

7. CONSULTATION PROCESS

The general public, government agencies and various interest groups were provided opportunities to review and comment on this project during the course of the study. The City of Toronto Public Consultation Team was involved in the overall public consultation process. They offered a wide range of communication methods to the public, including project web site, dedicated telephone number, fax, and email address for contacting the project team.

Technical agencies, including federal, provincial, municipal agencies, utilities, and potential interested groups were contacted at the start of the project for their initial input. Two rounds of Public Information Centres were scheduled for the public to have direct communication with Project Team members. The consultation process for this study is described in this section.

Appendix M documents in detail the consultations carried out with the technical agencies, the public, and the First Nations communities. Copies of all correspondence, minutes of meetings and comments from notified agencies are provided in Appendix M. The comments and recommendations received from the public and correspondence with the First Nations communities have been included in the consultation reports in Appendix M. The main points of contact that were made during this study are shown in Exhibit 7-1.

7.1 External Agencies

7.1.1 METHOD OF CONSULTATION

Consultation was carried out to encourage technical agencies to provide input during the course of the study. The following agencies were invited to be involved and provide comment on the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) study for the Etobicoke-Finch West Light Rail Transit (EFLWRT):

Exhibit 7-1: Review Agencies

Government Review Agencies	Technical Agencies
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	All Stream
Environmental Canada	MTA All Stream Inc.
Department of Fisheries and Oceans	Telus
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)	Enwave Energy Corporation
Transportation Canada-Ontario Region	Group Telecom/360 Network
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs	Hydro One Network Inc.
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs	Toronto Hydro
Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration	Toronto Hydro Telecommunications
Ministry of Culture	Enbridge Gas Distribution
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Rogers Cable Inc.
Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Bell Canada
Ministry of Natural Resources	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Ministry of the Environment	Canadian National Railway
Ministry of Tourism and Recreation	Canadian Pacific Railway

Government Review Agencies	Technical Agencies
Ontario Ministry of Transportation	GO Transit
Ontario Realty Corporation	Toronto District School Board
Ministry of Health Promotion	Humber College
Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure	Ontario Provincial Police
Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care	City of Toronto Fire Services
	City of Toronto Police Services
	Toronto Emergency Medical Services

Meetings with major stakeholder agencies including the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA), the Ontario Ministry of Transportation, and Humber College were held to discuss the potential impacts and mitigation measures regarding the proposed LRT facility. The TRCA were interested in Regulated Areas, TRCA Program & Policy Areas and Provincial and Federal Program Areas located within the study area. The correspondence with external agencies and the meeting minutes are included in Appendix M.

7.1.2 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Exhibit 7-2 summarizes comments received from the TRCA during a meeting between the TTC and TRCA on August 24, 2008 and a TRCA letter of March 19, 2009 with comments on the Existing Conditions Report within the study area. The team's responses to these meeting comments and correspondence, as well as a letter dated October 7, 2009 regarding a review on an additional stop, and a letter on March 11, 2010 with responses to the Draft Environmental Project Report are also included. Comments were also received by the Ministry of Environment (MOE) in October 2009, however, these were based upon an original rough draft of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) that has subsequently been significantly modified. Responses are provided in Appendix M. A listing of MOE comments based upon MOE correspondence dated February 16, 2010 and responses are listed in Exhibit 7-3 with the copies of the correspondence in Appendix M. Commitments made over the course of this study are listed in Section 5.

Exhibit 7-2: TRCA Comments and Responses

Agencies Involved	Comment/Issue	Response/Future Course of Action
TRCA	Response to Existing Environmental Conditions Report: Lack of figures and plates in Existing Environmental Conditions Report (EECR). TRCA requires figures showing crossing locations, ELC mapping and fish data collection points should be provided. Also, an Appendix C is referenced in the EECR, but this appendix was not provided in the submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See Table 2: Summary of Existing Aquatic Resources Within the Project Area (page 14) in Appendix B Existing Environmental Conditions Report for crossing locations. Mapping for the crossings is provided in Figures 4 through 7. ➤ See Appendix B1 Photographic Record for crossing location plates. ➤ Appendix B3 is the <i>Vegetation</i>

Agencies Involved	Comment/Issue	Response/Future Course of Action
		<p><i>Species Listing</i> which is now included in the report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Aquatic habitat and fish data collection studies will be undertaken if and when detailed design of the LRT system indicates disturbance of watercourses.
	Information on aquatic habitat descriptions including channel dimensions (width, depth etc) at all crossing, and fish community data should be provided for all watercourses. This information was not provided for the West Don River. A photo log of existing conditions at all crossings should be provided to augment written descriptions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See Section 4.1.1 (page 6) in Appendix B for revised West Don River aquatic habitat description. ➤ See Appendix B1 Photographic Record for the photo log of existing conditions at all crossings.
	Section 4.2 – Environmentally Significant Areas (ESA) should reference the presence/absence of any areas designated by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, TRCA and the City of Toronto within the study area. Reference to the City of Toronto’s Natural Heritage system should also be identified as appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See Section 4.2 (page 14-15) in Appendix B for the revised <i>Environmentally Significant Areas (ESA)</i> which includes references to ESA designated by the OMNR, TRCA, City of Toronto as well as reference to the City of Toronto’s Natural Heritage system.
	Please provide mapping and ELC codes for vegetation communities. Identify if any species of conservation concern (provincially (NHIC), regionally (TRCA database of L ranks), or locally (City of Toronto, Varga <i>et. A.</i> 2000) were identified in the study area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ELC communities and locations for vegetation communities can be found on Table 3: ELC Vegetation Communities within the Study Limits (TRCA) Appendix B (page 15). These areas are illustrated on the crossing maps in Figures 4 through 7. The butternut tree is the single species of provincial concern (endangered); it occurs in the vicinity of Dufferin and Finch, but will not be affected by the LRT design, as proposed. See also Appendix B for Vegetation Species list with MNR, TRCA and Varga Toronto rankings. ➤ Provincial species of conservation concern are identified in Table 5: Species of Concern NHIC Section in Section 4.5 <i>Species of Concern</i> (page 22) of Appendix B.

Agencies Involved	Comment/Issue	Response/Future Course of Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Regional (TRCA) species of concern are identified in Section 4.5 <i>Species of Concern</i> (page 22) of Appendix B.
	Please revise section 4.4 to clarify that no significant wildlife habitat is anticipated to be within the ROW. TRCA did indicate that the likelihood of encountering significant wildlife habitat within the study is low. However, the paragraph appears to be more of a conclusion. We believe that such a statement should perhaps be made at the end of the site-specific study that has confirmed this statement and not just based on discussions. Staff also notes that the report identifies “significant wildlife habitat” on the south side of Finch at Garthdale Park (page 18). Also, review the EECR to ensure that Table 5 is referenced as Table 4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See Section 3.4.1 West Don River Valley (page 20) for discussion on “additional wildlife habitat” on the south side of Finch Ave. W. Garthdale Park. ➤ See revised Table 4: Summary of Wildlife Habitat Within the ROW on page 25 of Appendix B. ➤ Text has been revised to reflect the comment on further site specific studies during detailed design, when necessary.
	In Section 4.5, reference is made to the fact that some species of special concern have likely become extirpated. Please revise this statement; we recommend that the term “extirpated” only be used with reference to COSEWIC/COSSARO as this is a specific designation under the Species At Risk Act and the Endangered Species Act. Rather, the report should address the likelihood that the species would still be present in these specific locations based on habitat conditions, recent records, etc....	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See revised Section 4.5 Species of Special Concern (page 26) in Appendix B. Extirpated is used with reference to COSEWIC 2007 and there is discussion on the typical habitat requirements of the redbreasted nuthatch which are not present in the area.
	In Section 5.0, the last paragraph identifies that “the proposed construction....to satisfy that Transit EA process”. This statement is premature at this time as the EA is being undertaken to determine the impacts and or mitigation measures associated with proposed LRT. We recommend that this statement be provided as a section in the ESR once the EA is complete and it has been determined that there will be no significant alterations to the natural heritage features located in the study area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ This statement has been removed from Appendix B at this time.
	At the March 9, 2009 meeting with TTC and their consultants, TTC indicated that there are plans to extend the proposed LRT to the Pearson Airport area, through Humber College and the Woodbine Centre. TTC noted that an additional study will be conducted for that section of the project. Please ensure that TRCA staff are consulted and involved in that study, particularly regarding the crossing of the Humber River within the Highway 27 and Woodbine Centre are as well as the Mimico Creek crossing options.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The TTC and its Finch West LRT project team are conducting a feasibility study to decide whether to extend the Finch West LRT to the Woodbine Live site and/or the Pearson Airport Area. The March 9, 2009 meeting was the first consultation with TRCA regarding Humber River crossing options.

Agencies Involved	Comment/Issue	Response/Future Course of Action
		Further consultation will be conducted as findings become available. If extensions are recommended, an additional EA process will be started.
TRCA	TRCA staff completed a review of the request to add a stop at the proposed Fountainhead Road Extension/Black Creek area and notified TTC that it is not in a position to support the additional LRT stop request based upon its location within the Black Creek floodplain and potential impacts of construction and road way operation on Black Creek.	➤ TTC to respond that it concurs

Exhibit 7-3 MOE Comments and Responses

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (Stormwater Management) Comment	Delcan Response
1		The study area is urbanized and the LRT alignment remains within existing roadway allowances and with a majority of the road sections of the proposed alignment already built to urban standard. As such, the impacts on stormwater drainage are not expected to be significant.	Response to comment 5 - Page 2. Text added to 4.4.10
2		Improvements to the stormwater drainage system and any other alternative mitigation measures that may be evaluated during detailed design stage of the LRT should be able to address the impacts and any quality and quantity concerns. These improvements and mitigation measures will have to be reviewed and approved by regulatory agencies where deemed necessary in order to ensure that the impacts are addressed.	Response to comment 5 - Page 2. Text added to 4.4.10

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (Air, Pesticides and Environmental Planning - Technical Support) Comment	Delcan Response
1	General Comments / Section 2.3	An evaluation matrix for the rapid transit interfaces (both Yonge and Spadina subways) would clarify the selection process for the preferred design)	Will incorporate a basic matrix to help clarify the decision process for a preferred design.

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (Air, Pesticides and Environmental Planning - Technical Support) Comment	Delcan Response
2	General Comments / Section 2.3.2	Illustrations of the alternative solutions to the Highway 400 crossing between Jane St and Weston Rd would clarify the options going forward to the preferred design. An evaluation matrix would be helpful in showing how the preferred alternative was chosen and why.	These deliberations are clarified in the text of this section and the feasibility of the "least disruptive" solution is documented in Appendix D. Replacement bridge, aerial alignment or underground alignment were deemed to be exorbitantly expensive, onerously disruptive during construction, and more expensive to operate in the long term and were not carried forward to further design.
3	Soil contamination / Section 4.4.9	In our memo dated August 6, 2009, we recommended that any contaminated soils encountered not only be tested, but be handled in accordance with Part XV.1 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) and Ontario Regulation 153/04, Records of Site Condition. We recommend that the EPR reflect the proponent's requirement to handle contaminated soils in accordance with the aforementioned legislation.	Done
4	Soil contamination / Section 4.4.9	As per our memo dated August 6, 2009, we recommend that this section refer the reader to Appendix K: Contaminated Sites Assessment.	Done
5	Stormwater Management / Section 4.4.10	Information given regarding the SWM work locations and treatment is very limited. We recommend that the proponent identify all possible locations where SWM works are possible, and for each identify the treatment type and level of treatment that will be met. Additionally, we recommend that the proponent adhere to MOE Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (March 2003) and reference this commitment in the EPR	See Comments 1 & 2 - Page 1
6	Air and Noise / Section 4.4.11	We recommend that all potential air emission sources be identified in this section of the EPR.	No new emission sources created by LRT.
7	Air and Noise / Section 4.4.11	As per our memo dated August 6, 2009, we recommend that construction vehicles be driven at a reduced rate of speed to decrease particulate distribution. Commitment to this mitigation measure is not reflected in the EPR	TTC cannot commit to this mitigation measure. The Design-Build contracting

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (Air, Pesticides and Environmental Planning - Technical Support) Comment	Delcan Response
			specifications will provide the contractor with guidance for meeting all City, Provincial and Federal Air Quality standards and guidelines during construction.
8	Air and Noise / Section 4.5.2.1	This section mentions a night time increase of 4.8 dB is possible. Given that this prediction is close to the 5 dB threshold, we recommend that the proponent consider mitigation so not to risk approaching the 5dB threshold	See response below in item 8. Post-implementation monitoring will be considered.

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (Noise and Vibration) Comment	Delcan Response
			the five monitor devices. These five receptors represent a good choice of different roadway-receptor configurations. 7 Hunn Circle should be 7 Hun Crescent and its backyard faces Finch Avenue directly. A Google Map section is shown in Appendix A.
2		Reference is made in the reports to the Toronto Municipal Code. In addition, reference should be made to the following City of Toronto documents for the control of construction noise and vibration: a) City of Toronto By-Law No. 1400-2007 b) City of Toronto By-Law 514-2008	We agree. These two By-Laws have been incorporated in Toronto's By-Law Chapter 591. The construction phase assessment will follow these by-laws as well as adhere to the emission limits contained in MOE publication NPC-115.
3		The following parameters used in modelling of road traffic noise need further checking / verification: a) Adjusted Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes. b) Road traffic composition [automobiles (90%), medium trucks (4%-6%) and heavy trucks (6%-4%)]. c) Road traffic split [daytime (85%) and night-time (15%)].	The AADT values used in the noise assessment report were verified and were found to be correct by Delcan. The traffic split is based on conventional patterns used for arterial roads. The truck traffic split was calculated as average values based on the peak hour volumes that were provided.

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (Noise and Vibration) Comment	Delcan Response
1		Five receptors (Receptor -Location 1 to Receptor-Location 5) are selected in the reports. The following comments pertain to the selected receptors: a) The proposed LRT alignment is 17 km long and the selected five receptors are too few to represent all the sensitive areas. Additional receptors should be selected to represent the worst case (i.e. the nearest and most exposed) sensitive areas. b) The selected five receptors represent single family dwellings. Additional receptors should be selected to represent all other noise and vibration sensitive areas including but not limited to schools, churches, and daycare centres, etc. c) The distance setbacks of the selected receptors from Finch Avenue median are in the range or 25m to 41m. Additional receptors should be selected to represent the properties that are located closer to Finch Avenue median. d) Receptor-Location 2 is shown in the figures to represent a coffee shop while it is referenced in the tables as single family dwellings. The reports figures should be revised to reflect the correct receptor location.	After site review of the entire distance of 17 kms in 2007, these five locations (Location 1 was chosen after the alignment revision in early 2009) were chosen as they represented the worst case scenario impacts from the LRT proposal. These five locations were residential receptors. The impact results will be the same or better for all other locations along the route even if they happen to be day-care centres, schools, and/or churches. Twenty-five metres distances from Finch Av. Median was the closest receptor during the initial selection of

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (Noise and Vibration) Comment	Delcan Response
4		No specific project horizon year is used in the reports. A specific horizon year should be used to reflect the project ultimate/mature state conditions.	The horizon year is 2031, However, in agreement with City of Toronto, all traffic counts are accepted as ultimate counts, with any increases absorbed by transit.
5		The Light Rail Transit (LRT) system is assessed based on the use of train consists of two Light Rail Vehicles (LRVs). However, the future service could incorporate three LRVs per train consist. Therefore, the noise assessment should account for the future service case where the train consists will be made up of three LRVs.	Only 2 car train maximum for Finch West.
6		The noise and vibration reports only addressed the future LRT movements on straight track sections between stations. The reports did not address the following potential sources of noise and vibration: a) Special track work such as switches and crossovers (noise and vibration) b) Traction power stations (noise) c) LRT stations (noise and vibration) d) Maintenance and storage facilities (noise and vibration) e) Bus terminals/bus loops (noise) f) Construction staging areas (noise) The above sources should be addressed in the reports. It should be noted that some of the above facilities/sources will require a Certificate of Approval from the MOE.	(a, b, d): Facilities listed will be located exactly in final design; additional analysis will be conducted to establish effects, when defined. C): Performance at platform stops not appreciably different than running. E): None associated with Finch W LRT project. F): Staging areas not defined until Design/Build contractor's scope. MOE jurisdiction will be observed for all approvals.

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (Noise and Vibration) Comment	Delcan Response
7		Light Rail Transit (LRT) sound and vibration level calculations are missing. Sample representative calculations should be included as a separate appendix in the report.	Sample noise calculations are shown for two representative locations in Appendix F. The vibration levels from the proposed LRV cars are not known at this time. And hence, as a worst case scenario, the vibrations levels from the heavier street cars, as measured by RWDI, were used in the assessment. The vibration levels at different distances were measured by RWDI and were reported in Table 4.1 of Aiolos Engineering's Phase II re-port. Since most of the sensitive receptors are located beyond 12 m from the track, the vibration impact was found to be insignificant and no calculations were necessary.
8		Field monitoring is not recommended in the reports. It is prudent to consider monitoring post-project sound and vibration levels at representative sensitive areas to document the potential noise and vibration impacts of the proposed LRT system.	Added to appropriate chapters

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (EAAB-Project Officer) Comment	Delcan Response
1	General comments	Numerous typos were found in this document. Please edit carefully prior to final submission and issuance of the Notice of Completion	Done

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (EAAB-Project Officer) Comment	Delcan Response
2	Executive Summary / Pg 4	Under 'Air Quality' should 'LRVs' be 'LRTs'?	LRT refers to trains which may have several vehicles. LRV refers to an individual vehicle. In this case, the wording is correct.
3	Executive Summary	Include in the summary of First Nation consultation what documentation they received and when they were contacted.	Paragraphs have been added from chap 7 to this location.
4	Executive Summary / Pg 6	Include Indian and Northern Affairs in the list of Government Review Agencies	Done
5	Executive Summary / pg 6	Include First Nations in future consultation commitments	Done- See page ES7
6	Section One	A one or two sentence summary of the purpose/justification of the project needs to be included in this section. Text can be used from section 2.	Done
7	Section One / 3rd paragraph	The third paragraph starts with a sentence fragment, please revise.	Formatting mistake, space removed
8	Section 1.3	In section 1.3, be sure to use standard wording to describe the process. Replace "provincial interest issues" with "matters of provincial importance" and "EA" with "EPR".	Done
9	Section 1.5.2.1	In section 1.5.2.1 include where in the study area there are 'designated growth areas'.	Added in final paragraph. (Yonge-Bathurst, Emery Village, Jane/Finch node.
10	Section Two / General comment	A final design must be included in the final submission of the EPR. Therefore, ensure that the design for the Humber College connection and the Yonge Subway connection is complete.	Included on plates
11	Section 2 / pg 2	The term 'LOS' needs to be defined, with reference to the implications of whether it is 'D' or 'E', page 2	This reference is to Section 2.3.2 and terms are now

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (EAAB-Project Officer) Comment	Delcan Response
			defined.
12	section 2.3.3	There are a number of grammatical errors in section 2.3.3, correct these.	Corrected
13	Exhibit 2-18	Describe Exhibit 2-18 (note typo in title) in the text of the section. Include a justification for the criteria used (and why a limited number of environmental indicators were used).	Table is a summary of text discussion that precedes it. In a small land area, factors that highlighted differences in the alignments were preferred.
14	Section Three	Include an introduction to this section that outlines the areas of the existing environment to be described. Briefly discuss what studies were undertaken for this section.	Intro added to text, starting: "The following describes the study area in the context of transportation infrastructure and the natural, socio-economic and cultural environments. This section summarizes the results of studies that were completed as part of the project assessment or that were previously completed for the study area, including the Existing Environmental Conditions Report, a Geotechnical Report, and a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment.

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (EAAB-Project Officer) Comment	Delcan Response
15	Section three	All aspects of the natural environment that are included in section 4 need to be included in this section for consistency. For example, if this study applies, consider using the information on air quality from the study "Greenhouse Gases and Air Pollutants in the City of Toronto ..." to describe existing air environment.	Air Quality section added with reference to existing conditions according to the report referenced.
16	section 3.1.2	Describe the terms used in the second paragraph under section 3.1.2	Done see section 3.1.2. Explanations are too large to add to this table specifically.
17	Section three	Impacts of the project should only be found in section 4 and not in the section for the existing environment.	Removed
18	pg 3-4	State whether the scarlet beebalm and mousetail plants were found in the study area, page 3-4	These species were not recorded within the study area during preliminary field investigations conducted in the summer and fall of 2008; however, dedicated surveys for these species were not completed at that time. Site-specific surveys will be required in impacted areas during detail design to confirm the presence or absence of these species and appropriate mitigation measures will be incorporated where appropriate.
19	section 3.1.2.3	Include a brief introductory paragraph at the beginning of section 3.1.2.3 that describes the work/studies that were undertaken.	Text added: "Background information on wildlife and wildlife habitat in the study area was obtained from various sources including the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources"

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (EAAB-Project Officer) Comment	Delcan Response
			Natural Heritage Information Centre online databases and documents published by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. Following this review, preliminary field investigations were conducted in the summer and fall of 2008."
20	section 3.1.2.5	A more detailed summary of information found in the appendices needs to be included in section 3.1.2.5. Discuss the type of geology and what studies were done. Summarize the results of the data collected for these studies: geology, surface water and groundwater.	Section should read geotechnology rather than geology. Study results have been summarized and added.
21	section three	Provide more detail on all potentially impacted watercourses.	Further investigation at each watercourse located within the study area will be completed during detail design. Determination of specific impacts associated with the proposed LRT on these reaches as well as appropriate mitigation and/or compensation measures will be developed and presented to the TRCA for approval.
22	section 3.1.4.3	There are a few grammatical mistakes	Corrected

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (EAAB-Project Officer) Comment	Delcan Response
23	sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.4	The statements in sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.4 need to be justified considering the length of changes then described in future population and development sections. State how this was determined and based on what information/studies.	Text adjusted in each section. Text is too large to add to this table, but can be found directly in these referenced sections
24	Section Four / General comment	- Please see Ontario's Transit Project Assessment Process Guide, March 2009. This section needs to meet the documentation requirements outlined in this guide. Specifically for this section ensure that the EPR clearly documents: and assessment and evaluation of the impacts of the preferred method of carrying out the transit project and other methods might have on the environment, and the criteria for the assessment and evaluation of those impacts. - All subsections should follow the same format and include a discussion of criteria, construction/operation impacts, mitigation measures and monitoring plans.	Done
25	section four	Clarify what "Conserve our environment capital and life off the interest" means	Should read "Conserve our environment capital and live off the interest." Typo is in the original policy document from the City of Toronto
26	Exhibit 4-1	Exhibit 4-1 lists more information on impacts and monitoring than can be found in the text. Include all information found in Exhibit 4-1 in the text of this section. Furthermore, the column titled 'Environmental Issue/Concern' is likely the criteria for evaluation. This can be used to outline the necessary criteria in the text of section 4.	Adjusted
27	section 4.4.7 and 4.4.8	All impacts need to be consolidated for all aspects of the natural environment. For example, section 4.4.7 describes how sediment-laden stormwater could enter watercourses, but this impact is not also listed in 4.4.8 and Aquatic Habitat. Ensure that all areas of the environment considered include all potential impacts. This will likely mean that multiple aspects of the environment will have similar impacts.	Adjusted

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (EAAB-Project Officer) Comment	Delcan Response
28	section 4.4.1	It is not clear why 'Aquatic Habitat' and a discussion of fish are listed under 4.4.1. Consider moving to a separate section. In addition, provide more information on individual water crossings and their potential impacts from the project.	More detail on individual water crossings and the impacts associated with each will be provided as part of the design phase of this assignment.
29	section 4.4.1	Describe in more detail how much vegetation removal will be required in section 4.4.1	The quantity and species of vegetation to be removed will be determined during the design phase of this assignment.
30	section 4.4.3	Describe what the impacts are, and what type of work may be done on any TRCA property as discussed in section 4.4.3.	As stated in section 4.4.4 "Designated Natural Areas", it is not anticipated that any TRCA property will be required for this project although temporary access may be required during the construction phase. This temporary access may result in a minor disturbance of some roadside vegetation and a localized increase in noise and dust. No permanent or significant impacts to TRCA property are anticipated as a result of the proposed LRT.
31	section 4	Combine the discussion of navigable waters with aquatic environment. Discuss impacts and mitigation measures.	Done

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (EAAB-Project Officer) Comment	Delcan Response
32	section 4	What are the potential impacts to geology?	There are no potential impacts to geology and this section has been renamed geotechnology to reflect existing studies.
33	Section 4.4.6	Describe the potential impacts to groundwater. The third paragraph states that "in the areas where dewatering is required, the groundwater quality will be further assessed through the installation of shallow monitoring wells, particularly in areas where a high risk of potential contamination has been identified." Explain "particularly", and how mitigation measures will differ. Explain what "appropriate treatment" constitutes. Describe impacts, mitigation and monitoring in greater detail.	Potential groundwater impacts and the associated mitigation measures will be further detailed during the design phase of this assignment.
34	section 4.4.7 (bullet points)	The bullet points listed in section 4.4.7 are for general guidance documents. Provide some examples of the mitigation measures that will be implemented as well as keeping these references.	See Section 4.4.5.1 "Surface and Ground Water - Some specific examples of the mitigation measures detailed in these documents include: phasing construction to limit the duration of soil exposure where possible; minimizing nonessential clearing and grading; and stockpiling soil more than 15 meters from watercourses, other drainage features and the top of steep slopes.
35	section 4.4.8	As noted previously, consider all types of impacts in section 4.4.8 (sediment-laden run-off for example). This section needs to be elaborated on to include more discussion of impacts, and monitoring of mitigation measures.	Done

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (EAAB-Project Officer) Comment	Delcan Response
36	section 4.4.9	Section 4.4.9 needs to be expanded. As it is noted in an earlier section that there are 77 sites with a high potential for soil contamination there needs to be a clear plan of how contaminated soils will be addressed. What are the impacts, mitigation measures and monitoring plans? Provide reference to information provided in section 3.1.4.3. State that 'the MOE District Office will be contacted' rather than 'should be'.	Done
37	section 4.4.11	Section 4.4.11 needs more information regarding what studies were undertaken.	Studies for other similar projects have been performed that indicate air emissions would decrease with the replacement of buses by LRT. Therefore, no specific studies were performed for the Finch Project.
38	section 4.5.2.1	Include in section 4.5.2.1 if there are any expected impacts from operation as well as construction	Paragraph 3 in this section addresses long-term LRT operations.
39	section 4.5.2.2	Include in section 4.5.2.2 if there were any studies considering the impacts to vibration from construction	Construction activities were analyzed for noise according to the MOE/TTC protocol. No separate studies for vibration during construction were carried out. These activities will be similar to traditional road construction methods.
40	Exhibit 4-1	As noted for the text section, ensure that all impacts are listed. Impacts can be duplicated for all aspects of the environment they apply to. For "Erosion control" list all creek crossings under location.	As per # 26 adjustments made
41	section 5.2 / Exhibit 4-1	Ensure that all monitoring commitments listed in section 5.2 are also listed in Exhibit 4-1	Done

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (EAAB-Project Officer) Comment	Delcan Response
42	section Seven	In the introduction to this section, outline what information is available in Appendix M.	Done
43	Exhibit 7-1	Include Indian and Northern Affairs in Exhibit 7-1	Done
44	section 7.1.2	In section 7.1.2, provide the date(s) that comments were received from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). The letters received from TRCA will need to be included in the Record of Consultation, Appendix M.	Done
45	section 7.2	In section 7.2, explain in general terms how issues raised by the public were addressed. In Appendix M it outlines that letters were sent in response. Make that clear in this section.	Done
46	section 7.3	Indicate what follow-up activities were undertaken to ensure that all First Nations identified were aware of the project.	Done
47	Appendix O	Appendix O has a letter received from the Alderville First Nation, but no indication of this letter is present in this section. Include a summary of this correspondence in this section.	Done
48	section 7.4	The second bullet in section 7.4 has two periods.	Fixed
49	Appendices	The following appendices contained no content: - Appendix B - Appendix F and - Appendix M	Appendix B has been deleted. Appendices re-ordered. All appendices are now complete.
50	Appendices	Some of the appendices still appear to be in draft form. Please indicate when they will be finalized.	Finalized for final submission
51	Appendix O: Record of consultation	Include out-going letters in this section both to agencies and first nations. If similar letters were sent out, a general example will suffice. Include also all letters responding to issues raised. Include agency response letters, for example from the TRCA, and the Ministry of Culture.	Added

Item	Page # /Section/ Paragraph	MOE (EAAB-Project Officer) Comment	Delcan Response
52	Appendix O: Record of consultation	Include minutes of meetings held with agencies/First Nations. Specifically, include the minutes of the October 7, 2008 meeting with the TRCA.	No meeting was held with TRCA on October 7, 2008. Minutes from the August 24, 2008 TRCA meeting are included and these address the TRCA letter of October 7, 2008 referencing the August 24th meeting.
53	Appendix O: Record of consultation	Merge Appendix O with Appendix C. The list of contacts for the Ministry of the Environment is not up-to-date.	The consultation information in Appendix C is for the natural existing conditions only. The list of contacts for the MOE have been updated in Section 7 of the report.

7.2 General Public

One of the key components of the TPAP process is public consultation throughout the study. Information panels and audio-visual presentations were provided at the Public Information Centres. The project team, including representatives from TTC, City of Toronto, Delcan (prime consultant) and Lura Consulting (Public Consultation Unit), attended to answer questions regarding the study.

Letters and/or emails were sent directly to individuals on the Project Team's mailing list, and to all residents and businesses within the Finch West corridor. The list included representatives from external agencies, municipalities, and members of the public within the study area or affected by the project, and the public who requested to be added to the mailing list. From the beginning of the study, the following methods were set up for the public to submit their comments, obtain project information at any time:

Telephone: 416-393-6900
 TTY: 416-397-0831
 Fax: 416-392-2974
 Email:
 Mail: Etobicoke-Finch West LRT
 Public Consultation Unit
 City of Toronto
 Metro Hall, 19th Floor

55 John Street
 Toronto, ON M5V 3C6
 Web: http://www.toronto.ca/involved/projects/etobicoke_finch_w_lrt/index.htm

Exhibit 7-4 below provides a list of the PIC dates and locations. The PIC location and dates were also provided on the project website listed above.

Exhibit 7-4: Main Points of Contact

Period		Date	Main Points of Contact
Preliminary Planning Phase	Public Information Centre No. 1	July 16 th , 2008	78,189 notices sent to properties across the study corridor within approximately 300 meters of Finch Avenue West
		July 16 th , 2008	Notice of first PIC was published in the North York Mirror and Etobicoke Guardian
		July 29, 2008	First PIC held at North York Memorial Community Hall
		August 6, 2008	First PIC held at Jane-Finch Mall
		August 7, 2008	First PIC held at Elmbank Community Centre
TPAP Phase	Public Information Centre No. 2	November 20, 2009	1795 notices were sent to all property owners; 77 029 notices dropped across the study corridor to properties within approximately 400m of Finch Avenue West.; 350 emails sent to established project contact list; notice of meeting posted on the project web site.
		November 24, 2009	Notice of the second PIC and Notice of Commencement was published in Metro
		November 25, 2009	Notice of the second PIC and Notice of Commencement was published in the North York Mirror and the Etobicoke Guardian
		November 25, 2009	440 letters to all registered owners of property that will be affected by road widening
		November 30, 2009	Letters to all MPs and MPPs on Finch West Corridor via fax and mail
		December 1, 2009	RJ Lang Elementary and MS (cafeteria) - 227 Drewry Avenue
		December 3, 2009	Jullius Banquet Centre - 2201 Finch Avenue West
		December 7, 2009	Charles H Best MS (cafeteria) – 285 Wilmington Avenue
		December 9, 2009	Elmbank JMA – 10 Pittsboro Drive

7.2.1 METHODS OF CONSULTATION

7.2.1.1 Public Information Centre No. 1

Three Public Information Centre (PICs) meetings were held on July 29, August 6 & 7, 2008 as part of the first set of Etobicoke-Finch West LRT public consultations. The purpose of the centres was to share information about the project with the community and to gather feedback on preliminary project plans. Issues raised by the public at the PICs were addressed directly with the public participant at the PICs and responses to public comments received via email had replies sent either by email or letter depending on the issue. Telephone calls were responded to directly via the appropriate technical staff person. Exhibit 7-6 provides a summary of the comments received throughout the study and responses.

The following information was presented to the public in Public Information Centre No. 1:

- Study Area;
- Study Purpose and Objectives;
- The Transit EA Study Process;
- Transportation, Planning, Urban Design Policies and Objectives;
- Existing and Future Conditions;
- Evaluation of Alternative Transit Solutions; and
- Next Steps.

Participants were invited to communicate their ideas, concerns and opinions on comment forms and submit them at the registration table. In addition to the comment forms, project team members and public consultation staff also recorded participant comments on clip boards.

A summary of key issues and comments raised is provided below:

- Overwhelming support for the new LRT on Finch.
- Considerable amount of concern over the large distances between stops, especially for elderly, handicapped and women at night.
- Concerns over the raised curb, which restricts left turns and forces U-turn movements.
- Concern about congestion caused by the project construction.
- Interest in the use of hydro corridors as an alternative to on street transit and/or bike paths.
- Support for safe bike lanes and storage.
- Preference for underground connections to subway because it reduces the need for stairs and provides shelter from winter weather conditions.
- Questions concerning the timing and phasing of construction, and funding of the project.
- Assorted questions and comments relating to other transit issues.

A total of 276 participants attended the first round of PICs. The public was also able to provide comments online or via telephone. Until August 20, 2008 the TTC also received 76 comments via email and telephone, many of which were questions and/or requests to be added to the mailing list. Email or letter responses as appropriate were provided to comments received from the public via email. Details of email comments and responses are provided in Appendix M. Comments received by email were reflective of those key issues outlined above.

7.2.1.2 Notice of Study Commencement

The Notice of Study Commencement was placed in the Metro, North York Mirror and Etobicoke Guardian newspapers on November 24 and November 25, 2009. A copy of the notice is included in Appendix M. The notice advised the public of the commencement of the Transit Project Assessment Study on November 24, 2009.

7.2.1.3 Public Information Centre No. 2

A second set of four Public Information Centre meetings were held in December, 2009 at the locations listed above in Exhibit 7-3. The purpose of this second round of public information centres was to share information about the project with the community and to gather feedback on the preferred design concept, the associated impacts and proposed mitigation measures.

The following information was presented to the public in Public Information Centre No. 2:

- Preferred design including features, typical cross-sections;
- Final passenger stop locations;
- Traffic management strategies;
- Details related to all environmental aspects of the project including mitigation measures;
- Project Schedule;
- Next steps and activities of the study.

Each open house presented 57 detailed display boards, including 5 panels presenting information about Metrolinx. In addition, a Frequently Asked Questions handout was distributed, as well as a comment form for the public to submit questions, concerns and ideas to the project team.

A total of 309 participants attended the open houses and 72 comment forms were received. The public was also able to provide comments on line or via telephone. Between December 1 and 23, TTC received 25 comments via email and telephone, many of which were questions, comments and/or requests to be added to the mail list. Email or letter responses as appropriate were provided to comments received from the public via email. Details of email comments and responses are provided in Appendix M. Email comments were reflective of the key issues from the PIC as outlined below.

Key issues and comments raised are presented below, with more detailed comments provided in a public consultation report included in Appendix M.

- General support and encouragement for the project specifically and for expanded transit in general;
- Concerns about accessibility for connecting at Yonge/Finch Station and proposed Keele Station;
- Concerns about increased traffic congestion as a result of reduced left hand turn lanes;
- Concerns about locating the LRT mid street on Finch rather than in the Hydro corridor;
- Concerns about disruption to businesses during construction, the re-routing of traffic and staging impacts;
- Support and concerns about the provision of bike lanes within the corridor.

7.2.1.4 Additional Public Meetings

In addition to the two sets of Public Information Centres, a number of additional public meetings and presentations were requested and arranged by local councilors along the Etobicoke-Finch West LRT route. These are listed below in Exhibit 7-5.

Exhibit 7-5 Additional Public Presentations

Date	Location	Arrangements
September 3, 2008	Mitchell Field Community Centre 89 Church Avenue	Arranged by local councillor
September 15, 2008	York Woods Library Theatre 1785 Finch Avenue West	Local councillor Town Hall Meeting
May 11, 2009	York Woods Library Theatre 1785 Finch Avenue West	Local councillor Town Hall Meeting
May 19, 2009	North York Civic Centre Members Lounge 5100 Yonge Street	Local councillor Condo Board Presidents' Meeting
September 3, 2009	Emery Village BIA	Arranged by local councillor
November 26, 2009	Edithvale Community Centre 7 Edithvale Drive	Arranged by local councillor

7.2.2 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Exhibit 7-6 summarizes the comments received and the responses provided. More detail is included in Appendix M. Commitments made during the course of this project are listed in Section 5.

Exhibit 7-6: Summary of Comments

Category	Comment/Issue	Response/Future Course of Action
Traffic	Left turn lanes are being eliminated from all but signalized intersections.	Recommended changes to the left turn movement arrangements can ensure effective and safe LRT operation and pedestrian movements.
	Traffic infiltration concerns due to the reconfiguration of intersections.	A traffic monitoring program will be undertaken by the City's Transportation Services Division before project construction. The monitoring program relating to local traffic impacts will be an ongoing initiative. It is not possible to be definitive at this time regarding the specific measures (such as turn prohibitions) that would be implemented as a result of the monitoring program, because the exact nature of the magnitude of the traffic effects is uncertain. However, Traffic Services staff will work with City Councilors and the community to address any local traffic issue. Should any residents/businesses have existing traffic/operation concerns they are encouraged to contact Transportation Services.
Stop Location	The proposed stop locations are too far apart.	Stop locations were carefully examined as part of the study. The stop locations were recommended based on consideration of the transit ridership generated, LRT operations performance, and proximity to adjacent intersections, roadway gradient, physical constraints and

Category	Comment/Issue	Response/Future Course of Action
		traffic impacts.
Noise and Vibration	Concern with noise impacts	A detailed noise analysis was completed for the noise sensitive areas within the study corridor. The projected noise level changes as a result of the implementation of the EFWLRT are forecast to be less than 5dBA at any receptor location. Therefore, consideration of noise mitigation is not required in accordance with MOE/TTC criteria.
LRT System	Preferred subway rather than LRT	The forecast ridership demand indicates that LRT will be a more cost-effective transit solution for the corridor.
Property Impacts	Concern about the property impacts due to the LRT facilities	Compensation will be provided for temporary and permanent property requirements. For permanent property taking, compensation will be provided at fair market value, which is determined at the time of purchase with a property appraisal report forming the basis for negotiations. Compensation will also be provided for temporary property requirements. Upon completion of construction, temporary property will be returned to the owner and as near as reasonably possible restored to its original condition.
Bicycle Lanes	The utilization of bicycle lanes	The provision of bicycle lanes along EFWLRT supports the vision of the Toronto Official Plan and the City's policies to provide road users an alternative transportation mode to commute. Providing bicycle lanes along Transit City routes can create a bicycle friendly environment that encourages the future use of bicycles for everyday transportation and enjoyment.
LRT Alignment	LRT in the Hydro Corridor instead of Finch Avenue West	LRT needs to serve the transit demand, transfer points and trip generators that are on Finch Avenue West. A bus service would still be required on Finch Avenue if a transit services were running in the Hydro corridor. In addition, there are technical challenges to operating in the corridor despite its appearance of openness, such as crossing the G. Ross Lord Reservoir near Dufferin Street. Hydro One also have stringent requirements for clearances, electrical isolation and other considerations that would be difficult for an electrically powered transit line to meet.

TPAP preliminary planning on July 10, 2008, and asked for information on potentially interested First Nation Communities:

- Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA)
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)
 - Specific Claims Branch
 - Litigation Management & Resolution Branch
 - Comprehensive Claims Branch

INAC responded indicating that they would only provide written responses to the City should the claims circumstances affecting the City of Toronto change.

7.3.1 METHOD OF CONSULTATION

In correspondence dated March 19, 2009, INAC also confirmed that other than the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, there are no other First Nations in the vicinity of the City. In a further correspondence dated April 11, 2009, INAC indicated that they were aware of only one active litigation claim "in the area of part of Eastern Toronto" by the eight (8) First Nations Communities making up the Williams Treaty Bands. In a correspondence dated August 28, 2009, the TTC notified these Bands of the TPAP study and asked them to provide the nature of any interest they may have in the EFWLRT in writing. They were also invited to meet with the TTC to discuss any such interests.

As of March 23, 2010, no Williams Treaty Bands indicated any interest in the project. A meeting with the Bands will again be offered should they express any interest or concern.

On January 10, 2007, Public Consultation staff from the City of Toronto met with Director Margaret Sault and Chief Bryan LaForme of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation to discuss the best method of consulting with the community for all Environmental Assessments undertaken by the City of Toronto. The City was asked to notify Ms. Sault of all Environmental Assessments undertaken by the City, but should not expect a written response from the Mississaugas. Furthermore, they wish to be contacted immediately should any First Nations archaeological material be found, and construction stopped temporarily until a mutually acceptable agreement is reached on how to proceed.

For the EFWLRT study, the preliminary planning notice and notice of the first Public Information Centres and request for any expression of interest were mailed to the Mississaugas of the New Credit on July 23, 2008. The Notice of the second Public Information Centres was mailed on November 20, 2009. The notice was sent via email to all three branches of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (Comprehensive Claims, Specific Claims, Litigation Management and Resolution). On this same date, a notice was sent via email to the Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs. Letters advising of the Notice of Commencement of the study and seeking any comments were also mailed on November 20th, 2009 asking First Nations (as identified by INAC and Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs) which included Mississaugas of the New Credit, eight Williams Treaty Bands and Williams Treaty Legal Coordinator Ms. Karry Sandy McKenzie.

Follow-up phone calls and emails were made to the Mississaugas of the New Credit as well as the eight Williams Treaty Bands on December 15 and 16, 2009 to ensure that all First Nations identified were aware of the project. A follow-up email asking for confirmation of receipt of Notice of Commencement was sent to the Director of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation on December 17th, 2009. As of March 23, 2010, no comments have been received from the notified First Nations groups.

7.3.2 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

No comments were received from the First Nations Communities.

7.3 Aboriginal Communities

This TPAP has addressed the new Ontario Regulation 231/08 requirement to involve and consult with involved First Nations communities. The City of Toronto established a protocol to address the First Nations Consultation, included in Appendix M. The following government agencies at the federal and provincial level were notified of the EFWLRT

Correspondence from the Alderville First Nation indicated that the EFWLRT project was deemed a level 3 having minimal potential to impact their First Nations' rights.

7.3.3 COMMITMENTS

A meeting with First Nations officials will be offered should they express any interest or concern.

7.4 Public Review Period/Notice of Completion

With the completion of this Environmental Project Assessment Report,

- A Notice of Completion of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) will be published on/or before March 23, 2010.
- The public, regulatory agencies, First Nations communities and other interested persons will have 30 days to review the EPR after the Notice of Completion.
- The Ministry of the Environment (MOE) will have an additional 35 days to act if there is a potential for a negative impact on a matter of Provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value; is of interest to, or has an impact on a constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty right.
- A Statement of Completion will be issued by the proponent as noted in the following Section.

7.5 Project Approval – TTC/City

During the Transit Project Assessment Process period, the following approvals have been obtained in order to complete the study.

- TTC Commission, December 16, 2009
- Toronto City Council, January 26, 2010

7.6 Statement of Completion

The Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) is completed when the proponent submits a Statement of Completion to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch of the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of the Environment Regional Director, excluding any unforeseen circumstances that may require a change to the transit project.

The proponent will submit the Statement of Completion under one of the following circumstances:

1. The Minister gives a notice allowing the proponent to proceed with the project in accordance with the EPR;
2. The Minister gives a notice allowing the proponent to proceed with the project in accordance with the EPR, subject to conditions;
3. The Minister gives a notice requiring further consideration of the transit project and subsequently gives a notice allowing the proponent to proceed with the project in accordance with a Revised EPR; or
4. The Minister gives no notice within 65 days of the proponent giving the Notice of Completion.

The Statement of Completion must indicate that the proponent intends to proceed with the transit project in accordance with either:

- The EPR;
- The EPR subject to conditions set out by the Minister; or
- The Revised EPR.

The proponent will also post the Statement of Completion on its project website. Construction or installation of the transit project subject to the TPAP cannot begin until the requirements of the TPAP have been met. Subject to these requirements, the transit project may proceed subject to any other required approvals.