

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
<p>March 26 2013 Mike Delgrande's Office Attch 03-26-13 A</p>	<p>Hi Jennifer,</p> <p>Good speaking with you. Sorry you couldn't open the attachment. I am resending the pdf. Please let me know if you're able to open it.</p> <p>With regard to the stakeholders listed in your email, I was planning on visiting them personally (as well as any other neighbouring properties) in April so that we can start building a relationship with them. If there is someone specific that I should be speaking with, please let me know.</p> <p>We can discuss this further once you have the notice in hand.</p> <p>Thanks, Lito Romano</p>	<p>Public Notice associated with Soil Testing Activity April 2013- May 2013 Attch 03-26-13 AR</p>
	<p>Good Afternoon Lito:</p> <p>With the assistance of Carol McDonald from our office, I have the contact information for the following properties, as requested:</p> <p>Mon Sheong [REDACTED]</p> <p>Villa Elegance [REDACTED]</p> <p>Scarborough Chinese Baptist Church [REDACTED]</p> <p>Commercial Building [REDACTED]</p> <p>As was discussed at the November 28th, 2012 meeting, we will send your flyer (attached) with a cover letter from our office to the four properties.</p> <p>Regards, Jennifer Coutinho, PMP</p>	
<p>October 2, 2013 [REDACTED] Monsheong Foundation</p>	<p>Hello Lito,</p> <p>Thank you for your offering to meet us and letting us know of the project details. Can you let me know when is the good time in the coming weeks for the meeting, preferably in our [REDACTED] facility. We will have representatives from the Board to attend the meeting.</p> <p>Thanks and regards, [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
October 31 2013 Dave Simpson Alderville First Nation	TTC invitation to Open House and offer to meet	Project is deemed a level 3, having minimal potential to impact First Nations Rights. Requested to be kept apprised of archaeological finds. Attch 10-31-13 AR
November 1 2013 Lori Louck Hiawatha First Nation	TTC invitation to Open House and offer to meet	Project is deemed as having minimal potential to impact First Nations rights. Requested to be kept apprised of archaeological finds. Attch 11-1-13 AR
November 5 2013 Villa Elegance Bamburgh Gate	TTC will be hosting an open house to share preliminary plans for a new bus garage near Kennedy Road and McNicoll Ave. Details of the event are as follows: Date: November 27, 2013 Time: 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. Location: Kennedy Public School 20 Elmfield Crescent Event flyers in English and Chinese are attached. Kindly share this information with anyone who may be interested in learning more about this project. Thank you, Lito Romano	Dear Lito Flyer received. Will post the notice and advise our resident of the open house meeting. Thanks. [REDACTED] Property Manager Brookfield Residential Services Agent For And On Behalf of MTCC1278 - Villa Elegance [REDACTED]
November 20 2013 Chief Sharon Stinson Henry Chipewas of Rama First Nation	TTC invitation to Open House and offer to meet	Acknowledge receipt. Attch 11-30-13 AR
November 27 2013 [REDACTED] Heathwood Ratepayers Association	Invitation to First Open House	Lito Thanks for sending me this invitation. Some residents from the Heathwood Community were already planning to attend. I will share this info with others Regards [REDACTED]
December 9 2013 Adam Brutto TCDSB	Lito, I am emailing on behalf of the TCDSB's Planning Services department. I was wondering if you would be able to provide us with a copy of the presentation from the November 27 th , 2013 open house regarding the construction of the New McNicoll Bus Garage? I have attached the flyer that you had previously forwarded to us. Your response to this message is greatly appreciated. Regards, Adam	Hi Adam Thanks for your email. A copy of the presentation panels are available on the project website where we will also post updates as we move forward. You can access the site and the panels at the following link: http://www.ttc.ca/About the TTC/Projects/McNicoll Bus Garage/index.jsp Can I address future correspondence about this project to you? Thanks
December 12 2013 Sheri Taylor Chipewas of Georgina First Nation	Invitation to First Open House	Acknowledge receipt and keep us apprised of project developments Attch 12-12-13 AR
January 26 2014 [REDACTED]	Request 01-26-14 to meet with the residents	TTC agreeable to meeting


Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
President Bamburgh Manor Gate Condo Complex Attch 01-26-14 A		Attch 01-26-14 AR
February 13 2014 [Redacted]	Petition from Mon Sheong residents opposing the garage	Response provided addressing each of the concerns. Attch 02-13-14 AR
February 26 2014 [Redacted] President Bamburgh Manor Gate Condo Complex	Hi [Redacted], Pleasure speaking with you today. As agreed, kindly forward dates when you and your Board Members may be able to meet with TTC to further discuss the proposed TTC McNicoll Bus Garage. Regards,	Got your email Lito. Will send you the list of dates once I have them prepared. [Redacted]
April 7 2014 Scarborough Chinese Baptist Church	Hi Lito, It has been 5 months since we met and we have no news from TTC. We'd appreciate if you would update us on the McNicoll bus garage project. Specifically we have follow-up questions on the page titled "Next Steps" in the handout material you provided on November 4, 2013: 1. Have Public Open House #2 (scheduled for early 2014) and #3 (scheduled for spring 2014) been held? If yes, when were these open houses held? If no, why the delays and what is your revised schedule? 2. You informed us that URS will be preparing an Environmental Project Report in mid-2014. Kindly provide the terms of reference and scope of work, which I requested in the November 2013 meeting, for information and review. 3. You informed us that TTC will commence the Transit Project Assessment Process. What does the process entail and what are the steps in this process? Has the process been started? What is the current status or plan? We look forward to hearing from you. We'd appreciate timely and periodic updates. As you know, our church is very concerned about adverse impacts of the TTC garage on the environment and our congregation. Have a very nice week [Redacted]	Hi [Redacted], Thank you for the follow up email. Below are the responses to each of your questions: 1. The next public open house for the McNicoll Bus Garage is scheduled for May 14. This event was originally scheduled for March however the design work (operational issues) took longer than expected. TTC did not feel there was sufficient information to return to the community and thus the meeting was pushed to May 14 2014. Public Open House #3 is scheduled for fall 2014. 2. URS will be preparing the Environmental Project Report. The scope is outlined in the Transit Project Assessment Process (click on the link for the document -a copy was also provided in my original response). URS' scope of work includes preparing this report as per the Provincial Ministry of the Environment. I would draw your attention to section 3.2.4 Documentation Requirements which provides further details. 3. The full details of the TPAP are outlined here Transit Project Assessment Process , however a simplified graphic (draft below) may help explain the process. Note that we are currently in the Pre-Planning Activities stage Meeting with Executive confirmed for May 26 2014
April 9 2014 [Redacted] Mon Sheong	Hi [Redacted], I wanted to follow up on TTC's commitment to meet with the residents of Mon Sheong to share more details about the McNicoll Bus Garage. Please advise on two possible dates the week of May 21 that may be suitable for this presentation. Please also advise if you would prefer a morning, afternoon or evening event for the residents? Note that TTC will also be hosting a public meeting on May 14 - I will send you English and Chinese notices with details as soon as they are ready. A translator will also be available at that event should anyone require such services. Thank you, Lito Romano	Meeting confirmed for May 21 2014
May 1 2014 Dave Simpson Alderville First Nation	Invitation to Second Open House and offer to meet to share details on the project	Project is deemed a level 3, having minimal potential to impact First Nations Rights. Requested to be kept apprised of archaeological finds. Attch 05-01-14 AR
May 22, 2014	Hi Joby,	Hi ,

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
Lito's correspondence with Toronto Fire Services	<p>TTC is planning to build a bus garage at Kennedy and McNicoll (start 2016). Our neighbour is a long term care facility whose residents have expressed concern on how we (or more likely the Toronto Fire) would evacuate the residents if there were ever a blast at the TTC garage. They are particularly concerned about a diesel refueling station which we have relocated further away from their building. The site is zone heavy industrial and permits the use of a bus garage.</p> <p>What assurance can we provide the community that EMS and TFS are capable of dealing with any emergencies which may arise. We have explained to them that diesel is not an explosive gas when not under pressure.</p> <p>Thanks, Lito Romano</p>	<p>Long term care facilities Staff are obligated by law to evacuate the residence. They have plans in place for outside issues as well as inside. TFS members would of course assist once on scene. They will have agreements (mutual aid) with other homes to take the residence should they not be able to return to the home overnight or longer. (I'm sure the TTC will provide buses as needed to them). This could be an advantage to being neighbours should they have a major internal issue.</p> <p>I don't see any reason other than it may be bit noisy for the residence. I hate seeing residential and industrial lots next to each other but it happens in this City.</p> <p>Jim Acting District Chief</p>
May 22 2014 Chief Sharon Stinson Henry Chipewas of Rama First Nation	Invitation to Second Open House and offer to meet to share details on the project	<p>Acknowledge Receipt. Copy forwarded to Karry Sandy-McKenzie, Barrister and Solicitor.</p> <p>Attch 05-22-14 AR</p>
April 22 2014 TRCA	ON-site meeting to review TRCA requirements	<p>Minutes</p> <p>TRCA advised that waterway to the north must be maintained.</p> <p>04-22-14 AR</p>
May 9 2014 Lorna Zappone MOECC	TTC request for list of Aboriginal Communities	<p>Response from MOECC with details</p> <p>Attch 05-09-14 AR</p>
May 27 2014	Bamburgh Gate Condominium – Open House and Presentation to residents and Condo Board to share details about the project and answer questions.	<p>Minutes Prepared</p> <p>Attach 05-27-14 AR</p>
May 27 2014 Angelo Sangiorgio TCDSB	TTC request for comments on Project	<p>TCDSB prefers that for the safety of pedestrians and drivers at Mary Ward School, vehicular access to the TTC property be provided via an extension of Redlea Ave</p> <p>Attch 05-27-14 BR</p>
06-04-14 President Villa Elegance (Bamburgh Gate Condo)	Concerns raised about safety pollution and traffic	<p>Response sent. Concerns have been addressed in draft EPR</p> <p>Attch 06-04-14 AR</p>
June 7 2014 Heathwood Ratepayers Association	<p>Lito</p> <p>The 2 Heathwood residents in the note below showed up at our Board Meeting on Thursday and were really concerned that the above ground diesel tank planned for the TTC garage will be in close proximity of the GO line and could be hit by a train.</p> <p>Can you please advise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. why the tank is above ground rather than underground like at all service stations 2. Where will it be located on the site 3. Will it be protected by a dyke in case of a leak 4. Will you have a pump to transfer the diesel into to the tank 	<p>Hi [REDACTED],</p> <p>Thank you for your email. I know there is a some misinformation in the community about the proposed McNicoll Bus Garage even though TTC presented material at the open houses to address the issues. I appreciate you reaching out and asking these questions. I am hoping that we will be able address the issues raised by your ratepayers.</p> <p>In response to your questions, I offer the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why are diesel tanks above ground rather than underground like at all service stations? <p>TTC diesel storage tanks are situated at surface level as they are safer when it comes to detecting fuel leaks. Possible leaks are easier to detect</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>5. Do you have underground tanks at other garages?</p> <p>Also, at the last Community meeting you had a chart showing bus traffic in and out of the garage being mainly on Redlea. I remember seeing traffic mainly (55%) on Redlea South etc.</p> <p>Can you please send me a copy of that chart and the one with the number of buses in and out at different hours.</p> <p>Lastly didn't you have a chart showing how buses are refueled?</p> <p>I would appreciate your reply as soon as possible</p> <p>Thanks  President HRA</p>	<p>and thus pose a low environmental risk. Slow leaks of petroleum products can lead to major environmental contamination, leading to costly clean up and remediation.</p> <p>The tanks used by TTC have double walls (sealed tank within another sealed tank) and are fire rated. If the primary tank was to develop a leak, it would be safely contained within the secondary tank. The space between the tanks contains a vacuum and is equipped with a fuel leak detection system, so any perforation of the primary tank is quickly detected.</p> <p>These tanks have a two-hour fire rating. This rating protects the tank contents from fire for a minimum of two hours, which will provide time for Emergency Services to respond in the event of a fire. The tanks have also passed impact testing and are protected with a combination of jersey barriers and bollards. All tanks are ULC- approved fire rated.</p> <p>One of the reasons fuel supplier may decide to bury their tanks is the lack of space available at surface. It's not always easy or cheap to find storage for 50,000 litre reservoir tanks in dense urban settings. Given that the flash point of diesel is significantly different than that of regular gasoline, their storage requirements may also differ. To illustrate this, a diesel fuel spill will not ignite with a flame unlike regular gas.</p> <p>2. Where will the tank be located on the site?</p> <p>The tanks will be located at the east side of the building. I refer you the presentation panels from our public meeting on May 14, 2014. Slides 18 and 22 include an image of what the fuel tanks look like (encased in concrete and protected by yellow concrete bollards). Slide 22 shows the location of the refueling station at the easterly side of the building. This is at the opposite end of Mon Sheong. People concerned about a potential fire should know that the entire building would act as buffer between MonSheong and the reservoir tanks.</p> <p>The tanks were relocated to this side of the building in response to noise concerns from Mon Sheong. Given that buses will be refueled at night, this area is expected to generate noise and thus the designers were able to adjust the layout, closer to the tracks to accommodate their concerns.</p> <p>People opposed to the garage have talked about the impact of a possible derailment. Although the facility is adjacent to the GO Rail corridor the track alignment in the vicinity of the garage runs straight without any cross overs or switches. Straight track presents the least risk for train derailments compared to special track work. Also the Milliken GO station is within 1.0 KM of the McNicoll garage therefore northbound trains will be decreasing their speed while southbound trains will be beginning to accelerate. Trains are not anticipated to travel past the bus garage at full speed. The probability of a derailment at this site affecting TTC's diesel storage tanks is extremely remote.</p> <p>Here are the panels that containing the images: http://www.ttc.ca/PDF/Transit_expansion_PDFs/McNicollBusGarage_DisplayBoards_05142014.pdf</p> <p>3. Will it be protected by a dyke?</p> <p>Dyke protection is not required as the tanks are provided with a secondary containment system. See response #1 for more details.</p> <p>4. Will you have a pump to transfer diesel into the tanks?</p> <p>The diesel is supplied via tanker trucks which have a pump on board of their vehicle. TTC will not use stationary pumps to fill the tanks.</p> <p>5. Does TTC have underground tanks at other garages?</p> <p>Of the eight garages operated by TTC, six are above ground and the remaining two are underground. TTC has a plans to have these two brought to the surface for the reasons noted above.</p> <p>The presentation panels include a graphic showing bus flow volumes (as a percentage) see slide 28. 80% of the buses will use Redlea to access north and south routes, with the balance using McNicoll Ave.</p> <p>The timing and frequency of buses entering and exiting the facility is captured in slides 26 and 27.</p> <p>Slide 18 includes a photo of a typical diesel tank (lower right corner). You will note that it is encased in concrete and protected by bollards – primarily to protect against vehicular impact.</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
		<p>Slide 22 identifies the flow of buses within the facility, including the location of the refueling station.</p> <p>I hope this helps. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate contacting me.</p> <p>Thanks again for your questions.</p> <p>Lito Romano</p>
		<p>██████ and ██████,</p> <p>Further to our meeting at Kennedy School on June 5, I questioned the TTC about the above ground diesel tank and the proximity to the GO Train.</p> <p>Their answer is below.</p> <p>I am satisfied that the above ground tank is double wall and protected by a concrete wall and bollards as shown on slide #18.</p> <p>You can also see a bus road between the tank and the East end of the property which would act as a buffer in the unlikely scenario that the Go Train would derail in this straight section.</p> <p>For these reasons, I am not concerned that the diesel tank be a risk for our Community.</p> <p>Regards ██████</p>
<p>June 9 2014 Chris Williams</p> <p>Attch 06-09-14</p>	<p>Dear Councillor Augimeri,</p> <p>Attached please find Mr. Williams' correspondence of today's date.</p> <p>Thank you and best regards.</p>	<p>Mr. Williams,</p> <p>Thank you for your letters of June 9th and 27th, 2014 relating to the above noted matter. A copy of both of your letters have been forwarded to me for a response on behalf of my client, Toronto Transit Commission.</p> <p>Attached please find a copy of our response, together with a copy of the TTC's April 30th, 2014 Board Report and the Request for Work Plan as issued by TTC.</p> <p>If you have any further questions, please feel free to call.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Attch 06-27-9/14 AR</p>
<p>June 11 2014 ██████ Scarborough Chinese Baptist Church</p> <p>Attch 06-11-14 A</p>	<p>Concerns with locating the facility at the existing location</p>	<p>TTC response</p> <p>Attch 06-11-14 AR</p>
<p>June 22 2014 ██████</p>	<p>http://www.tsb.gc.ca/eng/surveillance-watchlist/rail/2012/rail_1.asp</p> <p>Hello Lito,</p> <p>Would you kindly provide me the source you are using to analyze the risk associated with collisions at level crossings.</p> <p>Currently, there are three: Steeles, Passmore, McNicoll.</p> <p>Thank you, ██████</p>	<p>Hi ██████,</p> <p>Thank you for clarifying the context of your question. I have looked into this further and provide you with the following:</p> <p>Buses travelling between an operating Division and their assigned route may have to use a road that passes over a level railway crossing as do the many buses that provide scheduled transit service on these roads. As these level railway crossings employ audible and visual warnings and physical barriers to stop vehicular traffic when a train is approaching, TTC does not have safety concerns related to the crossing protection that is provided.</p> <p>From a traffic operations perspective, a level railway crossing is similar to a signalized intersection. Given the operating characteristics of trains</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>The context is from an Emergency Management perspective. As you know, Steeles/Kennedy is the 2nd most dangerous intersection in Toronto (Sheppard/Kennedy being #1, Sheppard/McCowan #3). Traffic on McNicoll is problematic to bad (during rush hour) and there is a level crossing next to the garage where you plan to have your fuel storage beside the tracks. Finch/Kennedy is worse and you will have 50% of your buses trying to infiltrate into regular traffic at Milliken/Finch; this point is in close proximity to another level crossing. GO train service will increase (EA for double tracking underway) -- looking at 30 min service at least for most of the day. [REDACTED]</p>	<p>(i.e. they require a very long distance to stop), they are detected far enough upstream of the crossing to allow the crossing protection system to provide an adequate visual and audible warning and to lower the gates before the train reaches the level crossing enters the roadway.</p> <p>Virtually all the bus and employee traffic generated by a TTC Bus Operating Division occurs outside the peak traffic hours when traffic volumes on the road network are much lower than during the peak traffic periods. Given the operating characteristics of TTC Bus Operating Divisions, there will be few if any buses entering or leaving the facility during the AM or PM peak traffic periods. The majority of bus traffic to and from the Division will occur outside the busy traffic periods. In the evening transit service is reduced further meaning only a few buses assigned to provide overnight transit service on the Blue Night Network remain on the street during the overnight period.</p> <p>Similarly most of the employee traffic generated by the facility would be outside the peak roadway traffic periods since most employees at such facilities are Bus Operators and Bus Maintenance employees whose shifts begin and end outside the peak traffic periods.</p> <p>The impact of level railway crossings on a TTC Bus Operating Division would be no different than on any other land use that generates vehicular traffic in the vicinity of the level crossing. The traffic capacity of a road at a level railway crossing is determined by the number of trains using the level crossing, the length of the trains and the length of time between consecutive trains. As the bus and employee traffic generated by the proposed Bus Division would occur outside the peak traffic periods when traffic would be much lower, TTC does not expect that there would be traffic congestion at these railway crossings during these periods.</p> <p>Thank you again for your interest.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lito Romano</p>
<p>June 23 2014 Helen Leung Carefirst Seniors and Community Services Association 06-23-14 A</p>	<p>Concerns related to air, traffic and noise</p>	<p>TTC response provided and details addressed in EPR</p> <p>Attch 06-23-14 AR</p>
<p>June 27 2014 Chris Williams Attch 06-27-14 A</p>	<p>Dear Councillor Augimeri: Attached please find Mr. Williams' correspondence of today's date. Thank you so much.</p>	<p>Mr. Williams,</p> <p>Thank you for your letters of June 9th and 27th, 2014 relating to the above noted matter. A copy of both of your letters have been forwarded to me for a response on behalf of my client, Toronto Transit Commission.</p> <p>Attached please find a copy of our response, together with a copy of the TTC's April 30th, 2014 Board Report and the Request for Work Plan as issued by TTC.</p> <p>If you have any further questions, please feel free to call.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Attch- Response; 06-27-9/14 AR</p>
<p>July 4 2014 Chris Williams Attch 07-04-2014 A</p>	<p>Please see the attached correspondence of today's date from Christopher Williams. Thank you.</p>	<p>Mr. Williams,</p> <p>Attached please find TTC's correspondence dated July 11, 2014.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Michael Atlas</p> <p>Attch 07-04-14-AR</p>
<p>July 21 2014 [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Correspondence listing multiple concerns including, zoning, safety, traffic, noise and air quality</p>	<p>Concern addressed in reply email and throughout EPR.</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
Atch 07-21-14 A		Atch 07-21-14 AR
July 22 2014 Councillor Karygiannis	<p>Approximately 1700 individuals supporting the following petition presented to the TTC Board</p> <p>TTC Board Members</p> <p>I am writing to pass on the comments of the following individual that has signed the petition on my website against the proposed TTC Bus Garage at McNicoll and Kennedy</p> <p>They have joined in voicing their objection to the proposed TTC Bus Garage which will affect our daily lives in our area.</p> <p>The proposed TTC transit garage to maintain over 200 buses at the northeast corner of Kennedy Road and McNicoll Avenue, adjacent to Mon Sheong Seniors Home will introduce hundreds of buses on our streets and add more unwanted pollution in our area.</p> <p>It will exacerbate traffic congestion creating a gridlock in this busy, vibrant neighbourhood – where we have two seniors’ residences, a condominium, a high school with a student population of more than 1,000 students and a very busy community centre.</p> <p>They are not supporting this proposal, in its present form, for these and other reasons.</p> <p>They are demanding that the TTC Board consider an alternative area for this Bus transit garage.</p> <p>I am joining in their request and request that members of the TTC Board take their request very serious.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Regards, Jim Karygiannis</p>	<p>Minutes from TTC Board Meeting of July 23 2014</p> <p>Atch 07-22-14 AR</p>
July 22 2014 Christopher Williams Atch 07-22-14 A	<p>Please see the attached correspondence from Mr. Williams who will be a deputant at tomorrow’s meeting of the Board</p> <p>Thanks</p>	Presented to TTC Board Meeting of July 23, 2014
July 31 2014 Chris Williams Aird Berlis Attach 07-31-14 A	<p>Dear Mr. Atlas,</p> <p>Attached please find Mr. Williams’ correspondence of today’s date.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Mr. Williams,</p> <p>Please see attached correspondence of August 6th. As noted in the letter, in order to allow your clients a better opportunity to both review and comment on the EPR and to further facilitate discussions amongst our respective clients, the TTC will delay issuing the Notice of Commencement for at least two additional months (November 2014). In the interim, Marcello Favaro, TTC Senior Project Engineer will contact you to arrange for a meeting.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Michael Atlas</p> <p>Atch 07-31-14 AR</p>
August 6 2014 Dr. S.K. Lee St. Johns McNicoll Centre Atch 08-06-14 A	Concerned about air quality and impact to senior.	Details noted and addressed in EPR
August 25 2014 [REDACTED] Scarborough	Concerns about traffic and safety of church patrons crossing Redlea. TPAP should be terminated and project should be subject to full EA	Addressed in correspondence and EPR Atch

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
Chinese Baptist Church 08-25-14 A		08-25-14 AR
October 28 2014 Solange Desautels MOECC Attch 10-28-14 A	MOECC comments on EPR related to Air Quality	Comments addressed in the Traffic Assessment Report. Attach 10-28-14 AR
November 3, 2014 MOECC Attch 11-03-14 A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vacant lost noise receptors 2. Noise source summary table 3. Table 4 4. Night time noise limit 	Comments addressed in the Noise Assessmsnet Study. Attch 11-03-14-AR
November 19 2014 [REDACTED]	http://www.thestar.com/life/homes/2014/11/07/vimy_oaks_the_sentinals_for_first_community_gar.html	<p>Hi [REDACTED],</p> <p>Thanks for sending this along. This certainly sounds interesting; however the TTC site has no Vimy Oak plantings in the magnitude described by Monty. He references Oaks trees, large enough that he could barely wrap his arms around and "girth of almost two metres". The tree inventory report completed for the site of the bus garage identified a single Vimy/English Oak measuring under 30cm.</p> <p>This certainly doesn't minimize the importance of the Vimy Oak however it's possible that the large Vimy Oaks referenced in the article may be on a different property, other than the one proposed for the bus garage.</p> <p>It was good seeing you again at City Hall. I didn't recognize the gentleman sitting between us engaged in conversation. Was he there on the McNicoll item as well?</p> <p>Regards, Lito</p>
December 15, 2014 City of Toronto Archaeology	<p>The Toronto Transit Commission is continuing further analysis on the proposed site at Kennedy Road and McNicoll Ave for the future Bus Garage. Updated technical reports have been posted on the project site and can be downloaded by clicking on the following link:</p> <p>http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/index.jsp</p> <p>Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments are available in Appendix F and Appendix G.</p> <p>Please note that the project is in still in the pre-planning stage and will be subject to the Provincial Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP). The TPAP is planned to launch in early 2015 and will include further consultation with the community.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito Romano</p>	<p>Thanks Lito</p> <p>There are no further archaeological concerns with this project. Our office would have the standard advisory comments only.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the event that deeply buried archaeological remains are encountered on the property during construction activities, the Heritage Operations Unit of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, be notified immediately at (416) 314-7146 as well as the City of Toronto, Heritage Preservation Services Unit (416) 338-1096. 2. In the event that human remains are encountered during construction, the proponent should immediately contact the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, and the Registrar or Deputy Registrar of Cemeteries at the Cemeteries Regulation Unit, Ministry of Government Services, (416) 326-8393. 3. If any expansions to the boundaries of the subject property are proposed, further archaeological assessment work may be required. <p>Regards Susan</p>
December 16, 2015 Solange Desautels MOECC Attch 12-15-14 A	<p>MOECC Air Quality Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) submission, we recommend to applying a 10 meter spacing along the fence line property as oppose to 20 metre spacing as noted in the Air Dispersion Modelling Guideline in Ontario (ADMGO). - In addition, we recommend revising the population entered in the AERMOD input file to reflect the study area and not the city of Toronto. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The US EPA recommends that population densities by square kilometer surrounding the study site be reviewed. Where the population density is greater than 750 people/km2, they recommend using the combined population within this area; which was interpreted as a combination of Markham and Toronto. - Additionally, a more conservative population was selected in order to obtain an urban heating effect, which in theory will predict more conservative ground-level concentrations at the closest sensitive receptors. In particular, the objective was to conservatively predict concentrations at Mon Sheong. <p>It should be noted that the population density is dependent on population to the one-forth power, meaning that it is not highly sensitive to differences in population.</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
		<p>Attch 12-15-14 AR</p>
<p>December 16, 2015 Solange Desautels MOECC</p> <p>Attch 12-16-14 A</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. D-6 Guideline 2. The future Redlea Avenue 3. Ambient sound levels 4. List of significant noise sources 5. Addressing the peer review from Valcoustics Canada Ltd. 	<p>MOECC response to EPR – Noise Review</p> <p>Attch 12-16-14 AR</p>
<p>December 18, 2014 Curve Lake First Nation</p>	<p>The Toronto Transit Commission is continuing further analysis on the proposed site at Kennedy Road and McNicoll Ave for the future Bus Garage. Updated technical reports have been posted on the project site and can be downloaded by clicking on the following link:</p> <p>http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/index.jsp</p> <p>Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments are available in Appendix F and Appendix G.</p> <p>Please note that the project is in still in the pre-planning stage and will be subject to the Provincial Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP). The TPAP is planned to launch in early 2015 and will include further consultation with the community.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito Romano</p>	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Thank you for the update, I have reviewed the archaeological assessment and understand that no further assessments are required.</p> <p>If there are any unforeseen environmental concerns, please let us know.</p> <p>Melissa</p>
<p>January 8 2015 Solange Desautels</p> <p>Attch 01-08-15A</p>	<p>Enclosed is public submission.</p> <p>Yours Truly, Solange Desautels</p>	<p>Response prepared and included in EPR</p> <p>Attch 01-08-15 AR</p>
<p>December 15 2014 Lito's letter to Susan Hughes (City of Toronto- Archaeology)</p>	<p>To: Susan Hughes</p> <p>The Toronto Transit Commission is continuing further analysis on the proposed site at Kennedy Road and McNicoll Ave for the future Bus Garage. Updated technical reports have been posted on the project site and can be downloaded by clicking on the following link:</p> <p>http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/index.jsp</p> <p>Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments are available in Appendix F and Appendix G.</p> <p>Please note that the project is in still in the pre-planning stage and will be subject to the Provincial Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP). The TPAP is planned to launch in early 2015 and will include further consultation with the community.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito Romano</p>	<p>Thanks Lito</p> <p>There are no further archaeological concerns with this project. Our office would have the standard advisory comments only.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the event that deeply buried archaeological remains are encountered on the property during construction activities, the Heritage Operations Unit of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, be notified immediately at (416) 314-7146 as well as the City of Toronto, Heritage Preservation Services Unit (416) 338-1096. 2. In the event that human remains are encountered during construction, the proponent should immediately contact both the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, and the Registrar or Deputy Registrar of Cemeteries at the Cemeteries Regulation Unit, Ministry of Government Services, (416) 326-8393. 3. If any expansions to the boundaries of the subject property are proposed, further archaeological assessment work may be required. <p>Regards Susan</p>
<p>January 21, 2015 Lori Loucks Hiawatha First Nation, ON</p>	<p>Thank you for this information.</p> <p>Please update your contact list to include my new email address.</p> <p>lloucks@hiawathafn.ca</p>	<p>Thank you for the information. Our records have been updated.</p> <p>Lito</p>
<p>January 21, 2015 Heathwood Ratepayers Association</p>	<p>Lito</p> <p>Thanks for the info.</p> <p>We have our HRA Board meeting that evening at Kennedy from 7:30 to 9:30PM</p>	<p>Noted. In response to invite to Open House On February 5 2015</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>I will be at Mary Ward at 6:30 PM to see the displays and speak to TTC staff. I expect to leave shortly after 7 PM for our Community Board meeting.</p> <p>I would appreciate if you could send me the electronic presentation after your meeting like you had done with the slides of prior meetings.</p> <p>As you know, the Heathwood Ratepayers Association(HRA) is supporting this project because it brings work to our area and it does not affect our Community'</p> <p>Regards [Redacted]</p> <p>P.S. Please take note that I will be away without E Mail from Jan 23 to Jan 31.</p>	
<p>January 21, 2015 Arleen Maracle First Nation Six Nations Council</p>	<p>I have forwarded the information on to Chief G. Ava Hill.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>January 23, 2015 Dave Mowat Community Consultation Specialist Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation</p>	<p>Regarding the New McNicoll Bus Garage, firstly thank you for the notice related to the Open House. Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation have no issues pertaining to the project and while the project location is within Williams Treaty Clause 2 lands and while the Williams Treaty is currently being litigated in the Federal Court of Canada, the litigation does not involve or give us any ability to impede such processes as this one. And given that the location is within heavily settled urban lands we have no issues other than from an archaeological perspective which you have documented as having no historic or archaeological potential.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Dave Mowat</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>January 25 2015 [Redacted]</p>	<p>I have reviewed the study reports and found deficiencies that may have major impacts.</p> <p>One of the 2nd public open house display boards indicated 50% of bus traffic from the proposed facility will be to the south using future Milliken Blvd. Yet there is no mentioning of the status of the future Milliken Blvd. If the facility operates before the completion of Milliken Blvd., bus traffic to the south will use Kennedy Road. Therefore, all it's negative impacts, such as noise, traffic, traffic safety, etc., will affect residents living to the west side of Kennedy Road. The study reports were only assessed to the stationary facility against nearby land use based on Redlea Ave. These off-site impacts are missing if bus traffic use Kennedy.</p> <p>There is no traffic safety assessment regarding bus turning movement if buses can safely turn onto traffic lane , especially McNicoll Ave. The tragic incident involved TTC bus that killed the young girl recently, raises the alarm of this kind of safety concern. Particularly the use of long articulated buses. Note that there are nearby school and senior residents. Some of them are short in height and some have hearing deficiency. People like them standing at street corner waiting for crossing at intersection can potentially clipped by bus, especially long bus with the lack of adequate bus turning radius and poor sight line.</p> <p>Increase bus traffic on Kennedy road will affect the traffic movement ingress and egress of Perthshire and Dancy T- intersections. Safety is already an existing concern of these intersections. This will aggravate the problem.</p> <p>Your truly, [Redacted] Scarborough</p>	<p>Dear Mr. [Redacted],</p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>The Redlea Ave construction is being undertaken by the City of Toronto and they have confirmed that the work will be complete by the end of 2015, well before the scheduled opening of the bus garage in 2019. Thus once the facility is operational, 96% of the buses will be using Redlea Ave. The remaining 6% will be using McNicoll because they will be servicing this route (i.e. 41 Cummer). These figures were presented at the open house on February 5th. Please click the following link to access the Project Page and a copy of the presentation panels:</p> <p>http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/index.jsp</p> <p>The project team and the TTC's design consultants have reviewed the turning radii and have confirmed that buses will be able to safely negotiate movements into and out of the bus garage.</p> <p>Regards, Lito Romano</p>
<p>January 27 2015 [Redacted]</p>	<p>Hi Lito, You know the site! For your interest. Good turnout public and press alike. The 'repatriation' journey has begun.</p> <p>Rick Schofield, Scarb Heritage and Lorne Ross, former Commission Planning for Scarborough were on hand with MP Peter Kent (representing Veterans Affairs) and MP Arnold Chan.</p>	<p>[Redacted]</p> <p>Thanks. I caught the article in the Star. There is one Vimy Oak on our property that TTC will have to address. We are exploring the possibility of relocating it.</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>Regards, [REDACTED] on behalf of the Vimy Oaks Team</p> <p>http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2015/01/24/on-vimy-ridge-mighty-oaks-will-grow-again-thanks-to-a-canadian-soldier.html</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OErGFkvPqs</p> <p>http://www.680news.com/2015/01/25/interview-the-vimy-oaks-project/</p> <p>Chinese (photo MP Peter Kent, MP Arnold Chan, myself) http://www.mingpaocanada.com/Tor/htm/News/20150125/tge1.htm?m=0</p>	<p>Regards, Lito</p>
<p>January 30, 2015 [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Hello Lito,</p> <p>I was told by Councillor Jim Karygiannis that your consultant report on air pollution will be ready next Monday. Could you please send me a copy as soon as you get it?</p> <p>Thank you. [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Hello Dr. [REDACTED],</p> <p>Lito Romano is currently away and I would like to reply to your message.</p> <p>Please note that TTC is continuing to consult with Toronto Public Health and will do so throughout the Transit Project Assessment process. Final reports on air quality, pollution or otherwise will be included in the Environmental Project Report. That report will be posted for a 30 day public review period and TTC will notify you (and all those who have expressed interest in the proposed project) as soon as it is finalized.</p> <p>If despite their best efforts, the TTC project team is not able to address your concerns to your satisfaction through the Transit Project Assessment, these concerns and any other objections can be sent to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change. You will receive notice as soon as the formal review period begins. Final approval of the Environmental Project Report will be at the discretion of the MOECC.</p> <p>Sincerely, David Nagler</p> <p>Hello Dr. [REDACTED],</p> <p>As follow-up, please note that two recent letters to Toronto Public Health are now posted on the TTC's project website: http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/index.jsp</p> <p>Sincerely, David</p>
<p>February 4, 2015 Brenda Thompson Scarborough Transit Action</p>	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>Scarborough Transit Action is a grassroots organization advocating for transit riders in Scarborough.</p> <p>As such, we would like to receive updates on the progress of the McNicoll Bus Garage.</p> <p>Best regards, Brenda Thompson</p>	<p>Hello Brenda</p> <p>Thank you for your email. I have added you to the project mailing list. If you haven't already done so, please visit the project page at the following link for more details: http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/index.jsp</p> <p>Regards, Lito Romano</p>
<p>February 9, 2015 Rahul Gupta Staff Reporter Metroland Media Toronto</p>	<p>Hi David, just wondering if anticipated traffic created by new condo developments in the area were taken into consideration for the traffic impact study undertaken as part of the McNicoll bus garage study. It's the contention of the Scarborough Baptist Church and others this uptick in traffic volume was not considered.</p> <p>Vincent Ching from the church also told me at last week's meeting they attempted to present to the TTC their own commissioned traffic study which does take into account anticipated increased traffic volume on Redlea avenue caused by future development, but were rebuffed by TTC planners. Can you speak to this?</p> <p>I have a deadline today so would appreciate a response as soon as you're able. Feel free to call me at 647-998-3514 if you'd rather speak directly.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>Hi Rahul,</p> <p>TTC met with Mon Sheong representatives in October 2013, again on May 21, 2014 and have offered to meet again to review any and all of its concerns. In fact, that commitment was reiterated on a phone call with them before the public meeting on February 5th and at the meeting itself. Quite the opposite of how it has been presented to you, TTC is more than willing to meet and discuss Mon Sheong's traffic report or any other interests they have. In terms of last week's meeting, TTC must give an equal opportunity to all residents who attend public meetings to ask questions and submit comments. The largest portion of the meeting was in fact the Q&A. If 20 minutes was reserved for Mon Sheong's consultants or any other individual to make a "presentation", it would have only provided 40 minutes for the entire community to ask questions. Their consultants also addressed all in attendance during the open Q&A and were again invited for a follow-up meeting to discuss any interests in greater detail with TTC.</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>R</p>	<p>The McNicoll Bus Garage is part of the solution to improving transit and traffic, as it will significantly improve bus service in Scarborough and across Toronto. The traffic study accounts for the number of buses travelling to and from the proposed facility. The vast majority of buses will travel well outside of morning and outside of afternoon rush hours. Furthermore, the total volume of buses is a miniscule fraction of the overall traffic volume of cars. Slides 35-38 on the project website give a good overview, please see this link: Open House presentation panels. Any future condo development at Steeles --or otherwise-- makes a stronger case for the need to improve transit and the construction of the McNicoll Bus Garage.</p> <p>If you have any additional questions, please let me know.</p> <p>Best regards, David</p> <hr/> <p>Hi Rahul.</p> <p>In addition to info below, the attached gives an overview of the traffic study methodology, which accounts for traffic growth. Attached is from the draft Environmental Project Report (EPR) which has been on the project website since July, 2014. A final EPR is scheduled for completion in May, 2015 and will be posted online for a 30 day review and comment period.</p> <p>Best, David</p>
<p>February 9, 2015 Lito Romano to Local Health Integration Network</p>	<p>Hello Marco,</p> <p>I wanted to follow up on our discussion of this afternoon and share some details about a new bus maintenance and storage facility that TTC is planning to construct at Kennedy and McNicoll Ave. The facility will be constructed on industrial land adjacent to the Mon Sheong Long Term Care Facility which is partially funded by the Province. At a recent meeting with Soo Wong MPP, she suggested that TTC connect with the Central East LHIN to share details about the project.</p> <p>This Project is subject to the 6 month Provincial Transit Project Assessment Process which includes a public consultation process which was launched on January 29 2015. The consultation will be followed by a 30 day public comment period and then 35 days for review by the Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Details on the project including the display panels from our recent public meeting are available on a dedicated project page located here:</p> <p>http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/index.jsp</p> <p>I would strongly encourage you to review the FAQ's which provide you with high level information about the project as well as some of the concerns raised by the community and how TTC is mitigating them. Here is a link to the FAQ:</p> <p>http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/FAQ.jsp</p> <p>Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or would like to meet to discuss this further. In the meantime, I have added you to our mailing list so that you will receive future notices associated with this project.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lito Romano</p>	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>Thanks for sending me the links and the information provided in this email.</p> <p>I have forwarded this to our Communications/Public Relations unit – Karen O'Brien and Katie Cronin-Wood. If they need further information they will contact you directly.</p> <p>Regards, Marco Aguila CHRP, CHRL Manager of Corporate & Business Services /Chef des services généraux et des affaires Central East LHIN/RLISS du Centre-Est</p>
<p>February 10 2015</p>	<p>Dear Mayor Tory,</p>	<p>Dear Ms. Koo,</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
<p>██████ to Mayor John Tory</p>	<p>My name is ██████, a resident of Mon Sheong Court (██████). I came to Canada over 40 years. I spent best years of my life to work in Canada, now I retired.</p> <p>I love Canada very much, because it is a fair and equal multicultural country.</p> <p>I was in the public meeting on Feb.5, 2015 for TTC McNicoll Bus Garage,. The room was full of local people, it was almost 100% objection of the garage and also protest (see pictures below). But our opinions didn't count to TTC.</p> <p>TTC got their first piece of land on Markham Rd. and Steele Ave. for bus garage, but TTC finally sold it. We were told that TTC could save 1.1 million/ year by moving to McNicoll. The only reason I can think of is that the local people got a big voice in opposing the project.</p> <p>TTC staff are looking for a second piece of land for their project, it is Kennedy and McNicoll, next to a nursing home and a high-rise senior residential building, It is a very weak and vulnerable community, majority are Chinese seniors, speaks no English, don't know how to use a computer, TTC face much less pressure in this community. TTC wants McNicoll Ave to be their new garage, they don't choose a land, they purposely choose a weak community to bully. They wouldn't care senior's health and life. But we have human rights as every Canadian has.</p> <p>Put 1.1 million \$ on one side of scale and 100,000 senior's health and life on the other side of scale. Everybody knows which side is heavier. TTC has made a very wrong decision, but it is a lot of industrial land in the area of Steele and Markham (I just check Zoning Map of Toronto). It is also good for future TTC development as well.</p> <p>During the open public meeting, TTC staff told us (the public) that St. Joseph Hosp. is also next to a garage (Roncesvallas carhouse). In fact, the carhouse was built in the late 1800's, and St. Joseph was built in early 1900's. Carhouse was built before the medical facility. It is almost 100 years ago. Toronto was very small at that time, there was not such a thing as air pollution.</p> <p>In 2015, pollution is the enemy of human beings. TTC put up a garage next to a nursing home (they are not able to stand up or speak up for themselves and they got the worse health condition) and it is also in the middle of Chinese senior corridor. It is able to damage 100,000 seniors health, but they are Chinese-TTC doesn't have to care. The residents speak no English, no voice. Easy to be bullied.</p> <p>TTC opens my eyes. I also know TTC is a government service, I am only a small guy. But I still have confidence because this is Canada!!</p> <p>██████</p>	<p>Thank you for your email to Mayor Tory which has been forwarded to me for response. The McNicoll Bus Garage will be required in order to help meet growing ridership demand. In 2014, TTC had record ridership numbers with over 540 million riders, of which 240 million were by bus. TTC purchased additional buses to help meet this demand and thus a new facility is required to maintain and store them.</p> <p>The current location at Kennedy and McNicoll was selected because it meets all the minimum requirements including size, industrial zoning and location (proximity to the routes being served). This last factor is key in that locating the garage close to the routes being served minimizes "dead head" costs (the amount of time buses travel to and from the routes to the Garage). Every hour that that is reduced from this "dead head" time can be re-invested into improving transit for TTC customers. Moving the site further east as you suggest to Markham Road and Steeles Ave, would result in over \$1 million dollars in annual operating costs for the life of the facility.</p> <p>TTC is working closely with the community, having hosted three separate open houses to share details about the project and identify concerns. Chinese translation was provided at each of these meetings to ensure comments from non-English speaking participants could be captured. In addition, several one-on-one meetings were hosted with stakeholders in the community, including two at Mon Sheong (one with representatives of the family council and the other with Board Members). A number of concerns raised by Mon Sheong, resulted in design improvements to the proposed McNicoll Bus Garage, such as moving the fueling area to the far east side of the facility away from Mon Sheong and moving the bus entrance further north – also away from Mon Sheong.</p> <p>I understand your concern about pollution, however improving transit is part of the solution to reducing traffic and in turn greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>I look forward to continuing a dialogue with you and the community as we work towards improving transit in Toronto.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lito Romano</p>
<p>February 10, 2015 Correspondence between Lito and ██████</p>	<p>Hello ██████,</p> <p>It was a pleasure speaking with you this morning about traffic flows along McNicoll Ave. I have confirmed with the City of Toronto that there are plans for traffic signals at Redlea Ave and McNicoll Ave. Approximately 6% of the buses will be using McNicoll Ave (3% west and 3% east of Redlea), the remaining will be travelling north towards Passmore/ Steeles and south towards Finch Ave East.</p> <p>Here is a link to the presentation panels provided at the open house which include projected bus flows:</p> <p>http://www.ttc.ca/PDF/Transit_expansion_PDFs/Coxwell_EA-Const-Update_Jan21-2015.pdf</p> <p>Regards, Lito Romano</p>	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>Thank you so much for your call this morning, along with this information. I will review them and get back to you if need your help for further information.</p> <p>Regards ██████</p>
<p>February 12, 2015 Alderville First Nation</p>	<p>Dear Lito,</p> <p>Thank you for the information to Alderville First Nation regarding the Transit Project Assessment – Notice of Commencement and Open House which is being proposed within our Traditional and Treaty Territory. We appreciate the fact that Toronto Transit Commission recognizes the importance of First Nations Consultation and that your office is conforming to the requirements within the Duty to Consult Process.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>Please keep us apprised of any further developments and any environmental impacts during construction, should any occur. I can be contacted at the mailing address above or electronically via email, at the email address below.</p> <p>In good faith and respect, Dave Simpson</p>	
<p>February 13, 2015 Megan DeVries, M.A. Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation</p>	<p>Dear Mr. Lito Romano,</p> <p>I am writing to you today in regards to a "Notice of Commencement" regarding a transit project assessment submitted to the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation [MNCFN]. As the proposed work for the New McNicoll Bus Garage falls within MNCFN's traditional territory, it is our expectation that MNCFN will be meaningfully engaged during the development process. Therefore, we would request from you a copy of the archaeological assessment report conducted under this study. It is paramount that MNCFN has access to this information in order to undertake a knowledgeable review of the project to identify any outstanding areas of interest and/or concern, particularly in regards to our First Nation's cultural heritage.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p> <p>Megan DeVries, M.A. Archaeological Coordinator Department of Consultation and Accommodation Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation</p>	<p>Dear Megan,</p> <p>Thank you for your reply to the Notice of Commencement for the proposed TTC McNicoll Bus Garage.</p> <p>The stage one and stage two archaeological assessment reports were completed and form part of the Draft Environmental Project Report (EPR). The reports are available at the following links:</p> <p>Stage One Archaeological Report Stage Two Archaeological Report</p> <p>A full copy of the EPR is available on the project site at the following link: http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/index.jsp</p> <p>If you have further questions, please do not hesitate contacting me.</p> <p>Regards, Lito Romano</p>
	<p>Hello Lito,</p> <p>Thank you for your prompt response pointing me in the right direction. After reviewing the information provided, MNCFN has no outstanding environmental or archaeological concerns regarding the proposed project.</p> <p>I would like to reiterate MNCFN's policy that our First Nation is properly engaged during planning and development activities within the traditional territory as outlined on the map I have attached. We appreciate prompt notification which allows us the opportunity to review and provide comments in a timely manner. It is also MNCFN policy that our trained Field Liaison Representatives are permitted to participate during environmental and archaeological assessments. This should have included the Stage 2 property assessment conducted by URS Canada Inc. We are disappointed that MNCFN was not provided with the opportunity to have its representatives on location while this archaeological fieldwork was occurring. Because no further archaeological work has been recommended, there is no additional opportunity for participation on this project. However, we would hope that you bear this in mind for future developments in which you may be involved.</p> <p>Kind regards, Megan DeVries, M.A.</p>	<p>Hi Megan,</p> <p>Thank you for your comments which I will share with URS. We will certainly consider your involvement in future developments.</p> <p>Regards, Lito</p>
<p>February 15, 2015 Correspondence between TPH and Councillor Karygiannis</p>	<p>Good Morning Dr. Shapiro</p> <p>Can I please get for the stakeholders copy of the reports that TTC has submitted to you.</p> <p>Please and thank you</p> <p>Regards, Jim Karygiannis Councillor Ward 39 Scarborough-Agincourt</p>	<p>Good Afternoon Councillor Karygiannis,</p> <p>In response to your request I spoke with the TTC and they have posted the two letters to Toronto Public Health (concerning noise and on the project website. This way they are available to all members of the public. The link is:</p> <p>http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/index.jsp</p> <p>Howard Shapiro MD MSc FRCP Associate Medical Officer of Health & Acting Director Healthy Environments Toronto Public Health</p>
<p>February 17, 2015 ██████████</p>	<p>Lito,</p> <p>Would you please send these reviews to Novus and Intrinsik again asking them to redo their data gathering and analyses?</p>	<p>Dear ██████████,</p> <p>Thank you for your email requesting clarification on the earlier analysis provided by TTC's consultants. Attached, please find the following documents:</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
02-17-15 A 02-17-15 B	<p>We are scientists and I want to see things done properly, especially without any political bias .Their company's reputation is at stake if they submit this quality of work. If they disagree with my comments, at least they should send in a point-by-point rebuttal to me, just like we all do in professional journals.</p> <p>██████████, Ph.D. Editorial Board, International Journal of Environmental Studies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correspondence dated March 5, 2015 from TTC's environmental consultants, Novus Environmental Inc. and Intrinsik Environmental Sciences Inc, responding to your January 4, 2015 peer review of the Novus' Air Quality Assessment Report and Intrinsik's Screening-Level Human Health Risk Assessment Report. Correspondence dated November 6, 2014 from Novus Environmental Inc. responding to your October 20, 2014 review of the Novus air quality study dated May 12, 2014. Please note that this correspondence was included in Appendix H (pages 59-62) of the Environmental Project Report posted on our project website, http://projects.ttc.ca , in December 2014. <p>I hope these documents provide you with the information you require.</p> <p>Regards, Lito Romano</p> <p>Attch 02-17-15-AR 02-17-15-BR</p>
February 17 2015 ██████████	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>I would greatly appreciate if you would provide me with the following info:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> name of all TTC bus facilities next to a nursing home, please specify type of facility & specific functions name of all TTC bus facilities in seniors community, please specify type of facility & specific functions <p>Thank you for your attention. Look forward to a speedy reply.</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Hi ██████████</p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>The following are examples of long term care facilities, hospitals and rehab centres that are in proximity to TTC facilities and busy transit routes. Of note is that these are all situated on industrially-zoned land, similar to the McNicoll site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copernicus Lodge (http://www.copernicuslodge.com/) is immediately adjacent to Roncesvalles Streetcar Yard (it shares a property line), and St. Joseph's Hospital is just across the street. Although this is not a bus garage, there is significant volume of large vehicles travelling to/from site. Noise levels may actually be higher than that of a bus garage given squealing from steel wheels on a steel rail. Ina Grafton Gage Home (http://www.iggh.org/), a 128-bed long-term care facility, is about 300m west of the Birchmount Garage. Hillcrest Rehab Hospital is about 150m northeast of the Hillcrest facility, which supports buses and streetcars. Of not as well is a seniors home near the corner of Bloor and Dufferin (New Horizons Tower http://www.newhorizontower.com/) that is 40m from one of TTC's busiest bus routes, the 29 Dufferin route. According to these bus schedules (http://www.ttc.ca/Schedule/schedule.jsp?Route=29N&Stop=n.b. on DUFFERIN at BLOOR , http://www.ttc.ca/Schedule/schedule.jsp?Route=29S&Stop=s.b. on DUFFERIN at BLOOR), there are over 588 bus passages north bound and southbound through this intersection each weekday, including both standard and articulated buses. <p>TTC bus garages, subway yards and street car yards are also located in very close proximity to residential neighbourhoods (Malvern Bus Garage, Birchmount Bus Garage, Mount Dennis Bus Garage, Greenwood Subway Yard, Vincent (Keele) Subway Yard, Davisville Subway Yard, Roncesvalles Streetcar Facility, Russell Facility, and the Hillcrest Facility).</p> <p>It is not uncommon for transit facilities to coexist in proximity to residential areas. TTC will continue to work with the community and all regulatory agencies as well as the Province to ensure a successful project.</p> <p>Thank you Lito</p>
February 17, 2015 TRCA 02-17-15 C	<p>Dear Mr. Favaro:</p> <p>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) staff received the Draft Environmental Project Report for the above-noted environmental assessment (EA) on December 18, 2014.</p> <p>Staff understands that the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) has completed a Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) for a new bus garage to be located near the intersection of McNicoll Avenue and Kennedy Road. The proposed bus garage will include an indoor storage facility to accommodate 250 conventional buses in the barn, brake, body and paint shop, bus cleaning areas, maintenance and transportation offices, two service lines, fuel and repair bay, employee amenities including parking locker room and lunch room/cafeteria and material receiving, storage and distribution area. It is our understanding that as of 2014, forecasted growth in transit ridership is projected to require the acquisition of approximately 120 new buses by 2018, some of which will be</p>	<p>Comments addressed in 02-17-15 CR.</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>the significant longer articulated buses. As a result, bus garage capacity must be increased by over 200 buses within the next five years. The proposed bus garage site was initially acquired by the City of Toronto in 2005 and has been identified as suitable location as it offers a significant reduction in bus operating cost and it is closer to the routes it would service. A 19,000m² lot is proposed to the west of the proposed Redlea Avenue extension, which will be used for TTC staff parking with approximately 350 parking spots.</p> <p>Staff has completed the review of the Draft Environmental Project Report as well as the preliminary design plan provided in the report. Staff also met with TTC staff in December 2014 to go over the project and to provide preliminary feedback to the TTC. Staff has no objections to the proposed bus garage as presented in the report. Staff is however, providing the following comments in Appendix A for incorporation into the project design and implementation as the project moves to the next phases. The comments are aimed at providing direction into the EA process, during the detailed design phase and finally to facilitate TRCA's review of the permit application.</p> <p>As stipulated in the 2014 TRCA's "The Living City Policies (LCP) Document for Planning and Development in the Watersheds of the TRCA", the technical comments are being provided as part of TRCA's review and commenting roles under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act as well as the Planning Act, and as a Resource Management Agency. Staff is available to discuss these comments further and to provide clarification prior to the detailed design phase.</p> <p>TRCA recommendation and technical commitments included in this letter and submit in a draft, to TRCA for review and discussion. The TRCA Pre-Design Brief Checklist for Infrastructure Projects is available on our website (http://www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/xxx.pdf), and should be used as a guide to your submission. The draft Pre-Design Brief should also include reference to the comments in Appendix A of this letter.</p> <p>Should you have any questions, please contact me at 416-661-6600 extension 5714 or by email at rafoomboateng@trca.on.ca.</p> <p>Yours truly, Renée Afoom-Boateng, MES, RPP, MCIP</p>	
<p>February 18, 2015</p> <p>Lito Romano to Metrolinx</p>	<p>I spoke with my counterpart at Metrolinx who is dealing with GO's project to double track the Stouffville line adjacent to McNicoll.</p> <p>Some key points:</p> <p>Our EPR should be updated to state that their EA is complete and this project is proceeding (Tender closing March 2015 and they will mobilize in May 2015) - Metrolinx will provide comments that we can include in EPR</p> <p>Contract duration- one year</p> <p>Staging and lay down area is on McNicoll adjacent to the tracks</p> <p>Need for a grade separation on McNicoll has yet to be determined- feasibility study underway</p> <p>Open house to be arranged in May 2015</p> <p>Lito Romano</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>February 20, 2015</p> <p>██████████ (A resident of Mon Sheong Court)</p>	<p>Hi my friend Mr. Romano,</p> <p>How are you? I haven't talk to you for a long time, I have a question, I hope you let me understand it more clearly. By your information, TTC plans 30% buses of McNicoll Garage (total 250 buses) are going north via Redlea Ave., it means 75 buses are going north. According to your information, it is 192 daily bus volume - I like to know is it included buses in and out trips (from or to) the garage every day. Going south buses via Redlea Ave are 64%= 160 buses, plus 3% buses are going McNicoll East and 3% buses are going McNicoll West (total 6% buses =15 buses. Total buses are going south, east and west are 175 buses. By your information, the daily bus volume is 428 - this is included buses in and out trips from the bus garage. I wonder is it truth? Do you mind to let me know the way of your calculation?</p> <p>Daily car volume, I guess TTC has no control of your employees private car driving, they can drive Kennedy, McNicoll or Redlea as they please. But you give us a number, going north is 262 and south 594. How do you get</p>	<p>Hi ██████████,</p> <p>I am fine and I hope all is well with you as well.</p> <p>The bus flows at McNicoll have been modelled after a similar sized facility (Mt. Dennis Bus Garage) and represent an estimate of the service levels once McNicoll is operational.</p> <p>Although the facility has the capacity for 250 buses, not all will be in service. Based on the modelling, there will be approximately 242 buses entering the facility and then re-entering between 4:00 AM and midnight each weekday. The percentages of buses using the various arterials should be applied to this number. For example approximately 7 buses (3% of 242) will be travelling west on McNicoll and then returning over that period. Also keep in mind that this is based on 40 foot equivalents which means the number of buses might actually be less on certain routes if articulated buses are used.</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>those numbers??</p> <p>I hear from you at your earliest convenience.</p> <p>██████████ (A resident of Mon Sheong Court)</p>	<p>The actual bus flows were presented at the May 14, 2014 Open House. See slide 19 of the presentation:</p> <p>http://www.ttc.ca/PDF/Transit_expansion_PDFs/McNicollBusGarage_DisplayBoards_05142014.pdf</p> <p>Thank you, Lito Romano</p>
<p>February 21, 2015</p> <p>MPP</p>	<p>Hello Lito,</p> <p>MPP Soo Wong would like arranging a meeting with the TTC to discuss the proposed McNicoll Garage, which will be built in her riding. She has received a number of complaints about the project from her constituents about this file, but was unable to attend the public meeting held earlier this month at Mary Ward Catholic School. She'd like to have the opportunity to discuss the concerns raised by her constituents with you and your colleagues.</p> <p>Can you give me a call Monday? (416) 985-1967</p> <p>Thanks, Blair Ostrom Legislative Assistant Office of Soo Wong, MPP</p>	<p>Hello Blair,</p> <p>It was good speaking with you today. Just confirming our meeting with MPP Sue Wong on March 2 at 3 pm at the Legislative Building. I will be joined by our Project Manager, Jason MacDonald.</p> <p>Please confirm room details when they become available.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito Romano</p>
<p>02-24-2015</p> <p>██████████/Chris Williams</p> <p>Attachments 02-24-15 A</p>	<p>David/Lito</p> <p>Attached please find your questionnaire completed by Mon Sheong Foundation respecting the TTC Public Open House held on February 5, 2015. We trust that the feedback from these questionnaires' gets duly recorded in the final EPR Report submitted to the MOECC. Thank you.</p> <p>██████████ -Board of Director, MSF</p>	<p>Hello ██████████,</p> <p>Thank you for your email and correspondence from your solicitor Aird Berlis dated January 15, 2015. A response was prepared and sent by TTC's solicitor. I have attached a copy for your reference.</p> <p>Regards, Lito</p> <p>Attch 02-24-15-AR</p>
<p>February 28, 2015</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>Just wonder if you would let me know answers to the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total budget for the McNicoll garage 2. Itemized ballpark estimate of each item, please be specific e.g. construction of what facility, equipment cost, supply,etc., etc. to arrive at the total of #1 3. Ballpark figure of money already spent, up until now, please list. e.g. consultant fees, promotional fees, etc. etc. 4. Estimate of the cost of yearly maintenance for the garage once in operation, would appreciate itemization <p>I would greatly appreciate if your corporation would provide me with a copy of the proposed itemized McNicoll garage budget to arrive at the total of item 1.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention. Looking forward to your speedy reply.</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Dear ██████████,</p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>The total approved budget for the McNicoll garage project is \$181 million. This includes planning, design and construction of the facility, to commissioning of equipment. For a project of this size, hundreds of staff will be involved to varying degrees for varying lengths of time.</p> <p>This year, pending finalization of the Transit Project Assessment Process, we intend to release a Request For Proposals (RFP) for companies to submit bids to construct the facility. TTC needs to protect the integrity of this process by ensuring that no documents associated with direct construction and equipment costs are released.</p> <p>The Project Team confirmed that just under \$4 million has been expended to date to get the project to its current stage. This includes costs associated with such things as design services, technical studies for the Environmental Project Report, as well as any work associated with community consultation.</p> <p>With respect to annual maintenance costs, although it is difficult to determine a precise figure for the future McNicoll Bus Garage, staff are compiling figures from a similarly-sized garage which I can share with you as soon as they are available.</p> <p>Regards, Lito Romano</p>
	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>Thank you for your reply. Follows are further questions that I would like to gain some understanding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I would appreciate getting TTC progress updates per each planned McNicoll garage related motions adopted in the TTC Board meeting, City Council meeting and all other relevant Council meetings. Please refer to Council 	<p>Dear ██████████</p> <p>Thank you for your follow up email.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The motions presented at the TTC Board meeting are still being explored. Given that these were outside the original scope of the project, the Project Team is determining feasibility and costs associated for each item. As soon as this review is complete, TTC will share details

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>meeting minutes and please list progress updates item by item.</p> <p>2. What are the steps that TTC has taken, are taking and will take to ensure that the proposed McNicoll garage will be completed within the approved budget and within the projected time frame?</p> <p>3. As TTC strongly believes in the urgent need for a TTC garage at the proposed McNicoll site, what are the reasons a) why TTC did not start the community consultation and TPAP process immediately after land purchase? b) why TTC did not start the community consultation and TPAP process for the past 9 years? c) why waited all these years and start these processes in late 2013?</p> <p>4. How many pieces of land had TTC considered during the 2004-2005 land search other than the land E and W of the GO rail in the Kennedy/Midland and McNicoll area?</p> <p>5. What were the criteria TTC used in 2005 to determine that McNicoll site was the ideal piece of land?</p> <p>6. Any second thoughts about the McNicoll piece of land before purchasing? If the answer is affirmative, what were the reasons of reservation? How had those reservations been dealt with prior to land purchase?</p> <p>7. Is TTC 100% sure that there is no other land in the GTA which is more suitable than the proposed McNicoll site? If so, please explain.</p> <p>Would greatly appreciate a question by question reply for enlightenment. Also look forward to receiving the estimated annual maintenance cost. Thank you for your clarification.</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>with the community.</p> <p>2. Construction of the McNicoll Bus Garage is scheduled to begin in 2016 and be completed in 2019. TTC has a rigorous tendering process which prequalifies suitable contractors based on such criteria as past work, bonding, safety performance and size. The successful bidder is bound by a lump sum price and a fixed number of days to complete the work. Breach of the contract may be subject to a number of actions including daily financial penalties, poor performance reviews, which would impact future opportunities with the TTC, and in the event of extreme violations, removal from the project. These performance requirements and penalties apply throughout the life of the contract – the only instance where adjustments to costs and/or schedules are made is when unforeseen circumstances (i.e., conditions that are not known at the commencement of construction) are uncovered during the execution of the project.</p> <p>3. The City purchased this property in 2004 for the express purpose of constructing a bus garage for an anticipated growth in ridership in the future. After reaching record ridership levels in early 2013, TTC determined that the time to construct a new facility had arrived and initiated dialogue with the community. This included a issuing a construction notice informing residents of borehole testing on the site. Since then, there have been three public meetings and many one-on-one meetings with property owners and stakeholders to share details about the project. With respect to your question about the start of TPAP; TTC would not have started the TPAP process until it was absolutely certain that a facility was required. As you know, the TPAP began on January 29, 2015 with the issuance of the Notice of Commencement. The TPAP is a time-limited process so starting it in 2004 when the land was purchased would not have been prudent.</p> <p>4. The site at Kennedy and McNicoll was selected because it meets the minimum requirements including, size, industrial zoning and location (proximity to the routes being served). This was the only site that met that these requirements.</p> <p>5. When the site was purchased in 2004, it met TTC's requirements for a bus garage and therefore no other properties were pursued.</p> <p>6. TTC is unaware of any other sites that fulfill the criteria listed above which can be built and be operational by 2019.</p> <p>Regards, Lito Romano</p>
	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>Thank you for your reply. Please clarify what is the exact date (MM/DD/YY) that the McNicoll site was purchased by the city of Toronto for TTC usage? You noted 2004 in your email but TTC web site stated 2005. Many thanks.</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Hi ██████████,</p> <p>There was a property search in 2004 and the sale transaction was completed on September 5 2005. The website is correct. Sorry for the confusion.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito</p>
<p>March 2 2015</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Hello Lito,</p> <p>Would you kindly confirm the 30 Day Objection Period on the proposed McNicoll Bus Garage.</p> <p>If the process began January 28, 2015 I estimate the 30 day period begins on or about April 29, 2015?</p> <p>Thank you, ██████████</p>	<p>Hi ██████████,</p> <p>The project team has up to 120 days for consultation from the Notice of Commencement which was issued on January 29, 2015. If they decide to use the entire 120 days, the Notice of Completion would be issued on or about May 29, 2015. This would be followed by a 30 day public review period.</p> <p>A date for the Notice of Completion has not been set however TTC will inform interested parties of this date through the regular channels (similar to those used to issue the Notice of Commencement). This will include direct mail, email, website, and ads in the local paper.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito Romano</p>
<p>March 2, 2015</p> <p>Blair Ostrom, Soo Wong MPP's assistant</p> <p>Attachments 03-02-15 A 03-02-15 B 03-02-15 C</p>	<p>Hi Jason, Lito,</p> <p>Thanks again for coming in to meet with MPP Wong and myself this afternoon to discuss the McNicoll Garage file.</p> <p>Here are several of the reports from Mon Sheong's consultants that ██████████ shared with us.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ortech's Peer Review on Air Quality, January 28, 2015 - Valcoustics, February 4, 2015 - ██████████, February 5, 2015 <p>Blair</p>	<p>Sent to Jo- Anne Linton EA to Soo Wong MPP</p> <p>Hi Jo-anne,</p> <p>Further to our conversation of this morning, I am forwarding an email sent to Blair Ostrom, who I understand is no longer with your office. The email includes responses to reports which were sent to MPP Wong by MonSheong.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please do not hesitate contacting me.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Good day, Blair</p> <p>Thank you for bringing these reports to our attention. Find attached correspondence from our consultants that address the concerns raised by Ortech, ██████████ (Director of Resident Care, Mon Sheong Scarborough LTC), and Valcoustics Canada Ltd.</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
		<p>I would also like to note that the concerns regarding noise, traffic, air quality and fire/explosion risks raised by Dr. [REDACTED], Medical Director at the Mon Sheong Scarborough Long Term Care Centre, were thoroughly addressed in the Environmental Project Report and in the Information Boards from our three Public Information Centres. The Environmental Project Report and the Information Boards are available for public viewing at our project website http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/index.jsp. Throughout the consultation with the community regarding the Garage, TTC has undertaken expert analyses and assessments to understand the ramifications of the Garage in relation to its neighbours, including the Mon Sheong Long Term Care Centre, and to the broader environmental context.</p> <p>While we can appreciate that the prospect of a bus garage being located next to the Mon Sheong Long Term Care Centre can bring about concerns, please be assured that TTC is listening to the concerns of the community and is adjusting its design to the maximum extent possible to minimize the effect on the residents of the Long Term Care Centre. Examples of such design changes include the entry and exit points of the buses into and out from the facility, and locating the fueling area as far from the Long Term Care Centre as possible. We have also assessed the potential effects of the facility on the sensitive members of the exposed population (i.e. children, elderly, those with impaired respiratory/cardiovascular conditions, etc.) against very conservative health-based benchmarks and found that the Garage will have a negligible impact.</p> <p>With respect to Dr. [REDACTED]'s concern about emergency response, the fuel to be stored on site is diesel fuel, which has chemical properties that are very different from fuels that are more typically the source of explosions, such as propane and compressed natural gas. Diesel fuel has a flash point that is above 50 degrees Celsius (versus -43C for gasoline, -104C for propane, -188C for natural gas); given the climate of Toronto, the chances of an explosion are minimal. Despite the low risk, TTC regularly inspects fuelling equipment to ensure it is functioning safely, provides fire protection equipment in the fuelling areas, and trains employees in safe fuelling procedures, all in an effort to further reduce risks. The absence of even a single fuel explosion at any of TTC's facilities over the span of multiple decades is indicative that the risks are very well-managed.</p> <p>Dr. [REDACTED]'s letter concludes with the hope that TTC can find an alternative location for the McNicoll Bus Garage. We have investigated other potential locations but none meet the size and location criteria for the Garage. TTC is proceeding with the McNicoll Bus Garage Project, and looks forward to continuing consultations with the community in order to be assured that the Garage can meet the needs of a growing transit system while also minimizing the effect on its neighbours.</p> <p>Finally, we intend to issue the Notice of Completion for our Transit Project Assessment in May, which will be followed by a 30-day public review period. We have attempted several times this year to arrange a meeting with the Mon Sheong Foundation's consultants but they have not been willing to meet with us to discuss their technical concerns. TTC remains open to meeting with the Mon Sheong Foundation and their consultants regarding this project, and we are committed to keeping the lines of communication open throughout delivery of the project.</p> <p>If you require any further information please contact Lito Romano, Senior Community Liaison Officer at lito.romano@ttc.ca. Thanks again.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attachment s - 03-02-15AR Responses to Ortech's comments provided to TTC on March 25, 2015 - 03-02-15 BR Responses to Valcoustics' comments under Novus' revision - 03-02-15- CR Responses to [REDACTED]'s comments provided to TTC on April 1, 2015
March 4, 2015	Lito,	<p>Good afternoon [REDACTED],</p> <p>For your info, MPP Soo Wong invited us to her office last month to discuss the McNicoll Bus Garage project and the related concerns that her constituents have brought to her office. She brought to our attention several reports and letters that we had not previously seen from Valcoustics, Ortech, [REDACTED], and Dr. [REDACTED]. We asked our consultants to review these documents and provide feedback. This morning I forwarded the e-mail below and attachments to MPP Wong's office. I am forwarding the message and attachments to you as a courtesy.</p> <p>If you wish to speak further, or if you are interested in a meeting between our respective consultants for a technical discussion, we are happy to accommodate. Please contact our Senior Community Liaison Officer, Lito Romano, if you require further assistance.</p> <p>Thank you, and have a good day.</p> <p>Dear [REDACTED],</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
<p>██████████, on behalf of the MS Task Force</p> <p>Atch 03-04-15 A 03-04-15 B</p>	<p>Attached please find the completed TTC questionnaires by Mon Sheong Foundation consultants who attend the Feb.5.15 Open House meeting. Please confirm that you have received same after email is sent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trans Plan's questionnaire - Valcoustics's comments dated February 23, 2015 <p>Thank you. ██████████ on behalf of the MS Task Force</p>	<p>Thank you for your email including attachments from your consultants related to noise and air. Their questions have been reviewed and addressed in the attached reports.</p> <p>Please contact me if you have further questions or are interested in arranging a meeting with the project team and technical consultants to address any further concerns.</p> <p>Regards Lito</p> <p>Atch 03-04-15 AR 03-04-15 BR</p>
<p>March 5, 2015</p> <p>Katie Cronin-Wood, Central East Local Health Integrated Network (LHIN)</p>	<p>I wanted to follow up on our discussion of this afternoon and share some details about a new bus maintenance and storage facility that TTC is planning to construct at Kennedy and McNicoll Ave. The facility will be constructed on industrial land adjacent to the MonSheong Long Term Care Facility which is partially funded by the Province. At a recent meeting with Soo Wong MPP, she suggested that TTC connect with the Central East LHIN to share details about the project.</p> <p>This Project is subject to the 6 month Provincial Transit Project Assessment Process which includes a public consultation process which was launched on January 29 2015. The consultation will be followed by a 30 day public comment period and then 35 days for review by the Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Details on the project including the display panels from our recent public meeting are available on a dedicated project page located here: http://www.ttc.ca/About the TTC/Projects/McNicoll Bus Garage/index.jsp</p> <p>I would strongly encourage you to review the FAQ's which provide you with high level information about the project as well as some of the concerns raised by the community and how TTC is mitigating them. Here is a link to the FAQ: http://www.ttc.ca/About the TTC/Projects/McNicoll Bus Garage/FAQ.jsp</p> <p>Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or would like to meet to discuss this further. In the meantime, I have added you to our mailing list so that you will receive future notices associated with this project.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lito Romano</p>	<p>Lito, As per my voice mail I would encourage you to keep talking to the Long Term Care home about the possibility of your new bus facility being a temporary evacuation point for them in the event of an emergency since it is a requirement, in their emergency plans, that they identify such a space.</p> <p>Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any additional information.</p> <p>Katie Cronin-Wood</p>
<p>March 11 2015</p>	<p>██████████ redirected to me your email to him dated March 5, 2015 for a response.</p> <p>Further to Chris Williams' letter dated February 27, 2014 addressed to your in-house counsel, Mr. Michael Atlas (which we asked be forwarded to you), we are not in a position to advise if our consultants will be submitting further reports or questions until we obtain full disclosure of TTC's background, reports, studies, models, data, etc. so that they can perform a proper peer review of your draft EPR. As you know, we have repeatedly asked for this information for nearly a year (since June 2014).</p> <p>As you know, the community feedback from your three Public Open Houses has been poorly received and there continues to exist a high level of frustration among the community that its concerns have not been fully addressed together with the lack of inclusive community consultation especially regarding your design process. Your Open House forums and presentation boards reflect design changes with no meaningful input or dialogue with the community at large. This is "consultation from the top down" and not "consultation from the ground up" the latter being true inclusive community consultation. This is tantamount to "consultation after the fact" or "rubber-stamping".</p> <p>We would respectfully request that Mr. Williams' letter be included in your final EPR Report when you report your findings of this TTC Public Open House on February 5, 2015.</p> <p>Also please confirm at your earliest convenience the expiry date of the 120 day TPAP period which TTC commenced on January 29, 2015. Mr. Williams' is on record that the issuance of this notice of commencement under TPAP is premature given the serious health and safety issues that remain outstanding. This is an abuse of process and disingenuous for TTC to proceed in this manner.</p>	<p>Dear ██████████,</p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>I am in receipt of the your solicitors letter of February 27 2015 and have shared it with the Project Team for a response. Comments and responses will be reflected in the EPR.</p> <p>I am concerned that you do not have the reports associated with the EPR. Can you please clarify which reports are still outstanding? In an effort to help clarify this, I requested a list of reports shown below which, have either been provided to you or are available to you for review. Please advise which of these, you are missing and I will arrange to have them sent to you. Current versions of items 1, 2, & 3 were made publicly-available in December 2014 on the project website at http://www.ttc.ca/About the TTC/Projects/McNicoll Bus Garage/index.jsp. In addition, Items 1, 4a, and 4c were provided to Mon Sheong on a CD delivered in December 2014.</p> <p>Item 1. Draft EPR, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Appendix A - Traffic Impact Study b. Appendix B - Natural Heritage Characterization Study c. Appendix C - Tree Survey & Vimy Oak Investigation d. Appendix D - Air Quality Report e. Appendix E - Noise Assessment f. Appendix F - Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment g. Appendix G - Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment h. Appendix H - Correspondence i. Appendix I - Nov 27, 2013 Open House Report

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>Regards, [REDACTED]</p>	<p>j. Appendix J - May 14, 2014 Open House Report k. Appendix K - December 2, 2014 Human Health Risk Assessment 2. Noise Health Letter - January 27, 2015 a. Additional modelling data associated with Noise Health Letter 3. Draft Report - Roadway Assessment Letter - January 26, 2015 4. Modelling Data: a. Noise Modelling Data b. Traffic Modelling Data (included as part of EPR Appendix A) c. Air Quality Modelling Data</p> <p>TTC would welcome the opportunity to meet again with you, your executive board and/or your consultants to further discuss the above-noted items or any aspect of the project.</p> <p>With respect to the issuance of a Notice of Completion, this must be released within 120 days of the Notice of Commencement (January 29, 2015). This would mean that the Notice of Completion would have to be released by May 29, 2015.</p> <p>Regards, Lito Romano</p>
<p>March 17, 2015 [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>Thank you for your reply. Follows are further questions that I would like to gain some understanding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I would appreciate getting TTC progress updates per each planned McNicoll garage related motions adopted in the TTC Board meeting, City Council meeting and all other relevant Council meetings. Please refer to Council meeting minutes and please list progress updates item by item. 2. What are the steps that TTC has taken, are taking and will take to ensure that the proposed McNicoll garage will be completed within the approved budget <u>and</u> within the projected time frame? 3. As TTC strongly believes in the urgent need for a TTC garage at the proposed McNicoll site, what are the reasons a) why TTC did not start the community consultation and TPAP process immediately after land purchase? b) why TTC did not start the community consultation and TPAP process for the past 9 years? c) why waited all these years and start these processes in late 2013? 4. How many pieces of land had TTC considered during the 2004-2005 land search other than the land E and W of the GO rail in the Kennedy/Midland and McNicoll area? 5. What were the criteria TTC used in 2005 to determine that McNicoll site was the ideal piece of land? 6. Any second thoughts about the McNicoll piece of land before purchasing? If the answer is affirmative, what were the reasons of reservation? How had those reservations been dealt with prior to land purchase? 7. Is TTC 100% sure that there is no other land in the GTA which is more suitable than the proposed McNicoll site? If so, please explain. <p>Would greatly appreciate a question by question reply for enlightenment. Also look forward to receiving the estimated annual maintenance cost. Thank you for your clarification.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Dear [REDACTED],</p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>The total approved budget for the McNicoll garage project is \$181 million. This includes planning, design and construction of the facility, to commissioning of equipment. For a project of this size, hundreds of staff will be involved to varying degrees for varying lengths of time.</p> <p>This year, pending finalization of the Transit Project Assessment Process, we intend to release a Request For Proposals (RFP) for companies to submit bids to construct the facility. TTC needs to protect the integrity of this process by ensuring that no documents associated with direct construction and equipment costs are released.</p> <p>The Project Team confirmed that just under \$4 million has been expended to date to get the project to its current stage. This includes costs associated with such things as design services, technical studies for the Environmental Project Report, as well as any work associated with community consultation.</p> <p>With respect to annual maintenance costs, although it is difficult to determine a precise figure for the future McNicoll Bus Garage, staff are compiling figures from a similarly-sized garage which I can share with you as soon as they are available.</p> <p>Regards, Lito Romano</p>
<p>March 13 2015 March 20 2015 [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Lito,</p> <p>Thank you for your response. We will get back to you.</p> <p>To be clear, if the notice of completion is released on May 29/15, when does the 30 notice of objection expire.</p>	<p>Hi [REDACTED],</p> <p>I am surprised to hear that you are missing the Air Quality Monitoring Data. That information was included in the CD which was couriered to MonSheong on December 14 2014. It was addressed to [REDACTED] and signed for at 11:44 am. I would it send by email but it's a large file and not easily transmitted electronically. (this is why it was couriered on a cd in the first place)</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>Thank you. [REDACTED]</p> <p>We are advised that we are missing the following document from your list below: "4. Modelling Data: c. Air Quality Modelling Data".</p> <p>Please forward to Nelson and me at your early convenience. We would also appreciate a response to our question "when does the 30 day notice of objection expire". Thank you. [REDACTED]</p>	<p>With respect to your second question, the 30 day period for agency and public review (referred to you in your email as the "objection period") has not yet be established. The30 day agency and public review period will follow the Notice of Completion. TTC has not yet determined when it will issue the Notice of Completion but as per the TPAP Regulations, it must be issued within 120 days of the Notice of Commencement. (Note that the Notice of Commencement was January 29 2015)</p> <p>I would like to share a graphic that was presented at the last open house that may help explain this further. Please refer to slide 30 in the following link: http://www.ttc.ca/PDF/Transit_expansion_PDFs/McNicollBusGarage_Presentation_Feb05-15_w.pdf</p> <p>If you are still uncertain, please do not hesitate contacting me.</p> <p>Regards, Lito Romano</p>
<p>March 21 2015 [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Hi Mr. Romano,</p> <p>In McNicoll Bus Garage, it is only 242 buses in use instead 250 buses. I would like to know how many trips a bus is driven in and out of the garage in 24 hours base on a week day. According to TTC's information, it is 242 buses inbound and 242 buses outbound - total 484 trips for 250 buses in 24 hours. Is each bus only inbound once and outbound once per 24 hours. You may need more then one bus driver to drive a bus in 24 hours,do the drivers.have to change shifts? Do they have to drive the buses back to the garage to change hands? Often I see a bus put " out of service" sign up and drive back to the garage after rush hour. If it is,are more.buses in and out of the garage.?</p> <p>[REDACTED] (A residence of MSC)</p>	<p>Dear Ms. [REDACTED],</p> <p>250 standard (40') buses will be stored and maintained at the McNicoll Bus Garage. If articulated buses are maintained at the facility the number will be reduced.</p> <p>Based on similar sized facilities, TTC expects that approximately 242 buses will be exiting the facility and the same number will be re-entering the facility in a 24 hour period during the weekday. See slide 19 in the link below, showing the panels presented at the May 14 2014-TTC Open House: http://www.ttc.ca/PDF/Transit_expansion_PDFs/McNicollBusGarage_DisplayBoards_05142014.pdf</p> <p>Note that not all 250 buses will be operating, as some of these will be used as spares in the event of mechanical failures. Having spare buses available, minimizes the inconvenience to passengers in the event of a breakdown on a route.</p> <p>In response to your question on whether operators return to the bus garage at the end of their shift, this is not always the case. In many instances, shift changes take place mid route depending on the specific situations. So it is not uncommon for a bus to be on the road for more than one shift without returning to the garage.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito</p>
<p>March 21, 2015 [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Hi Lito, Please provide answers to the following questions: 1) What make and model number of articulated buses is TTC going to buy? 2) How many are you buying? When? 3) How are these accident rates that are you experiencing compared to ordinary 40 ft. buses? 4) How many articulated buses are you planning to put in this McNicoll garage? 5) Do you think it will be difficult in manipulating these buses on a 23m road? [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Dear [REDACTED],</p> <p>Thank you for your email. TTC purchased 153 articulated buses (Nova Bus's LFS Artic 9000) which have all been delivered (staggered delivery starting in 2013) and now operating in our network.</p> <p>The use of 60-foot Articulated Low Floor Buses in place of 40-foot Low Floor Buses will result in better service through increased capacity.</p> <p>With respect to accident rates, TTC's rate of bus collisions has remained relatively stable year after year. As of the end of 2014, the TTC Total Bus Collision Rate was 36.1 collisions per million miles which is comparable to large urban public transit agencies in North America. The TTC does not distinguish between its 40ft and articulated buses in its collision statistics. However, we have not seen an increase in the bus collision rate since the introduction of the articulated buses."</p> <p>Like all buses operated by the TTC, articulated buses undergo provincially required semi-annual and annual mechanical inspections, TTC also has a rigorous maintenance and safety program. This includes daily, weekly, monthly and annual checks of systems and components. Vehicles are also subject to emission testing every two years.</p> <p>Further, TTC recently announced the Safe Service Action Plan. The plan contains 12 action items that have been undertaken or are under review. Here is a summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A notice was issued last November to all operators stressing the absolute need for observance of the Highway Traffic Act. • An information campaign was distributed to all operators stressing diligence when approaching red traffic signals and the need for defensive

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
		<p>driving techniques. The campaign was combined with one-on-one counseling and support from supervisory staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speed audits using GPS data gathered from buses and streetcars will be used to identify speeding infractions and violations, and will result in operators being coached. • A trial is underway on the 111 East Mall route to remove the schedule deviation display from vehicle communications units. The test is being conducted to determine if operators will experience less stress by driving to conditions rather than driving to schedule, and have less incentive to speed in order to keep to schedule. • The TTC has reached out to other transit organizations to identify best practices and new and effective ways to prevent collisions. • The TTC is investigating new technologies to mitigate and prevent collisions. • A comprehensive review of the TTC’s training for new operators and for recertifying operators over the course of their career. • The TTC will work with the City’s Transportation Services on an outreach campaign around pedestrian, motorist and cycling safety and behaviours. Last year, the TTC began a review of the organization’s recruitment, training, supervision and monitoring of operators after several incidents involving TTC vehicles running red lights were reported. Last December, the review was accelerated following the tragic death of a 14-year-old girl struck by a bus in Scarborough <p>The precise number of articulated buses and standard bus to be stored and maintained at the McNicoll Bus Garage will be known closer to the completion date when routes being served are finalized. Ridership numbers in the area will certainly factor into this decision. The facility will have a capacity for 250 – 40ft buses.</p> <p>Although articulated buses are 60 feet long, they have similar operating characteristics (including turning radius) as the 40 ft buses. They are able to service the same city streets as the 40 ft buses and thus TTC does not anticipate issues operating them on Redlea Avenue.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito Romano</p>
<p>April 7 2015</p> <p>Solange Desautels MOECC</p>	<p>Hi Solange,</p> <p>I did not complete a preliminary duty to consult assessment, but from my understanding of Aboriginal interests and traditional territories the following communities may have an interest in the project:</p> <p>Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation 2789 Mississauga Road R.R. 6 Hagersville ON N0A 1H0 Project located within MNCFN asserted traditional territory as per the Consultation Protocol dated Dec 2013. Indicated to Toronto an interest in archeological and heritage resources.</p> <p>Alderville First Nation PO Box 46 Roseneath ON K0K 2X0 Project located within the Williams treaty area. Current direction is to include Mississauga communities in consultation for projects located in the L. Ontario watershed.</p> <p>Curve Lake First Nation 22 Winookeeda Road General Delivery Curve Lake ON KOL 1R0 Project located within the Williams treaty area. Current direction is to include Mississauga communities in consultation for projects located in the L. Ontario watershed.</p> <p>Hiawatha First Nation RR 2 Keene ON KOL 2G0 Project located within the Williams treaty area. Current direction is to include Mississauga communities in consultation for projects located in the L. Ontario watershed.</p> <p>Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation</p>	<p>Acknowledged and applied to EPR</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>22521 Island Road Port Perry ON L9L 1B6 Project located within the Williams treaty area. Current direction is to include Mississauga communities in consultation for projects located in the L. Ontario watershed.</p> <p>Kawartha Nishnawbe RR4 General Delivery Burleigh Falls ON K0L 2H0 Project located within the L. Ontario watershed. Project area within asserted traditional territory. Direction is to identify the community for consultation in the traditional Mississauga territory where Crown decisions could affect harvesting rights or Aboriginal archeological resources.</p> <p>Conseil de la Nation Huronne-Wendat 255, Place Chef Michel Laveau Wendake Québec G0A 4V0 Project located within the Huron Wendat area of interest. Project is not located within close proximity to a waterway. Notice should be provided when it is highly likely that Archaeological resources that are culturally affiliated with the Huron Wendat will be discovered, or once they have actually been discovered. If the cultural affiliation of the archaeological resources cannot be determined, then the Huron Wendat could be consulted when Archaeological resources are uncovered in the Huron Wendat area of interest. In the Toronto Area (GTA), Holland Marsh, and Trent-Severn to Belleville Huron Wendat are identified up-front for any projects within 300m of a water-way. This project is located greater than 300m to a waterway (approx. 2km +).</p> <p>It is standard practice to copy correspondence to Williams Treaty First Nations (for this project: Alderville, Curve Lake, Hiawatha, Mississaugas of Scugog Island) to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Karry Sandy-McKenzie Williams Treaty First Nation Claims Coordinator 8 Creswick Court Barrie On L4M 2J7</p> <p>Note: These communities align with those that would be considered as part of a duty to consult analysis.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Michelle Schlag, MNRM Aboriginal Consultation Advisor Environmental Approvals Access and Service Integration Branch Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change Operations Division</p>	
<p>April 15 2015</p> <p>Metrolinx</p> <p>Tom Aylward-Nally Stakeholder Relations Coordinator</p>	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>Further to our phone call, please find attached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The four-page community flyer circulated in the past weeks by Canada Post mail drop. It will have been received by probably all of the same households you've been engaging in the vicinity of the MBG site • Some suggested language related to this Metrolinx project for consideration as your team puts together the final EPR. It updates the content related to our project in your draft EPR to reflect advancement over the past six months. All information has already been made public by Metrolinx and it aligns closely with the information in the flyer. <p>Happy to discuss further.</p>	<p>Updates incorporated into revised EPR</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
<p>April 24 2015</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>Atth: 04-24-15 A 04-24-15 B</p>	<p>Tom Aylward-Nally Stakeholder Relations Coordinator</p> <p>This email is re-sent to attach also the previous email to TTC about the May 26, 2014 meeting.</p> <p>Dear Mr. Romano,</p> <p>Thank you for your kind invitation to meet with your Project Team “to address any outstanding issues.”</p> <p>You may recall that our church directors have met with you and your team twice before and expressed our concerns about the Bus Garage Project. Our last meeting took place on May 26, 2014 and we wrote to you and TTC CEO to express our concerns about the project. (Our email to you and TTC CEO are attached.) Unfortunately, we have not received any further communication from you as to how our concerns are being addressed. While TTC called our two meetings as “consultations” in your Environmental Project Report, we did not find these meetings to be meaningful dialogues. Neither did we find your Open House sessions address most of the issues that we raised.</p> <p>While we welcome your invitation for another meeting, we would like to ensure that this this (third) meeting to be a more fruitful and transparent consultation. Hence, we have consolidated and re-stated our concerns in the attached document “SCBC Concerns about the Health and Safety Risks of the Proposed McNicoll Bus Garage” and request that your Project Team provide <u>specific</u> response to our concerns before our meeting.</p> <p>I look forward to receive a written response from you before we set up our meeting.</p> <p>I have taken the liberty of forwarding a copy of this report to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change to keep them informed of our concerns.</p> <p>██████████ Chair of Board of Directors Scarborough Chinese Baptist Church</p>	<p>Dear Mr. ██████████,</p> <p>Thank you for e-mail and your attachment titled <u>Scarborough Chinese Baptist Church Concerns About the Health and Safety Risks of the Proposed McNicoll Bus Garage</u>. I understand that that the document also includes and restates the concerns expressed in your June 2, 2014 letter to TTC. The Project Team has had an opportunity to review these concerns and have provided the following response. For ease of relating to the original document, responses are presented by section heading as in the original document.</p> <p>WHY BUILD A BUS GARAGE HERE?</p> <p>In identifying candidate sites for a new bus garage, TTC employed the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site having at least 20 acres (approximately 8 hectares) in order to accommodate 250 standard buses • Located in an area that minimizes “deadhead time” (i.e., the time required for buses to travel between the garage and the beginning of revenue service) • A site having the appropriate zoning classification <p>The search concluded with two candidate sites – the current site and the vacant lot immediately to the east of the current site on the east side of the GO Transit rail line. The current site was chosen because it is larger (19 acres versus approximately 14 acres). The land TTC previously held near Markham Road and Steeles Avenue East was recognized as not ideal because it is further removed from the bus routes to be served. When a developer approached TTC with an offer to purchase, TTC took this opportunity to find a site which better served the business need, which led to the current site. Further subsequent attempts to find land that meets the above criteria have similarly resulted in the identification of the McNicoll Site as the preferred site. Vacant industrial lots are still available in the Markham/Steeles area, but as previously noted, the current site is in the best location for deployment of buses and will yield significant, ongoing savings over time.</p> <p>With regard to the comment about the appropriateness of the zoning by-law to allow “heavy industrial in this highly populated and commercial neighbourhood”, the zoning classification of the property is determined by the City of Toronto City Planning Division and not TTC. Whether or not the zoning classification is appropriate is a matter to be brought forth to the City Planning Division.</p> <p>SERIOUS HEALTH RISKS CAUSED BY THE BUS GARAGE</p> <p>We are concerned about the health and wellbeing of the residents of the Mon Sheong Long Term Care Centre. TTC undertook a Screening Level Human Health Risk Assessment (SLHHRA) that employed the most restrictive acute (short-term) and chronic (long-term) health benchmarks selected from a sample of such benchmarks from major health organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO), the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment and the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The results of the SLHHRA showed that the estimated emissions from the McNicoll Bus Garage would represent a minimal to negligible contribution to air quality. The SLHHRA was submitted to Toronto Public Health for review; we anticipate TPH will release the results of their review in the next few days, and we will make this available to the public through our project website. Based on recent discussions with TPH we do not anticipate the report will raise any public health concerns regarding the proposed facility.</p> <p>Moreover, the noise and vibration analysis recognized the sensitive nature of the Mon Sheong Long Term Care Centre. To mitigate the noise and vibration effects, we are committing to constructing a five-metre high noise barrier, moving the entrance to the garage away from the Long Term Care Centre, and positioning exhaust vents away from the Centre as well. With these measures in effect, we are able to assure ourselves that provincial standards related to noise and vibration can be met.</p> <p>With regard to emergency response related to fuel storage and traffic congestion as your report suggests, for reasons explained later in this reply, we don’t believe that emergency response services will be compromised by the McNicoll Bus Garage.</p> <p>COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY</p> <p>We are aware that Metrolinx completed an Environmental Project Report for the twinning of the Stouffville Line and that Metrolinx plans to increase GO Transit service on the line in the near future. The fuelling facility is being placed approximately 70 feet from the rail right-of-way, considerably more than the minimum 25 feet required by federal regulations. The fuelling facilities will be reviewed and certified by the Technical Standards and Safety Authority (TSSA), a provincial safety agency, to ensure they meet all modern safety standards. Additionally, the flash point of diesel fuel is over 50 degrees Celsius, which minimizes the risk of explosion and fire as compared to other fuels such as gasoline (-43C) or propane (-104C). It is worth noting that TTC, with fuelling facilities across the city that have been in operation for decades, has never had a fuel explosion at any of its bus garages.</p> <p>The rail/road crossing next to the site is protected with advanced warning lights in accordance with appropriate standards. We expect that, with professional drivers providing the delivery of fuel to the McNicoll Bus Garage, that the likelihood of a collision at the rail/road crossing would be no different than at any other at-grade rail crossing in the city. A future separation of the crossing, while currently not scheduled for construction, would reduce the impact.</p> <p>While London may have decided to discontinue the use of the “bendy” buses, we also recognize that articulated buses are effectively and efficiently serving the transportation needs of numerous cities and metropolitan areas in North America and around the world.</p> <p>IMPACT OF BUS GARAGE ON HEALTH AND SAFETY OF SCBC CONGREGANTS</p> <p>We agree that the McNicoll Bus Garage will generate vehicle trips, including buses having lengths of 40 feet and 60 feet. However, we also note that the majority of the bus trips to and from the garage (about 70%), according to our estimates, will travel south to McNicoll Avenue and not</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
		<p>pass the Scarborough Chinese Baptist Church. We also note that the entrance and exit to the garage and to the employee parking lot are near the property boundary with the church. Consequently, traffic speeds near the location where parishioners would cross Redlea Avenue are expected to be slow.</p> <p>We also note that traffic volumes would be generated by any other use of the McNicoll Site, including potentially transport trucks, which could have operating hours that extend into the evenings and weekends.</p> <p>THE BUS GARAGE IS NOT SUPPORTED BY COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE AND FUTURE COMMUNITY PLANNING</p> <p>Given that Redlea Avenue is located in an area that is zoned for employment uses (including industrial), we accept that the City of Toronto would have designed Redlea Avenue to accommodate such future uses. And, it is likely that if we did not build a bus garage on the site, a developer could have constructed an employment facility that would generate transport truck traffic, with vehicles lengths approximating those of the TTC bus fleet, including the articulated fleet.</p> <p>We understand the issue of pedestrian safety in relation to the need for congregants to cross Redlea Avenue to reach the Scarborough Chinese Baptist Church. Our own employees will face the same situation when walking between our parking lot and the maintenance and storage building. We will be monitoring the situation immediately upon opening day and will seek to receive permission from the City of Toronto to install crosswalk warning lights if needed. Perhaps there is an opportunity for both TTC and the Church to approach the City jointly to address the issue.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Study was based on the traffic forecast found in the Redlea Avenue and Silver Star Boulevard Extensions Class Environmental Study Report prepared by Read, Voorhees & Associates. The forecasts were developed based on trip generation rates associated with the permitted land uses of adjacent properties in the zoning by-law. At the time of the Traffic Impact Study, the development proposal mentioned in your report had no official status; therefore, the forecast volumes from that development were not included in the Traffic Impact Study.</p> <p>With regard to the comments about TTC's use of articulated buses, it is important to note that two articulated buses carry the same capacity as three standard buses. Therefore, while longer articulated buses may require a fraction more time to clear an intersection than a standard bus, fewer articulated buses than standard buses will be required. Also, the peak time for bus traffic to and from the garage does not coincide with the traditional commuter peak periods. Any minor increase in time needed for articulated buses would have little effect on the vehicle/capacity ratio for the commuter peak periods when vehicle and pedestrian volumes are highest, as such increases would not occur in the commuter peak periods (rush hours).</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>We respectfully disagree with the conclusion stated in your report. TTC has undertaken consultation with the neighbouring property owners and tenants to hear all issues and concerns from the community. TTC has listened to the comments heard at the open houses and from the e-mails received, and has made adjustments to the McNicoll Bus Garage design. Two of the adjustments include moving the entrance/exit of the garage away from the Mon Sheong Long Term Care Centre and moving the fueling of vehicles to the east side of the site to also minimize the effect on the Long Term Care Centre. Other efforts include performing additional air quality analyses that go above the provincial requirements. Listening to the community will not end with the release of the Environmental Project Report, but rather, will continue during the design phase to give the community an opportunity to comment on more detailed matters.</p> <p>Additionally, we have consulted with experts in the fields of acoustical engineering, health, and traffic to assure ourselves that not only the design but the operation of the garage will not adversely affect the neighbourhood. We have applied very conservative worst-case criteria to assure that not only will the garage meet provincial guidelines and standards but will assure ourselves and hopefully the community that the effects of the garage are not a burden on our neighbours.</p> <p>We are very aware that a number of residents have expressed concerns about the McNicoll Bus Garage. We appreciate their sentiment, however, we, as a public agency that provides transportation services to the residents of the City of Toronto, have heard from our customers that we need to increase our service levels to alleviate overcrowded conditions on our buses. We have also received direction from Toronto City Council to proceed with this project, at this site, because in their opinion it is the most appropriate site for the garage.</p> <p>TTC acknowledges that construction and operation of the McNicoll Bus Garage will require measures to mitigate potential impacts that neighbours may experience. The Environmental Project Report, scheduled for release later this month will describe those measures in greater detail. TTC remains committed to working with our neighbours and other stakeholders to address their concerns.</p> <p>Our offer to meet with you and your Executive to further discuss the project is open. If you are interested, please contact me.</p> <p>Regards, Lito Romano</p>
<p>April 24 2015</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Lito,</p> <p>Would you please ask Novus to give me the following numbers ASAP? January 26, 2015, 9-page report</p> <p>1. On p.8, Table 4, buses and cars will not be going 60km/hr in a 23m wide road. Please change the corresponding number assuming they are going at 20km/hr.</p>	<p>Hi ██████████,</p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>In response to your first question, 60km/hour is the speed limit used in the study because this will be the posted speed limit for vehicles on Redlea Avenue as stated in the Traffic Impact Study (page 5).</p> <p>With regard to your second question, the % of standard refers to the guidelines referenced in Section 4.0 Ambient Pollutant Concentrations of</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response																																																																																																													
	<p>2. Table 5, present all percentages there in actual numbers. % of standard---what is standard?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>the report. Below is the updated table including the value for the standard.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Contaminant</th> <th rowspan="2">Averaging Period</th> <th rowspan="2">Standard (µg/m³)</th> <th rowspan="2">Maximum Concentration Due to Roadway Alone (µg/m³)</th> <th rowspan="2">Maximum Concentration Due to Roadway Alone (as % of Standard)</th> <th colspan="3">Combined Concentration as % of Standard (Ambient + Facility + Roadway)</th> <th rowspan="2">Additional # of Guideline Exceedances due to Project Over 5 Years (Exceedances due to Roadway)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Maximum</th> <th>90th Percentile</th> <th>Average</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">NO₂</td> <td>1-hour</td> <td>400</td> <td>18.5</td> <td>4.6%</td> <td>84%</td> <td>58%</td> <td>52%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>24-hour</td> <td>200</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>0.4%</td> <td>61%</td> <td>40%</td> <td>30%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">CO</td> <td>1-hour</td> <td>36,200</td> <td>72</td> <td>0.2%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>1%</td> <td>1%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>8-hour</td> <td>15,700</td> <td>30</td> <td>0.2%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>3%</td> <td>2%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>PM_{2.5}¹</td> <td>24-hour</td> <td>27*</td> <td>1.4</td> <td>5.2%</td> <td>144%</td> <td>58%</td> <td>35%</td> <td>5 (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PM₁₀</td> <td>24-hour</td> <td>50</td> <td>1.7</td> <td>3.4%</td> <td>140%</td> <td>54%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>3 (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acetaldehyde</td> <td>24-hour</td> <td>500</td> <td>0.10</td> <td>0.02%</td> <td>1%</td> <td><1%</td> <td><1%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acrolein</td> <td>24-hour</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0.02</td> <td>4.7%</td> <td>43%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>25%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Benzene</td> <td>24-hour</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>0.05</td> <td>2.1%</td> <td>109%</td> <td>52%</td> <td>37%</td> <td>6 (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1,3-Butadiene</td> <td>24-hour</td> <td>10</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>0.1%</td> <td>3%</td> <td>1%</td> <td>1%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Formaldehyde</td> <td>24-hour</td> <td>65</td> <td>0.23</td> <td>0.4%</td> <td>13%</td> <td>8%</td> <td>5%</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* The CWS is based on the annual 98th percentile concentration, averaged over three consecutive years. The standard becomes 27 in year 2020.</p> <p>Regards, Lito</p>	Contaminant	Averaging Period	Standard (µg/m ³)	Maximum Concentration Due to Roadway Alone (µg/m ³)	Maximum Concentration Due to Roadway Alone (as % of Standard)	Combined Concentration as % of Standard (Ambient + Facility + Roadway)			Additional # of Guideline Exceedances due to Project Over 5 Years (Exceedances due to Roadway)	Maximum	90 th Percentile	Average	NO ₂	1-hour	400	18.5	4.6%	84%	58%	52%		24-hour	200	2.3	0.4%	61%	40%	30%		CO	1-hour	36,200	72	0.2%	6%	1%	1%		8-hour	15,700	30	0.2%	12%	3%	2%		PM _{2.5} ¹	24-hour	27*	1.4	5.2%	144%	58%	35%	5 (2)	PM ₁₀	24-hour	50	1.7	3.4%	140%	54%	32%	3 (2)	Acetaldehyde	24-hour	500	0.10	0.02%	1%	<1%	<1%		Acrolein	24-hour	0.4	0.02	4.7%	43%	30%	25%		Benzene	24-hour	2.3	0.05	2.1%	109%	52%	37%	6 (0)	1,3-Butadiene	24-hour	10	0.01	0.1%	3%	1%	1%		Formaldehyde	24-hour	65	0.23	0.4%	13%	8%	5%	
Contaminant	Averaging Period	Standard (µg/m ³)						Maximum Concentration Due to Roadway Alone (µg/m ³)	Maximum Concentration Due to Roadway Alone (as % of Standard)	Combined Concentration as % of Standard (Ambient + Facility + Roadway)			Additional # of Guideline Exceedances due to Project Over 5 Years (Exceedances due to Roadway)																																																																																																		
			Maximum	90 th Percentile	Average																																																																																																										
NO ₂	1-hour	400	18.5	4.6%	84%	58%	52%																																																																																																								
	24-hour	200	2.3	0.4%	61%	40%	30%																																																																																																								
CO	1-hour	36,200	72	0.2%	6%	1%	1%																																																																																																								
	8-hour	15,700	30	0.2%	12%	3%	2%																																																																																																								
PM _{2.5} ¹	24-hour	27*	1.4	5.2%	144%	58%	35%	5 (2)																																																																																																							
PM ₁₀	24-hour	50	1.7	3.4%	140%	54%	32%	3 (2)																																																																																																							
Acetaldehyde	24-hour	500	0.10	0.02%	1%	<1%	<1%																																																																																																								
Acrolein	24-hour	0.4	0.02	4.7%	43%	30%	25%																																																																																																								
Benzene	24-hour	2.3	0.05	2.1%	109%	52%	37%	6 (0)																																																																																																							
1,3-Butadiene	24-hour	10	0.01	0.1%	3%	1%	1%																																																																																																								
Formaldehyde	24-hour	65	0.23	0.4%	13%	8%	5%																																																																																																								
<p>April 24 2015</p>	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>I wonder if you would enlighten me per the following 2 claims. Please list grounds in detail for the claims.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The planned McNicoll garage is a D6 Class II industry. 2. The planned McNicoll garage is a redevelopment. <p>Thank you for your attention.</p>	<p>Hi [redacted],</p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>I refer you to section 5.3.2 of the draft EPR which addresses this issue. I have taken an excerpt for easy reference:</p> <p>Guideline D-6</p> <p>The D-series of guidelines were developed by the MOECC in 1995 as a means to assess recommended separation distances and other control measures for land use planning proposals in an effort to prevent or minimize 'adverse effects' from the encroachment of incompatible land uses where a facility either exists or is proposed. The guideline specifically addresses issues of odour, dust, noise and litter.</p> <p>Guideline D-6 Compatibility between Industrial Facilities and Sensitive Land Uses addresses industrial land uses similar to the proposed bus facility. From the Guideline's synopsis, Guideline D-6 is "intended to be applied in the land use planning process to prevent or minimize future land use problems due to the encroachment of sensitive land uses and industrial land uses on one another." As the proposed project does not require a land use planning assessment (neither an Official Plan Amendment nor a Zoning By-law Amendment is required), Guideline D-6 does not strictly apply; regardless, it still can be used to consider what would generally be considered acceptable.</p> <p>Guideline D-6 defines an Area of Influence and a Recommended Minimum Setback distance for three classes of industrial operation: light, medium, and heavy industrial uses. These distances</p>																																																																																																													

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response												
		<p>are determined by industry class and are shown in Table 5-1.</p> <p>Table 5-1: Guideline D-6 Potential Influence Areas and Recommended Minimum Setback Distances for Industrial Land Uses</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Industry Classification ---</th> <th>Area of Influence</th> <th>Recommended Setback Distance</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Class I Light Industrial</td> <td>70 m</td> <td>20 m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Class II – Medium Industrial</td> <td>300 m</td> <td>70 m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Class III – Heavy Industrial</td> <td>1000 m</td> <td>300 m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Based on the size of the facility and the nature of the use, the proposed MBG is consistent with a Class 2 industry, with an Area of Influence of 300 m, and a Recommended Minimum Setback Distance of 70 m.</p> <p>Guideline D-6 recommends that detailed assessments be conducted where sensitive land uses are located within the Area of Influence of the industrial facility. There are several sensitive receptors within the Area of Influence. The closest sensitive use is the Mon Sheong Court and Long-Term Care Facility. <i>The detailed analyses presented in the EPR meet this requirement of Guideline D-6.</i></p> <p>Guideline D-6 also provides a Recommended Minimum Setback Distance of 70 m for Class 2 facilities. The distances between the Mon Sheong Long-Term Care Facility and the MBG are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Property line to property line – 23 m <input type="checkbox"/> Mon Sheong Long-Term Care Facility to closest on-site bus route – 30 m <p>While the Mon Sheong Long-Term Care Facility lies within the Recommended Minimum Setback Distance from the proposed MBG, Guideline D-6 is clear that the Minimum Setback Distance is a recommendation only. Section 4.10 of the Guideline allows for development to occur within the minimum setback for “redevelopment, infilling and mixed use” areas. <i>This project would qualify as redevelopment since the land is already zoned as industrial rather than re-zoning of the lands.</i> In such cases, Section 4.10 of the Guideline requires that a detailed assessment be conducted to show that the relevant air quality guidelines are met. <i>The detailed analyses presented in the subsequent sections of the EPR show that this is the case. Thus, the minimum setback requirements of Guideline D-6 have been addressed.</i></p> <p>With respect to your second question on whether this constitutes a redevelopment, I refer you to section 5.3.4 related to NOISE in the draft EPR which states:</p> <p>“While the Mon Sheong LongTerm Care Facility lies within the Recommended Minimum Setback Distance from the proposed MBG, Guideline D-6 is clear that the Minimum Setback Distance is a recommendation only. Section 4.10 of the Guideline allows for development to occur within the minimum setback for “redevelopment, infilling and mixed use” areas. This project would qualify as redevelopment or infilling since the land is already zoned as industrial rather than re-zoning of the lands. In such cases, Section 4.10 of the Guideline requires that a detailed assessment be conducted to show that the relevant noise guidelines are met (in this case, MOECC Publication NPC-300, the successor guideline to former MOE Publication LU-131). The detailed analyses presented in the subsequent sections of the EPR show that this is the case. Thus, the minimum setback requirements of Guideline D-6 have been addressed.</p> <p>I trust this addresses your questions.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	Industry Classification ---	Area of Influence	Recommended Setback Distance	Class I Light Industrial	70 m	20 m	Class II – Medium Industrial	300 m	70 m	Class III – Heavy Industrial	1000 m	300 m
Industry Classification ---	Area of Influence	Recommended Setback Distance												
Class I Light Industrial	70 m	20 m												
Class II – Medium Industrial	300 m	70 m												
Class III – Heavy Industrial	1000 m	300 m												

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
(April 24 2015) ██████████	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>Thank you for your speedy reply and EPR excerpt.</p> <p>The EPR excerpt noted, “ <i>This project would qualify as redevelopment since the land is already zoned as industrial rather than re-zoning of the lands.</i>” May you help me better understand what it meant by the term redevelopment? Is the criteria for land labeled as “redevelopment” simply means no rezoning of land? Please cite specific policies that define the term “redevelopment” as claimed. Thanks.</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Lito</p> <p>Hi ██████████,</p> <p>Thank you for your follow up question related to the D6 Guideline and how it relates to the McNicoll Bus Garage. The Ministry of Environment and Climate Change advised TTC that the D-6 guideline is not applicable for this project because the guideline is a land use planning document used for the purpose of developing official plans and zoning. Given that neither apply in this circumstance, TTC is not required to fulfill the requirements. Nonetheless, TTC undertook a noise assessment under Guideline D-6 in response to a stakeholder request. The results of the assessment show that even if the Guideline D6 were in effect, the facility would be in compliance.</p> <p>With respect to your request for policies which define the term “redevelopment”, you may wish to contact MOECC as this would fall outside TTC’s area of expertise.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito</p>
April 27 2015 ██████████	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>While awaiting for your clarification of the policy based definition of “redevelopment”, I still have a couple of questions to ask of TTC as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I was at the 3rd TTC Open House very briefly, just wonder what is TTC’s understanding of the 3rd Open House participants’ responses? 2. Other than the 3rd TTC Open House, TTC probably has done further consultation with a number of neighborhood organizations during the TPAP process. Please list name of organizations, with dates of consultation and organization responses, which you had consulted since the start of TPAP. 3. For your past and present consultation with stakeholders in the community, what criteria do you use to determine which stakeholders are to be consulted? 4. For TTC Open House flyer distribution, is that done per a set radius? What criteria do you use to determine where to send the flyers? <p>Thank you. ██████████</p>	<p>Hi ██████████,</p> <p>Thank you for your follow up questions.</p> <p>A summary report of TTC’s 3rd Open House was prepared and posted on line. It includes a summary of the discussion and comments throughout the evening. The report is available on the project site at:</p> <p>http://www.ttc.ca/About_the_TTC/Projects/McNicoll_Bus_Garage/index.jsp</p> <p>TTC has been consulting with community for over two years, sharing details as the project advanced through different stages. A listing of individuals and groups included in the consultation is outlined in the Draft EPR under Section 6.0 CONSULTATION. Please note that this is an organic list that has increased with each open house and with each Project Notice that TTC issues. Anyone who either requested further details on the project or that TTC identified as having an interest in the project would have been added to this list. The consultation section of the report will be updated with the Final EPR.</p> <p>The TPAP regulation requires that property owners within 30 metres of the site be notified. TTC has expanded this catchment to more than double the minimum requirement. Further, ads in English and Chinese newspapers were purchased to ensure that anyone with an interest in the project had the opportunity to learn more about it. Notices for the Open House were distributed to approximately 4000 homes to an area bound by Birchmount Ave, Midland Ave, Finch Ave E and Steeles Ave. As a result of this outreach, TTC has developed a contact list including area residents, tenants, businesses, ratepayer groups and elected officials.</p> <p>We look forward to continuing this dialogue throughout the Transit Project Assessment Process.</p> <p>Regards, Lito</p>
	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>Thank you for your speedy reply and EPR excerpt.</p> <p>The EPR excerpt noted, “ <i>This project would qualify as redevelopment since the land is already zoned as industrial rather than re-zoning of the lands.</i>” May you help me better understand what it meant by the term redevelopment? Is the criteria for land labeled as “redevelopment” simply means no rezoning of land? Please cite specific policies that define the term “redevelopment” as claimed. Thanks.</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Hi ██████████,</p> <p>Thank you for your follow up question related to the D6 Guideline and how it relates to the McNicoll Bus Garage.</p> <p>The Ministry of Environment and Climate Change advised TTC that the D-6 guideline is not applicable for this project because the guideline is a land use planning document used for the purpose of developing official plans and zoning. Given that neither apply in this circumstance, TTC is not required to fulfill the requirements. Nonetheless, TTC undertook a noise assessment under Guideline D-6 in response to a stakeholder request. The results of the assessment show that even if the Guideline D6 were in effect, the facility would be in compliance.</p> <p>With respect to your request for policies which define the term “redevelopment”, you may wish to contact MOECC as this would fall outside TTC’s area of expertise.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito</p>
April 30 2015	Hi Lito,	Hi ██████████,

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
<p>██████████</p>	<p>Thank you for your speedy reply. I inquired about the definition of “redevelopment” as this term is referenced in the TTC EPR excerpt that you sent to me. Would appreciate if you would consult with your EPR writer as to what government policy is used to make the claim that the stated land is a redevelopment. There must be some valid policies that the writer of your EPR based on to make that claim. Thank you for enlightening me further.</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Thank you again for your interest and question related to the definition of ‘redevelopment’ in the D-6 Guideline and how it relates to the McNicoll Bus Garage.</p> <p>I have copied the definition from the D-6 guideline below:</p> <p>Redevelopment <i>Where existing land uses are being phased out and replaced by another type of designated land use as part of a land use plan or proposal which has been substantiated by studies and is in accordance with a municipal official plan policy or other formally approved plan.</i></p> <p>In the case of the McNicoll Bus Garage, the vacant lot is being replaced by the McNicoll Bus Garage, which has undergone a number of studies that show that its impacts are either not significant or can be addressed through mitigation measures. The McNicoll Bus Garage is located in an area where the Official Plan for the City of Toronto has identified employment uses and the Official Plan supports increased transit service to meet the mobility needs. When viewed against the definition, the McNicoll Bus Garage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has an existing land use (vacant) being replaced by another type of type of designated land use (McNicoll Bus Garage) • The designated land use is part of a land use plan or proposal which has been substantiated by studies (the Environmental Project Report, Air Quality Study, Noise Study, Archaeological Assessments, etc.) • Is in accordance a municipal official plan (employment use, transit usage) <p>That is the context by which the term “redevelopment” applies to the McNicoll Bus Garage Project.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito</p>
<p>May 3 2015</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>Thank you for your reply and alerting me to the release of TTC 3rd Open House Summary. While I am waiting for your reply regarding the substantiation and validation of TTC’s EPR claim that the planned McNicoll land is a development, my further questions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As you mentioned in your reply that TTC has developed “a contact list including area residents, tenants, businesses, ratepayer groups and elected officials”, would appreciate that TTC shares the list with me with date and name of facilities, groups, organizations and businesses so I know when and whom you have contacted specifically. 2. TTC repeatedly asserts that “the City required owner of the development to notify all perspective <u>buyers</u> at Mon Sheong that the adjacent property was zoned heavy industrial ...” when answering inquiry questioning TTC building next to a Long-term care facility. How is this requirement applicable to all LTC residents whom we all know neither lease nor buy their living quarters at the LTC and that all over the city LTC admissions are coordinated by CCAC? Please <u>explain and be specific how this requirement is relevant and applicable to LTC residents.</u> 3. Any past and current TTC garage which <u>met/meet all 3 conditions</u> as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. closely comparable to the size and operations of the planned McNicoll bus garage b. 23m property line to property line c. of a Long term Care facility Please provide straight and specific answer. Apple to apple comparison requested. There is no need to make reference nor elaborate on residential proximity as LTC is a unique entity, more than residential. 4. Any past and current TTC garage which <u>met/meet all 2 conditions</u> as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. closely comparable to the size and operations of the planned McNicoll bus garage b. in an already established seniors corridor with comparable size and profile <u>before the built</u>. That is, built in prior view of an already existing seniors community as large as the size and of the same profile as this seniors community of over 100,000. Please provide straight and specific answer. Apple to apple comparison requested. There is no need to make reference or elaborate on legal 	<p>Dear ██████████</p> <p>The draft EPR included a section on TTC’s consultation for this project listing key stakeholders and meeting dates. I refer you to the draft EPR for such details.</p> <p>The requirement for the developer to notify prospective buyers that the adjacent property was zoned industrial was specific to MonSheong. City Planning approved a by-law amendment in August 2004 for the adjacent Long Term Care Facility and Condominium Complex. The developers were advised that they would be constructing next to an industrial-zoned property. The City required that the following wording clause for offers of purchase and sale to be included as a condition of site plan approval. The intent was to ensure that residents were aware of the type of operations that could be set up at the adjacent lands:</p> <p><i>“Future residents are advised that this development is in proximity to existing industrial facilities and industrially zoned lands whose activities may at times be audible and emit exhaust. These industries may legally expand their operations and/or hours of operations, including operations on a 24-hour/7 day basis and such operations at times may be audible which may affect the living environment of the residents, notwithstanding the inclusion of noise, vibration attenuation measures in the design of the development and individual units.”</i></p> <p>The conditions you’ve identified in questions 3 and 4 are very specific to the McNicoll site and not replicated at other bus garages. However, as stated to you in earlier correspondence, TTC operates garages in proximity to long term care facilities, hospitals and rehab centres across the city, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copernicus Lodge (http://www.copernicuslodge.com/) is immediately adjacent to Roncesvalles Streetcar Yard (it shares a property line), and St. Joseph’s Hospital is just across the street. Although this is not a bus garage, there is significant volume of large vehicles travelling to/from site. Noise levels may actually be higher than that of a bus garage given squealing from steel wheels on a steel rail. • Ina Grafton Gage Home (http://www.iggh.org/), a 128-bed long-term care facility, is about 300m west of the Birchmount Garage. • Hillcrest Rehab Hospital is about 150m northeast of the Hillcrest facility, which supports buses and streetcars. • Of not as well is a seniors home near the corner of Bloor and Dufferin (New Horizons Tower http://www.newhorizonstower.com/) that is 40m from one of TTC’s busiest bus routes, the 29 Dufferin route. According to these bus schedules (http://www.ttc.ca/Schedule/schedule.jsp?Route=29N&Stop=n.b. on DUFFERIN at BLOOR, http://www.ttc.ca/Schedule/schedule.jsp?Route=29S&Stop=s.b. on DUFFERIN at BLOOR), there are over 588 bus passages north bound and southbound through this intersection each weekday, including both standard and articulated buses. <p>TTC is also consulting with Local Health Integration Network who are aware of TTC’s plans for the site.</p> <p>TTC bus garages, subway yards and street car yards are also located in very close proximity to residential neighbourhoods (Malvern Bus Garage, Birchmount Bus Garage, Mount Dennis Bus Garage, Greenwood Subway Yard, Vincent (Keele) Subway Yard, Davisville Subway Yard, Roncesvalles Streetcar Facility, Russell Facility, and the Hillcrest Facility).</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
	<p>entitlement and busy bus routes as TTC has already enlightened me.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention. Looking forward to your unfailing prompt reply.</p> <p>██████</p>	<p>It is not uncommon for transit facilities to coexist in proximity to residential areas. TTC will continue to work with the community and all regulatory agencies as well as the Province to ensure a successful project.</p> <p>Thank you, Lito</p>
<p>May 5 2015</p> <p>██████ President Villa Elegance</p>	<p>Hi Lito,</p> <p>I have several concerns regarding the proposed McNicoll bus garage that needs clarifications:</p> <p>1) Villa Elegance was new in 1999 for frail seniors specially with Chinese culture as a transition before end of life or to long term care; we were not aware of the zoning on the east side of Kennedy; a) TTC did not buy the land till 2005; please fill me in of the zoning of that land in 1997; b) any consideration at time of land purchase from TTC in 2005 of the seniors and families at Villa Elegance and Bamburgh Gate, students at Mary Ward Catholic School?</p> <p>2) What is the guideline of notification from TTC on the site proposal to those affected: a) perimeter (meters or yards) and b) types (official announcement, notice etc.)? In other words, how far distance-wise should TTC inform the neighbourhood to fulfil its obligation for consultation? Other than the Open House flyers, was there any other official notification sent out since 2005?</p> <p>3) Villa Elegance at 3088 Kennedy Road have frail seniors and is with Assisted Living Program, Open Houses held in other sites did not give chance to seniors to voice out other than petitions we signed. Would TTC consider consultations including these immobile seniors?</p> <p>4) Traffic by buses - even TTC said the buses travel off peak hours, does buses go out early in the morning before 7 am. and never comes back till late at night? What are the expected in and out times of buses at the proposed site. Peak hours - what is the TTC's definition?</p> <p>5) TTC Staff - a) What are the different types of staff in the proposed site? b) How many stayed at the site and how many are in and out? c) total of staff, 500 persons? d) further to 5a), what is the % of each type and their start + end time of their shift?</p> <p>6) Report from TTC consultants : a) air pollution: did report take into consideration of the # of buses coming out from the proposed site and travel along Redlea, McNicoll Ave. ? b) noise pollution: same question as 6a) c) derailment from Go-train : any report (such as a collision impact study report for new developed vehicle) on consequence of a derailment ? Any study/report on the double layered tank in the case of derailment? d) what is the disaster recovery in case of such mishaps - how much of damage of an explosion from the oil tank? how far would that covers?</p> <p>Please advise Villa Elegance regarding the above concerns that we have thought of so far.</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>██████ President Villa Elegance</p>	<p>Dear ██████,</p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>1. One of the reasons TTC secured this site was because it was properly zoned as "Heavy Industrial" which permits the construction of a transit facility. The property was zoned Industrial in 1962, well before construction of the Long Term Care Facility or the adjacent condominium. City Planning approved a by-law amendment in August 2004 for the adjacent Long Term Care Facility and Condominium Complex. The developers of Mon Sheong were advised that they would be constructing next to an industrial-zoned property. The City required that the following wording clause for offers of purchase and sale to be included as a condition of site plan approval: <i>"Future residents are advised that this development is in proximity to existing industrial facilities and industrially zoned lands whose activities may at times be audible and emit exhaust. These industries may legally expand their operations and/or hours of operations, including operations on a 24-hour/7 day basis and such operations at times may be audible which may affect the living environment of the residents, notwithstanding the inclusion of noise, vibration attenuation measures in the design of the development and individual units."</i> The property for the Long Term Care Facility and the condo was originally purchased as industrial land. The proponents rezoned them in 2002 and 2003 to allow construction of these two complexes.</p> <p>2. The project is subject to the Provincial Transit Project Assessment Process which details the consultation requirements. These are laid out in the Guidelines available at the following link; http://www.ontario.ca/document/guide-environmental-assessment-requirements-transit-projects Summary reports on each of TTC's Open Houses were posted on the project site available at the following link: http://www.ttc.ca/About the TTC/Projects/McNicoll Bus Garage/index.jsp Updates will also be included in the completed Environmental Project Report, scheduled for release later this month. As well, the Environmental Project Report dedicates a chapter on consultation, listing comments received during the consultation and TTC's responses.</p> <p>3. To accommodate residents who were unable to attend any of the Open Houses or those who wished to receive further information, TTC hosted open houses and "question and answer" sessions for residents of the Mon Sheong Long Term Care Facility as well as the Mon Sheong Condo. In addition TTC accepted an invitation from the President of the Bamburgh Manor Condo Corporation which includes Villa Elegance Retirement Condominium to present to their residents on May 27 2014. The event was very well attended with only standing room available. At each of these events, translators were available to ensure participants understood the project and were engaged in the discussion.</p> <p>4. At each of the Open Houses, TTC presented a table illustrating the flow of buses and the approximate times they will be entering and exiting the facility. This information is available on slide 36 in the following display panels which were presented at the February 5 2015 Open House: http://www.ttc.ca/PDF/Transit expansion PDFs/McNicollBusGarage Presentation Feb05-15 w.pdf</p> <p>5. TTC expects there will be approximately 100 staff working at the facility including Service Line Staff who are responsible for fueling and cleaning buses, Repair Bay Technicians, staff to support the Transportation Office (route scheduling) and building maintenance staff. In addition there will be an additional 400 operators who will report their for their routes over a 24 hour period.</p> <p>6. Updated copies of noise, air quality and traffic reports will be available in an updated EPR which is scheduled for release later this month when TTC issues its Notice of Completion. TTC is committed to mitigating levels as required by the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change.</p> <p>With respect to the safety of storing diesel on site, although the facility is adjacent to the GO Rail corridor, the track alignment is straight</p>

Comment/Response Log

Date/From	Comment	Response
		<p>with no cross-overs, switches or other special track work typically associated with train derailments. As well, the Milliken GO station is less than 1 km of the garage site; northbound trains will be decreasing their speed as they approach the station and southbound trains will be very early into acceleration. In short, trains are not expected to travel past the bus garage at a significant speed. GO Transit has provided TTC with guidelines for minimum setbacks from the tracks; the TTC will be complying with these recommendations and not constructing the building or tanks within this minimum setback zone.</p> <p>Further, the diesel storage tanks have a two-hour fire rating. This rating protects the tank contents from fire for two hours, which will provide time for emergency services to respond in the event of a fire. Tanks have also passed impact-testing and will be protected with a combination of jersey barriers and bollards. All tanks are ULC- approved fire rated. (ULC Standards develops and publishes standards and specifications for products having a bearing on fire. It is accredited by the Standards Council of Canada.) TTC has never experienced an explosion at any of its diesel tanks. Diesel it must be atomized or compressed before it can ignite. In fact, if diesel spilled on the ground, a lit cigarette or match would not ignite it.</p> <p>Thank you again for your interest in this project.</p> <p>Regards, Lito</p>
<p>May 15, 2015 Dr. David McKeown Medical Officer of Health Toronto Public Health</p>	<p>Dear Mr. Byford:</p> <p>Thank you for providing Toronto Public Health with the opportunity to comment on the proposed McNicoll Bus Garage project.</p> <p>As you are aware, this review was initiated following a City Council directive and in part also responds to the concerns raised by local community groups.</p> <p>The attached comments (Attch 05-15-15) were restricted to the review of air quality assessment, noise assessment, traffic assessment, and the screening level human health risk assessment. In all cases, our assessment finds that the impact resulting from the future operation of the proposed McNicoll Bus Garage would be minimal and it is unlikely that any adverse impacts on human health would be encountered.</p> <p>At this point, I would like to reiterate that my staff and I will remain available to provide public health input as this project proceeds. In addition, Toronto Public Health supports policies that enhance affordable and accessible public transit.</p> <p>Should you require further information or assistance, please contact Barbara Lachapelle at blachap@toronto.ca or 416-392-7691.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dr. David McKeown</p>	<p>Noted.</p>