

**Yonge Subway Extension Train Storage Facility
Environmental Project Report Addendum - Public Review Period Feedback**

Reviewer	Date	Comment	Response
Federal Agencies			
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	September 29, 2014 (received by proponents October 7, 2014)	<p>Thank you for your correspondence of September 3, 2014 regarding the yonge subway train storage facility.</p> <p>As part of the Government of Canada's plan for Responsible Resource Development which seeks to modernize the regulatory system for project reviews, the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012</i> (CEAA 2012) came into force on July 6, 2012. CEAA 2012 focuses federal environmental reviews on projects that have the potential to cause significant adverse environmental effects in areas of federal jurisdiction.</p> <p>The CEAA 2012 applies to projects described in the <i>Regulations Designating Physical Activities</i> (the Regulations). Based on the information provided, your project does not appear to be described in the Regulations. Kindly review the Regulations to confirm applicability to your project including section 1 (h), which relates to federally designated wildlife areas and migratory bird sanctuaries.</p> <p>According to sections 25 (a) (b) and (d) a railway line that requires a total of 32 km or more of new right of way; a railway yard with seven or more yard of tracks or a total track length of 20 km or more; and/or a railway line designed for trains that have an average speed of 200 km/h or more may require a Federal Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>For more information on CEAA 2012, please access the following links on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's (the Agency) website:</p> <p>Overview of CEAA 2012 http://www.ceaa.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=16254939-1</p> <p>Regulations Designating Physical Activities, and Prescribed Information for a Description of a Designated Project Regulations http://www.ceaa.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=9EC7CAD2-1</p> <p>If it appears that CEAA 2012 may apply to your proposed project, you must provide the Agency with a description of the proposed project. Please see the link below to the Agency's guide to preparing a project description.</p> <p>Guide to Preparing a Description of a Designated Project http://www.ceaa.gc.ca/63D3D025-2236-49C9-A169-DD89A36DAOE6/Guide to Preparing a Description of a Designated Project under CEAA 2012.pdf</p> <p>If you believe the project is not subject to a federal environmental assessment, and do not submit a project description, we kindly request that you remove the Agency from your distribution list. If you have questions, please get in touch with our office through the switchboard at 416-952-1576.</p>	<p><i>Response sent by email on October 9, 2014:</i></p> <p>Thank you for the feedback. The proposed works have been reviewed against the <i>Regulations Designating Physical Activities</i> and it is understood that the project is not described in the Regulations. This review has also been reflected in Section 6.6 of the Environmental Project Report (EPR) Addendum. For ease of reference, the attached PDF provides a copy of Section 6.6 of the EPR Addendum.</p> <p>As requested, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency will be removed from the project distribution list.</p>

**Yonge Subway Extension Train Storage Facility
Environmental Project Report Addendum - Public Review Period Feedback**

Reviewer	Date	Comment	Response
Provincial Agencies			
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change	October 16, 2014	<p><i>Comments from Environmental Approvals Branch, Environmental Assessment Services Section:</i></p> <p>The Regional Municipality of York, the Toronto Transit Commission, York Region Rapid Transit Corporation, and the City of Toronto, as co-proponents, are proposing to make changes to the Yonge Subway Extension (YSE) project that are inconsistent with the Environmental Project Report (EPR) submitted to the Ministry of the Environment, now known as the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (ministry), on February 2, 2009, for which a Notice to Proceed was issued by the Minister of the Environment on April 6, 2009. The proposed physical changes include an alignment extension north of the proposed Richmond Hill Centre Station, an underground train storage facility, and new surface facilities (ventilation and drop shafts, maintenance operators' facility, emergency exit buildings, and an employee parking lot).</p> <p>On September 4, 2014, in accordance with Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08 and the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), a Notice of EPR Addendum was published and the final EPR Addendum, dated September 2014, was submitted to the ministry, initiating the 30-day review period.</p> <p>The EPR Addendum was reviewed by ministry staff of the Environmental Approvals Branch, Environmental Assessment Services (EAS) Section, and technical reviewers in the Approval Services Section, and the ministry's Central Region office, Technical Support Section, Toronto District Office (TSS/TDO). Comments on the EPR Addendum main report from EAS Section are provided below. Attached for your consideration you will find technical comments related to air, noise, and wastewater, as well as TSS/TDO comments.</p> <p>Generally speaking, ministry comments on the draft EPR Addendum reflected in Appendix K have been addressed. However, it is noted that in some cases requests for additional information were acknowledged but disregarded. It is important the proponents recognize the intent of the requests is to obtain clarification about the process followed and/or the assessment results presented in the EPR Addendum, to ensure the process is traceable and documented in a clear and logical manner.</p> <p>In other instances the final EPR Addendum does not reflect revisions or provide additional information, contrary to responses given in Appendix K. For example, the brief summary of issues raised during the review of the draft EPR Addendum has not been provided in Section 2. Also, it is stated that text in Section 3.1.1 has been revised to provide clarification about the process followed to arrive at the evaluation of alternatives and selection of preferred alignment, yet the text is identical to that of the draft EPR Addendum.</p> <p>Concluding Remarks</p> <p>Responses to the ministry's comments, above and in the attachments, and comments submitted by other stakeholders during the 30-day review</p>	<p>Feedback noted. Please see below for responses to technical reviewer comments.</p> <p>In response to the Environmental Assessment Services (EAS) comments:</p> <p>It is noted that the EAS has confirmed that, generally speaking, ministry comments on the draft EPR Addendum reflected in Appendix K have been addressed.</p> <p>The EAS suggests that some requests for additional information were acknowledged but disregarded. Specific examples were not provided in support of this comment. It is believed that where additional information was requested appropriate responses were provided and as warranted corresponding revisions were made and reflected in the final EPR Addendum.</p> <p>The EAS has indicated that in other instances the EPR Addendum does not reflect revisions or provide additional information, contrary to responses given in Appendix K. Two examples were provided. The following outlines the examples provided and the associated response to these identified examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Example: The brief summary of issues raised during the review of the draft EPR Addendum has not been provided in Section 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Response: A brief summary was not included in Section 2; however, Section 2.3 of the final EPR Addendum addresses the circulation of the draft EPR Addendum to the Technical Advisory Committee and refers readers to Appendix K for a comment-response table documenting comments received during the review of the draft ERP Addendum and how those comments have been addressed. As a result, the inclusion of the comment-response table in Appendix K did provide readers with a copy of comments received and the associated responses. That said, a brief summary will be added through an update to the final EPR Addendum. 2. Example: Also, it is stated that text in Section 3.1.1 has been revised to provide clarification about the process followed to arrive at the evaluation of alternatives and selection of preferred alignment, yet the text is identical to that of the draft EPR Addendum. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Response: The response provided in Appendix K did not specify that edits were made to Section 3.1.1 but rather that text revisions were made to address the associated comment which was not limited to Section 3.1.1 – for reference, the comment was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is unclear if the consideration of design criteria (3.1.1) resulted in the alignment configuration alternatives (3.1.2). Provide clarification about the process followed to arrive at the evaluation of alternatives and selection of preferred alignment (3.1.3). For clarification, Section 3.1.2 (Alignment and Configuration Alternatives) was updated to address this comment. This will be clarified through and update to the corresponding response in Appendix K. <p>The requested documentation is being prepared and will be provided to MOECC as soon as possible. Per a clarification received from MOECC by email on October 24, 2014, the documentation will be posted to project website only once the Minister issues the Notice, or after November 10, 2014 if no Notice is issued.</p>

**Yonge Subway Extension Train Storage Facility
Environmental Project Report Addendum - Public Review Period Feedback**

Reviewer	Date	Comment	Response
		<p>period are to be incorporated into the final EPR Addendum in a table format, where appropriate, including revisions to Table 5-3 to reflect clarifications/additions related to commitments. All other changes and/or clarifications are to be addressed in errata pages which will be considered to be appended to the final EPR Addendum.</p> <p>The errata, EPR Addendum comment response table, and Table 5-3, including any revised pages, should be posted on the project website as soon as possible. The ministry requires two paper copies of the errata, comment response table, and any revised pages. The ministry also requires one black-line and one final paper copy of the entire EPR Addendum, including the appendices, as appropriate, for the public file.</p>	
	September 9, 2014 (received by proponents October 16, 2014)	<p><i>Comments from Senior Noise Review Engineer, Environmental Approvals Services Section, Approval Services Unit (Team 3):</i></p> <p>As Appendix C (Noise and Vibration Assessment) of the Addendum has not changed since my previous comments of May 7, 2014, and since those comments were reported appropriately in Appendix K of the September 2014 Addendum, I have at this time no noise or vibration-related comments regarding the Addendum.</p>	Feedback noted. No response required.
	September 12, 2014 (received by proponents October 16, 2014)	<p><i>Comments from Supervisor, Approval Services (Team 3), Environmental Approvals Branch:</i></p> <p>Follow up to May 22, 2104 comments:</p> <p><u>Repeat of previous comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EAB air engineers do not review air quality assessments for construction activities. • Re: Environmental Noise and Vibration Assessment: It is not the area of expertise of EAB air engineers. Indeed comments on the document have already been provided by Thomas Shevlin, P.Eng., Senior Noise Engineer. <p><u>Previous comment – still the same in this final document:</u></p> <p>This addendum seems on the 14-car Train Storage Facility c/w service facilities (sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3). In section 5.1.6.1, it indicates that "there are no permanent air quality impacts associated with the TSF". And in section 6.1(8), it indicates that "Certificates of Approval for noise and air quality related impacts resulting from vent shafts, stations and parking lots for MOE" would be obtained. These 2 sections do not seem to match.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Regarding the previous comment identified as being the same in the final EPR Addendum:</p> <p>As noted in Appendix K of the EPR Addendum, in response to the previous comment text was revised to read "no notable permanent" impacts. That revised text is reflected in Section 5.1.6.3 of the final EPR Addendum which addresses the operation and maintenance impacts of the proposed works. While Certificates of Approval will be obtained the need for the certificates is not linked to notable permanent impacts. To provide additional clarification, please note that Section 5.1.6.1 addresses air quality associated with the displacement of existing facilities. The comment is linked to Certificates of Approval which relate to operations and as a result it was appropriate for the text revisions to be addressed in Section 5.1.6.3.</p> <p>With the above in mind, no additional revisions are required to the EPR Addendum.</p>
	September 22, 2014 (received by proponents October 16, 2014)	<p><i>Comments from Environmental Resource Planner & EA Coordinator, Central Region, Technical Support Section:</i></p> <p>We have reviewed the Yonge Subway Extension EPR Addendum and the responses to MOECC Central Region and YDDO comments (pp 5-8) in Appendix K of the Addendum. We do not have any further concerns regarding this addendum.</p>	Feedback noted. No response required.

**Yonge Subway Extension Train Storage Facility
Environmental Project Report Addendum - Public Review Period Feedback**

Reviewer	Date	Comment	Response
	September 30, 2014 (received by proponents October 16, 2014)	<p><i>Comments from Senior Wastewater Engineer, Approval Services Section (Team 1), Environmental Approvals Branch:</i></p> <p>I have reviewed the Yonge Subway Extension Transit Project - Train Storage Facility Final EPR Addendum focusing on the mandate of the Environmental Approval Services Section, EAB, under Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act (OWRA). During the review, particular attention was given to the following sections of the final EA report with respect to the mandate of the wastewater unit of the EAB:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section 5.1.4 – Soil and Groundwater 2. Section 5.1.5 – Drainage and Stormwater Management 3. Section 5.1.7 – Contaminated Properties 4. Section 6.1 – Permit and Approval <p>I provide the following review comments for your consideration.</p> <p>All wastewater review comments provided to the draft EA report have been addressed or dealt with in this final EA report. The proposed approaches, mitigation measures and monitoring are acceptable with respect to the mandate of the Environmental Approval Services Section, EAB, under Section 20.2 of Part II.1 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA), previously referenced under Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act (OWRA).</p> <p>It is expected that more details will be provided during the ECA application period and any identified issue will be addressed as part of the detailed pre-application consultation with the Ministry.</p>	Feedback noted. No response required.
	October 20, 2014	<p><i>The MOECC requested clarification regarding the Proponent's responses to comments received,</i></p> <p>Re: The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proponents' response appears twice. Should other information be included here? • It is indicated that CEAA will be removed from the distribution list, 'as requested', but record of such a request is missing. Provide clarification. <p>Re: Alderville First Nation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify if follow up efforts were conducted to ensure the October 8, 2014, email to Dave Simpson was received, and/or whether or not comments would be forthcoming. <p>Re: Resident of Coburg Crescent – September 28, 2014 submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional details are needed in support of the statement about York Region's expected increases to population (50%) and employment (100%) numbers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The duplication in the response has been removed from the table. No information is missing from the response. • The correspondence from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency contained a second page which addressed the request to be removed from the contact list. The missing comment text has been added to the table. • As documented in the table, Dave Simpson was copied on the September 29, 2014 email from Chief Marsden and a follow up email was sent to Dave Simpson on October 8, 2014. A note has been added to the table to indicate that no further comments were received. • The population and employment forecasts were established by the Region for a separate study, and are presented on the Region's VivaNext website (www.vivanext.com). The population and employment forecasts were considered in the Region's decision to pursue the implementation of higher-order transit, including the Bus Rapid Transit project on Yonge Street; the subject of the Resident's comment. For further information on the Yonge Street Bus Rapid Transit project, it would be appropriate to refer to that project's webpage.

**Yonge Subway Extension Train Storage Facility
Environmental Project Report Addendum - Public Review Period Feedback**

Reviewer	Date	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to other comments this submitter outlines four specific concerns yet the response does not address the second and third items. Similarly, concern about dropping property values has not been addressed. Provide responses, as appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Those comments are not specific to the Yonge Subway Extension and relate to various transit initiatives (for a related map see: http://www.vivanext.com/project-map/). Sufficient response has been provided in the response information re: Need for Rapid Transit along Yonge Street. The proponent will address the Resident's comments regarding property value through ongoing discussions with the Resident.
Utilities			
Utility Circulations MTS Allstream	September 4, 2014	MTS Allstream has no existing plant in the area indicated in your submission. No markup and no objection.	Feedback noted. No response required.
Aboriginal Communities			
R. Donald Maracle, Chief Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte	September 8, 2014	<p>We acknowledge your invitation to participate in the review of the proposed amendments to the subway infrastructure as it relates to the Yonge Subway Extension – Underground Train Storage Facility, Environmental Project Report.</p> <p>The Crown has a legal obligation concerning the Duty to Consult as established by the Supreme Court of Canada decisions <i>Haida</i>, <i>Taku River</i>, and <i>Mikisew Cree</i>. The Duty to Consult is invoked when the Crown contemplates conduct that might interfere with or have an adverse effect on established or potential Aboriginal rights which are recognized and affirmed in Section 35 of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>. The Duty to Consult requires timeliness for the review of a project and engagement in meaningful consultation. The scope and content of consultation and accommodation must be proportionate to the strength of the potential right and the seriousness of the potential adverse effect of the contemplated activity; and, in some cases, Consent must be obtained.</p> <p>While the Crown owes the Duty to Consult, it can delegate procedural aspects of the Duty to third parties. Should the Crown fail to consult or fail to consult adequately with affected First Nations, industry and proponents increase the risk having their projects delayed, hindered, or even suspended. As a result, developers must be intimately involved in the process of consultation and engagement, and undertake significant efforts to ensure the process occurs.</p> <p>When a proposed project is occurring on lands of federal interest, and in addition to the Duty to Consult, the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte (MBQ) expect a proponent to act, in the very least, in accordance with the purposes outlined in the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012</i>, to promote communication and cooperation between responsible authorities and Aboriginal peoples with respect to environmental assessment.</p> <p>When a proposed project is occurring on lands of provincial interest, and in addition to the Duty to Consult, the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte (MBQ) expect a proponent to act, in the very least, in accordance with the principles established by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment who requires, under the <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i>, to "consult with</p>	<p><i>Response sent by email on September 15, 2014:</i></p> <p>Thank you for your response (first document attached) regarding the Yonge Subway Extension – Train Storage Facility Environmental Project Report (EPR) Addendum. Please note that the full document is available for review at http://www.vivanext.com/epraddendum</p> <p>Per your data requirements to determine your level of interest in the proposed project, we have extracted the relevant content from the EPR Addendum, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1-2 page summary of proposed project including potential adverse impacts to the land and affected community; <p><i>This Addendum focuses only on changes to the 2009 EPR proposed in the section north of the proposed Richmond Hill Centre Station to approximately Northern Heights Drive. The following is a summary of the components of the proposed changes to the approved YSE project addressed in this Addendum:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Extension of the YSE alignment to approximately 1km north of the approved Richmond Hill Centre Station;</i> <i>Underground Train Storage Facility (TSF) for 14 trains, on the YSE alignment north of the approved Richmond Hill Centre Station;</i> <i>Maintenance building for staff access to the proposed TSF east of Coburg Crescent, and associated 25-30 space employee parking lot;</i> <i>Private access roadway connecting the proposed TSF employee parking lot to Beresford Drive;</i> <i>Ventilation shaft in the vicinity of the northern end of the TSF; and</i> <i>Emergency Exit Building.</i> <p><i>These proposed changes are discussed in further detail in Section 3.2 of the EPR Addendum.</i></p> <p><i>The anticipated impacts resulting from the project, along with the Region's proposed approach to mitigating the impacts and commitments to future work, are described in detail in Section 5 of the EPR Addendum, and summarized in Table 5-3 of the EPR Addendum (attached).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological reports and assessments (see Sections 4.3.2 and 5.3.2, and Appendix G); <p><i>The following is an excerpt from the EPR Addendum:</i></p> <p><i>From Section 4.3.2 – Study Area Conditions: Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment Reports were prepared by Archaeological Services Inc. for the 2009 EPR. It was ultimately found that with the exception of the East Don River crossing, no additional archaeological assessment was required and the Ministry of Culture (now the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport) concurred with the findings of the reports.</i></p>

**Yonge Subway Extension Train Storage Facility
Environmental Project Report Addendum - Public Review Period Feedback**

Reviewer	Date	Comment	Response
		<p>persons who have an interest in a proposed project...where there may be the potential to infringe on Aboriginal or treaty rights.” (http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/eaab/general.php)</p> <p>The level of impact a project may have on our people and lands will determine the level of interest the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte (MBQ) have in participating in projects requiring environmental assessments, and consultation and engagement initiatives.</p> <p>MBQ has an interest in all projects occurring in our traditional territory, which encompasses a significant area across Southern Ontario and the northern shore of Lake Ontario. The Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte would be concerned if the preliminary archaeological investigations identified the potential for artifacts or burial remains. There is a traditional process that must be followed for the repatriation or re-interment of remains. Further, MBQ would be concerned with projects that will impact traditional hunting, fishing and gathering rights, and resource extraction rights.</p> <p>To determine our level of interest in your proposed project, please provide the following documentation for review, and address to the Consultation Coordinator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-2 page summary of proposed project including potential adverse impacts to the land and affected community; • Archaeological reports and assessments; • Any comments or review-type documentation provided by involved government parties (i.e. the Ministry of Natural Resources; Ministry of the Environment; Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Environment Canada; Indian and Northern Affairs; etc); AND • A detailed map of the proposed project and location. <p>MBQ will contact you regarding our interest in the project after reviewing the above documentation. Should MBQ have a significant interest in your project, we look forward to building a relationship with you to address matters of consultation, accommodation, and informed consent.</p> <p>We appreciate your participation in our endeavours to determine proper use of lands of interest to the community, the prevention or mitigation of anticipated and non-anticipated effects of the proposed project, and efforts to ensure maximum benefit to our community and generations to come.</p> <p>The above shall not be construed so as to derogate from or abrogate any inherent, Aboriginal, treaty, constitutional, or legal rights of the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte.</p>	<p><i>A subsequent Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment was carried out in 2012 by New Directions Archaeology, in support of the EPR Addendum to address areas within Study Area not previously assessed. A copy of that report can be found in Appendix G [of the EPR Addendum]. The majority of the study corridor lies within the existing right-of-way and is generally disturbed due to roadway construction and surrounding residential and commercial land uses and utilities.</i></p> <p><i>...During field investigations the Study Area was visually determined to be disturbed by roadway, parking lot, building, and railroad track construction and subsequent berming and was therefore not subject to test pit survey. No cultural material was recovered during the assessment. As a result, the Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment Report (Appendix G) recommended that no further archaeological assessment is required. Should the boundaries of the Study Area change to include lands outside the current plan, further Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended.</i></p> <p>From Section 5.3.2 – Detailed Assessment of the Impacts, Proposed Mitigation, And Monitoring of the Transit Project: The Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment Report has been submitted to the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport in compliance with Section 65 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports.</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Consultation with relevant stakeholders, including any applicable Aboriginal communities, will be initiated in the event that archaeological resources or human remains are discovered. If cultural heritage resources (such as archaeological sites, artefacts, building and structural remains, and/or human burials) are discovered during excavation, the following procedures will apply:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work shall be suspended until an assessment has been completed by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport; and 2. YRRTC / TTC shall perform required measures to mitigate negative impacts on found resources as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport. <p><i>In addition, if human burials are encountered, the Registrar/Deputy Registrar of the Cemeteries Regulation Unit, Ministry of Government and Consumer Services will also be notified.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any comments or review-type documentation provided by involved government parties (i.e, the Ministry of Natural Resources; Ministry of the Environment; Department of Fisheries and Oceans; Environment Canada; Indian and Northern Affairs; etc.); <p><i>The consultation program undertaken for the EPR Addendum is documented in Section 2 of the report, and consultation material presented throughout the study is available for review in Appendices I-K;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A detailed map of the proposed project and location. <p><i>See attached Figures 1-4 and 3-5a-c, excerpted from Sections 1.4 and 3.2 respectively.</i></p> <p>We trust that this information will help your agency determine its interest in the project. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>
	September 30, 2014 (received by proponents October 3, 2014)	We have had the opportunity to review Yonge Subway Extension - Train Storage Facility Environmental Project Report Addendum. The Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte (MBQ) lack adequate financial means to be consulted fully and provide the informed consent that you are seeking. To that extent, MBQ does not waive any of our Treaty rights to our traditional territory as a result of this development project.	<p><i>Response sent by email on October 8, 2014:</i></p> <p>Thank you for your letter and feedback regarding archaeological resources and associated mitigation measures. As documented in the Environmental Project Report (EPR) Addendum, a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment has been completed as part of the assessment of the proposed works. A copy of this Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment is available online at: http://www.vivanext.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Appendix-G-Arch-Assessment-Report.pdf. Given the findings of the Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment, it is anticipated</p>

**Yonge Subway Extension Train Storage Facility
Environmental Project Report Addendum - Public Review Period Feedback**

Reviewer	Date	Comment	Response
		<p>It is an inviolable obligation to protect the remains of our ancestors and we ask that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBQ be informed immediately should any archaeological burial remains or artifacts be identified • Further Stage 2 archaeological assessment is completed should the boundaries of the study area change to include lands outside of the current plan; and • Work be suspended and YRRTC/TTC perform required measurements to mitigate negative impacts on found resources should any cultural resources and/or burial remains be discovered during excavation. <p>There is a traditional process that must be followed for the repatriation or re-internment of remains. Further, MBQ implores YRRTC / TTC to take the appropriate measurements should any adverse impacts to the environment be identified during the excavation.</p> <p>We appreciate your participation in our endeavours to determine proper use of lands of interest to the community, the prevention or mitigation of anticipated and non-anticipated effects of the proposed project, and efforts to ensure maximum benefit to our community and generations to come.</p> <p>The above shall not be construed so as to derogate from or abrogate any inherent, Aboriginal, treaty, constitutional, or legal rights of the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte.</p>	<p>that archaeological resources will not be discovered during construction.</p> <p>The mitigation measures identified in your letter are in keeping with commitments for this project. As noted in the EPR Addendum, although archaeological resources are not anticipated to be discovered mitigation measures are in place should resources (e.g. archaeological sites, artifacts, building and structural remains, and/or human burials) be discovered during construction. If resources are discovered work will be suspended and follow up will occur with the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. If human remains are found the local police and the Cemeteries Regulation Unit of the Ontario Ministry of Government and Consumer Services will be notified. Where resources may be of interest to an Aboriginal community, or communities, outreach will occur to engage with the relevant communities. The EPR Addendum also commits to further Stage 2 archaeological assessment, as warranted, should the boundaries of the study area change to include lands outside of the current plan.</p> <p>With the above in mind, we are confirming that appropriate mitigation measures are in place and will be followed during construction.</p> <p>For further discussion regarding the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte's interests and approach to engagement please contact:</p> <p>Stephen Hollinger, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager York Region Rapid Transit Corporation Email: stephen.hollinger@york.ca Phone: 905-886-6767 ext. 71032</p>
Chief Marianna Couchie Nipissing First Nation	September 29, 2014	Nipissing First Nation has no interest in the Younge subway extension. We are 344 kms north of Toronto.	Feedback noted. No response required.
Grand Chief Peters Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians	September 29, 2014	<p><i>Comment in response to a follow up email re: notification letter:</i></p> <p>Please explain what you are intending to express.</p>	<p><i>Response sent by email on October 8, 2014:</i></p> <p>This is further to previous correspondence to the Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians regarding the proposed underground train storage facility and associated aboveground buildings. The assessment of the proposed works has been documented in a report, the Environmental Project Report Addendum, which is currently available for review. The noticed provided with the follow up email, and with the August 28, 2014 letter, includes information regarding where hardcopies of the report are available for review as well as online access from www.vivanext.com.</p> <p>The intent of this follow up was to request feedback regarding any interest your organization has in the proposed change to the transit project. However, the 30-day review period ended on Monday, October 6. If you would like additional clarification or to discuss how your organization wishes to participate please contact me.</p>
Chief James R. Marsden Alderville First Nation	September 29, 2014	<p><i>Comment in response to a follow up email re: notification letter:</i></p> <p>I included Dave Simpson on the thread of emails..Dave looks after our concerns around projects...</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p><i>Follow up email sent to Mr. Simpson on October 8, 2014:</i></p> <p>As you may know, the official review period for the Yonge Subway Extension - Train Storage Facility, Environmental Project Report Addendum ended this past Monday, October 6, 2014. I have not received any comments back from Alderville First Nations with respect to the proposed addendum. If you have any comments or concerns, please send your feedback to me by Friday, October 10, 2014.</p> <p><i>Note: No further comments were received.</i></p>
Chief Phyllis Williams Curve Lake First Nation	September 30, 2013	<p><i>Comment in response to a follow up email re: notification letter:</i></p> <p>thank you for this.</p>	Feedback noted. No response required.

**Yonge Subway Extension Train Storage Facility
Environmental Project Report Addendum - Public Review Period Feedback**

Reviewer	Date	Comment	Response
Melanie Vincent, Coordinator Huron-Wendat Nation	October 1, 2014	<p>Good morning Danielle, the Huron-Wendat Nation has received your correspondence about the project (train storage facility). I am the Coordinator for all Huron Wendat related files in Ontario and I work for the Huron Wendat Nation Council and Grand Chief Sioui.</p> <p>There is a Huron archeological site located within 300 meters of the right of way and therefore, there is potential for encountering an ossuary. The Huron-Wendat Nation would like to be engaged in the monitoring of the project construction and we are available to discuss what York Region is planning to do with regards to our Nation's interests / consultation in this project. Can you please contact me as soon as possible so that we can discuss it ?</p> <p>Thank you!!</p> <p>Have a nice day!</p>	<p><i>Response sent by email on October 8, 2014:</i></p> <p>Thank you for your response and feedback regarding archaeological potential. A Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment has been completed as part of the assessment of the proposed works. That Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment included consideration of registered archaeological sites within 1 km of the proposed works and included in that was a Huron site known as the Two Pines site (Borden # AkGu56).</p> <p>The Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment found that the majority of the study corridor lies within the existing right-of-way and is generally disturbed due to roadway construction and surrounding residential and commercial land uses and utilities. During field investigations the study area was visually determined to be disturbed by roadway, parking lot, building, and railroad track construction and subsequent berming and was therefore not subject to test pit survey. A copy of this Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment is available online at: http://www.vivanext.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Appendix-G-Arch-Assessment-Report.pdf.</p> <p>It is noteworthy that the Two Pines site, a cabin site, was discovered in 1991 during a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment associated with Highway 407. Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment was completed followed by a Stage 4 salvage excavation in 1994 and the site was subsequently cleared of any additional archaeological concern. With that in mind and given the findings of the Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment completed for the proposed Train Storage Facility, it is anticipated that archaeological resources will not be discovered during construction.</p> <p>As noted in the Environmental Project Report Addendum, although archaeological resources are not anticipated to be discovered mitigation measures are in place should resources (e.g. archaeological sites, artifacts, building and structural remains, and/or human burials) be discovered during construction. If resources are discovered work will be suspended and follow up will occur with the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. If human remains are found the local police and the Cemeteries Regulation Unit of the Ontario Ministry of Government and Consumer Services will be notified. Where resources may be of interest to an Aboriginal community, or communities, outreach will occur to engage with the relevant communities.</p> <p>For further discussion regarding the Huron-Wendat Nation's interests and approach to engagement please contact:</p> <p>Stephen Hollinger, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager York Region Rapid Transit Corporation Email: stephen.hollinger@york.ca Phone: 905-886-6767 ext. 71032</p>
Jim Meness, Councillor Algonquins of Pikwàkanagàn First Nation	October 6, 2014	The project is outside of the Algonquin Territory. For your correspondence, I trust you will be in contact with the appropriate First Nation who's territory this project is within.	Feedback noted. No response required.
Local Residents			
Local resident	Week of September 8, 2014	<p><i>Summary of inquiry via telephone call:</i></p> <p>Questioning how addresses/personal information was collected and distributed regarding the EPR TSF Addendum and review period.</p>	<p><i>Response by telephone call on the same day:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apologized for misunderstanding and said thank you for the feedback. • Explanation that property information was given to us by York Region GIS Department. • Explained that this information is collected quarterly from MPAC and if there are inaccuracies that is should be reported back to MPAC.
Resident of Coburg Crescent	September 15/16, 2014	<p><i>Summary of inquiry via telephone call:</i></p> <p>Had questions regarding the above ground facility and was concerned about garbage being kept onsite. Also concerned about property values depreciating with constructions of this train storage facility.</p>	<p><i>Response by telephone call on September 17, 2014:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for the feedback • Explanation of facility and purpose/what would be contained • Discussed public meetings and feedback that was included in the addendum • Advised to review information on website

**Yonge Subway Extension Train Storage Facility
Environmental Project Report Addendum - Public Review Period Feedback**

Reviewer	Date	Comment	Response
Resident of Coburg Crescent	September 15/16, 2014	<p><i>Summary of inquiry via telephone call:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wanted to know exactly where the Train Storage Facility would be located (below ground) Wanted to know where Richmond Hill Centre was. 	<p><i>Response by telephone call on September 22, 2014:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for the feedback Explanation of location of Train Storage Facility (underground north of Richmond Hill Centre) facility and purpose/what would be contained Advised to review information on website
Local resident	September 22, 2014	<p><i>Summary of inquiry via telephone call:</i></p> <p>Looking for general information about the project and Yonge Subway Extension in general (i.e. timing etc.).</p>	<p><i>Response by telephone call on September 22, 2014:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of Yonge Subway Extension project and funding to date Advised to review information on website including links to other general project information as well as EPR Addendum information
Resident of Coburg Crescent	September 28, 2014	<p>I wish to bring forward my concerns and strong objections about the proposed train storage facility, Yonge subway extension and the rapid transit lanes on Yonge street.</p> <p>I live in the alcove of Bantry and Yonge on Coburg Crescent. I live with two seniors.</p> <p>It is my understanding that the rapid transit on Yonge street is scheduled for construction from 2014 to 2018.</p> <p>Project timelines for Yonge subway extension and the proposed train storage facility is unknown. At least I could not find them on the website.</p> <p>The environmental study and I specifically looked at noise and vibration study to say that a layperson could understand what it is said would be an understatement.</p> <p>I work at Yonge and Finch (5650 n 5700 Yonge street), and can unequivocally state that the vibration I can feel on 12th floor of the building at night is unacceptable in a residential area. I don't live at Yonge and Finch area for the reason that I don't want noise and vibration in my home. I had checked out the Tridel buildings in the area. Also, I don't want a terrorist attack that blows up my home.</p> <p>Couple of nights ago I was breathing the fresh air and enjoying a quiet and beautiful night on Coburg Cres you are threatening this by building a railway yard in my front yard.</p> <p>It is obvious, that you have not listened to the people who have already brought in their objection to this build. However, I will still place my strong objection to this proposal.</p> <p>So let's see, on one side you are asking me to put up with the rapid transit builds, noise of construction and the constant traffic jams for 4 years. Then either during that time or after that time you will build the Yonge subway extension and then the rail yard storage facility. The rail yard storage facility will then essentially add on to the already existing noise we face with CN Rail. Further this will be a continuous noise till such time I move away from this location. Previously, I had no intention of moving for the 20 years.</p> <p>So essentially for the next ten years, I and my two seniors are being asked to put up with noise pollution and constant inconvenience in</p>	<p><i>Response sent by email on October 9, 2014:</i></p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Yonge Subway Extension – Train Storage Facility Environmental Project Report (EPR) Addendum. We have reviewed your comments, and are pleased to provide the following response to your concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re: Project Timeline and Impact of Overlapping Construction <p>Construction of the Yonge Subway Extension is anticipated to take approximately six years, once funding has been secured. As noted in the 2009 EPR and the EPR Addendum, a number of additional studies will be completed during the design/construction phase of the project. Specific related task commitments are listed in Section 6.3 of the EPR Addendum. One of the commitments is development of traffic, transit and pedestrian management strategies to be included in construction contract documents. Those strategies would include consideration of other construction activities that would overlap with this project.</p> <p>Furthermore, Section 6.3 of the EPR Addendum includes commitments related to development of a construction noise mitigation plan, vibration monitoring and post construction noise and vibration monitoring.</p> Re: Potential Noise and Vibration Impacts <p>It is important to note that the Train Storage Facility (TSF) is primarily an underground facility. Aboveground facilities will include buildings and 'ancillary' equipment, such as surface Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) equipment required for the operation of the underground TSF. This facility will house 12 trains for overnight storage and one or two trains will be kept at the Richmond Hill Centre Station platforms overnight.</p> <p>The noise and vibration assessment was completed to identify the potential noise and vibration impacts of the construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed TSF, and to identify measures to mitigate those impacts. This analysis was carried out in accordance with current criteria developed by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC), and the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC).</p> <p>It is recognized that the Noise and Vibration Report appended to the Environmental Project Report (EPR) Addendum is a technical document. With that in mind, the results of the Noise and Vibration Assessment are summarized in more general terms in Section 5.2.2 of the EPR Addendum which can be found here: http://www.vivanext.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Yonge_Subway_Extension_EPR_Addendum-Section_5-Impact_Assessment.pdf</p> <p>With reference to Section 5.2.2 of the EPR Addendum, the following details may further assist with understanding the findings:</p> <p><u>Construction:</u></p> <p>Construction noise levels will vary over time as the activities at the site change. Construction noise impacts are temporary in nature, and generally unavoidable. Although construction noise will be noticeable for some periods and types of work, with adequate controls impacts can be minimized.</p> <p>A Construction "Code of Practice" has been identified to mitigate the potential impacts from construction noise. As listed in Section 5.2.2.2 of the EPR Addendum, a number of provisions have been identified to mitigation the potential impacts from construction noise.</p>

**Yonge Subway Extension Train Storage Facility
Environmental Project Report Addendum - Public Review Period Feedback**

Reviewer	Date	Comment	Response
		<p>moving around the area. You are going to make a perfectly beautiful and convenient location a nightmare for the next ten years I don't think my seniors will even survive this project.</p> <p>First and foremost, do you really need a rapid transit system on Yonge? Especially when you have a Yonge subway extension in the works.</p> <p>Second, the York buses cannot use the rapid extension because they have more stops. The rapid section is more likely to be used by the blue, purple and pink lines.</p> <p>Third, you have not provided the amount of time that is going to be saved by the rapid transit system. The site only indicated it will save time or time will be consistent nothing else. There is an HOV lane why not just extend the HOV lane further up north.</p> <p>Fourth, and probably the most important, everyone is aware of the construction monopoly and the extensive time taken for any construction project that involves the cities or provinces funds.</p> <p>My father was in construction so I am fully cognizant of the fact that something that may be take a year to be built in private sector takes twice the amount of funds and time in the public sector.</p> <p>Now for the railway storage yard. It should not be any where near residences period. Your presentations on option 5 and option 3 are not detailed. However, since they will not effect residents it should be the preferred option.</p> <p>Dropping of property values is but one outcome, it the nightmare of going through three construction projects for extended period of time. The mental stress you are inflicting on the residents of Richmond hill has not been taken into consideration.</p> <p>You appear to not care or value the mental health and well being of the residents of Richmond Hill.</p> <p>Last but not the least, I don't want my home to be sitting duck to terrorist attacks.</p> <p>I was excited about the Yonge subway extension because it was only till Richmond hill centre and would not have noise and vibration effect in my alcove.</p> <p>So, in short this is a matter of grave importance and consequences and I am placing my strong objections and I kindly request that you drop the whole idea of building a rail storage facility in my front yard.</p>	<p><u>Operations and Maintenance:</u></p> <p>Section 5.2.2.3 of the EPR Addendum outlines details related to guideline limits for noise associated with this type of facility. Excesses over the guideline limits are not expected in any noise sensitive areas, including residential properties. For example, the guidelines indicate that 'ancillary' equipment such as HVAC should not exceed 60 dBA at a 1 m distance in all public areas. For reference, 60 dBA can be compared to typical background noise levels in a large department store.</p> <p>Long term noise generated by the site will be limited to that generated by the surface Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) equipment required for the operation of the underground train storage facility. The TTC requires that all such ancillary equipment operate at low-noise levels in public spaces, and therefore is not expected to exceed the MOECC-governed limits for noise-sensitive areas (i.e. residential outdoor living areas).</p> <p>The vibration impact assessment assumes the track will be constructed using current TTC track bed and "double tie" designs, which reduce ground-borne noise and vibration. The TSF is planned to be approximately 20 m underground, with trains operating through the TSF at a very slow speed. Even with the conservative assumption of trains travelling of 60 km/h (actual speeds are anticipated to be lower) through the TSF, vibration levels generated by the operation of vehicles at the underground storage facility are expected to remain below the MOECC/TTC guideline limit at any of the vibration-sensitive locations in the study area. Therefore, no adverse vibration impacts from normal operations are anticipated.</p> <p>As noted in Section 6.3 of the EPR Addendum, post construction noise and vibration measurements will be completed to determine if "no adverse impact" was achieved as predicted in the noise and vibration impact analysis completed for the Train Storage Facility. For additional information, Section 6.3 can be found here: http://www.vivanext.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Yonge_Subway_Extension_EPR_Addendum-Section_6-Commitments.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Re: Security Concerns</p> <p>While the details of the proposed security system for the TSF will be developed during the design phase of the project, it is known that the TSF site will have controlled access for TTC employees; it will not be open to the public. The facility will be staffed overnight to provide a permanent presence for security purposes and additional measures to maintain site security may be reviewed once the project is in the engineering and detailed design phase. On a broader scale, TTC coordinates with the Toronto Police Services, the York Regional Police, and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) to identify potential threats and their associated risk, and responds accordingly.</p> <p>For additional information regarding TTC safety and security please visit: https://www.ttc.ca/Riding_the_TTC/Safety_and_Security/index.jsp.</p> <p>Re: Consideration of Public Feedback</p> <p>Stakeholders have been consulted regarding this project on a number of occasions, as outlined in Section 2 of the EPR Addendum. The comments received by the public have been given sincere consideration and changes were made to the design of the TSF to mitigate the concerns of the public, including a redesign of the surface elements of the TSF, and additional commitments for noise and vibration controls during construction.</p> <p>As noted in Section 6.4 of the EPR Addendum, a commitment has been made for continued consultation with the public, property owners and stakeholder agencies during the detailed design of the Yonge Subway Extension including, but not limited to, the TSF and ancillary facilities proposed in the EPR Addendum.</p> <p>Re: Need for Rapid Transit along Yonge Street</p> <p>Over the next 20 years, York Region's population is expected to increase by 50% and the number of jobs by 100%. To help manage this growth, a faster and more convenient rapid transit system is essential.</p> <p>Yonge Street is one of the main arteries in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area – and has been for generations. That is why it is vital to move the planned Yonge subway extension forward along with other proposed transit projects, steadily improving the overall transportation network.</p> <p>York Region is working together with Metrolinx, TTC and City of Toronto on a Regional Relief Strategy to develop a comprehensive plan to improve transit along the Yonge corridor and improve the daily lives of people for generations to come. This is a comprehensive approach that is looking at all options, including service improvements, fare and network integration, and new rapid transit projects so that you can go</p>

**Yonge Subway Extension Train Storage Facility
Environmental Project Report Addendum - Public Review Period Feedback**

Reviewer	Date	Comment	Response
			<p>where you want, when you want – comfortably, conveniently and reliably.</p> <p>Additional information regarding planning and implementing vivaNext Bus Rapid Transit in York Region is available online at vivanext.com. If after reviewing that information you have additional comments or questions related to transit projects in York Region, please contact your Community Liaison, Leslie Pawlowski, at 905-886-6767 ext. 71357 or at leslie.pawlowski@york.ca.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re: Construction Procurement Methods <p>Your desire for fiscally responsible and time efficient construction has been noted. The method of procurement for the implementation of the subway extension will be determined at a later date. Currently, we remain focused on obtaining funding to implement the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re: Location of Proposed Train Storage Facility <p>As discussed in Section 3 of the EPR Addendum, the location of the proposed TSF was identified through a Conceptual Design Study. Alternatives were developed and assessed related to design requirements and evaluation criteria. As noted in Section 3.1.2 of the EPR Addendum, some of the options (i.e. Options 3, 4 and 5) were determined not to meet the design criteria and as a result were not further assessed. The evaluation criteria included impacts to adjacent lands and land uses. Table 3-1 of the EPR Addendum provides a summary of the assessment of alternatives. For additional information regarding the Conceptual Design, please refer to the Conceptual Design Report available online at: http://www.vivanext.com/files/EnvironmentalAssessments/YongeExtension/Conceptual%20Design%20Report/ConceptualDesignReport.pdf.</p>
	October 15, 2014	<p><i>Summary of inquiry/questions via telephone call:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train storage facility being constructed very close to her home • Depreciation of home value • Noise associated with construction and train operations • What are the next steps in this process? • What can I do to stop this project? 	<p><i>Response by telephone call on October 15, 2014:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for the feedback • Explained that all of her comments and concerns will be included as part of the review process • Mentioned that we would look into the next steps and be in touch. <p><i>Note: No new concerns have been raised through the October 15, 2014 comments. A response will be sent by the proponent.</i></p>