

Item	Section / Area of Concern	Agency Comment	Response to Comment / Action
<b>City of Toronto</b>			
<i>Engineering and Construction Services (ECS)</i>			
1	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.1 Existing Rail Infrastructure</i>	Clarify the last sentence in the second paragraph that Metrolinx intend to increase the number of track from existing 2 tracks to 3 tracks with provisions for a potential fourth track on the structures?	We will clarify as suggested in the final EPR.
2	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.2.1 Scarborough Gold Club Road</i>	An overpass in this location is not preferred, possible to include documents to support this statement in the appendix?	Per the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) requirements, the final EPR will only present the preferred design. The rationale for why an underpass is preferred to an overpass for grade separations within the study area is provided in Section 3.4.1.
3	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.2.2 Galloway Road</i>	In the appendix, the General Arrangement shown is Alternative 4, possible to include documents for all other Alternatives in the Appendix?	Per the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) requirements, the final EPR will only present the preferred design.
4	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.2.3 Morningside Avenue Bridge</i>	Is an overpass in this location considered? If so, possible to include documents to support the structure type selection?	Per the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) requirements, the final EPR will only present the preferred design. The rationale for why an underpass is preferred to an overpass for grade separations within the study area is provided in Section 3.4.1.
5	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.2.4 Construction Staging of the Grade Separation</i>	Is there an acceptable detour route during construction of the Galloway Road crossing?	Southbound - Waldock St. to Poplar Rd. to Dearham Wood Northbound - Dearham Wood to Poplar Rd. to Waldock St. is considered to be an acceptable route. The detour route will be determined during detailed design, in consultation with the City of Toronto.
6	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.5.1 Highland Creek Bridge</i>	Not City of Toronto bridge, Railway and TRCA to comment.	The Highland Creek Rail Bridge is Metrolinx-owned. We have consulted with freight operator on this corridor, as well as with stakeholders including TRCA the adjacent land owner; City of Toronto Parks staff that manage the adjacent lands; and Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.
7	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.5.2 Rouge River Bridge</i>	Not City of Toronto bridge, Railway and TRCA to comment.	The Rouge River Rail Bridge is Metrolinx-owned. We have consulted with freight operator on this corridor as well as with stakeholders including TRCA the adjacent land owner; City of Toronto Parks staff that manage the adjacent lands; Parks Canada; City of Pickering and Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.
8	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.1.1 Potential Construction Effects</i>	1. Do we have Poplar Road grade separation? 2. Should we include Galloway Road Grade Separation?	We will seek approval for a pedestrian/cyclist grade separation at Poplar Road and include in Section 5.7.1.1 of the Final EPR.  Galloway Road grade separation is currently discussed in Section 5.7.1.1.
9	<i>Appendix A</i>	Morningside Avenue Bridge: 1. Under Design Notes: Add City of Toronto design standards 2. Clarify the required minimum vertical clearance (5.300m)? 3. Clarify the construction staging for this bridge.	1. City of Toronto design standards will be added. 2. Minimum vertical clearance required as per CN General Guidelines for Railway Bridges (Part 1, Section 5.1) is 5.3m. 3. Construction staging needs will be determined during detailed design, in consultation with the City of Toronto.
10	<i>Appendix A</i>	Galloway Road Bridge: 1. Alternative 4 is included in the Appendix, where are the other alternatives? 2. Is Alternative 4 the preferred scheme? 3. Clarify the required minimum vertical clearance (5.300m)? 4. Will the C-I-P jacked structure and C-I-P extension structure continuous in their final configuration? 5. The road grade is 6.0%, is this an acceptable grade? 6. What are the planned utilities for the 2-100 dia embedded conduits on the sidewalks? 7. Will both structures be construction as cut and cover bridges?	1. Per the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) requirements, the final EPR will only present the preferred design. 2. Yes. 3. Minimum vertical clearance required as per CN General Guidelines for Railway Bridges (Part 1, Section 5.1) is 5.3m. 4. The cast in place (CIP) jacked structure and CIP extension structure will be continuous in their final configuration 5. 6.0% is an acceptable grade for the classification and design speed of Galloway Rd. as per TAC. Please note that as a result of subsequent consultation with the City and residents, 6.55% road grade is being advanced in consultation with the City. 6. There are no conduits to be embedded in the sidewalk. Toronto Hydro conduits are proposed to be placed in backfill under sidewalk. 7. Only one structure which will be constructed, site excavated, structure jacked into place and backfilled during track block.
11	<i>Appendix A</i>	Scarborough Golf Club Road Grade Separation: 1. Under Design Notes: Add City of Toronto design standards 2. Clarify the required minimum vertical clearance (5.300m)? 3. Clarify the construction staging for this bridge, why is temporary railway shoring shown on the south edge of the proposed railway structure only?	1. City of Toronto design standards will be added. 2. Minimum vertical clearance required as per CN General Guidelines for Railway Bridges (Part 1, Section 5.1) is 5.3m. 3. Construction staging needs will be determined during detailed design, in consultation with the City of Toronto. Location of temporary railway protection will be assessed during detailed design.

12	<i>Appendix B11</i>	<p>Of the three (3) grade separations proposed two (2) will create large localized depressions in the road ROW under the RR tracks. The localized depressions will have zero ability for gravity outlet of accumulated storm runoff.</p> <p>The Galloway localized depression will have a contributory area of 6 Ha and the Morningside localized depression will have a contributory area of 1 Ha.</p> <p>For the Morningside grade separation a SWM storage tank under the lowered road in the ROW to provide peak shaving of the major storm to meet the capacity of the minor storm sewer is offered as one of the possible solutions to be evaluated.</p> <p>For the Galloway grade separation a SWM storage tank under the lowered road in the ROW to provide peak shaving of the major storm to meet the capacity of the minor storm sewer is NOT offered as one of the possible solutions to be evaluated. Instead the offered solution is to discharge the major storm directly to the existing storm system.</p> <p>The Galloway proposal is a major non-compliance with the Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 681, Sewers" and "BY-LAW No. 100-2016, (To amend City of Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 681, Sewers)", the Wet Weather Flow Management Guidelines, and the City of Toronto design Guidelines for Sewer and Watermains.</p> <p>A SWM storage tank under the lowered road in the ROW to provide peak shaving of the major storm will be mandatory for the Galloway grade separation. Upsizing of the storm sewers downstream of the SWM storage tank(s) for either grade separation project may be considered as ancillary function of a larger solution; however, upsizing the storm sewers alone without a SWM storage tank is not a feasible option.</p> <p>Please note: Use of under-slab sub-soil drainage systems to mitigate buoyancy forces on the SWM tank base slab is not recommended due to the significant quantitative and qualitative impacts of the GW collected by the system on the pumping/treatment system required for the discharge of the effluent collected by the SWM tanks.</p>	Acknowledged. SWM design at the grade separations will be completed during detailed design, in consultation with the City of Toronto.
13	<i>Draft EPR, Section 2.3 and Appendix B11</i>	<p>The report identified the track expansion will likely encroach into the existing drainage ditch and retaining walls will be required to ensure conveyance of the 100-year storm without causing flooding of the tracks. In addition to ensuring protection of the track structure, the assessment must also ensure the flooding condition of the adjoining public and private lands along the drainage corridor would not be negatively impacted with additional stormwater runoff and/or flooding resulting from modification of the drainage ditch cross sections. Riparian rights should be considered and assessed as part of the stormwater management analysis.</p>	<p>It is important to note that the retaining walls are required for grading purposes and maintain the proposed corridor expansion within the rail right-of-way.</p> <p>Proposed drainage ditch capacity was assessed using typical drainage ditch cross-sections. The analysis found that typical drainage ditch cross-sections would provide sufficient capacity to convey the 100-year event without overtopping.</p>
14	<i>Draft EPR, Section 2.4 and Appendix B11</i>	<p>As noted in the report and identified in Figure 2, Scarborough Golf Club Road at and around the proposed grade separation location could fall within the floodplain where modification with fill and/or cut could have implication to the flood storage. Riparian rights need be considered and assessed as part of the stormwater management analysis to ensure no negative impact of the lands that are affected by the project. In addition, changing the flood area/volume in areas where existing storm sewer system is located could also impact the system and a hydraulic analysis should be completed.</p>	Acknowledged. SWM design at the grade separations will be completed during detailed design.
15	<i>Draft EPR, Section 2.4 and Appendix B11</i>	<p>The proposed grade separations at Galloway and Morningside will lower the road profiles by 7.52m and 7.5m respectively and result in significant road depressions with potential for severe ponding, if appropriate overland flow is not provided. One option being considered in the report for conveyance of the flow during a major storm event is via the minor storm sewer systems. The minor systems in the area were not designed to capture major storm events and such proposal could have significant implications with basement flooding.</p> <p>These road depressions without the appropriate means to ensure adequate conveyance of major storm flows could result in ponding with excessive depth and could pose public safety concerns and jeopardize the ability for emergency vehicles to respond for emergencies.</p>	Acknowledged. SWM design at the grade separations will be completed during detailed design.
16	<i>Appendix B11</i>	<p>Any proposal of wet wells and pumps should be located within the railway corridor and maintained by the rail authority.</p>	Acknowledged. SWM design at the grade separations will be completed during detailed design.
17	<i>Appendix B11</i>	<p>City Council adopted Wet Weather Flow Management Policy, the Wet Weather Flow Management Guidelines and the Toronto Municipal Code need to be included and considered as part of the analysis for stormwater management and storm runoff discharge associated with the project.</p>	Acknowledged. SWM design at the grade separations will be completed during detailed design.

City Planning			
18	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.3.2</i>	The design of retaining walls on the west side of the Rouge River bridge should be prepared in consultation and collaboration with Toronto Parks, Recreation and Forestry, Parks Canada, and City Planning, and should consider terracing, use of vegetation and/or green wall systems, and strategies to reduce/avoid opportunities for graffiti. Please explain what 'gravity walls are'.	Agreed, we too agree that consultation with the suggested stakeholders is important. Consultation with all parties has been ongoing. We have held multiple design workshops; site walk; and invited TRCA and Parks Canada to participate as Guest Panelists in the September 15, 2016 Metrolinx Design Review Panel presentation of the Port Union Waterfront retaining walls.  Explanation of gravity walls will be included in Section 3.3.2 of the Final EPR to clarify.
19	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.3.3</i>	The waterfront trail runs to the south of the existing rail corridor and would be heavily impacted by retaining walls proposed. As noted above, the design of these walls should include the City's Parks, Recreation and Forestry as well as City Planning divisions.	We have been working closely with City of Toronto, TRCA and Parks Canada to mitigate the effects of retaining wall at the waterfront trail. To this effect multiple design workshops to explore options/alternatives have been completed. A site walkthrough was held in June with key stakeholders including City of Toronto to further discuss alternatives. A Metrolinx Design Review Panel (MDRP) meeting is planned for September 15 to review the proposed retaining wall options.
20	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4</i>	The explicit criteria and decision making process used to determine grade separation, close roads or maintain at-grade crossings is not identified or included. Additional detail is required: Criteria and decision should not be solely based on traffic but must account for the social, environmental, other impact and the opportunity to improve the public realm. Any decision regarding road closure must address the following Official Plan Policies: 3.1.1.7: Toronto's concession road grid is a major organizing element to be maintained, improved and recognized in public design initiatives. To improve mobility and recreational opportunities where these streets are interrupted by topographical features or utility corridors, pedestrian and bicycle routes should be established across these features. 2.2.3 f): The City's transportation network will be maintained and developed to support the growth management objectives of this Plan by: ensuring that streets are not closed to public use and stay within the public realm where they provide present and future access for vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles, space for utilities and services, building address, view corridors and sight lines.	The rationale for grade separations and road closures is provided in Section 3.4. Metrolinx acknowledges the City's Official Plan policies.
21	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.2</i>	Subsections describing Galloway Road and Morningside Avenue grade separations note the bridge structure will protect for a future fourth track, but the section on Scarborough Golf Club Road does not make this statement. Is there no future fourth track proposed at that crossing?  This section does not mention property impacts (either permanent or temporary/during construction) additional information is required.	Clarification will be made that the Scarborough Golf Club Road structure will accommodate a future fourth track.  Property impacts are discussed in Section 5.7.5.
22	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.2.4</i>	How will properties in the area be affected (access etc.) during construction while Galloway Road is closed.	Potential environmental effects are discussed in Section 5, more specifically Section 5.7 for Socio-Economic and Land Use and Section 5.8 for Traffic for likely impacts experienced as a result of the road closure.
23	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.3</i>	Road closure discussion focuses on traffic. Active modes (pedestrian and cycling) and connections within the community (e.g. safe access to local schools and other destinations) must be included.	Potential environmental effects are discussed in Section 5, more specifically Section 5.7 for Socio-Economic and Land Use and Section 5.8 for Traffic for likely impacts to pedestrians and cyclists.
24	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.3.1</i>	The treatment of pedestrian and cycling travellers in this section is relegated to a statement at the end of the section that appears as an afterthought. As impacts to these travellers will be far greater than rerouting of vehicular traffic there needs to be more effort devoted to exploring maintaining safe pedestrian/bicycle crossing at Poplar Road.	We are working closely with the City of Toronto regarding the closure of Poplar Road and provision for a pedestrian/cyclist grade separation. We are also collecting public feedback on Poplar Road closure/pedestrian grade separation options through the public consultation process. Pedestrian/cycling overpass or underpass will be built if the City/community decides to close the Poplar Road rail crossing. If not, the crossing will remain and be enhanced.  The final EPR will provide more discussion of effects on non-vehicular road users; mitigation and document these consultation efforts.
25	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.3.2</i>	the enhanced pedestrian/bicycle tunnel facilities at the station which are proposed to also accommodate access to the waterfront trail should include enhanced wayfinding as well as a clear and comfortable travel route to and through the station for these recreational users.	Enhancements to Rouge Hill GO Station including to the station facilities will be considered as part of the separate works to upgrade the station and are not part of the scope of this TPAP.
26	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.4</i>	Manse Road and Beechgrove Drive provide access not only to industry but also to East Point Park and recreational access to Lake Ontario from the neighbourhoods to the north and northwest – not just 'local industry'. One or both of these crossings may also be key links in the City's bicycle network. Please ensure the City's bicycle infrastructure team is a party to future discussions on these crossings.	Acknowledged.

27	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The text states "Metrolinx will continue to conducting safety audits and make any necessary improvements at these crossings ..." additional detail and clarification regarding future improvements is required.	We will be enhancing the rail crossing safety features. TAC meetings are being set up with the City during detailed design to discuss necessary improvements.
28	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.5.2</i>	Please explain the notion of "a 'greener' boundary between the rail corridor and the waterfront", particularly in light of proposed high retaining walls in this area.	Section 3.5.2 will be updated in the Final EPR to clarify that although retaining walls are proposed in this area, landscaping opportunities will be used to maintain a green boundary between the retaining wall and the waterfront.
29	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.6</i>	New or replaced culverts should be sensitive to and recognize that wildlife will attempt to use them to pass through the rail corridor. Any culverts that do not currently respond in a sensitive way to these considerations, such as 'hanging' culverts, should be corrected through the Project.	Acknowledged. We are not proposing new or replacement culverts through this project. We will determine feasibility of corrected perched culverts as detailed design progresses, taking into consideration engineering, natural environment and heritage factors.
30	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.1</i>	No reference regarding the Provincial Policy Statement related to Natural Heritage.	Acknowledged. Reference will be added to Section 4.1 of the Final EPR.
31	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Please reference the City of Toronto Official Plan Map 12 Environmentally Significant Areas and policies (amended by OPA 262) that was adopted by City Council at its meeting of November 3, 2015.	Acknowledged. Reference will be added to Section 4.1 of the Final EPR.
32	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.1.2.5</i>	Text should be add to address how the project conforms with the policies in section 4.2 of the 2005 Greenbelt Plan.	Acknowledged. Suggested text will be added to Section 4.1.2.5 of the Final EPR
33	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.5</i>	Please confirm if MOE Guideline NPC 300 was applied?	No. NPC-300 applies to land use planning (new development applications) and stationary sources at facilities and is not relevant for the operation of trains on the rail corridor.
34	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.6.2.1</i>	The December 2010 Official Plan reference is incorrect and outdated. The most recent Official Plan consolidation of policies is in effect as of June 2015 and available on the City's website: <a href="http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=03eda07443f36410VgnVCM1000071d60f89RCRD">http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=03eda07443f36410VgnVCM1000071d60f89RCRD</a>	This reference will be updated in Section 4.6.2.1 of the final EPR.
35	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Please see previous note above respecting ESAs in the Toronto OP.	Acknowledged.
36	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.6.3.2</i>	What about applications for high density residential development at 4121 Kingston Road and 85 Galloway Rd?	These high-density residential developments applications within the City of Toronto will be added to the Final EPR.
37	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.6.3.5</i>	Should also reference the employment use on the north side of the rail corridor, the text only discusses the water treatment plants with no mention of the major chemical companies in the area.	Acknowledged. We will add this in Section 4.6.3.5 of the final EPR.
38	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.7</i>	The section only references traffic operations, active forms of the transportation network are not included or discussed. The section should be updated to include the pedestrian and bicycle networks, including recreational trails i.e. Waterfront Trail.	Section 4.7 discusses the study completed to document existing traffic volumes. Non-vehicular (pedestrian and cyclist) volumes are currently included in Section 4.7. A description of recreational uses including the Waterfront Trail is provided in Section 4.6.
39	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.7.2</i>	The traffic counts taken in late October 2014 may under-represent pedestrian and cycling activity as this time frame is outside of the peak season for those activities. In addition, a newly installed sidewalk on Poplar Drive requires that traffic counts on that road be updated to assess any changes to the pedestrian and cycling activity along that road. Any new traffic counts should be conducted in good weather with the weather conditions described in the report. Further counts should take into consideration volumes/movement related to local schools and other destinations, and account for the specific time periods and peaks of these facilities, which may fall outside of typical peak traffic conditions.	We would not expect any new pedestrian counts to change the overall results of the study, considering a pedestrian grade separation is proposed.
40	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.6.3.3</i>	The City requests to review the design and specifications of the proposed noise wall at 90 Morningside Avenue.	Acknowledged. The EPR recommends noise mitigation at this location. Design and specifications will be developed during detailed design, in consultation with the City.
41	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.2.3</i>	The paragraph describing mitigation measures at Chesterton Shores and Rouge Hill GO station should identify not only tunnel enhancements at the station but also enhancements to the station grounds to accommodate pedestrian and cyclist through traffic using the station to access the waterfront. Such enhancements should consider wider sidewalks, marked bike paths/lanes, lighting, shade trees, street furniture, and wayfinding/signage.	Enhancements to Rouge Hill GO Station including to the station facilities will be considered as part of the separate works to upgrade the station and are not part of the scope of this TPAP.

42	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.5</i>	<p>This section states that there will be impacts to private property, but does not expand on the nature and extent of the impacts. As a result Table 5-5 should include not just properties where land may be required to be purchased but also properties where grading work may have an impact on properties. Table 5-5 also contains errors. Specific comments are:</p> <p>Property impacts at the Poplar Road rail crossing are completely absent from the table and should at a minimum include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 66 &amp; 79 Poplar Road</li> <li>- 4 Portia Street</li> <li>- 1 Gardentree Street</li> <li>- 1 &amp; 3 Cultra Square</li> </ul> <p>The table identifies 261 Scarborough Golf Club Road, but that address does not appear to exist. 96 Dunelm Street is noted twice.</p> <p>If a new access road to Tillinghast Lane is proposed from Dunelm Street through the property at 94 Dunelm, then 90 &amp; 94 Dunelm Street should also be on the list of affected properties.</p> <p>7, 9, 12, 16, 30X, 34 &amp; 52X Dale Avenue appear to be missing from the table.</p> <p>46R Dunelm Street is missing from the table.</p> <p>28, 30, 32, 32A &amp; 34 Saunders Road should be on this list as a realigned Dale Road would run directly behind these properties.</p>	At the draft EPR stage this information was not available in its entirety. This section will be updated as appropriate for the final EPR and taking into consideration it may be refined further during detailed design.
43	<i>Draft EPR</i>	<p>The Morningside Avenue project should include the following addresses in the list of affected properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 79, 80, 81 &amp; 82 Tivoli Court</li> <li>- 66, 76 &amp; 78 Morningside Avenue</li> <li>- 26, 28, 30 &amp; 32 Greyabbey Trail</li> <li>- 43-63 Syracuse Crescent</li> <li>- 9-21 Pixley Crescent</li> </ul>	At the draft EPR stage this information was not available in its entirety. This section will be updated as appropriate for the final EPR and bearing in mind it may be refined further during detailed design.
44	<i>Draft EPR</i>	2 Chantrey Court and 66 Galloway Road may need to be added to Table 5-5	At the draft EPR stage this information was not available in its entirety. This section will be updated as appropriate for the final EPR and bearing in mind it may be refined further during detailed design.
45	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.5</i>	Generally references property requirements, and additional discussions with property owners during detailed design, should property acquisition and/or expropriation be discussed in this section?	At the draft EPR stage this information was not available in its entirety. This section will be updated as appropriate for the final EPR and bearing in mind it may be refined further during detailed design.
46	<i>Draft EPR, Section 6.1.1</i>	A visit to the project website on February 18, 2016 notes no new information on the LSE expansion project since a slide deck supporting the March 25 & 26, 2015 public consultations. This section is misleading as the stated purpose of the website "to keep the public up-to-date on the latest developments of the Project" apparently assumes that no developments have occurred in the past year.	<p>The project website is updated as and when appropriate information is available. There was a gap between the first public meeting in March 2015 and the second public meeting in May 2016 which explains the lack of information provided during this period.</p> <p>Since the May 2016 meetings, additional information has since been provided, including public meeting summary report, meeting recap, public feedback and Metrolinx responses, as well as some technical reports.</p> <p>We will endeavour to update the project website more frequently.</p>
47	<i>Draft EPR, Section 6.1.3</i>	Any properties identified in Table 5-5 should be notified of the Notice of Commencement by direct registered mail.	Acknowledged. Per the O. Reg. 231/08 requirements, all properties within 30 m of the project will be notified as a minimum and Metrolinx has endeavoured to include a much wider catchment area of 100 m.
48	<i>Draft EPR, Section 6.2</i>	<p>Table 6.1 - This meeting was not solely with Community Planning staff many other division represented. As documented in the meeting minutes this was TAC meeting #7. Please clarify which meeting this was. In addition to individual stakeholder meetings this table should all TAC Meetings.</p> <p>A City of Toronto TAC is identified on 104 page with general details. Please clarify.</p>	Will clarify in Section 6.2 of the final EPR.
49	<i>Draft EPR, Section 6.2.1</i>	It is unclear whether the Design Review Panel will provide input to matters such as aesthetic design, finishing materials and landscaping associated with major structural elements including extensive retaining walls, particularly as its involvement ends at early stages of design. Please clarify that aesthetic elements of the design and integration of the structures with surrounding context will be reviewed by the DRP. For elements to be constructed in the City of Toronto, City Planning should be a party to the design review.	<p>The Metrolinx Design Review Panel (MDRP) reviews and provides non-binding advice on architecture, urban design and landscape architecture for select Metrolinx capital projects. MDRP meetings have been completed to discuss modifications to Highland Creek Rail Bridge and Rouge River Rail Bridge. A MDRP meeting is scheduled for September 15, 2016 for reviewing the proposed design for retaining walls/embankments through the Port Union Waterfront Trail. Parks Canada and TRCA will be Guest Panelists. The City was also invited to participate, Staff (Shalin Yeboah) advised that the City will not participate on the MDRP.</p> <p>We have typically solicited feedback from City of Toronto staff through other mechanisms i.e.: Working Groups or Technical Advisory Committees.</p>

50	<i>Draft EPR, Section 6.3</i>	Please provide information on the number and content of mailings that have occurred to members of the public who requested to be added to the project mailing list.	All correspondence will be attached in Appendix C of the final EPR.
51	<i>Draft EPR, Section 7.2.4</i>	The last bullet of this section states that Metrolinx will make submissions to the City of Pickering under their Tree Protection Bylaw. The City of Toronto also has Tree Protection Bylaws. An additional bullet should be added to reflect these bylaws.	Acknowledged, suggested information will be added.  As a general standard practice Metrolinx endeavours to meet all municipal by-laws and policies in areas where it operates.  Please note that, we are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. A joint meeting has been scheduled for September 2016, including City of Toronto.
52	<i>Draft EPR, Section 8</i>	The City of Toronto Official Plan referenced is the 2010 version. A new 2015 version was made available to the public on November 2, 2015. The EPR should reference the current version of the Plan and in particular acknowledge new or modified policies respecting the natural environment and Environmentally Sensitive Areas.	Metrolinx will update this reference in the final EPR.
53	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Does not include a reference to the City of Toronto Ravine and Natural Feature Protection By-law (Chapter 658 of the Toronto Municipal Code).	This is referenced in a few places throughout the EPR with notable references in Section 4.1.2.7 and 7.4.
54	<i>Appendix B-B1</i>	Table 3-2 ESAs within Study Area - Rouge Marsh Area – please correct name of this ESA - Stephen's Swamp/Highland Creek East ESA – please see information attached to this email - ESA descriptions appear to indicate that field work was done by TRCA rather than North South Study Team, please clarify.	We will clarify in Section 3.1.2 of the final EPR.
55	<i>Appendix B-B1</i>	Rouge National Urban Park - Please note that lands in the study area have not yet been transferred to Parks Canada and are not yet part of RNUP.	Acknowledged. We understand this through consultation with both Parks Canada and TRCA for this project. We are also cognizant that this transfer could occur during any phase of the project and have therefore included mitigation, permits and approval information that should be considered in the event of a transfer.
56	<i>Appendix B-B1</i>	Greenbelt Plan Please note policies in section 3.2.4 regarding key natural heritage and key hydrological features and policies in section 4.2.1 regarding Infrastructure.	Acknowledged.
57	<i>Appendix B-B1</i>	City of Toronto Official Plan - Please note policy 3.4.13 regarding ESAs and policy 3.4.14 regarding provincially significant areas.	Acknowledged.
58	<i>Appendix B-B1</i>	Ravines & Natural Features Protection Bylaw (RNFP) - The RNFP bylaw protects natural features by regulating the removal of trees and changes to grade.	Acknowledged.
59	<i>Appendix B-B1</i>	Significant Wetlands - Additional information on PSWs in Toronto is available at: <a href="http://www1.toronto.ca/city_of_toronto/city_planning/home/files/pdf/wetland_report_aug09_small.pdf">http://www1.toronto.ca/city_of_toronto/city_planning/home/files/pdf/wetland_report_aug09_small.pdf</a>	Acknowledged.
60	<i>Appendix B-B1</i>	Natural Environment – Terrestrial - Identify vegetation approvals required from City of Toronto Urban Forestry – Ravine Protection under RNFP bylaw.	As a general standard practice Metrolinx endeavours to meet all municipal by-laws and policies in areas where it operates.  We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities, including the City of Toronto. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project.  We will continue to work collaboratively with the City regarding any trees affected on City managed lands.

61	Appendix B-B1	Table 4-2 - Vegetation restoration plans also should be prepared in consultation with Urban Forestry. Terrestrial feature restoration plans within the proposed RNUP also should be prepared in consultation with Parks Canada.	As a general standard practice Metrolinx endeavours to meet all municipal by-laws and policies in areas where it operates.  We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities, including the City of Toronto. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project. We will continue to work collaboratively with the City regarding any trees affected on City managed lands.  Please note that the future RNUP lands within the project area are under TRCA ownership. We do acknowledge that a transfer to Parks Canada is underway and will work with Parks Canada as required.
62	Appendix B-B1	Table 4-3 - Aquatic restoration plans within the proposed RNUP should be prepared in consultation with Parks Canada.	Please note that the future RNUP lands within the project area are under TRCA ownership. We do acknowledge that a transfer to Parks Canada is underway and will work with Parks Canada as required.
63	Appendix B-B1	Figures 2A, 2A-4 and 2A-5 - ESA boundary is missing from Highland Creek and does not appear correct for East Point. Shape files can be provided.	AECOM to advise
64	Appendix B-B1	Figures 3A and 3B - Rouge Marsh Area ESA boundary is missing. Shape files can be provided.	AECOM to advise
65	Appendix B-B1	Retaining walls should be designed in consultation with City of Toronto Parks, Forestry and Recreation, City Planning, TRCA and Parks Canada and should have minimal visual impact and provide opportunities for public realm improvements including vegetation.	We are working closely with City of Toronto, TRCA and Parks Canada to mitigate the effects of retaining wall at the waterfront trail. To this effect multiple design workshops to explore options/alternatives have been completed. A site walkthrough was held in June 17, 2016 with key stakeholders including City of Toronto to further discuss alternatives. A Metrolinx Design Review Panel (MDRP) meeting is planned for September 15 to review the proposed retaining wall options.
<b>Parks, Forestry and Recreation (PFR)</b>			
66	Draft EPR	Please include discussion of the Metrolinx Electrification project and how it relates to (and works with) the expansion project. Other related projects along the rail corridor should also be mentioned.	The Draft EPR references future electrification in Sections 1.2 and 3.2.6. A short summary of the Electrification Project will be provided in Section 1.2 of the final EPR.
67	Draft EPR	There is a general lack of clarity in the information provided in the EPR, with both missing information on the preferred design (Scarborough G.C.) as well as conflicting information (Appendix B2 shows a different alignment than Appendix A). Please update the EPR to reflect the most current alignment and preferred design.	Metrolinx will clarify for the final EPR.
68	Draft EPR	No timelines are mentioned in the EPR. Please provide a proposed schedule for the project outlining construction seasons that take into consideration the summer trail and beach season. Best timing to close the beach path for construction is from October to April. If construction occurs outside this timeframe, please provide AODA access around the construction zone for both park users and EMS vehicles.	Construction staging has not yet been determined. Outline dates will be provided in the final EPR.
69	Draft EPR	Metrolinx has expressed an interest in acquiring the 90 Morningside property from the City for staging the construction of the Morningside underpass. PF&R does not support this acquisition, and instead recommends a lease arrangement, since the City would likely reacquire the lands upon completion of the project.	Current design does not require 90 Morningside Ave. for staging of the work. A parcel of land on the east side of the property is required for the proposed retaining wall and sidewalk. In addition, there is a possibility of a permanent utility easement on the east side of the property behind the proposed retaining wall, but will be confirmed through detailed design.
70	Draft EPR	PF&R has procedures in place for approving access to Parks for the purposes of access and construction. These are Park Access Permit, Park Occupation Permits and a Lease Agreement for construction staging in parks, and what triggers it instead of a Park Access Permit or Park Occupation Permit. PR will provide information for these independent of these comments.	Acknowledged.

71	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Cycling Infrastructure (Trans. Serv.) has expressed an interest in locating a bike path along the section of corridor between Copperfield and Morningside, as well as through the existing 90 Morningside Drive Park property. Please consider this as any part of the expansion of the rail corridor.	Acknowledged.
72	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Please include the December 2000 Scarborough Transportation Corridor Study and the 2001 Bike Plan on the development of potential cycling trails in the list of studies considered, along with more recent studies and reports along the Scarborough Transportation Corridor.	MX to confirm - these studies are 15 years old and I would question how valid they remain today for inclusion in our EPR.
73	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.2.5</i>	PF&R supports the use of retaining walls to reduce overall track footprint impacts to parks and open space in those areas where aesthetics are less of a concern. In those areas where aesthetics are more of a concern, such as where the wall will be visible, PF&R recommends investigating a hybrid approach using some retaining and some property acquisition to provide an optimal solution.	Acknowledged.
74	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.3.2</i>	PF&R understands the need to use retaining walls along this stretch to reduce overall track footprint impacts to parks and open space, and recommends a hybrid approach using a lower retaining wall and some property acquisition to provide an optimal solution of a reduced wall height that allows for screening planting in front of it to help make it more aesthetically pleasing.	Acknowledged.
75	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.3.3</i>	The EPR mentions retaining walls being proposed along the south side of the corridor between Rouge Hill GO Station and Highland Creek, yet none are shown on the most current drawings provided to the City (dated Dec.15, 2015).	All drawings will be finalized based on an appropriate level of detail for the final EPR. Metrolinx will continue to consult with the City during detail design of retaining walls.
76	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.3.3</i>	The EPR mentions a retaining wall being proposed along the south side of the corridor 95m west of Manse Road, which is adjacent to parkland. PF&R is interested in this location and would like to understand the specifics of the retaining wall and potential impacts to these parklands as a result of the retaining wall construction.	Metrolinx will continue to consult with the City during detail design of retaining walls.
77	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.2.2</i>	Galloway Road is recommended for an underpass grade separation. This creates a potential barrier between Galloway Park and Poplar Park where one did not exist previously. PF&R would like to have an assurance that access will be maintained between the two parks that is AODA compliant.	Acknowledged. Metrolinx will construct crossing to be AODA compliant.
78	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.2.3</i>	Morningside Road is recommended for an underpass grade separation. As a result of the proposed underpass blocking the existing entrance to 90 Morningside, a new access is being proposed of Portia Street. PF&R would like to have an assurance that access will be maintained between the two parks that is AODA compliant.	Acknowledged. Metrolinx will construct crossing to be AODA compliant.
79	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.3.1</i>	Poplar Road Closure - How will pedestrian access be maintained to the park from the north side of the rail corridor? Please investigate the need for a pedestrian bridge at this location, and potential alternatives for maintaining access to the park.	Metrolinx is currently determining the feasibility of a pedestrian/cyclist grade separation at Poplar Road.
80	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.3.2</i>	Chesterton Shores Road Closure - PF&R cannot support the closure of this access point for the following reasons: 1. It would increase response times for EMS vehicles, create turnaround issues for EMS and maintenance vehicles, as well as create access issues in the event that another access point is closed temporarily. 2. PF&R relies on this access point for its maintenance and construction vehicles to service the waterfront parks. 3. The Rouge Hill GO Station pedestrian tunnel is not AODA compliant.	The proposed crossing treatment would allow access for EMS and City maintenance vehicles and only prohibit public access by cars and on foot/cycle. The pedestrian tunnels will be upgraded as part of future works to enhance Rouge Hill GO Station and these tunnels will provide access to the Waterfront Trail for recreational users.
81	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.3.2</i>	Chesterton Shores Road Closure - Please investigate mitigative measures for maintaining this access point for City of Toronto EMS, maintenance and construction vehicles.	The proposed crossing treatment would allow access for EMS and City maintenance vehicles and only prohibit public access by cars and on foot/cycle. The pedestrian tunnels will be upgraded as part of future works to enhance Rouge Hill GO Station and these tunnels will provide access to the Waterfront Trail for recreational users.
82	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.3.2</i>	Chesterton Shores Road Closure - Please provide the separate feasibility study conducted by Metrolinx to the City for review and comment.	MX to confirm - hasn't the City already seen this?
83	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.3.2</i>	Chesterton Shores Road Closure - Please provide the separate feasibility study to the City for review and comment.	MX to confirm - hasn't the City already seen this?
84	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.4</i>	Other At-Grade Crossings - Please recognize that recreational uses are another reason for maintaining the at-grade crossings at Manse Road and Beechgrove Drive.	Acknowledged



85	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.5.2</i>	Rouge River Bridge - The report mentions the preferred alignment of the new tracks are south of the existing bridge, however Appendix B2 shows the track and retaining wall along the north side of the existing bridge. Please clarify the preferred alignment and update the supporting information for subsequent review and comment.	Metrolinx will clarify for the final EPR
86	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.5.2</i>	Rouge River Bridge - PF&R has provided comments previously as they relate to the retaining wall at this location, which may be at a finer level of detail than covered by this EPR.	Acknowledged.
87	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.6.3.3</i>	Operational Noise Mitigation - Will there be noise walls required other than the one proposed for 90 Morningside as part of this expansion or other Metrolinx projects within this corridor?	Based upon the findings of the Noise & Vibration Impact Assessment, Metrolinx does not anticipate a requirement for other noise walls as a result of the project impacts
88	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.2</i>	Recreational Uses, Parks and Open Spaces - Please provide a list of parks that are within the study area and that will have potential impacts from this project.	This will be clarified in Section 5.7.2
89	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.3</i>	Aesthetics - PF&R has already provided comments on aesthetics of the proposed retaining walls and works adjacent to Rouge River and Highland Creek. Please refer to those comments for those areas.	Acknowledged
90	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.3</i>	Aesthetics - Please include PF&R in the Metrolinx Design Review Panel to ensure a transparent review process.	MX to confirm
91	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.3.2</i>	Aesthetics Mitigation - PF&R would like to be included.	MX to confirm
92	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.3.2</i>	Aesthetics Mitigation - PF&R supports the proposed consultation process for determining appropriate design features, and suggests an interdisciplinary workshop involving key stakeholders.	Metrolinx is consulting with all parties.
93	<i>Draft EPR, Table 5.5</i>	Aesthetics Mitigation - PF&R supports the proposed consultation process for determining appropriate design features, and suggests an interdisciplinary workshop involving key stakeholders	Metrolinx is consulting with all parties.
94	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.8.1.4</i>	Chesterton Shores Permanent Closure - This access point serves as a critical access point for both Parks maintenance and construction vehicles as well as EMS vehicles, and PF&R does not support its permanent closure. The City of Toronto looks forward to discussing this further to determine suitable solutions for maintaining this critical access point. See also item no.15 above.	The proposed crossing treatment would allow access for EMS and City maintenance vehicles and only prohibit public access by cars and on foot/cycle. The pedestrian tunnels will be upgraded as part of future works to enhance Rouge Hill GO Station and these tunnels will provide access to the Waterfront Trail for recreational users.
95	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.8.3</i>	There is no real discussion in the EPR of how Emergency Medical Services (EMS) will be provided during and after construction. EMS access needs to be maintained on all parts of the Waterfront Trail at all times during and after construction in a manner that does not compromise safe access and response times. This must be included as a priority consideration in the overall EPR.	The proposed crossing treatment would allow access for EMS and City maintenance vehicles and only prohibit public access by cars and on foot/cycle. The pedestrian tunnels will be upgraded as part of future works to enhance Rouge Hill GO Station and these tunnels will provide access to the Waterfront Trail for recreational users.
96	<i>Appendix A</i>	The preferred alignment shown in Appendix A - Preferred Design is not consistent with the detailed drawings provided to the City for the Rouge River and Highland Creek areas (dated Dec.15, 2015).	All drawings will be finalized based on an appropriate level of detail for the final EPR.
97	<i>Appendix B-B1</i>	There will be a significant amount of disturbance and removal of the Natural Heritage System along the length of the corridor that will need to be replaced where it can be, and compensated for where it can't be replaced.	Acknowledged. We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities, including the City of Toronto. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project.  We will continue to work collaboratively with the City regarding any trees affected on City managed lands.
98	<i>Appendix B-B2</i>	The preferred alignment and design shown in Appendix B - B2 Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report is not consistent with the description in the EPR, nor the detailed drawings provided to the City for the Rouge River and Highland Creek areas (dated Dec.15, 2015).	All drawings will be finalized based on an appropriate level of detail for the final EPR.
99	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Urban Forestry TPRR's goals in reviewing the submitted materials are as follows:	N/A

100	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Identify proposed tree removals or injuries that may be unnecessary (it is hoped that there will be none).	At the detailed design phase, a detailed tree inventory will be undertaken based on the near-final design drawings. Results will be compared against the 2015 tree inventory to identify the need to update/confirm specific trees which may no longer be slated for removal, or new ones which will be based on design drawing changes since the 2015 inventory.  Overall, we endeavour not to undertake tree removals or injuries that may be deemed unnecessary.
101	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	For the purposes of tree permit issuance, confirm and finalize details regarding which trees will be removed, at what time, under what bylaw, and issue permits accordingly.	Acknowledged. To be addressed at Detailed Design.  We are also currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities, including the City of Toronto. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties.  We will continue to work collaboratively with the City regarding any trees affected on City managed lands.
102	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Secure appropriate planting as compensation for removed trees, with respect to each relevant bylaw. Compensatory tree planting to be confirmed by MLX in the form of a letter stating the number of trees that will be provided, and confirming payment in lieu of any trees not planted.	The Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work collaboratively with the City and keep City informed of any trees affected on City managed lands.
103	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	The Tree Inventory & Preservation Plan Report (TIPPR) requires a general update, as it appears to be based on dated plans. For example, on figures 27 & 28, the proposed 3rd track will be added on the south side of the existing two tracks at the Rouge bridge, not the north as indicated in the TIPPR. The specified tree and tree polygon removals in this area are therefore no longer accurate or valid. Review/revision of the TIPPR, especially the tree removal/injury requirements, is necessary before the TPRR can finalize application/replanting requirements.	At the detailed design phase, a detailed tree inventory will be undertaken based on the near-final design drawings. Results will be compared against the 2015 tree inventory to identify the need to update/confirm specific trees which may no longer be slated for removal, or new ones which will be based on design drawing changes since the 2015 inventory.
104	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	The TIPPR does not include trees in the vicinity of the Scarborough Golf Club crossing. A number of large and potentially significant trees may be affected by the grade separation and/or nearby surface road changes. A TIPPR is required for the SGC Rd proposal(s). With specific reference to the Dale Ave extension proposal, Urban Forestry TPRR's notes that a fair number of large mature trees would require removal to accommodate this plan; alternatives that involve fewer large tree removals would be preferred.	Acknowledged. To be addressed at Detailed Design and in consultation with the City.
105	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	If the applicant is amenable, please adjust the column ordering of the revised Tree Inventory table for ease of use/tabulation: Tree # — Cat./Other By-Law — Action — Permit Requirement... — Common Name — Scientific Name — Condition — DBH — mTPZ — RmTPZ — Within Reg. Area — Pin/Location — Comments — Conflict — Application Fee. This would allow TPRR and RNFP to review/tabulate this document more quickly.	Acknowledged. To be addressed at Detailed Design.
106	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Please also omit data from the RmTPZ column for all non-category 4 (RNFP) trees.	Acknowledged. To be addressed at Detailed Design.
107	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Where trees are to be preserved with injury, replace "preserve" in the Action column with "Injure".	Acknowledged. Will be updated to "preserved with injury" in the Final EPR.
108	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	If the applicant wishes Urban Forestry to contact neighbours where tree permit injuries or removals on adjacent private lands are involved, a list of affected trees (within CoT only) should be submitted to Urban Forestry. The specific address, with property owner information, should be included. Ideally, the list would be a filtered version of Table 1.	Acknowledged.  The Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects will address vegetation removal from linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project.  We will continue to work collaboratively with the City regarding any trees affected on City managed lands.

109	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	No application form or fee will be required for Category 3 trees (trees in city-owned parks). These trees remain protected under Chapter 608, and permission from the GM of PF&R is required prior to injury or removal. A letter to the GM of PF&R is required, listing the affected trees, the permission required (i.e., removal or injury), and citing the applicant's reasons for removal/injury. The letter should be addressed to David Bostock, Ass't Planner Urban Forestry TPPR, 150 Borough Dr., 5th Floor, M1P 4N7. TIPPR revision required.	Acknowledged. To be addressed at Detailed Design per The Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol in consultation with City and other aforementioned parties.
110	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	P87, a tree polygon shown on Figures 8 & 9, is slated for "partial removal". In Table 1 (TIPPR), under the "Permit Requirement [...]" column, it is stated that no permit is required, and consent from neighbour property owner is required. It appears these are road allowance (street) trees, therefore CoT is the neighbouring property owner, and a permit is required for each tree removed in this polygon, regardless of size (as per MC Chapter 813, Article II). TIPPR Appendix A summarizes 18 trees in this polygon that are within 2m of the fence, therefore TPPR presumes this would be the number of trees removed.	Acknowledged. The exact number of trees to be removed will be addressed at Detailed Design. We will continue to work collaboratively with the City regarding any trees affected on City managed lands.
111	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Regarding replanting requirements, the following ratios will be administered:	N/A
112	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Category 2 (private, neighbour owned or boundary line with ROW, Chapter 813, Art.III): 3:1	Acknowledged. We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities, including the City of Toronto. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project.  We will continue to work collaboratively with the City regarding any trees affected on City managed lands.
113	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Category 3 trees (Parks, Chapter 608, Art.VII): 3:1	Acknowledged. We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities, including the City of Toronto. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project.  We will continue to work collaboratively with the City regarding any trees affected on City managed lands.
114	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Category 5 (city owned street trees, Chapter 813, Art.II): 1:1	Acknowledged. We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities, including the City of Toronto. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project.  We will continue to work collaboratively with the City regarding any trees affected on City managed lands.
115	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	In accordance with the Official Plan, replacement trees should be large growing, long lived shade trees, preferably native species (see Policy 1d under Chapter 3.4.1).	Acknowledged. To be addressed in Metrolinx's Ecosystem Services Compensation Protocol, in consultation with aforementioned stakeholders, including the City of Toronto.
116	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Tree #208 appears to be Category 5. If MLX has info to the contrary, please share it.	Acknowledged. To be addressed in Metrolinx's Ecosystem Services Compensation Protocol, in consultation with aforementioned stakeholders, including the City of Toronto.
117	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	"The payment in lieu of new/replacement trees required but not provided is \$583 per tree. This applies to replacements required as a consequence of the removal of trees in Categories 2, 3 & 5."	Acknowledged. To be addressed in Metrolinx's Ecosystem Services Compensation Protocol, in consultation with aforementioned stakeholders, including the City of Toronto.
118	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	The Study lacks sufficient detail necessary to determine the applicability of the various tree by-laws, and the degree of intrusion into the respective Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) of a protected tree. Such generality renders the information meaningless. Further, without this information, mitigation in terms of minimizing tree injury can not be explored. Consequently, many protected trees may be removed that could have been preserved through proper arboricultural practices.	At the detailed design phase, a detailed tree inventory will be undertaken based on the near-final design drawings. Results will be compared against the 2015 tree inventory to identify the need to update/confirm specific trees which may no longer be slated for removal, or new ones which will be based on design drawing changes since the 2015 inventory.

119	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The draft EPR is vague. It is not possible to understand the extent of the disturbance or destruction of the protected natural features that will result from the proposal (preferred option). For example, "proposed vegetation removal may have potential effects on wildlife habitats identified within or near the existing rail corridor (pg.54).	A refined analysis of impacts will be provided in the Detailed Design Natural Environment Report (NER) based on near to final detailed design drawings. We will have more detailed understanding of the effects. In Final EPR, will endeavour to make this as clear as possible.
120	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The proposal relies on assumptions and lacks a "Plan B" in the event that field conditions are different than previously assumed. This is especially concerning in the two ESA. For example, "if a snake is encountered during construction, staff should try to herd it away safely from the construction area" (draft EPR, pg. 63).	Consultation with the MNR will be ongoing throughout the detailed design phase; mitigation recommendations such as protocol to follow if encountering wildlife/SAR provided by MNR will be incorporated. For the EPR, text will be revised to be targeted and reference a Sighting Response Protocol, to be developed at detailed design.
121	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Many organisms will be displaced and/or their biological patterns disturbed by the extent and duration of construction. Are there re-location opportunities? Can the Toronto Zoo or other conservation agencies provide temporary habitat? What is realistic and what is not possible?	Habitat supporting wildlife in the railway ROW and areas slated for construction is very limited in quantity and function. Construction for the most part will take place within or immediately adjacent to the existing rail ROW. Wildlife using such areas are highly tolerant of disturbance such as the daily noise and vibration from passing trains and vehicles on the road, and are likely to remain during temporary construction disturbances. In the unlikely event that wildlife enters the temporary construction areas, they may be moved safely outside of the construction area and into nearby suitable habitat. An appropriate agency (such as the MNR) may be contacted by contractors for further direction as required. For the EPR, text will be revised to be targeted and reference a Sighting Response Protocol, to be developed at detailed design.
122	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The <u>Assessment of Potential Effects and Proposed Mitigation</u> relies on non-committal, undefined words such as "may have potential effects", "some damage", "where possible", regarding impacts and mitigation.	For clarity, when stating mitigation measures, monitoring and reporting activities, we will strive to use "will" as opposed to "should", "must" or "recommended" to indicate a commitment in the EPR wherever possible. Please note that as more detail will only be available during Detailed Design phases and associated stakeholder consultation, effects and damage are therefore identified as potential given the level of design in the Final EPR. This level of design is consistent with TPAP requirements.
123	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Mapping that identifies opportunities and constraints relating to the construction objectives and the existing conditions has not been provided. It is only through such an exercise that the most appropriate solution can be identified.	Where possible the additional third track will be constructed within the existing rail corridor ROW. Given the nature of the project there is a fairly restricted and well-defined corridor in which the new rail track and associated infrastructure may feasibly be placed. The rationale for the preferred track alignment placement is provided in Section 3.3 of the EPR and this demonstrates why the additional third track has been placed on either the north or south side of the existing rail tracks in specific sections. The potential impacts and proposed mitigation and monitoring are based upon this preferred alignment which is considered to be the most technically feasible solution. Further, construction laydown and staging will be determined during detailed design, bearing in mind EPR commitments to avoid or minimize impacts.
124	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The Lakeshore East Corridor drawings do not include a Limit of Disturbance (LOD). The LOD is the boundary within which construction, materials storage, grading, landscaping and related activities shall occur. This must include everything including compliance with Ont. Ministry of Labour requirements. This is a critical piece of information in the evaluation of tree injury or destruction. This limit is often coincident with the proposed location of TPH.	The Draft EPR was based on preliminary design drawings. Mapping of the Limit of Disturbance based on near final detail design drawings will be provided in the detailed design NER.
125	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Protected trees have been excluded from the inventory. The RNFP By-law protects trees of all sizes and species within the ravine area (as denoted by the RNFP By-law Limit). The draft EPR explains that only trees with 10cm diameter (DBH) have been included in the inventory. Polygons are not appropriate as a RNFP Permit is issued on a tree by tree basis. Metrolinx should discuss thresholds, significant trees and special areas of interest with RNFP.	Acknowledged. Arborist to address at detailed design. Metrolinx's Ecosystem Services Compensation Protocol, in consultation with aforementioned stakeholders, including the City of Toronto, will address RNFP By-Law protected trees.
126	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Placing anything inside a TPZ without prior authorization from RNFP, is a contravention of the RNFP By-law. Currently, the draft EPR states, "if material is removed from the waterbody, it will be set aside and returned to the original location once construction activities are complete" (pg.64). Sufficient stockpiling and staging areas should be identified on the drawings.	Acknowledged. Construction laydown and staging (including stockpiling areas) will be determined during detailed design, bearing in mind EPR commitments to avoid or minimize impacts.
127	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Tree protection Hoarding (TPH) is required if there is construction in or near a protected tree. Construction includes all activities related to the installation of the project including demolition, removals, layout, storage, stockpiling, etc. Installing it only where grading is proposed is not acceptable and is a contravention of the RNFP By-law.	Acknowledged. Metrolinx's Ecosystem Services Compensation Protocol, in consultation with aforementioned stakeholders, including the City of Toronto, will address tree protection hoarding. Arborist will be retained to address during detailed design as required.

128	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	The tree inventory notes that several trees are butternuts and several others are hybrids of butternut. Butternut trees are Species at Risk and hybrid butternut trees may be protected by the various tree By-laws.	Acknowledged. Butternuts understood to be within the zone of impact were tested for purity and found to be hybrids. The Tree Inventory works at the detailed design phase will further explore the genetic purity and retainability of pure Butternut, if found to be present and if deemed to be within a zone of impact from the Project study area.
129	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Use the appropriate City standard details including the installation of tree protection. T-bars are not acceptable as they are easily moved.	Acknowledged. Acceptable tree protection to be reviewed and updated in Final EPR as required such as 2x4 framing or approved equivalent per City of Toronto PFR Tree Protection Policy and Specification for Construction Near Trees.
130	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Only trees that have been assessed by RNFP Officers, and found to be terminally diseased, dead or imminently hazardous may be exempt from the Tree By-laws.	Acknowledged.
131	<i>Draft EPR</i>	A discussion of timing is lacking. The bird breeding season runs from April 1 to August 31. During this window, there should not be any removal of trees or large tree limbs. The bat roosting season extends from April 30 to September 1. The turtle over-wintering period runs from October 1 to April 30. There are wildlife disturbance restrictions all year round. How will this be managed effectively?	Acknowledged. This will be clarified in the Final EPR and will incorporate results of MNRF consultation.
132	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The drawings and the draft EPR [with regards to natural environment and disturbance effects & mitigation] each appear to be have been developed in a vacuum - separate from the other.	We have investigated and are not clear on this comment. Please clarify so we can resolve for the final EPR.
133	<i>Draft EPR</i>	There is contradiction within the same section of the draft EPR. For example, at the Rouge River Crossing (which falls within an ESA) the text states that "...no negative impacts to the aquatic environment are expected" (pg.63). The following paragraph explains that "new sheet piles are proposed to be <i>driven</i> into the river bed on either side of the existing pier. This work may require coffer damming and dewatering of the work area"... "Installation of the coffer dams may disrupt any natural substrate that currently exists" (pg.64)... "Contamination from construction equipment may also lead to the potential mortality of fish/eggs/ova" (pg.65).	The first part of the text referred to regarding "no negative impacts" on page 63 is indeed in reference to the Rouge River crossing. The second part however referring to "sheet piles...driven into the river bed on either side of existing pier" is in reference to proposed works at Highland Creek crossing, as stated at the beginning of that paragraph on page 63.
134	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	The arborist report must detail how the proposed development is expected to impact individual trees and ecosystem features and functions as a whole. It must provide recommendations for mitigating negative impacts for the proposed development on trees, and natural features and functions. The arborist report must also provide a rationale for the removal or injury of any trees.	Acknowledged. To be addressed at Detailed Design.
135	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	For all ash trees, the arborist should look for evidence of Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) and note his/her observations in the Tree Inventory. Infested trees should not be preserved (e.g. tree #300, 309, 314, 318, 325, 328, 331, 342, 343, 368, etc.).	Acknowledged. To be addressed at Detailed Design.
136	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The draft EPR notes that "it is expected that substantial construction efforts will likely be undertaken at night" (pg.73). The draft EPR should go on to discuss lighting impacts on nocturnal wildlife and appropriate mitigation during construction.	Acknowledged. Lighting impacts on nocturnal wildlife and appropriate mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Final EPR.
137	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The project area traverses two (2) Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs). ESAs are natural spaces within Toronto's natural heritage system that require special protection to preserve their environmentally significant qualities. The draft EPR fails to address the protection/impact that the construction will cause and as such, mitigation measures have not been explored. East Point has a high diversity of successional vegetation which supports a high diversity of wildlife. The landform in East Point is considered especially significant because it demonstrates the maintenance of bluff formation due to erosion at the toe of the slope by Lake Ontario. The landform and successional processes that maintain open habitat in this area need to be maintained if the significant features are to be maintained. The Rouge Marsh is a section of the second ESA. It is in good condition with high quality wildlife habitat and a high diversity of vegetation communities and plants. The landform and the vegetation within this area should be protected. The baymouth bar on the Pickering side of the river is critical to the maintenance of the significant natural features of this area.	Acknowledged. Impacts to the two ESAs have been discussed in Section 4.1.1.1 of Appendix B1 of the Draft EPR. A refined analysis of impacts and mitigation will be provided in the Detailed Design NER based on near final detailed design.

138	<i>Draft EPR</i>	<p>The Official Plan environmental policies recognize the importance of protecting, restoring and enhancing the natural ecosystem which includes the natural heritage system. Policy 3.4.10 states that development is generally not permitted in the natural heritage system illustrated on Map 9 – which includes large portions of the project area.</p> <p>A Natural Heritage Impact Study (NHIS) may need to be submitted to RNFP for review and approval. The authority to request this study is provided by the Planning Act, the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and the 2006 Toronto Official Plan. All proposed development in or near the natural heritage system will be evaluated to determine the potential for the development to adversely impact the natural heritage system (policy 3.4.12).</p>	It is our opinion that the TPAP EA covers the intent of what is being asked here. We will address as required, in a reference within the final EPR to confirm why a NHIS not needed.
139	<i>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report</i>	Tree Protection Hoarding (TPH) should be shown as straight lines segments in all cases. There are many instances where hoarding is not shown around a protected tree to be preserved.	Acknowledged. TPH will be identified in the Final EPR where known. To be confirmed and addressed at Detailed Design.
140	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Add the Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) to the appropriate Figures and drawing sheets.	Acknowledged. Figures between 2A-4 and 2B-2 for the Draft EPR show boundaries of the two ESAs, East Point and Rouge Marsh, respectively.
141	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The site is situated on the Waterfront and Trans Canada trails, of regional and national significance.	Acknowledged
142	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The site will feature the most southerly of several park welcome areas planned by Parks Canada; it will shape first impressions of the park by visitors	Acknowledged
143	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Estimates suggest the beach attracts 300,000 visitors per summer season—single largest visitation anywhere in Rouge National Urban Park	Acknowledged
144	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Drawings referenced for these comments are those presented at the Jan. 21st meeting, namely those labeled LAKESHORE EAST CORRIDOR - Impact Mitigation & Typical Sections C-001 to C-008, excluding C-003 which is Pickering and approved by L.B. on 15/12/15	Acknowledged
145	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Note that these comments are preliminary for those locations and areas shown on the above mentioned drawings for discussion and review. Additional comments may be submitted as part of the EPR commenting process	Acknowledged
146	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Note that these comments do not address the proposed retaining wall along the north side of the embankment adjacent to Lawrence Ave. East.	Acknowledged
147	<i>Draft EPR</i>	PF&R generally prefers a single wall option that provides sufficient space for a widened walkway and tree planting while not visually nor physically detracting from the natural environment of the national park. This may be best represented as a medium wall option somewhere in between the two options prepared by AECOM. This is considered the easiest option from a maintenance perspective. More investigation of this and other options are required.	Acknowledged - to be considered during detail design. Consultation with City will continue as detailed design progresses.
148	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Retaining wall alignment could follow the existing fence line between Sections D and E, and then where the fence intersects with the existing Metrolinx ROW property line the fence could follow the property line set back by 1m setback until it terminates to the west	Acknowledged - to be considered during detail design. Consultation with City will continue as detailed design progresses.
149	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The City generally supports the recommendations of Parks Canada and the TRCA	Acknowledged.
150	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The City strongly supports the recommendation of Parks Canada to hold a design workshop including representatives from Parks Canada, TRCA and City of Toronto that includes the various options suggested to be investigated - low wall, tall wall, and hybrid two wall options	We are working closely with City of Toronto, TRCA and Parks Canada to mitigate the effects of retaining wall at the waterfront trail. To this effect multiple design workshops to explore options/alternatives have been completed. A site walkthrough was held in June 17, 2016 with key stakeholders including City of Toronto to further discuss alternatives. A Metrolinx Design Review Panel (MDRP) meeting is planned for September 15 to review the proposed retaining wall options. We will continue to consult with the City throughout detailed design.
151	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Walkway between Section D and E must support a high volume of public and multiple transportation systems, i.e. Pedestrian, bikes, EMS, maintenance vehicles and may	Acknowledged - to be considered during detail design. Consultation with City will continue as detailed design progresses.

152	<i>Draft EPR</i>	A retaining wall will be highly visible to all visitors to the beach, trails, and welcome facilities. Consider a mix of varying design treatments (e.g., textures and colours) along the length of the wall; even a well-textured design can appear monotonous over a large area	Acknowledged. We are working closely with City of Toronto, TRCA and Parks Canada to mitigate the effects of retaining wall at the waterfront trail. To this effect multiple design workshops to explore options/alternatives have been completed. A site walkthrough was held in June 17, 2016 with key stakeholders including City of Toronto to further discuss alternatives. A Metrolinx Design Review Panel (MDRP) meeting is planned for September 15 to review the proposed retaining wall options. We will continue to consult with the City throughout detailed design.
153	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Integrate opportunities for the wall to serve one or more public programming functions over its length.	Acknowledged - to be considered during detail design. Consultation with City will continue as detailed design progresses.
154	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Areas of the wall without a public programming focus should be planted with shrubs and climbing vines so that it creates a natural backdrop for users and does not offer a suitable space for graffiti.	Acknowledged - to be considered during detail design. Consultation with City will continue as detailed design progresses.
155	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Parks (Toronto or Canada) should not be responsible for maintenance of graffiti on this wall; Metrolinx is to own the wall and will be responsible for graffiti removal. There should be a protocol established to follow when graffiti does occur so there can be a level of expectation that it will be removed in a timely manner.	Acknowledged. A Master Agreement will be developed during detailed design, and address issues such as those mentioned here.
156	<i>Draft EPR</i>	In terms of public programming, wall and underpass should be an opportunity for artistic enhancement with possible historical elements, cultural education, surfaces to support community-based art, possible First Nations motifs relevant to the Rouge (in consultation with First Nations).	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
157	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Widening of path needs to be considered in areas of high pedestrian volumes, such as near the Rouge River bridge.	Widening of path is not being contemplated as this is not related to the rail corridor expansion project.
158	<i>Draft EPR</i>	PF&R supports the location of the fence on top of the retaining wall for greatest protection of the ROW. Fence should be ornamental in nature with a black finish	Acknowledged - detailed of the fence will be considered during detail design
159	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Walkway for the length of the Rouge Park beach will need to be widened to 6m. Please take this into consideration when determining the wall location. If the existing walkway is damaged during construction then it will be expected to be replaced at the 6m width	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
160	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Lengthen the Rouge Bridge and provide a greater span on the west side to allow for a min. 5m fire route and 20m turning radius, as well as multiple transportation systems, i.e. Pedestrian, bikes, EMS, maintenance vehicles	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
161	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Create more space between walkway and wall (i.e.. move retaining wall away from walkway)	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
162	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Location of existing fence seems good for the retaining wall location	Acknowledged
163	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Wall should be highly textured to reduce graffiti and allow plants to climb	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
164	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Encourage shrubs and climbing vines to cover wall and create a "green" living backdrop for users. Vines should be planted to cover wall to reduce graffiti and have waterfront looking more natural, except in areas where the wall is to serve interpretive and other programming purposes.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
165	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Distance between wall and walkway should be wide enough to allow for tree and shrub planting, and should be a preferable distance of 6m between the retaining wall to widened walkway to allow adequate planting to screen the wall.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
166	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Vines should be planted to cover wall to reduce graffiti and have waterfront looking more natural, except in areas where the wall is to serve interpretive and other programming purposes.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
167	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Wall should be viewed as area of opportunity for beautification, i.e. Historical drawings, sculpture, communication of natural environment, potential for community art projects (limited to accessible hubs I.E Rouge Park not along the entire length).	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
168	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The retaining wall needs to be low maintenance, discourage vandalism and support safety, i.e. not climbable	Acknowledged

169	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Area at Section D must support a high volume of public and multiple transportation systems, i.e. Pedestrian, bikes, EMS, maintenance vehicles.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
170	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Move wall back to ensure +/-6m between widened walkway and wall and allow for widening of walkway toward the wall (no room for widening on beach side).	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
171	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Location needs to support high volume of public and transportation, i.e. Pedestrians, bikes, EMS, maintenance vehicles.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
172	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Lifeguard building is just west of Section E and can be demolished during construction if it will be replaced by a new building as part of the Metrolinx project	Acknowledged - demolition of this building is not being contemplated by the proposed undertaking.
173	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Lake is very close to Scarborough Waterfront Trail(SWT).	Acknowledged
174	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Trail is already not able to support increased use by public due to SWT, Rouge Park, media attention. Lake infill may be needed along this stretch, especially if trail is widened.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
175	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Please relocate the fence to the property line of the ROW when not on top of the retaining wall.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
176	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Natural regeneration of area is strong since installation of Scarborough Waterfront Trail. Please investigate opportunities for salvaging existing vegetation for transplanting either within the project boundaries or other areas within the project area.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
177	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Natural regeneration of area is strong since installation of Scarborough Waterfront Trail. Please investigate opportunities for salvaging existing vegetation for transplanting either within the project boundaries or other areas within the project area	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
178	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Walkway may be too close to lake and cannot be easily realigned.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
179	<i>Draft EPR</i>	A low retaining wall is the preferred solution along this section	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
180	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Move fence away from walkway to ROW property line.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
181	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Land use agreement needs setup for slope on south side of tracks.	Acknowledged
182	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Area inside Metrolinx responsibility should be restored to natural environment and support backdrop to passive recreation on trail, i.e. More benches	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
183	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Need to ensure no debris can fall onto walkway from Colonel Danforth to Waterfront trail – where train bridges cross	Acknowledged - safety is of paramount importance to Metrolinx. The proposed rail bridges will have concrete ballasted decks, which reduce risk of debris falling.
184	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Current bridge is 3.46m wide and 59m long. A new bridge will be required to accommodate EMS Vehicles during closure of the Rouge Bridge access as this will be the only means of access during emergencies	Acknowledged. The proposed crossing treatment would allow access for EMS and City maintenance vehicles at the existing Chesterton Shores crossing.
185	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Bridge 974 belongs to transportation, transportation needs to be consulted - Transportation CTC : William Mason - - Julfiker Hassan	Acknowledged. The project team has consulted with appropriate City divisions, including Transportation.
186	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Security fencing—place atop the retaining wall; if chain link must be used, ensure it is black; consider other types of more refined, decorative fence designs that offer the same level of security (again the fence could contain park motifs).	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
187	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Consider clean (e.g., monopole) electrical overhead wire supports with black or rust patina.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design
188	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Hydro wires? Will there be any? Can they be integrated into the electrification system (or moved, if that follows?)	No hydro wires are proposed as part of this project.
189	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Is there a need for lighting (security, programming) to be attached to a wall?	Lighting requirements will be investigated during detail design
190	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Is there a need for sound barrier along this stretch of rail corridor? If so, please demonstrate locations, style, and potential impacts	The Ontario Ministry of Environment and Energy /GO Transit Draft Protocol for Noise and Vibration were used to carry out the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. In accordance with the Protocol, the feasibility of operational noise mitigation measures is to be reviewed where the predicted noise impact of the project is 'significant' i.e. equal to or greater than 5 dB compared to existing noise levels. Noise mitigation is recommended for one location: 90 Morningside Avenue.



191	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Please indicate potential staging areas and access points for discussion and comment.	Acknowledged - to be determined during detail design. Consultation with City will continue as detailed design progresses.
192	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Please indicate potential construction zone / limit of disturbance for discussion and comment.	Acknowledged - to be determined during detail design. Consultation with City will continue as detailed design progresses.
193	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Please indicate potential impacts of the electrification along this section of the corridor for discussion and comment.	Metrolinx is completing a separate TPAP environmental assessment to electrify the GO service which will be looking at any potential impact of electrification. More information on the final results of the noise and vibration study will be available as the Electrification TPAP completes its work.
194	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Best timing to close the beach path for construction is from October to April. If construction occurs outside this timeframe, please provide AODA access around the construction zone.	Acknowledged - to be considered during detail design. Consultation with City will continue as detailed design progresses.
<i>Transportation Services (TS)</i>			
195	<i>Appendix A</i>	<p>The EPR report does not illustrate the proposed reconfiguration of the adjacent local road network as a result of the proposed grade separation. See below for examples:  For the Scarborough Golf Club Road, 1) new access to Tillinghast Lane from Dunelm St, 2) Extension of Dunelm St to connect to Dale, 3) The closure of Dale Ave access to SGC, 4) New access to development.  For Galloway Road, The proposed access roads to rail  For Morningside:  1) The New access road to 90 Morningside Ave.  2) The proposed access roads to rail.  For Poplar Road: Road Closure and the need to have a Pedestrian grade separation. it is understood that on January 29, 2016 - Mx TAC meeting, Metrolinx stated that further analysis needs to occur regarding the Pedestrian grade separation ( i.e. business needs). This analysis should be completed as part of the TPAP process.</p>	<p>The road configuration at the Scarborough Golf Club Road grade separation is currently being investigated. There will be no access roads to rail at the grade separations.</p> <p>The Final EPR will be updated to show the preferred design, including the final proposed reconfiguration of the road network. We will seek EA approval for a non-vehicular grade separation at Poplar, in consultation with the City. Additional information will be included in the Final EPR.</p>
196	<i>Appendix A</i>	<p>Although a listing of property impacts are provided. The ERP should illustrate the road changes required/impacts/mitigating measures as a result of the proposed grade separation preferred solutions. If not through the TPAP process, how will Metrolinx gain the appropriate authority to made changes to the City of Toronto local network as a result of the proposed grade separations?</p> <p>Also, from an impact and mitigating measures perspective, aside from looking at the road network. Metrolinx should also look at the underground and utility impacts ( if any) as a result of the proposed reconfiguration of local roads due to the proposed grade separation. I will defer comments to Toronto Water representation.</p>	<p>The road configuration at the Scarborough Golf Club Road grade separation has been revised to reflect an 8% road grade. The Galloway road configuration has also been revised to reflect a 6.55% road grade. These revisions will be updated in the Final EPR along with any other applicable road changes.</p> <p>There will be no access roads to rail at the grade separations. Utility impacts will be determined in greater detail during detail design in consultation with third party utilities as appropriate.</p>
197	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.3</i>	Chesterton Shores: The detail requirements for the Rouge Hill GO Station Pedestrian Tunnel - and its ability to cater to Pedestrian/Cyclist traffic to the Waterfront Trail should be further described in the EPR. Transportation Services - Cycling Infrastructure and Pedestrian Projects will provide requirements.	<p>Enhancements to Rouge Hill GO Station including to the station facilities will be considered as part of the separate works to upgrade the station and are not part of the scope of this TPAP.</p> <p>The Final EPR will be updated to include analysis of the pavilion portion.</p> <p>Detailed design TAC meetings will continue and requirements can be provided to Metrolinx.</p>
198	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.3</i>	<p>The preferred solution for the road closure of Poplar Road should detail if a pedestrian grade separation is required. This needs to be identified in the EPR.</p> <p>Transportation Services - Pedestrian Projects to further provide comments.</p>	We will seek EA approval for a non-vehicular grade separation at Poplar, in consultation with the City. Additional information will be included in the Final EPR. Pedestrian/cycling overpass or underpass will be built if the City/community decides to close the Poplar Road rail crossing. If not, the crossing will remain and be enhanced.
199	<i>Appendix B6</i>	<p>All Way Stop Control review analyses are required at the new intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Dunelm St and SGC</li> <li>* Dunelm St and Tillinghast Lane</li> </ul> <p>Other, traffic related issues, comments defer to Traffic Operations.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Please be advised that with the 8% road grade at SGCR, there will be no new intersection at Dunelm and SGCR.</p>

200	<i>Draft EPR, Section 1</i>	Identify which at-grades have been removed to date - have any been closed as a result.	Recent examples of Metrolinx grade separation projects within the City of Toronto from the Kitchener rail corridor include Denison Road and Strachan Avenue. For the final EPR, we will provide renderings of key infrastructure (e.g. grade separations, bridges, and public-facing retaining walls) to allow the reader to understand what the project will look like. These were not available at the time the draft EPR was submitted for review. The renderings will be supported by plan view drawings of the proposed track alignment including key infrastructure which will be developed to provide easy interpretation. Drawing sheet numbers will be added while referencing Appendix A.
201	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Adjacent property may be required at south - what impacts does this have on the parkland and waterfront trail - not determined? Some detail on type of structural wall and heights would be needed to assess impacts on the waterfront trail.	Acknowledged - to be investigated during detail design. For the final EPR, we will provide renderings of key infrastructure (e.g. grade separations, bridges, and public-facing retaining walls) to allow the reader to understand what the project will look like. These were not available at the time the draft EPR was submitted for review. The renderings will be supported by plan view drawings of the proposed track alignment including key infrastructure which will be developed to provide easy interpretation. Drawing sheet numbers will be added while referencing Appendix A.
202	<i>Draft EPR</i>	They detail benefits of underpasses and only identify one user (motorist) but should also indicate challenges - can be dark, unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists - where overpasses are preferred. Were overpasses assessed? If underpass is preferred - must detail conditions that make it workable for pedestrians/cyclists as well as motorist - included shortest distance, adequate grades, wide travel areas for pedestrians/cyclists, proper lighting and drainage.	Acknowledged - these considerations will be reviewed during detail design to improve the pedestrian/cyclist experience through the underpass. The underpasses are being designed to provide elevated sidewalks, dedicated bike lanes etc. The rationale for why an underpass is preferred to an overpass for grade separations within the study area is provided in Section 3.4.1.
203	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Identify current City of Toronto road design standards - they should better articulate what these entail.	This information will be clarified in the Final EPR.
204	<i>Draft EPR</i>	One lane open each way for construction - how does this protect for pedestrians?	Pedestrian access will be maintained where feasible and will form part of a wider Traffic Management Plan developed during detail design, in consultation with the City.
205	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The closure of Poplar will not "may" cause disturbances to pedestrians and cyclists. What are the solutions that Metrolinx will explore during the detailed design phase - these should be detailed. Why are they proposing total closure of this road when City has identified need to keep open for pedestrians and cyclists. Has ped/cycling bridge been explored? What mitigating measures have been reviewed?	Acknowledged. We will seek EA approval for a non-vehicular grade separation at Poplar, in consultation with the City. Additional information will be included in the Final EPR. Pedestrian/cycling overpass or underpass will be built if the City/community decides to close the Poplar Road rail crossing. If not, the crossing will remain and be enhanced.
206	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Tunnel provision at Rouge should be similar to at Port Union Park - no staircases and ease of access for cyclists/pedestrians to the trail or other options need to be reviewed at Chesterton. As is admitted it is widely used by pedestrians/cyclists to access trail.	Enhancements to Rouge Hill GO Station including to the station facilities will be considered as part of the separate works to upgrade the station and are not part of the scope of this TPAP. The enhanced tunnel will be AODA compliant with staircase and switchback ramp as discussed at the July 14 design workshop with City of Toronto, Parks Canada and TRCA. Consultation effort with key stakeholders is ongoing.
207	<i>Draft EPR</i>	The modifications to the Highland Creek bridge should be identified as having no impact on the Highland Creek Trail or trail underpass below the structure. Need to work with City to ensure during detailed design. Views of Lake Ontario are among the best in the city at this junction and should be preserved	We will try to maintain trail access throughout construction activities, where access will be restricted or closed on a temporary basis to move equipment or to maintain safety as we complete specific work in the area, the community will be notified in advance of any temporary closures or restrictions. We are committed to work with the City during detailed design.  A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for Highland Creek Bridge. No negative impacts are anticipated with regards to views of Lake Ontario from the bridge.
208	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Waterfront Trail - off road in project area is from Beechgrove east not Highland Creek. The on-street route west of Beechgrove in study area - is Route 79/16 along Copperfield to Manse, Coronation, Morningside and Guildwood Parkway. There is additional on-street signed route on Galloway	Acknowledged
209	<i>Draft EPR</i>	What about identification of planned projects in EPR - Scarborough Waterfront EA and other planned works in area. As proposed trail is identified along south side of rail corridor from Manse west to Morningside. Need to ensure there are no impacts to this potential trail on city Parks lands.	Acknowledged. We will continue to work with key stakeholders including City of Toronto, TRCA, Parks Canada and City of Pickering.
210	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Counts took place in October and February - were during weekday and at peak hours. To measure accurate cycling volumes you need to do counts in warmer weather and non-peak or weekends as well. Especially with use of the waterfront trail access. This data does not accurately reflect cycling volumes crossing the corridor.	We would not expect any new pedestrian counts to change the overall results of the study, considering a road rail grade separation (SGCR, Galloway and Morningside) or pedestrian / cyclist grade separation is proposed (Poplar and west of Chesterton at Rouge Hill Station) or the crossings remain at grade (Beechgrove, Manse and Rodd Avenue).

211	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Potential operational impacts at Chesterton and Poplar should not only include impacts to vehicles but impacts to pedestrians and cyclists. How will Metrolinx consider maintaining pedestrian/cycling access at Poplar - a cycle/ped bridge/tunnel - this should be stated.	Acknowledged. We will seek EA approval for a non-vehicular grade separation at Poplar, in consultation with the City.  At Chesterton Shores, an enhanced pedestrian / cyclist tunnel is proposed at the adjacent Rouge Hill station and a pavilion south of the station. Please note that enhancements to Rouge Hill GO Station including to the station facilities will be considered as part of the separate works to upgrade the station and are not part of the scope of this TPAP. The pavilion will be covered in the TPAP. Additional information will be included in the Final EPR.
212	<i>Draft EPR</i>	What are the mitigating measures being considered for the retaining walls and impact on the Waterfront Trail. Hard to comment on this item when we are not really sure what impacts will be - just to reiterate that we need to work to common solutions during detailed design and that all effort to minimize impact on the trail or the future trail potential will be foremost. In terms of property requirements - is this city park? If so this will need Council approval.	We are working closely with City of Toronto, TRCA and Parks Canada to mitigate the effects of retaining wall at the waterfront trail. To this effect multiple design workshops to explore options/alternatives have been completed. A site walkthrough was held in June 2017, 2016 with key stakeholders including City of Toronto to further discuss alternatives. A Metrolinx Design Review Panel (MDRP) meeting is planned for September 15 to review the proposed retaining wall options.  The land is currently owned by TRCA. City Council approval is not required.
213	<i>Draft EPR</i>	A mitigation measure for cyclists is not using sidewalk - it is illegal for cyclists to ride on sidewalk - need to think of other efforts to assist cycling access during construction. Special directional signage will be used - not "may be considered".	Cycling access will be maintained where feasible and will form part of a wider Traffic Management Plan developed during detail design.
214	<i>Draft EPR</i>	This is the first we are hearing of permanent modifications to existing Waterfront Trail - if this is case we need to know what these may be and how they will be mitigated. Need to use stronger language to ensure that Metrolinx will do whatever is necessary to ensure continuity of the trail and park experience. - "not just appropriate mitigation measures".	To date, we have worked closely with City of Toronto, TRCA and Parks Canada to communicate the effects and consult on mitigation of those effects on the waterfront trail. To this effect multiple design workshops to explore options/alternatives have been completed. A site walkthrough was held in June 2017, 2016 with key stakeholders including City of Toronto to further discuss alternatives. We will continue to work with key stakeholders, including the City to consult on any proposed modifications and mitigation.
215	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Metrolinx needs to use language that commits to preserving and enhancing recreational amenities and aesthetics. It would be more re-assuring to see examples of how they will mitigate these elements - rather than just stating it will be done in design. What options are there for ensuring the park experience as concepts - be it greening of retaining walls, ensuring reduced heights, etc. At this point we are really not sure what the impacts are and whether there has been thought on how to mitigate - just that it will be looked at in a later stage?	We are working closely with City of Toronto, TRCA and Parks Canada to mitigate the effects of retaining wall at the waterfront trail. To this effect multiple design workshops to explore options/alternatives have been completed. A site walkthrough was held in June 2017, 2016 with key stakeholders including City of Toronto to further discuss alternatives. A Metrolinx Design Review Panel (MDRP) meeting is planned for September 15 to review the proposed retaining wall options.
216	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Design of new structures at Highland Creek - should not impede current viewpoints of the Lake.	A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for Highland Creek Bridge. No negative impacts are anticipated with regards to views of Lake Ontario from the bridge.
217	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Cyclists cannot use sidewalk unless they walk their bikes - so this is not a solution during construction. The permanent closure of Poplar Rd will not "may" result in detours for pedestrians and cyclists if there is no solution proposed for cycling/pedestrian access. Detail travel distances - based on longest scenario to walk or cycle - I believe this is over 1.5km re-routing.	Acknowledged. We will seek EA approval for a non-vehicular grade separation at Poplar, in consultation with the City. Additional information will be included in the Final EPR. Pedestrian/cycling overpass or underpass will be built if the City/community decides to close the Poplar Road rail crossing. If not, the crossing will remain and be enhanced.
218	<i>Appendix A</i>	Height of retaining wall between 1-8m - this is quite a range - are there ways to narrow down the requirements. The impacts on the trail of a 1m and an 8m wall are very different and so hard to comment on.	We have since held multiple design workshops with City of Toronto, TRCA and Parks Canada to review each proposed retaining wall at the waterfront trail and to explore mitigation options. A site walkthrough was held in June 2017, 2016 with key stakeholders including City of Toronto to further discuss alternatives. A Metrolinx Design Review Panel (MDRP) meeting is planned for September 15 to review the proposed retaining wall options - TRCA and Parks Canada will participate on the MDRP. Consultation with the City will continue during detailed design.
219	<i>Appendix A</i>	Don't see new underpass at Rouge Station identified - did I miss its location?	Enhancements to Rouge Hill GO Station including to the station facilities will be considered as part of the separate works to upgrade the station and are not part of the scope of this TPAP. The pavilion portion, which has been discussed with key stakeholders including the City, will be included in the Final EPR.
220	<i>Appendix A</i>	Not enough detail at the road crossings to comment on cycling facilities - already commented on more detailed material as provided in the last stakeholder meeting with Metrolinx.	Acknowledged. Will continue to work through detailed design with the City as required.

221	<i>Draft EPR</i>	I do have concerns on how the Manse crossing and Beechgrove crossing will be handled. I do see a solution but it would be to have just one vehicle underpass through Wallsend or possible Chemical Court to Copperfield on an angle tunnel ending in a roundabout. Should no grade separation take place, I think the tractor trailers entering/exiting from Rohn & Haas plant at the Manse tracks, and with the proposed speed of the trains will be challenging.	Acknowledged. No grade separation is proposed at these crossings. Crossing enhancements will be made. The project team has met with stakeholders in this location to consult on the proposed undertaking.
222	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Petticoat Creek to Rouge Hill Go Station: it states that the trains will pass the station and maintain an operating speed of 95 mph for passenger trains and 65 mph for freight trains. I hope this is a mistake.	The rail will be designed for Class 5 track which allows for max. speed of 95 mph for passenger trains and 65 mph for freight trains. This will be clarified in the Final EPR.
223	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Road Closures: Poplar Rd. is identified as closing at the level crossing and will have an impact to the community. Timing of the closure may have an impact on the other grade separations as they are being constructed.	Acknowledged. We will seek EA approval for a non-vehicular grade separation at Poplar, in consultation with the City. Additional information will be included in the Final EPR. Pedestrian/cycling overpass or underpass will be built if the City/community decides to close the Poplar Road rail crossing. If not, the crossing will remain and be enhanced.
224	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.3.2</i>	Correct, as there is no real closing at Chesterton Shores & Lawrence Ave. as it is already restricted. This crossing was looked at a couple of years ago and downsized but had two concerns, #1, access for the railway to maintain their signals and snow removal from the platforms, a locked swing gate was installed, #2, public access to the new Waterfront Trail and access for Emergency Responders. If a tunnel is installed at the station and open to the public, it also must meet EMS/Fire requirements. The various grade separations have always been a concerns of ours as we have over the years try to restrict property access where the grade would take place. I do not see any distance for the grades in the report for those selected locations.	Acknowledged. The proposed crossing treatment would allow access for EMS and City maintenance vehicles at the existing Chesterton Shores crossing. The pedestrian tunnel will be upgraded as part of future works to enhance Rouge Hill GO Station and these tunnels will provide access to the Waterfront Trail for recreational users. This update will be clarified in the Final EPR.
225	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.4.4</i>	Other at Grade Crossings: Manse Rd. and at Beechgrove Dr. crossings. these areas does need to be cleaned up. the crossing materials need upgrading and I would not recommend the rubber I see used between the tracks is a good idea here after seeing other locations where heavy trucks/tractor trailers cross. the material comes apart. This is an area where many tracker trailers cross.	Acknowledged. This feedback will be considered during detailed design.
226	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Construction staging will be a challenge and must be timed, as we have to make sure the diversion of traffic is not heading into another diversion. The schedule will required that all of the crossing are not taking place at the same time.	Acknowledged. Construction staging needs will be determined during detailed design, in consultation with the City of Toronto.
227	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Issues surrounding the Scarborough Golf Club Road and Dale realignment that were raised at the January 2016 TAC meeting and appeared in the PowerPoint should be in the EPR, namely: - All-Way Stop Control assessments of the intersections of the realigned Dale Avenue at Pin Lane and at SGC & Dunelm - Cul-de-Sac functional design where the current Dale Avenue would be closed at SGC Road. - The new road to the west of Tillinghast lane and a functional design thereof - Functional design of the Dale Avenue realignment.	Acknowledged, the Final EPR will be updated with the 8% road grade at SGC Road and associated road realignment.
228	<i>Draft EPR</i>	There must be an accessible bridge or tunnel ( preference for bridges due to perceived safety) for pedestrians as they would otherwise have to travel significant distances in order to access major community destinations (Eastview P.S., Poplar Road Junior P. S. and Poplar Park) on either side of the tracks. As area cyclists are also likely to use this route, it must be of sufficient width to ensure that it meets multi-use guidelines.	We are working closely with the City of Toronto regarding the closure of Poplar Road and provision for a pedestrian/cyclist grade separation. We are also collecting public feedback on Poplar Road closure/pedestrian grade separation options through the public consultation process. Pedestrian/cycling overpass or underpass will be built if the City/community decides to close the Poplar Road rail crossing. If not, the crossing will remain and be enhanced.  The final EPR will provide more discussion of effects on non-vehicular road users; mitigation and document these consultation efforts.

Major Capital Infrastructure Coordination (MCIC)			
229	Appendix B4	<p>At the penultimate level of service (Guildwood Station), based on the information provided there will be 154 train movements daily and at the current service level the number is 82. That's an increase of almost double, why isn't there any mitigation being proposed beyond that which is recommended at 90 Morningside during construction?</p>	<p>Noise impacts are usually assessed by their cumulative effects - characterized by the equivalent noise level experienced over a certain period (Leq (h)) in Decibel (dB or dBA).</p> <p>Per the Ministry of the Environment/GO Transit Noise and Vibration Protocol, noise mitigation is dictated by changes relative to existing or pre-set noise conditions:  For daytime, higher of Leq (8h) = 55 dBA or existing ambient noise level.  For night-time, higher of Leq (16 h) = 50 dBA or existing noise level.  Mitigation considered only for new infrastructure and where the change in noise level (Leq) exceeds <b>5 dBA</b>. Mitigation is also subject to "administrative, operational, economic and technical feasibility".</p> <p>Further, a doubling of sound energy equates to an increase of approximately 3 dB. This would typically be considered as perceptible but not significant (with significant being 5dB, based on Ministry of the Environment/GO Transit Noise and Vibration Protocol).</p> <p>Metrolinx understands that residents are concerned about potential increases in noise from the GO service expansion. We are being proactive to review options to see what can be done to mitigate any noise increase beyond the existing noise protocol, through a noise action plan.</p>
230	Appendix B4	<p>Temporary construction noise impacts at all site locations are anticipated to be significantly higher than baseline levels at the most affected receptors. Predicted noise levels exceed the US FTA guideline limit of 80 dBA Leq,8hr for daytime construction work at four locations, particularly during excavation and grading works. At six locations, predicted noise levels meet or exceed the US FTA guideline limit of 70 dBA Leq,8hr for night-time construction work.</p> <p>Noise levels are expected to be lower because the predictions are based on the assumed equipment operating together at the same conservative set-back distance, rather than distributed around the work site. However, noise will be controlled to ensure that the guideline limits are not exceeded, where possible. This paragraph is very confusing. Are the noise impacts going to be significant or not? I understand that there will be measures used to reduce noise impacts at sensitive receptors during construction but there also needs to be actual mitigation as well. The proposed measures will do very little to minimize auger piling at 3:00 a.m.</p>	<p>Acknowledged, this will be made clearer in the Final EPR.</p> <p>Noise during construction will be significantly higher than baseline ambient noise levels; however noise levels will be controlled to within guideline limits. There will be mitigation measures to reduce impacts at sensitive receptors, as outlined in Appendix B4. We are committed to informing the public of upcoming construction works, including work at night, which is anticipated to occur. We will also be discussing construction noise mitigation at TAC meetings with the City during detailed design.</p>
231	Appendix B4	<p>Given the scale of the proposed project and associated impacts including prolonged construction, a robust and proactive communications protocol is required to address both community and City staff concerns. It would be prudent and useful to establish a Construction Liaison Committee to help facilitate disputes during construction. The group should consist of local community members including businesses, City staff, Metrolinx, the local Councillor's Office and the contractor who will be undertaking the work.</p>	<p>MX to confirm commitment</p>
232	Appendix B4	<p>Given the high level of peak construction vibration predicted at 67 Galloway Road (13.96 mm/s), the associated risk of structural damage, and the requirements of the construction vibration bylaw, further information should be included on the cause of the high vibration level during access road construction. Vibration monitoring should be proposed to ensure that vibration levels stay within City Limits and further discussion on how this impact would be addressed should be included in line with best management practice. Additional mitigation should be proposed at this location to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.</p>	<p>The contractor will be required to monitor vibration and ensure that vibration levels do not exceed City by-law limits. To achieve this the contractor may need to restrict use of certain equipment in areas close to structures.</p>
233	Appendix B4	<p>The vibration impacts are generally not considered to be significant, given their low level and temporary nature. Therefore construction vibration mitigation measures are not anticipated to be required, with the exception of the set-back limit for vibratory rollers. Given the extent of the predicted nuisance impacts, further mitigation should be proposed even if the impacts are temporary.</p>	<p>It is considered that mitigation will be implemented as required to meet City by-law limits.</p>
234	Appendix B4	<p>When will the proposed mitigation measures for 90 Morningside be available for review and comment?</p>	<p>Metrolinx will consult with the City regarding the design of the noise mitigation during detail design.</p>
235	Appendix B4	<p>There's no discussion of electrified service as part of this analysis which is curious since it is my understanding that this corridor will also be electrified.</p>	<p>Metrolinx is completing a separate TPAP environmental assessment to electrify the GO service which will be looking at any potential noise and vibration impacts. More information on the final results of the noise and vibration study will be available as the Electrification TPAP completes its work.</p>

236	Appendix B3	The assessment addresses current conditions in 2015, future no-build conditions in 2025 and future with project conditions in 2025, but uses the terminology 'cumulative effects' to refer to future plus project air quality modelling results in 2025. Cumulative impact analysis typically refers to consideration of project emissions combined with emissions from any other reasonably foreseeable or planned projects in the project vicinity. It does not appear that an assessment of cumulative air quality effects was conducted for this project. Analysis of these effects should be conducted consistent with best management practice. In addition, the assessment terminology should be revised to more accurately reflect the modelling that was done and to avoid confusion.	Local air quality impacts were assessed by estimating contaminant concentrations at representative sensitive and critical receptors within the study area, using the AERMOD model - an advanced Gaussian dispersion model identified by the Ontario Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) as one of the approved models under O. Reg. 419/05. Background contaminant concentrations from MOECC and National Air Pollution Surveillance (NAPS) air quality monitoring stations located closest to the study area were added to the modelling results to determine the cumulative concentration of contaminants of concern at sensitive and critical receptors within the study area. The modelled concentrations due to GO Trains, CN Trains, VIA Trains, roads and parking lots were combined with background concentrations for each contaminant to determine the cumulative maximum concentration at representative sensitive and critical receptors. The AQIA is based on a best approach agreement with the MOECC and typically does not include "Cumulative Impact Analysis" that accounts for other planned / foreseeable projects in the vicinity.
237	Appendix B3	Construction impacts and mitigation need to be detailed further in the report, consistent with best management practice. Mitigation has only been briefly referenced in the report.	Section 4 of the report provides measures to mitigate construction impacts that is consistent with best management practice.
238	Appendix B3	The assessment is designed on the basis that the Future "No Build" and Future "Build" scenarios assume that the entire GO locomotive traction engines are operating to Tier 4 emission standards. It should be confirmed that trains are in fact designed to meet Tier 4 standards as this will have an influence on emissions.	All trains are being rehabilitated to meet Transport Canada guideline for Tier 4 locomotives. Metrolinx is currently phasing in Tier 4 into the locomotive fleet in compliance with Transport Canada guidelines. Ultimately, Metrolinx is moving towards electrified service on Metrolinx-owned corridors, including the corridor section in the Guildwood to Pickering TPAP.
239	Appendix B3	The report should include a discussion on the expected length of the construction period given that impacts are deemed to be temporary.	Acknowledged. Will include suggested information in Final EPR.
240	Appendix B3	Techniques for the reduction and control of air emissions from construction and decommissioning sites should be described in more detail. Mitigation for construction should be included in the report.	Section 4 of the report provides measures to mitigate construction impacts that is consistent with best management practice. As plans develop through Detailed Design TAC meetings, specific mitigation can be discussed with City.
241	Appendix B3	All work proposed with this vicinity must be coordinated with the City of Toronto's Capital Works Program.	Acknowledged.

City of Pickering			
1	<i>Draft EPR, Traffic Impact Study</i>	We concur with the continued level crossing of the Rodd Avenue at this time. We encourage Metrolinx to undertake more extensive consultation with the residents on both sides of the rail line, in the vicinity of the rail line, in looking towards an appropriate solution in the future. Although the at-grade intersection of Rodd Avenue was not assessed in the TIA for this project, Metrolinx will need to review this intersection in a separate feasibility study in the future.	We acknowledge that more extensive consultation with local residents will be required to determine an appropriate solution for the Rodd Avenue level crossing. We held a second round of public meeting with one event in the City of Pickering on May 31, 2016 and consulted with local residents and gathered feedback. We will be enhancing the Rodd Avenue rail crossing safety features in the short-term. For the long-term, we will revisit the crossing at a later date to determine if anything further is required.
2	<i>Draft EPR, Aesthetics of Proposed Retaining Wall &amp; Positive Drainage / Grading of the Existing Properties</i>	The preliminary drawings are proposing a retaining wall on the west side of the tracks, west of Whites Road, within the City of Pickering. The positive drainage and grading to the existing adjacent properties must be maintained in this area. Metrolinx will seek to develop an aesthetically pleasing design for public-facing retaining walls in consultation with adjacent landowners. The City of Pickering would like to be engaged in aspects of mitigation and the detail design of the retaining walls.	We acknowledge that the positive drainage and grading to the existing adjacent properties will need to be maintained in this area. We will undertake a design excellence process for public-facing retaining walls. The project team has since been in touch with City staff regarding the proposed retaining wall west of Whites Road. The retaining wall is designed for a cut-slope and is not public-facing. City staff advised that there are no concerns and suggested a fence along the rail right-of-way, which will be implemented.
3	<i>Draft EPR, Noise and Vibration</i>	Please confirm if the noise walls will be required in the City of Pickering, with the addition of 3rd rail. In addition, please clarify what the noise impacts on Bayly Street and Rosebank neighbourhood areas are, and whether both diesel and electric locomotive technologies were assessed through the noise evaluation.	The Ontario Ministry of Environment and Energy /GO Transit Draft Protocol for Noise and Vibration were used to carry out the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. In accordance with the Protocol, the feasibility of operational noise mitigation measures is to be reviewed where the predicted noise impact of the project is 'significant' i.e. equal to or greater than 5 dB compared to existing noise levels. No noise walls have been identified for the City of Pickering as part of our Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. The noise impacts in the Rosebank area (represented by receptors R13 and R15) are predicted to be less than 4 dB increase and the noise impacts along Bayly Street (represented by receptors R16, R17, R18, R19 and R20) are predicted to be less than 1 dB increase from existing levels. In the Rosebank area, the predicted change in noise levels is considered to be potentially noticeable, but not significant. In the Bayly Street area, average daytime and night-time noise levels are mainly due to highway noise, so the influence of rail noise is considered minimal. The predicted change in noise levels here is considered to be insignificant. We understand that noise impacts are top of mind for communities adjacent to our GO service. As part of a separate process, Metrolinx is working proactively to examine ways to minimize noise impacts not addressed by the MOEE/GO Transit Noise Protocol.
4	<i>Draft EPR, Active Transportation</i>	During construction, unrestricted access to bikes and pedestrians should be maintained. There are existing waterfront trails, south of Rodd Ave and in the conservation area, south of Whites Road. The City of Pickering would like to be engaged in aspects of mitigation.	We will continue to engage City of Pickering when developing appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that access for bikes and pedestrians is maintained. We will try to maintain waterfront trail access throughout construction activities. Where access will be restricted or closed on a temporary basis, such as to move equipment or to maintain safety as we complete specific work in the area, we will work with the City on mitigation measures. The community will be notified in advance of any temporary closures or restrictions.
5	<i>Draft EPR, Property Impacts in City of Pickering</i>	The Metrolinx EA study shows that there is no land acquisition required within the City of Pickering. Please confirm.	There is potential property required within the City of Pickering that is owned by the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). We continue to consult with these affected landowners. Property requirements will be confirmed as the detail design phase progresses. The property requirements outlined in Table 5-5 of the draft EPR will be refined for the Final EPR submission.
6	<i>Draft EPR, Tree Compensation Protocol</i>	Within the City of Pickering, 78 trees, 6 tree polygons and portions of 3 tree polygons require removal. Metrolinx is currently developing a tree compensation protocol, which would be used to further identify mitigation and compensation requirements. The City of Pickering would like to be engaged in the implementation of the tree compensation protocol.	We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities. The protocol will address pruning of limbs for construction. The Final EPR will be updated to reflect that pruning should be completed by appropriately qualified staff and in accordance with the protocol.
7	<i>Draft EPR, Potential Cultural Heritage Effects and Mitigation Effects in City of Pickering</i>	The EA study mentions that there would be indirect impacts on Whites Road and Liverpool Road overhead bridges. Although they are the regional bridges, the City of Pickering would like to be engaged in aspects of mitigation and the detail design.	The EA study identified general construction and operation impacts related to introduction of an additional rail track for Whites Road and Liverpool Road overhead bridges. Based on current design no impacts are anticipated at Liverpool Road and Whites Road and the Final EPR will be updated accordingly. The City of Pickering will be engaged during detailed design and kept apprised if any additional impacts and mitigation measures are identified.

<p>8</p>	<p><i>Draft EPR, Active Transportation</i></p>	<p>During the detailed design and implementation of the project, should further impacts and potential mitigation measures be identified for the portions of the corridor with the City of Pickering, the City would like to be consulted and engaged in the implementation of such measures.</p>	<p>The City of Pickering will be engaged when developing appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that access for bikes and pedestrians is maintained. Metrolinx will maintain waterfront trail access throughout construction activities. Where access will be restricted or closed on a temporary basis, such as to move equipment or to maintain safety as MX completes specific work in the area, they will work within the City on mitigation measures. The community will be notified in advance of any temporary closures or restrictions.</p>
----------	--	--	--



Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR)			
1	<i>Draft EPR, Water Crossings</i>	As indicated, all of the watercourses within the project area are considered warm-water. No in-water works are to occur between April 1 and June 30 of any year.	Acknowledged. This timing window will be incorporated into the Final EPR.
2	<i>Draft EPR, Water Crossings</i>	This project should consider the replacement of all perched culverts to enhance fish passage (see pictures for Sites 2, 3 and 10 in Appendix E). Where feasible, we recommend box culverts - preferably open-footed, three sided structures.	Acknowledged. We will consider feasibility of replacing perched culverts as detailed design progresses, taking into consideration engineering, natural environment and heritage factors.
3	<i>Draft EPR, Species at Risk</i>	Please complete the attached spreadsheet to include all species at risk sightings for our records.	The completed spreadsheet including all species at risk sightings is enclosed with this letter for MNR's records.
4	<i>Draft EPR, Species at Risk</i>	Bank Swallow – the project will not adversely affect Bank Swallow if the works remain in the ROW and do not encroach into the colony located outside of the ROW. Please confirm.	Two site visits to this colony were completed in late July. A brief memo of the methods and findings will be provided to MNRF once finalized. The bluff containing the Bank Swallow colony is currently 35 m from the edge of the existing rail ROW, facing away from the ROW. The proposed expansion is likely to encroach approximately 5 m closer to the bluff. Currently the colony does not appear to be affected by vibrations caused by trains passing by on the tracks. It is assumed that an additional track 5 m closer will not affect the colony. However, the amount of ground vibration from grading and track construction is likely to be greater than from the regular trains. MNRF have provided comments on the draft EPR, noting that "the project will not adversely affect the Bank Swallow colony if the works remain in the ROW and do not encroach into the colony located outside of the ROW". However, track expansion is proposed outside of the current ROW, however, it will still be sufficiently distant that it will not negatively impact the colony. An Overall Benefit / C-permit from MNRF is not anticipated.
5	<i>Draft EPR, Species at Risk</i>	Bats – Further analysis is required for potential impacts to bat species (Little Brown Myotis, Eastern Small-footed Myotis and Northern Myotis). Attached is our standard protocol starting with the identification of suitable ELC polygons/forest types.	As discussed during the August 29, 2016 conference call, we will first conduct a desktop analysis using the known Ecological Land Classification (ELC) polygons and the MNRF protocol to identify the vegetation communities which support Bat SAR. We will follow this up with snag cavity surveys, if warranted, based on the results of the desktop study. Acoustic monitoring/exit surveys are not warranted. MNRF will be kept updated.
6	<i>Draft EPR, Species at Risk</i>	Butternut – A Butternut Health Assessment for the 16 observed trees should be completed and submitted to our office for review and approval. Please note that we now apply a 50m protective buffer around Butternut trees instead of 25m. If any works are being proposed within 50m of a Butternut tree, an authorization may be required.	Acknowledged. We will update the Final EPR to include the change in protective buffer. Butternut testing for purity / hybridity and health assessment will be completed and submitted to MNRF for review. We will develop and implement a plan if pure Butternut trees are encountered during construction, including submitting any BHA reports completed to MNRF, as requested.
7	<i>Draft EPR, Species at Risk</i>	Eastern Pondmussel – Further analysis is required for potential impacts to Eastern Pondmussel.	As discussed during the August 29, 2016 conference call, MNRF and Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) will carry out further analysis and provide Metrolinx with information as to the nature of the additional analysis required for Eastern Pondmussel. We will co-ordinate a call between MNRF and DFO to discuss the approach.
8	<i>Draft EPR, Wetlands</i>	Please note that if any of the unevaluated wetlands are to be evaluated, the reports must be submitted to our office for review and approval.	As discussed during the August 29, 2016 conference call, there are unevaluated wetlands in the area, though no trigger for the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES). Further, we are currently in the process of carrying out Wetland Staking in the project area. Once the wetlands are staked we will provide MNRF the staked wetland boundaries as shapefiles.
9	<i>Draft EPR, ANSIs</i>	Further analysis is required for potential impacts to the three ANSIs located within the project area.	As discussed during the August 29, 2016 conference call, we will review ANSI report and cross-reference sensitive species listed therein against what field investigations documented. Consultation with TRCA will be undertaken if compensation for non-sensitive/rare species is determined to be required.
10	<i>Draft EPR, General Recommended Mitigation Measures</i>	All vegetation clearing should occur outside of the sensitive period for bat and bird processes (April 30 – September 1). This timing window will also protect any hibernating herpetofauna (e.g. frogs and turtles).	Acknowledged. This timing window will be incorporated into the Final EPR.

Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO)			
1	<i>Draft EPR, Corridor Management</i>	<p>An MTO encroachment permit is required for any proposed works within an MTO Right of Way (for example, if the recommendations of the study necessitate rehabilitation or replacement of any sewers that cross the Hwy. 401 corridor). Survey work and any preliminary investigative engineering work (e.g. boreholes, coring) also require MTO Encroachment Permits. For further information on encroachment permits, please refer to the following link:  <a href="http://www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/engineering/management/corridor/encroach.shtml">http://www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/engineering/management/corridor/encroach.shtml</a></p> <p>For work which is to take place outside the MTO Right-of-Way, but within the Ministry of Transportation's permit control area, the owner / applicant will require an MTO Building &amp; Land Use Permit. This applies to any development, entrance, change of entrance use, building or structure within 45 metres of the provincial highway property line or within 395 metres of the centre point of an intersection or interchange with a provincial highway. In addition, construction on these lands must not commence prior to the issuance of the necessary MTO permits.</p> <p>Any proposed structures (above or below ground) or amenities which are essential to the viability of the site (e.g. utilities, frontage roads, fire routes, parking, stormwater management ponds) must be set back a minimum of 14 metres from the highway property line. In locations where the Ministry currently has plans for future highway widening that will require additional land, the minimum 14 metre setback is to be taken from the future highway property line.</p> <p>MTO Sign permits are required for any signs which are visible from Highway 401 and other new 400 series highways and within 400 metres of the highway property line. This requirement includes alterations or location changes of existing signage. For more information on MTO sign permits including submission requirements and application forms, please refer to the following link:  <a href="http://www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/engineering/management/corridor/signs.shtml">http://www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/engineering/management/corridor/signs.shtml</a></p>	<p>Acknowledged, we will add further clarification in Section 7.2.2.4 of the Final EPR regarding MTO permit requirements.</p>
2	<i>Draft EPR, Drainage</i>	<p>MTO has concerns that the third track will require culvert extensions or addition of new culverts, and this will have a negative impact on the high water elevations experienced at the 401. We request that the work include a review of hydraulic impact on upstream lands (MTO) and that proposed works ensure that no negative impact results on the highway drainage system.</p>	<p>The Stormwater Management and Drainage (SWM) Report provided in Appendix B11 of the EPR includes a hydraulic assessment of culverts requiring extension including the hydraulic impact on upstream lands. A total of five culverts were identified as requiring extension (Mi. 315.20, Mi. 317.10, Mi. 317.15, Mi. 317.75 and Mi. 320.50, Kingston Subdivision). There are no new culverts recommended. The assessment identified that there would be no negative impact to upstream flooding of structures or private property, as noted in the following is an excerpt from the SWM report (Section 5.2, Page 27):</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>Upstream</u></p> <p><u>Water Surface Effects</u></p> <p>Any alterations to the existing culverts or the drainage hydraulic characteristics by the proposed works should not increase flooding upstream if impacting any structures or private property. The proposed conditions hydraulic analysis found that culverts 315.20, 317.10, 317.15 and 317.75 have a HW/D of 0.23 m or less [during the 100-year event]. Furthermore the increase from existing conditions was minimal (+0.02 m). Therefore, there is no concern at these culverts and peak flows will be confined within the drainage ditch. Culvert 320.50 is flowing full during the 100-year design flow (HW/D = 0.97); however, the culvert is operating under inlet control for existing and proposed conditions. Therefore, extending the culvert has no effect on capacity and will not impact upstream water levels.</p> <p>Further to this, the five culverts requiring extension primarily convey drainage from the rail corridor and the upstream catchments do not cross the 401, therefore, there will be no impact to high water elevations experienced at the 401 from the proposed culvert extensions.</p>
3	<i>Draft EPR, Environmental / Property</i>	<p>In speaking to our specialists, we are fine with the reports. However, with regard to any work on MTO property we would like to be kept informed and apprised of any permit required, i.e., fisheries, archaeology, heritage, etc.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that MTO property may be required and we are currently in discussion with MTO in relation to property requirements. MTO will be kept informed and apprised of any permit requirements on MTO property as it pertains to this project.</p>
4	<i>Draft EPR, Environmental / Property</i>	<p>Is electrification being considered as part of this project? Is land required for the 3<sup>rd</sup> rail? If more land is required, it is recommended that this be identified as the process to acquire land is lengthy?</p>	<p>Electrification is not being considered as part of this project; Metrolinx is undertaking a separate TPAP for Electrification.</p> <p>It is anticipated that MTO land may be required to accommodate the third track. Property requirements will be refined as detailed design progresses and we will consult with MTO as expeditiously as possible.</p>

5	<i>Draft EPR, Planning and Design</i>	The files provided did not provide sufficient details required to conduct a comprehensive review since limits of grading and permanent structures that may be required where not shown. MTO is assuming these details will be provided during detail design. From the drawings provided we have the following comments (see comments listed below):	N/A
6	<i>Draft EPR, Planning and Design</i>	Confirm that the existing two tracks cannot be shifted to provide 14 m offset between MTO's ROW and proposed track. Can a temporary or permanent track be constructed towards the south to maintain a 14 m offset?	Due to the track infrastructure alignment and junction point in this area the existing two mainline tracks cannot be repositioned to provide the MTO's required 14m offset from their property line.
7	<i>Draft EPR, Planning and Design</i>	Confirm if all works will be conducted outside MTO's ROW.	At this level of design all Metrolinx construction activities adjacent to MTO property are expected to stay within the rail corridor lands. Some areas of grading work may extend beyond the rail corridor right-of-way. During detailed design these property requirements will be refined and we will review these impacts in consultation with MTO.
8	<i>Draft EPR, Planning and Design</i>	The proposed track will be closer towards the highway, what are the impacts to vehicles on the highway involving driver visibility when a train passes by at night? The concern is that the intensity of light emitting from the train heading westbound can be blinding to drivers heading eastbound on the collector lanes.	The proposed new third track mainline will be on a similar alignment and gradient as the existing two main lines. It is expected that no additional impacts will be created for Highway 401 users.
9	<i>Draft EPR, Planning and Design</i>	At this time, there are no major highway projects scheduled in proximity of the proposed tracks. If this changes MTO will notify Metrolinx.	Acknowledged.

Ontario Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC)			
1	<i>Draft EPR, Section 1.3</i>	Section 1.3 (Description of the Study Area) of the EPR describes the Study Area as the "section of the rail corridor broadly between Guildwood GO Station and Pickering GO Station, more specifically from Scarborough Golf Club Road (Mile 322.10) to Durham Junction (Mile 312.96)". Figure 1-1 presents this section of the Lakeshore East GO rail corridor as the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) Study Area. It is acknowledged that specific study areas were delineated for individual studies and impact assessment reports completed as part of the TPAP; however, an overall Study Area or study areas (e.g. regional and local), should be defined and shown in Section 1.3.	Acknowledged. The overall TPAP study area and study areas delineated for individual studies and impact assessment reports will be more clearly defined in Section 1.3 of the Final EPR.
2	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.1</i>	Section 3.1 (Existing Infrastructure) would be more appropriately placed after Section 1.3 to illustrate the operational constraints associated with the existing rail infrastructure. Figures 3-1A and 3-1B in Section 3.1 can also be improved to show existing rail infrastructure with greater clarity. The following are some suggestions: Include GO Stations for reference; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify sections of the corridor where there are currently only two rail tracks;</li> <li>• Add mile markers/post intervals along the rail corridor;</li> <li>• Label road names at railway crossings;</li> <li>• Use a different colour to distinguish between existing grade separations and at-grade road crossings since it may be difficult for the reader to distinguish between yellow and orange circles;</li> <li>• Remove "Culvert To Be Modified" and "Proposed Alignment" references in the legend as they are future works; and,</li> <li>• Adjust the line weight for "Municipality Boundary" in the figures to be consistent with the legend.</li> </ul>	Acknowledged. We will move Section 3.1 so that it logically flows from Section 1.3. We will also incorporate suggested details to figure 3-1A and 3-1B in the Final EPR.
3	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3 Project Description</i>	The introduction in Section 3 (Project Description) should provide an overview of the preferred project undertaking and its components. The inclusion of a figure showing the overall project and the locations of new track construction, bridge structure modifications, grade separations, culvert extensions, road closures and station upgrades, would be useful to assist the reader in navigating through this section.	Acknowledged. We will add a project overview to the introduction section and a figure showing the location of key infrastructures/project elements.
4	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3 Project Description</i>	Section 3 refers readers to conceptual design drawings in Appendix A when discussing the preferred designs in the EPR. The conceptual design drawings for the preferred track alignment, grade separations, and bridge crossings are not easy for a lay person to understand. Illustrations or renderings should be included where appropriate to complement the discussion of the preferred design. Also, please reference drawing sheet numbers when directing readers to Appendix A.	For the final EPR, Metrolinx will provide renderings of key infrastructure (e.g. grade separations, bridges, and selected retaining walls) to allow the reader to understand what the project will look like. These were not available at the time the draft EPR was submitted for review. The renderings will be supported by plan view drawings of the proposed track alignment including key infrastructure which will be developed to provide easy interpretation. Drawing sheet numbers will be added while referencing Appendix A.
5	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.2</i>	In addition to stating key design criteria based on Metrolinx and City of Toronto design standards in Section 3.2 (Key Design Criteria), a summary of how specific input from public, agency and Aboriginal communities was incorporated into project design considerations would demonstrate the effectiveness of consultation activities.	We will add any relevant suggested information regarding stakeholder input and how it was incorporated into project design considerations, in the Final EPR as appropriate. For instance, based on feedback from City of Toronto and the general public during consultation, the Scarborough Golf Club Road grade separation is being designed to an 8% road grade, instead of 6%. Stakeholder input was also incorporated into design considerations for other elements such as the Port Union waterfront, Rouge River Bridge, Highland Creek Bridge, grade separations and road closures / pedestrian grade separations.
6	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.2.2</i>	In Section 3.2.2 (Design Speed), Tables 3-1 and 3-2, please include Km/h equivalences for MPH speeds. In Section 3.5 (Bridges) and Section 3.6 (Culverts) the phrase "protecting for a future fourth track" appears. Alternate wording is suggested for clarity. Additional justification from an environmental perspective for infrastructure expansion at watercourses to accommodate the operation of a fourth track in the future is also recommended.	We will provide metric conversions in Tables 3-1 and 3-2 of the Final EPR. We will revise the above phrase for clarity in Section 3.5 and Section 3.6 of the Final EPR. We will also provide further justification for infrastructure expansion to accommodate a future fourth track in addition to the proposed third track at watercourses in the Final EPR. The fourth track is required as a temporary rail diversion for construction staging at key locations, such as the Rouge River and Highland Creek watercourse crossings, to maintain train service operations. Post construction, there will be three operational tracks. Making provisions for a fourth track i.e. the bridge deck, at the grade separations and rail bridges minimizes future disruption at these locations at such a time as a fourth track is to be added.
7	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4</i>	An introductory paragraph in Section 4 (Existing Conditions) stating the purpose of determining existing conditions, the environments examined, and a summary of studies completed during the TPAP, would be beneficial.	We will provide introductory paragraph as suggested in Section 4 of the Final EPR.

8	<i>Draft EPR, Figures 4-1A &amp; 4-1B; Figures 4-2A &amp; 4-2B</i>	Section 4.1.2 (Designated Features) lists ANSIs, ESAs and PSWs found within the Study Area. Please label these terrestrial features in Figures 4-1A and 4-1B, and extend TRCA regulation limits northward along watercourses. TRCA regulation limits should also be extended in Figures 4-2A and 4-2B.	We will revise these figures as per the comments.
9	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.6</i>	Section 4.6 (Land Use Planning and Policy) should identify growth areas and projected population and employment increases within the rail corridor Study Area. Please note that the City of Toronto's most recent Official Plan consolidation was June 2015, and the most recent Durham Regional Official Plan consolidation was June 26, 2015. Figures 4-3A and 4-3B should show all land use designations within the rail corridor and differentiate between "Open Space," "Park" and "Green Space/Park".	We will revise the Planning Context per the 2015 Official Plan consolidation, and figures as per the comments.
10	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.7</i>	Section 4.7 (Traffic and Transportation) should include information on existing transit service and ridership.	We will provide information on existing transit service (this is provided in Appendix B6 - Traffic Impact Study Report, and will be summarized here).
11	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5</i>	Section 5 (Assessment of the Potential Effects and Proposed Mitigation Measures) of the EPR should provide an overview of the assessment process and document the criteria used to assess the potential impacts of the preferred undertaking on key natural, socioeconomic, and cultural environment features within the Study Area.	We will incorporate the suggested information in Section 5 of the Final EPR.
12	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.1.1.1</i>	Under the "Mitigation" sub-heading in Section 5.1.1.1 (Vegetation Cover and Designated Natural Areas), it may be useful to mention that tree protection measures will follow municipal by-laws and policies, such as City of Toronto's Tree Protection Policy and Specifications for Construction Near Trees (March 2016).	Metrolinx has typically followed a 3:1 compensation ratio. We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project.
13	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.3.1.3</i>	In Section 5.3.1.3 (Mitigation), please mention mitigation measures for the treatment of any contaminated groundwater encountered during construction dewatering as a result of previous rail corridor contamination.	We will incorporate the suggested information in Section 5.3.1.3 of the Final EPR.
14	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.5.3 &amp; Appendix B3</i>	The discussion on Greenhouse Gas (GHG) effects is overly simplistic in Section 5.5.3 (Regional Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Effects). The EPR states that project-related GHG emissions will likely be insignificant relative to the provincial 2020 target. Table 30 in Appendix B3 (Air Quality Assessment) indicates that the project contribution will be 0.04% (0.09 megatons) compared to Ontario's 2020 GHG emission projection of 249 megatons (Mt). The discussion of the GHG effects of the project would be more relevant if project CO <sub>2</sub> -e emissions were compared against emission projections for the transportation sector, rather than the overall provincial projections, since contributions from individual projects will tend to be insignificant compared to province-wide emission projections. Also, please provide a reference source for the 249 Mt emission projection in Appendix B3. According to Ontario's Climate Change Update (2014), emissions in 2020 are forecast to be 170 Mt given current policies and trends.	The data source used in the latest National Inventory Report (NIR), which is prepared by Environment and Climate Change Canada and submitted to the UNFCCC. For the Final EPR, we will compare the predicted project GHG emissions to the transportation sector figure(s) in Ontario's Climate Change Update (2014) as suggested.
15	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.5.3 &amp; Appendix B3</i>	Section 5.5.3 should include a discussion of project benefits in reducing greenhouse gases and air pollutants in the cities of Toronto and Pickering. The transportation sector represents approximately 34% of Ontario's GHG emissions according to 2012 estimates, with the largest sources being passenger cars and light-duty trucks accounting for over half of the sector's emissions. This section should mention that while public transit vehicles such as commuter trains are sources of emissions, transit use contributes to reducing overall emissions levels by removing car trips from the road. The Air Quality Assessment study in Appendix B3 should assess the reduction of GHG emissions that would result from this project.	The principal GHG emissions benefit arises from the reduction in car travel and associated reduction in fuel consumption and GHG emissions. While this benefit is real and significant, it is difficult to quantify accurately. We will elaborate on project benefits in reducing greenhouse gases and air pollutants in the cities of Toronto and Pickering.
16	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.5.4</i>	Mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions should also be mentioned in Section 5.5.4. Examples of mitigation measures include the use of alternative fuels for existing diesel trains and the procurement of new trains that employ fuel efficient, low emission technology.	Acknowledged, this suggestion will be incorporated into the Final EPR. Diesel engines are already highly optimized for fuel efficiency and low emission. Metrolinx is constantly seeking to improve and modernize the train fleet. In addition, Metrolinx is working towards the electrification of most of its rail corridors within 10 years. This is an Ontario government commitment.
17	<i>Draft EPR, Table 7-1</i>	All mitigation measures and commitments identified in Sections 5, 6, and 7 should be included in Table 7-1 of Section 7.4 (Future Commitments). Commitments should be categorized by project phase: design, tender, construction and operation.	Acknowledged. We will endeavor to incorporate the suggested information in Table 7-1 of the Final EPR.

18	<i>Draft EPR, Table 7-1</i>	Table 7-1 should include monitoring and reporting commitments for all listed mitigation measures and actions. The table should also identify the responsible party for carrying out monitoring and reporting activities, and the timing of these activities. An example could be "an environmental monitor will conduct weekly checks of tree protection fencing and sediment erosion controls during construction". Another example could be "Metrolinx will assign a public relations officer to document and address concerns during construction and operation." For clarity, when stating mitigation measures, monitoring and reporting activities, please strive to use the word "will" as opposed to "should", "must" or "recommended" to indicate a commitment in the EPR. Additional comments on specific mitigation measures in Table 7-1 are indicated below.	Acknowledged. We will endeavor to incorporate the suggested information in Table 7-1 of the Final EPR as appropriate.
19	<i>Draft EPR, Table 7-1</i>	Natural Environment – Terrestrial Features Limbs that may interfere with construction should be pruned by a Certified Arborist rather than "under the supervision of the contract administrator".	We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities. The protocol will address pruning of limbs for construction. The Final EPR will be updated to reflect that pruning should be completed by appropriately qualified staff and in accordance with the protocol.
20	<i>Draft EPR, Table 7-1</i>	Natural Environment – Aquatic Features Please specify the location of the unevaluated wetland that requires consultation with the MNR and TRCA in order to determine its significance.	Acknowledged. We will make the suggested revision.
21	<i>Draft EPR, Table 7-1</i>	Air Quality Please identify mitigation measures for operational air quality impacts.	The air quality assessment specifies that we will meet Tier 4 emission standards which are considered to be the state of the science for diesel technology. It should also be noted that this corridor has been identified for future electrification, which is being covered under a separate TPAP.
22	<i>Draft EPR, Table 7-1</i>	Noise and Vibration The proposed noise and vibration mitigation measures mainly apply to 90 Morningside Avenue. Please describe any proposed operational noise and vibration mitigation measures and monitoring activities along the length of the expanded rail corridor.	Based on the Noise and Vibration study conducted in accordance with the MOEE/GO Transit Noise Protocol, significant (5 dBA or more) operational Noise and Vibration impact is only predicted for 90 Morningside and mitigation measures for this location is identified in the EPR. We understand that noise impacts are top of mind for communities adjacent to our GO service. As part of a separate process, Metrolinx is working proactively to examine ways to minimize noise impacts not addressed by the MOEE/GO Transit Noise Protocol.
23	<i>Draft EPR, Table 7-1</i>	Archaeology Please include a commitment to inform First Nations communities of Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment findings.	Acknowledged. We will incorporate the suggested commitment, which is in line with commitments made during consultation with First Nations communities.
24	<i>Draft EPR, Section 7.2</i>	Section 7.2 (Permits and Approvals Required) would be more appropriate as a standalone section in the EPR. Please note that Section 7.2 currently states that "a Notice to Proceed must be obtained from the Minister for the Environment and Climate Change before the Project can proceed to implementation". A Notice to Proceed is issued by the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change prior to the proponent submitting a Statement of Completion; however, if the Minister does not give a Notice to Proceed within the regulated timeline of 65 days from the date of the Notice of Completion of the EPR, a project can proceed.	We will consider reorganization of Section 7 to extract Section 7.2 Permits and Approvals Required, into a standalone section. We will also incorporate suggested clarification regarding Notice to Proceed in the Permits and Approvals Required section of the Final EPR.
25	<i>Draft EPR, Section 7.2.4</i>	In Section 7.2.4 (Municipal), please also reference City of Toronto Urban Forestry By-laws in addition to the City of Pickering Tree Protection By-law. Any municipal Noise By-law exemption permits that may be required during construction should also be mentioned.	Acknowledged, the suggested By-Laws will be properly referenced. With respect to municipal Noise By-Law exemption permits, as a general standard practice Metrolinx endeavors to meet all municipal by-laws and policies in areas where it operates.
26	<i>Draft EPR, Section 6</i>	In Section 6 (Consultation Process), please provide a description of the stakeholder engagement strategy or consultation program followed during the TPAP, and summarize how public comments and concerns were addressed in the EPR. Key concerns raised by the public include: the need for grade separation at the Rodd Avenue rail crossing, increased freight traffic and rail safety, noise and vibration impacts on residences, and Waterfront Trail access. It may be useful to consult with the Waterfront Regeneration Trust as they may have comments regarding Waterfront Trail access closures.	Where appropriate, we will incorporate the suggested information in Section 6 of the Final EPR. Appendix C (Consultation Materials) will also be updated to include public comments/concerns received throughout the TPAP process including the public meetings. Since providing the Draft EPR to the MOECC for review, the project team has since met with the Waterfront Regeneration Trust to consult on the proposed undertaking. Details of this consultation will also be included in Appendix C (Consultation Materials) of the Final EPR.
27	<i>Appendix C</i>	It is acknowledged that Appendix C (Consultation Materials) will be updated as the Project progresses. Please also include the minutes of meetings held during the TPAP process.	We will provide minutes of meetings held in the Final EPR.

28	<i>Draft EPR, Sections 6.1.3 &amp; 6.1.5</i>	Please note in Section 6.1.3 and Section 6.1.5, that the Notice of Commencement and Notice of Completion should be sent by email and addressed mail to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) Environmental Approvals Branch Director with a copy to the Project Officer, and the Regional Director of the MOECC Central Region Office.	Section 6.1.3 and Section 6.1.5 clearly state that the Notice of Commencement and Notice of Completion will be sent via email and addressed mail to the MOECC contacts. Metrolinx will revise Sections 6.1.3 and 6.1.5 to include the Regional Director of the MOECC Central Regional Office. The Notice of Commencement was issued on July 7, 2016 and was sent by email and addressed mail to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) Environmental Approvals Branch Director with a copy to the Project Officer, and the Regional Director of the MOECC Central Region Office. The Notice of Completion is scheduled for November 4, 2016 and will also be provided to the MOECC contacts.
29	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Although the Pearson meteorological data is valid for use around Toronto, thought must be given to the project's study area and whether a specific location would require a more site-specific meteorological data set. For example, depending on the location of the study area in relation to Lake Ontario, the Toronto Island Airport may provide a better representation of the meteorological conditions in the study area. In the future, please ensure that the meteorological data set chosen offers the best representation of the site.	Acknowledged. We will examine alternate site specific meteorological data for future projects to ensure that the meteorological data set chosen offers the best representation of the site.
30	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Thank you for the clarification regarding the reasoning behind the 1-hour average. However, the specific calculations listed on page 13 remain unclear. If 0.66774g is the amount of PM2.5 emitted specifically for the 71.8s of the Notch 8 segment, and 0.01237g is the amount of PM2.5 emitted at each volume source within the Notch 8 segment, please elaborate on how dividing 0.01237g again over 3600 s is not underestimating emissions are in units of g/hr. Please provide a more detailed explanation for the "PM2.5 emission factor averaged over 1-hour" portion of the calculation.	Please find attached a detailed explanation of the "PM2.5 emission factor averaged over 1-hour" portion of the calculation.
31	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Although the Notch settings recorded may be representative of average or target conditions such as traffic during rush hour or weather related delays? Please elaborate on how the event recorded data files used are representative of maximum conditions and if only four are used, how they are representative of the entire fleet.	The notch settings do account for differences in train speed and notch settings during times of unideal conditions. The notch settings do not vary significantly from run to run, since the train has to follow a strict schedule and strict speed limits for safety and operational reasons. Current rail regulations are principally governed by Transport Canada and the US Federal Rail Administration; while Metrolinx, CN and CP are the principal sources of operational policies, standards, and rules. other contributors to rail policy are the American railway Engineering and maintenance of way Association (AREMA) and the American public Transportation association (APTA). Collectively, these regulators and associations set limits on how railways are designed, operated and maintained. In addition, traffic during rush hour would not apply to train service and the notch settings, as the train schedule is set.
32	<i>Draft EPR</i>	<p>The ministry acknowledges that there are limitations to the "credible worst case scenario" described in the MTO's "Environmental Guide for Assessing and Mitigating the Air Quality Impacts and Greenhouse Gas Emissions of Provincial Transportation Projects" (2012) (MTO's Guide) document. While the ministry requests that a reasonable worst case emissions scenario be modelled, the methodology used for the worst case assessment does not necessarily have to follow what is outlines in MTO's Guide as long as the maximum potential concentrations are assessed, the scenario surrounding these maximum potential concentrations is explained, and sufficient detail of the methodology used is provided in a project's Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA).</p> <p>Results of the worst case assessment must show the maximum potential concentration that could occur if the maximum emissions coincided with the worst meteorological conditions. The assessment could use the meteorological data set chosen for the study. However, the emissions scenario used for the worst case assessment must be clearly detailed in the AQIA to indicate how the emissions scenario represents the maximum emissions that could reasonably occur, typically during events outside of standard operations. This worst-case assessment will provide the top few maximum concentrations, the days on which these concentrations occurred. If the maximum concentration is significantly greater than the AAQC this may suggest a greater likelihood of the AAQC being exceeded in the future. however, a frequency assessment of exceedances is not expected in conjunction with this worst-case assessment as the worst-case emissions scenario will not occur every day. However, it does provide a range of potential concentrations that could be experienced.</p> <p>It remains unclear whether this AQIA assessed a maximum or an average scenario. Please provide a more detailed explanation of the methodology used in this assessment, specifically detailing how the emissions scenario used may be representative of a reasonable worst-case scenario and provides maximum potential concentrations.</p>	The credible worst- case scenario is based on established service goals upon which the minimum infrastructure needs to be determined. Increase to the service levels would require additional infrastructure due to the operational and safety considerations. Current rail regulations are principally governed by Transport Canada and the US Federal Rail Administration; while Metrolinx, CN and CP are the principal sources of operational policies, standards, and rules. Other contributors to rail policy are the American railway Engineering and Maintenance of Way Association (AREMA) and the American Public Transportation Association (APTA). Collectively, these regulators and associations set limits on how railways are designed, operated and maintained. Therefore the proposed infrastructure and service levels represent a credible worst-case scenario.

33	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Although in general the month of January may see greater concentrations for the majority of contaminants, this may not be true for all contaminants. Was the model used to verify that concentrations in July were lower than those in January for all contaminants in this study?	<p>There is little difference in the diesel locomotive emissions during January versus July conditions, since locomotive engines are continuously running during their entire service period and experience little difference in the "under-the-hood-environment". Furthermore, we do not have emission test data that quantifies summer versus winter emissions for diesel locomotives.</p> <p>Emissions of gasoline powered cars and light trucks, on the other hand, are a bit more sensitive to climatic conditions. The difference is small and highly unlikely to alter the report's conclusions.</p>
34	<i>Draft EPR</i>	Although MTO's Guide may not have suggested SO2 as criterion, SO2 concentrations should be screened before a decision is made on whether or not to include SO2 as a contaminant of concern for a specific project's AQIA.	<p>Transportation SO2 emission are very small, given the nationally regulated levels of SO2 in diesel fuel and gasoline. Previous studies have confirmed that resulting project specific SO2 concentration impacts are much smaller than the air quality criteria.</p> <p>The principal method for reducing SO2 emissions is that control of sulphur levels in the fuels, which is the responsibility of the federal and provincial governments. GO Transit already used Ultra Low Sulphur Diesel (15 ppm maximum Sulphur content) that meets the requirements of the Federal Sulphur in Diesel Fuel Regulations (SOR/2002-254).</p>
35	<i>Draft EPR</i>	<p>Surface Water</p> <p>The stormwater management is unlikely to change much from existing conditions (which is conveyance along the ditch). Site disturbance and dewatering during construction in areas where contamination exists may result in the need to manage contaminated water. We recommend that the management of discharge water, especially in areas of known contamination, should be given attention during detailed design.</p> <p>In dewatering discharge requires more elaborate treatment other than settling to remove particulates, Environmental Compliance Approvals (ECA) may be required in addition to the Permits to take Water (PTTWs).</p>	<p>Stormwater management at grade separations including discharge to an appropriate minor and major system outlet will be addressed during detailed design. We acknowledge that Environmental Compliance Approvals (ECA) may be required in addition to the Permits to Take Water (PTTWs) if more elaborate treatments is required to treat water before discharging.</p>
36	<i>Draft EPR</i>	<p>Surface Water</p> <p>The draft EPR proposes to add grade separations at several points. The possibility of permanent dewatering/drainage (and possible impacts of the dewatering &amp; discharge) should be given adequate attention during the PTTW preparation stages.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. As Part of the TPAP, we completed a review of the existing drainage within the study area and a detailed assessment of the required drainage and storm water management associated with the proposed development. The storm water management plan will be revised as necessary upon finalization of the grade separation design and reflected in the PTTW preparation stage.</p>



<p>37</p>	<p><i>Draft EPR</i></p>	<p>Groundwater                  Various groundwater issues are discussed at a level appropriate for this stage of the project. These include ESAs performed and the possible problems associated with excavation in brownfields areas, possible needs for a PTTW for construction dewatering and the effect of groundwater level drawdown and of the discharge on surrounding features, the longer-term effects of constructed facilities on groundwater flow, spill management, etc.                  Section 4.2 indicates that the surficial geology likely involves lower-permeability silt and clay except for modern sands and gravels near streams. depth to groundwater ranges from 4 to 15m.                  The report suggests possible industrial influences on groundwater quality, and the area is urbanized and therefore unlikely to contain water supply wells excepting the possibility of irrigation wells.                  Section 4.3 discusses possible soil contamination. Phase 1 &amp; 2 ESAs were done for the section from the Don Valley to Frenchman's Bay in Pickering, and the additional ESAs are being planned for the detailed design stage. 40 to 80 boreholes became monitoring wells and, of these, 24 to 35 were in the Lakeshore East GO corridor. Soil and groundwater samples showed Table 3 exceedances for some metals, PAHs, VOCs and salt. Copper, cobalt and nickel and PAHs in soil are substances typically found in railway corridors. Salt was likely due to road de-icing. A cis-1, 2-DCE issue was detected in groundwater at one location. The report states that contaminated soil and groundwater must be considered during construction in terms of environmental effects and worker health and safety.                  Section 5.3 discusses the possible need for a Permit to Take Water for construction dewatering for various structures, and the possible need for a Sewage Works ECA for discharge of the water.                  Possible effects of dewatering on ecological and human features within the zone of influence are discussed. Possible longer-term effects of construction on groundwater flow patterns are expected to be negligible. It is expected that additional studies will be undertaken to support a PTTW application both in terms of drawdown effects and discharge effects and possible mitigation measures.                  Possible groundwater quality effects are discussed in terms of spill management and control of quality of water discharged. Management of contaminated soils is discussed. Technical support is of the opinion that the report discusses groundwater-related issues in a manner that is appropriate at this early stage of the project and that is adequately foresees the need for additional study in order to prepare submissions to support applications for various MOECC-administered approval instruments.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>38</p>	<p><i>Appendix B11</i></p>	<p>In support of application for Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) for the proposed STM works, clearance letters from relevant authorities should be provided to the MOECC confirming that they have no objection to the proposed STM works.</p>	<p>The Stormwater Management and Drainage Report has been provided to relevant agencies for review, including City of Toronto; Toronto and Region Conservation Authority; City of Pickering. We will complete stormwater management design for the proposed grade separations during detailed design, in consultation with the City of Toronto.</p> <p>Typically, the works proposed for this project are not subject to ECA. Clearance letters will be requested from the relevant authorities should any ECA application be required.</p>
<p>39</p>	<p><i>Draft EPR and Appendix B11</i></p>	<p>Soil and groundwater contamination was identified at multiple locations within the rail corridor, reported in Section 4.3, Rail Corridor Contamination overview of the Report. And, presence of the new tracks would increase the amount of the pollutants that may already exist in the rail corridor by increasing rail service. Therefore, it is recommended that:</p> <p>a) Stormwater treatment be thoroughly addressed by incorporating stormwater best management practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent [practicable in all phases of the Project, and</p> <p>b) prior to ECA applications, pre-application consultation be carried out by the proponent with MOECC's Toronto District Office with respect to,</p> <p>i. the need of construction dewatering - related ECA application and approval, and</p> <p>ii. stormwater treatment criteria for the proposed permanent STM works during rail service.</p>	<p>a) Acknowledged. We will prepare a soil and groundwater management plan prior to construction for managing soil materials on-site (including excavation, location of stockpiles, reuse, and offsite disposal). The soil and groundwater management plan will be prepared in accordance with Management of Excess Soil - A Guide for Best Management Practices (MOECC 2014), and industry best practices. A copy of the soil and groundwater management plan will be provided to MOECC, Toronto District office for comment. This is included in the Final EPR (Table 7-1 - Summary of Future Commitments and monitoring requirements).</p> <p>b) Typically, linear corridor works such as those proposed for this project are not subject to ECA.</p>

40	Appendix B11	<p>As reported in section 2.4, on Page 9 of Appendix B11, "lowering the (Scarborough Golf Club) road on the southern side of the rail corridor (for grade separation) will result in additional flooding during the regulatory storm event". Therefore, I suggest that, viable flood abatement solutions be developed to ensure that,</p> <p>a) the proposed undertaking does not exacerbate the existing drainage problems of flooding, and</p> <p>b) by implementing flood abatement measures, the flooding risk at this location can be reduced to a level acceptable to the City of Toronto.</p>	<p>The Stormwater Management and Drainage Report recommend that a detailed floor control strategy be completed at the proposed Scarborough Golf Club Road grade separation during detailed design. This will include further assessment of the storm sewer network to determine the potential for adverse impact to flooding and develop appropriate mitigation to reduce flood risk. This is included in the Final EPR (Table 7-1 - Summary of Future Commitments and monitoring requirements).</p>
41	Appendix B11	<p>Should there be any alterations to the existing drainage patterns at other location, please ensure that the existing drainage systems along the railway are not overloaded by receiving new flows resulting from grade separation and rail track expansion, and the proposed alternations do not exacerbate the existing drainage problems of flooding.</p>	<p>The addition of the third track will largely remain within the current right-of-way and will not increase runoff potential from the corridor; however, the expansion could potentially reduce the space available for ditching. An assessment of typical drainage ditch cross-sections has been undertaken to confirm sufficient conveyance capacity in the proposed drainage ditch is provided for the corridor and external drainage.</p> <p>The reprofiling of the roadways at the grade separations could result in alterations to the existing drainage patterns at these locations. During detailed design, analysis of flows from external catchments and the proposed grade separations will be completed and adequate drainage provided to capture and convey these flows. This will ensure that drainage systems are not overloaded and existing drainage problems are not exacerbated.</p>
42	Appendix B11	<p>How is the STM system designed to efficiently and effectively respond to spills in emergency should the rail tracks also be used by CNR and CPR?</p>	<p>An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be developed in consultation with relevant authorities, including spill provisions, and implementation of the prescribed mitigation and will conform to recognized standard specifications such as Ontario Provincial Standards Specification (OPSS). The construction contractor will be required to develop and implement a site-specific Health and Safety Plan and a Spill Prevention and Response Plan outlining steps to prevent and contain any chemicals and/or spills in a timely and effective manner and to avoid soil contamination.</p> <p>If potential areas of contamination are identified during operations, further investigations will be completed to determine presence of contamination and necessary remedial action. All contaminated materials found during operation and maintenance activities will be handled in accordance with applicable provincial and federal legislation, regulations and standard procedures.</p>
43	Appendix C	<p>No records of public response to the proposed stormwater management system can be found in Appendix C - Consultation Materials. Was the proposed STM system ever presented to the public? Was any public consultation done in this regard?</p>	<p>The results of Environmental Studies completed for this TPAP, including the Stormwater Management and Drainage Report, was presented to the public at the May 2016 and September 2016 rounds of public meetings. The draft report was made publicly available on the project website on September 19, 2016 and notification was sent to the mailing list.</p> <p>A summary of all public comments received and Metrolinx responses is provided in the Final EPR (Table 6-3 - Summary of Public Comments). Copies of all correspondence related to public consultation is provided in Appendix C.</p>
44	Appendix B11	<p>Are there any design considerations being incorporated in the proposed STM system to adapt to climate change? Please explain.</p>	<p>As a minimum, the stormwater management design for grade separations will be undertaken during detailed design to meet the current City of Toronto guidelines. At the moment there is no widely adopted standard for incorporation of climate change into storm sewer sizing.</p>

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)			
1	<i>Draft EPR, Direct Impact</i>	<p>The reports identify the following five (5) structures as, a) having known or potential CHVI and b) having the potential to be directly impacted (e.g. demolished or removed) by this project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rouge River Bridge</li> <li>2. Highland Creek Bridge</li> <li>3. Petticoat Creek Culvert</li> <li>4. Double Stone Culvert</li> <li>5. Dunbarton Subway</li> </ol>	Acknowledged.
2	<i>Draft EPR, Rouge River Bridge</i>	<p>A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) has been completed for this structure. Based on the recommendation of the CHER the Metrolinx Heritage Committee identified the Rouge River Bridge as a Metrolinx (provincial) Heritage Property of Provincial Significance. As you are aware under the S&amp;Gs, MTCS Minister's consent is required prior to demolition or removal of PHP of provincial significance. Minister's Consent is subject to an HIA and community input.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of the Notice of Commencement, we require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of Cultural Heritage Value – this should have been attached to the Heritage Committee Decision form, but we did not receive it.</li> <li>• preparation of a Heritage Impact Assessment. The HIA must articulate all the alternatives considered, and if demolition or removal is the preferred alternative, it must state why other conservation alternatives are not feasible.</li> <li>• a minimum of Stage 2 archaeological assessment for the area that may be impacted by the bridge work. Given that the Rouge River area is considered to have high potential for archaeology, additional assessment is required at an early phase of planning to determine what, if any, archaeological resources are present, and to allow for proper protection and avoidance if necessary.</li> </ul>	The SCHV and decision forms for the Rouge River Bridge along with the draft HIA report was provided to MTCS in July, 2016. The area potentially impacted by the project around Rouge River Bridge is owned by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and we will work with TRCA to conduct the stage 2 AA during the detailed design phase of the project.
3	<i>Draft EPR, Highland Creek Bridge</i>	<p>A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) has been completed for this structure. Based on the recommendation of the CHER the Metrolinx Heritage Committee identified the Highland Creek Bridge as a Metrolinx (provincial) Heritage Property.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of the Notice of Commencement, we require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of Cultural Heritage Value – this should have been attached to the Heritage Committee Decision form, but we did not receive it.</li> <li>• preparation of a Heritage Impact Assessment. The HIA must articulate all the alternatives considered, and if demolition or removal is the preferred alternative, it must state why other conservation alternatives are not feasible.</li> <li>• a minimum of Stage 2 archaeological assessment for the area that may be impacted by the bridge work. Given that the area is considered to have high potential for archaeology, additional assessment is required at an early phase of planning to determine what, if any, archaeological resources are present, and to allow for proper protection and avoidance if necessary.</li> </ul>	Please find attached the HIA, SCHV and decision forms for the Highland Creek Bridge. The area potentially impacted by the project around Highland Creek Bridge is owned by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and we will work with TRCA to conduct the stage 2 AA during the detailed design phase of the project.
4	<i>Draft EPR, Dunbarton Subway</i>	<p>Prior to the issuance of the Notice of Commencement, we require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report to be completed for each of these structures and the Metrolinx Heritage Committee Decision Form for each. If any of these structures are determined to have cultural heritage value or interest, then the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value should be attached to the Decision Form</li> <li>• If any of these structures are determined to have cultural heritage value or interest, then a Heritage Impact Assessment will also be required.</li> <li>• Additional archaeological assessment(s) (minimum of stage 2 and possibly Stage 3) will be required for each culvert area.</li> </ul>	Please find attached the CHER, SCHV and decision forms for the Petticoat Creek Culvert and Dunbarton Subway. Please also find attached the CHER and decision forms for the Double Stone culvert. The Metrolinx Heritage Committee determined the Petticoat Creek Culvert and Dunbarton Subway as Provincial Heritage Properties. Should the project result in modification of these structures a Heritage Impact Assessment will be conducted during detailed design. Stage 2 archaeological assessments will also be conducted during detailed design, for any identified properties requiring this assessment.
5	<i>Draft EPR, Indirect Impact</i>	<p>In addition, the Cultural Heritage Screening Report and the EPR identify the following additional five (5) sites that may be indirectly impacted by construction/introduction of grade separation structures. Please be aware that further evaluation and/or impact assessment should be undertaken during detail design.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scarborough Golf Club Road</li> <li>2. 321 Scarborough Golf Club Road</li> <li>3. Galloway Road</li> <li>4. 90 Morningside Avenue (Purvis-Castle Log Cabin)</li> <li>5. Morningside Avenue</li> </ol>	We will note in the Final EPR that further evaluation and/or impact assessment should be undertaken during detailed design as necessary.

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)			
1	<i>Draft EPR, Grade Separation</i>	Staff is concerned that flooding of the underpass will occur as a result of localized drainage. Please identify within a report and/or drawing a preliminary flood control strategy to mitigate the localized flooding during a storm event. A detailed flood control strategy will be required for the proposed underpasses at the detailed design stage.	Flood control options have been developed for each grade separation and are provided in the Stormwater Management and Drainage (SWM) Report (Appendix B11 of the EPR). A detailed flood control strategy will be developed during the detailed design stage of the project. This will include further assessment of the storm sewer network to determine appropriate mitigation for the major and minor systems at each grade separation.
2	<i>Draft EPR, Grade Separation Scarborough Golf Club Road</i>	Fluvial risk to existing road and new road/infrastructure/fill slopes should be assessed. It is very important to include the City of Toronto in these discussions. The creek is extremely active in this location. The footprint during construction and post construction of the works in this area should avoid any conflict with the hazards present. Please confirm measures that will be taken to address this issue.	During the site inspection completed with TRCA on October 21, 2015, it was observed that the Highland Creek channel has been hardened and fixed in place reducing the likelihood of channel movement. It is the intent of the proposed works to be undertaken outside of the regulatory hazard extent. An assessment of the proposed works at the Scarborough Golf Club Road grade separation will be conducted during detailed design to confirm the proposed works are outside of the regulatory hazard extent and do not negatively impact flooding upstream of the location. City of Toronto will be kept apprised as required.
3	<i>Draft EPR, Grade Separation Scarborough Golf Club Road</i>	The Highland Creek crosses Scarborough Golf Club Rd. north of the rail tracks and also flows through the Scarborough Golf course immediately west of the rail tracks. During a Regulatory storm, please note that Scarborough Golf Club Rd. is overtopped at the road crossing and the extent of the floodplain remains within the valley, but abuts the road just west of the rail crossing. Please demonstrate with a preliminary grading plan of the Scarborough Golf Club Rd. and TRCA's HEC-RAS model and floodplain mapping that the proposed grade separation will not be impacted by the existing floodplain.	The regional flood elevation of Highland Creek at the cross section northwest of the proposed Scarborough Golf Club Road grade separation is 130.04 m according to the existing HEC-RAS model provided by TRCA. The bottom of sag road elevation at the proposed grade separation is 137.116 m according to the road profile on the 30% preliminary design drawings. This is approximately 7 m above the closest regional flood elevation. Therefore the proposed grade separation will not be impacted by the existing floodplain. Further analysis / assessment will be conducted during detailed design.
4	<i>Draft EPR, Grade Separation Galloway Road</i>	The potential impacts on any hydrologic connection between wetland units east and west of Galloway should be undertaken. An underpass has potential to sever this connection and drown or starve the wetlands. Additionally, potential designs of the underpass should endeavour to not drain the wetlands with standard drainage systems. Perhaps a sealed design with sumps at the invert would be possible. Please provide information on how these issues will be addressed.	We are currently reviewing drainage design alternatives at Galloway Road to maintain flow connection between the wetland units and ensure wetland units are not drained as a result of the proposed undertakings. This is being completed in conjunction with the detailed flood control strategy for the grade separation. Alternative sealed design and invert sumps would be considered during detailed design and TRCA will be kept apprised.
5	<i>Draft EPR, Highland Creek Crossing</i>	Specific discussion on the high erosive forces in this location should be provided. Recent experience on mobilizing in this location should be incorporated into the designs. Lessons learned and techniques/access experience should be assessed and provided for our review	Following discussions with the TRCA, a separate Hydraulic, Fluvial Geomorphology and Scour study was undertaken which assessed the high erosive forces and scour potential at the bridge location under proposed conditions, and to determine the existing 100-year erosion limit upstream of the crossing. We will incorporate the lessons learned in the detailed design specifications. We will continue to work with TRCA throughout detailed design to finalize design, construction staging and access plans.
6	<i>Draft EPR, Highland Creek Crossing</i>	The proposed bridge modification for the Highland Creek crossing includes the expansion of the central pier on both the north and south ends of the existing pier. Please provide a HEC-RAS model with the existing and proposed condition scenarios and provide a summary (include a table) of the changes to the hydraulics for the Regional and 2-100 year storm events. Please also, provide a preliminary grading plan for the existing and proposed conditions. Please note that there should be no increase to flood risk (i.e. increase in water level) both upstream and downstream of the crossing. This is requirement that has to be met prior to TRCA sign off on these works.	A standalone hydrology and hydraulic assessment memorandum has been completed for the proposed bridge at Highland Creek and is included in Appendix B of the SWM report (Appendix B11 of the EPR). The memorandum provides a summary of the changes to the hydraulics for the Regional and 2-100 year storm events under proposed conditions. The HEC-RAS model indicates that there is a minimal increase of 0.06m during the Regional Event and concludes that it is unlikely to cause an increase in flood risk upstream of the crossing. HEC-RAS model with the existing and proposed conditions was provided to TRCA for review. We will continue to work with TRCA throughout detailed design. A grading plan will be developed during detailed design and shared with the TRCA.
7	<i>Draft EPR, Highland Creek Crossing</i>	The Highland Creek watershed is very urbanized with limited SWM controls implemented. Thus, the watershed is "flashy" during a storm event. The rail bridge crossing the Highland Creek has and will continue to be exposed to high flows and velocities. Please provide supporting documentation and/or calculations demonstrating that the proposed modification to the bridge (including the pier) will withstand the forces imposed on it during the Regional and 2-100 year storm events.	A review of the design of the additions to the Highland Creek Railway Bridge indicates that following the stabilization work previously undertaken, the center pier continues the anchoring of this gravity pier into the subsoil with the use of additional micro piles on the new expanded pier work both to the north and south of the original pier. In this way the revised bridge will withstand the current pressures and any impact of scouring. The design is in accordance with Metrolinx design standards and AREMA standards. Further, a standalone hydrology and hydraulic assessment memorandum has been completed for the proposed bridge at Highland Creek and is included in Appendix B of the SWM report (Appendix B11 of the EPR). The memorandum provides calculations for rock sizing for scour protection for proposed conditions during the Regional storm event. Scour protection has been designed to withstand the 2-100 year velocity and protect the pier from undermining due to scour.

8	<i>Draft EPR, Rouge River Crossing</i>	Further discussion is required with parks Canada on design options that can provide viable options for planting trees to retain current function and mask retaining walls.	The workshop held on March 24, 2016 related to design issues covered this specific issue. We provided minutes of that workshop to participants, including the TRCA, City of Toronto and Parks Canada. Feedback provided at the workshop has been incorporated into the design, as appropriate. The workshop was followed up by the May 19, 2016 workshop and a site walk on June 17, 2016, with key stakeholders (including Elected Officials, Parks Canada, TRCA, City of Toronto, City of Pickering, Friends of the Rouge Watershed and other community groups) to discuss options to reduce the impacts along the Port Union Waterfront. We are committed to working with Parks Canada and TRCA throughout detailed design - both stakeholders have participated in the Metrolinx Design Review Panel (MDRP) process. The MDRP reviews designs and provides advice on the architectural, aesthetic and landscaping elements.
9	<i>Draft EPR, Rouge River Crossing</i>	The proposed bridge modification for the Rouge River crossing includes the construction of a second bridge south of the existing crossing. Please provide a HEC-RAS model with the existing and proposed condition scenarios and provide a summary (include a table) of the changes to the hydraulics for the Regional and 2-100 year storm events. Please also provide a preliminary grading plan for the existing and proposed conditions. Please note that there should be no increase to flood risk (i.e. increase in water level) both upstream and downstream of the crossing. This is requirement that has to be met prior to TRCA sign off on these works.	A standalone hydrology and hydraulic assessment memorandum has been completed for the proposed bridge at Rouge River and is included in Appendix B of the SWM report (Appendix B11 of the EPR). The memorandum provides a summary of the changes to the hydraulics for the Regional and 2-100 year storm events under proposed conditions. There is a small increase for the 2 to 50 year storm events of less than 0.04m. There is a small decrease in the water surface elevation during the Regional and 100 year storm. It is anticipated that this will not increase the probability of flooding of surrounding land uses. The HEC-RAS model with the existing and proposed conditions was provided to TRCA for review. A grading plan will be completed during detailed design and shared with the TRCA.
10	<i>Draft EPR, Petticoat Creek Crossing</i>	Limits of fill slope and construction access should be provided in detail to assess the full impact of the structure proposed. Information pertaining to construction impacts should be provided for our review. Efforts should be taken to reduce impacts to the extent possible.	The limits of fill slope, construction access plans and area of disturbance will be provided to TRCA during detailed design. Detailed design for the grading works and retaining wall proposed on the north side of the rail right-of-way at the Petticoat Creek crossing will refine the proposed impacts in this location and will be reduced to the best extent possible. We will continue to work with TRCA during detailed design on preferred approach and minimizing impacts.
11	<i>Draft EPR, Petticoat Creek Crossing</i>	The proposed modification to the slope at the Petticoat Creek culvert includes additional fill to raise and expand the rail track. Please provide a HEC-RAS model with the existing and proposed condition scenarios and provide a summary (include a table) of the changes to the hydraulics for the Regional and 2-100 year storm events. Please also provide a preliminary grading plan for the existing and proposed conditions. Please note that there should be no increase to flood risk (i.e. increase in water level) both upstream and downstream of the crossing. Similarly, this is requirement that has to be met prior to TRCA sign off on these works.	A standalone hydrology and hydraulic assessment memorandum has been completed for the proposed culvert at Petticoat Creek and is included in Appendix B of the SWM report (Appendix B11 of the EPR). The memorandum provides a summary of the changes to the hydraulics for the Regional and 2-100 year storm events under proposed conditions. As noted in the SWM report, the existing culvert does not require extension to accommodate the proposed track. As a result, there will be no change to the hydraulic conditions of the culvert under proposed conditions. Therefore, there is no increase to flood risk or water levels. A grading plan will be developed during detailed design and shared with TRCA.
12	<i>Draft EPR, Wetlands</i>	Please provide details on where the wetlands to be impacted are located the assessment should demonstrate that proposed designs avoid impacts to the extent possible. Efforts should be made to reduce impacts to the extent possible. Appropriate compensation would be required where impacts are unavoidable.	Acknowledged. The EPR identifies potential impacts to Wetlands and their locations (Section 4.2.1.1). We will make efforts during detailed design to reduce impacts to the extent possible and implement appropriate compensation where impacts are unavoidable. We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project, and specifically with TRCA regarding any trees affected on TRCA managed lands.
13	<i>Draft EPR, Culverts</i>	Section 5.2.1 references many culverts within the study area. TRCA staff identified various culverts and their status as regulated features during site visits in 2015. The EPR should identify the culverts that may be widened that convey watercourses and fish habitat. This will require potential impacts to be identified for these features and mitigation proposed.	We will incorporate the suggested information in Section 5.2.1 of the Final EPR. The SWM report (Appendix B11 of the EPR) provides a list of culverts requiring extension and a subsequent hydraulic assessment to ensure the proposed conditions continue to meet American Railway Engineering Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA) guidelines and there is no negative flooding impact upstream of the culverts.
14	<i>Draft EPR, Fisheries Timing Window</i>	Section 5.1.2.3 references a fisheries timing window of March 15 to September 15. This is incorrect. Please revise the applicable timing window for the entire study area to allow works between July 1 and March 31 of any given year.	We will revise Section 5.1.2.3 of the Final EPR with the correct information. Please note that all of the watercourses within the project area are considered warm-water and as per the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR), recommendation no in-water works are to occur between April 1 and June 30 of any given year.
15	<i>Draft EPR, Compensation</i>	TRCA looks forward to further discussion on compensation for loss to natural features and street/ornamental trees on and off TRCA lands. Rouge Park, Cities of Toronto and Pickering should also be included in discussions.	We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project.

16	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	Detailed geotechnical investigation should be conducted for site characterization. The geotechnical investigation program should include sufficient number of boreholes and piezometers. The boreholes should be sufficiently deep particularly in the vicinity of valleys and slopes to entire the stratigraphy. In-situ and lab tests should be also conducted as part of site characterization. The factual section and recommendations will be used for the detailed design and erosion hazard assessments in the valleys and banks.	Geotechnical investigation is being undertaken to support the design of this project, including site characterization in valleys and slopes / banks.
17	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	Stability assessment is required for high embankments or cuts to ensure that no risk exists for instability.	Acknowledged. Any potential instability of track bed slopes will be detailed and addressed in the detailed design process.
18	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	The abutments, wing walls, piers, retaining walls and foundations should be also designed by a qualified professional engineer for all applicable geotechnical and structural failure modes as per the geotechnical information and codes, standards and guidelines. All engineered drawings and supporting design documents should be submitted as signed and sealed by a Licensed Professional Engineer.	Acknowledged. The detailed design of this project is being undertaken by, and will be signed and sealed by a Licensed Professional Engineer.
19	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	For the steep valleys, detailed erosion hazard assessment should be conducted to ensure that the proposed work does not destabilize the slopes or the long-term erosion or slope recession cannot undermine the alignment and structures. The long-term stable slope crest should be delineated as the extent of erosion hazards where applicable along the steep valleys or active erosion areas. It should be also noted that the TRCA regulatory factor of safety for slope stability assessment is 1.50. The erosion hazard assessment should be performed by a qualified geotechnical engineer and the findings and recommendations should be presented as a slope stability assessment report and submitted as signed and sealed by a Licensed Professional Engineer.	The detailed design of this project will be signed and sealed by a Licensed professional engineer. The design of new track bed grading works will be designed to a standard 2H/1V side slope and to meet the design load requirements for a rail carrying structure. Should any reductions of this slope standard be required, the revised slope will still be required to meet the requirement to be designed to carry the required load. This may require the reinforcing of the slope design to make certain it will carry the required load.
20	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	Where abutments and wing walls or other retaining walls are proposed in the vicinity of the valleys, the slope stability assessment should be conducted to confirm that the proposed abutment or walls can satisfy a minimum factor of safety of 1.50 for global stability. Therefore, they cannot be undermined by deep-seated sliding.	The detailed design of this project will be signed and sealed by a professional engineer. The design of new track bed grading works will be designed to a standard 2H/1V side slope and to meet the design load requirements for a rail carrying structure. Should any reductions of this slope standard be required, the revised slope will still be required to meet the requirement to be designed to carry the required load. This may require the reinforcing of the slope design to make certain it will carry the required load. The design loads required to build the embankments for the railway grade follows Metrolinx design standards and AREMA standards. All grading works will be designed to carry the railway loadings required using appropriate drainage and soil materials. Finishing of the slopes will be developed in accordance with Metrolinx standards and TRCA input.
21	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	If required, any stabilization or remediation, where active erosion exists in the vicinity of the abutments should be designed by a geotechnical engineer. The design briefs, specifications and engineering drawings should be also submitted as signed and sealed by a Licensed Professional Engineer.	Acknowledged. The detailed design of this project will be undertaken by, and will be signed and sealed by a Licensed professional engineer.
22	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	As a minimum, detailed hydrogeological investigations should be undertaken at areas where structural changes (modifications/expansions for culverts, bridges and retaining walls) are proposed to better understand existing groundwater systems so appropriate mitigation measures could be designed during the detailed design phases to ensure construction and groundwater management does not become a construction issue.	Acknowledged. We will determine the need for further hydrogeological investigations during detailed design.
23	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	Our preference is to avoid stockpiling within TRCA regulated areas to the extent possible. Please bear this in mind when design construction activities and logistics. Particularly in areas of potential soil and water contamination identified in Section 5.4.	Acknowledged. We will seek to avoid stockpiling within the TRCA regulated area, where feasible.
24	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	Please ensure that ESC measures are design based on GTACAs ESC guidelines. TRCA should be consulted on ESCs going forward.	Acknowledged. We will continue to work with TRCA on ESCs as required throughout detailed design.
25	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	Please ensure that there is a commitment to work with TRCA regarding impacts to Waterfront Trail, Highland Creek and Rouge River bridges. Ensure that TRCA is part of the stakeholders identified in addition to the City of Toronto as the Waterfront Trail is a TRCA trail.	Section 5.7 of the EPR acknowledges TRCA along with City of Toronto and Parks Canada as key stakeholders for the Port Union Waterfront Trail. We have been in continuous dialogue with TRCA to develop viable solutions for reducing the impacts of the project on the Waterfront Trail and are committed to continue working with TRCA throughout detailed design.
26	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	Please note that as part of property impacts, any TRCA property requirements – temporary (for construction staging or permanent) will require an Archaeological Assessment prior to construction commencement. The archeological assessment must be undertaken by TRCA staff at the expense of the Proponent.	A stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA) has been completed and was included in the Draft Environmental Project Report (EPR) package that was submitted for TRCA for review. We acknowledged that the archaeological assessment will be undertaken by TRCA staff on TRCA property identified as having archaeological potential and recommended for a Stage 2 AA.
27	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	Impacts to TRCA Petticoat Creek Conservation Area – please confirm whether there will be a need to impact Petticoat Creek Conservation area– particularly regarding construction access and impacts. A meeting with Conservation Area staff will be required as this may have impacts on planned area activities, community and public usage of park lands as well as planned park projects.	As the detailed design progresses, elements such as construction access and impacts will be identified. Metrolinx will continue to consult with TRCA how best to access the rail corridor from within the Petticoat Creek Conservation Area, including consideration of accessing from outside of the Conservation area. Minimizing impacts on wildlife and habitat will also be considered as noted during our August 27, 2015 site visit with TRCA.

28	<i>Draft EPR, Section 7.2.2</i>	Please note that TRCA is not a municipal agency. We are a provincially mandated agency. Please make the necessary revisions to the section. Please include impacts to the Waterfront Trail as one of the key issues and commitments to be discussed going forward.	Acknowledged. Suggested revisions will be made in Section 7.2.2 of the Final EPR.
29	<i>Draft EPR, Section 7.1</i>	Please revise the Section 7-1 bullets on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compensation. Please note that compensation is not limited to trees removed. Compensation should be provided for other vegetation loss such as shrubs and understorey, and will be discussed with the appropriate personnel as the study progresses.</li> <li>• Stormwater and Surface water- please include a commitment to work with TRCA to ensure that any structural changes/modifications do not have negative impacts to flooding and dynamic beaches.</li> <li>• Socio-Economic – Please include a commitment to work with TRCA regarding the Waterfront Trail and impacts to park users as the Waterfront Trail system is a TRCA system.</li> </ul>	Metrolinx has typically followed a 3:1 compensation ratio. We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project. The comments regarding storm water, surface water and socio-economic are acknowledged. Metrolinx is committed to continue to work with TRCA throughout detailed design to minimize impacts to flooding and dynamic beaches as well as the Port Union Waterfront Park users.
30	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.4</i>	Please note that if the utility works are required within TRCA regulated areas, utility agencies will be subject to TRCA regulation under the Conservation Authorities Act. Thus it is imperative that this requirement is identified by Metrolinx and discussions with the utility agencies are done separately and well in advance of these works to avoid potential project delays.	Acknowledged. We will endeavor to flag this requirement to third party utilities as conversation progresses through the detailed design process.
31	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	Petticoat Creek : Sheet 1/1: Section A-A The proposed side slope of 1.5H:1V for the embankment is very steep and can cause stability concerns. Please evaluate if some reinforcement (e.g. geo-grid, etc.) is required to ensure that the proposed embankment stays stable in long-term. If so, this should be properly designed and specified by a qualified engineer.	The detailed design of this project will be signed and sealed by a Licensed professional engineer. The design of new track bed grading works will be designed to a standard 2H/1V side slope and to meet the design load requirements for a rail carrying structure. Should any reductions of this slope standard be required, the revised slope will still be required to meet the requirement to be designed to carry the required load. This may require the reinforcing of the slope design to make certain it will carry the required load.
32	<i>Draft EPR, Geotechnical</i>	Please ensure that the works within TRCA regulated areas are designed in line with these TRCA guidelines that can be downloaded from our website <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TRCA Stormwater Management Criteria – (2012);</li> <li>• Low Impact Development Guidelines for Storm Water Management Design;</li> <li>• GGHACA Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Urban Construction (2006);</li> <li>• TRCA Geotechnical Engineering Design and Submission Plan Guidelines;</li> <li>• TRCA Crossing Guidelines;</li> <li>• TRCA Post Construction Restoration Guidelines;</li> <li>• TRCA Compensation Protocol;</li> <li>• TRCA Seed Mix Guidelines; and,</li> <li>• TRCA Environmental Impacts Statement Guidelines.</li> </ul> Link to TRCA website where all these documents can be downloaded <a href="http://www.trca.on.ca/planning-services-permits/developers-and-consultantsinformation/planning-and-development-procedural-manual.dot#subm">http://www.trca.on.ca/planning-services-permits/developers-and-consultantsinformation/planning-and-development-procedural-manual.dot#subm</a>	Acknowledged. We will work in line with the TRCA guidelines within TRCA regulated areas. With respect to tree compensation, Metrolinx has typically followed a 3:1 compensation ratio. We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities. The protocol will address vegetation removal from within the rail right-of-way, ecological wood lots, wetlands and linear trees adjacent to our properties. We will continue to work with all stakeholders regarding any trees affected by the project.

Parks Canada			
1	<i>Draft EPR, Section 1.1</i>	State the retaining-walled berms on either side of the Rouge River Bridge structures will also support four-tracking.	Section 1.1. is intended to provide a high-level overview of the project. The suggested statement is best made in Section 3.5 – Bridges, where a future fourth track is discussed. The final EPR will be updated with renderings of key infrastructure (e.g. grade separations, bridges, and public-facing retaining walls) to allow the reader to understand what the project will look like. The fourth track is required as a temporary rail diversion for construction staging at key locations, such as the Rouge River and Highland Creek watercourse crossings, to maintain train service operations. Post construction, there will be three operational tracks. Making provisions for a fourth track i.e. the bridge deck, at the grade separations and rail bridges minimizes future disruption at these locations at such a time as a fourth track is to be added.
2	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.3.2</i>	In the retaining wall description in the second half of the second paragraph, indicate the berm is also designed to accommodate four tracks.	Four tracks are only being accommodated at key infrastructures like bridges and grade separations. While the bridge will be designed to accommodate four tracks, only one additional track (new third track) is currently planned for the stretch between Rouge River Bridge and Highland Creek Bridge.
3	<i>Draft EPR, Section 3.5.2</i>	The sentence "Adding the new tracks to the south is also considered to present the best opportunity to develop 'a green boundary between the rail corridor and the waterfront' is unclear in meaning and should be removed, or explained.	Acknowledged, we will clarify this information in Section 3.5.2 of the Final EPR.
4	<i>Draft EPR, Table 4-1</i>	Replace "Contains Rouge National Urban Park" with "is within the future Rouge National Urban Park."	Acknowledged, we will replace with the suggested text in Table 4-1 of the Final EPR.
5	<i>Draft EPR, Table 4-2</i>	Replace "Encompasses portions of the Rouge National Urban Park" with "Encompasses portions of the future Rouge National Urban Park."	Acknowledged, we will replace with the suggested text in Table 4-2 of the Final EPR.
6	<i>Draft EPR, Table 4-2</i>	Revise other park references throughout the document in a similar manner, to "future Rouge National Urban Park."	We will ensure that reference to the future Rouge National Urban Park is consistent throughout the Final EPR.
7	<i>Draft EPR, Table 4-3</i>	Add to the second bullet beginning with "One Threatened...": "Contains Critical Habitat for one Endangered mussel, the Eastern Pondmussel."	We will incorporate the suggested text in Table 4-3 of the Final EPR. The species is identified in the Natural Environment Impact Assessment report, from Rouge River rail crossing to Lake Ontario.
8	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.1.2.4</i>	Replace "The park is approximately 4,700 ha in size..." with "The future park will be approximately 7,900 ha in size..."	We will replace with the suggested text in Section 4.1.2.4 of the Final EPR.
9	<i>Draft EPR, Table 4-5</i>	With respect to the Eastern Musk Turtle, historical records of the presence of this species in Rouge Marsh exist, but no recent surveys have been undertaken to confirm its presence.	We will update Table 4-5 of the Final EPR to include "Rouge River, including Rouge Marsh Area" as potentially suitable habitat for Eastern Musk Turtle. This update will also be reflected in Appendix B1.
10	<i>Draft EPR, Table 4-5</i>	Several species at risk are missing from the table and should be added: Blanding's Turtle, Little Brown Bat, Northern Myotis, Tri-Coloured Bat. Critical habitat for the Blanding's Turtle has been identified in the marsh area (under SARA).	We will update Table 4-5 of the Final EPR to include federally listed species as suggested. We will also list the Rouge Marsh Area as potentially suitable habitat for Blanding's Turtle and will revise mitigation measures to include Blanding's Turtle. These updates will also be reflected in Appendix B1. Note that the Rouge Marsh Area is located outside of the rail ROW and across a busy pedestrian walking trail and therefore construction activities are not anticipated to negatively affect this area. These updates will also be reflected in Appendix B1.
11	<i>Draft EPR, Table 4-6</i>	More recent information is available for the Rouge River. Refer to the Rouge River Fisheries Management Plan (2011 Draft), which includes a complete fish species list referencing surveys undertaken in 2009/2010 by DFO; in 2000, 2003, 2006, and 2009, by the TRCA; and pre-2000 records.	We will update Table 4-6 of the Final EPR to include fish species from Table 4-44 of the Rouge River Fisheries Management Plan (2011 Draft).
12	<i>Draft EPR, Table 4-7</i>	Eastern Pondmussel and American Eel should be added to the table. Critical habitat for the Eastern Pondmussel has been identified in the marsh area (under SARA).	We will update Table 4-7 of the Final EPR to include Eastern Pondmussel and its designation. Note that American Eel was already listed in this table.
13	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.6.2.1</i>	The Rouge River (on both sides of the rail corridor) should be added to the list of areas covered by the City's Ravine and Natural Feature Protection By-law and regulated by the TRCA.	We will incorporate the suggested information in Section 4.6.2.1 of the Final EPR.
14	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.6.2.2</i>	The EPR should also note the City Official Plan designates this part of the Rouge River as a provincially-significant wetland (see <a href="http://map.toronto.ca/maps/map.jsp?app=TorontoMaps_v2">http://map.toronto.ca/maps/map.jsp?app=TorontoMaps_v2</a> )	We will incorporate the suggested information in Section 4.6.2.1 of the Final EPR.



15	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.6.2</i>	<p>Add a section in the EPR briefly describing Parks Canada's 2014 draft Management Plan for Rouge National Urban Park. Suggested text:</p> <p>"The draft management plan for Rouge National Urban Park issued by Parks Canada in 2014 notes several initiatives relevant to the Rouge Beach/Marsh area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome Area to serve the most southerly gateway to the park.</li> <li>• Trail connections from the beach/marsh north to the Glen Rouge Campground at Kingston Road</li> <li>• Enhancement of the marsh area</li> <li>• Maintenance of the beach area for public use</li> </ul> <p>"The draft management plan is currently being finalized. The final, approved management plan will be the primary guiding document for Rouge National Urban Park once the transfer of lands in this area (which are currently owned by TRCA) to Parks Canada takes place."</p>	We will add a new subsection to Section 4.6.2 of the Final EPR to include the suggested text on Parks Canada's 2014 Draft Management Plan.
16	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.6.3.6</i>	Add a reference to Rouge Beach, and that summer visitation to the beach is upwards of 300,000 visitors according to Parks Canada research undertaken in 2013 and 2014.	Acknowledged. We will incorporate the suggested reference in Section 4.6.3.6 of the Final EPR.
17	<i>Draft EPR, Section 4.6.3.7</i>	Add reference to Rouge Park and the transition to Rouge National Urban Park, the first of its type in Canada.	Acknowledged, we will incorporate the suggested reference in Section 4.6.3.7 of the Final EPR.
18	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.1.1.1</i>	It is not clear that trees that "may require removal" have been inventoried. All trees that are negatively affected should be compensated for, regardless of whether the effects are direct or indirect (i.e., removed or not). Metrolinx's tree compensation protocol (mentioned on page 58 of the EPR) should also include this provision.	We are currently establishing an Ecosystem Service Compensation protocol for Metrolinx projects, in consultation with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, other conservation authorities and municipalities. The protocol will address indirect impacts, such as pruning of limbs for construction. The Final EPR will be updated to reflect that pruning should be completed by appropriately qualified staff and in accordance with the protocol. We will work with Parks Canada regarding any trees affected on Parks Canada managed lands.
19	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.1.1.3</i>	The implications of the last paragraph are unclear; the mitigation that would overcome this issue should be described.	Acknowledged, we will incorporate text in Section 5.1.1.3 of the Final EPR to clarify that contravention of the Migratory Birds Convention Act (MBCA) will be avoided if the prescribed mitigation measures are followed during construction.
20	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.1.1.4</i>	If this land is in Parks Canada Ownership at the time of permit application, a permit for Butternut removal will be required from Parks Canada instead of from MNRF.	Acknowledged, we will incorporate text in Section 5.1.1.4 of the Final EPR to note that no Butternut trees were identified within the boundaries of the Rouge National Urban Park during the 2014 field investigations or the 2015 tree inventory and, as such, a permit for removal from Parks Canada is not required. Metrolinx will include text to note that if any pure retainable Butternut trees are identified within the Rouge National Urban Park during the detailed design stage, consultation with Parks Canada will be initiated. This language will also be included in Appendix B1.
21	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.1.1.4</i>	Potential Construction Effects: Blanding's Turtle is missing from the list in the second line.	Acknowledged, we will update Section 5.1.1.4 of the Final EPR to include Blanding's Turtle and revise subtitle from "Reptile Special Concern Species" to "Reptile Species at Risk and Special Concern Species". This update will also be reflected in Appendix B1.
22	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.1.1.4</i>	A section on Eastern Pondmussel mitigation is required (before section 5.1.2.).	Acknowledged, we will outline mitigation measures for Eastern Pondmussel under Section 5.1.2.3 (Fish and Fish Habitat—Mitigation) of the Final EPR.
23	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.1.2.2</i>	This work [Rouge River] may require Eastern Pondmussel surveys and relocation.	Acknowledged, we will incorporate the suggested information in Section 5.1.2.3 of the Final EPR.
24	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.1.2.3</i>	A SARA permit may be required to address mitigation involving the Eastern Pondmussel.	Acknowledged, we will incorporate the suggested information in Section 5.1.2.3 of the Final EPR.
25	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.3.2.3</i>	Although reference is made to a Spill Prevention and Response Plan, we suggest the EPR require a spill kit to be on site at all times during construction. This requirement is consistent with Parks Canada Environmental Impact Assessment requirements.	Acknowledged, the suggested information will be reviewed and incorporated in the Spill Prevention and Response Plan as required.
26	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.3.2.4</i>	A similar requirement for the on-site presence of a spill kit should be included in this "Surface Water and Soil Management" section.	Acknowledged, the suggested information will be reviewed and incorporated in the Spill Prevention and Response Plan as required.
27	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.6.3.1 and Section 5.6.3.2</i>	We recommend construction in the beach/marsh area related to the Rouge River bridge and related retaining wall occur outside the main May-September visitor season. If construction is required during this period, we recommend most occur at night so as to impose minimal impact on the visitor experience of those visiting the beach (see also comments listed under page 81 below).	Acknowledged, please note that in-water works are required at Rouge River Bridge and the construction schedule will depend on applicable timing windows restrictions. Best practice measures will be put in place to mitigate construction impacts on visitor experience regardless of the timing of construction.

28	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.2.1</i>	There is a need to identify the effects of the retaining wall and Rouge Bridge reconstruction/expansion on public use of Rouge Beach and Marsh (including use of the parking lot, Waterfront Trail, and pedestrian bridge). For example, will construction equipment require access through the parking lot? What staging areas and temporary fencing will be required? How will any pedestrian bridge ramp relocation affect use of the bridge? Will construction require the closure of the Waterfront Trail?	We will continue to engage with adjacent landowners and stakeholders when developing appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that public use access for bikes and pedestrians is maintained. We will try to maintain trail access throughout construction activities. Where access will be restricted or closed on a temporary basis, such as to move equipment or to maintain safety as we complete specific work in the area, the community will be notified in advance of any temporary closures or restrictions. Items such as staging area and temporary fencing, temporary access for equipment and closure of parts of parkland or pathways due to construction will be determined during detailed design and discussed with affected parties prior to implementation.
29	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.2.3</i>	Measures to lessen construction and operational impacts on the Rouge Beach/Marsh area need to be identified. Given the intensity of public use of the beach and marsh area during the summer months (June-September), we recommend the EPR commit to no construction in the Rouge Beach/Marsh area occur over this period. We also suggest the recommendations of our covering letter for a communications/engagement strategy to address public use of the marsh/beach area during construction be included here.	Acknowledged, please note that in-water works are required at Rouge River Bridge and the construction schedule will depend on applicable timing windows restrictions. Best practice measures will be put in place to mitigate construction impacts on visitor experience regardless of the timing of construction. We also acknowledge the proposed communications/engagement strategy to inform public if, how and when use of the Rouge Beach/Marsh area, waterfront trail, waterfront trail and parking lot will be affected. A plan will be developed to inform the public on construction activities and schedule, as well as address any public concerns.
30	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.3.1</i>	In the last paragraph on page 51, the statement that retaining walls "may be permanent" is incorrect insofar as Rouge Beach is concerned as there they will be permanent. Given the size of the wall, we recommend the EPR indicate the length and height of this particular wall and briefly describe the options that have been discussed to this point in the study (tall, low, stepped). The description should clearly state the wall in this area will be designed to support two additional tracks (not one, as the text currently describes).	The anticipated retaining walls in the vicinity of the Rouge River will be defined as detailed design progresses. These retaining walls will be permanent and structural in nature to support the revised track plan within the rail corridor. Allowance for a future fourth track is only being accommodated at key infrastructures like bridges and grade separations. The entire rail corridor with the project area will have three operational tracks. While the rail bridges (Rouge River and Highland Creek) will be designed to accommodate four tracks, only one additional track (new third track) is currently planned for the stretch between Rouge River Bridge and Highland Creek Bridge. This will be made clearer in the Final EPR as suggested.
31	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.3.2</i>	We are pleased to see the recognition given to the importance of the Rouge River Bridge and continued Parks Canada involvement in design review. We ask that the Rouge Beach retaining wall be specifically identified along with the bridge in this description.	Acknowledged, we will incorporate the suggested information in the Final EPR.
32	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.7.5.1</i>	The text should note the possible need for property along the south side of the retaining wall in Rouge Beach, depending on the selected retaining wall concept.	The possible property needs along the south side of the retaining wall in Rouge Beach will be noted in the Final EPR based on preliminary design information available. Property impacts will be refined during detailed design based on the final design of the retaining walls/embankments. We will continue to engage with adjacent landowners and stakeholders during detailed design.
33	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.8.1.4</i>	The issues of EMS access identified in the covering letter are relevant here. The statement "Emergency vehicles may benefit from improved access at Rouge River" is not quite accurate as these vehicles already have access. The issues raised by various parties at the January 21 meeting should be identified as issues associated with this closure: EMS provincial response time standards would not be met in the vicinity of Chesterton Shores; potential for EMS traffic being routed through the very busy Rouge Beach area; parking lot congestion; the potential for flooding in the Beach area for major storm events that could hinder EMS vehicle access.	We intend to maintain access for Emergency Services at the Chesterton Shores crossing. Statement will be added in the Final EPR to better reflect design implications to existing access at Rouge River: the west abutment at the existing access will be opened up and provide a wider turning radius for emergency vehicles. We will continue to work with Emergency Services during detailed design to ensure access needs are met.
34	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.9</i>	Parks Canada understands Metrolinx will be responsible for mitigating any impacts to cultural heritage resources and the TRCA, as current landowner, will address archaeological aspects within the limits of the future national urban park in the Beach/Marsh area.  One element the EPR has not addressed is the cultural landscape value of the Beach and Marsh area. This area is part of a cultural landscape identified through the Preliminary Inventory of Cultural Landscapes of Rouge NUP (PCA, 2014), in draft form. The "PARKS CANADA LETTER APPENDIX—Cultural Heritage Values" at the end of this document identifies the heritage values associated of the Rouge River, associated trail system and shore of Lake Ontario cultural landscape; the surviving attributes of this cultural landscapes, and potential impacts affecting and mitigation to conserve these heritage values.	The cultural landscape value of the Beach and Marsh area at Rouge River has been considered for the project. To this end, we completed a Cultural Heritage Evaluation for the Highland Creek Rail Bridge and the Rouge River Rail Bridge. A Heritage Impact Assessment will also be completed during detailed design. Furthermore, Metrolinx Design Review Panel (MDRP) meetings were held for the Highland Creek (October, 2015) and Rouge River (December, 2015) Rail bridges. The MDRP reviews and provides non-binding advice on architecture, urban design and landscape architecture for select Metrolinx capital projects. We have also been working closely with City of Toronto, TRCA and Parks Canada to mitigate the effects on the cultural heritage landscape.

35	<i>Draft EPR, Section 5.9.1</i>	The text just below Table 5-6 describes the "removal" of the Rouge River truss whereas text elsewhere in the document refers to the replacement of certain parts of the bridge. A consistent description of the contemplated modifications and/or replacement should be used throughout the document.	We will ensure a consistent and clear description of the contemplated modifications and replacement throughout the document.
36	<i>Draft EPR, Table 6-1</i>	Add a description of the January 21, 2016 meeting with the cities of Toronto and Pickering, Toronto EMS, TRCA, and Parks Canada to this table.	Table 6-1 will be updated in the Final EPR and Appendix C (Consultation Materials) will include the minutes of meetings held during the TPAP process.
37	<i>Draft EPR, Section 6.2.1</i>	Add the Rouge Beach retaining wall to the list of structures described in the third paragraph that are to be reviewed by the panel.	Acknowledged, we will clarify that these public-facing retaining walls will be reviewed by the MDRP in Section 6.2.1 of the Final EPR.
38	<i>Draft EPR, Section 7.2.1.2</i>	Parks Canada very much appreciates the recognition of the potential role of the Agency in permitting, which of course depends on the timing of land transfer at the time of permit applications. Perhaps in recognition of the uncertainty associated with the timing of land transfer, the EPR frequently mentions the need to consult with "the appropriate authorities." In some instances specific agencies (e.g., MNRF, TRCA, etc.) are identified; in these cases, specific permit requirements may be wholly or partially replaced by those of Parks Canada.	We understand that specific permit requirements may be wholly or partially replaced by those of Parks Canada and therefore will consult with Parks Canada, as required.
39	<i>Draft EPR, Table 7-1</i>	We are pleased to see the inclusion of commitments regarding the retaining wall design. Specific suggestions on how to approach the design process are contained in our letter requested by Metrolinx on the retaining wall dated February 25.	Acknowledged. Suggestions contained in the February 25, 2016 Parks Canada letter, as well as subsequent design workshops with stakeholders including Parks Canada, TRCA and City of Toronto have shaped the retaining wall design to date. We will continue to work with stakeholders during detailed design.
40	<i>Draft EPR, Table 7-1</i>	Stakeholder Engagement: As mentioned in our covering letter, we recommend a specific stakeholder communications/engagement initiative be identified in the table to address what we expect to be significant public interest in construction impacts and the nature of retaining wall design in the Rouge Beach/Marsh Area. This suggestion was raised at the October 1, 2015 meeting with the City of Toronto, the TRCA and Parks Canada; all parties felt a coordinated approach to the public communications in this area would be beneficial.	Metrolinx will work with the City of Toronto, TRCA, Parks Canada and City of Pickering to develop and implement a communications/engagement strategy to include the community and other stakeholders in the design and construction planning.
41	<i>Appendix A</i>	Both the schematic in this appendix and the project description in the ESR state that a new bridge with two new tracks will be built south of the existing bridge; however, Point 1 in the "General Notes" accompanying the Rouge River Bridge plan and elevation (page 39 of the appendix—sheet 1/3) states one new track is to be built on either side of the existing bridge. This text should be corrected.	In the Final EPR, renderings of proposed key infrastructure, including the Rouge River Bridge will be provided.
42	<i>Appendix B-B2</i>	The statement that permission will be required from Parks Canada to remove trees from within Rouge National Urban Park should be clarified to state that Parks Canada has not yet taken ownership of these lands.	We will make suggested clarification regarding ownership in Section 2.7 of Appendix B2.
43	<i>Appendix B-B2</i>	Section 2.8 makes reference to the Provincial Endangered Species Act but the Federal Species at Risk Act is not mentioned; it will apply to all lands in Rouge National Urban Park once they are transferred, as well as to aquatic species.	We will incorporate the suggested reference in Section 2.8 of Appendix B2.