

## Part 6: Comment/Response Table

**Comment Summary Table**

**Proposal:** Rathburn Road Transit Priority Measures Project  
**Proponent:** City of Mississauga

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
<b>Aboriginal Communities / Related Agencies</b>		
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada	<i>November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via letter to City of Mississauga</i> Indian and Northern Affairs Canada inventory includes no active litigation on lands in study area.	N/A
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs	No comments received.	N/A
Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation	No comments received.	N/A
Six Nations of Grand River	No comments received.	N/A
Metis Nation Council	No comments received.	N/A
<b>Federal Agencies</b>		
Transport Canada	<p>Thank you for your letter regarding the above referenced environmental assessment. Please in future forward correspondence on this environmental assessment to the undersigned.</p> <p>We have reviewed the information, and note the following:                      Transport Canada is responsible for the administration of the Navigable Waters Protection Act, which prohibits the construction or placement of any “works” in navigable waters without first obtaining approval. If any of the related project elements or activities may cross or affect a potentially navigable waterway, you are requested to prepare and submit an application in accordance with the requirements as outlined in the attached Application Guide. Send your completed NWP application to the NWP Regional office below. Any questions about the NWP application process should be directed to the Navigable Waters Protection Program at 1-866-821-6631 or <a href="mailto:NWPOntario@tc.gc.ca">NWPOntario@tc.gc.ca</a>.</p> <p>NWP Regional Office - South Western Ontario                      Navigable Waters Protection Program                      100 Front Street South,                      Sarnia, ON N7T 2M4</p> <p>Please note that certain approvals under the Navigable Waters Protection Act or Railway Safety Act trigger the requirement for a federal environmental assessment under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. You may therefore wish to consider incorporating CEAA requirements into your provincial environmental assessment.</p>	<p>The project team reviewed the NWP Application Guide (April 1st, 2004) as provided by Transport Canada. The Guide indicates that works (e.g. bridge, dam, dock, intake, outfall, retaining wall, tunnel, etc) in, upon, under, through, or across a navigable water require approval under the NWP.</p> <p>Given that all works associated with the Rathburn Road Transit Priority Measures project occur outside of the Cooksville Creek, and therefore no “works” are occurring in, upon, under, through, or across a navigable water, no NWP approval is required..</p>
CEAA	<p><i>December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009 via Mail from CEAA to MRC</i></p> <p>Thank you for your email dated December 8, related to the above- noted project.</p> <p>The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (the Act), applies to federal authorities when they contemplate</p>	<p><i>Early January, 2010 via phone message from MRC to CEAA Project Manager</i></p> <p>Per the direction of the Ministry of the Environment, the Notice was sent to CEAA to advise of the project. The City of Mississauga had previously consulted with Lori Kelly at the Ontario</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>certain action or decisions in relation to a project that would enable it to proceed in whole or in part. A federal environmental assessment (EA) may be required when a federal authority:</p> <p>a) is the proponent of the project;  b) provides financial assistance to the proponent;  c) sells, leases or otherwise disposes of federal lands; or  d) issues a permit, licence or any other approval as prescribed in the <i>Law List Regulations</i>.</p> <p>In the case of projects that are subject to the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act, if there is uncertainty as to whether the Act may also apply, the Agency can help proponents answer this question. For projects that are subject to the Act, the Agency will act as the federal environmental assessment coordinator and facilitate the involvement of the federal authorities in a co-ordinated assessment aimed at meeting all agencies' needs simultaneously.</p> <p>In order for the Agency to undertake either of these roles, it must have a project description that can be distributed to various federal authorities to determine their interest in the project. It is recognized that at the early stages of the planning process, there may not be much detailed information to provide. However, proponents should try to provide some information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the nature of the project and its location;</li> <li>• federal decisions which may be made in relation to the project;</li> <li>• whether federal funding is being contemplated or federal lands are required.</li> </ul> <p>To better assist proponents, the Agency has developed an Operational Policy Statement, which provides guidance in preparing project descriptions. This is available on the Agency's website at: <a href="http://www.ceaa-acee.pc.ca">http://www.ceaa-acee.pc.ca</a></p> <p>If your purpose in sending us notification of your project is to determine whether the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act applies, please be aware that simple notification will not be sufficient. A project description will be required.</p> <p>Important Note: Please be aware that release of documents to the public may be part of the EA process. Information provided by you related to the EA for this project will be part of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Registry and will be made available to members of the public, if requested. A package with additional information will be provided to you upon submission of the project description. Should you provide any documents that contain confidential or sensitive information that you believe should be protected from release to the public, please contact the undersigned to obtain an Exclusion Form. This Form can be used to identify the information to be considered for exclusion from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Registry and the rationale for the exclusion.</p>	<p>Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs, their Infrastructure Stimulus Fund co-ordinator, to confirm the federal EA requirements for the Transit Project.</p> <p>The City was advised that, pursuant to Schedule 4, paragraph 7 of the CEAA Exclusion List Regulations, 2007 (SOR/2007-108), the above-noted Transit Project was exempt from the requirements of the federal EA.</p>
	<p><i>April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via letter from CEAA to City of Mississauga</i></p> <p><i>It has been determined that this project is excluded from requiring a federal environmental assessment under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, Exclusion List Regulation 2007, Schedule 4, Para. 7.</i></p>	<p><i>Noted.</i></p>
Environment Canada	No comments received.	N/A
<b>Provincial Agencies</b>		

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
Ministry of the Environment – Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB)	<p><i>March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 (via letter to S. Anderson, Mississauga)</i></p> <p>The Ministry of the Environment (MOE) has reviewed the draft Environmental Project Report and Appendices dated February 2010, submitted to the MOE on March 4, 2010 and under separate cover, Appendix D: Consultation Record, submitted to the MOE on March 22, 2010. The Addendum was reviewed by MOE staff of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch, Environmental Assessment Project Coordination Section (EAPC), the Certificate of Approval Section, Air &amp; Noise Unit (ANU) and Wastewater Unit (WWU); the Central Region office, Technical Support Section (TSS), including the Halton-Peel District Office.</p> <p><b>GENERAL</b></p> <p>The Environmental Project Report (EPR) is to contain sufficient information about the proposed project, including summaries/descriptions of studies undertaken in relation to the project, in a manner that is easily read by interested members of the public, agencies, Aboriginal communities, and the Minister without the need of referring to lengthy appendix documents.</p> <p>The EPR also needs to contain, at a reasonable level of detail, the proponent's assessment and evaluation of impacts of the preferred method of carrying out the project and other methods of carrying out the project that were considered including the criteria used for assessing and evaluating the impacts.</p> <p>Where measures are proposed to mitigate negative impacts, it is encouraged that industry-recognized standards, guidelines and procedures, where applicable, are referenced in the EPR. The proponent should also ensure that the EPR contains a summary of commitments made during the transit assessment process, highlighting monitoring and reporting commitments.</p> <p><b>EPR Requirements: Section 9, Ontario Regulation 231108</b></p> <p><i>Inadequate/incomplete documentation was provided for the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o statement of purpose of the project;</li> <li>o summary of background information relating to the project;</li> <li>o final description of the transit project including a description of the preferred method of carrying out the transit project;</li> <li>o local environmental conditions at the site of the transit project;</li> <li>o all studies undertaken in relation to the transit project, including a summary of all data collected or reviewed;</li> <li>o a summary of all results and conclusions of all studies;</li> <li>o assessment and evaluation of the impacts the preferred method of carrying out the transit project and other methods might have on the environment;</li> <li>o criteria for assessment and evaluation of the impacts the preferred method of carrying out the</li> </ul>	<p>Section 1.0 revised and all elements elaborated on.</p> <p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>transit project and other methods;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o mitigation measures proposed to address negative impacts to the environment;</li> <li>o description of the means proposed to use to monitor or verify effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures;</li> <li>o description of municipal, provincial, and federal approvals and permits; and</li> <li>o consultation record</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation record provided is incomplete as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Identification of specific Aboriginal communities consulted;</li> <li>o No list provided of the interested persons, agencies, including Aboriginal communities who participated in consultation activities;</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Summary of all comments received not provided;</li> <li>o Description of what was done to respond to concerns raised</li> </ul> <p><b>Presentation of Material</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Throughout the document there are placeholders where information is intended to be added. Ensure that these areas are modified appropriately when finalizing the EPR for submission to the MOE.</li> </ul> <p><b>Consistency of Terminology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When referring to the Ministry of the Environment ensure to include <i>the</i>.</li> <li>• Prior to using an acronym ensure it is first defined, identifying the acronym in brackets as it will be used consistently throughout the remainder of the document.</li> </ul> <p><b>Table of Contents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that this is updated to reflect all changes made as a result of comments on the draft EPRR submitted by the GRT and other stakeholders.</li> <li>• Identify quaternary sections here and amended visually in EPR.</li> <li>• Title of Section 2.2 should be Description of and Rationale for the Preferred Design Method.</li> <li>• Air Quality (3.2.2) must appear in Section 3.1, description of natural environment.</li> <li>• Ensure that all titles of tables and figures are consistent between the Table of Contents and the EPR.</li> </ul>	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed.</p> <p>Complete documentation of all persons/agencies circulated during the study is included in Appendix D.</p> <p>The record of comments received is included in new Section 4.3.</p> <p>The record of responses to comments is included in new Section 4.3.</p> <p>The draft was circulated at approximately 80-90% complete. The blank sections will be completed prior to finalizing the report.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Done.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>Section 3.2.2 re: Air Quality moved to under Section 3.1.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where an appendix contains its own appendices they should be listed here (e.g. Appendix D has two, possibly four appendices).</li> </ul> <p><b>Figures and Tables</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that titles of figures and tables appear on same page (see page 4-2). Appendices</li> <li>• Ensure that all appendices are cross referenced in the EPR main report and that a summary of relevant information is also presented in the EPR.</li> <li>• Ensure that hard copies of all complete appendices are included in final EPR to be placed in public record locations (clerks, libraries, project office, etc.).</li> <li>• Ensure all pages have been oriented in same direction.</li> </ul> <p><b>Commitments and Monitoring</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As indicated in Section 4.3.5 of the EA Code of Practice, the EPR must include details of commitments made to stakeholders regarding mitigation and monitoring. For ease of reference all commitments should be presented in a table format, listed by category.</li> </ul> <p><b>1. INTRODUCTION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 1.1 Study Background: What is the relevance of the statement re: significant investment to complete the BRT? Provide context, adjust accordingly.</li> <li>• Section 1.3 Purpose of the Study: Should include assessment and evaluation of the potential impacts of the preferred method and other methods considered.</li> <li>• Section 1.4.1.1 Official Plan: Is the referenced Mississauga Transitway EA Addendum what is now known as the Mississauga BRT? If yes, identify as such. If no, provide details.</li> <li>• Section 1.4.1.1 Official Plan: clarify precisely to which project “this project” refers.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. DESCRIPTION OF THE TRANSIT PROJECT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the contents of this section DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE OF THE PREFERRED TRANSIT PROJECT is a more accurate title.</li> <li>• Section 2 Description of the Transit Project: what is the length of the project?</li> <li>• Section 2.1.1 Do Nothing: Expand on comment “...thereby resulting in limited impacts and costs.”</li> <li>• Section 2.1.3 Alternative 2: identify the report and/or analysis as relates to the statement about low frequency of un-signalized access.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Table included as Table 5-1.</p> <p>Statement revised to clarify.</p> <p>Statement revised to read “The purpose of this study was to assess and evaluate the potential impacts of the preferred design method and other methods considered.”</p> <p>Statement added to clarify.</p> <p>Statement revised to clarify.</p> <p>Title revised.</p> <p>Length of project added to text.</p> <p>Statement removed.</p> <p>There is a single unsignalized access on the north side of Rathburn Road within the study area.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 2.1.4 Selection of Preferred Design Method: provide analysis demonstrating how the preferred design method was determined. Include a comparative analysis table illustrating criteria and weightings.</li> <li>• Section 2.2 Description of the Preferred Design Method: rename this section to Description of and Rationale for the Preferred Design Method, as noted above.</li> <li>• The order in which the criteria are discussed in this subsection must be consistent with the order in which the criteria were listed on pages 2-2 and 2-3.</li> <li>• Section 2.2.1 Traffic Operations: Section 3-3 cross-referenced incorrectly.</li> <li>• Section 2.2.1.2 Signalized Intersections: Figure 2-4 cross-referenced incorrectly.</li> <li>• Section 2.2.1.3 Access to Adjacent Development: this appears to be a description of future conditions. If so, should this section appear with the description of the preferred design method?</li> <li>• Section 2.2.1.4.Hurontario Ramp Configuration: where in the EPR is the rationale for diverting traffic from Rathburn Road to Centre View Drive presented? Why isn't the bus only portion of this ramp reconfiguration discussed in this section? Where is it discussed?</li> <li>• Section 2.2.2.2 Future BRT Services: is this rationale for the purpose of the project? Where is the analysis? How is the information pertaining to the GO Transit Services relevant to the Rathburn Road project?</li> <li>• Section 2.2.3 Estimated Projected Cost: Change proposed project construction commencement date from April 2010 to June 2010 as Minister's Notice to Proceed is due June 14, 2010.</li> </ul> <p><b>3. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS ON LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3.1 Description of Natural Environment Investigations and Findings: define LGL biologists. For what purpose was the field assessment done in 2003?</li> <li>• A summary of the Mississauga BRT Natural Environment Report as relates to this project is to be provided in the final EPR main document. Excerpts of the report have not been provided in Appendix A.</li> <li>• Appendix D is incorrectly cross-referenced for the above excerpts.</li> <li>• Section 3.1.1 Watercourses/Fish Habitat: what does (City of Mississauga 1994) reference (see page 3-2)? Provide conclusion reached regarding potential impacts resulting from the Preferred Design Method?</li> <li>• Section 3. 1.2.2 Drainage and Storm water Management Design: the order of the first and second paragraphs should be switched. Identify, approximately, the lengths of roadway to be widened.</li> </ul>	<p>Text revised.</p> <p>No change is proposed. "Description of the Preferred Design Method" is an appropriate title for Section 2.2.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>Section 2.2 (and sub-sections) describes the preferred design method, and as this is a description of how the existing development accesses will operate under the proposed design, it is appropriate in the current location. Rationale in Section 2.2.1.4 expanded upon to clarify justification for ramp modification.</p> <p>Section 2.2.2.2 discusses future transit operations associated with the Mississauga BRT (comprised of both Mississauga Transit AND GO Transit services). These services would also be operating in the Rathburn Road corridor within the study area for the Rathburn Road Transit Priority Measures project.</p> <p>Noted. Statement revised to indicate "June".</p> <p>LGL is an environmental research firm that conducted surveys within the study area in 2003 for [purpose]. Statement has since been removed.</p> <p>The reference to the Natural Environment Report in Appendix A has been replaced by a link to the Mississauga BRT CEAA Screening Report, available online at <a href="http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/residents/brt">http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/residents/brt</a>.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>A concluding paragraph has been incorporated into Section 3.1.2.</p> <p>Lengths of widenings added to text.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify if it was the City of Mississauga that provided the calculations. Cross- reference the appendix where the design calculations can be found.</li> <li>• Identify IDF (page 3-3, first paragraph).</li> <li>• The next paragraph is overly technical and should be re-written to clarify. In addition, the reader is cross-referenced to Appendix F to locate figures MH24, MH25 and MH30. These figures are not in Appendix F.</li> <li>• Define the Rational method referenced in the last paragraph on page 3-3.</li> <li>• Figure 3-2 was not provided in the draft EPR. Ensure it is included in final EPR.</li> <li>• Section 3. 1.2.4 Conclusions and Recommendations: advise how the proponent intends to confirm the recommended assessments (see top of page 3-5)?</li> <li>• Section 3.1.3 Groundwater: Discussion presented here relates to mitigation, move to appropriate section. Provide conclusion reached regarding potential impacts resulting from the Preferred Design Method.</li> <li>• Section 3.1.4 Natural Environment inventory: this section deals specifically with vegetation. Rename as appropriate.</li> <li>• Appendix A is cross-referenced as the location where site photographs can be found however, there are no site photographs presented in this appendix.</li> <li>• Section 3.1.5 Wildlife Habitat: a conclusion regarding potential impacts resulting from the Preferred Design Method is required.</li> <li>• Section 3.1.6 Air Quality: new subsection to be created as Air Quality must be reflected under Natural Environment. A conclusion regarding potential impacts resulting from the Rathburn Road Preferred Design Method is required.</li> <li>• Section 3.2 Description of Socio-Economic Environment Investigations and Findings: this section should present the potential construction impacts and a conclusion regarding those impacts resulting from the Preferred Design Method.</li> <li>• Section 3.2.1 Noise Conditions: A conclusion regarding potential impacts resulting from the Preferred Design Method is required.</li> <li>• Section 3.2.3 Soil Contamination: A conclusion regarding potential impacts resulting from the Preferred Design Method is required.</li> </ul>	<p>Cross-reference to <b>Appendix F</b> added.</p> <p>IDF has been clarified as “Intensity-Duration-Frequency”</p> <p>Figure illustrating manholes has been added to Appendix F.</p> <p>Rational method defined in text.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Proposed confirmation approach added.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Statement added reading “No impacts to wildlife habitat are therefore anticipated.”</p> <p>Air Quality impacts added as Section 3.1.1. The conclusion regarding air quality impacts is provided at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of the section.</p> <p>New Section 3.2.5: Potential Construction-Related Impacts added.</p> <p>Added.</p> <p>Statement added reading:</p> <p>“It is not anticipated that the Transit Project will result in any impacts associated with Soil Contamination. However, any contaminated soils encountered will be tested and handled in accordance with PartXV.I of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) and Ontario Regulation</p>



Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 3-4 is incorrectly cross-referenced (see page 3-9).</li> <li>• Section 3.2.4 Property Requirements: Figure 3-3 is incorrectly cross-referenced.</li> <li>• Section 3.2.5 Utility Protection/Relocation: A conclusion regarding potential impacts resulting from the Preferred Design Method is required.</li> <li>• Figure 3-5 is incorrectly cross-referenced (see page 3-1 1).</li> <li>• Section 3.3 Description of the Cultural Environment Investigations and Findings: An overall conclusion regarding potential impacts resulting from the Preferred Design Method is required.</li> <li>• Section 3.3.2 Heritage and Archaeological Resources: clarify the relevance of the last sentence to the Rathburn Road Transit Priority Measures.</li> <li>• Figure 3-6 is cross-referenced but that figure was not provided (see page 3-12).</li> <li>• Section 3.5 Description of Proposed Mitigation Measures and Future Commitments: The order in which the impact is listed should be consistent with the order in which it is presented in Section 3.</li> <li>• It is necessary to specifically describe the proposed means of mitigating impacts (see Table 3-6).</li> <li>• Description of mitigation is incomplete for street tree/landscaping removal.</li> <li>• Description of impacts, mitigation and monitoring is incomplete for construction impacts, traffic staging and Cooksville Creek.</li> <li>• Description of mitigation and monitoring process for stormwater management is incomplete (i.e. enhanced level standards).</li> <li>• Description of monitoring process for noise is incomplete (i.e. noise by-laws).</li> <li>• Reference to mitigation for dust dispersion and contaminated soils is required.</li> </ul> <p><b>4. CONSULTATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4.1 Consultation Overview: where is the tracking table referenced to be found in Appendix D? What are the issues noted in Schedule 2?</li> <li>• Section 4.1.1 Potentially Affected Property Owners: Oxford Properties should be identified in first</li> </ul>	<p>153/04, Records of Site Condition.</p> <p>A copy of these documents is available at: <a href="http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca">www.e-laws.gov.on.ca</a>”</p> <p>Reference revised to Figure 3-3</p> <p>Reference revised to Figure 3-4</p> <p>Added.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>Section 3.3 includes sub-sections, under which conclusions are presented.</p> <p>Clarified.</p> <p>The figure had not been developed at the time of circulation of the draft EPR.</p> <p>Previous Section 3-5 moved to new Section 5-5.</p> <p>Table 3-6 replaced by new Table 5-1. Means of mitigating impacts specified in new Table 5-1.</p> <p>The City’s Arborist will review opportunities to relocate candidate trees (24 in total) prior to construction.</p> <p>Description of mitigation measures enhanced.</p> <p>Description of mitigation measures enhanced.</p> <p>Revised to include specific reference to Mississauga’s Noise Control By-Law.</p> <p>Revised to include commitments re dust dispersion and contaminated soils.</p> <p>The tracking table has been included in new <b>Section 4.3</b>.</p> <p>Added.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>paragraph.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4.1.1 Table 4.1: Outcomes should be recorded in this table, otherwise the table appears to present only the text information that preceded it.</li> <li>• Section 4. 1.3 Government Technical Review Team Consultation: there is no Section 2.3.1, does this sentence apply?</li> <li>• Populate date that the draft Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment reached the Ministry of Culture.</li> <li>• Did the Credit Valley Conservation Authority provide comments on the Technical Memorandum or the Impact Assessment? Provide details concerning the consultation undertaken with them prior to February 10, 2010.</li> <li>• Identify the kind of plans that were circulated to the GO Transit. Identify if GO Transit provided comments?</li> <li>• Identify the kind of plans that were circulated to the MTO. Identify if GO Transit provided comments?</li> <li>• The MOE met with the City to discuss the preliminary draft of the EPR (see Table 4-3).</li> <li>• A summary of all key issues raised, responses provided by the City and resolutions reached for all stages of the TPAP must be summarized in Section 4.</li> <li>• Section 4.1.3.2 Ministry of Transportation: provide summary of comments submitted by the MTO.</li> <li>• Section 4.1.4 Aboriginal Consultation: this paragraph is inaccurate and requires re-writing due to the fact that the reference is to the government agencies rather than Aboriginal communities.</li> </ul>	<p>Outcomes added to table.</p> <p>Text revised as appropriate.</p> <p>Approximate dates of December 2009 and February 2010 added.</p> <p>Comments from CVC were received on March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2010.</p> <p>An introductory memorandum describing the project and a copy of the preliminary design plans for the proposed transit priority measures were circulated to GO Transit on <b>February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b> with a request for comments. No comments were received in response. A copy of the material circulated is included in Appendix D.</p> <p>An introductory memorandum describing the project and a copy of the preliminary design plans for the proposed transit priority measures were circulated to GO Transit on <b>February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b> with a request for comments. No comments were received in response. A copy of the material circulated is included in Appendix D.</p> <p>The Ministry of Transportation responded [<b>dates</b>] with a request for clarification on relating to project scope and operation of the proposed realigned ramp and it's potential effects on Hurontario Street. In response, on [<b>date</b>] the City committed to implementing an operating protocol for transit services using the ramp to ensure that queuing transit vehicles do not affect operations on Hurontario Street. A record of the related correspondence is provided in Appendix D.</p> <p>No further comments have been received in response to circulation of the memorandum.</p> <p>Noted and included in Section 4.1.3.1</p> <p>New Section 4.3 includes all comments received and responses provided by the City.</p> <p>Comments documented in new Table 4-4.</p> <p>Revised.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4. 1.5 General Public Consultation: recommend this information be moved to the beginning of this section as it outlines the general consultation methods undertaken. Additional details as relates to the number of newsletters produced, when posted, when the website launched, how many PICs were held and when is required.</li> <li>• The Transit Project Assessment Process that was initiated in December 2009 does not end until the 120 day period has expired, April 8, 2010, or the date the Notice of Completion is posted. Adjust accordingly.</li> <li>• Section 4.2 Overview of Changes Resulting from Consultation: Table 4-4 is incorrectly titled Table 4-3.</li> </ul> <p><b>5. COMMITMENTS TO FUTURE WORK</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 5.1.3 Utility Companies: identify when potentially affected utilities will be consulted.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 5.2 Property Acquisition: modify accordingly as per comments made above (Section 4).</li> </ul> <p><b>6. AMENDMENT PROCESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete reference to “if a newspaper exists” as a newspaper does exist.</li> <li>• The Regional Director must also be provided with Notice, adjust accordingly</li> <li>• Delete “...that were given a Notice of Commencement,” as appears after Aboriginal communities.</li> </ul> <p><b>APPENDIX A — NATURAL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References in the draft EPR suggest that this appendix may be incomplete.</li> </ul> <p><b>APPENDIX B - HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References in the draft EPR suggest that this appendix may be incomplete.</li> </ul> <p><b>APPENDIX D - CONSULTATION RECORD</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix A: Letters Distributed: appears twice. Rename or merge accordingly.</li> <li>• Appendix B: Responses Received appears twice. Rename or merge accordingly.</li> <li>• Letter from MOE Central Region dated January 6, 2010 is missing page 2 and 4.</li> <li>• Has Transport Canada identified the Cooksville Creek as a navigable waterway?</li> </ul>	<p>These details are included both in this section and in Appendix D. No changes are required.</p> <p>Revised.</p> <p>Table 4-4 is now the correct title.</p> <p>Section 5.1.4 revised to specify “<i>The detailed design plans at utility crossings will have to be circulated to potentially affected utilities to confirm that the design does not negatively affect their facilities. This will occur upon completion of the draft detailed design plans, prior to any construction activities. The anticipated time of availability for this material is Spring 2010. The necessary crossing permits for each affected utility will be obtained through the detailed design phase of the study.</i>”</p> <p>Removed.</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Removed.</p> <p>Site photos added to Appendix A.</p> <p>Appendix B is complete.</p> <p>Appendix D contains three memoranda, each with their own appendices. “Appendix A: Letters Distributed” is an appendix in two memoranda included in Appendix D of the main report. Appendix D contains three memoranda, each with their own appendices. “Appendix B: Responses Received” is an appendix in two memoranda included in Appendix D of the main report.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>No works are proposed in, on, under, over, Cooksville Creek as part of the Rathburn Road Transit Priority Measures project.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Email dated January 22, 2010 indicates that contact with Six Nations was unsuccessful. Document attempts to reach Six Nations and advise status.</li> <li>• <i>Record of Correspondence</i>: Where is correspondence, consultation undertaken with Ontario Realty Corporation?</li> <li>• Ensure the commitment made in an email dated March 16, 2010 from the City to the local property owner is captured in the appropriate table in the final EPR.</li> <li>• What is the status of the City's response to an email dated February 11, 2010 from a member of the general public regarding suggestion for Rathburn Road RBLs at Station Gate Road?</li> </ul> <p><b>APPENDIX E — NOISE ASSESSMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 11 of the Noise Review memo is missing.</li> </ul> <p><b>APPENDIX F - DRAINAGE AND STORM WATER MANAGEMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct the orientation of tables and figures as they appear upside down.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concluding Remarks</b> The foregoing comments, along with any feedback received by government review agencies, the public and Aboriginal communities should be considered as you prepare the Final EPR for submission to the ministry. Proponents are responsible for identifying and resolving, or attempting to resolve, any issues raised.</p>	<p>Documented.</p> <p>Added</p> <p>The commitment made is and was in the draft report submitted to the MOE for review.</p> <p>Comment was responded to. No further correspondence occurred after the response.</p> <p>The noise memo provided was complete and included page 11.</p> <p>The tables and figures were oriented correctly.</p>
MOE – Noise and Air Unit	<p>March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via letter to MOE Project Coordinator from MOE Noise Unit</p> <p>The Air and Noise Unit of tile Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch of MOE was requested by Loma Zappone. Project Officer, MOE Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch. to review the noise aspects of tile Environmental Project Report prepared by McCormick Rankin Corporation (MRC). dated February 2010, Draft. Particular attention was given to Appendix E: Noise Assessment prepared by MRC. dated October 2009 and signed by Darek Sobik.</p> <p>Tile proposed undertaking entails the modification of the existing general traffic lanes (four lanes and a centre left—turn lane) to two at—grade centre median dedicated bus—only lanes, and two general purpose traffic lanes on Rathburn Road from east of Hurontario Street to Duke of York Boulevard in tile City of Mississauga.</p> <p>Tile following are tile main findings of the MRC October 2009 Noise Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land uses within the study area are commercial including vehicular parking lots; restaurants; entertainment complexes (go carts, video arcade); bookstore; and shopping centre.</li> <li>• No noise sensitive areas (e.g. residential and/or institutional land uses) are located within the study area.</li> </ul> <p>No adverse noise impact is envisaged from the proposed undertaking as there are no noise sensitive areas located adjacent or in close proximity to the subject Rathburn Road corridor.</p> <p>Based on the above, it is the finding of this office that the noise aspects of the MRC October 2009 Noise Assessment are acceptable.</p>	<p>No response required.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
MOE – Water and Wastewater Unit	<p><i>March 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via letter to M. Mahmood (MOE) from H. Vaja (MOE)</i></p> <p>I have reviewed the above noted document prepared by McCormick Rankin Corporation, Consulting Engineers for the City of Mississauga as required under the Provincial Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08, Transit Projects and Greater Toronto Transportation Authority Undertakings (2008). The report documents the design, analysis, consultation, potential for impacts and mitigation measures associated with the proposed Rathburn Road Transit Priority project in the Mississauga City Centre.</p> <p>The proposed undertaking is generally to improve the reliability and the speed of transit operations through the City Centre whilst improving safety of the general public and accommodating increased capacity for the future. The works are to comprise of widening of Rathburn Road in the subject area, realignment of the existing ramp to Rathburn Road from Hurontario Street to Centre View Drive and the provision of new roadway signage.</p> <p>It is noted that the proposed roadworks will have very minimal impacts on the existing storm sewer system (which has adequate reserve capacity to receive this increased flow) and that a manhole oil/grit separator is proposed to treat storm runoff from the increased imperviousness area prior to discharge to the nearby Cooksville Creek. This appears to be satisfactory; however the City should seek an approval under s53 Ontario Water Resources Act (OWRA) prior to its installation. I have no other comments.</p>	<p>Commitment added to <b>Section 3.1.3</b> and <b>Section 5</b> specifying that “Proponent to seek approval under s53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act prior to implementation.”</p>
MOE – Environmental Resource Planner and EA Coordinator, Air, Pesticides, and Environmental Planning	<p><i>March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via letter to MOE Project Coordinator from MOE Environmental</i></p> <p>Our File No. EA 03-09-05</p> <p>This letter is in response to EAAB’s request for the Technical Support Section to review the above noted project under Ontario Regulation 231/08 for the City of Mississauga’s Rathburn Road Transit Priority Measures project. The following is a summary of our review.</p> <p>Our office has reviewed the Environmental Project Report and offers the following comments to applicable sections of the EPR regarding Air Quality and Noise.</p> <p><b>General Comments:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 2 — there are only two alternatives to the “do nothing.” It is recommended that the proponent examine a third alternative such as a mixed traffic.</li> <li>2. Section 4.2.6 — Appendix D is referred to as an overview of Aboriginal Consultation. Appendix D is missing and contains only a title page. In order to meet the requirements of the Environmental Assessment process, the proponent must demonstrate that sufficient aboriginal consultation has been completed.</li> <li>3. There are several sections of the EPR that state “to be completed.” We recommend that these sections be submitted to the Ministry for review prior to the submission of the Final EPR.</li> </ol> <p><b>Soil Contamination:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Section 3.2.3 - we recommend that any contaminated soils encountered be tested and handled in accordance with PartXV.I of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) and Ontario Regulation 153/04, Records of Site Condition. We recommend that the EPR reflect the proponent’s requirement to handle contaminated soils in accordance with the aforementioned legislation.</li> </ol> <p><b>Stormwater Management:</b></p>	<p>The “Do Nothing” alternative would result in buses operating in mixed traffic, and as such is a reflection of the potential</p> <p>Appendix D contains <b>all</b> correspondence related to the Transit Project Assessment Process for the Rathburn Road Transit Priority Measures project. The final document includes a record of all aboriginal community consultation.</p> <p>Sections will be completed prior to finalizing EPR, but will not be circulated in draft format for review.</p> <p>Section 3.2.2 has been revised to incorporate the commitment to handle any contaminated soils encountered in accordance with the PartXV.I of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) and Ontario Regulation 153/04, Records of Site Condition.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>5. Section 3.1 .2.1 — we recommend that the proponent state how they intend to meet enhanced level standards for stormwater quality. Additionally, we recommend that the proponent provide details on the proposed treatment of stormwater, given the proximity of the proposed road works to the adjacent watercourse.</p> <p><b>Air and Noise:</b></p> <p>6. Section 5.3 — this section is incomplete (blank); we recommend that when this section is completed it reflects the proponent's commitment to dust suppressant during construction, reduction of traffic speed through the construction area to reduce dust dispersion, and an adherence to any applicable noise by-laws. We also recommend that these commitments be added</p>	<p>The proposed means of treating the additional stormwater runoff is specific in the "Conclusions and Recommendations" section of Section 3.1.3. A new Section 3.1.3.4 added further detailing the proposed means of treating the additional stormwater runoff generated by the project.</p> <p>Section 5.3 has been completed, and includes a description of commitments relating to potential construction impacts including: noise, dust, and traffic staging.</p>
Ministry of Transportation	<p><i>January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via Fax-Back Form</i> Request to be kept informed of study.</p> <hr/> <p>Further to the Application for Encroachment Permit submitted on December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2009, the Ministry requested an additional 2 copies of the plans.</p> <hr/> <p><i>March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 (via e-mail to S. Anderson, Mississauga)</i> The ministry's Traffic Office would need a Traffic Impact Study for this proposal showing through traffic modelling, the impact of this on our facilities and for Mississauga to demonstrate that there will not be any adverse impacts (safety /operational) on our facilities in the vicinity, when it is installed and in the future.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An application for encroachment permit was submitted by MRC (on behalf of the City of Mississauga) to the Ministry of Transportation's corridor control group, along with the required 4 copies of the preliminary design plans for the proposed ramp realignment on <b>December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2009</b>.</p> <p>2 additional copies of the requested plans were submitted to the Ministry on <b>February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b>.</p> <p>No further comments were received.</p> <p>An introductory memorandum describing the project and a copy of the preliminary design plans for the proposed transit priority measures were circulated to the Ministry of Transportation on <b>February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b> with a request for comments. No comments were received in response. A copy of the material circulated is included in Appendix D.</p> <p>The Ministry of Transportation responded on <b>February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b> with a request for clarification on relating to project scope and operation of the proposed realigned ramp and it's potential effects on Hurontario Street. In response the City committed to implementing an operating protocol for transit services using the ramp to ensure that queuing transit vehicles do not affect operations on Hurontario Street. A record of the related correspondence is provided in Appendix D.</p> <p>No further comments have been received in response to circulation of the memorandum.</p> <p>Bus queuing on the bus-only pass-through was not modeled in a traffic microsimulation as the anticipated bus volumes using the facility are not expected to result in any significant queuing or traffic impacts on the ramp or upstream MTO facilities. As discussed above, the potential for ramp queue to spill back into the Highway 403 / Hurontario Street interchange is unlikely, and in the event that queues become significant, they will be mitigated .by operating protocol directing transit vehicles to use the general traffic lane directly onto Centre View Drive.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	No comments received.	N/A
Ministry of Natural Resources	No comments received.	N/A
GO Transit	<p><i>January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via Fax-Back Form</i> Request to be kept informed of study. Areas of interest include all aspects of the study that may impact GO Bus operations during and after construction.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An introductory memorandum describing the project and a copy of the preliminary design plans for the proposed transit priority measures were circulated to GO Transit on <b>February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010</b> with a request for comments. No comments were received in response. A copy of the material circulated is included in Appendix D.</p>
	<p><i>March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via e-mail from M. MacKay to S. Anderson, Mississauga</i></p> <p>With the completion of the Mississauga BRT, GO Transit buses will be following one of two possible routings:  <b>GROUP 1:</b> trips between points west and Kipling Station or the Highway 401 Corridor. These trips will travel along both the BRT West and BRT east segments (i.e., from Winston Churchill Station or Erin Mills Station to Renforth (Commerce) Station); or  <b>GROUP 2:</b> trips between points west and Bramalea and York Region. These trips will use the BRT West and Highways 403/410 east of Mississauga City Centre. At the intersection of Rathburn Rd/BRT East, it is not indicated whether this intersection will be signalized, though the EA Addendum for the BRT East suggests that there will be signals at this location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under the signalized scenario - the conceptual design should include and the analysis should factor for upstream transit vehicle detection for the east-to-north left-turn as well as the south-to-west right-turn and the signal timing should be done in a manner that maximizes the opportunity for transit vehicles to turn thereby minimizing delay.</li> </ul> <p><b>At the intersection of Rathburn Rd/City Centre Drive:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the use of farside stops at this intersection, consideration should be given to the use of lag-lefts for Rathburn Road in conjunction with green extensions. Lag-lefts would ensure that buses waiting at the intersection through the east-west red phase would have priority over left-turns and reduce the bus/passenger delays for the transitway. Green extensions would increase the probability that vehicles approaching the intersection during the east-west green phase, or waiting for the farside platform to clear, would be able to complete the movement without having to wait until the next regular east-west green phase.</li> <li>If forced into the shoulder lane for the entire trip on Rathburn, eastbound GO Buses in Group 2 may be unduly delayed by traffic congestion. It may be desirable to have these buses merge from the median right-of-way into the mixed traffic lanes east of this intersection to access the ramps at Hurontario Street. The movement should not be precluded in the detailed design. If buses do move from the centre lane out to the ramp at this point, northbound right-turn on reds on City Centre Drive would likely need to be prohibited for safety reasons, which could also have an impact on the overall intersection analysis and operation.</li> <li>To avoid congestion on Rathburn Road west of City Centre Drive, Group 2 GO buses arriving at this</li> </ul>	<p>Signals will be optimized based on overall traffic at the intersection. The performance of this intersection with respect to transit delay cannot be isolated from the overall signal performance of the intersections west along Rathburn Road.</p> <p>In the comments provided by GO Transit 19 March 2010, GO requested the City consider a number of modifications to the signal phasing and timing to provide further priority for transit vehicles. The City will consider the various suggestions during the detailed design of the signal system.</p> <p>The barrier-free design allows for transit vehicles to transition from the curb to median lanes.</p> <p>GO Transit Operations staff advised early in the planning stage of the project that GO Transit</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>intersection from Hurontario Street via the bus-only ramp should have access to the median right-of-way. This would require a protected bus-only phase for this movement. It was unclear if this option will be available or how it would be implemented to minimize bus delays. It should be noted that having all buses in the right-of-way west of City Centre Drive, as opposed to split between the right-of-way and the curb lane, eliminates inherent competition for right-turn green time at Station Gate Road.</p> <p>At the intersection of Rathburn Rd/Station Gate Rd:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the proposed plan, GO Buses could be in the median right-of-way at this intersection. They would thus have to turn from the median right-of-way to Station Gate Road. The final roadway geometry should ensure this right-turn can be made by GO Buses and that the signal phasing allows this movement in a protected phase.</li> <li>• The intersection analysis should consider the magnitude and variability of delay to transit vehicles for routes - both GO Bus routes that would need to wait for a protected right-turn phase onto Station Gate Road, and Mississauga Transit vehicles that might be delayed behind a waiting GO Bus.</li> </ul> <p>• If GO Buses operate in the median right-of-way on Rathburn Road, it may be more beneficial to move the rightturn lane for westbound traffic at Station Gate Road from the general purpose lanes to the bus-only right-of-way to decrease delays at the intersection. This would leave a through-right westbound general purpose lane at the intersection.</p> <p>• There is potential for bus driver confusion and collision under the proposed operating concept. The west-to-north right turn from the curb lane will need to be posted "No Right on Red" due to the potential conflict with buses making the right-turn from the median right-of-way. Additionally though, bus drivers in the right-turn lane (if they cannot access the median right-of-way upstream) will need to be aware that the transit signal heads for the median right-of-way do not apply to them. Careful consideration should be given to the signal head placement and signage at this intersection to ensure that this confusion does not occur.</p> <p>• The detailed analysis should include the proposed operating plan for this intersection. In particular, given that there will be farside stops and no by-pass lane in the right-of-way, it will be imperative to ensure a short signal cycle length. This will allow more opportunity to reduce the delays from south to westbound buses that have to miss a phase due to local transit passenger service time and the on-line platform.</p> <p><b>General Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not specified what pavement markings, curbing or other measures might be used on all sections of transit only roadway in order to mitigate violation by the traveling public. If the intention is that there will be no physical barrier (such as curbs etc.) between the transit lanes and the general purpose lanes, consideration should be given to implementing coloured transit lanes. TAC recently carried out a study and there are now guidelines for this type of application in the MUTCDC. The knowledge base document for this study found that a number of other jurisdictions have substantially reduced the incidence of transit lane violation by colouring the lanes. As such, this type of application should be considered for this project.</li> </ul>	<p>intends to operate westbound transit services in the curb lane on Rathburn Road between the BRT East connection and Station Gate Road. This was the rationale for the additional right-turn lane on the eastern approach to Station Gate Road.</p> <p>The City will, however, consider the opportunity to protect for westbound GO Transit services to operate in the median lane in the detailed design phase of the project.</p> <p>The limited right-of-way available, presence of utilities in the northern boulevard, and requirement to maintain acceptable intersection geometrics preclude the ability to implement this suggestion.</p> <p>Westbound buses in the median will not be turning right at Station Gate Road under the recommended plan.</p> <p>In the comments provided by GO Transit 19 March 2010, GO requested the City consider a number of modifications to the signal phasing and timing to provide further priority for transit vehicles. The City will consider the various suggestions during the detailed design of the signal system.</p> <p>The preliminary design proposes no physical barriers between the median reserved bus lanes and the adjacent general traffic lanes. Introduction of barriers would preclude the ability to bypass disabled vehicles in the general traffic lanes. Mississauga Transit (the primary user of the bus lanes) is satisfied that the volume of buses will render the section of reserved bus lane self-enforcing.</p> <p>The reserved bus lanes will be signed and marked according to City of Mississauga standards.</p>
Ontario Realty Corporation	<p><i>January 11, 2010, via e-mail from ORC to MRC</i></p> <p>The ORC is the strategic manager of the government's real property with a mandate of maintaining and optimizing value of the portfolio, while ensuring real estate decisions reflect public policy objectives of the government.</p>	



Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>As you may be aware, ORC is responsible for managing real property that is owned by the Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure (MEI). Our preliminary review of your notice and supporting information indicates that ORC-managed property is directly in the study area. As a result, your proposal may have the potential to impact this property and/or the activities of tenants present on ORC-managed lands. Attached please find a map that identifies these properties to assist you in identifying and avoiding potential impacts on ORC-managed lands.</p> <p><b>Potential Negative Impacts to ORC Tenants and Lands</b></p> <p><b>General Impacts</b>  Negative environmental impacts associated with the project design and construction, such as the potential for dewatering, dust, noise and vibration impacts, and impacts to natural heritage features/habitat and functions, should be avoided and/or appropriately mitigated in accordance with applicable regulations best practices and Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and Ministry of the Environment (MOE) standards. Avoidance and mitigation options that characterize baseline conditions and quantify the potential impacts should be present as part of the EA project file. Details of appropriate mitigation, contingency plans and triggers for implementing contingency plans should also be present.</p> <p><b>Impacts to Land holdings</b>  Negative impacts to land holdings, such as the taking of developable parcels of ORC managed land or fragmentation of utility or transportation corridors, should be avoided. If the potential for such impacts is present as part of this undertaking, you should contact the undersigned to discuss these issues at the earliest possible stage of your study.</p> <p>If takings are suggested as part of any alternative these should be appropriately mapped and quantified within EA report documentation. In addition, details of appropriate mitigation and or next steps related to compensation for any required takings should be present. ORC requests circulation of the draft EA report prior to finalization if potential impacts to ORC-managed lands are present as part of this study.</p> <p><b>Heritage Management Process &amp; Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Process</b>  Should the proposed activities impact cultural heritage features, on ORC managed lands, a request to examine cultural heritage issues which can include the cultural landscape, archaeology and places of sacred and secular value could be required. The Ontario Realty Corporation Heritage Management Process should be used for identifying and conserving heritage properties in the provincial portfolio (this document can be downloaded from the Heritage section of our website: <a href="http://www.ontariorealty.ca/What-We-Do/Heritage.htm">http://www.ontariorealty.ca/What-We-Do/Heritage.htm</a>). Through this process, ORC identifies, communicates and conserves the values of its heritage places. In addition, the Class EA ensures that ORC considers the potential effects of proposed undertakings on the environment, including cultural heritage.</p> <p><b>Potential Triggers Related to MEI's Class EA</b>  The ORC is required to follow the MEI Class Environmental Assessment Process for Realty Activities Not Related to Electricity Projects (MEI Class EA). The MEI Class EA applies to a wide range of realty and</p>	<p>A draft copy of the EPR was circulated to ORC for review/comment on March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2010.</p> <p>Noted</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>planning activities including leasing or letting, planning approvals, disposition, granting of easements, demolition and property maintenance/repair. For details on the ORC Class EA please visit the Environment and Heritage page of our website found at <a href="http://www.ontariorealty.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=2240">http://www.ontariorealty.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=2240</a></p> <p>If the MEI Class EA is triggered, and deferral to another ministry's or agency's Class EA or individual EA is requested, the alternative EA will be subject to a critical review prior to approval for any signoff of a deferral by the proponent. The alternative EA needs to fulfill the minimum criteria of the MEI Class EA. When evaluating an alternative EA there must be explicit reference to the corresponding undertaking in the MEI Class EA (e.g., if the proponent identifies the need to acquire land owned by MEI, then "acquisition of MEI-owned land", or similar statement, must be referenced in the EA document). Furthermore, sufficient levels of consultation with MEI's/ORC's specific stakeholders, such as the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, must be documented with the relevant information corresponding to MEI's/ORC's undertaking and the associated maps. In addition to archaeological and heritage reports, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), on ORC lands should also be incorporated into the alternative EA study. Deficiencies in any of these requirements could result in an inability to defer to the alternative EA study and require completing MEI's Class EA prior to commencement of the proposed undertaking.</p> <p>In summary, the purchase of MEI-owned/ORC-managed lands or disposal of rights and responsibilities (e.g. easement) for ORC-managed lands triggers the application of the MEI Class EA. If any of these realty activities affecting ORC-managed lands are being proposed as part of any alternative, please contact the Sales and Marketing Group through ORC's main line (Phone: 416-327-3937, Toll Free: 1-877-863-9672), and contact the undersigned at your earliest convenience to discuss next steps.</p> <p><b>Specific Comments</b> If the project involves an individual EA and the undertaking directly affects all or in part any ORC-managed property, please send the undersigned a copy of the DRAFT Individual EA report and allow sufficient time (minimum of 30 calendar days) for comments and discussion prior to finalizing the report to ensure that all MEI Class EA requirements can be met through the EA study.</p> <p><b>Concluding Comments</b> Thank you for the opportunity to provide initial comments on this undertaking. If you have any questions on the above I can be reached at the contacts below.</p>	
Ontario Realty Corporation	<p><i>March 10, 2010 via Letter from ORC Environmental Coordinator to City of Mississauga</i></p> <p>Thank for Contacting the ORC regarding the proposed undertaking. ORC is required, by the MOE and the environmental assessment act, to follow the "MEI Class EA Process for Realty Activities Other Than Electricity Projects (approved April 2004, amended September 11, 2008)" prior to any activities on ORC managed lands. The Class EA parent document can be found at: <a href="http://www.ontariorealty.ca/Assets/MEI+Class+EA+Document+(amended)_11Sep2008.pdf">http://www.ontariorealty.ca/Assets/MEI+Class+EA+Document+(amended)_11Sep2008.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Issue #1: Identification of undertaking(s) and trigger to MEI Class EA</b></p> <p>Generally, for EA projects, the ORC is consulted regarding the applicability of the MEA/IEA Class EA processes and requirements when a proponent's proposed undertaking may directly or indirectly affect lands</p>	<p>It appears an easement will be required to realign the existing ramp from southbound Hurontario Street to westbound Rathburn Road. Although the existing ramp occupies a portion of the ORC</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>or facilities owned by MEI and managed by ORC. This would ensure that the correct undertaking described in the MEI Class EA is clearly identified and addressed. Please refer to section 9.7 of the Class EA, referenced in the preceding section, which explains that despite a proponent receiving an approval under the EA Act ("Act"), MEI, ORC, or an authorized agency under MEI ("MEI/ORC/Agency"), are still responsible for meeting the requirements of the Act when carrying out an undertaking on behalf of the proponent. (For example, this means that if a proponent's undertaking includes acquiring an easement or transfer of ownership of land owned by MEI and transacted by ORC on the ministry's behalf, then such realty activities to be conducted by ORC must be clearly identified and assessed in the proponent's EA study; otherwise, MEI/ORC/Agency must conduct a separate EA under the MEI Class EA process to meet its requirements under the Act.)</p> <p>In addition, please ensure to include any lands that have been, or are subject to, an easement that include Hydro One towers and transmission lines on Bill 58 lands. MEI/ORC's realty undertaking should be clearly identified, and be made separate from undertakings conducted by Hydro One. MEI is the owner for all Bill 58 lands and is solely responsible for granting any easements or conducting any disposition of such lands to another party.</p> <p>The proponent is requested to identify how the EA meets MEI/ORC's minimum EA requirements by referring to the seven point analysis, as described in section 4.2, Step B1 of the MEI Class EA and detailed within the Consultation and Documentation Report template located in Appendix 3.</p> <p>According to the MEI Class EA, an undertaking is defined on Page 9-11, in the Glossary of Terms. Undertakings are broken down into components; that is, one or more actions which may apply to one or more subgroups. MEI/ORC/Agency undertakings need to be identified as real estate activities, including the issuance of a license/lease, granting of an easement, or disposition. Each undertaking has a different category level of consultation and analysis associated with it, as identified in Figure 2.2 EA Category Listing Matrix of the MEI Class EA.</p> <p><b>Issue #2: Identifying the associated EA Category and ability to defer to an alternative EA</b> Please note that different undertakings in combination with the type of land to be impacted, determines the ORC EA Class. As an example, granting an easement on ORC managed lands is considered a Category "B" and an easement on Bill 58 lands, managed by Hydro One, is considered a Category "A". Category "A" is applied to undertakings that are minor in scale and have minimal or no adverse environmental effects. Based on the criteria of a Category "A" EA and depending on the scale of the area to be impacted by an undertaking, proper due diligence of an easement, impacting hydro corridor land, could require an elevation to a Category "B". Please note that licenses and leases on Hydro corridor lands are considered a Category "A" and therefore, generally do not require any EA work; however, the purchase of Hydro corridor lands is considered a Category "B" EA, according to the Figure 2.2 Category Listing Matrix.</p> <p>As stated previously, the EA must meet the 7 point analysis identified in the MEI/ORC's Class EA.</p> <p><b>Issue #3: Consultation with ORC Stakeholders</b> MEI/ORC/Agency is required to circulate major stakeholders prior to land transfer, dispositions or easements, depending on the type of land to be impacted and it is possible under the MEI Class EA Process</p>	<p>property in the southwest quadrant of the Highway 403/Hurontario interchange, the realignment to connect with Centre View Drive will require an increase in the property footprint. Typically when ORC leases property, these realty activities must be clearly identified and assessed in the proponent's EA study. Given the ORC activities are ancillary to the Rathburn Road Transit Priority Measures project, the intent of the City is to address the MEI EA requirements as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process. This is consistent with the direction provided in Section 9.7.1 of the MEI Class EA.</p> <p>The following details the response provided in the Environmental Project Report (EPR) to the seven point ORC analysis criteria for a category B Consultation and Documentation Report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Describe the Undertaking</b> The EPR documents the need for Provincially owned property which is ancillary to the transit project (refer to Section 2.2.2.4 and Figure 3-4).</li> <li><b>2. Description of Environmental Effects, Mitigation and Monitoring</b> The EPR documents the potential environmental effects of the project and the associated mitigation measures and monitoring commitments (refer to Section 3 and Section 5.4).</li> <li><b>3. Consultation with Affected Agencies and the Public</b> The EPR summarizes the consultation with the potentially affected stakeholders and the general public (refer to Section 4)</li> <li><b>4. Reporting</b> The EPR has documented all the issues typically discussed in a Category B Consultation and Documentation Report.</li> <li><b>5. Confirmation of Category B Project</b> The required easement over Provincially owned land has some potential for adverse environmental effects. These impacts are well understood from a technical perspective and are minor in nature. Consultation with technical agencies has been carried out to ensure the impacts of the project have been identified and adequate mitigation measures have been proposed.</li> <li><b>6. Notice of Completion and 30 Day Review</b> The EPR will be made available for public and agency review in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08.</li> </ol> <p>The City will continue to work with ORC to address the requirements of the MEI/ORC Class EA.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>to defer to an alternative EA, if the client ministry or agency's EA circulates the appropriate stakeholder. One major stakeholder to contact is the MNR. Often the MNR is not a significant contributor to the MEA process; however, they are in ORC's Class EA, as the MNR has a greater interest in our projects (being another government agency). This is where confusion lies between a Municipal Class EA and ORC's Class EA. Because of MNR's significant role in our EA, especially where there are significant natural features, we need to ensure that their comments are addressed. It would create potential future problems, with the MNR, if we choose to ignore their concerns, especially when they could be quite reasonable. As such, a "no response" is not sufficient for ORC. ORC will require a letter indicating the MNR is choosing to decline and documentation of consultation with the stakeholder is required.</p> <p><b>Issue #4: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Stage I/II Archaeological Assessments/Cultural Heritage Assessments</b> Depending on the type of realty activity to be completed, there is potential, based on the MEI Class EA Process, that a Phase I/II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), Stage I/II Archaeological Assessment or Cultural Heritage Assessment may be required. The Phase I ESA must be, within CSA standards and reliance must be extended to the ORC. Please note that although a Phase I ESA was not completed for ORC managed lands, the deferral to the EA is still possible; however, the Phase I ESA must still be completed prior to disposition or granting of the easements according to the standards indicated.</p> <p><b>Issue #5: Ability to defer</b> The ability to defer to an alternative EA is determined if the EA meets MEI's Class EA seven point analysis. The identification of the MEI realty undertaking and sufficient consultation must be adequately documented. When the EA has been reviewed by ORC staff, and approval to defer has been granted, then the proponent will be required to complete and sign a deferral sheet acknowledging that the EA meets ORC's/MEI's Class EA requirements.</p> <p><b>Concluding Remarks</b> If the proposed undertaking has a potential to cause impacts to MEI-owned property, it also has the potential to cause net negative environmental effects. Our comments are intended to ensure that outstanding issues of environmental, socio-economic and cultural heritage concerns related to this property, as well as complying with all regulations, will be appropriately addressed prior to the commencement of this undertaking. ORC looks forward to continuing communication regarding this project and we look forward to the opportunity to comment on the Draft EA.</p> <p>Please note that in addition to the above requirements, and depending on the type of agreement, ORC may also be required to circulate First Nations regarding the undertaking. Should First Nations consultation be a requirement of your EA, I recommend you contact ORC for further details regarding this subject.</p> <p>Please contact the undersigned at your earliest convenience to incorporate the above requirements into the Environmental Project Report.</p>	
Credit Valley Conservation Authority	<p><i>March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via e-mail from CVC to MRC, cc to City of Mississauga</i></p> <p>Sorry for the delay in responding. The draft report is presently under review. Based upon my preliminary review the primary concerns relate to the spill from Cooksville Creek onto Rathburn Road and stormwater</p>	<p><i>March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via e-mail from City of Mississauga to CVC</i></p> <p>We trust your concerns have been addressed through the peer review recently undertaken for the BRT East project, but would be pleased to meet with you, upon your review, if requested.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>management.</p> <p>A meeting is probably the best way to address these items. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
	<p><i>March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2010 via e-mail from CVC to City of Mississauga</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There needs to be recognition in the main document that portions of Rathburn Road are within a spill area associated with Cooksville Creek. CVC recognizes that it may be beyond the scope of this project to eliminate the spill but the City needs to recognize the issue and that it will be addressed through the appropriate process.</li> <li>2. CVC in general does not support the use of stormceptors as stand alone facilities to address water quality. The report should recommend that as part of detail design that other opportunities for water quality treatment be reviewed including LID.</li> <li>3. That a permit will be required from CVC for works with the regulated area associated Cooksville Creek.</li> </ol>	<p>The City is committed to continue working with the CVC in the future to ensure that their concerns regarding the potential for spillage are reviewed and an appropriate means of addressing the potential impacts is implemented through a separate study.</p> <p>The City is committed to continue working with the CVC throughout the detailed design phase of the project to determine the most appropriate means of providing enhanced quality treatment of stormwater runoff prior to discharge into Cooksville Creek.</p> <p>The City is committed to continue working with the CVC throughout the detailed design phase to ensure that the appropriate CVC permits/approvals are obtained prior to implementation of the Transit Project.</p>
<p>Ministry of Culture – Culture Programs Unit</p>	<p><i>March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via letter from N. Stanchley (MCL) to P. Woodley (NDA)</i></p> <p>This office has reviewed the above-mentioned report, which has been submitted to this Ministry as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. This review is to ensure that the licensed professional consultant archaeologist has met the terms and conditions of their archaeological licence, that archaeological sites have been identified and documented according to the 1993 technical guidelines set by the Ministry and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario.</p> <p>As the result of our review, this Ministry accepts the above titled report into the Provincial register of archaeological reports. The report indicates that the subject property has low archaeological potential and, consequently, a Stage 2 assessment is not required. This Ministry concurs with this recommendation. Given the above, this Ministry is satisfied that concerns for archaeological sites have been met for the area of this development project as depicted by Figure 1 of the above titled report addendum.</p> <p>Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
<p>Ministry of Tourism and Culture</p>	<p><i>March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via e-mail from MCL (Heritage Planner) to City of Mississauga</i></p> <p>Your letter accompanying draft EPR is dated March 2, 2010 with a request for responses by March 19th. Unfortunately the document was sent to the wrong staff member at MTC and was redirected this week. As per your letter, I am notifying you that I will need until the end of this month to review and comment back to the Project Team.</p> <p>Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.</p>	<p>Further comments have not been received from MTC.</p>
<p>Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure –</p>	<p>No comments received.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
<b>Growth Secretariat</b>		
<b>Regional Agencies</b>		
Region of Peel	No comments received.	N/A
<b>Municipal Departments</b>		
Mississauga Community Services, Culture Division	<p><i>October 28<sup>th</sup>, 2009 via e-mail from Senior Heritage Coordinator, Mississauga Community Services to Mississauga Transportation Project Office</i></p> <p>[Upon review of the study area], I am not aware of any heritage resources, or suspected heritage resources within the study area. Therefore there are no heritage related concerns.</p>	Findings documented in Draft Environmental Project Report.
Mississauga Transit	Comments discussed internally and incorporated into the design where appropriate.	N/A
Mississauga Fire	No comments received.	N/A
<b>Utilities</b>		
Bell	<p><i>December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009, via e-mail from Bell to City of Mississauga</i></p> <p>Bell/Group Telecom has no plan within the proposed work area.</p>	Noted.
	<p><i>Via Fax-Back Form from Bell to City of Mississauga</i></p> <p>Request to be kept informed of the study.</p>	Noted. Confirmed on mailing list.
Enbridge	<p><i>December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009 Via mail from Enbridge to City of Mississauga</i></p> <p>Provided mark-ups of Enbridge plant in study area.</p>	Existing Enbridge facilities in the study area are reflected in the report/design.
Enersource	No comments received during TPAP.	N/A
Telus	Request to be kept informed of the study.	Noted. Confirmed on mailing list.
Rogers Cable Communications	<p><i>Via Fax-Back Form from Rogers to City of Mississauga</i></p> <p>Request to be kept informed of the study.</p>	Noted. Confirmed on mailing list.
Peel Fibre	No comments received during TPAP.	N/A
<b>Public Stakeholders</b>		
Oxford Properties	Request to be added to mailing list.	Added to mailing list.
	<p><i>Ltr of February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 from Oxford to City of Mississauga</i></p> <p>We are writing on behalf of the owners of Square One Shopping Centre and adjacent lands to express our strong concern that the proposed Transit Priority Measures on Rathbun Road will have a negative impact on the current viability of Square One as a super-regional shopping centre, and on the substantial future development potential of our adjacent lands.</p> <p>Square One, with 1.7 million square feet of shops and restaurants, is one of the largest such facilities in Canada, which attracts some 23 million visitors per year from Peel Region and beyond. To the north of Rathburn Road is a further 208,000 square feet of commercial development. These lands have the potential to accommodate several million square feet of mixed uses through redevelopment.</p> <p>As outlined in our letter of July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2009, we continue to be generally supportive of improved transit service to the City Centre area, including the BRT project. The current City Centre Transit Terminal is situated on lands previously provided by the shopping centre, as is the 2005 platform expansion. At the City's request, we have also provided a 14.2m easement along the north side of Rathburn Road to accommodate future transit needs.</p>	The City commits to meet with Oxford Properties to further discuss their concerns and ensure that they are considered by City Council prior to Council decision regarding approval of the project.

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>The transition from car-dependence to greater reliance on public transportation in Mississauga is a very complex issue when the BRT, the Hurontario HO Transit, and the Downtown 21 Plans are factored in. In view of this complexity, Ralph Bond of BA Group Transportation Consulting has reviewed the plans presented at the January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2010 Open House and has provided us with the attached letter which details his technical concerns and possible solutions.</p> <p>Our principal concerns are the reduction in through lane capacity on Rathburn Road, the conversion of Station Gate Road to Bus only traffic, and the elimination of northbound left-turns at City Centre Drive and Rathburn Road. These and other concerns are explained in more detail in the attached letter from Ralph Bond.</p> <p>We look forward to reviewing your analysis and working with you on a resolution of these items.</p> <hr/> <p><i>Ltr of February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 from BA Group to Oxford</i>  BA Consulting Group Ltd.  Ralph Bond  Senior Vice-President  Via Oxford Properties</p> <p>We attended the January 28 Open House regarding the captioned project, have reviewed the latest plans and remain concerned with the proposed resolution of the Rathburn Road interface with the BRT service and how this would impact upon the vehicular access to existing and future development.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the existing signalized access to Square One via the Hammerson Drive intersection with Rathburn Road will be maintained, however we continue to have considerable concerns with the following elements of the plan:</p> <p><b>1. Reduction of Through Lane Capacity on Rathburn Road</b></p> <p>The proposed elimination of two existing through lanes for all drivers in order to provide dedicated bus only lanes will substantially reduce road capacity, creating substantial traffic queues along Rathburn Road that will back up into adjacent intersections. This includes the City Centre Transit Terminal entrance that will be blocked by eastbound drivers queued on Rathburn Road. We are aware of the proposal to direct southbound drivers from Hurontario Street to Rathburn Road onto Centre View Drive. This will divert some people from Rathburn Road in the short term. However, we believe that most of these people are destined for points along Rathburn Road and will have to make their way back to it at Duke of York Blvd. A southbound to westbound right turn lane should be provided at Duke of York Blvd. as part of the plan to accommodate this demand.</p> <p>In the longer term as development proceeds in the City Centre in general and along Rathburn Road in particular, we are concerned that sufficient road capacity will not be available to accommodate the demand. In order to successfully market large scale office projects and maintain the success of the regional shopping centre, it is important to provide good access for both drivers as well as transit riders. In order to maintain a</p>	<p>The City commits to meet with Oxford Properties to further discuss their concerns and ensure that they are considered by City Council prior to Council decision regarding approval of the project.</p> <p>The Project Team agrees and has reflected the suggested southbound right-turn lane in the current plans.</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>reasonable level of service for existing and future drivers we believe that Rathburn Road should be widened to accommodate the proposed two new dedicated bus lanes while maintaining four through lanes for general vehicular traffic. This balanced approach will provide the improved bus service that the City seeks while maintaining existing road capacity. The existing right of way and easements can accommodate this widening because they were provided by the owners of Square One for the exact purpose of maintaining four through lanes for general traffic and additional space for transit. In the longer term, the curb side lanes can be utilized for on street parking during non peak periods, thereby providing important shared public parking resources to support the Downtown 21 Master Plan.</p> <p><b>2. Conversion of Station Gate Road to Bus Only Lanes</b></p> <p>The proposal to convert the south end of Station Gate Road to bus only lanes will deny people convenient access to the existing commercial development along the north side of Rathburn Road. This street and traffic signal are important to the tenants in these buildings in terms of providing safe and convenient access for their customers and in accommodating future development. For example, a substantial portion of Starbucks coffee business consists of people who drop in while passing by along Rathburn Road because it is convenient to do so. This business would be put in jeopardy by the City's proposal, as would other customers who drop into the Chapters and Coast Mountain Sports Store while passing by on Rathburn Road.</p> <p><b>3. Northbound Bus Only Left Turn Lane at City Centre Drive &amp; Rathburn Road</b></p> <p>This recent addition to the plan which does not appear to be related to buses moving between Rathburn and the Highway 403 BRT route, will force drivers to divert from Rathburn Road where they want to be, to another route — most likely Square One Drive. These people will increase congestion within the shopping centre and reduce the ability of this street to accommodate future drivers associated with new development on the Square One site. We believe it is important to maintain the integrity of the street grid for all drivers, not just transit vehicles, if the urbanization of the area is to take place successfully. We have previously asked the City for copies of any supporting technical analyses, including bus volumes and future traffic projections that properly take into account approved and planned development in the area over the next ten years. We have also asked that a detailed evaluation of the alternatives be provided, including the option of continuing to run buses in mixed traffic.</p> <p>If the City has conducted due diligence in this regard, we would ask again to receive a copy as soon as possible so that we can evaluate it.</p> <p>We would also appreciate a meeting with the City to discuss these issues in more detail. Sincerely,</p>	<p>The proposed design for transit priority measures on Rathburn Road has since been revised to allow general traffic to operate on Station Gate Road; however, general traffic will be limited to a right-in/right-out operation at the Rathburn Road / Station Gate Road intersection.</p> <p>A meeting was held on February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010. The City committed to providing Oxford with a copy of the traffic analysis for their review.</p>
	<p><i>March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via e-mail from BA Group to City of Mississauga</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table 3-5 on page 3-16 of the report provides a summary of traffic operations under the future analyses conditions (2023 PM Peak Hour). This data source appears to be from a memo dated Feb.1, 2010 (Appendix D of this memo) from MRC to the City. Is this correct? Operational characteristics appear the same in both documents.</li> </ul>	<p><i>March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via e-mail from City of Mississauga to BA Group</i></p> <p>The reference to 2031 in Appendix D is a typo. The Appendix D title: 2031 PM Peak Hour Analysis should be 2023 PM Peak Hour Analysis. This will be corrected for the filing of the EPR.</p>



Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>The report refers to an analysis year of 2023, while the Feb.1 memo considers 2031. I gather this just a change in naming convention, since a 15-year analysis period is analyzed in the report and operational characteristics appear the same. Could you please confirm?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After going through the Feb.1 memo Appendix Data (Scenario 7.1), we believe there are a couple typos (some moves are mislabelled) in the "Rathburn Transit Priority Measures" report table. I've attached the table with typos changed / crossed-out to reference the memo appendix data. In this table I've also added the eastbound westbound operation characteristics to provide an overview of the main movements on Rathburn (sourced from the Feb.1st memo data).</li> <li>• The report analyses summary table 3-15 is based on Background Traffic (Existing + 30% Growth). An earlier analyses from a MRC memo dated October 26, 2009 (included in the report appendix) includes an analyses set with 'site traffic' for what we believe is the Block 3 - Crate and Barrel + Whole Foods development (Scenario 6.1A). This scenario was not analyzed in the report. Was this omission intentional?</li> </ul>	<p>The table prepared by BA Group is correct. The final report will be revised to incorporate the revised table.</p> <p>The original Rathburn Road traffic analysis (October 26, 2009) was prepared assuming a 30% growth rate on background traffic over 15-years, as the City's traffic forecasts were not available at that time. Scenario 6.1 reflected the assumed 30% growth rate AND traffic associated with the proposed development (Whole Foods, Crate and Barrel). This scenario was assessed to ensure that the implications of that development on the level of service of the adjacent intersections were reflected, had they not been sufficiently captured in the 30% growth rate. The analysis indicated that the impacts on the Rathburn Road / Hammerson Drive intersection would be in the order of an additional 125 vehicles entering the site (approximately 3-4 vehicles per cycle), and 115 leaving the site in the PM Peak Hour.</p> <p>Subsequent to conducting the analysis, MRC received the City's updated traffic forecasts and reviewed them to confirm the appropriateness of the initial 30% assumed growth rate. This was found to be relatively consistent with the City's traffic growth forecast for 2031. The 30% growth rate was applied in MRC's updated analysis (Scenario 7.1), reflecting design changes that have occurred in the period following the October 2009 traffic analysis. Given that Scenario 7.1 incorporates traffic volumes that exceed the City's anticipated 2023 traffic volumes, these sufficiently account for all forecast growth in the City Centre to the horizon year of 2023. These are the traffic volumes and associated levels-of-service presented in the report.</p> <p>So to answer the question, yes the omission of Scenario 6.1 was intentional as it was superseded by Scenario 7.1. In light of the City's updated traffic forecasts, Scenario 6.1 reflects a double-counting of the proposed development.</p>
<p>4310 Sherwoodtowne Boulevard BLC Construction (on behalf of 4310 Sherwoodtowne Boulevard)</p>	<p><i>March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via e-mail from BLC Construction to City of Mississauga</i></p> <p>Is the enclosed draft Environmental Project Report available in electronic format? We only have the one copy and it would be much faster to distribute if we had a disc or pdf files.</p>	<p><i>March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via e-mail from City of Mississauga to BLC Construction</i></p> <p>Attached is a link to the report, as you have requested an electronic copy for which you can circulate. Let me know if this meets your purposes. Alternatively, we can provide you a disk if you have any difficulty in accessing.</p> <p>The City's website link is as follows: (<a href="http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/residents/rathburnroadtransitpriorityproject">http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/residents/rathburnroadtransitpriorityproject</a>)</p>

Submitter	Summary of Initial Comments Received	Proponent's Response to Initial Comments
	<p>Is there a dust control management plan? If so do we have or could we get a copy? Does it include monitoring measures?</p> <p>As to the timelines for response I am not yet sure that March 19 is possible for us so I am advising you of this now as you requested.</p>	<p>We will include a commitment in the report, as follows:  <i>“Construction activities may result in the creation of dust. Dust impacts will be mitigated by ensuring that proper watering and/or other dust suppressant techniques, as identified in Ontario Provincial Standard Specification (OPSS) 506, are used during the construction phase. OPSS 506 outlines the requirements for dust suppressants and their application including application. Following construction, any open, unpaved areas will be seeded.”</i></p>
<b>General Public</b>		
D. Vincent	<p><i>February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 via e-mail from D. Vincent to City of Mississauga</i></p> <p>Today, I was reviewing the PDF posted on the BRT website. The plan on page 12 looks very good, however for increased operational ability, I would make one change. On the north (westbound) side of Rathburn, there is a bus only right turn lane and acceleration lane on the east and west sides of the intersection, respectively. I would suggest that that space be used to allow a second centre RBL in each direction adjacent to each direction's platform. This would allow buses to pass other stopped buses without being forced to enter the opposing direction's lane. Being Square One, there will be a high turnover rate at that stop, which means an increased dwell time will inevitably be experienced, negating the benefit of using the RBLs for any buses held behind a loading unit. A single lane at those locations would also render it impossible for operators to access washroom facilities at the CCT because leaving their buses there would block the single lane while they are gone.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration and please reply to me if you can't understand what I'm trying to tell you, or if you would like to follow up,</p>	<p><i>February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010 – confirm with City that the response was submitted.</i></p> <p>This is a physically and operationally feasible proposal that is attractive in that it does provide passing opportunities at the median platforms.</p> <p>However, the median platforms are intended for use primarily by BRT buses. Local buses will use the existing terminal and GO buses will remain on Station Gate. BRT buses are not expected to pass one another in the City Centre, since all BRT buses will stop there in sequence. If a bus is delayed at a median platform (e.g. in the event of a wheelchair loading), a through bus is free to use the adjacent general traffic lane in that direction to bypass it. The through BRT buses will not have a time point at the City Centre, so buses should not be laying over at the platform. Bus operators will be required to use layover space rather than wait at a platform if they take a break. All of the above applies equally to the proposed City Centre Drive BRT stop.</p> <p>The proposal would also see westbound GO buses tied up in general traffic at the approach to Station Gate rather than having their own right turn lane from which they could turn right on red; the GO delays would be undesirable.</p> <p>The proposal would involve additional cost, since we would be back into realigning both north and south curbs on Rathburn for some distance west of Station Gate, and any south curb line change triggers the need for a retaining wall on the parking lot embankment to the south.</p> <p>So all in all no deal breakers, but a general sense that a simpler, smaller footprint (as recommended) would meet BRT functional requirements and with least cost and impact. In the longer term with the Hurontario RT plan and other City Centre changes, further modifications to the layout are likely.</p>
L. Mercader (via e-mail of December 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2009)	Request to be added to mailing list.	Added to mailing list.
H. Sookraj (via e-mail of December 13 <sup>th</sup> , 2009)	Request to be added to mailing list.	Added to mailing list.