

## APPENDIX C

### ACTION FOR COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE GOVERNMENT REVIEW TEAM HIGHWAY 7 CORRIDOR AND VAUGHAN NORTH-SOUTH LINK PUBLIC TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (SPADINA SUBWAY EXTENSION – YORK REGION)

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO)	Robb Minnes Project Manager Highway Engineering	1	<u>Parking</u>  We note that you have assumed the initial 600 spaces at the 407 station as previously agreed. While we also agreed to assume 2000 spaces for the traffic analysis, this was to test whether the traffic could be handled on Jane Street and not to be assumed as a given. As we have indicated, until we complete the Transitway EA we will not know the extent of the parking capacity at the station. Further, there has been no commitment to a parking structure on site, which undoubtedly TTC and York region will assume to be a provincial responsibility.	Agreed, please check COA report	Done
			Given these concerns we request that section 3.3.1 and 3.3.8 be modified to state that 600 spaces are assumed for the combined station now. Additional parking will be determined through the 407 Transitway environmental assessment/preliminary design study based on Transitway site requirements including the operations/control centre and maintenance and storage yard requirements.	Agreed	Done
		2	<u>Parking</u>  3.4.7 indicates that “as a result of intensive development activities planned for the Vaughan Corporate Centre the majority of commuters are expected to utilize the 407 station for subway access”. I indicated at a number of our meetings that the VCC station provides direct commuter access from Highway 400 and Highway 7 and suggested that park and ride facilities need to be provided notwithstanding developer aspirations. The 407 station is not as accessible and has site restrictions. We do not find it acceptable for the COA to assume that the 407 station will	Vaughan’s development plans (VCC) at the Station area do not provide space for a commuter parking facility at the VCC Station location.  The HWY 407 Station will constitute the preferred location for a commuter parking facility especially when direct access from HWY 400 is provided. Direct access from HWY 400 will be studied in a separate project.	Done

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
			provide most all of the commuter parking demand. Additional provisions should be made at the VCC. Development at the VCC will be optimized by the subway extension. The benefiting developments should be required to contribute toward a park and ride facility at this highly accessible location. This section should be modified to reflect these points and should indicate that the strategic study of parking for transit users will explore additional commuter parking at the VCC station that will be reflected in development plans for the VCC.	Nevertheless, The report indicates that York’s strategic study of parking for transit users will “explore” commuter parking opportunities in the VCC Station area.	
		3	<u>Passenger Pick-Up/Drop Off</u>  Section 3.3.9 indicates that a 20 space PPUDO will be provided. This should include provision for both the subway and 407 Transitway.	This will be re-assessed during the design phase after integrating both the subway and Transitway needs. Report will be updated accordingly.	Done
GO Transit	Adam Snow Transportation Planner Marketing and Planning	4	<u>Highway 407/Jane Street Station</u> As we have noted previously, our calculations indicate that GO Transit requires 14 bus bays plus 2 loading/unloading platforms at the Highway 407/Jane Street Station. The plan indicates that a total of 18 platforms will be provided to accommodate GO as well as Brampton and YRT buses. Are enough platforms being provided to meet the anticipated demands? Furthermore, does the proposed configuration allow for future expansion?	The report includes a design of the facility at a functional level. At this stage 18 bus-bays are shown in the lay-out, however there is space for expanding the platform to the west adding more bus-bays if required. MTO has recently begun the 407 Transitway study which will also address the bus-transfer requirements at this multimodal station. During preliminary and detail design of the facility later this year, the final size and capacity of the bus-platform will be defined.	None at this time
		5	It is unclear where bus layovers will be accommodated.	Bus layover location will be integrated with the adjacent Transitway storage and maintenance facility. Report to be updated.	Done
		6	In previous comments we suggested that the bus terminal should be located parallel to the subway station to permit multiple direct access points to/from the platform below. The current proposal does not reflect such a configuration and provides only a single connection between the terminal and the subway, in the middle of the terminal building. Will this provide sufficient capacity for the anticipated passenger flows? Will passengers be unduly inconvenienced by the need to walk within the terminal and the subway station, as well as the possible crowding at this single access point?	The quadrant where the station is being proposed is property of-ORC and is being protected by MTO for their future Transitway. As implied in the report, when the MTO Transitway study determines their physical and operational requirements as far as alignment, parking, storage and maintenance facilities, this proposed lay-out will be optimize to integrate the needs of all transit authorities involved as well as maximizing users convenience and comfort.	None at this time.
		7	The timing of the MTO Transitway has yet to be determined. Does the proposed facility suitably accommodate bus access	The facility concept accommodates bus access without the Transitway in place. Two accesses (both from Jane Street) are	None at this time.

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
			<p>without the Transitway in place? Are a suitable range of connections provided to facilitate bus movements? Possible alternative arrangements could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct access from Highway 407 E/B and W/B and/or Highway 400 N/B and S/B (although we acknowledge the area around Highway 400 may be beyond the assignment's scope). Some of these facilities could be converted into portions of the Transitway, if it has not yet been built.</li> <li>• As a possible solution for direct access to Highway 407 W/B and Highway 400, a dedicated underpass structure from the station and/or Transitway with connections to the appropriate W/B access and egress ramps.</li> <li>• As a possible alternative, a southbound bus only lane could be provided from the west side of the Jane Street overpass to facilitate westbound bus movements to the station and a northbound bus only median lane could extend to a dedicated transit priority left turn signal to facilitate the movement of westbound buses leaving the station.</li> <li>• Introduction of special provisions (such as transit priority measures).</li> </ul>	<p>being proposed at this stage. A traffic capacity analysis that considered the widening of Jane Street from four to six lanes indicated that the two proposed intersections (one signalized the other right-in right-out) would have acceptable capacity. Other potential accesses such as a direct option from HWY 407 and HWY 400 will be addressed in a future study. Preliminary discussions with MTO and 407 ETR concluded that other studies such as the HWY 400 HOV project, the HWY 7 – HWY 400 revised interchange and the MTO Transitway should consider these access options.</p>	
		8	<p>It should be noted in the report that the Highway 407/Jane Street station will serve as the hub for GO's 407 BRT service. It is anticipated that, while new markets will take advantage of the transit network connections to be provided, the core market of the BRT service at this location will continue to be York University students. As such, the viability of GO's operations at this location depends on the development of a fare concession that allows students to transfer between the bus and subway and travel to/from the York campus at a reduced cost.</p>	<p>The report will be updated accordingly.</p>	Done

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
City of Vaughan	Roy McQuillin	9	On Page 3-5, under 3.7 'Associated Road Improvements" it states that certain road improvements are not part of the Highway 7-Vaughan N-S Link EA. Included in this list under No. 2, is the construction of the East-West Collector Road from Jane Street to Keele Street. The Highway 7-Vaughan N-S Link EA does include the portion of this road from the Region's Steeles Avenue Terminal over to Jane Street. It should be amended to say that it is road section from the terminal over to Keele Street that is not part of this EA	Agreed	Done
		10	In Table 4-2 Effects and Mitigation for the Social Environment under B2, "Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation" on page 4-5. Under VCC Station Facility it does not mention any potential impacts on the road network of the operation of the Passenger Pick Up and Drop-off. This should be examined to determine whether any mitigation measures need to be taken, e.g. entrance-exit locations or road improvements are needed to make it work. This could be done during the design stage.	Agreed. This analysis will be performed during the detailed design stage.	Done
		11	In Table 4-2 Effects and Mitigation for the Social Environment under B5, "Minimize adverse effects on stakeholders and property owners directly affected by the subway" on page 4-7. Under VCC Station facility it states that "Land required by the City for transit purposes, identified in Vaughan OPA 500 will be acquired.". The surface area where the PPUDO is to be located was designed to be a public square, without such transit facilities. I suspect the term "transit square" has been misinterpreted. It would be appropriate to simplify the statement and just say that the "Land required for the PPUDO will be acquired".	Agreed	Done
Toronto & Region Conservation Authority	Miss Beth Willston, Manager, Environmental Assessment Review Planning and Development	12	<u>Stormwater Management/Floodplain</u> 1. Flood lines in the project area limits will need to be confirmed at detailed design. This could include a requirement for the proponent to carry out appropriate studies including flood studies, hydraulic studies etc. 2. Under Section 2.1 #5 – Pg. 2-1, the last sentence should be revised to state "TRCA staff do not support construction of any at grade facilities within the floodplain" 3. Under Section 6.2.2, second bullet, please revise statement c) to state the following: "The backwater effect on ORC land	1. OK  2. Section 2.1 # 5 edited accordingly.  3. Section 6.2.2 edited accordingly.	N/A  Done  Done

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
			<p>will need to be addressed prior to development of associated services with the future Highway 407 Transitway or its associated service yard and parking/access area.</p> <p>4. Note that Section 3.3.10 should be revised to state “The detailed design of the Spadina Subway Extension and the Vaughan North-South Link Subway will also take into consideration the recommendations obtained from the stormwater management plan study being undertaken by the City of Vaughan...”</p> <p>5. Table 4.3 in Section 4.1.6: Effects and mitigation for the Natural Environment, outlines steps that will be taken to protect and enhance the natural environment within the transit corridor. Please be advised that the TRCA has recently updated Erosion &amp; Sediment Control Guidelines in cooperation with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, as well as a number of Conservation Authorities. The proposed project will be subject to these guidelines, which are available at <a href="http://www.sustainabletechnologies.ca">www.sustainabletechnologies.ca</a> We encourage the proponent to review this document and outline how the guideline will be addressed in detail in the EA document. Please revise Section C1 in Table 4.3 to reflect the fact that sediment and erosion control is of major concern of the TRCA and that the impacts due to sediment could be significant. The TRCA strongly advocates prevention through means of erosion and sediment control during construction so that mitigation measures are not required. However, mitigation measures will be required if it is determined at detailed design that erosion and sediment control may be an issue and have potential effects on watercourses.</p> <p>6. Section C4 – Pg. 4-12 states there will be a “minor increase in peak streamflows” and that no mitigation is required. Note that the development must match post development peak flows to the pre development conditions, therefore this statement is incorrect. Please revise the report and include the TRCA stormwater management criteria (including an erosion component) within the document which includes the following:  a) Water Quality – Enhanced Level 1 with 80% TSS removal</p>	<p>4. Section 3.3.10 edited accordingly</p> <p>5. Section 4.1.6 is indicating that the project will be subject to the up-dated TRCA Erosion &amp; Sediment Control Guidelines.</p> <p>Table C-1 is clearly indicating that sediment and erosion is a major concern during construction and operation under the project/activity issue. Please read the column called “Built-in Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations”, not the column called “Further Mitigation” . Also the level of significance after mitigation indicates the level as insignificant, <b>after mitigation measures have been applied.</b></p> <p>6. The increased pavement; decreased infiltration issue row has been edited in Table 4-3 C4).</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Done</p>

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
			<p>b) Water Quantity – 2 to 100 yr, post to pre development using unit flow rate equations for pre-development conditions.</p> <p>c) Erosion – detain first 5 mm of runoff on site; and overall 25 mm detention for 48 hours for stormwater management ponds.</p> <p>7. A water balance analysis must be undertaken to maintain the natural hydrologic cycle over the study area. There are a number of options available to achieve a water balance on site including the installation of green roofs, bio-swales, infiltration systems/basins, rain water harvesting techniques, porous paving, perforated pipes, wet ponds, etc. Please revise the report to include this information.</p> <p>8. In terms of increased temperature (Pg. 4-10), the shading that will be provided by culverts and bridges will not offset the removal of riparian vegetation. Please revise this statement in the EA document.</p> <p>9. With respect to the issue of potential spills entering watercourses due to accidents during construction, no monitoring or recommendations have been proposed in Table 4.3 (Section C1 – pg. 4-9). Note that mitigation measures are listed as ‘impractical’ and the spill itself is listed as ‘insignificant’. In the event of a spill, the impacts to the watercourse could be substantial. In this regard, please revise this column in the table. The proponent will also be required to provide mitigation and monitoring in the event of a spill. Please revise the report accordingly.</p> <p>10. Please note that all works must be performed “in the dry”. Please revise Section C1 – Pg. 4-9 accordingly.</p> <p><u>Groundwater</u></p> <p>11. Staff concurs that significant groundwater dewatering will be required for the proposed VCC station as the mezzanine and the upper portion of the platform occurs within a water-bearing interval. Staff also concur that some groundwater dewatering will be required for the proposed Highway 407 station. More detailed sites specific geotechnical and hydrogeological studies will be required at detailed design to confirm both groundwater control requirements, estimated</p>	<p>7. Addressed in last paragraph of Section 3.3.10.</p> <p>8. It seems that this was a misread situation. Table 4.3 C1) indicates as a “further mitigation” measure It indicates that in areas disturbed during construction, riparian vegetation will be restored. The text is being edited to make clarify the “increased temperature” issue.</p> <p>9. We understand this is another misread case. The column “Built Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations” lists the potential mitigation measures; “Further Mitigation” comes after “Potential Residual Effects” column, consequently the insignificant level is considered after the mitigation measures have been applied; however, a bullet to the built-in mitigation measures has been added.</p> <p>10. Agreed. A second bullet has been added to the potential spill built-in mitigation measures.</p> <p>11. Agreed. This was addressed and complemented in Section 5.4.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
			<p>dewatering quantities, the zone of influence (ZOI), and potential impacts to any watercourses (i.e. Black Creek and its tributaries)</p> <p>12. TRCA supports the use of the earth pressure balance (EPB) tunnel boring machine (TBM) technology as it should minimize the need for planned dewatering (groundwater table lowering) and would be the recommended method for the advancement of underground works. The potential environmental impacts associated with the dewatering should be minimized using EPB TBM techniques. We also understand that construction may require open cut and cover methodologies. The potential for planned dewatering and resulting environmental impacts increases significantly with this technology.</p> <p>At detailed design TRCA will require submission of an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) detailing how affects relating to fish/fish habitat, watercourse, wetland and forest/vegetation resources that occur through the planned and contingency dewatering will be monitored and mitigated. The EMP will require a determination of monitoring measures of various components (i.e. fish/fish habitat, watercourses, wetland and forest/vegetation) pre-, during, and post- construction, trigger levels at which point dewatering must be terminated, and contingency plans/mitigation measures to be developed and put in place to minimize effects on the environment and the above noted components.</p> <p>13. In terms of baseflow alterations, it is understood that the proposed works may cause alterations to groundwater flows. Baseline condition monitoring should be undertaken immediately so the effects of construction on baseflow connections to watercourses can be accurately assessed. The EA document should not state that effects on baseflow will be negligible until a thorough analysis is undertaken. Please revise the EA document accordingly.</p> <p><u>Fluvial Geomorphology</u></p> <p>14. The long term effects on the fluvial geomorphology of the watercourse pre- to post-development must be assessed through monitoring. Monitoring should be initiated as soon</p>	<p>12. Correct. Appendix A explains the dewatering issue in cut and cover construction. Section 4.1.6 indicates that an EMP will be included in the detail design phase.</p> <p>13. Table 4-3 -C1 states that proposed works may cause alterations to baseflow, provides the mitigation measures and indicates that <b>potential residual effects are not expected if the mitigation measures are applied.</b></p> <p>14. A fluvial geomorphological assessment will be included in the detail design phase as being indicated in Section 4.1.6. Miss Farrell did not answer our calls.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>N/A</p>

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
			<p>as possible to obtain baseline conditions for creek migration. Please contact Laurian Farrell, Water Resource Manager at extension 5601 for further information that will assist in baseline conditions monitoring for Black Creek.</p> <p>15. Page 4-10 refers to “spanning the watercourse, floodplain with new structures where warranted by site conditions”. Note that this section should be revised to state that new structures are to be sized in accordance with TRCA’s criteria for spanning watercourses and floodplain with appropriate studies to be undertaken including a meander belt assessment, a 100-year erosion limit assessment, and appropriate hydraulic studies. Note that the aforementioned studies should be conducted as early as possible to determine appropriate sizing.</p> <p>16. A new section should be added to Table 4.3 (i.e. C5) that specifically addresses watercourse crossings in relation to comments 14 and 15 above.</p> <p>17. The Hwy 407 station plans show two entrance roads, both within the regulated area. Please explore the possibility of creating one entrance road to reduce the impacts on the valley and its associated vegetation. If two entrances are necessary, please consider the possibility of combining the 407 Transitway with the northern entrance road.</p> <p><u>Vegetation</u></p> <p>18. It is understood that vegetation will most likely need to be removed as part of the proposed project. At the detailed design stage, an inventory of all vegetation to be removed or disturbed as part of the proposed works will be required. A compensation and restoration plan that will provide a net</p>	<p>15. Text has been edited accordingly.</p> <p>16. The effects tables classify the assessment based on environmental values such as “Minimize adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems”. Watercourse crossing is a potential effect, not a value. However, both comments are being addressed.</p> <p>17. Although both accesses cross the regulated area, only the south access will cross the creek bedding with a bridge structure. Only one access will have a critical social environmental impact to road capacity on Jane Street as well as at the intersection of Jane Street with the access road. The northern right in/out access will not only mitigate traffic congestion but will decrease travel time for to bus-transit users, since bus entrance to the facility and southbound exit will use the northern access. It is anticipated that the 407 transitway will cross Jane Street underground. The access definition will be re-visited during the design phase in coordination with the 407 transitway requirements.</p> <p>18. Requirement included in Table 4-3, Section C-2.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
			<p>environmental gain and compensate for the loss of any habitat will also be required at that time.</p> <p>19. Note that TRCA would like to ensure a net environmental gain is achieved throughout the entire study area for the proposed project. Please revise the EA document accordingly.</p> <p><u>Cultural Heritage</u></p> <p>20. Cultural heritage work should be completed at detailed design in order to assess the impact of the proposed works including the construction of Steeles West Station and the subway alignment on TRCA buildings at Black Creek Pioneer Village, and at the northwest corner of Jane Street and the railway tracks. In particular the affects of noise, vibration, dust, and traffic flow on these buildings and the operation of the village both during construction and operation of the subway will need to be considered. Please revise the report and Table 4-2 accordingly to include this statement.</p> <p><u>Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)</u></p> <p>21. Staff recommends that the building design incorporate as many Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) credit features as feasible, thus achieving environmental and socio-economic gains through eco-efficiency. To this end, TRCA suggests that the proponent develop a sustainability plan that shows how LEED design and construction criteria will be incorporated into the design of the project. Please refer to the document entitled <i>The Living City-Supporting Green Building Initiatives Across the Greater Toronto Region</i> to assist in developing this plan which was sent to Gus Garron at Delcan on August 17, 2006.</p> <p>To expand on the above, the design should include mechanisms for water conservation, energy conservation, waste management, and indoor environmental quality, such as:</p> <p>A. Sustainable Community Design (e.g. developing a program to capture and use the heat lost in the surrounding industrial community);</p> <p>B. Sustainable Technologies, (e.g. improvements to the</p>	<p>19. Mentioned in Section 4.1.6. Objective C</p> <p>20. Comment has been included in Section 4.1.5</p> <p>21. Section 4.2 addressing the LEED initiative has been added to Chapter 4.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
			<p>building operations to ensure the most innovative technologies for water and energy conservation are used);</p> <p>C. Pollution prevention, (e.g. plant maintenance and operating procedures, as is advocated through programs such as ISO 14001);</p> <p>D. Sustainable design for the preferred site, (e.g. recycled materials, disposal, division, reduction, rapidly renewable materials, and locally manufactured materials; as well as dust, odour, particulate matter, lighting, daylight and views, and VOC's); and,</p> <p>E. LEED or alternative eco-efficiency programs for the long term operation of the project so as to achieve an environmental and socio-economic gain.</p> <p>Upon request, staff would be pleased to make a presentation to representatives of the proponent in regard to the LEED building standards and how they relate to this project.  Please add a statement to the revised document that discusses how LEED criteria could be incorporated to the proposed design.</p> <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <p>22. Confirm what is proposed and what is existing on Figures 2-1 and 3-1. Clarify if the Future VCC road network, 407 Transitway, proposed E-W Collector Road, works west of Jane in the area of Interchange Way, and the Hydro Transmission Lines on these Figures have been finalized under previous approvals. If these works have not yet been approved and are still subject to approval under the Environmental Assessment Act or the Planning Act, please revise these Figures to indicate that these layers are only provided at a conceptual level for reference purposes only and are not yet approved.</p> <p>23. Page 4-9 – note the proposed works are in the Humber River Watershed.</p> <p>24. Note that TRCA staff will confirm Ontario Regulation 166/06 permit requirements at detailed design. At the onset of detailed design please provide TRCA with all</p>	<p>22. Both figures have been changed accordingly.</p> <p>23. Correction made.</p> <p>24. Understood.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>N/A</p>

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
			<p>detailed design documentation for the entire study area for TRCA staff to review and provide comment.</p> <p>25. Note that the “fill regulation area” referenced throughout the report is now referred to the “regulation limit” under Ontario Regulation 166/06. In addition please note that these regulation limits are subject to change.</p> <p>26. note that three paragraphs above table 4-3 under Section 4.1.6 – Pg. 4-9 draw conclusions that may be premature to make at this time. A number of the issues discussed in this section of the report will need to be confirmed at detailed design. Please refer to the above comments 1, 11, 14, 15, 23, 24 in this regard and revise this section of the report accordingly.</p>	<p>25. The Report is referring to regulation limits in opposed to regulation area. Section 3.3.2 is mentioning that these limits are subject to change.</p> <p>26. A note is being added to Section 4.1.6.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>Done</p>
	TTC		<p>1. <i>Section 2.1, page 2-1, TTC Triple Track</i> - The section on the three track structure is incorrect. Options to move the three track structure south of Steeles West Station are still being investigated, however at this time no acceptable option has been formally identified.</p> <p>3. <i>Section 3.1.2, page 3.1</i> - The second paragraph should be reworded. This is an engineering issue and there are many other environmentally sound soil retaining (or dewatering) methods which could be contemplated.</p> <p>4. <i>Section 3.3.1, page 3-2</i> - It is not clear in the text whether the demand for 2,000 spaces is at 407 and/or VCC station or whether this includes the demand at Steeles West Station and whether this demand is contingent on the 407 Busway. TTC/Toronto EA states that requirement for Steeles West Station is 2500 spaces.</p> <p>5. <i>Section 3.3.5.1, page 3-2</i> - The current intention is that the main entrance to every station be staffed by a collector.</p> <p>6. <i>Section 3.3.8, page 3-3</i> - The narrative describes demand for 2,000 spaces, this section says 600 spaces will be provided as an interim facility and the drawing says 500 spaces (Figure 3.8). Clarification required. On a cost per space basis it would be much cheaper to provide more surface spaces at Steeles West Station than to provide decked parking at Highway 407 to respond to increased demand.</p> <p>7. <i>Section 3.4, pages 3-3 and 3-4</i> - A "limited parking facility"</p>	<p>1. Section 2.1 - Triple Track - has been edited in accordance to the current situation.</p> <p>3. The paragraph has been re-worded.</p> <p>4. A demand in the range of 2000 spaces is anticipated by 2031 at the 407/Jane Station commuter parking (text will be re-worded to clarify this). The 2500 spaces demand for Steeles West (TTC EA Report) was a figure arrived from a forecast assuming Steeles West would be the terminal station.</p> <p>5. Okay, there is no need to edit the text.</p> <p>6. Figure 3.8 has been edited to show 600 spaces.</p> <p>7. As the referred Section indicates, the Region will undertake a</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Done</p> <p>None at</p>

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
			<p>at VCC Station is proposed but there are no details on what is envisioned. If known, the number of spaces being contemplated should be mentioned.</p> <p>8. <i>Section 3.4.5, page 3-4</i> - The PPUDO is located a long way from the northern limits of the station platform. TTC experience is that if the PPUDO is not conveniently located in relation to the station, people will use the street. Consideration should be given to locating the PPUDO closer to the station if possible.</p> <p>9. <i>Section 3.4.6, page 3-4</i> - A number of typos were found.</p> <p>10. <i>Section 3.4.8, page 3-4</i> - The actual demand for a PPUDO at the end of the line may be up to 40 or 50 spaces, based on our experience at Finch and Kipling stations. These facilities were undersized on opening day, and since then we have been having to live with the consequences due to the developments which followed the initial station concept. Although we recognize the space constraints faced at this location, the number of spaces should be maximized.</p> <p>11. <i>Section 3.5.1, page 3-5</i> - Source of power supply will need to be confirmed (Hydro One or local distributor)?</p> <p>12. <i>Section 3.8, page 3-5</i> - This section references a "following exhibit" which delineates a shaded area within which modifications can be made to the alignment without an EA amendment; no such exhibit is provided.</p> <p>13. <i>Figure 3-2</i> - Layout of UPS expansion is different than on Figure 3-1.</p> <p>14. <i>Figure 3-3</i> - Hydro tower footing should be plotted on profile at sta 1+500 to confirm that there is no conflict. An Emergency Exit Building is shown in the middle of the future East-West Collector Road (recognizing that this road alignment may need to be modified).</p> <p>15. <i>Figure 3-4</i> - Profile indicates platform of 407 Station at a depth of 30 metres. This needs to be revised; deepest platform in existing system is at less than 20 metres.</p>	<p>strategic parking study for transit users in the area. Most commuter parking is expected at the 407 Station, land availability in the VCC area will be scarce, being the reason why an underground "limited" parking opportunity along the subway right of way is an option recommended to be considered during detail design, in coordination with the Region Parking Study.</p> <p>8. We share your concern, however, following a series of discussions with the City, the triangular shape area where the PPUDO is proposed, was the only feasible spot with fairly easy vehicular access within the VCC area, that could be reserved for the temporary parking facility by the City of Vaughan. Note that the north end of the subway platform is not far from the south end of the PPUDO.</p> <p>9. Thanks...</p> <p>10. As indicated in Comment No 8, the only available space, feasible for a PPUDO facility is the area shown in the Report.</p> <p>11. Hydro One as indicated in the Report.</p> <p>12. Agreed. The Figure has been added.</p> <p>13. Agreed. Correction on Figure 3-2 made.</p> <p>14. Okay</p> <p>The drawings has been corrected.</p> <p>15. The alignment crosses under the 500KV Hydro tower No 158. The information obtained from Hydro One indicates a depth of 8.25 m. for the deepest footing of this tower. The profile is providing 1 diameter cover under the deepest footing.</p>	<p>this time</p> <p>None at this time</p> <p>Done</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action
			<p>16. <i>Figure 3-6</i> - If possible, VCC station should be shallower. The tail tracks at VCC Station shall be similar to Finch Station, i.e. a single-ended three-track structure.</p> <p>17. <i>Figure 3-7</i> - References to the TTC ROW should be eliminated from the drawing. The 1-metre clearances are incorrect; should be 3 metres. Note 2 concerning Platform Edge Doors should be eliminated.</p> <p>18. <i>Figure 3-8</i> - Drawing should be clarified to indicate that a bridge is required over the creek at the southerly access road. The text references the bridge but the drawing should show it as well.</p> <p>19. <i>Figures 3-8, 3-10</i> - Creek realignment referenced in subsequent tables is not illustrated on any drawings. Will this be presented as part of this document?</p> <p>20. <i>Table 4.2, B5, page 4-6</i> - In the first objective for B5, the potential for tunneling/mining for the three-track structure under UPS should be highlighted. Second objective for B5 specifies 1.5 to 2 tunnel diameters below tower footing - refer to comment #14 above.</p> <p>21. <i>Table 4.3, fish mortality</i> - Cross reference section 5.3.1 as it pertains to dewatering for the 407 station (cut and cover section).</p> <p>23. <i>Section 5.1.2, page 5-1</i> - This section is too detailed for an EA, particularly the beginning of Page 5-2. Page 5-2 first paragraph: typo for injection (infection).</p> <p>24. <i>Section 5.2.1, pages 5-1 and 5-2</i> - This section is too detailed for an EA, particularly the beginning of Page 5-2. Page 5-2 first paragraph: typo for injection (infection).</p> <p>25. <i>Section 5.4, page 5-2</i> - Should mention if dewatering require a Permit to Take Water for VCC and Highway 407 stations.</p> <p>26. <i>Section 6.2.3, page 6-2</i> - Consider including a summary of issues/items discussed with the stakeholders.</p>	<p>Nevertheless the Station has been raised and may be raised even more when detail foundation information and soils conditions under tower No 158 is available.  16. Profile has been adjusted.</p> <p>17. TTC's Design Manual Volume 1. Fig. 3.1.1 shows a cross section with the same dimensioning as Figure 3.7 of the Report. (minimum clearance of 1m.; not 3 m.)</p> <p>18. The exact location and length of the bridge has not been defined, they will be defined after a meander analysis is done and following TRCA's criteria. The drawing now shows conceptually the presence of a bridge.</p> <p>19. No creek re-alignment is anticipated. Can you be more explicit about the sections or tables where we mention creek re-alignment?</p> <p>20. The first objective clearly addresses the matter.</p> <p>The statement does not specifies 1.5 to 2 m. cover; it recommends 1.5 to 2 m. cover, indicating that if the actual cover is less, special settlement control measures will be taken to ensure stability of the tower.</p> <p>21. This activity refers to Black Creek, not to 407 Station.</p> <p>23. Referred table has been excluded.</p> <p>24. Section 5.2.1 has been edited accordingly.</p> <p>25 Okay</p> <p>26. Comments and answers are being included in the final document.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>None at this time</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>

Representative	Name	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action