and concerns raised by the public, including how these issues have been addressed.</p>	Presentation followed by a Q&A session.
2	February 1, 2017	City Hall, 100 Queen Street West	12	<p>The Study Team provided an overview of the study status, including Council direction, timelines and the staff report recommending a preferred alignment, station location and bus terminal concept. An overview of potential impacts, mitigation measures and monitoring for the Project as described in the EPR was also presented.</p> <p>Questions raised largely related to Project timelines and next steps.</p>	Presentation followed by a Q&A session.

Prior to the commencement of the TPAP, the Study Team met with the MOECC on April 11, 2017 to discuss the SSE and the general approach to undertaking the TPAP. An outline of the proposed dates to commence TPAP was discussed. The Study Team shared the consultation plan and public meeting approach. MOECC identified agencies for the City to arrange meetings with to discuss the Draft EPR, and respond to any questions.

7.3.5 Engagement with Indigenous Communities

The City of Toronto and TTC developed an engagement plan that was implemented during the preliminary planning phase to encourage consultation with interested Indigenous communities. As part of this plan, in October 2014, the Study Team met with the MOECC to seek guidance on key aspects of the Project including indigenous communities to be engaged.

Indigenous communities were contacted for an opportunity to participate and provide comments on the Project. The following Indigenous communities were consulted during the preliminary planning phase, prior to the Notice of TPAP Commencement:

- Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation;
- Alderville First Nation*;
- Curve Lake First Nation*;
- Hiawatha First Nation*;
- Mississaugas of Scugog Island*; and,
- Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation.

*All correspondence was sent to the Williams Treaty First Nations Coordinator.

Each of the above-noted Indigenous communities were contacted by email and registered mail to notify them of the Project, invite them to public meetings, and seek their input on the Project. The updates provided an opportunity for Indigenous communities to connect with Study Team.

The table below provides a summary of when each Indigenous community was contacted by the Study Team:

Table 7-8: Summary of Contact with Indigenous Communities

Update	Date	Purpose	Description
1	January 14, 2015	SSE – Introduction	Introduced the SSE and public consultation details.
2	June 8, 2015	SSE – Phase 2	The Study Team finalized the Terms of Reference, Public Consultation Plan and Evaluation Criteria based on feedback received from stakeholders and the public in Phase 1. The three best performing corridors and public consultation details were provided in the update.
3	February 19, 2016	SSE – Update	The Study Team examined the changing conditions related to the SSE, including the introduction of SmartTrack and RER and the delay in the Sheppard LRT project. Public consultation details were provided in the update.
4	May 20, 2016	SSE – Update	Based on thorough technical analysis, the Study Team identified the preferred alignment and two potential station concepts for the SSE. Public consultation details were provided in the update.

Communication and Consultation Process

The table below provides a summary of comments received from Indigenous communities.

Table 7-9: Summary of Comments Received from Indigenous Communities

Date	Community	Summary of Comment Received
February 24, 2015	Alderville First Nation	Responded to update #1 with interest in the Project and wished to remain informed as the Project progressed.
March 23, 2015	Curve Lake First Nation	Responded to update #1 with interest in the Project and wished to remain informed as it may affect archaeological and burial remains.
April 1, 2016	Curve Lake First Nation	Responded to update #3 with interest in the Project and wished to remain informed as it may affect archaeological and burial remains.

7.3.6 Stakeholder Advisory Group

A SAG was established to provide a forum for identified stakeholders to discuss opportunities, concerns, needs, issues and risks related to the Project.

In total, 33 organizations representing a broad range of stakeholder interests (community / neighbourhood, businesses, institutions, professional interests and transit-oriented groups) were invited to take part in the SAG, including:

- BILD GTA
- CD Farquharson Community Association
- Centennial College
- Chinese Cultural Centre of Greater Toronto
- CodeRedTO
- Curran Hall Community Association
- Dorset Park Community Hub (Agincourt Community Services)
- Dorset Park Neighbourhood Association
- East Scarborough Storefront
- Eglinton East-Kennedy Park-Ionview Neighbourhood Action Plan
- Evergreen
- Glen Andrew Community Association
- Kennedy Road Business Improvement Association (BIA)

- Kevric Real Estate Corp Inc.
- Midland Park Community Association
- North Bendale Community Association
- Oxford Properties
- Pembina Institute
- Scarborough Centre for Healthy Communities
- Scarborough Hospital
- Scarborough Neighbourhood Action Plan
- Scarborough Village Neighbourhood Association
- Sheppard East Village BIA
- Sheppard Subway Action Coalition
- Tesoc Multicultural Settlement Services
- Toronto Association BIA
- Toronto Catholic District School Board
- Toronto Centre for Action Transportation
- Toronto District School Board
- Toronto Region Board of Trade
- Transport Action Ontario
- TTC Riders
- Urban Land Institute

Further details on the feedback received during the preliminary planning consultation with the SAG can be found in the [Phase 1](#), [Phase 2](#), [Phase 3 February/ March 2016](#), and [Phase 3 June 2016 Public Consultation Reports](#).

7.3.6.1 Stakeholder Advisory Group Meetings

Table 7-10 below includes a summary of the discussions that took place during each SAG meeting.

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-10: Summary of SAG Meeting Discussions

Phase	Meeting	Date	Location	Attendance of Member Organizations	Discussion Summary	Format
1	1	February 9, 2015 5:00PM to 7:00PM	Bendale Branch of the Toronto Public Library	19	<p>Comments provided by SAG members ranged from costs to construction impacts, development opportunities and pressure, concern for existing residents and improving connectivity.</p> <p>Questions were related to the broader transit network and other transportation modes, ridership, the study's evaluation process, trade-offs and other nearby land use studies.</p> <p>Minutes from SAG Meeting #1 are included in the Phase 1 Consultation Report available on the Project website.</p>	The format of the meeting included a presentation focused on the Project background, scope, process and opportunities for public engagement, followed by a Q&A session. The SAG members participated in group discussions about the Evaluation Criteria and possible station locations and corridor options.
2	Interactive Workshop	April 2, 2015 1:00PM to 4:00PM	Chinese Cultural Centre	19	<p>The workshop participants reviewed the Evaluation Criteria and applied them against the long-list of corridor options, identified their short-list of preferred corridor options (which included McCowan, Markham and Bellamy), provided valuable feedback to the Study Team about the rationale behind their decisions, and developed a deeper understanding of the decision-making process and trade-offs that must be made in determining a short-list of preferred corridor options.</p> <p>Minutes from the SAG Interactive Workshop are included in the Phase 2 Consultation Report available on the Project website.</p>	Through facilitated large and small group discussions, the workshop provided SAG members with the opportunity to complete an evaluation of the nine corridor options to identify a preferred short list using the key criteria, technical data and their own experience/ expertise.
2	2	June 1, 2015 5:00PM to 8:00PM	Bendale Branch of the Toronto Public Library	17	<p>The comments provided by SAG members ranged from costs to construction alternatives, ridership, concerns from existing residents, proximity to proposed SmartTrack, and improving connectivity.</p> <p>Many questions regarding the importance of serving the Scarborough Hospital and the detailed ridership modelling process were also put forth. Strong opinions regarding the three short listed corridors were made clear, specifically regarding the Midland Corridor.</p> <p>Minutes from the SAG Meeting #2 are included in the Phase 2 Consultation Report available on the Project website.</p>	The format of the meeting included a presentation focused on the updated transportation model, a recap of Phase 1 of the Project, preliminary analysis of potential corridors, and the draft short list of potential corridors and proposed alignments, followed by a Q&A session. The SAG members participated in group discussions about the possible alignments and station concepts.
3	3	February 8, 2016 6:00PM to 8:00PM	Bendale Branch of the Toronto Public Library	13	<p>While questions and comments provided by SAG members included those about the change in direction of the SSE to a one-stop express subway and the details of the SSE (including the station location, preferred corridor, and development opportunities), much of the focus was on other transit initiatives including the Crosstown East, SmartTrack, and the Scarborough Express Rail.</p> <p>Minutes from the SAG Meeting #3 are available on the Project website.</p>	The format of the meeting included a presentation focused on the ongoing transit network planning, and the recent change in direction of the SSE followed by a Q&A session.
3	4	June 6, 2016 6:00PM to 8:00PM	Bendale Branch of the Toronto Public Library	13	<p>Strong opinions regarding the need for a more comprehensive explanation of cost for building the express SSE were made clear.</p> <p>Many questions surrounded the rationale for the preferred corridor and preferred alignment, the express SSE versus the three-stop extension, and the travel demand projections. In addition, questions were asked about the other transit initiatives (including Smart Track/ GO RER, Relief Line, and Waterfront Transit "Reset"), and Line 3 closures related to the SSE.</p> <p>Minutes from the SAG Meeting #4 are included in the Phase 3 June 2016 Consultation Report found on the Project website.</p>	The format of the meeting included a presentation focused on the update of the transit initiatives underway across the City, the SSE and next steps, followed by a Q&A session.
3	5	February 28, 2017 5:30PM to 7:00PM	Scarborough Civic Centre, Committee Room 1&2	13	<p>Comments provided by SAG members ranged from costs to construction impacts, development opportunities, the Bus Terminal configuration and parking.</p> <p>Questions were related to the movement of buses in and out of the centre and the expansion of the road network as part of the Scarborough Centre Transportation Master Plan.</p> <p>Minutes from SAG Meeting #5 are available on the Project website.</p>	The format of the meeting included a presentation focused on the Staff Report and Recommendations; an overview of the alignment evaluation; and Bus Terminal option and Next Steps, followed by a Q&A session.

Communication and Consultation Process

7.3.6.2 Ratepayer Interest Groups

Two ratepayer interest groups, Glen Andrew Community Association and North Bendale Community Association, requested meetings with Councillor Glenn De Baeremaeker, TTC and City of Toronto regarding the preferred alignment. Summaries of these meetings are found in **Table 7-11**.

Table 7-11: Summary of Meetings with Interest Groups

Meeting	Date	Location	Attendance	Summary of Topics Discussed
1	June 22, 2016	Scarborough Civic Centre	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ratepayers Associations were given the opportunity to ask Councillor Glenn De Baeremaeker, the City and TTC staff questions about the preferred alignment. The format of the meeting was a Q&A period. Discussion about the options for the tunnel construction site locations. Discussion about the traffic and construction impacts of a worksite in the Stanwell Drive neighbourhood. Staff committed to evaluate and respond to the station and alignment options presented by Ratepayer by letter. Councillor Glenn De Baeremaeker's office arranged a future meeting after the City's Executive Committee, City Council and TTC Meetings.
2	December 9, 2016	Scarborough Civic Centre	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Glen Andrew Association prefers the McCowan alignment pointing west via Triton Road and ultimately connecting to Don Mills Station (EA approved Sheppard Subway alignment). Suggestion is that using a 13 metre diameter tunnel boring machine would allow for construction station within the tunnel without requiring closure of Line 3. Hatch Ltd. conducted previous studies for the four-stop subway using 13 metre diameter TBM. Glen Andrew Association suggested alignment would still result in the closure of the SRT, while impacting more properties than the recommended preferred McCowan alignment Scarborough Centre Station would still require significant cut-and-cover construction for ventilation, station entrances, passageways, etc. Methods to evaluate advantages and disadvantages of corridor alternatives considered. Fare Integration studies being completed. Hospital ridership being studied.

7.4 Communication and Consultation during the TPAP

This section provides a summary of consultation undertaken during the TPAP of the SSE from April 27, 2017 to August 28, 2017.

7.4.1 General Public

During the TPAP, consultation with the general public included the distribution of the Notice of Commencement and holding a public meeting. In addition to providing feedback at the public meeting, the public were also able to submit comments and questions by phone and email. The following sections provide an overview of the general public consultation activities that were undertaken during the TPAP.

7.4.1.1 Notice of Commencement and Draft Executive Summary of the Environmental Project Report

A Notice of Commencement was distributed to announce the start of the TPAP for the SSE. The Notice also included notification for the public meeting that was held on May 10, 2017. The methods used to distribute the Notice to the public are provided in **Table 7-12**.

Table 7-12: Notice of Commencement Distribution

Date	Distribution Method
April 26, 2017	Direct mail to 4,095 property owners within 60 m of the proposed alignment
April 27, 2017	Email to 1,037 individuals who signed up for SSE project updates
	Posting on the Project website
	Publication in <i>Scarborough Mirror</i> newspaper
April 28, 2017	Publication in <i>Senthamarai</i> newspaper in Tamil
	Publication in <i>Ming Pao</i> newspaper in Mandarin
	Publication in <i>Sing Tao</i> newspaper in traditional Chinese
May 4, 2017	Publication in <i>Scarborough Mirror</i> newspaper

A copy of the Notice can be found in **Appendix C-4**.

The Draft Executive Summary of the Environmental Project Report was made available to the public and posted to the Project website on April 27, 2017.

7.4.1.2 Public Meeting

A public meeting during the TPAP was held on May 10, 2017 at the Scarborough Civic Centre from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m., located at 150 Borough Drive, Toronto. The public meeting was held at the same time as a public meeting on the Scarborough Centre Transportation Master Plan. The meeting provided an overview of the SSE, including Project updates from the last public meeting (i.e., Bus Terminal refinement), a description of the TPAP, a list of potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures, and next steps. Consultation materials developed in association with the Phase 4 public meeting are included in **Appendix C-4**.

Communication and Consultation Process

A total of 103 people attended the TPAP public meeting, as identified through sign-in sheets, including Councillor Glenn De Baeremaeker (Ward 38). Councillor Chin Lee (Ward 41) and Councillor Norm Kelly (Ward 40) were represented by staff from their offices.

The meeting featured a series of display boards to provide information on the Project (see **Appendix C-4** for display boards). Participants could move freely between display boards and speak with the Study Team. A presentation of the Project elements was given by the Study Team and attendees had the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback during a Q&A session. More details about the public meeting and the feedback received are provided in the [Scarborough Subway Extension Transportation Project Assessment Process Open House May 10, 2017 Highlights Report](#).

In addition to the Q&A session, comment forms were offered to attendees of the public meeting to provide feedback. Three comment forms were received by the Study Team and are included in **Appendix C-4**.

The display boards, presentation and other information materials displayed at the public meeting were posted on the Project website on May 11, 2017. The Highlights Report was posted on the Project website on May 29, 2017.

7.4.1.3 Phone and Email

In addition to the in-person public meeting, the public were able to provide comments via phone ((416) 338-3095) and email (scarboroughsubwayextension@toronto.ca). **Table 7-13** provides an overview of the public's participation over the phone and email.

Table 7-13: Phone and Email Responses

Method Feedback Received	Responses
Phone	3
Email	24

7.4.1.4 Summary of Feedback Received from the General Public

During the TPAP, comments and questions from the public received via comment forms, at the public meeting, the Project email address, and telephone calls were generally related to the following themes:

- Project schedule;
- Technology alternatives to a subway;
- SSE alignment and station locations;
- The TPAP;
- Parking;
- Safety and accessibility;
- Traffic and transit impacts; and
- Cost.

Further details on the consultation activities and the feedback received from the public and responses provided by the Study Team are provided in **Appendix C-4**.

7.4.2 Directly Affected Property Owners

A meeting was held on July 25, 2017 with invited members of the public living in the immediate vicinity of the planned location of TPSS 2, which will require acquisition of the residential properties at 1 and 3 Bellechasse Street. The purpose of the meeting was to explain the relocation of TPSS 2 which was initially planned to be located in the Hydro corridor. There were 19 attendees including the owners of 1 and 3 Bellechasse (the properties to be acquired and who had been met with previously). The meeting was chaired by Councillor De Baeremaeker and included presentations from TTC and IBI Group, the architecture company designing the EEBs and TPSSs.

Two key issues raised were:

- i. Questions as to why the TPSS could not be placed in the hydro corridor immediately to the south of Bellechasse Street which was seen, by the public, to be an appropriate location for such a facility; and,
- ii. Safety concerns related to pedestrians and automobiles during construction of the TPSS.

The Study Team advised as to the results of discussions with HONI, including that the areas in the hydro corridor that are now vacant, must be preserved for future expansion; they also assured the community that the facility would be constructed in a manner that would, in no way, compromise safety for pedestrians and traffic in the vicinity.

Councillor de Baeremaeker advised that he plans to have a further discussion with HONI representatives on this issue. These discussions are currently ongoing and were not resolved prior to the release of this EPR. With respect to the results of previous discussions with HONI on this matter, the Study Team's intent is to continue with the plan of placing the TPSS on 1 and 3 Bellechasse Street as presented in this EPR.

Further details on the presentation and property owner feedback received at this meeting are provided in **Appendix C-4**.

7.4.3 Technical Advisory Committee

Consultation with the TAC members during the TPAP included the distribution of the Notice of Commencement and Draft EPR as described below.

7.4.3.1 Notice of Commencement and Draft Environmental Project Report

The Notice of Commencement announcing the start of the TPAP for the SSE was sent to the TAC members via email on April 27, 2017. The Notice also included notification for the public meeting that was held on May 10, 2017. A copy of the email is provided in **Appendix C-5**.

A digital copy of the Draft EPR, including the Executive Summary, was circulated to all TAC members via email on May 8, 2017. TAC members were asked to review and provide comments on the Draft EPR by June 12, 2017. TAC members were also given the opportunity to request hard copies of the Draft EPR or digital copies on CDs. On June 2, 2017 a courtesy email was sent to the review agencies to remind them of the deadline to submit comments on the Draft EPR.

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-14 provides key comments from TAC members on the Draft EPR and the Study Team's consideration of the comments. The following TAC members indicated that there were no issues or comments at this time:

- City of Toronto Scarborough District Transportation Services (Traffic Planning);
- City of Toronto Legal Services; and
- City of Toronto Parks, Forestry & Recreation.

No comments were received from City of Toronto Real Estate in response to the circulation of the Draft EPR.

Comments received from Metrolinx and the TRCA are provided in **Table 7-15** and **Appendix C-6**.

7.4.4 Government Review Team

Consultation with the GRT members during the TPAP included the distribution of the Notice of Commencement and Draft EPR as described below.

7.4.4.1 Notice of Commencement and Draft Environmental Project Report

The Notice of Commencement announcing the start of the TPAP for the SSE was sent to the GRT members via email on April 27, 2017. The Notice also included notification for the public meeting that was held on May 10, 2017. A copy of the email is provided in **Appendix C-6**.

A hard copy of the Draft EPR, including the Executive Summary, was provided to the MOECC on April 26, 2017 and circulated to all other GRT members via email on May 8, 2017. The agencies were asked to review and provide comments on the Draft EPR by June 12, 2017. The agencies were also given the opportunity to request hard copies of the Draft EPR or digital copies on CDs. On June 2, 2017 a courtesy email was sent to the review agencies to remind them of the deadline to submit comments on the Draft EPR.

The City and TTC offered to meet with any of the agencies who had an interest. As a result, meetings were held with the TRCA, and MTCS to discuss their comments. In addition, phone discussions were held with Hydro One to resolve their comments.

Table 7-15 provides the comments from the GRT members on the Draft EPR and the Study Team's consideration of the comments. Letters that included the Study Team's responses were sent directly to each GRT member who provided comments prior to the publication of the EPR (see **Appendix C-6**).

The following agencies indicated that there were no issues or comments at this time:

- Conservation Ontario; and
- Toronto Catholic District School Board.

No comments were received from the following GRT members in response to the circulation of the Draft EPR.

- Bell Canada;
- Cogeco;
- Conseil Scolaire de district Catholique Centre-Sud;

- Greater Toronto Airports Authority;
- Enbridge;
- Environment Canada, Great Lakes and Corporate Affairs;
- Infrastructure Ontario;
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food & Rural Affairs;
- Ministry of Community Safety & Correctional Services;
- Ministry of Education;
- Ministry of Health and Long Term Care;
- Ministry of Natural Resources;
- Ministry of Transportation;
- Public Works and Government Services Canada;
- Rogers Communications;
- Telus;
- The Scarborough Hospital;
- Toronto Emergency Medical Services;
- Toronto Fire Services;
- Toronto Police Services;
- Toronto Public Library Board;
- Transport Canada; and
- Zayo (MTS Allstream).

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-14: TAC Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Applicable Environmental Project Report Section Reference
June 6, 2017	City Planning	Section 1.6.1.1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our preference would be to refer to it as the transportation component of the Official Plan Review and remove the reference to "Feeling Congested?" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All references to "Feeling Congested?" were removed from the EPR and replaced with "the Transportation component of the Official Plan Review." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1.6.1.1
			2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As we understand it, SmartTrack does not represent an increase in the frequency of transit service relative to what is planned for GO RER. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1.7.3 was revised to remove the following bullet, "Additional high frequency service improvements to GO RER on the Kitchener GO & Stouffville / Lakeshore East GO corridors to provide an urban service." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1.7.3
June 16, 2017	Economic Development	E.4.3 - Page 7	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While we understand the construction design constraints, the Scarborough Centre subway station would function better with a centre platform. A PPUDO should be offered for autonomous vehicle passenger pick up/drop off at the Scarborough Centre subway station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of a single, large diameter tunnel boring machine results in reduced costs and at-grade construction impacts because, for example, the special trackwork (crossovers and tailtracks) can be constructed within the tunnel. As a result, the tracks must remain at their minimum separation through the station requiring the use of side platforms. Regarding PPUDO – City Planning's stance is to preserve the available lands outside the station for transit oriented developments in order to achieve the vision of transforming Scarborough Centre into an urban node. For this reason, a PPUDO was not contemplated as part of the SSE project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N / A
		E.4.5.4 – Page 12	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideally, the entire new bus terminal would open at the same time as the new subway station, not 1.5 to 2 years later. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This phasing of construction for the bus terminal is the only way to maintain SRT service until the subway is operational, and such, is the best approach from a customer service perspective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N / A
June 20, 2017	Toronto Water	Page 16, Feature 13	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stormwater management strategy should also meet the Wet Weather Flow Management Guidelines of the City of Toronto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.1.3.3 was revised to read as follow: <i>"The City of Toronto’s Wet Weather Flow Management Master Plan (WWFMMP) and Wet Weather Flow Management Guidelines provide direction on various methods for improving the quality of stormwater runoff."</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.1.3.3
		Page 66, Table 5-1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The terrain and soil has some impact on the stormwater management because the type of soil impacts the amount and rate of absorption of the soil. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The terrain and soil impact (classified as “weak”) on Stormwater Management was added in Table 5-1 Interactions Matrix. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5-1
		Page 66, Table 5-1	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groundwater can get into the stormwater system and increase the amount of water in the sewers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the storm sewer normally is sized according to the peak flow of design storm, the impact from the groundwater seepage is negligible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N / A
		Page 67, Table 5-3	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To achieve the 80% TSS removal to meet water quality targets, additional strategies will have to be implemented, because the city credits a maximum of 50% TSS removal for OGS units. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommended SWM strategy for Water Quality at Tunnel Alignment in Table 5-3 was revised to read as “OGS and/or other LIDs”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5-3
		Page 87, Table 5-5	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For mitigation measures consider using the City of Toronto Green Streets guideline to incorporate low impact development strategies for stormwater management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City of Toronto Green Streets guideline and other LID guidelines, including the TRCA LID-SWM Planning Design Guide, were used to develop the mitigation measures presented in Table 5-5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5-5

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-14: TAC Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Applicable Environmental Project Report Section Reference
		Appendix B-2 (Stormwater management report)	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's not clear what the pink lines represent along Borough Drive in Figure 3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pink lines represent underground subway envelope. The line was added in Figure 3 as well as Figure 4 legends. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B-2, Figure 3 and Figure 4
		Appendix B-2 (Stormwater management report)	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's not clear what the yellow lines represent in Figure 4. Please clarify colour coding and the legend. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yellow Hatch represents existing station. This was added in Figures 3 and 4 legends. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B-2, Figure 3 and Figure 4
		Appendix B-2 (Stormwater management report)	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 3 and Figure 4 should be broken down into more drawings. A drawing for the grading and overland flows, a drawing for the catchment areas and a drawing for the proposed storm sewers. The labelling and legend needs to be clearer as well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 3 represents our existing condition interpretation based on limited information available in this stage of the study. Figure 4 shows only potential SWM layout and recommended drainage boundaries to maintain existing condition. Figures 3 and 4, therefore, cannot be broken down due to the limited level of detail available in this stage. Grading plan and storm sewer design will be provided in the detail design stage. The labelling and legends in Figures 3 and 4 were revised to provide clearer presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B-2, Figure 3 and Figure 4
June 21, 2017	City Planning East District	E.4.3 Bus Terminal pg. 8	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section: The terminal concept has two levels. The majority of the bus bays (28 bays) are accommodated in the lower level in a widened Triton Road. An upper level would accommodate the remaining six bays, on a new extension of Borough Drive. Comment: The revised station concept shows 28 bays on Triton and 3 bays on Borough – please confirm. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC buses are primarily in the long east-west bay. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 28 routes will be below Borough Drive extension in the Triton Trench. – Three routes will stop on the east side of Borough Drive. – The three private carriers will stop on-street. The exact location is still to be determined, which is why they are not shown on the updated station concept. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N / A
		E.4.5.4 pg. 13	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section: Phase 2... This will involve using the partially -completed Bus terminal to the greatest extent possible, supplemented as necessary by temporary bus stops in the southbound bus-only right turn lane on McCowan Road at the station entrance and / or on the newly constructed Borough Drive Comment: Any temporary bus bay locations should be further discussed with City Planning and Transportation Services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is one possible scenario for the construction timing and sequencing of the bus terminal construction. The sequencing of the construction and the location of temporary bus bays will be worked out during design and discussed with the City. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N / A
		2.3.2.1 pg. 15	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section: The North part of the SSE Study Area is approximately bounded by Highway 401 / Ellesmere Road / East Highland Creek in the south, Brimley Road in the west, the CN rail corridor in the north, and Gateforth Drive in the east. Comment: why have you chosen Gateforth Drive as the only eastern boundary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.3.2.1 has been updated to read as follows: “The North part of the SSE Study Area is approximately bounded by Highway 401 / Ellesmere Road / East Highland Creek in the south, Brimley Road in the west, the CN rail corridor in the north, and halfway between Markham Road and Neilson Road, in the vicinity of the Malvern Branch of Highland Creek in the east.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.3.2.1
		2.3.2.2 pg. 15	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section: Much of Scarborough Centre is considered a primary zone of interest, since options for the subway station are located central to the area, either along Triton Road, or west of McCowan Road. Comment: Please confirm what the primary zone of interest means? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the mobility hub guidelines, there is a 250 m zone (primary zone of interest) where the intensification occurs. Section 2.3.2.2 has been revised to provide this definition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.3.2.2

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-14: TAC Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Applicable Environmental Project Report Section Reference
		2.3.2.2 pg. 15	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider adding recent investments Library & Civic Green and planned Albert Campbell Park (soon under construction). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The points describing the existing land use in the centre have been revised to provide a better description. Recent investments such as the Library, Civic Centre Green and Albert Campbell Park have been included in the EPR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.3.2.2
		2.3.5 pg. 19	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lands with redevelopment potential commonly included low density, car-oriented commercial sites, located along arterials and at major intersections where future subway stations could be located, as well as low density employment areas. Comment: It is our understanding there are no planned future stations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section has been rewritten to: “Lands with redevelopment potential commonly included low density, car-oriented commercial sites, located along arterials and at major intersections where, during the evaluation phase, potential future subway stations could be located, as well as low density employment areas. Lands with redevelopment potential were predominantly identified in the McCowan Precinct of Scarborough Centre.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.3.5
		2.3.5 pg. 19	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section: Lands with redevelopment potential and located in potential station locations were predominantly identified in the McCowan Precinct of Scarborough Centre. However, lands surrounding Scarborough Town Centre were also seen as having development potential Comment: Opportunity exists on lands within the Centre that do not have higher density forms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section has been rewritten to: “However, lands surrounding Scarborough Town Centre were also seen as having development potential, including vacant parcels and lands with underutilized, low-rise built form.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.3.5
		5.2.3.4 pg. 71	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section: Mitigation: Particular attention will be paid to locating and screening of non-public station and tunnel elements such as EEBs, electrical substations and ventilation structures during the Detailed Design Phase of the Project to minimize impact on residential or commercial areas. Comment: What about future development potential and envisioned road network improvements being identified in the Scarborough Centre Transportation Master Plan (SCTMP)? The SSE should not be precluding these emerging directions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design of the station and ancillary facilities within Scarborough Centre has considered the following with respect to the emerging solution as described in the SCTMP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EEB 8 takes into account future development potential and the envisaged road network improvements. – The TPSS at the station will be underneath the roadway and the footprint reduced as far as possible in order to not preclude development. – The bus terminal was designed to ensure key City projects, such as the normalization of Progress/McCowan can be accommodated in the future. The TTC will continue to work with the City to ensure other connections throughout the Centre will not be precluded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N / A
		5.2.5.2 pg. 72	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section: Pedestrians and Cyclists Comment: The existing north-south connection on the west side of the YMCA over Triton Rd is impacted, this impact should be referenced with appropriate mitigation suggested. What about the STC entrance/connection to Albert Campbell Sq? Likewise the westerly access to McCowan Station from 50-60 Brain Harrison Way? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EPR has been updated to reflect the current access points into the bus terminal and SRT station and then describe the new access points into the new Scarborough Centre station which is east of the current Scarborough SRT station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.2.5.2
		Table 5-5 pg. 88	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section: Buildings and Property-Permanent property impacts will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Full acquisition: 1 Property – Partial acquisition: 41 Properties Comment: Is this correct? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EPR has been updated to reflect the new location of TPSS 2 which will increase full acquisition to 3 properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.2.3.2, Tables 5-4 and 5-5

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
June 16, 2017	Hydro One	Executive Summary and body of report	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft Executive Summary: Scarborough Subway Extension Environmental Project Report (EPR) that is currently being circulated to the Government Review Team states on pages 10 and 11 that the Traction Power Station (TPS) number 2 will be located on the Hydro Gatineau transmission corridor. On Feb. 1, 2017, Hydro One sent an e-mail to Stephanie Rice, Director, Third Party, Planning and Property, TTC, stating the Hydro One cannot allow a TPS on the hydro corridor, even underground. It is not considered a compatible use by our engineers. It is our understanding from a telephone conversation from Tessa Mackay (TTC) and Rick Schatz (Hydro One) on June 8 that all references to the TPS being located on the hydro corridor will be removed from the EPR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is the Study Team's intention to proceed with relocating TPSS 2 adjacent to the Hydro Gatineau transmission corridor at No. 1 and 3 Bellechasse Street. A meeting was held on July 25, 2017 with residents in the immediate vicinity of the properties affected by the relocation. The purpose of the meeting was to explain the reason for, and the details associated with, the relocation of TPSS 2. At this meeting, Councillor de Baeremaeker advised residents that he plans to further discuss this matter directly with Hydro One staff. These discussions will be taking place after the publication of the Notice of Completion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.4.4.4 Section 4.4.4 Exhibit 4-17 (Plate SSE-G313) Section 5.2.3.2
June 12, 2017	MOECC Environmental Approvals Branch	Section 3 and 4- Description of the Proposed Undertaking	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 3 entitled “Choosing the Preferred Alignment and Station / Bus Terminal Location” and section 4 entitled “Project Description” provide a description of the transit project; its preferred alignment and station location as well as the design description and illustration of the other components including, but not limited to, tunnel ventilation, emergency exit buildings and traction power substation that constitute the proposed Transit Project for which approval under the Transit Regulation is being sought. As per our email exchange on May 9, 2017 and meeting conversation on May 18, 2017 it is understood that, alternatives evaluation/analysis has been included in table 3-1 of section 3 entitled “Summary of Corridor Evaluation” of the EPR for informational and historical purposes only, and is to be consider “out of scope” for this undertaking. Accordingly, when referring to alternatives evaluation, the City/TTC should clarify that, alternatives were considered only as part of the pre-planning work and not as part of the proposed Subway Extension from Kennedy Station to Scarborough Centre Station project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment of alternative corridor options as described in Table 3-1, Chapter 3 are directly relevant to the subway extension from Kennedy Station to Scarborough Centre Station (the Project). During the early stages of pre-planning undertaken in 2015, nine corridor options were identified and evaluated as part of the three-stop subway from Kennedy Station to Sheppard Avenue. The Phase 1, Phase 2, Phase 3 February/ March 2016, and Phase 3 June 2016 Consultation Reports provide information on the public consultation undertaken with regards to the alternative corridor and alignment options evaluated and assessed during this period. Given the City’s Executive Committee direction in January 2016 to proceed with an express subway option, the information contained within the aforementioned reports is now considered out of scope and referred to for background context only. As such, details related to this assessment are not discussed in the final EPR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Section 7- Communication and Consultation Process	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 7 entitled “Communication and Consultation Process” provides a description of the communication and consultation activities that were carried out with stakeholders including general public, government regulatory agencies and Aboriginal communities. Appendix C entitled “Summary of Public Comments” provides a summary of the comments that were received from the public during the preliminary consultation phase (Phase 1-3). It is understood that, a total of four (4) formal rounds of communication and consultation activities were organized as part of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted above, the consultation that occurred during the preliminary planning phases of the Project is summarized in Section 7.3 During the preliminary planning, the City/TTC held two consultation meetings with the Government Review Team (GRT). The first meeting was held on May 24, 2016, and a second meeting was held on February 1, 2017. The meetings included a presentation given by the Study Team highlighting key Project milestones and to answer questions from the GRT. Prior to initiating Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), the Study Team met with the MOECC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 7.4 Appendix C-4

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
				<p>the consultation process, of which three were organized as part of preliminary planning and one under the TPAP phase which is currently underway, the ministry’s review of the draft EPR has noted that, no record of consultation describing the City/TTC interaction with interested persons or a complete summary of comments from key government regulatory agencies and Aboriginal communities, particularly; the Ministry of Natural Recourses and Forestry (MNRF), Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA), and Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) as identified in Section 7.3.5 and Section 7.3.6 of the draft EPR was included in the documentation to confirm that, there is no cultural or natural heritage or Aboriginal issues-matters of provincial importance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accordingly, the City/TTC should include in the EPR a complete record of consultation for ministry review prior to issuing a Notice of Completion. As previously mentioned during our meeting on May 18, 2017, it is suggested that consideration be given to including, within the final EPR a completed summary of comments, in a tabular format (Issue-Response format), describing how and what the City/TTC did to address all the concerns raised during the TPAP consultation phase, as required by the Subsection 9.2(10) of the Ontario Transit regulation (O.Reg.231/08). 	<p>on April 11, 2017 to confirm the TPAP schedule and identify key agency outreach. Following the pre-TPAP meeting, the Study Team offered the GRT agencies an opportunity to meet with the Study Team to discuss the Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the commencement of the TPAP on April 27, 2017, the Draft EPR was distributed to agencies on the GRT as well as the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review and comment. Responses to comments received are provided herein and have been considered in the finalization of the EPR. During this time, the Study Team also met with Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) to discuss questions and concerns related to the Project, including the Draft EPR. In addition, the Study Team met with the MOECC prior to commencing TPAP on April 11 with a follow up meeting immediately following the commencement of TPAP on May 17 to further discuss the Project and review next steps. A total of seven Indigenous communities were kept informed throughout from the early stages of the Project. Each community has been contacted by email, registered mail, and follow-up phone calls at key stages of the Project to ensure the information distributed has been received and to confirm and address outstanding questions or concerns, if any. These communities were notified and invited to all the public meetings held throughout preliminary planning and the TPAP. A total of six updates were issued throughout the Project. During the pre-planning phase of the Project, the Study Team did not receive any questions or concerns from the Indigenous communities consulted on the Project. The Study Team did, however, received responses from two communities, namely Alderville First Nations and Curve Lake First Nation, requesting further updates as it pertains to environmental impacts during construction, should any occur. Following the commencement of the TPAP on April 27, 2017, the Draft EPR was distributed to Indigenous communities for review and comment. The initial comment deadline of June 12, 2017, was extended to June 19, 2017 to ensure all communities had ample time to review and provide comment. Table 7-17 provides the Study Team’s responses to the questions and comments received and how they have been considered in the finalization of this EPR. Appendix C-4 provides relevant copies of the correspondence. 	

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		7.3.6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Furthermore, the review of section 7.3.6 entitled “Engagement with Indigenous Communities,” which describes what the City/TTC did to engage with the Aboriginal communities, has noted that there is very little information included with respect to how engagement with Aboriginal communities has been carried out or planned throughout all phases of the project in order to give them an opportunity to participate and provide comments on the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See response to comment #2 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 7.4 Appendix C-4
		7	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although it is understood that, the EPR package is still to be finalized prior to issuing a Notice of Completion, it is the ministry’s expectation that, the City/TTC will make a consolidated good faith effort (such as follow up calls and electronic mails...etc.) to appropriately inform, engage and notify the identified interested Aboriginal communities in order to reassure the ministry that potential environmental issues or concerns of provincial importance have been appropriately responded to and/or addressed throughout the TPAP process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Indigenous communities were circulated the Notice of Commencement on April 27, 2017 and Draft EPR via email and registered mail on May 1, 2017. These communities were provided with up to six weeks (with an additional week extension) to review and provide comment on the Draft EPR. The Study Team offered the Indigenous communities the opportunity to meet in person and discuss and respond to any questions or concerns. The Study Team also followed up with phone calls and emails between June 2 and June 15, 2017 to confirm that all materials were received and there were no outstanding issues or comments. The Study Team is in discussion with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation regarding an Archaeological field liaison for Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment. Table 7-17 provides the Study Team’s responses to the questions and comments received and how they have been considered in the finalization of this EPR. Appendix C-4 provides relevant copies of the correspondence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 7.4 Appendix C-4
		Section 5-EIA and Evaluation	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5, entitled “Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Monitoring” describes how the recommended plan as described in Section 4 and illustrated in Exhibit 4-17a-t may interact with the existing environmental conditions/features, as described in Sections 2. It also defines predetermined initiatives and monitoring activities that will act as built-in mitigation measures to counteract with the potential environmental impacts throughout the different phases of the project (Displacement of Existing Features, Construction, Operations and Maintenance). However, some of the mitigation measures impacting key environmental features such as Waste Management, Air Quality, Noise and Vibration, Drainage and Hydrology, Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat on Table 5-5 (Displacement of Existing Features), Table 5-6(Construction) and Table 5-7(Maintenance and Operation) are not associated/linked to a monitoring program to monitor or verify the effectiveness of the identified mitigation strategies. Accordingly, it is recommended that, consideration be given to including a monitoring program for each of the identified mitigation strategies as outlined in the above mentioned sections of the EPR prior to issuing a Notice of Completion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Future Commitments – Section 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3. Monitoring plans will be developed for all stages of Project to monitor proposed mitigation methods and ensure that they are effective and, where necessary, modify mitigation methods to ensure effective mitigation of impacts throughout the various phases of the Project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 6.1 Section 6.2 Section 6.3

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		Climate Change Mitigation	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From Section (1), entitled "Introduction" and Section (4), entitled "Project Description", understood that, the main objective of the Line 2 - Bloor-Danforth Subway extension project from Kennedy Station to Scarborough Center Station, is to support the development of Scarborough Centre as a vibrant regional urban centre by bringing a rapid transit option within walking distance to more people while creating a seamless journey for transit users at higher speed than a light rail transit. Even though it is also understood from section 5.4.2.4 entitled "Climate Change" that, the project will encourage residential intensification and urbanization of Scarborough Centre, by facilitating compact land use as well as contributing to Greenhouse Gases (GHGs) reduction by decreasing the number of cars on the route, the ministry’s review has noted that, nothing has been mentioned with respect to how the City/TTC intends to monitor and maintain the low carbon footprint cumulative benefit that has been identified in this section. And/or, if any predetermined improvement measures/strategies have been identified as part of the TPAP planning process in order to reassure the ministry that, the City/TTC, to the best of their knowledge and ability will continue to strive for the best possible technologies, infrastructures, vehicles, buildings and structures that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with the operation and maintenance of the new subway line. One of the key components of the ministry’s mandate includes building on and supporting the most current science, by leading the development of a new long-term climate change strategy for Ontario to help the government achieve its greenhouse gas reduction targets of 15% by 2020, 37% by 2030 and 80% by 2050 below 1990 level. Furthermore, the climate change action plan, as required by section 7(1) of Ontario's Climate Change Mitigation and Low-carbon Economy Act, 2016, sets out steps and actions that may be taken to fight climate change as well as initiatives relating to the reduction of greenhouse gas from transportation such as public transit vehicles, infrastructure and buildings that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. As the government work to achieve its goal of a "low-carbon economy", it is the expectation of the ministry that, the City/TTC demonstrate its awareness and contribution toward the government greenhouse gas reduction targets. It’s therefore suggested that further consideration be given to including in the EPR documentation, the City/TTC’s commitments and intentions with respect to how the Scarborough Subway extension project will be used as an opportunity to support the ministry’s mandate, and contribute to Climate Change mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.4.2.4 was revised to describe the City of Toronto and TTC’s strategies to achieving greenhouse gas reduction targets as outlined by the MOECC. The TTC and City of Toronto contribute to Ontario’s efforts of meeting its goal of becoming a low-carbon economy through their policies, practices, procedures and design. The TTC’s established safety, health and environment policy targets sustainability and environmental footprint reduction through energy and resource conservation. Additionally, the TTC complies with the Toronto Green Standard (TGS), and the associated Green Roof By-law subject to further discussions with the City. These standards are a set of performance measures and guidelines for new developments that promote sustainable site and building designs with the goal of addressing Toronto’s urban environmental pressures, such as air quality, climate change and energy efficiency. The TGS is also a key strategy to achieve the City of Toronto’s Climate Change Action Plan, an environmental plan aimed at reducing the City’s GHG emissions by 80% by 2050. The Plan outlines regular monitoring and reporting by the City to the community on the progress of reducing emissions and meeting their targets. Achieving the TGS also contributes towards Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Certification. The TTC goes beyond the TGS through the use of LEED specifications to ensure that additional LEED standards are incorporated in their projects in an effort to further encourage energy reductions (for further details see Section 5.4.2.4). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.4.2.4

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
June 12, 2017 (dated May 25, 2017)	MOECC Noise and Vibration	EPR (April 26, 2017) Section 2.2.2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise and Vibration Criteria: section 2.2.2 makes general reference to MOECC and TTC noise and vibration joint protocols, but does not identify the applicable document. Include specific reference to the applicable publication which is discussed in Section 2.1 of the Noise and Vibration Report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific reference to the MOECC/TTC Protocol for Noise and Vibration Assessment for the Proposed Yonge-Spadina Subway Loop (June 16, 1993) has been added to Section 2.2.2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.2.2
		EPR (April 26, 2017) 5.4.2.2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vibration Velocity Units: the table in section 5.4.2.2 expresses the vibration velocity criteria in units of decibels (dB reference 10-6 ips). The MOECC/TTC vibration velocity criterion is expressed in millimetres per second (mm/sec). Express the vibration velocity criteria in the units of millimetres per second (mm/second). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is acknowledged that the MOECC/TTC Protocol makes reference to vibration velocity levels Metric units in mm/sec. Additional text has been included in section 2.1 of the Noise and Vibration Impact Study (Appendix B-4) and the Table in Section 5.4.2.2 has been updated. A new column has been added to the table showing the conversions. The table has been expanded to include clear instructions distinguishing MOECC criteria and those from SS Wilson Associates’ (SSWA). In addition, a chart for conversions to mm/s has been included in Tables 1 and 2 of the Noise and Vibration Impact Study containing the overall results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.4.2.2 Appendix B-4
		Noise and Vibration Report (April 25, 2017)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise and Vibration Sub-Headers: the report currently discusses both noise and vibration under one header in each section. For clarity to the reader, split each section into discussion of noise and vibration individually under separate sub-headers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC subway projects generate vibration and their impact is manifested in building vibrations and sympathetic noise; i.e., both are related and cannot be separated. In many cases, the split of noise and vibration cannot be made. However, numerous editorial changes and a few paragraphs have been added in the revised Noise and Vibration Impact Study (Appendix B-4) to clarify noise and vibration impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B-4
		Noise and Vibration Report (April 25, 2017)	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Units of Vibration Velocity: the vibration criterion is 0.1 mm/sec (Section 2.0 of MOEE/TTC Protocol). The report discussions vibration effects in unit of decibels (dB reference 10-6 ips). Express the vibration velocity criteria in the units of millimetres per second (mm/second) throughout the report and in the prediction result tables (Table 1 and Table 2). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new column was added to the table in Section 2.1 showing conversions. The Table has been expanded to included clear instructions distinguishing MOECC criteria from SSWA’s. In addition, a chart for conversions to mm/s has been included in Tables 1 and 2 containing the overall results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B-4
		Noise and Vibration Report (April 25, 2017)	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predicted Noise and Vibration Levels: the predicted noise and vibration levels in Table 1 and Table 2 are expressed as ranges of value. This is vague and does not specifically quantify these impacts. Update this table to include specific noise and vibration levels at the worst case (i.e. the closest and most exposed) points of reception. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Throughout the study, the worst case Points of Reception (i.e., the most conservative for public protection) have been selected when predicting the noise and vibration levels at these the locations. This included the types of receptors and the closest ones for the selected groups of receptors. As to the range of the resulting noise and vibration levels, all noise and vibration models have a range for their accuracy including the MOECC’s own models. For this application, the accuracy is +/- 2.5 dB for noise and vibration. However, for conclusions and decision making purposes, the most conservative (highest) noise and vibration levels were selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B-4

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		Noise and Vibration Report (April 25, 2017)- Section 4.3.i	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment Method and Sample Calculations for Bus Terminal Noise: section 4.3.i presents predicted bus station sound levels at the nearest points of reception. The prediction method used to assess the bus station noise emissions should be based on the ISO model 9613-2 “Acoustics-Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors- Part 2: General method of calculation”. Furthermore, sample sound level calculations should be provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ISO 9613 standard (endorsed by the MOECC) for propagation of sound waves was used by SSWA to predict the sound levels due to the bus facilities and other applications involving air-borne noise. Additional explanation has been given along with sample calculations provided in Section 4.5 of the Noise and Vibration Impact Study (Appendix B-4). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B-4
		Noise and Vibration Report (April 25, 2017)- Section 4.5,3	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details of Vibration Prediction Model: section 4.5.3 discusses site specific features which are likely to affect the local vibration levels, and introduced the predicated results in Table 1 and Table 2. The vibration prediction method used and sample calculations should be provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief information on the nature of the vibration prediction model and new sample calculations have been provided in the revised Noise and Vibration Impact Study (Appendix B-4). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B-4
		Noise and Vibration Report (April 25, 2017)- Section 2.3	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise Impact Assessment Ratings: section 2.3 discusses the noise excesses in terms of subjective impact ratings. These are not appropriate criteria for this project as per the applicable MOECC/TTC Protocol. Additionally, the noise impacts assessment ratings are never referred to in the following sections of the report. Remove section 2.3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.3 refers to impact assessment with possibility of noise level excesses being predicted. In addition, Tables 1 and 2 in the Noise and Vibration Impact Study make reference to “excesses” for the predicted levels. Therefore, it is important to provide the readers with a measure of how to judge these excesses. In addition, there are several MOECC public documents in circulation that contain tables relating the excesses in levels to subjective reaction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Noise and Vibration Report (April 25, 2017)- 4.4 and 4.4.4	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of Traction Power Substations: section 4.4 refers to two traction power substations, while section 4.4.4 of the EPR refers to three traction power substations. The number of traction power substations should be the same in the EPR and the Noise and Vibration Report. Furthermore, figure(s) should be included to show the locations of the proposed traction power substations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes have been made as requested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B-4
June 13, 2017	MOECC Central Region	Air Quality	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EPR and Appendix B-3 do not address how the proposed Brimley Bus Terminal Station will comply with the D-series guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The D-series guidelines are typically looked at only in support of an application for a Zoning Bylaw Amendment (ZBA). The facility is located within the Scarborough Employment District By-Law No. 24982 (Progress). The D-series guidelines do not apply to this site or type of facility; however, if the guideline did apply and sensitive receptors are identified within the recommended setback distance and/or area of influence of the proposed facility, the guideline would require a detailed study. The Local Air Quality Assessment (Appendix B-3) performed satisfies the requirements of the detailed study as it assesses if applicable air quality guidelines are met at nearby residences when considering impacts from the facility alone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		Air Quality	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the EPR and Appendix B-3, it is not clear how the proponent will address local air quality impacts if contaminated soils are encountered during the construction phase of the proposed undertaking. Please clarify this issue and include the proposed mitigation measures in the commitments table of the EPR if applicable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The occurrence of impacts to air quality as a result of contaminated soils is unlikely; however, in the event that contaminated soils are encountered it will be handled in accordance with applicable environmental legislation, regulations and guidelines as required by the contractor. The details of which will be described in the Soil and Groundwater Management Plan to be developed during Detailed Design and implemented during construction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.3.1.1 Section 6, Table 6-1 Item #7
		Air Quality	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We recommend that the proponent apply non-chemical dust suppressants during dust mitigation Page 2 of 4 practices for the construction, wherever possible, instead of the chemical based dust suppressants as noted in the EPR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wherever possible water or non-chemical based dust suppression will be used. Section 5.3.2.1 to be updated to reflect use of non-chemical dust suppressants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.3.2.1
		Air Quality	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B-3 summarized the air quality impacts from the proposed Brimley Bus Terminal Station at the closest sensitive receptors. However it did not discuss how the proposed facility will comply at the point of impingement (POI) as stipulated in the local O. Regulation 419/05 or if the proposed facility falls under Air Emissions EASR (O. Reg. 1/17). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Air Quality Assessment focused on impacts at nearby sensitive receptors, in accordance with the <i>Environmental Guide for Assessing and Mitigating the Air Quality Impacts and Greenhouse Gas Emissions of Provincial Transportation Projects</i>. If required, in accordance with O. Reg. 419/05 or O. Reg. 1/17, point of impingement concentrations will be determined during the Detailed Design phase, once final equipment selections have been made and a full emissions summary and dispersion modelling (ESDM) report can be completed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Air Quality	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the bus idling impacts assessed in Appendix B-3, there is also by-products of natural gas combustion that contributes to the NO2 emission scenario, which was not included in Appendix B-3. Please provide a rationale why the NOx emission scenario did not include natural gas heating sources and how this facility will comply with O. Reg. 419/05 NO2 standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final equipment selections, including natural gas heating sources, will be reviewed at the time of Detailed Design to determine if an ESDM is required for the facility. According to the latest O. Reg. 1/17, the final sizing of the natural gas heating sources will determine if they are considered exempt or whether an assessment will be required. 	
		Air Quality	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Even if this proposed facility falls under Air Emissions EASR (O. Reg. 1/17), we recommend that the proponent assess how the proposed facility complies with local air regulation standards and/or guidelines, particularly in respect to NO2 emissions. 		
		Air Quality	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide further clarification on the following items: Will the proposed Bus Terminal Station include maintenance activities? If so, will these be significant or negligible as defined in Guideline A-5: Emission Summary Dispersion Modelling (ESDM Guideline)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This facility is a bus terminal and not a maintenance yard or garage. Buses will not overnight at this location but rather be sent from the nearest garage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Air Quality	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How was line sources/idling impacts modelled in Appendix B-3? It is not clear if the source parameters used in AERMOD followed the Air Dispersion Modelling Guideline in Ontario (ADMGO). For this reason, we request a sample input and output AERMOD modelling file for further review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roadway and idling vehicles were modelled as line-area sources in AERMOD, which is intended for modelling roadways. The latest ADMGO (Feb 2017) notes that this source type is a conservative approach for determining emissions from roadways. Sample electronic input and output AERMOD modelling files for the Future Build NOx scenario were provided to the MOECC on August 15, 2017. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		Air Quality	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide a rationale why cold starts were not discussed in Appendix B-3. For example, when the buses start at the beginning of each day, the cold start period also contributes to emissions. Please confirm if this was included in the emission scenario. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This facility is a bus terminal and not a maintenance yard or garage. Buses will not overnight at this location; therefore, cold starts were not included in the modelling, because buses will not be starting up at the facility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Air Quality	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Furthermore, the idling period for buses was estimated to be 3 minutes long. It appears that 3 minutes may not be realistic especially in very cold winter days. Please provide an explanation why cold starts were not included and why only 3 minutes were estimated for bus idling as the maximum idling scenario. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See comment above. City of Toronto by-laws permit 1 minute of idling with some exceptions that include buses while servicing customers. Based on current bus schedules, and TTC policy, 3 minutes is the maximum anticipated idling time for buses in bus terminals and is in compliance with the City’s by-laws. Cold starts are not applicable as starts are considered “cold” only after several hours of the engine being turned off. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Air Quality	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If cold starts were included in the idling emission scenario, how will this impact local air quality at the most impacted sensitive receptor (s)? 		
		Air Quality	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B-3 assumed the same number of buses during peak hours between current and future build scenario. However, as per Section 5.4.2, Toronto Transit Commission will expand its frequency of bus fleet by 11 buses in each direction during peak hours. As noted in the draft EPR, the fuel source type for the proposed future bus fleet is not known. However, there is the possibility of some future buses using diesel fuel as a source which contributes emissions to local air quality and therefore this should be looked at during the Transit EA stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicle traffic volumes on the surrounding roadways were grown by 2 % between the Existing and Future Build Scenarios. This 2 % growth rate includes buses driving on the roadway, which accounts for the increased bus volumes on local roadways. In the Local Air Quality Assessment (Appendix B-3), all buses were modelled operating on diesel fuel as the fuel type for the proposed fleet is not known. This is conservative, as diesel fuel results in the highest emission levels and therefore the assessment provides the worst-case results. If smart buses will comprise part of the fleet, emission levels would be reduced resulting in lower impacts at the nearby sensitive receptors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Air Quality	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lastly, we recommend that a discussion on the impact of the additional bus fleet on peak hour traffic be included in Appendix B-3. This discussion could be based on assumptions, for example, x% of the bus fleet will be comprised of smart buses and the remaining diesel, and how this will impact the closest sensitive receptors. 		
		Groundwater	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to the initiating of the construction project, the municipality should complete a hydrogeological assessment for the purpose of obtaining a Permit to Take Water and determining site specific subsurface conditions. The assessment should meet the requirements described in Technical Guidance Document for Hydrogeological Studies in Support of Category 3 Applications for Permit to Take Water, Ministry of the Environment of Ontario, Operations Division, April 2008. Construction Dewatering EASRs may be an option for shallow excavations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. All studies required prior to obtaining a Permit to Take Water will be completed prior to applying for the Permit. See Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		Groundwater	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The possible occurrence and depth of artesian conditions should be determined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing geotechnical investigations are determining where artesian conditions occur for the Project. Where construction occurs within artesian conditions, mitigation strategies will be developed as part of the construction plan for that site. See Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #7. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #7.
		Groundwater	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental site assessments should be completed for those areas along the alignment where subsurface contamination may occur. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. See Section 5.3.3.5, Table 5.5 and Table 5.6 for more details on environmental site assessment and designated substance surveys which will be conducted prior to property acquisition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Groundwater	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City engineering and environmental departments should be contacted to obtain information on possible contamination impacted sites along the area of interest. The ministry’s Toronto District should be contacted to see if it knows of any contaminated sites within the area of interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of the environmental due diligence prior to acquisition of properties, City engineering and environmental departments will be contacted to obtain information on possible contaminated sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #9
		Surface Water	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ministry would like to emphasize that given most of the existing stormwater management infrastructure was constructed prior to stormwater management controls being a requirement, there is an opportunity to improve the existing stormwater management system(s) found in the study area. We recommend that this opportunity be considered at this time and incorporated at the detail design stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An evaluation of the stormwater system is being undertaken in the area to determine the utility relocations and the upgrades required. TTC is working closely with Toronto Water in this regard. See Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #13. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Soil Management	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anyone engaging in soil management activities is responsible for ensuring excess soil is managed in and environmentally sound manner and according to all regulatory requirements. This includes municipalities, developers and owners of source and receiving sites. As you are aware, the ministry has finalized a guideline entitled “Excess Soil Management – A Guide for Best Management Practices”. These best practices are intended to complement existing approvals under provincial legislation and municipal by-laws. The ministry is also currently undergoing regulatory review for the movement of excess soils within the province through development of an Excess Soil Management Policy Framework. Based on the increased interest for the ministry in matters concerning the management of excess soil, the ministry’s Toronto District requests that the City provide a copy of its soil management plan for review. Please send the soil management plan directly to Kevin Webster, Manager of Toronto District Office, Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change at Place Nouveau 9th Floor, 5775 Yonge St, Toronto, ON M2M 4J1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed; comment noted. A Soil and Groundwater Management Strategy will be prepared during the Detailed Design of the Project. The Strategy will incorporate the guidelines and any changes to legislature that come into effect prior to construction. See Section 5.3.1.1 and Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #7. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
June 15, 2017	Metrolinx	Designated passenger pick-up/drop off (PPUDO) area	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We note that the Bus Terminal design does not feature a designated passenger pick-up / drop-off area. Metrolinx strongly supports the City’s efforts to promote transit-oriented development in the Scarborough Centre area and reduce personal vehicle usage for residents living in vicinity of transit stations. However, we feel that PPUDOs continue to play a role in the multi-modal first mile/last mile component for many longer distance travellers, serving the needs of those residing outside the vicinity of transit station areas. This includes intercity passengers who access regional transit services either by carpooling, taxi, or a demand-based ride share service (i.e. Uber). PPUDOs may also reduce demand for nearby parking spaces and reduce spillover onto the surrounding road system. We suggest that the City identify a PPUDO adjacent to the Bus Terminal, or an alternative location elsewhere within the wider Scarborough Centre area, possibly as part of the Scarborough On-The-Move Transportation Master Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing Scarborough Centre RT station currently has eight dedicated parking spaces serving Passenger Pick-Up/Drop Off (PPUDO). The facility is owned and maintained by Oxford properties and it is being left to Oxford to determine if they will replace it. A key objective of the SSE is to transform Scarborough Centre into a vibrant urban node, which requires as much land as possible within the vicinity of the station to be preserved for transit-oriented development and public space. The addition of a PPUDO would deplete the essential lands needed to achieve this vision for Scarborough Centre, and therefore was not included in the scope. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Section 4.3.4- Bus Terminal	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fare Integration- We suggest that section 4.3.4 ‘Bus Terminal’ make reference to the ongoing efforts underway to achieve fare integration amongst local and regional transit providers throughout the GTHA. Specifically, we feel this section should reference the impact that fare integration may have on the customer experience, and the need for the design to protect for a future integrated fare scenario. This would preclude the need for costly future retrofits at a later date. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This work is ongoing, but not concluded. The designs can readily be adapted in the future to reflect fare integration without significant, costly retrofits. As such, it is not seen as a key element for the TPAP discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Section 1.7	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interface of the SSE with Regional Express Rail- We suggest that the explanation of Regional Express Rail under section 1.7 “Transit Interface Considerations”, Table 1-1 (page 5 of the report) could be expanded beyond a description of the corridor as solely a “north-south transit spine through Scarborough”. Our suggested wording: “Transformation of the existing GO Rail system to deliver frequent two-way, all-day train service, seven days a week, on both the existing Stouffville and Lakeshore East lines that run through Scarborough, connecting passengers to both local and regional destinations.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested wording from Metrolinx has been incorporated into the final EPR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1.7
		No section specified	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elevator redundancy – The EPR does not contain any mention of a redundant vertical access for accessible pathways (often referred to as ‘elevator redundancy’) in the likely event of an elevator service disruption. Given the importance of vertical access to the design of the Bus Terminal, we feel this is essential to be mentioned even at this point in the design process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the size of the station, elevators are being incorporated at more than one station entrance location, which is a form of elevator redundancy. The issue of whether there should be further elevator redundancy at this station is currently under review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		Section 4.3.4.2-Barrier Free Access	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AODA compliance- We suggest that section 4.3.4.2 ‘Barrier Free Access’ should make reference to the importance of ensuring AODA compliance as part of the design of the Scarborough Centre Station and the Bus Terminal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 4.3.4.2 was updated to indicate importance of AODA compliance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 4.3.4.2
June 16, 2017	MTCS	Built Heritage Process and Cultural Heritage Landscapes	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft EPR makes note of heritage resources in the study area that are listed on the City of Toronto Heritage Register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. However, no technical cultural heritage study such as an Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment Report or Cultural Heritage Screening Report is appended, and it is unclear whether any consideration was given to potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes without previous recognition. Based on our discussion with the project team, it is our understanding that a screening was carried out earlier in the process by AECOM and found no previously unrecognized built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes, and that the final version of the EPR will include a “no finds memo” to this effect or a reference to the original screening. We would appreciate the opportunity to review this memo before the Notice of Completion and/or the final version of the EPR is circulated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed. A “no finds memo” was developed and sent to the MTCS prior to its inclusion in the final EPR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.4.2 Appendix B-7
		Archaeology	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Report carried out under PIF # P123-0274-2015 was submitted to MTCS for technical review on May 26, 2017, and is referenced in the draft EPR. Stage 2 fieldwork on the properties retaining archaeological potential within the impact footprint is named as a mitigation measure and future commitment. MTCS views the field survey component of the archaeological assessment process – in particular the Stage 2 property assessment – as a necessary part of the determination of potential archaeological impacts to be factored into the assessment of a proposed undertaking, rather than a mitigation measure to be carried out between planning and construction. Based on our discussion with the project team, it is our understanding that to the greatest extent possible based on timing and property access, the final EPR will include information obtained through the upcoming Stage 2 property assessment. It will also contain clear commitments to Stage 3 and 4 archaeological work, if necessary, with the resulting reports to be entered into the MTCS registry before detail design and/or construction. Additionally, and especially if it is not possible to incorporate the results of Stage 2 fieldwork into the final EPR, the final EPR should include more detail on the results of the Stage 1 background study and a timeline for further work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the meeting with the MTCS on May 30, 2017, field work for the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment was scheduled to be conducted late-June 2017. The Study Team since received a request from Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (MNCFN) for an MNCFN Field Liaison Representative to be present during the Stage 2 archaeological field work. Arrangements are currently underway to coordinate field work with MNCFN. Accommodating this request has delayed the Stage 2 work; therefore, a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will not be completed prior to the publication of the final EPR. Notwithstanding this delay, it is a future Project commitment to have all construction areas which were identified as having archaeological potential in the Stage 1 assessment, cleared of archaeological finds prior to the commencement of construction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.4.1 Section 5.2.4.1 Appendix B-7

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		E.2.4 Cultural Environment p.5	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph should be revised to make a clearer distinction between the findings of the Stage 1 AA and the status of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This paragraph in the Executive Summary has been reorganized for clarity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.2.4
		E.5 Impacts / Mitigation	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the project would not directly impact on built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, the EPR needs to include discussion about the potential indirect impacts on such resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following sentence has been added to Section 5.2.4.2 of the EPR clarifying that there are no anticipated indirect impacts: “<i>The two identified resources are separated from the Project footprint by other buildings and landscape features; therefore, no indirect impacts are expected.</i>” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.2.4.2
		E.6 Future Commitments	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per MOECC guidance material and previous discussions, a commitment ‘represents a guarantee from a proponent about a certain course of action’. It needs to be clear and detailed – what, when and how. Item 39 about archaeology needs to be more specific. Please clarify what the commitments are for indirect impacts on built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted, there are no direct or indirect impacts expected for built heritage or cultural heritage landscapes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.4.2 E.6 and Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #39 Appendix B-7
		E.7 Consultation Process And 7.3.5 Government Review Team	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please clarify who were the heritage stakeholders consulted and whether the City of Toronto Heritage Preservation Services was consulted and their recommendations/comments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In late-2015, during the preliminary planning phases, AECOM (heritage specialists retained by the TTC for this Project), consulted directly with the City of Toronto Heritage Preservation Services. Subsequently, upon the review of the current alignment, AECOM re-checked the City’s heritage lists, which included properties that are listed and designated. The list is up to date and is a reliable tool for determining where the city has interests. AECOM also checked Canada’s Register of Heritage Places and the Register of Federal Heritage Designations (FHBRO, HSMBC) prior to assessing potential impacts to heritage for the EPR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 7.3.4
		2.4.1 Archaeological Resources	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As discussed, the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment fieldwork, if possible, should be carried out before completion of the TPAP process and its results incorporated into this section. Additionally, and especially if this is not possible, this section should include more detail on the results of the Stage 1 background study and a timeline for further work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See response to comment #2 above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.4.1 Appendix B-7
		2.4.2 Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Landscapes	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As discussed, this section should include reference to a “no finds memo” or previous screening for potential unrecognized cultural heritage resources. Additionally, we would recommend changing the title of this section to Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional wording has been added to this section of the final EPR that references the “no finds memo”. The section heading has been revised, as suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.4.2 Section 5.2.4.2 Appendix B-7

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		5.2.4.1 Archaeology	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As discussed, this section will be updated to reflect the archaeological information available at the time of study completion. If Stage 2 of the archaeological assessment has not been completed or recommends further study, this section should include commitments to the remaining stages of archaeological assessment, as necessary, and to have the associated reports entered into the MTCS register before construction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See response to comment #2. This section has been revised accordingly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.2.4.1
		Table 5-5	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeology row should be updated in accordance with the updates to Section 5.2.4.1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5-5 has been updated accordingly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5-5
		Table 6.1	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Row 39 should be updated in accordance with the updates to Section 5.2.4.1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 6-1 has been updated accordingly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #39
		Section 7	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See comments above on E.7. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See response to comment #6. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 7.3.4
June 23, 2017	TRCA	2.1.3	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff notes in Section 2.1.3 Existing and Future Conditions Drainage and Hydrology, that although the proposed work is in the conceptual stage, please note that any increase in impervious area within TRCA’s jurisdiction is subject to stormwater management control per TRCA’s criteria (ref. http://sustainabletechnologies.ca/wp/wpcontent/uploads/2013/01/SWM-Criteria-2012.pdf). The most updated TRCA criteria must be used during the detailed design stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. During Detailed Design the latest TRCA criteria will be applied for any proposed work within TRCA jurisdiction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Table 5-5	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under Table 5-5 Impacts, Mitigation and Monitoring Related to the Displacement of Existing Features Please identify any outfalls that require relocation as a result of the project. TRCA will provide the hydraulic model for this section of the Highland Creek under separate correspondence. Please note that TRCA requires that any relocated outfalls are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside the 100 Year Erosion Limit (A certified Fluvial Geomorphologist to determine 100 Year Erosion Limit); Above the 25-Year Flood elevation (please contact TRCA to acquire the most up-to-date HEC-RAS model); Oriented downstream; and, Appropriate erosion treatments are placed at the outfall. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The identification of any outfalls which may require relocation as a result of the Project will occur during Detailed Design. TRCA requirements for relocated outfalls have been noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		Appendix B-2	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note the following comments relating to Appendix B-2 Stormwater Management Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 2 has the Regulatory Floodline in the legend however it is not present on the drawing. Please show the Regulatory Floodline on the drawing. Please ensure that the Emergency Exit Building 5 remains out of the Regulatory Floodplain throughout the detailed design process. As detailed design progresses, please provide TRCA with an erosion and sediment control report and plan for Emergency Exit Building 5. Please note that TRCA prefers for construction staging activities to be located outside of the Regulatory Floodplain to the extent possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Regulatory Floodline of Bendale Branch at McCowan Road was shown at the lower right corner of Figure 2 to demonstrate the potential impact from Emergency Exit Building 5 (EEB 5). An Erosion and Sediment Control Report and plan for EEB 5 will be prepared during Detailed Design stage and provided to TRCA for review. All construction activities will be located outside of the Regulatory Floodplain with the exception of EEB 5. Construction of EEB 5 might be within/adjacent to the Regulatory Floodplain. Detailed flood hazard assessment (if required) and erosion and sediment control plan will be developed during the Detailed Design stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Plan and Profile Drawings	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note these general edits for the Plan and Profile Drawings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please label the water courses on Keyplan SSE-G300 Please show the Regulatory Flood elevations and label watercourses on plan and profile drawings SSE-G307, SSE-G308, SSE-G312 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan and Profile Drawings were updated to include these revisions with the exception of adding the Regulatory Flood elevation on SSE-G307 drawing as the Study Team does not have this information for this particular area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibit 4-17 a-t
		Emergency Exit Building	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It appears the Emergency Exit Building 5 is extremely close to the valley to the north. The structure above ground is immediately adjacent to the trees contiguous with the valley. TRCA policy would require that this EEB and any associated construction disturbance be located 10 m from the dripline of the trees. Efforts should be taken to adjust the location of this structure away from the erosion hazard and natural features to the extent possible with appropriate buffers. TRCA will work with the city to ensure that our policy objectives are met while successfully implementing this infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. Through design and construction planning, all efforts will be made to stage works in such a way as to minimize construction disturbance. The design will consider adjusting the structure away from the dripline as much as possible; however, due to access constraints with the hospital and work site safety requirements, some disturbance may be unavoidable and may result in construction disturbance within 10 m of the dripline. Should such a case arise, careful consideration of impacts and effective mitigation will be applied to ensure disturbance is minimized, to the extent possible. The TTC/City will continue to work closely with the TRCA to ensure that EEB 5 is designed in a way that best meets the objectives of the Project and the TRCA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		Appendix B	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As indicated in Appendix B (Natural Heritage report) Staff recommends that once site specific details are confirmed during the detailed design stage, TTC and City provide an ecological and hydrogeological opinion on potential long term impacts to groundwater interaction within Frank Faubert Woods. Is there a potential for the tunnel works to cut off groundwater inputs to a portion of the woods? Is there potential for the tunnel wicking away recharge, impacting the water table? This information will be helpful both to assess construction and operational impacts and should be investigated at the earliest convenience and appropriate site specific data collected to assist in this assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tunnel will be completely sealed off, with no meaningful water inflow, and will not affect the water table or underground water regime in the area. Additionally, the space between the precast concrete liners and the ground is completely filled with grout so there will be no flow of water along the outside of the tunnel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Monitoring Section	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please expand the monitoring section to include an approach to be taken while drilling beneath the streams and valleys. Although TTC and the City are planning to use a single 10.7 m wide Earth Pressure Balance EPB TBM at a minimum of 10 m below the invert of the watercourses and the duration of tunneling is expected to be relatively fast, as part of the environmental management plan (EMP) for the duration of construction, please ensure that the environmental monitoring program is included to observe the watercourses and ensure that no issues arise. These could include sedimentation due to upward air or liquid movement associated with tunneling operations. Staff will be available to assist with defining the scope of the monitoring program as the project design progresses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. This will be determined during Detailed Design. A scour analysis has been scheduled which will identify any potential for sedimentation in the creek. In addition, the monitoring program will include monitoring of the creeks during tunnelling when the tunnel boring machine (TBM) reaches and passes underneath the creeks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
			8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear which sewer system would receive dewatering flows. If storm sewers are to receive flows, the potential impact of those additional flows at associated outlet locations should be assessed. Measures and monitoring should be undertaken to ensure erosion is not exacerbated at the inlet/outlet location. Our recommendation is to discharge to City sanitary sewer system if possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent of dewatering requirements, and where dewatering flows to, will be determined during Detailed Design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Cut and Cover Information	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding the cut and cover construction of the EEB located within the Highland Creek valley, a TRCA permit in line with Ontario Regulation 166/06 will be required prior to construction commencement within TRCA regulated areas. All efforts should be taken to assess and reduce construction impacts to natural hazards and features during the construction of this EEB. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. A TRCA Permit (per O. Reg. 166/06) will be applied for and received prior to construction commencing at EEB 5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		Natural Heritage Study	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff notes the a natural heritage study was undertaken and documented in the EPR appendices which indicates that there will likely be no impacts to the natural features as the EEB is located 15 m way from the deciduous forest of the Bendale Branch. Staff recommends that a comprehensive site assessment study be undertaken once the exact site of these structures is confirmed, to document the extent of natural heritage impacts, mitigation of the removals at the DD stage. Vegetation removals will feed into the development of site restoration and possible off—site vegetation/feature compensation. Please ensure that City of Toronto Urban Forestry staff is consulted with regards to vegetation impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. An initial meeting occurred with Urban Forestry and Ravine and Natural Features on June 23, 2017 to provide the agencies with an overview of the Project, confirm extent and requirements of the arborist work. Further consultation, as necessary, will occur with City of Toronto Urban Forestry staff as the Project develops. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		DFO review	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff notes the review from DFO will be requested at the detailed design stage, please keep TRCA informed on that request (for information purposes). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. TTC will provide the TRCA with information on the DFO application which will occur during Detailed Design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		DFO review	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efforts should be taken to manage and address surficial and groundwater dewatering along the construction area for the Highland Creek EEB and TPSS. With regards to dewatering, please consider potential for surficial erosion, groundwater seepage, and manage construction discharges to steep slopes needs to be avoided. Please provide details regarding how construction will occur while managing these environmental issues and protecting the features that should remain on site – through the preparation and implementation of an erosion and sediment control plan and EMP, in consultation with TRCA, as noted in the EA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. Details regarding the construction and management of environmental issues will be further developed during Detailed Design, included in an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Environmental Management Plan. See Section 5.3.1.2, Section 5.3.1.3 and Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #16 and #17. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		EEB and TPSS design	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff notes that there were in-depth groundwater and hydrogeological information provided at this. Please ensure that the EEB and TPSS designs located near Highland Creek are supported by the necessary technical studies such as hydraulic studies, geotechnical and hydro-geological studies, detailed vegetation inventory work, mitigation, restoration and compensation plans. Details of these studies should be confirmed early in the design process so they can inform the design. As discussed, staff recommends staking of the top of bank at EEB 5 location as soon as possible to help in the siting of this building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. This work will be undertaken during Detailed Design. See Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #15. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Construction Section	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please confirm whether any nearby recreational amenities (informal trail system) would be impacted during construction. Efforts should be taken to keep these amenities open during construction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts to the informal trail system north of West Highland Creek are not anticipated during construction. Construction of EEB 5 is south of West Highland Creek on Scarborough and Rouge Hospital property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		Design Section	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide a pre-design brief once a detailed design consultant is on board, that identifies commitments made during the EA with respect to TRCAs Areas of Interest and explain how these commitments have been fulfilled in the detailed design submissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. The pre-design brief will be developed once the design consultant has been selected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Permit Application Package	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When submitting a permit application package, please include the following information: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Construction schedule; Plan and profile of erosion and sediment controls and ensure they are designed in accordance with the Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Urban Construction - December 2006 (www.sustainabletechnologies.ca); Tree and Vegetation removals plan; Tree and Vegetation protection measures; Stockpiling areas and construction limits; Site access, including typical cross-sections of existing and proposed grades; Dewatering and unwatering plans, showing how groundwater and surface water from the work area will be treated prior to release to the natural environment, if required; Restoration planting details and schedule for all disturbed areas (including construction access points and staging areas). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. This will be undertaken during Detailed Design. See Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #7, #17 and #19. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Geotechnical Requirements	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following presents the geotechnical requirements that should be undertaken at the earliest convenience to provide direction to the design of project components <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please undertake the necessary geotechnical study in support of the proposed undertaking to assess the ground condition along the alignment and to provide the geotechnical design recommendations for the various components of the proposed undertaking; The proposed undertaking should avoid encountering any problematic ground conditions identified as per the geotechnical study, which can adversely impact the surrounding area and causes hazards; For the proposed emergency exit building, where it is located in proximity to the valley slopes or banks (e.g. Drawing SSE-G312 – Emergency Exit Building), the slope stability and erosion hazard assessment should be undertaken to ensure that the proposed work is not undermined by erosion hazard in long-term or does not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC and the City acknowledge the geotechnical requirements recommended by the TRCA to be undertaken to inform the design of EEB 5 and ensure long term stability of the permanent structures. The geotechnical investigation along the alignment is ongoing and the results of the investigation will inform the Detailed Design. A slope stability and erosion hazard assessment will be undertaken during Detailed Design. See Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #16. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #16

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
				<p>destabilize the valleys. In this case, the position of the Long-Term Stable Top of Slope should be delineated with a minimum safety factor of 1.50 as per geotechnical study;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In areas near the Highland Creek (Bendale Branch) the slope stability and erosion hazard assessment should be undertaken to ensure that the proposed work is not undermined by erosion hazard in long-term or does not destabilize the valleys. ▪ Where the stabilization is required due to the active erosion in the Highland Creek valley system, the stabilization should be designed by geotechnical engineer to ensure that a minimum safety factor of 1.50 is met after stabilization; ▪ If warranted, any grading, alterations or earthworks and retaining structures should be properly reviewed and design by a site-specific geotechnical studies and all necessary analyses. Further, all engineering drawings should be prepared showing all necessary details and specifications and submitted as signed and sealed by Licensed Professional Engineer; ▪ If it is determined that works are warranted near the creek slope and valleys, the construction methodology and sequencing should be presented to ensure that the surrounding ground/slope is not adversely impacted during the construction; ▪ Where the work requires the construction access into the steep slopes and valleys (e.g. the shafts for construction of the EEB 5), the cross-sections and profile should be presented for the access. ▪ The slope stability assessment is required to study the cross-sections (cuts and fills) and to confirm that the slope stability is met. The slope stability analyses should also account for the heavy machinery/equipment loads and vibrations ▪ If the construction of EEB 5 or the TPSS results in alterations and disturbance into the slopes and valleys, the stabilization after the construction is required to be reviewed by the geotechnical engineer. Given the slope geometry and the extent of the alterations, the stabilization may require to be engineered (e.g. engineering structures) to ensure that the stabilization remains stable in long-term with a minimum safety factor of 1.50. Further, all necessary engineering details, cross-sections should be prepared by geotechnical engineer and submitted as signed and sealed by Licensed Professional Engineer. 		

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-15: Government Review Team Comments on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date Received	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
		Detailed Design	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the following TRCA policy programs and guidelines for guidance when developing the detailed design components of the EEB, Stations and TPSS. Please include these studies and reference documents to Table 5.5 of the EPR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRCA Stormwater Management Criteria – (2012); Low Impact Development Guidelines for Storm Water Management Design; GGHACA Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Urban Construction (2006); TRCA Geotechnical Engineering Design and Submission Plan Guidelines; TRCA Environmental Impacts Statement Guidelines. Link to TRCA website where all these documents can be downloaded http://www.trca.on.ca/planning-services-permits/developers-and-consultants-information/planning-and-development-procedural-manual.dot#subm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5-5 was updated to reflect criteria and guidelines needed to develop the EEBs, TPSSs and the Scarborough Centre Station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5-5
		Natural Environment-mitigation	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please ensure that vegetation protection is implemented in line with City of Toronto Tree Protection Policy and Specifications for construction near trees. As mentioned in previous discussions, our preference is to stage works in such a way to minimize the amount of disturbed areas at a given time. Temporary site restoration should be incorporated into the construction staging and sequencing process to the extent possible. As noted in previous discussions, TRCA may seek further compensation for all vegetation losses within the natural system as a result of this project. The removals plan will be used to determine compensation required for losses and damages. Please ensure removals plan show species and quantity of vegetation removed and where they will be removed. On average TRCA recommends a minimum compensation in line with TRCA compensation protocol ratios, the details can be worked out with City of Toronto Urban Forestry during the detailed design phase. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. The construction footprint for the EEB 5 will be limited as far as practical. Where vegetation removal is required, TTC in collaboration with the City will develop a Removal Plan and continue consultation with Urban Forestry and the TRCA for any due mitigation and/or compensation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 6 Future Commitments, Table 6-1 Item #16
			20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please ensure that TRCA is circulated on the planning act review for the structures proposed within our regulated area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. TRCA will be included in planning act review related to EEB 5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		6.1	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staffs notes and commends the efforts to coordinate construction with Toronto Hydro, Toronto Water and other agencies that may be affected by utility relocations to help minimize the overall impacts of the project on the existing natural heritage system. Please note that these works may require separate permits from TRCA and include this item the future commitment section (6.1) of the report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. Future Commitment for utilities (Chapter 6, Table 6.1 Item #29) will be amended to be clearer that all permits necessary for utility relocations will be sought from all relevant parties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 6, Table 6-1 Item #29

Communication and Consultation Process

7.4.4.2 Meetings

As previously mentioned, prior to the commencement of the TPAP, the Study Team met with the MOECC on April 11, 2017 to discuss the SSE and the general approach to undertaking the TPAP. An outline of the proposed dates to commence TPAP was discussed. The Study Team shared the consultation plan and public meeting approach. MOECC identified agencies for the City to arrange meetings with to discuss the Draft EPR, and respond to any questions.

During the TPAP, meetings were held with several review agencies to discuss the Draft EPR. A summary of the discussions that took place during these meetings are provided in **Table 7-16**.

Table 7-16: Summary of Feedback Received from Review Agencies on the Draft EPR

Date	Agency	Location	Summary of Meeting
May 17, 2017	MOECC	135 St. Clair Avenue West, 2 nd Floor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed the history of the SSE including all council decisions and key issues. The Study Team shared a presentation with all the key issues raised during the project, and how these concerns were addressed. The Study Team also shared its full engagement log with Indigenous communities, and discussed future commitments of the SSE.
May 30, 2017	MTCS	City Hall, 21 st Floor, East Tower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion on how the built heritage landscape was developed and the screening process. A technical memo with more detail will be produced outlining the approach and rationale to be included in the final EPR. Archaeological discussions on the Stage 1 report submitted to MTCS, evaluation criteria, Stage 2 Assessment, Stage 3 and 4 Assessments prior to construction if applicable.
June 19, 2017	TRCA	TRCA Head Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion regarding TRCA's comments on the Draft EPR, the Environmental Management Plan and specifics related to Emergency Exit Building (EEB) 5 which is located within TRCA jurisdiction. Many of the TRCA comments will need to be addressed as part of Detailed Design as opposed to during the TPAP.

7.4.5 Engagement with Indigenous Communities

7.4.5.1 Notice of Commencement and Draft Environmental Project Report

Prior to the distribution of the Notice of Commencement, the Study Team sent a letter to the Indigenous communities on April 4, 2017 to provide an update regarding the upcoming TPAP for the SSE.

It should be noted that in a letter dated April 12, 2017, the MOECC provided a list identifying Indigenous communities who may have an interest in the Project. The list did not include any additional communities than those that were consulted with during the preliminary planning phases. Therefore, all of the communities that were consulted with during preliminary planning phases were also consulted with during the TPAP.

The Notice of Commencement announcing the start of the TPAP for the SSE was sent to the Indigenous communities via email and registered mail on April 27, 2017. The Notice also included notification for the public meeting that was held on May 10, 2017. A copy of the emails and letters are provided in **Appendix C-7**.

A hard copy of the Draft EPR, including the Executive Summary, was provided to the Indigenous communities on May 1, 2017 via registered mail. On May 8, 2017 a hard copy of the Stormwater Management Report was sent to the Indigenous communities. The communities were asked to review and provide comments on the Draft EPR by June 12, 2017. Courtesy emails and phone calls were made on June 2 and June 6, 2017 to ensure that the communities received the reports and remind them of the deadline to submit comments on the Draft EPR. On June 15, 2017, an email was sent to the Indigenous communities stating that the deadline for comments was extended to June 19, 2017.

Table 7-17 provides the comments from the Indigenous communities on the Draft EPR and the Study Team's consideration of the comments. Letters that included the Study Team's responses were sent directly to each Indigenous community that provided comments prior to the publication of the EPR (see **Appendix C-7**).

No comments were received from Alderville First Nation and Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation in response to the circulation of the Draft EPR.

7.4.6 Stakeholder Advisory Group

The SAG was established to provide input during the preliminary planning phases; during the TPAP they were consulted in the same way as the general public. Any comments or feedback received from SAG members during the TPAP are included in **Section 7.4.1.4**.

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-17: Comments from Indigenous Communities on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
June 16, 2017	Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (MNCFN)	Archaeology Stages 2 through 4	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please note that it is our policy at MNCFN that all consultation should be carried out directly between the First Nation and the proponent, rather than through a consultant. • Therefore, MNCFN insists that its Field Liaison Representatives (“FLRs”) are on site whenever any environmental or archaeological fieldwork (Stages 2 through 4) is occurring within our treaty territory. • Our preference is that the cost for the participation of our FLRs is covered by the proponent, not the consultant, whom we view as having the ultimate responsibility to consult with the Nation. Please also note that MNCFN requires two of its Field Liaison Representatives to be on location whenever fieldwork is taking place within its treaty territory. This has become a requirement in light of uncommon, but unfortunate, occurrences when FLRs have felt pressured or intimidated from external persons while at work locations. We ask that you would respect this request. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since receipt of this request, the City and TTC have been in discussions with MNCFN and arrangements were made for an MNCFN Field Liaison Representative to be present during the Stage 2 archaeological field work conducted by AECOM, TTC’s consultants. • A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment is not required to be completed as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) process; however, it is a future Project commitment to have all construction areas which were identified as having archaeological potential in the Stage 1 assessment, cleared of archaeological finds prior to the commencement of construction. Archaeological Resources and Engagement with Indigenous Communities is described in detail in Sections 2.4.1, 5.2.4.1 and 7.4.6 in the EPR. A copy of the Archaeological Assessments for the Project will be made available to MNCFN. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2.4.1 • Section 5.2.4.1 • Section 7.4.6
June 9, 2017	Hiawatha First Nation		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to be reassured that wildlife, habitat, archaeological sites and water tributaries will be adequately protected from contamination for 7 generations without upsetting the balanced ecosystem/relationship we have with our Mother Shka-kimi-kwe. This project by its very nature has the potential to bring about momentous and long-lasting impacts on the natural environment. Any infringement on Treaty rights must be justified by the Crown. These Treaties are no less important than the Constitution in defining Canada. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We understand your concern for the long-term protection of wildlife, habitat, archeological sites, and water tributaries. As part of the future commitments of this Study, various plans and procedures will be developed to assist with addressing spills, erosion control, dewatering impacts on surface features, such as fish and fish habitats, and nearby terrestrial features. • Potential impacts are assessed and mitigation measures that will be taken to avoid any lasting impact in the areas that were mentioned are described in detail in the EPR (Chapter 5). The Report also describes monitoring plans and commitments for future work (Chapter 6) to reduce impacts to the environment to the extent possible. Care has, and will continue to be taken in the design and implementation of the SSE. In addition, a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment is not required to be completed as part of the TPAP; however, it is a future Project commitment to have all construction areas which were identified as having archaeological potential in the Stage 1 assessment, cleared of archaeological finds prior to the commencement of construction. Archaeological Resources and Engagement with Indigenous Communities is described in detail in Sections 2.4.1, 5.2.4.1 and 7.4.6 in the EPR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 5 • Chapter 6

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-17: Comments from Indigenous Communities on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
June 19, 2017	Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the project is running through heavy urbanized lands we remain constantly concerned on environmental impact as the land is continuously altered for increasing settlement and population increase purposes. While it will always be treaty land this may not register with planners and certain agencies; but over the long term we cannot help but be concerned with the push of development and population increase as it snakes its way eastward, as it pushes against the Greenbelt, as it pushes against the environment, as it alters the landscape. A rail network is not a highway system, insofar as the right of way is concerned, however it still alters the land and given that our history in this region has experienced extensive land alteration for generations we must remain diligent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We agree that encroachment of urbanized land on the Greenbelt and other natural areas should be carefully considered as part of transit planning. The SSE is an important part of managing the growth being experienced within the Toronto region without expanding the urban area. The assessment and mitigation of impacts to the natural environment is a key component of the TPAP, the Environmental Assessment (EA) process to which the SSE is subject. Potential impacts are assessed and mitigation measures that will be taken to avoid any lasting impact in the areas that were mentioned are described in detail in the final EPR (Chapter 5). The Report also describes monitoring plans and commitments for future work (Chapter 6) to reduce impacts to the environment to the extent possible. Care has, and will continue to be taken in the design and implementation of the SSE. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 5 Chapter 6
June 19, 2017	Curve Lake First Nation		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although we have not conducted exhaustive research nor have we the resources to do so, Curve Lake First Nation Council is not currently aware of any issues that would cause concern with respect to our Traditional, Aboriginal and Treaty rights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		Archaeology	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note that we have particular concern for the remains of our ancestors. Should excavation unearth bones, remains or other such evidence of a native burial site or any Archaeological findings, we must be notified without delay. In the case of a burial site, Council reminds you of your obligations under the Cemeteries Act to notify the nearest First Nation Government or other community of Aboriginal people which is willing to act as a representative and whose members have a close cultural affinity to the interred person. The regulations further state that the representative is needed before the remains and associated artifacts can be removed. Should such a find occur, we request that you contact our First Nation immediately. Curve Lake First Nation also has available, trained Archaeological Liaisons who are able to actively participate in the archaeological assessment process as a member of a field crew, the cost of which will be borne by the proponent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If any archaeological and/or historical resources are discovered during construction, the performance of the work in the area of the discovery will cease. The Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) (Archaeological Unit) will be notified for an assessment of the discovery. Work in the area of the discovery would not resume until cleared by the Ministry. Indigenous communities will be notified and a licensed archaeologist will be engaged to carry out fieldwork in compliance with the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>. If human remains are found, police will be notified immediately and all work will cease in the vicinity of the remains. The archaeologist will assist by determining if the remains are in fact human, and will work with the police to determine if the area is a forensic or archaeological situation. If it is considered forensic, the police will have control of the area; if it is considered archaeological, the Cemeteries Registrar and the Ontario Ministry of Government and Consumer Services will be contacted and the standard procedure for dealing with human remains will be followed. If previously unknown archaeological resources are impacted, the archaeologist monitor will have the power to halt construction until the archaeological resources have been appropriately dealt with. Thank you for your offer of services for a trained Archaeological Liaison; however, the TTC has retained licensed archaeologist from AECOM to conduct archaeological assessments for the Project who 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Communication and Consultation Process

Table 7-17: Comments from Indigenous Communities on the Draft Environmental Project Report and the Study Team’s Responses

Date	Agency	Sections Referenced	Comment #	Questions / Comments	Study Team’s Consideration and Response	Revised Environmental Project Report Section References
					<p>have been involved since the commencement of pre-planning for the SSE in 2014.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of the Archaeological Assessments for the Project will be made available once the work has been completed and the reports lodged with MTCS. 	
			3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If any new, undisclosed or unforeseen issues should arise, that has potential for anticipated negative environmental impacts or anticipated impacts on our Treaty and Aboriginal rights we require that we be notified regarding these as well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City and TTC are committed to keeping all interested parties, including Curve Lake First Nation, informed and involved in the Project as it progresses. As such, the City and TTC will notify Curve Lake First Nation if any new, undisclosed or unforeseen issues should arise, that has potential for anticipated negative environmental impacts on Treaty and Aboriginal rights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

Communication and Consultation Process

7.5 Notice of Completion and 30-Day Review of the Environmental Project Report

This EPR was completed in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings, where its environmental impact was assessed in accordance with the TPAP. Once completed the EPR is to be published for a 30 day review period (see **Section 1.4** for more details regarding the TPAP). As such, on August 24, 2017, a Notice of Completion was issued to inform stakeholders of the SSE, including the general public, property owners (within 60 metres of the Project), TAC members, GRT members, and Indigenous communities regarding the availability of the EPR for review.

A copy of the Notice of Completion is provided in **Appendix C-8**.

This EPR is being made available for review from August 24 to September 25, 2017 at several locations, in hard-copy format at the addresses below and electronically on the SSE website (www.scarboroughsubwayextension.ca):

- **City Hall Library**
100 Queen Street West, 1st Floor
Tel: 416-393-7650
Monday to Friday, 10:00 am to 6:00 pm
- **Scarborough Civic Centre – City Clerk’s Office**
150 Borough Drive, 3rd Floor
Tel: 416-396-7287
Monday to Friday, 8:30 am to 4:30 pm
- **Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, Central Region**
5775 Yonge Street, 8th Floor
North York, ON M2M 4J1
Tel: 416-326-6700
Monday to Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm
- **Environmental Approvals Branch**
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, 135 St. Clair Avenue West, 1st Floor
Toronto, ON M4V 1P5
Tel: 416-314-8001 or 1-800-461-6290
Monday to Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm
- **Toronto Public Library – Scarborough Civic Centre**
156 Borough Drive, Scarborough, ON M1P 4N7
Tel: 416-396-3599
Monday to Thursday, 9:00 am to 8:30 pm, Friday 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, Saturday 9:00 am to 5:00 pm
- **Toronto Public Library – Kennedy/Eglinton**
2380 Eglinton Avenue East, Scarborough, ON M1K 2P3
Tel: 416-396-8924
Tuesday & Thursday 12:30 pm to 8:30 pm, Wednesday & Friday 10:00 am to 6:00 pm, Saturday, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

- **Toronto Public Library – Bendale**
1515 Danforth Rd, Scarborough, ON M1J 1H5
Tel: 416-396-8910
Tuesday & Thursday 12:30 pm to 8:30 pm, Wednesday & Friday 10:00 am to 6:00 pm, Saturday, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm
- **Toronto Public Library – Cedarbrae**
545 Markham Rd, Scarborough, ON M1H 2A1
Tel: 416-396-8850
Monday to Friday, 9:00 am to 8:30 pm, Saturday 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, Sunday 1:30 pm to 5:00 pm

Following the 30-day EPR review period, the MOECC has authority to require further consideration of the transit project or to impose conditions on it if the Minister is of the opinion that:

- The transit project may have a negative impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value or interest; or,
- The transit project may have a negative impact on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right.

Before exercising the authority referred to above, the Minister is required to consider any written objections to the transit project received within 30 days after the Notice of Completion is first published.

Interested persons are encouraged to review the EPR and provide comments no later than September 25, 2017. If you have discussed your issues with the proponent and you object to the identified changes to the project, you may submit an objection to this transit project to the Minister by September 25, 2017 to the address provided below. All submissions must clearly indicate that an objection is being submitted and describe any negative impacts to matters of Provincial importance: impacts to the natural environment, cultural environment or Aboriginal rights.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental Approvals Branch
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
135 St. Clair Avenue West, 7th Floor
Toronto, ON M4V 1P5
Attention: Yves Dagssie, Special Project Officer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A copy of your objection should also be copied to the City of Toronto Project Manager:
Mike Logan, Acting Program Manager
Transit Implementation Unit
100 Queen Street West, 21st Floor, East Tower |
| <p>Tel: 416-314-7222
Fax: 416-314-8452
Email: Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca</p> | <p>Tel: 416-338-5568
Fax: 416-392-1591
Email: Mike.Logan@toronto.ca</p> |

7.6 Summary of Project Alterations in Response to Comments Received

Stakeholders of the SSE, including the general public, property owners (within 60 metres of the Project), TAC members, GRT members, and Indigenous communities were consulted with during the preliminary planning of

the SSE and their feedback was considered at that time. For example, feedback received during the public open houses; TAC, SAG and GRT meetings; online consultation were considered as part of the planning and development process for the SSE (see **Section 7.3** of further details).

During the TPAP, the Draft EPR was distributed to TAC and GRT members, as well as Indigenous communities in order to receive comments and feedback on the EPR prior to its completion. The Study Team also hosted a public meeting and held individual meetings with other stakeholders throughout the TPAP consultation period to ensure feedback was sought and concerns were addressed to the extent possible. **Table 7-14, Table 7-15** and **Table 7-17** include where alterations to the EPR were made based on the comments received.

7.7 Ongoing Engagement

As described in **Chapter 6**, Future Commitments, the City of Toronto and TTC are committed to continuing to engage and communicate with stakeholders beyond the TPAP. Specifically, the City and TTC will:

- Develop a Communication Plan for the Design and construction phases of the Project. This will include a community relations program that will provide businesses, residents and commuters with regular Project information and responses to enquiries. In addition this will include ongoing engagement as required with Indigenous communities.
- Create a Construction Liaison Committee made up of community stakeholders in order to respond to, proactively monitor and address construction issues.
- Provide a Project Information Office that is open to the public. TTC Community Relations Officers will be on-hand during the week to speak to visitors and share information about the Project. The Project Information Office will also be used to hold meetings and workshops with stakeholders.
- Consult with emergency service providers – fire, police and emergency medical services – to develop plans to maintain emergency access during construction.
- Develop a communications plan / protocol to address any changes in TTC, GO Transit, Durham Region Transit (DRT) and intercity bus carriers during construction.
- Conduct further consultation with emergency service providers on SSE facility design details (e.g., fire routes to stations).