

A decorative graphic on the left side of the page, consisting of a large light blue rectangle stacked on top of a smaller red rectangle.

Appendix L.4

Correspondences with Agencies

A solid dark gray horizontal bar located at the bottom right of the page.

**Ministry of Citizenship
and Multiculturalism**

Heritage Planning Unit
Heritage Branch
Citizenship, Inclusion and
Heritage Division
5th Flr, 400 University Ave
Tel.: 416.660.1027

**Ministère des Affaires civiques
et du Multiculturalisme**

Unité de la planification relative au
patrimoine
Direction du patrimoine
Division des affaires civiques, de
l'inclusion et du patrimoine
Tél.: 416.660.1027



December 12, 2022

EMAIL ONLY

Sonali Praharaj
Project Lead-Major Projects,
Transportation Services,
City of Toronto
City Hall, 22nd Floor, East Tower
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2
E: sonali.praharaj@toronto.ca

MCM File : **0016373**
Proponent : **City of Toronto**
Subject : **Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Schedule C –
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1**
Project : **ReNew Golden Mile: Reconfigured and New Major Streets EA**
Location : **City of Toronto**

Dear Sonali Praharaj:

Thank you for contacting the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) and hosting the Technical Advisory Committee Meeting for the above-referenced project.

MCM's interest in this Environmental Assessment (EA) project relates to its mandate of conserving Ontario's cultural heritage, which includes:

- archaeological resources, including land and marine;
- built heritage resources, including bridges and monuments; and
- cultural heritage landscapes.

Under the EA process, the proponent is required to determine a project's potential impact on known (previously recognized) and potential cultural heritage resources.

Please note that if the subject lands or part of the subject lands are owned or controlled by an Ontario government ministry or prescribed public body (PPB) on behalf of the Crown (the list of PPBs is available as Ontario Regulation 157/10), a ministry or PPB may have responsibilities under the [Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties](#) (S&Gs).

Project Summary

The City of Toronto has initiated a Schedule 'C' Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) for transportation infrastructure in the Golden Mile area. The study area is bounded by Bermondsey Road to the west, the Gatineau Hydro Corridor Trail to the north, Sunrise Avenue, Holswade Road, Comstock Road and Foxridge Drive to the south, and Kennedy Road to the east. The EA study builds on recommendations from the Golden Mile Secondary Plan (SP) and Golden Mile Transportation Master Plan (TMP)

Identifying Cultural Heritage Resources

While some cultural heritage resources may have already been formally identified, others may be identified through screening and evaluation.

Indigenous communities may have knowledge that can contribute to the identification of cultural heritage resources, and we suggest that any engagement with Indigenous communities includes a discussion about known or potential cultural heritage resources that are of value to them.

Municipal Heritage Committees, historical societies and other local heritage organizations may also have knowledge that contributes to the identification of cultural heritage resources.

Archaeological Resources

Slide 31 indicates that there are 4 previously registered archaeological sites and that some areas have been identified as areas of archaeological potential within the study area.

MCM recommends that, as a best practice, a combined Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment (AA) be completed for the entire study area during the pre-planning phase.

At a minimum, a Stage 1 AA will be undertaken for the entire study area during the pre-planning phase. The results of the Stage 1 AA will inform the EA and will be summarized in the draft EA report. If the Stage 1 AA recommends further AA(s), then MCM recommends that further stages of AA be completed as early as possible during the planning or design phase of the project, and prior to the completion of detailed design.

Archaeological assessments are required to be undertaken by an archaeologist licenced under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, who is responsible for submitting the report directly to MCM for review.

If archaeological assessments have been undertaken, please send us the Project Information Form (PIF) numbers.

The EA report must include specific information from the AA report(s). The Executive Summary of each AA report provides a brief summary of the work completed and the recommendations for next steps, whether for further archaeological assessment, in which case the report will include a map that identifies those areas, or for no further assessment. The EA report must also include clear commitments to undertake the recommended AA and a timeline for their completion.

Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Slide 30 indicates that 4 built heritage resources, 1 cultural heritage landscapes and 2 commemorative features have been identified within the study area.

A Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment shall be undertaken for the entire study area during the planning phase and will be summarized in the EA Report. This study will:

1. Describe the existing baseline cultural heritage conditions within the study area by identifying all known or potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, including a historical summary of the study area. The Ministry has developed screening criteria that may assist with this exercise: [Criteria for Evaluating for Potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes](#).
2. Identify preliminary potential project-specific impacts on the known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes that have been identified. The report should include a description of the anticipated impact to each known or potential built heritage resource or cultural heritage landscape that has been identified.
3. Recommend measures to avoid or mitigate potential negative impacts to known or potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. The proposed mitigation measures are to inform the next steps of project planning and design.

Given that this project covers a large study area, MCM recommends that the Cultural Heritage Report is carried out so that step 1 described above is undertaken early in the planning process. Then, steps 2 and 3 can be undertaken once the preferred alternatives have been selected.

Cultural Heritage Reports will be undertaken by a qualified person who has expertise, recent experience, and knowledge relevant to the type of cultural heritage resources being considered and the nature of the activity being proposed.

Environmental Assessment Reporting

All technical cultural heritage studies and their recommendations are to be addressed and incorporated into EA projects. We would appreciate if any any technical cultural heritage studies completed for this EA project be provided to MCM for review and comment before issuing a Notice of Completion or commencing any work on the site.

Please note that the responsibility for administration of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and matters related to cultural heritage recently transferred from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM). Individual staff roles and contact information remain unchanged. Please continue to send any notices, report and/or documentation to both Dan Minkin and I:

- Karla Barboza, Team Lead - Heritage | Heritage Planning Unit (Citizenship and Multiculturalism) | 416-660-1027 | karla.barboza@ontario.ca
- Dan Minkin, Heritage Planner | Heritage Planning Unit (Citizenship and Multiculturalism) | 416-786-7553 | dan.minkin@ontario.ca

Thank you for consulting MCM on this project and please continue to do so throughout the EA process. If you have any questions or require clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Karla Barboza, MCIP, RPP, CAHP
Team Lead – Heritage
karla.barboza@ontario.ca
Heritage Planning Unit

Copied to: Niki Siabanis, City of Toronto
Andrew Kim, City of Toronto
Heather Templeton, HDR
Patrick Yip, HDR
Dan Minkin, Heritage Planner, MCM

It is the sole responsibility of proponents to ensure that any information and documentation submitted as part of their EA report or file is accurate. The Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of the any checklists, reports or supporting documentation submitted as part of the EA process, and in no way shall MCM be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result if any checklists, reports or supporting documents are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.

Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out an archaeological assessment, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33* requires that any person discovering human remains must cease all activities immediately and notify the police or coroner. If the coroner does not suspect foul play in the disposition of the remains, in accordance with *Ontario Regulation 30/11* the coroner shall notify the Registrar, Ontario Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery, which administers provisions of that Act related to burial sites. In situations where human remains are associated with archaeological resources, the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism should also be notified (at archaeology@ontario.ca) to ensure that the archaeological site is not subject to unlicensed alterations which would be a contravention of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.



December 22, 2022

Sonali Praharaj
Project Lead-Major Projects,
Transportation Services,
City of Toronto
City Hall, 22nd Floor, East Tower
100 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

Attn: Sonali Praharaj

**Re: ReNew Golden Mile: Reconfigured and New
Major Streets Environmental Assessment (EA)
TCDSB Comments**

The TCDSB has reviewed the presentation regarding ReNew Golden Mile: Reconfigured and New Major Streets Environmental Assessment, which was presented at the first Technical Advisory Committee Meeting held on November 28th, 2022. With respect to the presentation, the TCDSB wishes to submit following comments:

Within the Golden Mile Secondary plan area, the TCDSB has engaged with City staff and landowners since 2018 and was consulted during the creation of City Council adopted Official Plan Amendment No. 499 for the Golden Mile Secondary Plan on October 30, 2020.

The TCDSB has engaged RioCan REIT on numerous occasions to discuss detailed plans for the development site municipally known as 1966 Eglinton Avenue East (Plan # 15 258686 ESC 37 OZ; 21 195478 ESC 21 OZ). The RioCan proposal calls for approximately 4,915 units contained within twelve buildings of heights ranging up to 48 storeys.

In confidence, RioCan has included a TCDSB school within Block 4 of the proposed development – to be located on the corner of the proposed Golden Mile Boulevard and “New North/South Street #10” which would be a connection to Ashtonbee Road. Under this configuration, the school site would be separated from the East Park by New North/South Street #10.

To maintain/improve student safety at street crossings, the TCDSB requests the following be considered:

- **Additional traffic calming measures on New North/South Street #10 to reduce speed and increase driver awareness**
- **Investigate grade separated pedestrian crossings to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of student and community pedestrian traffic**



The TCDSB is supportive of City's vision and overall objectives in developing an environmental assessment for the area and wishes to remain engaged in the ReNew Golden Mile Technical Advisory Committee.

The TCDSB requests notification of any modifications, community consultations, appeals or notices of decision relating to this Environmental Assessment. Please direct correspondence to development.applications@tcdsb.org

Should you require additional information regarding our comments, please contact Tomasz Oltarzewski at (416) 222-8282. Ext. 2278.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Michael Loberto". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first and last names being more prominent.

Michael Loberto
Superintendent, Planning and Development Services
Toronto Catholic District School Board

Cc: Erica Pallotta – Senior Coordinator, Development Services
Barbara Leporati – Senior Coordinator, Planning Services
Adam Brutto – Senior Manager of Planning & Admissions



ReNew Golden Mile

Date: Monday, November 28, 2022

Meeting Type: Virtual

Start time: 10:00 a.m. **End Time:** 11:30 a.m.

Project Overview:

The City of Toronto is undertaking a Schedule 'C' Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study to review transportation network improvements to the Golden Mile Network Area, in the City of Toronto.

The City of Toronto's Golden Mile Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and Golden Mile Secondary Plan (GMSP) identified improvements to the following corridors:

- O'Connor Drive (potential re-alignment, reconfiguration and extension to Birchmount Road);
- Golden Mile Boulevard, (potential new east-west public street from Victoria Park Avenue to Birchmount Road);
- Craigton Drive (potential re-alignment, widening and reconfiguration);
- Thermos Road / Sinnott Road at Eglinton Avenue East intersection (potential reconfiguration); and
- Jonesville Crescent / Craigton Drive / Ashtonbee Road from Eglinton Avenue East to Birchmount Road (potential corridor improvements)

Meeting Objectives:

The purpose of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting is to introduce the project background to the TAC Members. TAC Members were able to review and provide feedback on the work done to-date and ask questions on the project.

Meeting Overview:

The meeting was facilitated by City of Toronto. A presentation was provided by HDR. The meeting agenda is as follows:

1. Round of Project Team and TAC Member Introduction
2. Study Area and Background
3. Golden Mile Transportation Master Plan
4. Existing Conditions
5. Q&A Period #1
6. Street Alignment & Cross-Section Alternatives
7. Q&A Period #2
8. Next Steps

Q&A Periods allowed TAC members to ask questions and hear responses from City and HDR staff.

Discussion

Multiple Q&A Periods were provided as an opportunity for comments and discussion. Below is a record of key points, concerns and follow up. The discussion captured is summarized below: **Q:** Question/ **A:** Answer/ **C:** Comment/ **R:** Response **Action:** Action items and *Action Item* by Member.

	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Action Item</i>
1	Round of Project Team and TAC Member Introduction C#1: Dan Minkin (MCM) noted that the name has been formally changed from Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) to Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM).	HDR/City
2	Study Area and Background A summary of the study area and background was provided, including previous studies leading up to this EA study (i.e. Golden Mile Secondary Plan, Transportation Master Plan, and Eglinton Connects Planning Study). An overview of the Class EA process was presented and explained the previous TMP had satisfied Phase 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class EA process.	None
3	Golden Mile Transportation Master Plan A summary of problem and opportunities that were identified in the TMP was presented. A high-level overview of the alternative solutions and the preferred solution were presented to highlight what the recommendations were from the TMP.	None
4	Existing Conditions Existing traffic conditions (including mode splits), bikeways, pedestrian facilities, transit network, natural heritage features and species at risk, cultural heritage, Stage 1 archaeological assessment, and Phase 1 ESA were presented for consideration.	None
5	Q&A Period #1 Q#1: City Urban Design (UD) inquired how detailed was the existing arborist report for this study? A#1: A detailed tree inventory was conducted as part of the existing condition investigation. City's project team to share the arborist report to UD for review. Q#2: TTC inquired what are the transit improvements that were identified along Victoria Park Avenue and Warden Avenue? A#2: These improvements would be identified as part of the RapidTO study and would not be part of this EA study.	City

Topic	Action Item
• Q#3: City UD inquired how much space would be required to accommodate for the EcoMobility Hubs? • A#3: The exact size and location will be further developed as part of the study at a later stage. Larger EcoMobility Hubs are located near higher order transit stops (i.e. ECLRT stops). However, City's project team noted that these EcoMobility Hubs would focus on bike share rather than E-Scooters as E-Scooters are not permitted by Councillor. • Q#4: City UD inquired if there are opportunities to integrate these hubs with the developments? • A#4: There are opportunities to leverage the adjacent developments, especially if electrification of these hubs are needed.	
6 Street Alignment & Cross-Section Alternatives As part of this EA study, alternative street alignments were developed for the following streets: • O'Connor Drive Reconfiguration (to Pharmacy Ave) • O'Connor Drive Extension to Birchmount Road (NEW east-west connection) • Golden Mile Boulevard (NEW east-west connection) • Thermos Road and Sinnott Road Realignment • Craigton Drive Reconfiguration and Jonesville Cres/Ashtonbee Rd Streetscape Improvements Street alignment and cross section alternatives were presented for each of the key improvement corridors identified. High-level screening of the street alignment alternatives and recommended alternatives that were carried forward for further evaluation were presented.	None
7 Q&A Period #2 • Q#5: Toronto Fire inquired if the proposed lane widths would accommodate for emergency vehicles. • A#5: Project team confirmed that the lane widths all comply with City guidelines. In the next phase of the project, intersection designs of the preferred alternative design will accommodate for turning vehicles. • Q#6: City's Parks, Forestry and Recreation (PF&R) inquired what the length of Golden Mile Boulevard between Victoria Park Avenue and West Park Avenue is. • A#6: Approximately 300-400m. • Q#7: City UD asked if the cycle tracks will be elevated from the road. • A#7: Project team responded that cycle tracks can be either at-grade with the travel lanes or elevated. At-grade cycle	

Topic	Action Item
tracks are less aesthetically pleasing, but elevated cycle tracks poses a tripping hazard. • C#2: TTC commented that if a new east-west connections are made north and south of Eglinton Avenue East, it would be a great opportunity for TTC to protect these new streets for transit operations for short turns/diversions.	
8 Next Steps A draft detailed evaluation framework was presented. • Action #1: TAC members are requested to review the evaluation framework and provide input. In the next phase of the study, the design of the preferred alternatives will be developed following PIC #1. This includes intersection designs that will require additional property requirements to accommodate for intersection treatments for cyclists and pedestrians, transit stops, right and left turn lanes, green infrastructure, utilities, etc. Technical studies are continued to be conducted to inform the evaluation of alternatives and identify the preferred design. SHG meeting and PIC #1 are scheduled to be held in January 2023, followed by evaluation of alternative designs in March 2023, and identification of the preferred design in May 2023.	TAC Members

Follow Up Required:

Action #1: TAC members are requested to review the evaluation framework and provide input.

Attendees

City of Toronto:

- Andrew Kim – Transportation Services
- Cassidy Ritz – Transportation Services
- Khaled Chowdhury – Transportation Services
- Nima Arbabi – Transportation Services
- Shane Abraham – Transportation Services
- Sonali Praharaj – Transportation Services
- Anum Dhalwani – Toronto Water
- Carol Liu – Toronto Water
- Philip Cheung – Toronto Water
- Behnaz Djabarouti – Urban Design
- Diane Ho – City Planning
- Georgia Kuich – Urban Design
- Lara Tarlo – Urban Design
- Shayna Stott – Environment
- Xue Pei – Urban Design
- Dominic Cobran – Public Consultation Unit
- Cong Ming Ren – Engineering & Construction Services
- Diane Leal – Parks, Forestry & Recreation
- Sinead Goode – Parks, Forestry & Recreation
- Teresa Bosco – Parks, Forestry & Recreation
- Elysia Leung – Pedestrian and Cycling Unit
- Laurel Sharp – Fire Services
- Claudio Gloazzo – Fire Services
- Margie Galarneau – Economic Development & Culture
- Thomas McGinty – Economic Development & Culture
- Daniel Gagliotti – Toronto Paramedic Services

Agencies:

- Margie Akins – TRCA
- Dan Minkin - MCM
- Alex Butler – TTC
- Dominic Ho – TTC
- Patrick Yutiga – TTC
- Rob Shames – Metrolinx
- Sara Tavakolian – Toronto Public Library
- Tomasz Oltarzewski – TCDSB

Utilities:

- Raul Santos – Bell
- Anthony Pejovic - Bell



ReNew Golden Mile

Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2024

Meeting Type: Virtual

Start time: 2:00 p.m. **End Time:** 3:30 p.m.

Project Overview:

The City of Toronto is undertaking a Schedule 'C' Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study to review transportation network improvements to the Golden Mile Network Area, in the City of Toronto.

The City of Toronto's Golden Mile Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and Golden Mile Secondary Plan (GMSP) identified improvements to the following corridors:

- O'Connor Drive (potential re-alignment, reconfiguration and extension to Birchmount Road);
- Golden Mile Boulevard, (potential new east-west public street from Victoria Park Avenue to Birchmount Road);
- Craigton Drive (potential re-alignment, widening and reconfiguration);
- Thermos Road / Sinnott Road at Eglinton Avenue East intersection (potential reconfiguration); and
- Jonesville Crescent / Craigton Drive / Ashtonbee Road from Eglinton Avenue East to Birchmount Road (potential corridor improvements)

Meeting Objectives:

The purpose of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting is to recap the project background and introduce the recommended alignments and typical sections to the TAC Members. TAC Members were able to review and provide feedback on the work done to date and ask questions on the project.

Meeting Overview:

The meeting was facilitated by City of Toronto. A presentation was provided by HDR. The meeting agenda is as follows:

1. Study Overview
2. Alternative Design Concepts
3. Evaluations of Alignments & Cross Sections
 - a. O'Connor Drive Reconfiguration
 - b. O'Connor Drive Extension
 - c. Craigton Drive Reconfiguration
 - d. Thermos Road and Sinnott Road Realignment
 - e. Golden Mile Boulevard
4. Next Steps

Six Discussion Periods throughout the presentation allowed TAC members to ask questions and hear responses from City and HDR staff.

Discussion

Multiple Discussion Periods were provided as an opportunity for questions and comments. Below is a record of key points, concerns and follow up. The discussion captured is summarized below: **Q:** Question/ **A:** Answer/ **C:** Comment/ **R:** Response **Action:** Action items and *Action Item* by Member.

	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Action Item</i>
1	Round of Project Team and TAC Member Introduction	None
2	Study Overview A summary of the study area and background was provided, including the five study corridors and previous studies leading up to this EA study (i.e. Golden Mile Secondary Plan and Transportation Master Plan). An overview of the Class EA process was presented and explained that the previous TMP had satisfied Phase 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class EA process. This TAC Meeting #2 will focus on the alternatives - alignments and cross-sections, and rationale for the recommended alternatives. The next TAC Meeting (#3) will occur before the PIC #2, and it will focus on the functional design of the preferred alternatives.	None
3	Alternative Design Concepts A summary of alternative design concepts was provided: • Planned street widths in the City's Official Plan. • Policies, Plans & Guidelines used in this study. • Feedback from PIC #1. • Evaluation Framework for Street Alignments. • Evaluation Criteria for Street Cross-Sections. • Status of background and technical studies.	TAC Members
	Discussion Period • Q#1: Regarding the slide on Secondary Plan with the conceptual building mass model, has there been a rough calculation done for the density in this area? Firehall, ambulance, or police stations in this area may be required for adequate response time. • A#1: Toronto Fire was consulted during the Golden Mile Secondary Plan, and they provided input into the ultimate	

Golden Mile Secondary Plan, which was completed in early 2020.

- Q#2: Could you share the Toronto Fire contact information from the Golden Mile Secondary Plan?
- A#2: Toronto Fire representatives that were part of the TAC for the Golden Mile Secondary Plan Study were: Colin Booth, followed by Jim Kay, Scott Andrews and Doug Babcock.
- R#1: Booth, Kay, Babcock retired or quit. Andrews is on extended leave.
- Q#3: From the schoolboard perspective through TMP, Vision Zero, and Active Transportation, there is a safety concern with a road network that divides the built form of schools and access to park blocks. In Golden Mile, the school locations are not planned at this moment, but safe crossings and omitting roadways that bisect schools and parks for usability need to be considered for usability. Where schools are being considered, there will be 500-600 students needing to cross roadways. Is this the avenue to tackle this discussion?
- A#3: Yes, this is a good forum for this discussion. Currently, the study is at a high level, but as the study progresses, there will be more details on road corridors including pedestrian/cyclist crossing locations. This study will not be assessing what's designated outside of the road corridors, but it would be great if TAC members can provide an input to flag locations where they are concerned about safe crossing. Protected intersections will be considered during this study.
- Q#4: The background and technical studies that have been identified on slide 16 -are they the standard of EA Study that may be required from the ministry? Or are there additional studies listed here?
- A#4: Yes, these studies are typical of the Class EA Process. The focus so far has been on documenting existing conditions in the study area to fully understand what features exist in the study corridors. The next step is to conduct impact assessments, should any of those features potentially be affected by any of the recommended alternatives.
- Q#5: Regarding the Evaluation Criteria for Street Cross Sections (slide 15), public transit in the criteria should be considered as part of the public transportation framework.

	TTC is operating transit service in the impacted area. Route 70 O'Connor Drive uses Craigton Drive and this is where buses are parked and wait for the next schedule before returning to the point of origin. Standard minimum lane width requirement for the proposed cross-sections need to account for bus laybys. Curious about the status of this consideration? • A#5: The project team has established the minimum 3.3 m width where bus services are required. As the team evaluated cross-section alternatives, reference to existing TTC plan was considered for access to service. However, some alternatives propose changes to the road network, which could affect TTC service. It would be helpful to receive feedback on the alternatives from TTC. The project team requests that TTC provide details of where there are bus laybys.	
4	Evaluations of Alignments & Cross Sections The alignments & cross-sections have been packaged in groups for each of the five corridors.	None
5	O'Connor Drive Reconfiguration A summary of the alignment and cross-sections alternatives was provided. The current status of the recommended alternative for the O'Connor Drive Reconfiguration is pending. The intention for these alternatives is to be implemented in line with planned development, but there is also the objective to minimize impacts to existing properties. The existing O'Connor Drive is planned to be closed and may be repurposed in the future once the new alignment is implemented. Also, there will be a transition from maintaining existing 4 lanes to the west of Victoria Park Avenue to the proposed 2 lanes with future developments to the east side of Victoria Park Avenue. Discussion Period • No questions received.	None
6	O'Connor Drive Extension A summary of the recommended alignment and cross-section alternatives was provided. Alternative 1 is the recommended alignment. The city does not intend to displace any existing businesses, as this is planned to occur in line with developments. Discussion Period • Q#6: Do the cross-sections consider underground utilities or is that still to be investigated?	None

- A#6: The project team reviewed existing underground utilities, but for the most part, all corridors will require reconstruction or relocation of many existing underground utilities. The project team is in the process of developing a concept of where future utilities will be placed along the corridors as the designs are further developed.
- Q#7: Is the S curve on the O'Connor Drive Extension Alternative 1 going to be slightly wider?
- A#7: The project team has not looked at lane widening at this time. The radius at the S curve is at the minimum R65. If there are concerns about vehicle tracking, this will be investigated during the next stage.

7	Craigton Drive Reconfiguration	None
----------	---------------------------------------	------

A summary of the recommended alignment and cross-section alternatives was provided. Alternative 2 is the recommended alignment. Alternative 2 overall resulted in the least property impact and requires a shorter road. However, it impacts the Toronto Water pumping station property, and the project team is consulting with Toronto Water on potential impacts and mitigation strategies in relation to this site. The recommended intersection is skewed and exceeds the minimum standard. The existing intersection of Pharmacy Avenue and Ashtonbee Road will be removed and there will be a new set of traffic signals.

Discussion

- C#1: The property adjacent to Toronto Water to the north is a high-volume ambulance station. Any implementation will need to maintain continuity to the emergency services. The entrance is on Ashtonbee Road and the exit is on Pharmacy Avenue. The driveways are shared with Toronto Water.
 - Q#8: Is there any specific design consideration for the driveways, especially because they are close to the traffic signal at the intersection?
 - A#8: Currently, there is pavement marking (hash-mark) to prevent drivers from stopping inside the hatch. As long as that pavement marking remain in place, it should be fine.
 - C#2: From Toronto Water perspective, as expressed in previous discussions with the project team, there is a significant impact to the pumping station. This is a major pumping station that services a large district of Scarborough. Alternative 1 is much better from Toronto Water perspective than alternative 2.
 - R#2: At this time, the project team will closely review the recent e-mail commentary from Toronto Water. The project
-

	team will schedule a further conversation with Toronto Water to discuss this separately.	
8	Thermos Road and Sinnott Road Realignment A summary of the alignment and cross-section alternatives was provided. The recommended alternative for the Thermos Road and Sinnott Road Realignment is pending. Only alternatives 1 and 5 are shared in plan views because the project team has identified that other alignments impacting the Eglinton Crosstown LRT are not recommended. A rough sketch of Alternative 5 (do nothing plus), one of the short-listed alignments, was presented for comments. Discussion: • C#3: There is a development application on 2200 Eglinton Avenue East at Thermos Road that will be in the way of proposed potential realignment of Thermos Road. • R#3: The project team is aware of that development. The team is still assessing what is possible with development and whether the do-nothing plus option will mitigate the impact. This is why the recommended alternative for this corridor has not been determined yet, but it will be determined by the next TAC Meeting (#3).	None
9	Golden Mile Boulevard A summary of the recommended alignment and cross-section alternatives was provided. Alternative 4 is the recommended alignment because it is most consistent with what is planned in the area, it met or exceeded transportation criteria, and it is the most compatible with area developments and land uses. There is a narrower 20m-right-of-way width on the west side, which has been determined through a planning tribunal decision. Discussion: • Q#9: Comments have been provided internally within the project team regarding the widths of some cross-section elements. • A#9: Yes, the comments have been received and this can be discussed later during the next project team meeting.	None
10	Q & A Period • Q#10: I want to confirm whether there was consideration for watermain and other underground infrastructure for the proposed cross sections? Or will this be looked at in the future with the utilities. • A#10: Yes, there will be considerations for watermain and other underground infrastructures. At this stage, the work is very conceptual at a high level. The next phase of work will	None

be the engineering design of the recommended plans for each corridor for both above ground and below grade. There is a broader servicing plan for the Golden Mile area that the project team is taking into consideration for any impacts to existing infrastructures.

11 Next Steps

None

A summary of the project timeline with key milestones was provided. A range of stakeholders including landowners, property owners, developers, community groups, and agencies will be consulted. The virtual PIC #2 is targeted for Spring 2024 to present the recommended design plans with renderings.

TAC Meeting #3 will be scheduled before the PIC #2 to share and discuss the 10% design plans.

Discussion:

- Q#11: Are you including businesses with residents in PIC #2, or will the businesses be separated?
 - A#11: At this time, both businesses and residents will be combined for PIC #2. There may be smaller groups of businesses that may be consulted separately, but independent businesses will be combined with the general public.
 - Q#12: Are the Scarborough Business Association and Scarborough Community Renewal Organization (SCRO) included in the list? They are interested in Golden Mile, and I would be happy to share their contact information if they are not on the list.
 - A#12: Both groups were on the list of invitations. Although they did not engage in the first round, they will be invited to the stakeholder group. If businesses in the area receive public notice, that invites them to the public consultation.
 - Q#13: Are the notices via e-mail or mailed letters?
 - A#13: Interest group meetings (stakeholder meetings) are sent by e-mail. For the wider general community with addresses in the project area, the notices are sent by mailed letters.
 - C#4: With the new alignments, there should also be considerations of utility trench (combined utility corridor) to reduce future impact on the pavement/sidewalk from the utility works. ECS and Toronto Water require watermains to be located within the boulevard under the sodded portion.
 - R#5: The project team is in the process of assessing where soil cells would be required and how they may affect underground utilities.
-

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Action Item</i>
- Q#14: Will you let us know what the next date of public consultation will be? - A#14: Yes, we will when we have the date available. We do not have the exact date at this time, but a tentative date will be provided by the next TAC Meeting (#3).	
12 Final Remarks The project team will share a copy of today's presentation to provide all attendees and invitees an opportunity for further review. The presentation may be shared with colleagues at respective agencies and organization, but the slide deck and its information are not for public sharing yet. The project team is looking forward to receiving written feedback from the TAC members following this meeting.	None

Follow Up Required:

Action #1: Project team to share the presentation with TAC invitees.

[Post Meeting Note: The presentation was shared with the TAC members on February 21, 2024, after the meeting.]

Action #2: TAC members are requested to focus their review and feedback on the alignments and cross-sections alternatives and rationale for the recommendations.

[Post Meeting Note: All TAC member comments received as of March 7, 2024.]

Attendees

City of Toronto:

- Philip Morse – Transportation Services
- Sonali Praharaj – Transportation Services
- Cassidy Ritz – Transportation Services
- Behnaz Djabarouti – Urban Design
- Benjamin Morell – Transportation Planning
- Caroline Meier – Toronto Water
- Christina Zhang – Transportation Services
- Conming Ren – ECS
- Dominic Cobran – Public Consultation Unit
- Emily Caldwell – Community Planning
- Eric Beales – Heritage Planning
- Frank Difei He – Transportation Planning
- Gary Miedema – Heritage Planning
- Hamed Esmaeeli – Transportation Services
- Khaled Chowdhury – Transportation Services
- Lara Tarlo – Urban Design
- Margie M. Galarneau – Economic Development
- Mathu Kamalakaran – ECS
- Philip Cheung – Toronto Water
- Riad Rahman – Transportation Planning
- Sinead Goode – Urban Forestry
- Steve Turco - Transportation Planning
- Will Nixon – Environment and Climate
- Xinqi Wang – Urban Design

HDR:

- Heather Templeton
- Minsu Kee

Agencies:

- Patrick Yutiga – TTC
- Aditi Atodaria – TTC
- Carmelo Tancioco - TTC
- Felix Tse – TTC
- Khalil Heron – TTC
- Robert Shamess - Metrolinx
- Claudio Gloazzo – Toronto Fire Services
- Daniel Gagliotti – Toronto Paramedic Services
- Gaurav Kaushal – Toronto Hydro
- Liam Smythe – MCM

- Aliyah Khan - TRCA
- Caroline Mugo – TRCA
- Sara Tavakolian – Toronto Public Library
- Paul Nichols - TDSB
- Adam Brutto - TCDSB
- Barbara Leporati - TCDSB
- Erica Pallotta – TCDSB
- Tomasz Oltarzewski – TCDSB

Utilities:

- Brian Elbe – Bell Canada



ReNew Golden Mile EA Study

Date: Monday, July 22, 2024

Meeting Type: Virtual

Start time: 10:00 a.m. End Time: 12:00 p.m.

Project Overview:

The City of Toronto is undertaking a Schedule 'C' Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study to review transportation network improvements to the Golden Mile Network Area, in the City of Toronto.

The City of Toronto's Golden Mile Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and Golden Mile Secondary Plan (GMSP) identified improvements to the following corridors:

- O'Connor Drive (potential re-alignment, reconfiguration and extension to Birchmount Road);
- Golden Mile Boulevard, (potential new east-west public street from Victoria Park Avenue to Birchmount Road);
- Craigton Drive (potential re-alignment, widening and reconfiguration);
- Thermos Road / Sinnott Road at Eglinton Avenue East intersection (potential reconfiguration); and
- Ashtonbee Road from Pharmacy Avenue to Birchmount Road (potential streetscape improvements)

Meeting Objectives:

This is the third Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting held to date for the Renew Golden Mile EA Study. The purpose of this TAC Meeting is to recap the notable feedback received from the previous TAC meeting and present the working draft 10% functional design plans for the study corridors. TAC members were able to review and provide feedback on the work done to date and ask questions on the project.

Meeting Overview:

The meeting was facilitated by the City of Toronto. A presentation was provided by HDR. The meeting agenda is as follows:

1. Project Status Update
2. Recap of Key Comments and Feedback from TAC Meeting #2
3. Present Working Draft Functional Design Plans
 - a. Design Criteria
 - b. Constraints & Trade-offs
4. Next Steps

Discussion

Below is a record of key information presented and feedback received. Discussion topics captured are summarized below:

Q: Question | **A:** Answer | **C:** Comment | **R:** Response

Action: Action items by Member.

	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Action Item</i>
1	Round of Project Team and TAC Member Introduction	None
2	Project Status Update - A summary of the study area and background was provided, including the five study corridors and previous studies leading up to this EA study (i.e. Golden Mile Secondary Plan and Transportation Master Plan). - An overview of the Class EA process was presented and explained that the previous TMP had satisfied Phase 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class EA process. - An overview of the process in developing the recommended 10% functional designs, outlining the work that was completed during the long-list and short-list screening process that led to the selection of the recommended functional designs for the study corridors. - This TAC Meeting #3 focuses on the 10% functional design of the preferred alternatives and seeks to gather input from attendees on design elements.	None
3	Recommended Functional Design Plans - A summary of the recommended alignments for each of the five (5) study corridors. - A summary of the key feedback received, and responses provided during and after the previous TAC meeting. - An overview of the design criteria for the key design elements of the study corridors. - Outline of design elements pending input from TAC attendees. - O'Connor Drive Reconfiguration and Extension Functional Design Plan: - A description of the recommended functional design elements for O'Connor Drive along with the recommended cross-section, including connections to active transportation (AT) facilities on intersecting streets. - The recommended alignment exceeds the City's Official Plan right-of-way and requires additional right-of-way at the intersections of O'Connor Drive and	None

Pharmacy Avenue, O'Connor Drive and Lebovic Avenue, O'Connor Drive and Warden Avenue, and O'Connor Drive and Sinnott Road.

- Golden Mile Boulevard Functional Design Plan:
 - Golden Mile Boulevard has an Official Plan right-of-way of 20 m from Victoria Park Avenue to West Park, and 27 m from West Park to Birchmount Road. The recommended design is expected to stay within the Official Plan right-of-way.
 - The recommended design accounts for connections to future cycle tracks on intersecting streets.
 - Parking lanes are proposed for east of Victoria Park Avenue only and would be planned with considerations to at-grade uses.
- Thermos Road and Sinnott Road Functional Design Plan:
 - The recommended design maintains the existing offset signalized intersection at Eglinton Avenue East.
 - A bi-directional cross-ride is proposed on the north side of Eglinton Avenue.
 - The Thermos Road and Sinnott Road intersection has an Official Plan right-of-way of 23 m. The recommended design requires additional right-of-way on the southeast and southwest corners of the intersection.
- Craigton Drive Functional Design Plan:
 - The recommended alignment and design are not yet confirmed and under consultation with Toronto Water as it pertains to the potential impacts to the Eglinton Pumping Station property.

4 **Discussion**

Design Vehicle:

- **Q1:** What is the default design vehicle for intersections?
 - **A1:** It's a medium single unit truck, and a WB20 at the Thermos Road and Sinnott Road intersection.
- **Q2:** Is there a distinction between a design and a control vehicle?
 - **A2:** No there isn't at this point in the project.

Active Transportation:

- **C1:** The design criteria noted default 2.5 m wide pedestrian crosswalks. However, the City typically has 3.0 m wide pedestrian crosswalks.

- **Project team response:** 3.0m crosswalks are shown for all crossings. The design criteria document has been revised to reflect City of Toronto Standard 310.030-5 with a 3.0m standard width.
- **Q3:** Is there a bike box at Thermos Road and Sinnott Road intersection?
 - **A3:** Circulation zones are proposed for bike queuing at the intersection.

Transit Service:

- **Q4:** Are transit stops at intersections being accounted for?
 - **A4:** Yes, space is allocated for transit infrastructure.
- **C2:** The TTC and the City's AT team have done visibility tests in the past to assess visibility for turning especially in regard to cyclists' safety. There may be a need to assess visibility for TTC drivers making right turns.

TTC to provide comments on transit routing, including routes for deadheading and shuttle services for the Eglinton Crosstown LRT.

TTC to provide comments on transit routing, including routes for deadheading and shuttle services for the Eglinton Crosstown LRT.

Property Requirements:

- **Q5:** Can we establish additional property taking yet?
 - **A5:** There are opportunities to reduce property impacts in the current designs. Once TAC members have reviewed the designs, they are to provide comments on the constraints with landowners, at which point decisions can be made to revise the designs to potentially reduce property impact per feedback from TAC with considerations to other tradeoffs in the study corridor.
- **Q6:** What are the impacts to the Water Tower property?
 - **A6:** There is currently a small sliver that is impacted by the planting zone, but this impact can be avoided.
- **Q7:** What are the impacts to the IPEX property at 807 Pharmacy Avenue?
 - **A7:** The recommended O'Connor Drive alignment goes through the existing building across from the existing signal. 807 Pharmacy Avenue appears to be further south of the recommended alignment.
- **Q8:** What are the property takings required on Golden Mile Boulevard?

- **A8:** Along Golden Mile Boulevard, the design is contained within the proposed right-of-way, along Victoria Park Avenue, more space may be needed to accommodate the cycle track connection. However, the design of Victoria Park Avenue is not a part of this EA Study. The City is currently studying the feasibility of operating buses and having cycle tracks on Victoria Park Avenue, and the potential widening of Victoria Park Avenue is under internal City discussion.
- **Q9:** What are the impacts to Cosmetica's plans at the intersection of Golden Mile Boulevard and Warden Avenue?
 - **A9:** The lands east of Warden Avenue (1960 Eglinton Avenue East) are slated for redevelopment, and the roads will be built in tandem with the redevelopment. The project team has been consulting BA Group, who represents a collective of landowners including Cosmetica along Golden Mile Boulevard, to match up the CAD files between the developers' plans and the design of Golden Mile Boulevard.
- **Q10:** What is the building that will be impacted on the west side of Sinnott Road? Has that commercial plaza been consulted?
 - **A10:** The project team has notified them via letters but have yet to receive a response. However, the intersection will be developed in parallel with the land development.
- **Q11:** What are the impacts of the Craigton Drive alignment to the Eglinton pumping station? Toronto Water does not find this alignment preferable.
 - **A11:** Avoiding all impacts to the pumping station is unlikely. Perhaps there is an opportunity to coordinate the construction of Craigton Drive with the rehabilitation of the pumping station. Would it be feasible to relocate the valves underground?
- **C3:** The valves are replaced approx. every 80 years. Request for a follow up meeting with the project team to discuss the Craigton Drive alignment impacts.

City to share the draft report with Toronto Water for input before final Council report submission

City to share the draft report with Toronto Water for input before final Council report submission

City to set up follow up meeting with Toronto Water

City to set up follow up meeting with Toronto Water

Daylight Triangles:

- **Q12:** The City hasn't previously asked developers to account for daylight triangles, as such they are not reflected on subdivision plans. How big are the daylight triangles?
 - **A12:** They are 15 m.
- **Q13:** Are 15 m daylight triangles proposed for all intersections? Do all intersections require 15 m daylight triangles and are there opportunities to reduce?
 - **A13:** There are currently no distinctions between the intersections as part of the EA Study. However, there are streets being developed through development applications not included in this EA Study that wouldn't have the 15 m daylight triangles.

City to share drawings of roadways from the proposed developments.

City to share drawings of roadways from the proposed developments.

Intersection Restrictions:

- **Q14:** Are there intersections with right turns on red (RTOR) restrictions?
 - **A14:** That has yet to be determined.
- **C4:** All protected intersections completed or in delivery by the City include RTOR restrictions. The draft intersection design guidelines in development are proposing to recommend RTOR restrictions with protected intersections.

5 Next Steps

None

- Overview of project schedule, with Public Consultation #2 planned for the fall of 2024, a Design Review Panel planned for after the 30% design of O'Connor Drive has been drafted, and filing for Notice of Completion in early 2025.
- TAC attendees are asked to provide comments to the project team by August 9, 2024

Follow Up Required:

Action #1: Project team to share the presentation with TAC invitees.

[Post Meeting Note: The presentation was shared with the TAC members on July 22, 2024, after the meeting.]

Action #2: Project team to share the draft 10% functional design plans of all corridors to TAC invitees.

[Post Meeting Note: All draft 10% functional design plans and draft design criteria shared with TAC members on August 2, 2024]

Action #3: TTC to provide comments on transit routing, including routes for deadheading and shuttle services for the Eglinton Crosstown LRT, as well as layby areas and stop locations for the study area. TTC to provide feedback on turning movements – some locations are showing a 5 m flared receiving lane to accommodate larger vehicle turns.

Action #4: City to share the draft report with Toronto Water for input before final Council report submission.

Action #5: Toronto Fire to provide feedback on if there are maximum setback distances from face of curb to face of building to include in Design Criteria Document. Project team included minimum setbacks, but not maximums. Also looking for feedback on fire routes and turns at intersections.

Action #6: Toronto Parking Authority to share specifications for Bike Share stations including preferred dimensions and locations.

Action #7: Current Craigton Drive design shows 3 valves under the roadway – Toronto Water to share which valves are most important to keep out of the roadway so that the project team can alter the alignment as possible.

Action #8: City to set up follow up meeting with Toronto Water.

Please contact Brittany Zhang (Brittany.zhang@hdrinc.com) should you have any comments or questions on these meeting minutes.

Attendees

City of Toronto:

- Philip Morse – Transportation Services – Project Manager
- Sonali Praharaj – Transportation Services – Project Manager
- Benjamin Morell – Transportation Planning
- Chantel – Toronto Public Library
- Christina Zhang – Transportation Services
- Conming Ren – ECS
- Dominic Cobran – Public Consultation Unit
- Eda Conte-Pitcher – Toronto Public Library
- Frank Difei He – Transportation Planning
- Hamed Esmaeeli – Transportation Services
- Harinder Singh Viridi – Transportation Services
- Ian J Brown – Economic Development
- Janice Allen – Parks, Forestry & Recreation
- Kevin Tudhope – Toronto Water
- Lukasz Pawlowski – Transportation Services
- Owen McGaughey – Transportation Services
- Philip Cheung – Toronto Water
- Riad Rahman – Transportation Planning
- Saleem Khan – Engineering & Construction Services
- Sinead Goode – Urban Forestry
- Steve Turco - Transportation Planning
- Susan Martin – Toronto Public Library
- Ted Malkos – Transportation Services
- Will Nixon – Environment and Climate

HDR:

- Heather Templeton – Project Manager
- Justin Jones – Deputy Project Manager
- Brittany Zhang – Project Coordinator

Agencies:

- Alex Butler - TTC
- Barbara Leporati - TCDSB
- Caroline Mugo – TRCA
- Dhakal Neeraj - Metrolinx
- Dominic Ho - TTC
- Jordan Langlois - TTC
- Kanav Chowdhri - Metrolinx
- Liam Smythe – MCM
- Robert Shamess - Metrolinx



ReNew Golden Mile EA Study

- Shiv Naitram - TTC
- Tomasz Oltarzewski – TCDSB

Correspondences Tracking

Comment Tracking

Ref #	Date	Agency/ Utility	Name	Response Method	Message	Response	Action/Notes
1	29-Nov-22	Enbridge	Amy Brenham	email	Please see attached for a summary of the Enbridge project review and relocation process. The mark-ups department (Arnel Mangalino) is not the correct contact for these meetings. I have copied Jon Mansikka and Janice Page from our Planning department. Please contact mark-ups@enbridge.com for general location information and for design review once available.	n/a	Gas relocation Overview attached.
	16-Dec-22	Toronto Lands Corporation (agency of Toronto District School Board)	Paul Nichols	email	TDSB anticipates having at least one new elementary school within the GMSP area. Recently approved SASPs have identified a number of potential locations. The school is intended to be walkable for students within (and potentially outside) the GMSP area. To ensure safe travel paths for students, intersections should be designed with consideration of young children (sight lines, longer crossing times, etc)	n/a	policy permissions for new school sites attached
	12/22/2022	TCDSB	Michael Loberto	emailed letter	Requests for traffic calming measures on the	n/a	Attached letter
	11/15/2024	Ministry of Transportation	Amit Sharma	email	Good afternoon, Thank you for sharing the Public Consultation Notice for the Renew Golden Mile EA Study. Based on the Study Area identified in the attached notice (Map of the Street Corridors the City is Studying), the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has no comments at this time. However, if the proposed alignments and designs extend beyond the current study area boundary, please notify MTO and request	n/a	
	11/21/2024	Trans-Northern Pipelines Inc	Renee Flowerday	email	We can confirm that TNPI has NO infrastructure in the mentioned area.	n/a	
	11/26/2024	TCDSB	Oltarzewski Tomasz	email	I was not able to attend the virtual public meeting for the Golden Mile EA - Reconfigured & New Major Streets held on November 21, 2024 at 6:30 to 8:30 p.m	A record of the meeting will be made available online next Tuesday. I can alert you when it becomes available.	
	12/3/2024	Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, Ontario	Liam Smythe	email	Would you kindly be able to provide me the meeting recording for my records? Thank you for providing the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) with an update on the Renew Golden Mile EA Study. I have no specific comments on the alignments or design options; however, I am following up regarding the status of the technical cultural heritage studies undertaken for this project. At the previous TAC meeting in July, it was indicated that a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (CHAR) and Stage 1 archaeological assessment were underway and anticipated to be completed in the Summer or Fall. Would you be able to confirm if these reports have been completed, and provide us with the PIF Number for the Stage 1 report? Furthermore, Rosi Zirger can be removed from the contact list for this project as she is no longer with MCM. Please address all project correspondence to Karla Barboza and me.	Cultural Heritage report sent	

Agency Comments on the Draft ESR and Project Team Responses

ReNew Golden Mile EA ESR V2.0

Comments received June-Aug 2026

Page Number	Section	Comment	Commenter	Status	Response
	General	Hi Brittany, As the preferred design identified in the ESR is only at the early stages, the Metrolinx doesn't have any comments at this time associated your submission beyond the advisory comment below: 1.ReNew Golden Mile study area is within the review zone of the above Line 5 ECLRT corridor. As such, any works conducted within the public right-of-way (ROW) must receive prior approval from Metrolinx for potential space and time conflicts (i.e., excavation, shoring, scaffolding, hoarding, utility upgrades, sidewalk closures, lane closures or reductions, hauling routes, etc.). The applicant is advised to contact our Utility & Roadway review team at MCReviews@metrolinx.com with details of the proposed works, at least six (6) months before the intended start date of construction to avoid delays. Visit our Website to learn more about ROW works within LRT corridors.	Metrolinx	Complete	Noted, added consultation with Metrolinx to future commitments
	General	Please be advised that a portion of the proposed Ashtonbee Road Design falls within TRCA's Regulated Floodplain near the intersection at Ashtonbee Road and Birchmount Road. As such, a permit may be required at the detailed design stage. At the detailed design stage, please provide the following: a)General arrangement drawings, site grading plan, Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) Plan, Restoration Plan, and Landscape Plan for the relevant project area. b)Delineation of TRCA's Regulated Area limit on all the drawings. c)TRCA standard notes (found here: https://trcaca.s3.ca-central-1.amazonaws.com/app/uploads/2026/02/26162352/Standard-Notes-February-2026.pdf).	TRCA	Complete	Noted. The ESR noted that no construction outside of existing ROW is planned at this time, and also added TRCA's note for detail design
	General	At the detailed design stage for the proposed road improvements on Ashtonbee Road and Birchmount Road, please provide site plan with locations of proposed staging areas, access routes, water management, erosion and sediment controls (ESCs). In addition, please clarify if there are any proposed culvert modifications or channel works at the Taylor Massey crossing at Ashtonbee Road and Birchmount Road.	TRCA	Complete	Noted. The ESR will be updated to clarify that no construction outside of existing ROW is planned at this time, and also add in TRCA's note for detail design
	General	Please confirm if the proposed pedestrian clearway along Ashtonbee Road will expand the existing road right-of-way and impervious area. If so, TRCA staff require that any additional impervious areas have adequate stormwater management controls. The following is the TRCA stormwater management criteria for Don River Watershed: a) Quantity Control: Post-Pre for Don River. b) Water Balance: best effort 5 mm c) Erosion Control: 5mm retention In addition, please note that TRCA staff defers all water quality criteria to the City of Toronto. Please see here for more information on TRCA's SWM Criteria. https://trcaca.s3.ca-central-1.amazonaws.com/app/uploads/2021/10/20103017/SWM-Criteria-2012.pdf From the Drainage and SWM Report, under existing conditions, the project site is draining to the city sewers. Staff note that the SWM plan may change further during detailed design. Please confirm if the drainage plan will be the same under proposed conditions. TRCA staff may defer the SWM quantity control to the City of Toronto if the proposed sites will drain into the City's sewer system.	TRCA	Complete	Ashtonbee improvements are proposed within the existing ROW. The increase in runoffs on Ashtonbee are not anticipated but we will note in the ESR that it will be assessed if design changes. This will be reviewed during detailed design and appropriate stormwater management measures will be employed to mitigate any adverse effects.
	General	TRCA staff have reviewed the proposed LIDs in the Drainage and SWM report. Please provide the following: a)Plan and cross-sectional details for all proposed LIDs. Please also provide supporting calculations for the TRCA drawdown requirement. b)Demonstrate that the TRCA requirement of a minimum of 1 m separation between the bottom of the LID and seasonally high groundwater table can be maintained. For more information, please see here for the LID Planning and Design Guide.: https://wiki.sustainabletechnologies.ca/wiki/Main_Page?_gl=1*1k7pz22*_gcl_au*NTAzNzg2OTUxLjE3ODAzMzc3OTI	TRCA	Complete	As per the drainage report, LID's are presented at a high level for the EA Study and the type, size will be confirmed at the detail design stage. This includes the requirement for 1 m separation from bottom of LID to seasonally high groundwater level. TRCA's LID requirements noted in the ESR Future commitments

ReNew Golden Mile EA
ESR V2.0

Comments received June-Aug 2026

	General	Please be advised that TRCA staff reviewed a proposed sanitary sewer upgrade within the Gatineau Hydro Corridor associated with the Golden Mile EA. Please confirm if this proposal is related to the Golden Mile EA. Please also provide the City of Toronto contact that will be the project manager on this file. TRCA staff provided preliminary comments in October 2024 and noted a permit is required for the project. TRCA staff provided preliminary comments to Kelly Martin at Choice Properties.	TRCA	Complete	To HDR's knowledge, the Gatineau hydro corridor sanitary sewer upgrades is not related to the GMEA. City to provide contact for the Gatineau Hydro Corridor project. No action for EA team
	General	"Cultural Heritage Resources" includes archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes. For consistency, please use the correct terminology when referring to each one, and the term "cultural heritage resources" when referring to all three types. MCM recommends that archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscape be organized similar to section 3.2 (Socio Economic Environment) and 3.3 (Natural Environment). The ESR should be reorganized to consider archaeological resources together with built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes under one section, MCM recommends the ESR be revised to: ☐ Include a new section ("cultural heritage resources [or] cultural environment") ☐ This section should also provide a short description of cultural heritage resources (i.e. <i>Cultural heritage resources include archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes</i>) ☐ Revise Section 3.6 (<i>Archaeology</i>) and Section 3.4 (<i>Cultural Heritage</i>) to be subsections of the above. ☐ Retitle the current Section 3.6 from "Archaeology" to "Archaeological Resources" and Section 3.4 from "Cultural Heritage" to "Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes" MCM recommends the ESR be organized as follows: 3.4 Cultural Heritage Resources Cultural heritage resources include archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes 3.4.1 Archaeological Resources [see comment #3 for additional modifications related to the discussion of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment report] 3.4.2 Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes 3.5 Phase 1 ESA 3.6 Archaeology	MCM	Complete	Revised structure in ESR
49	Figure 3-17	Figure 3-17 should depict areas of archaeological potential as it relates to the project area. MCM recommends that this map be replaced with Figure 10: Project Area – Archaeological Potential, (p.55) from the Stage 1 archaeological assessment report. Replace figure 3-17.	MCM	Complete	revised

ReNew Golden Mile EA
ESR V2.0

Comments received June-Aug 2026

47	3.6	MCM recommends that the discussion of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment (AA) be revised to include the following: ☐ The Project Information Form (PIF) number of the Stage 1 AA ☐ The outcomes (conclusions and recommendations) of the AA; MCM recommends that the report specify that a Stage 2 AA was recommended for portions of the study area. Please also see comment #1 for additional recommendations as it relates to the organization of section 3.6. MCM recommends the following revisions: X.X Archaeological Resources A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA, under Project Information Form Number P094-0469-2025) was conducted by Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI), to determine the potential for archaeological resources within the Study area. The review of existing conditions entailed an investigation of past and present land use, the settlement history and any other relevant historical and geographical information pertaining to the Study area. Findings of the desktop review are documented in the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment in Appendix G. The Stage 1 Background Study determined that there are four previously registered archaeological sites within 1 km of the Study Area, none of which are located within 50 m of the Study area. The background research determined that there are areas within the Study Area which may have archaeological potential. The following recommendations are made: ☐ Lands east of Pharmacy Avenue require Stage 2 archaeological assessment (and subsequent stages, where recommended) prior to any ground disturbing activities ☐ The Stage All AA Reports will be submitted to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 2005, c 0.18. [...]	MCM	Complete	Revised
161	Table 9-1	Further to MCM's comment #1 above, we recommend that cultural heritage resources be considered separate from the 'social environment.' MCM recommends that this table be revised to align with the recommendations made in comment #1 above. MCM recommends the following revisions:	MCM	Complete	Revised
	General	•Update Traffic Baseline Metrics: The "Existing Conditions" section relies heavily on vehicle traffic volumes recorded in 2013 as a pre-construction baseline for the Eglinton Crosstown LRT. Because the LRT successfully opened to the public in February 2026, relying on 13-year-old vehicle data might risk skewing accurate capacity evaluations. Proactively supplement this section with validated 2026 traffic volumes to accurately justify full build-out projections.	MECP	Complete	Using 2013 pre-construction condition as the existing baseline was specifically requested by the City in the RFP when conducting the existing condition analysis. The GMEA traffic started in early 2022, when ECLRT was still in construction, so City requested that existing condition. The existing condition traffic data for 2020 and 2021 was in covid and construction, so not useful, which is why 2013 was used. It would take months to re-do existing model calibration and re-assess and justify full build-out projections and analysis. No action
	General	•Clarify Section 16 Order Mechanisms: Section 1.3.2 highlights Section 16 Order rights. Note that modern MCEA amendments limit Section 16 Ministerial Order requests primarily to impacts involving constitutionally protected Aboriginal and Treaty rights. Ensure the final Notice of Completion uses strict, modern statutory legal language to prevent public confusion regarding standard non-Indigenous property complaints.	MECP	Complete	Noted, will be kept in mind for the notice of completion

ReNew Golden Mile EA
ESR V2.0

Comments received June-Aug 2026

	General	Generally, our surface water review have no concerns/comments regarding the information provided in the reports and proposed stormwater management measures from the Ministry's perspective. However, it should be noted that the MECP's 'Enhanced Water Quality Protection' Level 1 should be applied to all future stormwater management facilities. When a stand-alone SWM control cannot achieve Level 1 protection, a treatment train approach that includes bioretention systems, vegetative buffers, OGSs and/or infiltration trenches should be considered in all suitable areas. A detailed SWM plan should be prepared during the later stages of design of the project and will be reviewed when the proponent applies for a SWM ECA.	MECP	Complete	Added to ESR Future commitments
	General	Recommendations Based on the information currently presented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR), the following groundwater-related recommendations are provided for consideration during Detailed Design: - As recommended in the ESR, additional soil and groundwater investigations should be completed to characterize potential contamination associated with the identified APECs, EcoLog Survey findings, and historical spill records. The findings should be used to confirm the presence of contaminants of concern and identify areas requiring consideration during design and construction. - If construction dewatering is required, the potential for groundwater flow alterations to mobilize or redirect contamination from identified or potential contaminated areas should be evaluated. Where a potential risk is identified, appropriate monitoring, mitigation, and contingency measures should be developed. - Where underground services are proposed within or adjacent to identified APECs, the detailed design should incorporate appropriate engineered measures, such as trench barriers or equivalent hydraulic controls, to minimize preferential groundwater flow pathways and contaminant migration. - Potential impacts to existing groundwater users should be assessed, including the three historical water supply wells identified in the Phase I ESA, if they remain active. The assessment should also identify whether any existing wells may be encountered during construction and, where applicable, describe how they will be managed in accordance with O. Reg. 903 (Wells). - Given that the study area is located within a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA), the Source Water Protection assessment should further describe the implications of the HVA designation and evaluate potential effects of the proposed works on groundwater quality and groundwater uses. Applicable Source Protection Plan policies should also be identified, where appropriate.	MECP	Complete	Added to ESR Future commitments
	General	- During construction, if any excavations below groundwater levels are needed, for water taking more than 50,000 L/day an authorization to take water would be required. Where applicable, the assessment should evaluate anticipated dewatering rates, duration, groundwater drawdown, radius of influence, discharge locations, potential impacts on groundwater users, nearby surface water features, and cumulative effects associated with nearby groundwater takings. - As identified in the ESR, the preliminary investigations do not meet the requirements of O. Reg. 406/19 (On-Site and Excess Soil Management). Accordingly, additional soil characterization, delineation, and documentation should be completed, particularly in areas where excavation is proposed within or near identified APECs. - Given the anticipated increase in impervious surface coverage associated with the proposed roadway improvements, the proposed stormwater management approach should demonstrate that groundwater recharge and site water balance can be maintained or that no unacceptable impacts on groundwater resources are anticipated.	MECP	Complete	Added to ESR Future commitments

**Ministry of Citizenship
and Multiculturalism**

Heritage Planning Unit
Heritage Operations Branch
Citizenship, Inclusion and
Heritage Division
16th Flr, 56 Wellesley St W
Toronto, ON M5S 2S3
Tel.: 613-242-3743

**Ministère des Affaires civiques
et du Multiculturalisme**

Planification relative au patrimoine
Opérations relatives au patrimoine
Division des affaires civiques, de
l'inclusion et du patrimoine
16e étage, 56 rue Wellesley Ouest
Toronto, ON M5S 2S3
Tél.: 613-242-3743



July 7, 2026

EMAIL ONLY

Brittany Zhang
Transportation Planner
HDR Inc.
brittany.zhang@hdrinc.com

MCM File : 0018898
Proponent : City of Toronto
Subject : **Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Schedule C – Draft
Environmental Study Report**
Project : **ReNew Golden Mile: Reconfigured & New Major Streets**
Location : **City of Toronto**

Dear Brittany Zhang:

Thank you for providing the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) with the Draft Environmental Study Report (ESR) for review and comment.

MCM's interest in this project relates to its mandate of conserving Ontario's cultural heritage.

Project Summary

The City of Toronto has completed a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) study to determine the design of new and reconfigured major streets in the Golden Mile area of Scarborough. This draft ESR documents the process and findings of Phases 3 and 4 of the Schedule C under the MCEA process. This Study is referred to as the ReNew Golden Mile: Reconfigured & New Major Streets Environmental Assessment Study (ReNew Golden Mile EA).

The Study builds on the recommendations of the Golden Mile Secondary Plan (SP), adopted by City Council in October 2020, and the Golden Mile Transportation Master Plan (TMP), adopted in August 2020, both of which completed Phases 1 and 2 of the EA process. The purpose of the Study is to improve the transportation network to accommodate the current and future transportation needs of all users of all ages and abilities — pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and motorists for the Golden Mile area.

The Study area is located in the Scarborough district, generally bounded by Bermondsey Road to the west, the Gattineau Hydro Corridor Trail to the north, Sunrise/Comstock/Foxridge to the south, and Kennedy Road to the east. The broader Golden Mile SP boundary extends from Victoria Park Avenue to Birchmount Road, and from Ashtonbee Road to Southmead/Civic Road

Comments

MCM has reviewed the *Environmental Study Report ReNew Golden Mile: Reconfigured & New Major Streets Schedule 'C' Class Environmental Assessment* (draft ESR, dated May 2026, prepared by HDR Inc.) and have the following comments and recommendations to support the documentation of due diligence related to cultural heritage:

Archaeological Resources

Our records indicates that a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA, under Project Information Form (PIF) No. P094-0469-2025 and included in Appendix G) has been initiated for this project. We note that the Stage 1 AA report has yet to be submitted to MCM for review. MCM strongly recommends that the proponent's licensed archaeologist submit the report to MCM as soon as possible and prior to the issuance of the Notice of Completion.

MCM recommends that Stage 2 AA (and any further stages of AA, if recommended) be completed as early as possible during detailed design and prior to any ground-disturbing activities.

Please note that archaeological concerns have not been fully addressed until reports have been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports ('the Register') where those reports recommend that:

1. The archaeological assessment of the project area is complete and
2. all archaeological sites identified by the assessment are either of no further cultural heritage value or interest (as per Section 48(3) of the Ontario Heritage Act) or that mitigation of impacts has been accomplished through excavation or an avoidance and protection strategy.

At this time, the findings and recommendations of the Stage 1 AA report should be considered preliminary. Approval authorities and/or proponents should wait to receive the MCM's written confirmation that the archaeological assessment report(s) has been entered into the Register before issuing a decision or proceeding with any ground disturbing activities. The letter will also indicate either that there are no further concerns for impacts to archaeological resources or articulate next steps to mitigate any concerns.

Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes

A Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment, ReNew Golden Mile: Reconfigured & New Major Streets Environmental Assessment Study City of Toronto, Ontario [Cultural Heritage Report, prepared by Archaeological Services Inc and dated April 2022 (revised June 2022, October 2024, January, February and April 2025) for the study area.

The report identified one (1) potential and two (2) known built heritage resources (BHRs), two (2) potential cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs), and two (2) commemorative features (plaques). The report also identified direct adverse impacts to BHR-2 and CHL-2 and recommended a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) be prepared for both properties, if avoidance is not feasible. Section 10.0 (*Future Commitments* – Cultural Heritage, p.165) of the draft ESR includes a commitment to complete CHERs [and Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), where recommended] for both properties during the detailed design phase.

We have included additional comments and recommendations in the table below.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft ESR and Cultural Heritage Report. If you have any questions or any of the above requires clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jackson Kaufman
Heritage Planner
jackson.kaufman@ontario.ca

Copied to: Andrew Chislett, Senior Project Manager, City of Toronto
Jamshaid Muzaffar, HDR Inc.
Heather Templeton, HDR Inc.
Trevor Bell, Environmental Resource Planner and EA Coordinator, MECP
EA Notices to Central Region, MECP
Karla Barboza, Team Lead, Heritage Planning Unit, MCM

It is the sole responsibility of proponents to ensure that any information and documentation submitted as part of their EA report or file is accurate. The Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of the any checklists, reports or supporting documentation submitted as part of the EA process, and in no way shall MCM be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result if any checklists, reports or supporting documents are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.

Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out an archaeological assessment, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 requires that any person discovering human remains must cease all activities immediately and notify the police or coroner. If the coroner does not suspect foul play in the disposition of the remains, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 30/11 the coroner shall notify the Registrar, Ontario Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery and Procurement, which administers provisions of that Act related to burial sites. In situations where human remains are associated with archaeological resources, the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism should also be notified (at archaeology@ontario.ca) to ensure that the archaeological site is not subject to unlicensed alterations which would be a contravention of the Ontario Heritage Act

Table 1: MCM Comments on Draft ESR

Comment #	Reference to report	Comment	Recommended revision
1.	Throughout the ESR	“Cultural Heritage Resources” includes archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes. For consistency, please use the correct terminology when referring to each one, and the term “cultural heritage resources” when referring to all three types. MCM recommends that archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscape be organized similar to section 3.2 (Socio Economic Environment) and 3.3 (Natural Environment). The ESR should be reorganized to consider archaeological resources together with built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes under one section, MCM recommends the ESR be revised to: • Include a new section (“cultural heritage resources [or] cultural environment”) ○ This section should also provide a short description of cultural heritage resources (i.e. <i>Cultural heritage resources include archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes</i>) • Revise Section 3.6 (Archaeology) and Section 3.4 (Cultural Heritage) to be subsections of the above. • Retitle the current Section 3.6 from “Archaeology” to “Archaeological Resources” and Section 3.4 from “Cultural Heritage” to	MCM recommends the ESR be organized as follows: 3.4 Cultural Heritage Resources Cultural heritage resources include archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes 3.4.1 Archaeological Resources <i>[see comment #3 for additional modifications related to the discussion of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment report]</i> 3.4.2 Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes 3.5 Phase 1 ESA 3.6 Archaeology

Table 1: MCM Comments on Draft ESR			
Comment #	Reference to report	Comment	Recommended revision
		"Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes"	
2.	Figure 3-17: Archaeological Existing Conditions, p.49	Figure 3-17 should depict areas of archaeological potential as it relates to the project area. MCM recommends that this map be replaced with <i>Figure 10: Project Area – Archaeological Potential</i> , (p.55) from the Stage 1 archaeological assessment report.	Replace figure 3-17.
3.	3.6 – Archaeology, p.47-8	MCM recommends that the discussion of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment (AA) be revised to include the following: • The Project Information Form (PIF) number of the Stage 1 AA • The outcomes (conclusions and recommendations) of the AA; MCM recommends that the report specify that a Stage 2 AA was recommended for portions of the study area. Please also see comment #1 for additional recommendations as it relates to the organization of section 3.6.	MCM recommends the following revisions: X.X Archaeological Resources A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA, under Project Information Form Number P094-0469-2025) was conducted by Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI), to determine the potential for archaeological resources within the Study area. The review of existing conditions entailed an investigation of past and present land use, the settlement history and any other relevant historical and geographical information pertaining to the Study area. Findings of the desktop review are documented in the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment in Appendix G. The Stage 1 Background Study determined that there are four previously registered archaeological sites within 1 km of the Study Area, none of which are located within 50 m of the Study area. The background research determined that there are areas within the Study Area which may have archaeological potential. The following recommendations are made: • Lands east of Pharmacy Avenue require Stage 2 archaeological assessment (and subsequent stages,

Table 1: MCM Comments on Draft ESR

Comment #	Reference to report	Comment	Recommended revision												
			where recommended) prior to any ground disturbing activities The Stage All AA Reports will be submitted to the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 2005, c 0.18. [...]												
4.	Table 9-1: Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures, p. 161-3	Further to MCM's comment #1 above, we recommend that cultural heritage resources be considered separate from the 'social environment.' MCM recommends that this table be revised to align with the recommendations made in comment #1 above.	MCM recommends the following revisions: <table><tr><th>Factor</th><th>Anticipated Impacts</th><th>Proposed Mitigation Measures</th></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Social Cultural Environment</td></tr><tr><td>Built Heritage Resources & Cultural Heritage Landscapes</td><td>[no revisions recommended]</td><td>[no revisions recommended]</td></tr><tr><td>Archaeological Resources</td><td>Most of the Study area is heavily disturbed and lacks archaeological potential. A small part east of Pharmacy Avenue preserves has archaeological potential and will require Stage 2 assessment (and further stages, where recommended) prior to construction any</td><td>[no revisions recommended]</td></tr></table>	Factor	Anticipated Impacts	Proposed Mitigation Measures	Social Cultural Environment			Built Heritage Resources & Cultural Heritage Landscapes	[no revisions recommended]	[no revisions recommended]	Archaeological Resources	Most of the Study area is heavily disturbed and lacks archaeological potential. A small part east of Pharmacy Avenue preserves has archaeological potential and will require Stage 2 assessment (and further stages, where recommended) prior to construction any	[no revisions recommended]
Factor	Anticipated Impacts	Proposed Mitigation Measures													
Social Cultural Environment															
Built Heritage Resources & Cultural Heritage Landscapes	[no revisions recommended]	[no revisions recommended]													
Archaeological Resources	Most of the Study area is heavily disturbed and lacks archaeological potential. A small part east of Pharmacy Avenue preserves has archaeological potential and will require Stage 2 assessment (and further stages, where recommended) prior to construction any	[no revisions recommended]													

Table 1: MCM Comments on Draft ESR					
Comment #	Reference to report	Comment	Recommended revision		
				ground disturbing activities.	

Central Region

Région du Centre

5775 Yonge Street, 8th floor

North York ON M2M 4J1

Tel.: 416-326-6700

Fax.: 416 325-6345

8^e étage, 5775, rue Yonge

North York ON M2M 4J1

Tél. : 416-326-6700

Téléc. : 416 325-6345

M E M O R A N D O M

Date: July 20, 2026

To: Chunmei Liu
Planning & Environmental Assessment Coordinator
Environmental Assessment and Permissions Division

From: Carolina D'Oswaldo, Hydrogeologist
Technical Support Section, Central Region

**RE: Hydrogeological review - ReNew Golden Mile: Reconfigured & New Major Streets
Environmental Assessment Study**

As requested, I have reviewed the following documents related to Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) for the design of new and reconfigured major streets in the Golden Mile area of Scarborough:

- HDR. 2026. Environmental Study Report, ReNew Golden Mile: Reconfigured & New Major Streets Schedule 'C' Class Environmental Assessment, prepared for the City of Toronto (Draft), dated May 2026.
- Thurber Engineering Ltd. 2022. Appendix F: Draft Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Golden Mile Area Street Network Environmental Assessment Study, Toronto, Ontario, report to HDR Corporation on behalf of the City of Toronto, prepared by Melanie St. Cyr and John Zoldy, dated July 13, 2022.
- Thurber Engineering Ltd. 2022. Appendix K: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Report, Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Study, Golden Mile Area Street Network, City of Toronto, Ontario (Draft), prepared for HDR Corporation, elaborated by Timothy Feather, Karel Furbacher, and Renato Pasqualoni, dated August 28, 2025.

The primary purpose of this review was to identify groundwater-related matters relevant to the EA process. As this draft ESR was prepared at a preliminary stage of planning and design, it does not include detailed hydrogeological or water resources information. Only groundwater-related considerations were reviewed as part of this assessment.

1. Project Summary

The City of Toronto completed a Schedule C Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) to determine the preferred design for new major streets, the realignment and/or extension of existing streets, and associated transportation infrastructure improvements within the Golden Mile Secondary Plan area. The preferred undertaking includes the reconfiguration and extension of O'Connor Drive, construction of Golden Mile Boulevard, widening and reconfiguration of Craigton Drive, intersection improvements at Thermos Road and Sinnott Road, and streetscape improvements along Jonesville Crescent, Craigton Drive, and Ashtonbee Road.

The ESR indicates that the study area is located within a highly urbanized area serviced by municipal water, sanitary sewer, and stormwater infrastructure. Taylor-Massey Creek is identified as the primary receiving watercourse within the study area, and the municipal storm sewer system ultimately discharges to Taylor-Massey Creek and Lake Ontario.

This groundwater review is based primarily on information presented in the preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), and Drainage and Stormwater Management Report. Based on the information provided in the ESR, the project remains at a preliminary planning stage and does not include a detailed hydrogeological assessment.

The ESR indicates that temporary construction dewatering may be required for the proposed works. It also identifies Areas of Potential Environmental Concern (APECs) within and adjacent to the study area and incorporates infiltration-based stormwater management measures intended to maintain groundwater recharge and water balance by offsetting the effects of increased impervious surface coverage.

2. Groundwater Review

- **Water Wells**

The report indicates that the study area is serviced by municipal water and wastewater infrastructure. As part of the Phase I ESA (Appendix F), the consultant reviewed the MECP Water Well Information System (WWIS) database and identified 401 well records within the Phase I Study Area. These records consist primarily of monitoring and test wells, with three historical water supply wells located south of the study area. The consultant noted that the operational status of the water supply wells is currently unknown.

The Phase I ESA indicates that groundwater levels recorded in the WWIS database range from approximately 1.2 to 9.1 m below ground surface (mbgs). Bedrock was not reported in the reviewed well records. Based on the available information, the report characterizes the subsurface as consisting of fill underlain by glaciolacustrine deposits and infers that regional groundwater flow is directed southwest toward Lake Ontario.

The preliminary geotechnical investigation included the installation of three monitoring wells to a depth of approximately 5.2 m. Stabilized groundwater levels were measured between approximately 1.7 and 2.7 mbgs. The investigation identified fill material overlying native silty sand, sand, silt, silty clay, and glacial till deposits.

The report does not assess potential impacts on the three historical water supply wells identified south of the study area (if still active) or to other nearby groundwater users. Although numerous well records were identified within the study area, the report also does not evaluate whether existing wells may be encountered during construction or whether any wells would require abandonment or decommissioning in accordance with the requirements of O. Reg. 903 (Wells).

- **Groundwater Quality and Contaminated Sites**

The Phase I ESA, presented in Appendix F, identified 115 APECs within or upgradient of the study area based on site reconnaissance, a review of historical records and Ecolog Survey. The identified APECs include gas stations, automotive facilities, dry cleaners, historical industrial operations, rail infrastructure, manufacturing facilities, properties containing active and historical aboveground and underground storage tanks (ASTs/USTs), and properties associated with historical spills, fuel releases, and waste generation.

No groundwater quality sampling was completed as part of the preliminary investigations. Limited soil sampling conducted during the geotechnical investigation identified one sand fill sample collected from Borehole GM-02, located near the intersection of Pharmacy Avenue and the proposed Golden Mile Boulevard, containing benzene concentrations exceeding O. Reg. 153/04 Table 9

Residential/Parkland/Institutional/Commercial/Community (RPI/ICC) Site Condition Standards, at a depth of approximately 0.8 to 1.4 m bgs, applicable for areas located within 30 m of Taylor-Massey Creek. The report notes that the measured benzene concentration did not exceed the corresponding Table 3 ICC Site Condition Standards. The ESR therefore recommends additional soil and groundwater investigations to confirm the presence or absence of contamination prior to construction.

Although the report indicates that construction dewatering may be required, it does not assess whether groundwater flow alterations associated with excavation or dewatering could mobilize or redirect contamination from identified APECs or other potential sources within or adjacent to the study area. The report also does not identify any groundwater monitoring, mitigation, or contingency measures should contaminated groundwater be encountered during construction.

- **Source Protection**

The report identifies that the project is located within the Toronto Source Protection Area and identifies project activities, including stormwater runoff, road salt application, and snow storage, as potential drinking water threat activities under the Clean Water Act, 2006. The report concludes that the proposed works are not expected to pose a significant threat to municipal drinking water sources, however, the Source Water Protection assessment remains at a high level. Although the report confirms that the study area is not located within a Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA), Wellhead Protection Area-Quantity (WHPA-Q), or Intake Protection Zone-Quantity (IPZ-Q), it does not discuss the presence or implications of other designated vulnerable areas, identify applicable Source Protection Plan policies, or indicate whether consultation with the appropriate Source Protection Authority has been undertaken or is required.

Based on a review of the Source Protection Information Atlas (SPIA), the study area is located within a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA) with a vulnerability score of 6 (intrinsically vulnerable to groundwater contamination). Although Source Protection Plan policies may not apply within HVAs, these areas represent sensitive groundwater resources that may be susceptible to impacts on groundwater quality, including potential effects on non-municipal drinking water sources.

- **Dewatering and Cumulative effects**

The report indicates that excavations for roadway construction, storm sewers, utilities, and associated infrastructure may extend below the groundwater table and require construction dewatering. The report acknowledges that a Permit to Take Water (PTTW) or Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR) registration for water taking may be required, depending on the nature and extent of the groundwater taking.

A review of the MECP Access Environment website did not identify any active PTTWs within the study area. However, active Water Taking EASR registrations for construction dewatering were identified. As the need for groundwater taking has not yet been confirmed, the report does not evaluate potential cumulative effects associated with nearby groundwater takings or potential impacts on existing groundwater users.

- **Excess Soil Management**

The preliminary geotechnical investigation (Appendix K) included waste characterization testing and a preliminary excess soil assessment to support the excavation, transportation, and management of excess soil during future construction activities. The waste characterization results indicated that the tested material was non-hazardous for disposal, subject to receiving-site acceptance criteria. No polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) were detected in the analyzed waste characterization sample, and asbestos was not detected in the analyzed asphalt samples.

As part of the preliminary excess soil assessment, analytical results were compared against the Excess Soil Quality Standards under O. Reg. 406/19 (On-Site and Excess Soil Management) to provide an initial assessment of soil reuse potential. One sand fill sample (GM-02 SS2) indicated benzene above the Table 1

and Tables 2.1 and 3.1 RPI/ICC limits. Elevated electrical conductivity (EC) and sodium adsorption ratio (SAR) values were also reported in all nine soil samples analyzed and were attributed to the use of de-icing road salts. However, the report notes that these investigations are preliminary and do not meet the requirements of O. Reg. 406/19.

- **Groundwater recharge and stormwater infiltration**

The SWM Report indicates that the proposed roadway improvements will increase impervious surface coverage, resulting in increased stormwater runoff and reduced groundwater recharge. To address these impacts, the proposed stormwater management strategy incorporates infiltration-based Low Impact Development (LID) measures intended to maintain groundwater recharge and water balance. However, based on the information provided, the effectiveness of the proposed measures in maintaining groundwater recharge has not yet been evaluated, as their feasibility and design remain subject to additional hydrologic, geotechnical, and hydrogeological investigations during Detailed Design.

- **Monitoring and Mitigation Plans**

The ESR includes general mitigation measures intended to minimize potential impacts during construction, including erosion and sediment control measures, treatment of dewatering effluent (if required), spill response procedures, and the implementation of stormwater management and LID measures. However, no project-specific groundwater monitoring, mitigation, or contingency plan for the construction and post-construction phases has been provided.

3. Recommendations

Based on the information currently presented in the Environmental Study Report (ESR), the following groundwater-related recommendations are provided for consideration during Detailed Design:

1. As recommended in the ESR, additional soil and groundwater investigations should be completed to characterize potential contamination associated with the identified APECs, EcoLog Survey findings, and historical spill records. The findings should be used to confirm the presence of contaminants of concern and identify areas requiring consideration during design and construction.
2. If construction dewatering is required, the potential for groundwater flow alterations to mobilize or redirect contamination from identified or potential contaminated areas should be evaluated. Where a potential risk is identified, appropriate monitoring, mitigation, and contingency measures should be developed.
3. Where underground services are proposed within or adjacent to identified APECs, the detailed design should incorporate appropriate engineered measures, such as trench barriers or equivalent hydraulic controls, to minimize preferential groundwater flow pathways and contaminant migration.
4. Potential impacts to existing groundwater users should be assessed, including the three historical water supply wells identified in the Phase I ESA, if they remain active. The assessment should also identify whether any existing wells may be encountered during construction and, where applicable, describe how they will be managed in accordance with O. Reg. 903 (Wells).
5. Given that the study area is located within a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA), the Source Water Protection assessment should further describe the implications of the HVA designation and evaluate potential effects of the proposed works on groundwater quality and groundwater uses. Applicable Source Protection Plan policies should also be identified, where appropriate.
6. During construction, if any excavations below groundwater levels are needed, for water taking more than 50,000 L/day an authorization to take water would be required. Where applicable, the assessment should evaluate anticipated dewatering rates, duration, groundwater drawdown, radius of influence, discharge locations, potential impacts on groundwater users, nearby surface water features, and cumulative effects associated with nearby groundwater takings.
7. As identified in the ESR, the preliminary investigations do not meet the requirements of O. Reg. 406/19 (On-Site and Excess Soil Management). Accordingly, additional soil characterization,

delineation, and documentation should be completed, particularly in areas where excavation is proposed within or near identified APECs.

8. Given the anticipated increase in impervious surface coverage associated with the proposed roadway improvements, the proposed stormwater management approach should demonstrate that groundwater recharge and site water balance can be maintained or that no unacceptable impacts on groundwater resources are anticipated.

If you have any questions regarding the above comments and recommendations, please do not hesitate to contact me at carolina.doswaldo@ontario.ca.

Regards,

Carolina D'Oswaldo

e-copy:

- Ted Belayneh, Supervisor, Water Resources Unit, Technical Support Section, MECP Central Region

July 16, 2026

TO: Chunmei Liu, Environmental Planner

FROM: Rui Zeng, Air Quality Analyst

**Subject: Air Quality Technical Review Comments
ReNew Golden Mile: Reconfigured & New Major Streets
Schedule 'C' Class EA Study, Scarborough
ECHO # 1-1625816512**

The Central Region Technical Support Section (TSS) of the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) has reviewed the Environmental Study Report (the ESR), and Appendix M - Air Quality and Noise Impact Assessment Report for the proposed ReNew Golden Mile study in Scarborough (the Study). The AQ report was prepared by HDR Inc. and is dated September 2025. The ESR was prepared by HDR Inc. and is dated May 2026. Please note that this review is limited to the air quality components of these reports.

The Study proposes transportation network improvements, including new and reconfigured major streets within the Golden Mile area of Scarborough. A screening-level air quality assessment was completed as part of the Study.

Please find below the ministry's comments for the proponent's consideration. These comments may be shared with the proponent.

1. A screening-level air quality assessment was completed as part of the EA study. Given the complexity of the project, which involves new and reconfigured major streets in a populated area with nearby sensitive receptors, it is recommended that a quantitative air quality assessment using air dispersion modelling be conducted to determine the maximum pollutant concentrations resulting from implementation of the project and the resulting air quality impacts at the most impacted sensitive receptors. Potential cumulative effects of the proposed project on existing air quality should also be assessed by adding the modeled concentrations to estimated "background" concentrations for each pollutant.
2. Appendix M notes that traffic data from 2013 were used as inputs to the MOVES5 model for the existing conditions scenario. This dataset is considerably outdated. It was also noted that the noise assessment used 2025 traffic data for the existing conditions assessment.

Please clarify why the 2025 traffic dataset was not used in the air quality assessment. The ministry recommends using a more recent input dataset for traffic emission modelling to better reflect current conditions, preferably the 2025 dataset used in the noise assessment, to ensure consistency between the two assessments.

3. Table 5 of Appendix M provides background ambient air concentrations only for CO, NO₂, SO₂, and PM_{2.5}. Please provide the background concentrations for the remaining contaminants of concern, including PM₁₀, Benzene, Benzo(a)pyrene, 1-3 Butadiene, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde and acrolein.
4. Please note that, in Table 1 of Appendix M, the 24-hour AAQC for PM_{2.5} should be 27 ug/m³ rather than 30 ug/m³. In addition, the annual AAQC for SO₂ should be 4 ppb rather than 20 ppb. Please revise these values and update the reports accordingly.
5. Section 6.2 of Appendix M and Tables E2 and 9-1 of the ESR report: Best management practices should be applied to mitigate any air quality impacts caused by construction dust. Please note that the ministry recommends that non-chloride dust suppressants be applied.

For a comprehensive list of fugitive dust prevention and control measures, please refer to *Best Practices for the Reduction of Air Emissions from Construction and Demolition Activities*. (Cheminfo Services Inc. prepared for Environment Canada, March 2005).

6. Given that a number of sensitive receptors, including two childcare facilities (R7 and R28) are located within or very close the study area, it is recommended that additional mitigation measures be implemented during construction in the vicinity of these receptors to minimize emissions from fugitive dust and the idling of construction equipment.
7. Appendix M currently combines both air quality and noise impact assessments into a single report. As air quality and noise assessments are typically reviewed separately by different technical reviewers. For future submissions, it is recommended that the air quality assessment be provided as a standalone report, separate from the noise assessment, to improve clarity and facilitate a more efficient review process

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at rui.zeng@ontario.ca.

Rui Zeng
Air Quality Analyst
Central Region, Compliance and Regional Technical Services Division
5775 Yonge Street
Toronto, ON M2M 4J1

Cc: Kristen Sones, Technical Support APEP Supervisor (A), MECP
Marinha Antunes, Air Quality Analyst, MECP

July 7, 2026

IEA-2026-00081
x. ref. CFN 68273

BY E-MAIL ONLY (Sonali.Praharaj@toronto.ca)

Sonali Praharaj, Senior Project Manager
Major Projects, Transportation Services
Toronto City Hall
22nd Fl. E., 100 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

Dear Sonali Praharaj:

**Re: Draft Environmental Study Report (ESR) and Appendices
Renew Golden Mile: Reconfigured and New Major Streets Environmental Assessment
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Schedule C
Don River Watershed; Scarborough Community Council Area; City of Toronto**

These comments respond to the materials that Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) received on May 29, 2026.

OVERVIEW

TRCA staff understand that the City of Toronto has initiated a Schedule 'C' Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) for transportation infrastructure in the Golden Mile Area of the City of Toronto. The study area is bounded by Victoria Park Avenue to the west, the Gatineau Hydro Corridor Trail to the north, Kennedy Road to the east, and roughly Comstock Road to the south. The EA study builds on recommendations from the Golden Mile Secondary Plan (SP, 2019) and Golden Mile Transportation Master Plan (TMP, 2019). Phases 1 and 2 of the EA process were completed as part of the TMP.

COMMENTING ROLE

Staff have reviewed the study area associated with this project in accordance with the Conservation Authorities Act, including mandatory commenting on Planning Act and Environmental Assessment Act applications. TRCA undertakes review and commenting functions in accordance with The Living City Policies.

TRCA REVIEW

TRCA staff have completed the review of this submission and note that as per the draft ESR and Appendices, there will be streetscape improvements along Ashtonbee Road, from Pharmacy Avenue to Birchmount Road, which fall within TRCA's Regulated Area. As such, staff have comments pertaining to these proposed streetscape improvements which are enclosed in Appendix B: TRCA Comments and Proponent Responses.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact the undersigned.

Regards,



George Tsourounis

Planner

Infrastructure Planning and Permits | Development and Engineering Services

Telephone: 437-880-2472

Email: george.tsourounis@trca.ca

/GT

BY E-MAIL

cc: HDR: Brittany Zhang, Transportation Planner (Brittany.Zhang@hdrinc.com)
TRCA: Caroline Mugo, Senior Planner, Infrastructure Planning and Permits

APPENDIX A: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED BY TRCA

1. Environmental Study Report – Draft (190 pages); prepared by HDR Inc. on behalf of the City of Toronto; dated May 2026; received by TRCA on May 29, 2026.
2. Appendix B - Land Use Background Context Memorandum (53 pages); prepared by HDR Inc. on behalf of the City of Toronto; dated May 10, 2023; received by TRCA on May 29, 2026.
3. Appendix C – Natural Environment Report (45 pages); prepared by LGL Limited on behalf of HDR Inc.; dated June 2025; received by TRCA on May 29, 2026.
4. Appendix D – Arborist Report (71 pages); prepared by LGL Limited on behalf of HDR Inc.; dated June 2025; received by TRCA on May 29, 2026.
5. Appendix I.1 Craigton Drive Preliminary Design (3 pages); prepared by HDR Inc. on behalf of the City of Toronto; dated May 2026; received by TRCA on May 29, 2026.
6. Appendix I.1 Ashtonbee Road Preliminary Design (5 pages); prepared by HDR Inc. on behalf of the City of Toronto; dated May 2026; received by TRCA on May 29, 2026.
7. Appendix J – Drainage and Stormwater Management Report (52 pages); prepared by HDR Inc. on behalf of the City of Toronto; dated August 29, 2025; received by TRCA on May 29, 2026.
8. Appendix K – Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (144 pages); prepared by Thurber on behalf of HDR Inc.; dated August 28, 2025; received by TRCA on May 29, 2026.

APPENDIX B: TRCA COMMENTS AND PROPONENT RESPONSES

ITEM	TRCA COMMENTS (December 12, 2022)	PROPONENT/ CONSULTANT RESPONSE	TRCA Comments (August 30, 2024)	TRCA Comments (July 7, 2026)
1.	While most of the study area is outside of regulation limits, improvements in the vicinity of Ashtonbee Road and Birchmount Road may impact regulated areas. Works in this area should include the TRCA Regulation limits and Regulatory floodplain on all drawings.	TRCA comments from the first TAC meeting have been reviewed and has been added to this comment log for appropriate responses. As acknowledged in TRCA's comment from the first TAC meeting, the majority of the study area is outside of the TRCA regulation limits. There is currently no roadwork planned directly in TRCA regulated limits. If drainage, geotech, or anyother work affects TRCA regulated lands, TRCA will be notified.	Staff note that there will be potential streetscape improvements along Ashtonbee Road from Pharmacy Avenue to Birchmount Road which will be developed in the next phase of this EA. Note that staff may have further comments once these improvements have been determined.	Please be advised that a portion of the proposed Ashtonbee Road Design falls within TRCA’s Regulated Floodplain near the intersection of Ashtonbee Road and Birchmount Road. As such, a permit may be required at the detailed design stage. At the detailed design stage, please provide the following: a) General arrangement drawings, site grading plan, Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) Plan, Restoration Plan, and Landscape Plan for the relevant project area. b) Delineation of TRCA’s Regulated Area limit on all the drawings. c) TRCA standard notes (found here).
Floodplain				

ITEM	TRCA COMMENTS (December 12, 2022)	PROPONENT/ CONSULTANT RESPONSE	TRCA Comments (August 30, 2024)	TRCA Comments (July 7, 2026)
2.	Please note that there should be no net fill within the TRCA Regulatory floodplain. In particular, for Ashtonbee Road, near the Birchmount Road intersection, existing grades should be matched within the TRCA Regulatory floodplain. If there are other areas that abut or are within the TRCA Regulatory floodplain, additional comments may follow.	Comment noted. Proposed work for Ashtonbee include streetscape improvements only within the existing ROW. Drainage and Stormwater Management Report will be completed for the Recommended Alternatives within the study limits. Any improvements that may affect TRCA regulatory floodplain will be consulted with TRCA accordingly.	Staff look forward to reviewing the Stormwater Management Report.	Please ensure all final drawings and Drainage and Stormwater Management (SWM) report are stamped and signed by a qualified professional engineer.
Watercourse Crossings				
3.	If the road within the TRCA Regulatory floodplain will be widened, then the following analysis is required: a. Please update the TRCA Original HEC-RAS model (which is available upon request) for any crossings and revise/upgrade existing crossings as required to ensure that the proposed floodplain water surface elevations and velocities for the 2-year to 100-year, and Regional design storms under proposed conditions match existing conditions. Please provide a hydraulic brief with a comparison table showing the original TRCA HEC-RAS modelling results, updated existing conditions and proposed conditions for the 2-year to 100-year and Regional design storms to ensure that there are no impacts to the floodplain water surface elevations and velocities. Please also ensure that existing conditions riparian storm volumes for the 2-year to 100-year, and Regional storm events met or exceeded at every 0.3m increments under proposed conditions. b. Please provide a fluvial geomorphology assessment for any watercourse crossings. At minimum, a professional fluvial	There are currently no plans to widen roads within the TRCA regulatory floodplain in this EA Study. The suggested analysis (HEC-RAS model & Fluvial Geomorphology Assessment) will be provided accordingly, if improvements are made within the TRCA regulatory floodplain. Drainage and Stormwater Management Report will be completed for the Recommended Alternatives within the study limits.	Acknowledged.	N/A

ITEM	TRCA COMMENTS (December 12, 2022)	PROPONENT/ CONSULTANT RESPONSE	TRCA Comments (August 30, 2024)	TRCA Comments (July 7, 2026)
	geomorphologist shall provide advice regarding the scope of work for fluvial geomorphic assessment. A fluvial geomorphic study is needed to provide professional advice related to the tie-in with the existing channel, the design of the bridge and abutments, the location and design of all local sewer and water infrastructure, and to ensure that erosion risks are mitigated. Given that TRCA has not had an opportunity to review an existing conditions geomorphic assessment of the local area (which may or may not include a partial concrete channel) we are not able to comment fully on this until a preliminary fluvial geomorphology study for existing conditions is provided. If the preliminary information (initial fluvial geomorphologist assessment and advice, along with interpretation from the existing HEC-RAS modelling) shows that there is a potential increase in erosion near or above the concrete lining, then the proponent may be requested to undertake an unsteady state 2D HEC-RAS modelling in support of an erosion threshold analysis and to provide appropriate erosion mitigation measures.			
4.	Changes to the watercourse crossing at Birchmount Road need to be assessed in accordance with TRCA's Crossings Guideline for Valley and Stream Corridors (link) and accompanied by the relevant studies. This should include a Fluvial Geomorphology Study as suggested in Comment 3b, as well as a Natural Heritage Impact Study (NHIS). TRCA staff would be happy to assist in the scoping of the NHIS as needed.	Comment noted. There are currently no plans to change the watercourse crossing at Birchmount Road in this EA Study. Drainage and Stormwater Management Report will be completed for the Recommended Alternatives within the study limits. Any improvements that may affect TRCA regulatory floodplain will be consulted with TRCA accordingly.	Acknowledged.	At the detailed design stage for the proposed road improvements on Ashtonbee Road and Birchmount Road, please provide site plan with locations of proposed staging areas, access routes, water management, and erosion and sediment controls (ESCs). In addition, please clarify if there are any proposed culvert modifications or channel works at the Taylor Massey crossing at Ashtonbee Road and Birchmount Road.

ITEM	TRCA COMMENTS (December 12, 2022)	PROPONENT/ CONSULTANT RESPONSE	TRCA Comments (August 30, 2024)	TRCA Comments (July 7, 2026)
Stormwater Management				
5.	For any roads that outlet to TRCA Regulated areas, please provide the following as per the TRCA SWM Criteria (2012; link here: https://sustainabletechnologies.ca/app/uploads/2013/01/SWM-Criteria-2012.pdf): a. Quantity: control peak flows for the 2-year, 5-year, 10-year, 25-year, 50-year and 100-year design storms to existing conditions; b. Quality: 80% total suspended solids removal; and c. Erosion Control: 5mm on-site retention above the initial abstraction.	Drainage and Stormwater Management Report will be completed for the Recommended Alternatives within the study limits.	Thank you.	Please confirm if the proposed pedestrian clearway along Ashtonbee Road will expand the existing road right-of-way and/or the impervious area. If so, TRCA staff require that any additional impervious areas have adequate stormwater management controls. The following is the TRCA stormwater management criteria for Don River Watershed: a) Quantity Control: Post-Pre for Don River. b) Water Balance: best effort 5 mm c) Erosion Control: 5mm retention In addition, please note that TRCA staff defers all water quality criteria to the City of Toronto. Please see here for more information on TRCA's SWM Criteria. TRCA staff note that as per the Drainage and SWM Report, under existing conditions, the project site is draining to the city sewer system. Staff note

ITEM	TRCA COMMENTS (December 12, 2022)	PROPONENT/ CONSULTANT RESPONSE	TRCA Comments (August 30, 2024)	TRCA Comments (July 7, 2026)
				that the SWM plan may change further during detailed design. Please confirm if the drainage plan will be the same under proposed conditions. TRCA staff may defer the SWM quantity control to the City of Toronto if the proposed sites will drain into the City’s sewer system.
6.	TRCA staff recommends that LIDs be incorporated into the project. It has been our experience that EAs for transit and public access improvements offer excellent opportunities for new and innovative LIDs. For example, Silvacells and StormTrees can be incorporated into the expanded boulevards providing greater tree growth and health and can help with the protection of the downstream watercourse. LID feasibility should be coordinated with TRCA Water Resources Engineering and Hydrogeology staff.	Comment noted. LID has been considered in this EA Study.	Noted.	TRCA staff have reviewed the proposed LIDs in the Drainage and SWM report. Please provide the following: a) Plan and cross-sectional details for all proposed LIDs. Please also provide supporting calculations for the TRCA drawdown requirement. b) Demonstrate that the TRCA requirement of a minimum of 1 m separation between the bottom of the LID and seasonally high groundwater table can be maintained. For more information, please see here for the LID Planning and Design Guide.
Geotechnical				

ITEM	TRCA COMMENTS (December 12, 2022)	PROPONENT/ CONSULTANT RESPONSE	TRCA Comments (August 30, 2024)	TRCA Comments (July 7, 2026)
7.	Geotechnical studies will be required if works impact the Taylor Massey Creek crossing at Ashtonbee Road / Birchmount Road. This should be used in the assessment of options and to inform the design/mitigation measures.	Comment Noted. There are currently no planned widening at the Taylor Massey Creek Crossing at Ashtonbee Road / Birchmount Road in this EA Study. Proposed work for Ashtonbee include streetscape improvements only within the existing ROW. Drainage and Stormwater Management Report will be completed for the Recommended Alternatives within the study limits.	Noted.	N/A
8.	Alignment 2 of the Craigton Drive Reconfiguration and works proposed at Jonesville Crescent may be located close to the ravine slope, or the earthworks and alterations may impact the ravine slope. The assessment of alternatives should consider the potential impacts to the ravine slope and its stability. All mitigative measures need to be developed to ensure that the ravine slope and its stability will not be endangered as part of the proposed works. This includes all earthworks, grading and means and methods for the construction (example: construction access, stockpiling, etc.).	Comment Noted. It is very unlikely that the improvement of Craigton Drive Reconfiguration will affect the ravine slope. If there is any potential of affecting the ravine slope, TRCA will be consulted.	Noted.	N/A
9.	All alterations that impact regulation limits need to be supported by geotechnical and structural design. Further, the proposed works, both temporary and permanent, should not impact the stability of the slopes/banks.	Comment Noted. There are currently no plans of alterations that will impact TRCA regulation limits. However, if there is any potential of affecting TRCA	Note that staff will be reviewing the Ashtonbee streetscape improvements which may impact the regulated area near the	N/A

ITEM	TRCA COMMENTS (December 12, 2022)	PROPONENT/ CONSULTANT RESPONSE	TRCA Comments (August 30, 2024)	TRCA Comments (July 7, 2026)
		regulation limits, TRCA will be consulted.	Birchmount Road intersection.	
Active Transportation Connections – The Meadowway				
10.	Please consider opportunities for connections to the Gatineau Hydro Corridor Trail / The Meadowway (https://themeadoway.ca/). The Meadowway is transforming the hydro corridor into a vibrant 16 km stretch of urban greenspace that cyclists and pedestrians will soon be able to travel from the heart of downtown to Rouge National Urban Park.	Comment Noted. Opportunities for future connections to Gatineau Hydro Corridor Trail / The Meadowway has been considered. It is not part of the scope of this EA Study to propose and design direct connections, but planning for future connections have been considered.	Acknowledged.	N/A
General				
11.	Staff note that we were not given the opportunity to review and comment on the Golden Mile TMP and we only received a Notice of Study Completion. Please ensure that TRCA staff are notified of all future milestones.	Comment Noted.	Noted.	N/A
12.	Please ensure that there is coordination between the EA and any other projects within the study area (e.g., Eglinton East LRT, basement flooding studies, watercourse improvements, etc.). This coordination should be clearly identified in the EA.	Comment Noted.	Noted.	N/A
13.	Please be advised that this application is classified as a <i>Municipal Class EA – Schedule C</i> and is subject to a review fee of \$24,250 as per our Fee Schedule . Please advise to whom an invoice should be sent.	Noted, the invoice should be addressed to the City.	Note that this fee is being revised since the proposed scope of work in the regulated area (along Ashtonbee Road) will only include streetscape improvements within the existing ROW.	Addressed.
14. (new)				Please be advised that TRCA staff reviewed a proposed sanitary sewer upgrade within the Gatineau Hydro Corridor

ITEM	TRCA COMMENTS (December 12, 2022)	PROPONENT/ CONSULTANT RESPONSE	TRCA Comments (August 30, 2024)	TRCA Comments (July 7, 2026)
				associated with the Golden Mile EA. Please confirm if this proposal is related to the Golden Mile EA. Please also provide the City of Toronto contact that will be the project manager on this file. TRCA staff provided preliminary comments in October 2024 and noted a permit is required for the project. TRCA staff provided preliminary comments to Kelly Martin at Choice Properties.

END OF APPENDIX B