Lafarge Stouffvile Site Alteration and Fill Permit Application
Comment Response Matrix

August 12, 2022

On behalf of our Client, Lafarge Canada Inc. Corporation, we are pleased to deliver the third submission of the Site Plan Alteration Application for the subject property located at 14204 Durham Regional Road 30, in the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville.

This document is intended to address the comments received from Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Staff and other commenting agencies on the second Site Alteration Application submission.

Jeff Almeida, Supervisor Development Approvals The Regional Municipality of Durham Works Department December 17, 2021			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
1.	The submission of the Fill Management Plan by Golder Associates is in support of a fill permit application to Whitchurch-Stouffville for the final grading of part of the above site. The Fill Management Plan includes a Traffic Impact Study prepared by TMIG.	Tylin	Acknowledged.
2.	The volume of fill required to restore part of the site is 8,000,000 m3, which equates to approximately 800,000 tri-axle dump truck loads. The proposal is to fill the site at 500-1000 truckloads per day between the hours of 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., which will put the restoration at between 8 and 16 years.	Tylin	Acknowledged. The timeframe has been revised to be between the hours of 6 a.m. to 5 p.m. Please refer to updated Transportation Impact Study dated July 2022.
3.	The existing aggregate operations are expected to continue on the remaining part of the site, using existing approved haul routes. The haul routes for the fill operations are using Regional Road 30 south of Hillsdale Drive and then either west using Bloomington Road (York Regional Road 40) or east using Regional Highway 47 / Goodwood Road (Regional Road 21).	Tylin	Acknowledged.
4.	The proposal is to utilize the existing pit entrance on Regional Road 30 for fill trucks entering the site and using the unopened ROW at Hillsdale Drive for trucks exiting, with all fill-traffic travelling to and from the south.	Tylin	Acknowledged.
5.	The terms of reference for the Traffic Assessment were agreed with the Region in advance, and we generally agree with the methodology used in the Traffic Assessment, the trip rate assumptions, 2026 and 2031	Tylin	Acknowledged. It should be noted that the updated TIS considers horizon years of 2028 and 2033 in order to account for a "buildout" year of 2023 for the increased fill activity, in line with the 5- and 10-year horizons outlined in the

Jeff Almeida, Supervisor Development Approvals The Regional Municipality of Durham Works Department December 17, 2021			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	horizon years and trip distributions used in the report.		Terms of Reference. Please refer to updated transportation impact study dated July 2022 included as Appendix G in the updated Fill Management Plan.
6.	Figure 2-1 Transfer Route – To minimize safety and noise concerns to the Community of Goodwood, it is recommended that access between the two pits be via Wagg Road and York Durham Line only. Outbound trips from the Goodwood Pit site would exit on Concession Road 3 and travel north to Wagg Road and south on York Durham Line to return to the Stouffville Pit Site. This route appears less developed with residential homes as opposed to travelling through Goodwood and could minimize impact. Intersection control may be required at Wagg Road/York Durham Line if this	Tylin	Lafarge worked collaboratively with the Township of Uxbridge and the Region of Durham in 2015 to develop the current truck route that is used. The initial issue with full trucks using Wagg Road and then travelling south of Durham Regional Road 30 is the steep incline that must be climbed, which is difficult for the filled trucks. The lack of a slow-moving/passing lane results in safety hazard due to the number of cars attempting to pass slow-moving trucks on the hill. Furthermore, there are reports of potential damage to the gravel shoulder due to the use of the suggested route. As such, it is not recommended to adopt the suggested route.
7.	Figure 2-2 to 2-5 – These figures should be expanded to show where the haul routes go beyond the immediate study area to assess possible impacts to other areas.	Tylin	The impact of the haul routes beyond the immediate study areas has been addressed in Section 2.3 of the updated study. Please refer to updated Transportation Impact Study dated July 2022.
8.	Table 2-3 – Please also include this table in terms of Total Daily Trips. There is a significant difference between average trips per day versus highest trips per day.	Tylin	Surveyed existing volumes for the Stouffville Pit were used in the updated TIS submission as presented in Figure 2-7 of Section 2.5. Since existing counts were used, the existing site trip generation presented originally in Table 2.3 is no longer applicable. Surveyed existing volume counts for the Stouffville Pit were used in the TIS Update to derive peak hour volumes. Please refer to updated Transportation Impact Study dated July 2022 included as Appendix G in the updated Fill Management Plan.
9.	Section 2.6.1.5 – Existing site trips have been generated to correspond with the AM and PM peak hour of the adjacent roadway. Please confirm inbound/outbound trips based on the peak hour of the site and the corresponding time(s).	Tylin	As noted in the response to Comment 8 above, existing counts were adopted for the TIS update, and the trip generation originally presented in Section 2.6.1.5. of the report is no longer applicable. Surveyed existing volume counts for the Stouffville Pit were used in the TIS update to derive peak hour volumes.
10.	Section 4.1 – Please confirm the distribution of truck loads throughout the day including times	Tylin	The distribution of trips throughout the day has been updated and is presented in the respective table.

Jeff Almeida, Supervisor Development Approvals The Regional Municipality of Durham Works Department December 17, 2021			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	and inbound/outbound trips based on the expected 1000 truckloads per day.		
11.	Section 4.3 of the Traffic Assessment evaluates the available sight distance at Hillsdale Drive based on TAC sight distances for a 100 km/hr design speed. We note that minimum stopping sight distance and Intersection sight distances are considered in the Traffic Assessment, however the Region would typically require Decision Sight Distance (DSD) for new entranceways, which would be 300 m.	Tylin	Acknowledged.
12.	The Traffic Assessment does not clearly state what the available sight distances are as measured in the field. Given the site access at Hillsdale Drive is proposed to act as a right-out only, we would want to be satisfied that DSD can be provided north of the site access. We recognize that DSD would not be achievable south of the site access, however as there are no inbound or left-turn outbound truck maneuvers, there shouldn't be any conflicts for northbound traffic. The consultant should confirm this.	Tylin	A decision sight distance (DSD) review was conducted for Hillsdale Drive north of the site access along York-Durham Line and is summarized in Section 8.12. The DSD review confirms that DSD can be provided.
13.	The proposed access at Hillsdale Drive will need to include traffic signage to advise traffic of the site access (truck turning signs) and signs advising drivers that the access is right turn only. The site access will also need to include paved shoulders to stop tracking of gravel shoulders that has been a long-standing issue for the Region on this section of Regional Road 30. The right-turn out only needs to be a condition of the Fill Management Plan approval.	Tylin	Acknowledged.
14.	The Region will require the applicant to enter into an Entranceway Permit with the Region. The permit will include several standard conditions, which will include the need for a mud mat and wheel-washing facilities at the site exit and a refundable $10,000 deposit.	Tylin	Acknowledged.
15.	We agree with the need to provide a left-turn lane at the site access on Regional Road 30. As per Regional left turn lane guidelines, for a 100 km/hr the required taper is 1:40 (140 m for a 3.5 m turn lane), 135 m deceleration lane and	Tylin	Acknowledged. The proposed functional design for the northbound left onto the access meets the requirements.

Jeff Almeida, Supervisor Development Approvals The Regional Municipality of Durham Works Department December 17, 2021			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	minimum 15 m storage. The Region will need to review a functional design and the implementation of the left-turn lane and associated road widening will need to be a condition of approval. The Region of Durham will be responsible for the approvals and the applicant will be required to enter into a Servicing Agreement with the Region.		
16.	The 2026 and 2031 analysis includes northbound left and southbound left and right turn lanes at the intersection of Regional Road 30 and Regional Highway 47. As noted in the Traffic Assessment the Region is planning to widen Regional Highway 47 to 4 lanes between York Durham Line and Goodwood Road. Construction is not currently proposed until beyond 2026 and the EA has not begun, and the scope of that project (and whether the scope includes turn lanes at the intersection) has yet to be confirmed.	Tylin	Acknowledged.
17.	The Traffic Assessment modelled east and west right-turn lanes at the intersection of Regional Road 30 and Regional Highway 47 for all scenarios. There are no existing right-turn lanes on the east or west legs of the intersection. Please revise the modelling and include recommendations on the need for right-turn lanes on these legs.	Tylin	Acknowledged. The analysis has been revised to remove the lanes.
18.	Additional analysis is required to be carried out in the 2026 scenario to determine what interim measures might be required to accommodate the fill traffic until the intersection is improved.	Tylin	Acknowledged. Based on the updated traffic capacity analysis presented in Section 6.4. For 2028 future total conditions, a northbound left-turn lane, southbound left-turn lane, and southbound right-turn lane at the intersection of York-Durham Line at Regional Highway 47 is recommended, and the signal timing splits are recommended to be optimized at the intersection of York-Durham Line at Regional Highway 47 and at the intersection of Goodwood Road at Regional Highway 47. Monitoring at the intersection of York-Durham Line at Aurora Road is recommended to determine if operations become critical. A sensitivity scenario in which the westbound left turn lane was extended and westbound right turn lane was considered with some

Jeff Almeida, Supervisor Development Approvals The Regional Municipality of Durham Works Department December 17, 2021			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
			improvement to AM peak hour capacity and queueing.
19.	The Region has concerns over the general impact of the increased truck traffic on our road network as well as ongoing issues with truck speed enforcement through Goodwood on Regional Highway 47 and Regional Road 21. These issues are likely to be exacerbated by the increase in truck traffic associated with the fill operation. We would therefore request an opportunity to discuss with Lafarge implementing remedial measures. Measures for consideration should include: • Automated Speed Enforcement measures within the 50km/hr zone on Regional Highway 47 and Regional Road 21. • Urbanized cross section on Regional Road 21 through Goodwood. • Follow up traffic study in 2-3 years to assess actual truck volumes and review truck routing and remedial measures, including any interim improvements at Regional Road 30 / Regional Highway 47 intersection. • Commitment to pavement condition monitoring and remedial action if required.	Tylin / Lafarge	Acknowledged. Lafarge would be happy to meet with the Region on 3 of the 4 requested remedial measures for consideration, taking into account Lafarge's proportion of the use of these roads and the annual TOARC fee that Lafarge contributes to the Region. Regarding the urbanized cross-section on Regional Road 21 through Goodwood, Lafarge should only be responsible for the proportion of the traffic added to existing volumes on the road.
20.	We require a revised Traffic Assessment to address the above comments and request the opportunity to discuss these comments further with the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville to agree how Regional concerns are addressed.	Tylin	Acknowledged.

Jeff Almeida, Supervisor Development Approvals The Regional Municipality of Durham Works Department June 7, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
21.	The resubmission of the Fill Management Plan by Golder Associates is in support of a fill permit application to Whitchurch-Stouffville for the final grading of part of the above site. The Fill Management Plan includes a Traffic Impact Study prepared by TMIG, which has been updated following comments on the 1st submission.	MHBC	Acknowledged
22.	The volume of fill required to restore part of the site is 8,000,000 m3, which equates to approximately 800,000 tri-axle dump truck loads. The proposal is to fill the site at up to 1,000 truckloads per day between the hours of 6 am to 6 pm. The TIS notes that this will put the restoration at between 8 and 16 years. We note this is a conservative estimate as 1,000 truckloads per day would take considerably less time. We note that Section 3.2 page 5 of the Site Alteration and Fill Management Plan notes that standard operating hours are between 7 am and 5 pm, but with an allowance for an hour to accommodate traffic already enroute.	MHBC	Acknowledged
23.	Our previous comments on Figure 2-1 (now Figure 2-2) Transfer Route with a recommendation that access between the two pits be via Wagg Road and York Durham Line only has not been addressed or commented upon.	Tylin	Please see response above. Please note that TMIG/TYLIN was not in receipt of the Region's comments on the first submission, and was therefore was not able to address the Region's initial comments. Lafarge worked collaboratively with the Township of Uxbridge and the Region of Durham in 2015 to develop the current truck route that is used. The initial issue with full trucks using Wagg Road and then travelling south of Durham Regional Road 30 is the steep incline that must be climbed, which is difficult for the filled trucks. The lack of a slow-moving/passing lane results in safety hazard due to the number of cars attempting to pass slow-moving trucks on the hill.
24.	Figure 2-2 to 2-5 – As previously requested, these figures should be expanded to show where the haul routes go beyond the immediate study area to assess possible impacts to other areas.	Tylin	The impact of the haul routes beyond the immediate study areas has been addressed in Section 2.3 of the updated study.
25.	Section 8 of the Traffic Impact Study evaluates the available sight distance at Hillsdale Drive based on TAC sight distances for a 100 km/hr	Tylin	Acknowledged.

Jeff Almeida, Supervisor Development Approvals The Regional Municipality of Durham Works Department June 7, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	design speed. As per our previous comments, we noted that minimum stopping sight distance and intersection sight distances are considered in the Traffic Assessment, however the Region would typically require Decision Sight Distance (DSD) for new entranceways, which would be 300m.		
26.	As per our previous comments, the Traffic Impact Study does not clearly state what the available sight distances are as measured in the field. Given the site access at Hillsdale Drive is proposed to act as a right-out only, we would want to be satisfied that DSD can be provided north of the site access. Although the 185 m intersection sight distance is confirmed, we would want to understand what sight distance is available and how close to the DSD can be achieved. We specifically requested in our previous comments that the consultant confirm this.	Tylin	As noted above, a desktop decision sight distance (DSD) review was conducted for Hillsdale Drive north of the site access along York-Durham Line and is summarized in Section 8.12. The DSD review confirms that DSD can be provided.
27.	As previously noted, the applicant will need to obtain an Entranceway Permit from the Region. The permit will include several standard conditions, which will include the need for a mud mat and wheel-washing facilities at the site exit and a refundable $10,000 deposit.	Golder	Acknowledged. Mud track out mitigation measures have been included in Section 3.14.2 of the Fill Management Plan dated August 2022.
28.	The revised Traffic Assessment now includes a functional design for the left-turn lane on Regional Road 30, which shows the appropriate approach tapers, deceleration lane and storage lane as per our previous comments. To demonstrate impacts / feasibility, the functional design also needs to show the road widening required for the left-turn lane which will require the widening of the road platform and regrading the boulevard, existing entranceways and ditching as necessary. The design will need to include traffic signage to advise traffic of the site access (truck turning signs). All works required to implement the left-turn lane are to be designed and built to Durham standards at 100% Lafarge's cost. The Region of Durham will be responsible for the approvals and the applicant will be required to	Tylin	Noted. Given the current lack of survey for the immediate roadway, the functional design has been renamed as a conceptual design and the estimated road widenings and required signage added. The updated conceptual design has been included in the TIS. A more comprehensive functional and detailed design will be subject to application approval and would require adequate topographic survey. It is noted that there is an existing 'Trucks Turning" signs posted in advance of the Stouffville Pit entrance for vehicles approaching from the north.

Jeff Almeida, Supervisor Development Approvals The Regional Municipality of Durham Works Department June 7, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	enter into a Servicing Agreement with the Region.		
29.	Section 3.2 has expanded the discussion on the study area network. As per the Region's 2022 Capital Road Program, the planned widening of Regional Highway 47 to 4 lanes between York Durham Line and Goodwood Road project is not expected to be constructed until after 2027, but as noted in our previous comments, the EA has not begun and the scope of that project (and whether the scope includes turn lanes at the intersection) has yet to be confirmed.	Tylin	Acknowledged.
30.	As per our previous comments, additional analysis is required to be carried out in the 2026 scenario to determine what interim measures might be required to accommodate the fill traffic until the Regional Road 30 and Regional Highway 47 intersection is improved. In particular, the consideration of the need for a westbound right-turn lane.	Tylin	Acknowledged. As noted above, based on the updated traffic capacity analysis presented in Section 6.4. for 2028 future total conditions, a northbound left-turn lane, southbound left-turn lane, and southbound right-turn lane at the intersection of York-Durham Line at Regional Highway 47 is recommended, and the signal timing splits are recommended to be optimized at the intersection of York-Durham Line at Regional Highway 47 and at the intersection of Goodwood Road at Regional Highway 47. Monitoring at the intersection of York-Durham Line at Aurora Road is recommended to determine if operations become critical. A sensitivity scenario in which the westbound left turn lane was extended and westbound right turn lane was considered with some improvement to AM peak hour capacity and queueing.
31.	As per our previous comments, the Region has concerns over the general impact of the increased truck traffic on our road network as well as ongoing issues with truck speed enforcement through Goodwood on Regional Highway 47 and Regional Road 21. These issues are likely to be exacerbated by the increase in truck traffic associated with the fill operation, particularly as there is no known truck trip distribution for the fill operations. We would therefore request an opportunity to discuss with Lafarge implementing remedial measures. Measures for consideration should include:	Tylin	Acknowledged. Lafarge would be happy to meet with meet with the Region on 3 of the 4 requested remedial measures for consideration. However, regarding the urbanized cross-section on Regional Road 21 through Goodwood, Lafarge should only be responsible for the proportion off the traffic added to existing volumes on the road.

Jeff Almeida, Supervisor Development Approvals The Regional Municipality of Durham Works Department June 7, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	a. Automated Speed Enforcement measures within the 50 km/hr zone on Regional Highway 47 and Regional Road 21. b. Urbanized cross section on Regional Road 21 through Goodwood. c. Follow up traffic study in 2-3 years to assess actual truck volumes and review truck routing and remedial measures, including any interim improvements at Regional Road 30 / Regional Highway 47 intersection. d. Commitment to pavement condition monitoring and remedial action if required.		
32.	Appendix A of the Traffic Impact Study now includes a comment – response matrix. It is disappointing that Region of Durham comments have not been included in this matrix and as noted above, a significant number of our comments have not been addressed in this resubmission. We request the opportunity to discuss these comments further with the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville and Lafarge to agree how Region of Durham concerns are addressed.	Tylin	Acknowledged. TyLin apologizes for the oversight and have attempted to adequately address the Region's concerns in this submission. Please note that TMIG/TYLin did not intentionally ignore the Region's comments; rather, our team was not in receipt of said comments, and were therefore unable to adequately address the comments in the subsequent submission.

Mayor Iain Lovatt Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Monday, November 15, 2021			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
33.	When I spoke to the proponent about their plans earlier this year, I brought up the need to address traffic concerns at the 10th Line &	Tylin / Lafarge	Acknowledged. Lafarge would be happy to discuss this while taking into account Lafarge's proportion of the use of these roads and the

Mayor Iain Lovatt Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Monday, November 15, 2021			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	Bloomington/47 intersection. With the increased truck traffic that this application will bring, dedicated left turn lanes in all directions, or a round about must be addressed. This is already a major bottleneck north/south that will need attention. The proponent was amenable to look at contributing to the costs of upgrading the intersection. I have cc'd the Regions Acting Transportation Commissioner Ann-Marie Carroll on this email so she's in the loop that this application is moving forward. Can we ensure that this is not lost as this moves forward?		annual TOARC fee that Lafarge contributes to the Region as part of the operation.

Jim Walls R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited May 20, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
General Comments			
34.	No. 2.1 – Re 1.1 A response letter addressing comments, including red-line comments provided by all disciplines (Site Plan, Civil, Geotechnical) is to be included in each submission. We support the use of a comment matrix to track comments and responses for all disciplines and agencies. A template is attached for reference. Matrix provided. Comment maintained for reference.	MHBC	Acknowledged.
35.	No. 2.2 – Re 1.2 Section 3.1.3 should clearly state that a Record of Site Condition (RSC) will be filed for Agricultural land use and the completion of the project and a copy of the Letter of Acknowledgement from the MECP will be provided to the Town. Addressed.	MHBC	Acknowledged.
36.	No. 2.3 – Re 1.3	MHBC	Acknowledged.

Jim Walls R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited May 20, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	Section 3.6, sixth bullet – Monitoring will continue until the Letter of Acknowledgement for the filing of an RSC for Agricultural land use is received by the Town. Addressed.		
37.	No. 2.4 – Re 1.4 Section 3.14.2 – Note that mud and dust tracking onto public roads that requires the use of a sweeper or other mitigation on public roads is an indication of a mud and dust control program failure. The control plan should clearly indicate that the need for mud and dust control on public roads is considered a rare event related to extreme weather events and not be a regular (daily) occurrence. Addressed.	Golder	Acknowledged. The mud track out mitigation measures have been included in Section 3.14.2 of the Fill Managment Plan dated August 2022.
38.	No. 2.5 – Re 1.5 Final grade topography should be based upon restoring as close as possible the pre-human activity topography and blending to match surrounding grades. The derivation of the final topography from historical records should be provided to confirm the proposed restoration is to pre-human activity topography. Addressed.	MHBC	Acknowledged.
39.	No. 2.6 – Re 1.6 Reference the Best Management Practices for Aggregate Pit and Quarry Rehabilitation in Ontario, Ontario Society of Professional Engineers, March 2021. The best practices should be adopted. *https://ospe.on.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Best-Management-Practices-for-Aggregate-Pit-and-Quarry-Rehab-in-Ont..pdf* Response suggests a misinterpretation of the comment. The point of referencing the OPSE document is because it includes filling practices unique to	MHBC	Acknowledged.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	former aggregate sites. It is referenced by the draft Ontario Regulation Ontario Regulation 244/97 entitled Proposed Regulatory Changes For The Beneficial Reuse Of Excess Soil At Pits And Quarries In Ontario. https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/019-4801. Although this Site Alteration will not be conducted under the Aggregate Resources Act, the Best Management Practices align perfectly with this Site Alteration. The Best Practices should be referenced as part of the practices and procedures for the Site Alteration. Advise if there is anything in the Best Management Practices that is not aligned with the proposed Site Alteration.		
Groundwater Monitoring and Protection Program – comments by Jim Walls, P.Geo., QPESA			
40.	No. 2.7 – Re 1.7 The hydrogeology report identifies four monitoring wells installed as part of the hydrogeological characterization of the site. This is reasonable; however, a more robust monitoring program will be required to monitor filling activities. Additional monitoring wells will be required to monitor groundwater flow along the property boundaries and installed immediately below the initial active fill areas. Please provide a layout for additional wells to be included in the monitoring program. It is acceptable if the wells are installed as a Condition of the Permit. Proposed future monitoring wells should be shown based on the staging of the filling areas over time. Addressed.	MHBC	Acknowledged.
Alignment with Ontario Regulation 406/19 – comments by Jim Walls, P.Geo., QPESA			
41.	No. 2.8 – Re 1.8 The submission should be reviewed and confirm full alignment with Ontario Regulation 406/19 including those items that will come into effect over the next few years as if this was not a site to operate under a Municipal Instrument as defined in the regulation. Identify what, if any, differences may result from	MHBC	Acknowledged.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	operating under a Municipal Instrument and not operating under a Municipal Instrument. Changes to the application to better align with Ontario Regulation 406/19 in place of current Town requirements would be considered by the Town. Addressed.		
Stage 1 Archeological Assessment – comments by Jim Walls, P.Geo., QPESA			
42.	No. 2.9 – Re 1.9 A copy of response from the MTCS should be provided to the Town when received. Addressed.	MHBC	Acknowledged.
Best Management Practices Plan for the Control of Fugitive Dust – comments by Kristina Zeromskiene, Ph.D., LEL			
43.	No. 2.10 – Re 1.10 According to Table 3: Preventative Procedures and Control Measures for Fugitive Dust Emissions at the Site, watering at least 2 L/m2 after 24 hours of dryness is recommended during non-freezing conditions as a reactive control measure for unpaved roads. Is 24 hours of dryness the only trigger when watering of the unpaved roads might be required? How frequent watering should be done and what other factors determine the frequency of required watering? Addressed. Additional recommendations provided in Table 3.	Golder	Comment Addressed.
44.	No. 2.11 – Re 1.11 According to Table 3 (as above), watering is recommended during high windspeed conditions for material storage "as required". More information should be provided to clarify the term "as required". Addressed. Clarification provided, and additional information added to Table 3.	Golder	"As required" has been removed. Water will be applied during high windspeed conditions (i.e., greater than 28 km/hr) or operations will be stopped. At windspeeds greater than 28 km/hr, operations will either be stopped, or stockpiles will be covered or watered if there is visible dust generated. Table 1 in Section 3.14.3 of the Fill Management Plan has been updated and Table 3 in the Dust Management Plan included as Appendix H of the Fill Management Plan dated August 2022.
45.	No. 2.12 – Re 1.12	Golder	Comment Addressed.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	According to Table 3 (as above), cease of operations or watering "as required" is recommended as a reactive control measure for material handling operations during high windspeed conditions. Clarification should be provided for the term "as required". How will it be determined when watering is required? Addressed. Clarification provided, and additional information added to Table 3.		
46.	No. 2.13 – Re 1.13 Table 4: Fugitive Dust Sources and Associated Relative Risk Scores provides a Relative Risk Score for each source. There is no explanation how this score was determined nor any discussion about the resulting values. While Appendix A provides risk factors used in the ranking process, there should be a discussion on the resulting relative score values to complement Table 4. Addressed. Clarification provided.	Golder	Comment Addressed.
Noise Feasibility Study – comments by Kristina Zeromskiene, Ph.D., LEL			
47.	No. 2.14 – Re 1.14 According to the report, sound levels at the outdoor points of reception were assessed and it was determined that these locations were not the most-impacted locations. This could not be verified as sound levels predicted at the outdoor points of reception and their locations were not included in the report. Sound levels and locations of the outdoors points of reception should be included in the report. Based on the Golder's comments in the Response Table, comments should be addressed. However, the revised report was not provided; therefore, it could not be verified. The revised report should be provided.	Golder	The updated noise assessment report is included as Appendix I. Section 3.14.4 of the Fill Management Plan has been updated accordingly based on the conclusions of the revised noise report.
48.	No. 2.15 – Re 1.15 Noise control measures described in Section 5 were developed based on one to two dozers. The report notes that all references to dozers	Golder	The updated noise report is provided as Appendix I in the Fill Management Plan dated August 2022.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	include a supporting front-end loader or excavator. The first point of the Summary of Assessed Operation in Appendix B indicates that up to two dozers may operate continuously, while next point indicates that an excavator or a front-end loader was assumed to operate continuously along with the dozers. This adds up to three pieces of equipment at the same time. Clarification should be provided regarding the maximum number of equipment allowed to operate at the same time and the number used in the model. Based on the Golder's comments in the Response Table, comments should be addressed. However, the revised report was not provided; therefore, it could not be verified. The revised report should be provided.		
49.	No. 2.16 – Re 1.16 Table 1 summarizes predicted "worst-case" sound levels. Clarification should be provided what does the range of sound levels provided for each receptor refer to. Based on the Golder's comments in the Response Table, comments should be addressed. However, the revised report was not provided; therefore, it could not be verified. The revised report should be provided.	Golder	Please refer to the updated noise report provided as Appendix I.
50.	No. 2.17 – Re 1.17 Figures 3 and 4 provide areas where dozers may operate without exceeding sound level limits. The resulting areas follow rather complicated outline that might not be feasible in the field. Clarification should be provided how these areas will be defined at the site, so the equipment operators will be aware of the areas they should not be operating at. Based on the Golder's comments in the Response Table, comments should be addressed. However, the revised report was not	Golder	Updated noise report is included as Appendix I in the Fill Management Plan.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	provided; therefore, it could not be verified. The revised report should be provided.		
Hydrogeological Assessment – comments by Jim Walls, P.Geo., QPESA			
51.	No. 2.18 – Re 1.19 A cross-section of the site showing the groundwater table, stratigraphy and monitoring well installations is required to show the separation between the water table and base of the fill. Surface water/groundwater interactions should be shown if relevant. Addressed.	MHBC	Acknowledged.
Natural Heritage Evaluation – comments by Tricia Radburn, MCIP, RPP			
52.	No. 2.19 – Re 1.20 No concerns. The best management practices listed in Section 7.0 of the Environmental Impact Assessment should be included as conditions on the Site Alteration Permit. Addressed.	MHBC	Acknowledged.
Transportation Impact Study (TIS) and Electronic Synchro Files– comments by Cindy Chung, EIT and David Angelakis, C.E.T.			
53.	No. 2.20 – Re 1.21 General Comments a) The Synchro electronic files for all analyses should be provided for review. Addressed. Synchro electronic files were provided. Please see comments on the Synchro files below. b) The Town follows the Region's Transportation Mobility Plan Guideline for Development Applications. Please provide a performance analysis for transit, pedestrian, and cyclist infrastructure under existing and future conditions. Addressed. Performance analysis (MMLOS) for transit, pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure were provided for all conditions. Please see comments on the MMLOS evaluation below.	Tylin	a) Acknowledged. b) Acknowledged. c) Acknowledged. d) Acknowledged. The queueing analysis has been revised based on updated information from the client. The inspection/weigh station location has been illustrated and is now included in Appendix G. The vehicle length was not updated as the fill truck queue will not be using such WB-67 vehicles (shown only for conservative maneuvering purposes). The additional 149 existing vehicles were also excluded for queueing analysis because they are accounted for in 1000 projected daily truck trips (however they remain included in the traffic capacity analysis to be conservative). The revised internal queueing analysis and proposed mitigation measures are outlined in Section 7.2.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	c) Please provide a maneuvering analysis at the site driveways for the largest expected design vehicles. Addressed. Maneuvering analysis was provided at the site driveway for the largest expected design vehicle. d) An existing Site Plan should be provided. Addressed. An existing Site Plan was provided. e) As a Site Plan was not provided, the location of the weight station is unclear and there is concern that queuing trucks may spill onto York-Durham Line. A review of potential queuing should also be provided between the weight station and York-Durham Line. In addition, any potential queuing on York-Durham Line should be provided for trucks waiting to enter the site. Should the traffic analysis suggest that truck queuing will impact the operations of York-Durham Line, then the Applicant would be required to revise their Site Plan to relocate the gate and weight station to alleviate any potential queuing issues. Partially addressed. A Site Plan was provided, but the location of the weigh station is unclear and must be shown on the plan to confirm inbound queuing distance. Section 7.2 in the updated TIS describes the length of travel after entering the site before requiring to stop and unload. The queueing review was based on the additional trucks generated. To be conservative, the total trucks entering the site should be considered (i.e., include existing trucks). In addition, the queue length was based on a 12.5 m truck, but based on the maneuvering analysis, the largest vehicle would be a WB-67, which has a length of approximately 20 m. This should be considered to be conservative. Please clarify and update accordingly.		
54.	No. 2.21 Synchro Comments	Tylin	a) Noted. The intersection will be remodelled. b) Noted. The speed limit will be updated.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	a) A northbound shared through-right lane was modelled at the Aurora Road/York Durham Line intersection. Based on Google Maps and Figure No., there is an exclusive northbound right-turn lane. Please update. b) The speed limit modelled in Synchro on Bloomington Road is 80 km/h. The posted limit is 70 km/h west of York Durham Line. Please update accordingly. c) The signal timing splits for the existing PM synchro file do not match the existing signal timing plan provided in Appendix C.		The splits noted in the York Region Signal timing plan were deemed inaccurate and do not reflect the actual timings noted for each of the phases. The timings entered for the minimum initial, amber, and all-red phases in the submitted Existing PM was found accurate.
55.	No. 2.22 MMLOS Comments a) The location of the planned transit stop for the Regional Road 47 transit line proposed for 2031 will be approximately 750 m away from the site. This is not equivalent to a level of service A as indicated in Table 9-1. Please update. b) In Table 9-2, under existing and 2028 conditions, northbound and southbound York-Durham Line segments were given a level of service F indicating there are no sidewalks. However, currently, there are paved shoulders on York-Durham Line. Please update accordingly. c) In Tables 9-2 and 9-3, under existing and all future conditions, York-Durham Line/Bloomington Road were given a level of service E indicating paved shoulders. However, there are some segments along Bloomington without paved shoulders. Please update accordingly.	Tylin	a) Noted. The level of service for the Regional Road 47 transit line stop was revised. b) A review of aerial imagery indicates that the significant majority of York-Durham Line at the study intersection segments has gravel shoulders or no shoulders at all. Accordingly, TYLin maintains the LOS assigned under existing and 2028 conditions in Table 9-2, the exception being at York-Durham Line at Bloomington Road / Regional Highway 47 where LOS was reduced to 'F' representing the lack of paved shoulders at the intersection segments. Noted. The level of service for the intersection segments was revised.
56.	No. 2.23 – Re 1.22 Section 1.0 a) The site location Figure 1-1 appears to include the North York Sand & Gravel (14395 Ninth Line) and Lee Sand and Gravel (14245 Ninth Line) Fill Sites (USM site). Please clarify	Tylin	a) Acknowledged. b) It is understood that in order to be able to use Hillsdale Drive, LaFarge is required to own the property on this street (as it currently does). The street is currently only being used by Lafarge. No compatibility issues are anticipated.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	ownership and if there are any interconnection that would allow access to Ninth Line. Addressed. Clarification has been provided that both sites operate under separate ownership and there is no interconnection between them. b) We note that there is an existing heavy truck restriction on Hillsdale Drive, possibility due to the existence of the single-family home on that street. It is proposed that Hillsdale be utilized as an outbound truck route. Please clarify. Partially addressed. Clarification was provided on the single-family home and the outbound truck route. However, access to what appears to be a residential street would introduce an incompatible use. c) It is noted that there is a connection to the quarry on the east side of York-Durham Line via an underpass of the road. Please clarify what interaction occurs between the two sites and how that will impact the subject site and the proposed driveway. Addressed. Clarification was provided on the quarry to the east.		
57.	No. 2.24 – Re 1.23 Section 2.0 a) Please provide a figure illustrating the existing lane configuration for all study intersections. Addressed. A figure illustrating an existing lane configuration was provided and there are no additional comments. b) The turning movement counts (TMC) at the York-Durham Line/Bloomington Road intersection was not provided in Appendix A. Please provide. Partially addressed. The afternoon peak hour TMC summary at the York-Durham Line/Bloomington Road intersection was		a) Acknowledged. b) Peak Hour Summaries for the AM were not available from the vendor, and were therefore processed by TMIG. The AM peak hour summaries have been added to the Appendices. c) Based on a review of historical TMC data for the intersection of York-Durham Line at Bloomington Road from 2019 and 2021, a COVID adjustment was deemed unnecessary. While the surveyed AM southbound through volume is lower in 2021 relative to 2019, the overall southbound traffic in the AM peak hour has increased by 57 trips from 226 to 283 trips. Furthermore, the overall intersection volumes are overall higher in 2021 than in 2019. In general, day-to-

Jim Walls R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited May 20, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	provided. However, all AM peak hour TMC summaries were not provided. Please provide. c) The TMCs' were conducted in either 2018 or 2019. A growth rate should be applied to estimate the current traffic volumes. Since 2022 is less than a month away, the projections should be updated to reflect 2022 conditions. Please update and provide justification for any assumed growth rates. Partially addressed. New TMCs were collected in August 2021 during the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic is ongoing, and it is expected that traffic volumes and patterns are impacted. For example, it appears that the southbound through traffic on York-Durham Line is underestimated. Historical counts should be reviewed and compared to the surveyed traffic volumes and adjusted where required. The largest turning movement volumes should be used in the analysis. d) The assumptions made in Table 2-3 and Table 2-4 are reasonable and in line with the information provided. A reduction of 50% was applied to the estimated trips based on seasonal data. However, the seasonal data does not appear to show that trips are reduced by 50% in any of the months provided. Regardless, the peak month should be examined. In this regard, it is suggested that the projected trips in Tables 2-3 and 2-4 without any reductions be utilized. Addressed. No reduction was applied. e) Based on the seasonal data provided, it is suggested that the TMCs used should reflect the peak operating month of August. Partially addressed. TMCs were conducted during August to reflect peak operating month. However, minor adjustments may be required		day fluctuations in traffic volumes can be expected; however, given the overall increase in the August surveyed data, no adjustment was considered required. Furthermore, given the relatively small amount of residential use in the surrounding area, it was predicted that home-based work and home-based school trips (which were the most common type of trip to be affected by the pandemic, as noted under the pandemic mobility trends provided by ITE) would be less impacted than in more urbanized areas. Finally, it was noted that the counts were collected during Step 3 of the Ontario pandemic response, in which capacity limits were increased relative to previous stages, and as such, counts would have been more representative of pre-pandemic conditions than in previous pandemic response stages. Based on the foregoing, it is TMIG's opinion that the August 2021 counts are acceptable without adjustment. d) Acknowledged.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	as counts were conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic. f) The trip distribution for the employees at the pit will be different than the truck trip distribution. Please provide a separate trip assignment for the employees and provide justification for the assumed distribution. Addressed. A separate trip assignment for employees was included.		
58.	No. 2.25 – Re 1.24 Section 3.0 a) Based on the information provided in the introduction section of the TIS, it will take approximately 8 to 16 years to complete the fill-in. The horizon year of 2026 and 2031 will be only 4 to 9 years (assuming it starts in 2022). To be conservative, a horizon year of 2038 should be reviewed (2022 plus 16 years). Addressed. Clarification was provided on the expected completion time and the study horizon years reviewed has been updated to 2028 and 2033 which are acceptable. b) It is unclear how the trips for the background development were determined. Please clarify how the trips for the background development was generated, distributed, and assigned. Partially addressed. Clarification was provided on the how the trips for the background development were determined. Traffic volume figures were provided from their traffic study. However, it is unclear from those figures the amount of site traffic that will be impacting the subject's study intersections. Please provide the relevant background site traffic volume excerpts from their respective studies. c) It appears there are other background developments within vicinity of the site that	Tylin	a) Based on a review of historical TMC data, no modification for COVID was deemed necessary, as explained above. b) Site traffic volume figures were not available from either background development study. Site traffic volumes were derived from the figures via the traffic entering/exiting the respective sites. Approach turning volume distributions from the extracted figures were used to derive the volumes impacting the study road network. A summary of these calculations has been appended to the background development appendix. c) Please see response to previous comment. d) Acknowledged. e) Acknowledged.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	should be included. In particular, we are concerned about the increase truck traffic from the USM site. Please review the Town's development application website and request the most recent transportation studies from the Town. All relevant excerpts for site traffic trip generation, assignment and distribution should be provided for each development. Partially addressed. The USM site was included as part of the background conditions. As per the comment above, please provide the relevant background site traffic volume excerpts from their respective studies. d) No growth was applied on Aurora Road. Please review historical counts and/or Town's Transportation Master Plan and/or Region's EMME model and provide justification for the assumed growth rate. Addressed. A growth rate was applied on Aurora and justification was provided. e) It appears no growth was applied to the left and right-turn movements at the York-Durham Line/Bloomington Road/Durham Highway 47 intersection. It is suggested that growth be applied to all movements at this intersection. Addressed. Growth was applied to all movements at the York-Durham Line/Bloomington Road/Durham Highway 47 intersection.		
59.	No. 2.26 – Re 1.25 Section 4.0 a) The assumed loads arriving on-site should be based on the existing data for arrivals. Please provide clarification on how the assumption of 500 to 1,000 loads per day was determined. Addressed. Clarification was provided on how the assumption of 500 to 1,000 loads per day was determined.	Tylin	a) Acknowledged. b) Acknowledged. c) Acknowledged. d) Acknowledged. e) Acknowledged.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	b) Based on 500 to 1,000 loads per day and a requirement of 800,000 truckloads to fill the site. This does not appear to equate to an 8 to 16-year timeline. Please clarify. Addressed. The timeline has clarified by the traffic. c) It appears the site trips are underestimated based on the existing hourly distribution. Please clarify the assumed inbound and outbound site trips in Table 4-1. Addressed. The site trips have been updated. d) Based on Figure 2-4 and Figure 2-5, the distribution to the north for fill trucks should be 0%. The distribution in Figure 4-1 appears to be consistent; however, Table 4-2 indicates 5% will be to/from the north. Please clarify. Addressed. Table 4-2 was updated to indicated 5% will be to/from the north and further clarification was provided on assignment. e) The required sight distances in Table 4-3 appear to be correct. Please provide an illustration of the existing sight distances on a plan. Addressed. An illustration was provided for the sight distance analysis.		
60.	No. 2.27 – Re 1.26 Section 6.0 a) The operations analysis should be updated based on the comments above. Partially addressed. The operation analysis should be updated as per the new comments above.	Tylin	a) Acknowledged. The files have been included. b) This was noted in the first TIS submission and was corrected in the second TIS submission. We note there is no statement of 'Addressed/Partly addressed' from the reviewer in the letter.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	b) Based on the Synchro reports in the appendices, it appears that exclusive eastbound right-turn and westbound right-turn lanes are modelled at the York-Durham Line/Regional Highway 47 intersection. However, based on a review of Google Maps, there are no exclusive right-turn lanes at those approaches. Please clarify.		
61.	No. 2.28 – Re 1.27 Section 8.0 a) Based on the volumes in Figure 5-2, the percentage of northbound lefts at north driveway on York-Durham Line is approximately 30% of all northbound traffic in AM peak hour. The MTO's nomograph provided in Appendix H for AM peak hour was 40%. As well, the volumes marked on the graph did not match the volumes in Figure 5-2. It appears a much shorter left-turn storage length is warranted. Please provide clarification for the left-turn warrant analysis and ensure that the proposed left-turn storage length can accommodate the project queue based on SimTraffic. Addressed. The left-turn warrant analysis was updated and there are no further comments. b) Please provide a preliminary design drawing for the proposed northbound left-turn lane at the north site driveway on York-Durham Line. Addressed. A preliminary design drawing for the proposed northbound left-turn lane at the north site driveway on York-Durham Line was provided. The design is subjected to Durham Region's review.	Tylin	a) Acknowledged. b) Acknowledged
Stormwater Management and Erosion Control – comments by Lana Russell, P.Eng.			
62.	No. 2.29 – Re 1.28 Although there are no concerns with stormwater management during the majority of the filling activities, a plan needs to be	Golder	Comment Addressed.

Jim Walls R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited May 20, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	prepared for the final proposed site grading. The report states that "final topographies will be graded in a manner that allows surface water to flow towards the central to southeast areas of the proposed site". However, based on the proposed Grading Plan (Drawing 3) stormwater runoff will be conveyed west once final grades are reached. What is the proposed stormwater management plan for the final stages? Have the adjacent properties to the west provided permission to allow stormwater flows to be conveyed across their property? The final Stormwater Management Plan should be provided. Addressed. The requirement of a stormwater management plan for the final elevations is to be provided prior to reaching the final proposed grades. This requirement is to be included as a condition of approval.		
63.	No. 2.30 – Re 1.29 Additional erosion and sediment details are required. An Erosion and Sediment Control drawing should be provided that shows the proposed location of silt fencing, and the mud mat/mud track out prevention at the proposed exit and the associated details. Partially addressed. Details for the mud mat at the proposed exit were not provided. We advise that an update to the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be required once filling reaches the final grades. Additional erosion and sediment controls will be required along the west property boundary to capture and treat stormwater runoff, which should be included in the final grade Stormwater Management Plan. Addressed. The requirement of a Stormwater Management Plan, including the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, for the final elevations is to be provided prior to reaching the final	Golder	Rumble plate details are included in Section 3.14.2 and their location is included on Drawing 2. A paved section of the exit route is now included on Drawing 2. Acknowledged. Acknowledged.

Jim Walls **R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited** **May 20, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	proposed grades. This requirement is to be included as a condition of approval. Refer to the red-line comments on Drawing 2 for additional details. Addressed.		
Proposed Final Grading Plan – comments by Lana Russell, P.Eng. and Bruce Alexander, C.E.T.			
64.	No. 2.31 – Re 1.30 A copy of the proposed final Grading Plan associated with the Site Alteration Permit to the west on the Lee Sand and Gravel site should be provided in the report to show how the final grades will match. Addressed on the revised Grading Plan.	Golder	Comment Addressed.
65.	No. 2.32 – Re 1.31 Additional details are required at the site boundaries. Refer to the red-line comments on Drawings 3 and 4. Addressed on the revised Grading Plan.	Golder	Comment Addressed.
Public Works Comments			
66.	No. 2.33 – Re 1.32 Comments will be provided directly to Planning.	MHBC	Acknowledged.

York Region **Acknowledgment and Approval Letter** **June 7, 2022**			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
67.	The following drawing forms part of this approval for **SP.21.W.0271** and is on file with the Commissioner of Transportation Services. • Site Alteration and Fill Management Plan, Site Alteration Plan, Drawing No.2, prepared by Golder Associates Ltd., dated April 2022.	MHBC	York Region Community Planning and Development Services has reviewed the drawings provided in support of the proposed application. Please refer to the signed acknowledgment and approval letter dated June 7, 2022 which has been included in the application submission.

York Region Acknowledgment and Approval Letter June 7, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
68.	The Owner agrees that any revisions made to the drawings after this approval shall be brought to the Regional Municipality of York's attention and the revised drawings submitted to the Region for approval. All drawings submitted for review are to be stamped, signed and dated by a Professional Engineer, in accordance with the Professional Engineers Act.	MHBC	Please refer to response to comment #67.
69.	This section of York Durham Line is under the jurisdiction of the Regional Municipality of Durham; therefore, all approvals for site works within the York Durham Line right-of-way must come from the Regional Municipality of Durham. As York Durham Line is a boundary road, York Region also has an interest in the approval and provides comments, as well.	MHBC	Please refer to response to comment #67.
Technical Conditions			
70.	The Owner agrees that no construction activities shall take place within the Region's Ninth Line right-of-way.	MHBC	Please refer to response to comment #67.
Securities, Insurance and Fees Conditions			
71.	The Owner agrees that this application is subject to payment of York Region's development applications processing fees identified in York Region Fee By-law 2020-04, as amended. **The fee for the application review is $3,300.000 minimum or 7% of the estimated cost of works on the York Region road allowance**, whichever is greater. Please forward a cheque in the amount of **$3,300.00** to the York Region Community Planning and Development Services, payable to **"The Regional Municipality of York"**, to the attention of the Development Engineering Application Coordinator. ***(York Region acknowledges receipt of Review Fee in the amount of $3,300.00)***	MHBC	Please refer to response to comment #67.
Utilities Conditions			
72.	If this site requires any service installation, connection or relocation, including hydro, telecommunications, gas, cable, water, sewers, etc. within York Region road allowance, the	MHBC	Please refer to response to comment #67.

York Region Acknowledgment and Approval Letter June 7, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	Owner must inform the affected utility company of the requirement to obtain approval from York Region, Community Planning and Development Services. The Owner must also contact **Matthew Aylett**, Utilities Coordinator with Transportation Services at 1-877-464-9675 ext 75959.		
73.	The Owner shall be responsible for determining the location of all utility plants within York Region right-of-way and for the cost of relocating, replacing, repairing and restoring any appurtenances damaged during construction of the proposed site works. The Owner must review, or ensure that any consultants retained by the Owner, review, at an early stage, the applicable authority's minimum vertical clearances for aerial cable systems and their minimum spacing and cover requirements. The Owner shall be entirely responsible for making any adjustments or relocations, if necessary, prior to the commencement of any construction.	MHBC	Please refer to response to comment #67.
Temporary/Construction Access Conditions			
74.	The Owner understands and agrees that access to the site must be gained from York Durham Line and that access to the site, permanent or otherwise from Ninth Line will not be permitted.	MHBC	Please refer to response to comment #67.
Other Conditions			
75.	The Owner agrees that these conditions of approval are applicable for a **maximum period of eighteen months from June 7, 2022**. Any extension to this approval period requires the consent of York Region and must be requested in writing by the applicant. Furthermore, all construction activities, on the Regional road allowance, including but not limited to, final restoration works, must be completed within a **maximum period of three months from the date of commencement of construction**. Any requests for extension of this timeline, requires the consent of York Region and must be requested in writing by the applicant.	MHBC	Please refer to response to comment #67.
76.	The Owner agrees to indemnify and hold harmless York Region, its elected and	MHBC	Please refer to response to comment #67.

York Region Acknowledgment and Approval Letter June 7, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
	appointed officials, employees, contractors and agents against any and all actions, causes of action, suits, orders, proceedings, claims, demands and damages whatsoever which may arise either directly or indirectly by reason of any of the work undertaken by or on behalf of the Owner with respect to this development proposal, including without limitation, any work undertaken within the Regional right-of-way.		
77.	The Owner shall be responsible for compliance with all applicable statutes and regulations, including without limitation, the *Construction Act*, the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*, the *Fisheries Act* (Canada), the *Environmental Protection Act*, and the *Ontario Water Resources Act*. The Owner, for the purposes of the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*, shall be designated as a Constructor and shall assume all of the responsibilities of the Constructor, as set out in that Act and its regulations. The Owner shall carry out or cause to be carried out all construction work in accordance with the requirements of the Act and regulations for construction projects.	MHBC	Please refer to response to comment #67.
78.	The Region, in connection with this approval, has reviewed the engineering submission, including but not limited to the engineering drawings submitted therewith. **The Region makes no guarantees, warranties or representations as to the completeness and/or accuracy of the engineering submission, and specifically does not certify the completeness or accuracy of any aspect or component of the engineering submission.** The Professional Engineer who stamped, signed and dated the submission is responsible for all aspects of its quality, completeness and accuracy.	MHBC	Please refer to response to comment #67.

Laura Tafreshi, Planner Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority July 21, 2022			
#	**Comment**	**Responder**	**Comment Response**
79.	No comments or submission requirements with respect to this application.	MHBC	Acknowledged

We trust the information provided in the tables above addresses the comments received from the commenting agencies on the application.

Regards,

Jonathan Pauk, HBASc, MSc, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner