Appendix B-9: Technical Agency, Local Municipalities and Utilities Correspondence and Meeting Minutes
## London BRT: Pre-Transit Project Assessment Process
### Agency Consultation Summary Table

The following tabulation is intended to summarize consultation activities with Agencies. All comments received, responses made and actions / commitments are detailed in this table with a complete Communications Record prepared as Appendix B of the Environmental Project Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Correspondence Between (include contact info)</th>
<th>Conversation Summary</th>
<th>Date / Response</th>
<th>Actions / Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-07-26</td>
<td>Kathryn Markham Management Biologist Aylmer District, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry</td>
<td>Completed an information request for Species at Risk, Significant Wildlife Habitat, In-water work timing windows, Natural Heritage Feature data, fish and mussel community data, thermal regime, flow regime, fisheries management plan, and water quality data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-09-05</td>
<td>Ron Tourigny Right of Way/Community Awareness Coordinator ESSO <a href="mailto:ron.tourigny@esso.ca">ron.tourigny@esso.ca</a></td>
<td>Requested information regarding impact of rapid transit project on Imperial’s pipeline in London and proposed construction schedule.</td>
<td>On 2017-09-05, A. Rosebrugh responded:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The RT project will not be impacting Imperial’s pipeline, as it ends at Fanshawe College, approximately a block south and west of the pipeline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 9.5.2 (pp.9-8 and 9-9) of the Rapid Transit Master Plan gives a high level overview of construction phasing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/shiftlondon/pages/149/attachments/original/1500429630/LondonRTMP_Chapter5s9to11.pdf">https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/shiftlondon/pages/149/attachments/original/1500429630/LondonRTMP_Chapter5s9to11.pdf?1500429630</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please let me know if there is any other information I can provide for you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-09-08</td>
<td>Brandon Tapp London Hydro <a href="mailto:tappb@londonhydro.com">tappb@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 2017-09-08 J. Heyninck wrote:</td>
<td>Added to mailing list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below are the coordinates and password for IBI Group’s ftp site from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-09-12</td>
<td>Yves Degassie</td>
<td>Special Project Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca">Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>On 2017-09-12 J. Ramsay submitted a letter requesting assistance in identifying potentially affected Aboriginal communities and an invitation to TAG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-09-12</td>
<td>Yves Degassie</td>
<td>Special Project Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>To process request for assistance in identifying potential affected Aboriginal communities, the following information was requested:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which you can download the most recent version of the rapid transit corridor drawings.

I must emphasize that these drawings are at a **conceptual level** only and have been prepared as part of the Rapid Transit Master Plan. The drawings are provided for general information only and should not be used for design purposes.

The next phase of the project which will occur over the next few months will result in a further evolution of the design to a preliminary engineering design level. Further effort will be required by the design team to address utility and servicing issues as part of this process.

Please let me know if you have any issues with the ftp site or are unable to download the drawings.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-09-13</td>
<td>Brandon Tapp</td>
<td>London Hydro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tappb@londonhydro.com">tappb@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td>Thank you for the conceptual design drawings. We will not use them to make any design decisions. They will simply be used for a preliminary impact assessment to see what conflicts may arise in the final design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-09-18</td>
<td>Yves Degassie</td>
<td>Special Project Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted a letter detailing Indigenous communities that may have an interest in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-09-28</td>
<td>Laura Hatcher</td>
<td>MTCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>I’m emailing to confirm that I’ve received the October 5 meeting invitation for the Technical Agencies Group for the City of London’s Rapid Transit TPAP, sent to me by Joe Muller. I look forward to participating. I am based in Toronto and I am wondering if it is possible for me to participate via teleconference? I am copying Chris Stack and Jo-Ann Hutchison from our Regional Services Office in London, since they had also sent us your invitation to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 2017-09-27 A. Rosebrugh responds: Thanks for your email. I will look into teleconference options for this meeting, and will be in touch to confirm. Added to the mailing list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-10-05</td>
<td>Rod Doyle</td>
<td>Senior Distribution Engineer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doyler@londonhydro.com">doyler@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td>Can you please send us copies (of FTP) CAD version of the SHIFT plans. The only versions I can find shared previously are in .pdf. Also, do your plans identify poles and guy wires in conflict?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 2017-10-06 J. Heyninck responds: – I did set up an ftp site for London Hydro a month or so ago – regardless – we will be setting up something here in the next day or so and all utillities will be circulated including London Hydro. All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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drawings will be CAD files referenced to City of London UTM coordinates.

The survey base plan that the RT corridor designs have been presented on is based on a recent topographic survey completed by the City of London specifically for RT. It should be noted that the topo and property information is more accurate than the typical OBM level of mapping that is used by the City for preliminary engineering design. The pole locations and guy wires have all been picked-up through the topo survey and are clearly shown on the base plans. Underground utility information shown is based on information provided by each utility to the City of London. It is my understanding that the individual firms that completed the field work and topo surveys for the City attempt to verify the underground plant locations where possible through field checks of manhole locations, pedestals, dips on poles etc.. The underground information is not based on field locates.

IBI and WSP have developed the preliminary corridor design for the purposes of completing the Master Plan and this design has been superimposed over the based plan outlined

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
above. The design team has not specifically identified or flagged any utility conflicts at this time.

You may see areas within the drawings where there are clear conflicts with hydro pole running lines. In some instances we may be able to avoid these conflicts by a slight shift in the alignment or a shift in the location of the sidewalks/pathways etc. This is all part of the process that we are now going through.

An email will be going out in the next day or two to all utilities with the coordinates and password for access to the ftp side.

**2017-10-06**

Joan Zhao  
Senior Real Estate Coordinator  
Hydro One  
joan.zhao@HydroOne.com

On 2017-10-06 J. Heyninck wrote:

We are currently working on the preliminary engineering design for the City of London’s Rapid Transit corridors.

One of the areas that we are coordinating from a design perspective, is the identification and resolution of potential utility conflicts with proposed rapid transit works.

Because of the size and significant of the infrastructure – there is one
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-10-06</td>
<td>Joan Zhao</td>
<td>I forwarded your request to the Head Office and will let you also upon hearing from them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydro One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-10-06</td>
<td>J. Heyninck responds:</td>
<td>Further to my recent email – please see a clearer version of the key plan. Also, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-10-13</td>
<td>Joan Zhao</td>
<td>Senior Real Estate Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-10-16</td>
<td>Joan Zhao</td>
<td>Senior Real Estate Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-10-16</td>
<td>Rob Elliot</td>
<td>Union Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-10-22</td>
<td>Rob Elliot</td>
<td>Union Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-10-31</td>
<td>Rob Elliot</td>
<td>Union Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-11-01</td>
<td>Rob Elliot</td>
<td>Union Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-11-14</td>
<td>Joan Zhao</td>
<td>Hydro One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-11-15</td>
<td>Yves Degassie</td>
<td>Special Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2017-11-17 | Joan Zhao  
Hydro One  
joan.zhao@HydroOne.com | Submitted plans of Hydro One facilities.  
On 2017-11-17 J. Heyninck responds:  
Thanks Joan for forwarding this information along. |                                                      |
| 2017-11-20 | Upper Thames River Conservation Authority | Meeting to discuss Environmental Impact Study, structures crossing watercourses and work within UTVCA regulated areas. | Minutes filed here:  
J:\37176_LondonRT_EA\5.0 Design (Work) \Phase\Consultation\TPAP - Pre-Planning\Agency\Meeting Notes\2017-11-20_UTRCA |
The Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) meeting on October 5, 2017 requested feedback on nine focus areas.

London Hydro wants to emphasize our concerns with the amount of resources, costs, cash flow, and project scheduling required for the BRT/SHIFT. Our engineering manager will be attending the November 22nd meeting to discuss these concerns in more detail.

Outlined below is London Hydro's initial (high-level) comments for the nine focus areas.

Overall Comment

- We are assuming maintenance holes (MHs) within or encroaching near the BRT lanes are not in conflict since they are not within the BRT station ramps.
- The details outlined below may change during detailed design.

1. **Western University**
   - The electrical distribution within Western’s property is owned and operated by Western. Please check with Western how the BRT plan affects their plant.
   - At Richmond St., London Hydro will require to relocate poles on both sides of Richmond St. Easements will be required on all
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties on the east side of Richmond St.</th>
<th>2. Richmond St. North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: Is the City of London placing streetlights along Richmond? If yes, is the City willing to share pole locations with London Hydro?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o London Hydro will require to relocate all poles on the west side closer to the property lines but no easements are required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o London Hydro will require to build a new pole line on the east side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Tree trimming or removals (depending on specific circumstances) will be required throughout the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Clearances between buildings through Huron St. intersection may require burying plant. Easements will be required on both sides of Richmond St. north of Huron St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Richmond Row</th>
<th>4. Downtown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Some maintenance holes (MH) are in the BRT lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o One MH is in a proposed parking lane. We are assuming this location is not in conflict since it’s not within a BRT station ramp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Forks of The Thames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Some maintenance holes (MH) are in the BRT lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One transformer vault is in a proposed parking lane. Relocating this will be very difficult. Lowering the grade to accommodate street parking may require lowering the vault grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One MH is located within a planned station ramp at northeast corner of Queens Ave. and Clarence St. Relocating this MH will be costly. We are assuming our running line under the BRT station ramp can remain in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Wellington South (Thames River to Baseline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- London Hydro will require to rebuild, and add, concrete duct structure across Wellington bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o MH south of bridge is encroaching northbound BRT lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Poles on cross-streets will require relocating further away from Wellington Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Easements are required for guying on 161 Grand Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Question: If poles south of Grand Ave. on the west side of Wellington require any further movement west, then London Hydro will require to bury the plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o For the identified property impacts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Old East Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Relocate north side pole line to south side of road or bury plant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

underground supplied.
- East side could be resupplied from rear yards. Each property will require work. Further engineering investigation is needed.
- Easements are required for relocated plant at 712 Wetter Ave.
  - Between Wetter Ave. and Baseline Rd.
    - London Hydro will require to bury its plant as a duct and MH system.
    - Easements will be required for equipment.
    - Each building remaining will require work at each site to convert the service to underground supplied.
8. Potential Park 'N' Ride

- Question: Is the City of London obtaining property rights from White Oaks Mall on the west side? London Hydro would require to relocate the pole line through the parking lot's easterly car parking spots that front Wellington Rd.
- London Hydro will relocate pole lines on both sides of Wellington Rd. (assuming no property restrictions on west side).
- Easements will be required on the west side. Pole line will be relocated to private property.
- If west side pole line cannot be relocated due to property restrictions, then we London Hydro will require to bury plant.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-11-20</th>
<th>Joan Zhao</th>
<th>Hydro One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:joan.zhao@HydroOne.com">joan.zhao@HydroOne.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spot easements will be required for equipment.**

**9. Fanshawe College**

- Pole line west of Ayreswood Ave. can be relocated further south but will require easements from 850 Highbury Ave.
- All plant between Ayreswood Ave. and east of Second St. will require to be relocated to underground as a duct and MH system.
  - Various easements will be required from a number of properties for equipment placement.

**Do you see possibility that this project will require modification/relocation of Hydro One’s facilities?**

We wonder who else/which group from Hydro One would join the meeting (via call in) tomorrow, as Gian indicated he can’t make it.

**On 2017-11-20 J. Heyninck responds:**

I think we will work hard to avoid any conflicts with this utility as I am sure that the costs of any modifications will be quite high. It's too early at this stage to confirm 100% that any conflicts can be avoided.

The Technical Advisory Meeting is Wednesday. Anyone that deals with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agency / Contact Details</th>
<th>Comments / Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-11-21</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry</td>
<td>Infrastructure planning could attend. If nobody from Hydro One is available we can touch base with Gian afterwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-12-18</td>
<td>Joseph Muller, Heritage Planner, Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, <a href="mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca">Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Is there any deadline for comments? I took a quick look but couldn't find one. As well, from pages 11-on to the end of the file, images in the Archaeology-Heritage PDF are inverted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-12-18</td>
<td>Joseph Muller, Heritage Planner, Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, <a href="mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca">Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>On 2017-12-18 B. Hollingworth responds: If you can provide comments by January 26th that would be great. Sooner would be even better. Thanks for pointing out the image issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-12-19</td>
<td>Bill Rayburn, Middlesex County CAO, <a href="mailto:cao@mdlsx.ca">cao@mdlsx.ca</a></td>
<td>Is the BRT team reviewing the provision of parking for rural residents that want to use BRT at the extremity of the system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-12-19</td>
<td>Bill Rayburn, Middlesex County CAO, <a href="mailto:cao@mdlsx.ca">cao@mdlsx.ca</a></td>
<td>On 2017-12-20 J. Ramsay responds: The Bus Rapid Transit Plan is currently reviewing options for BRT turnaround for each of the four transit nodes in the north, south, east and west. Turnaround options under review for the South leg of the BRT system include options where bus turning at the end of the route would be accommodated within a Park and Ride facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added to the mailing list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role/Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-12-20</td>
<td>Marcel Meyer</td>
<td>Thames Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-01-02</td>
<td>Davor Alisic</td>
<td>NBM Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-01-12</td>
<td>Carlos Simoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The City of London is currently undertaking an Environmental Assessment for the implementation of a Bus Rapid Transit system. Phases 1 and 2 of the Environmental Assessment were satisfied by the approval of the London Rapid Transit Master Plan by London City Council on July 25th, 2017. The Rapid Transit Master Plan defined the Rapid Transit network, including which streets will have dedicated lanes for transit, and that buses are the preferred transit technology.

The City is currently undertaking the pre-planning activities in preparation for the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) (Ontario Regulation 231/08). This work includes the development and evaluation of design alternatives for the approved Bus Rapid Transit network. We are also completing technical studies to assess potential impacts, identify mitigation and monitoring requirements.

Consultation with stakeholders and property owners is an important part of the process.
We have identified five Canada Post facilities along the approved Bus Rapid Transit network, as shown in the map below:
1. London Letter Carrier Depot 4, 720 Proudfoot Lane
2. London Letter Carrier Depot 6, 300 Wellington Street
3. Postal Station, 387 Wellington Road South, Unit 387A
4. London Processing Facility, 951 Highbury Avenue
5. London Divisional Office, 955 Highbury Avenue

For the first three facilities, potential impacts may include changes to traffic patterns during construction, and changes to access after construction.

For the facilities on Highbury Avenue, potential impacts may include property required to widen Highbury Avenue to accommodate dedicated transit lanes.

Attached are the conceptual engineering designs for the roads adjacent to each of the above noted properties. We would like to meet with you to review the design, and in particular along Highbury Avenue and potential impacts to Canada Post.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Meeting Details</th>
<th>Minutes Filed Here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2018-01-15 | Rob Elliott  
Union Gas  
roelliot@uniongas.com | Meeting to review conflicts between existing Union Gas infrastructure and the future BRT routes. | J:\37176_LondonRT_EA\5.0 Design (Work) Phase\Consultation\TPAP - Pre-Planning\Agency and Utilities\Meeting Notes\2018-01-15 - Union Gas.pdf |
| 2018-01-16 | Rod Doyle  
London Hydro  
doyler@londonhydro.com  
Sunny Patel  
London Hydro  
patels@londonhydro.com  
Boyan Brkic  
NBM Engineering  
boyanb@nbmengineering.com  
Davor Alisic  
NBM Engineering  
davora@nbmengineering.com | Meeting to review conflicts between existing London Hydro infrastructure and the future BRT routes. | J:\37176_LondonRT_EA\5.0 Design (Work) Phase\Consultation\TPAP - Pre-Planning\Agency and Utilities\Meeting Notes\London Hydro\2018-01-16  London Hydro |
| 2018-01-16 | Kristine Lowe  
Canada Post | I received your email from Carlos Simoes. He is our Facility Manager for Central Canada and                                             | On 2018-01-26 B. Hollingworth responds:                                                                                      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>From/To</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-01-25</td>
<td>Joseph Muller</td>
<td>I have taken a look at the PIC materials as posted, and attach prior comments for background. I do note that the focus on cultural constraints for built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes as outlined in the archaeology-heritage mapping is on previously identified listed and designated properties, and previously identified heritage conservation districts. Included in the scope of environmental assessments is the identification and evaluation of properties and landscapes of potential cultural heritage value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca">Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kristine.lowe@canadapost.postescanada.ca">kristine.lowe@canadapost.postescanada.ca</a></td>
<td>I am responsible for the Real Estate Planning for Central. I left you a voicemail as well, wasn’t sure which is the best way to connect. I understand that you would like to meet which is no problem but this week is not good for me. Next week is a bit better, and right now I think Wednesday may be my only available day. Otherwise the following week looks better. Let me know what works for you and hopefully we can find a common date/time to connect. Please keep in mind that I live in the GTA area so I will need some time to make the drive to London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We are in the process of drafting the Cultural Heritage Screening Report, and updating the Stage 1 &amp; 2 archaeology assessment. The draft reports will go to London’s Advisory Committee on Heritage for review and comment in February. Once in a final draft form, we will circulate to you for review and comment. Regarding the segment of Oxford between Wharncliffe and Platt’s Lane, this section is likely to be the last portion constructed, which would be between 2025 and 2028. Note that we are reviewing the implementation schedule in context with other capital improvement plans across the City, and will have an updated construction phasing plan in the draft Environmental Project Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 2018-01-26 B. Hollingworth responds: E-mail 1: I will consult with our heritage planner and provide an answer. Email 2: Thanks for following up. We are in the process of drafting the Cultural Heritage Screening Report, and updating the Stage 1 &amp; 2 archaeology assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or interest (and as noted in my letter of September 18, 2017). Have you any updates on my prior comments (which I’m reiterating here)?

As well, I note that for the segment of Oxford between Wharncliffe and Platt’s Lane, 7 listed and 1 designated properties will be impacted regardless as to the alternative selected. Can you describe the nature of these impacts? What will be the timing of heritage impact assessments on these properties, if warranted?

Please contact me if you have any questions or would like to further discuss the file/project.

The draft reports will go to London’s Advisory Committee on Heritage for review and comment in February. Once in a final draft form, we will circulate to you for review and comment.

Regarding the segment of Oxford between Wharncliffe and Platt’s Lane, this section is likely to be the last portion constructed, which would be between 2025 and 2028. Note that we are reviewing the implementation schedule in context with other capital improvement plans across the City, and will have an updated construction phasing plan in the draft Environmental Project Report.

| 2018-01-30 | Andrew Zuk  
Bell Canada  
[Andrew.zuk@bell.ca](mailto:Andrew.zuk@bell.ca) | Meeting to review conflicts between existing Bell infrastructure and the future BRT routes. | On 2018-02-07 J. Heyninck wrote: 
Please see attached meeting notes. Let me know if you have any comments. | Minutes filed here: 
J:\37176_LondonRT_EA\5.0 Design (Work) Phase\Consultation\TPAP - Pre-Planning\Agency and Utilities\Meeting Notes\2018-01-30 Bell.pdf |
| 2018-01-31 | Davor Alisic  
NBM Engineering  
davora@nbmengineering.com | RE: London Hydro  
Do you have any updates regarding the areas under review, we just want to make sure that we are able to meet your proposed deadline. | On 2018-02-01 J. Heyninck responds:  
We are currently going through our drawings to highlight those areas under review. Having said that, we do not want to impact on the delivery of information for the 16th of
### London BRT: Pre-Transit Project Assessment Process
#### Agency Consultation Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Notes and Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-01-31</td>
<td>Kristine Lowe, Canada Post and Nicholas Sirenko, Canada Post</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss Canada Post properties located along the 24 km of proposed RT corridor and identify potential impacts and mitigation measures where appropriate.</td>
<td>Minutes filed here: J:37176_LondonRT_EA\5.0 Design (Work) Phase\Consultation\TPAP - Pre-Planning\Agency and Utilities\Meeting Notes\Canada Post\2018-01-31 Canada Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-01-31</td>
<td>Bonnie Wludyka, Citi Plaza / Avison Young</td>
<td>Meeting to provide an update on the BRT project and review conceptual design options for the downtown area.</td>
<td>Minutes filed here: J:37176_LondonRT_EA\5.0 Design (Work) Phase\Consultation\TPAP - Pre-Planning\Individual Meetings\2018-01-31_Citi_Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-07</td>
<td>Rob Elliott, Union Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td>On 2018-02-07 J. Heyninck wrote: Please see attached meeting notes. Let me know if you have any comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-08</td>
<td>Andrew Zuk, Bell Canada</td>
<td>Thank you for providing the meeting minutes. I do not have any comments on the minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Participant(s)</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Minutes filed here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-09</td>
<td>Michael Nadeau, MTO, <a href="mailto:Michael.nadeau@ontario.ca">Michael.nadeau@ontario.ca</a>, Robert Bakalarczyk, MTO, Robert@<a href="mailto:bakalarczyk@ontario.ca">bakalarczyk@ontario.ca</a>, Dan Barber, MTO, <a href="mailto:Dan.barber@ontario.ca">Dan.barber@ontario.ca</a>, Steve Haight, OPP, <a href="mailto:Steve.Haight@opp.ca">Steve.Haight@opp.ca</a></td>
<td>Meeting to discuss opportunities to develop a Park N Ride Facility off Exeter Road on lands adjacent to the existing OPP Station and the Hydro One transmission corridor.</td>
<td>J:\37176\LondonRT_EA\5.0 Design (Work) Phase\Consultation\TPAP - Pre-Planning\Agency and Utilities\Meeting Notes\OPP\2018-02-09 OPP Park N Ride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-09</td>
<td>Staff Sargent Steve Haight, OPP, <a href="mailto:Steve.Haight@opp.ca">Steve.Haight@opp.ca</a></td>
<td>On 2018-02-09 J. Heyninck wrote: Please find attached digital versions of the two figures that we presented at today’s meeting.</td>
<td>J:\37176\LondonRT_EA\5.0 Design (Work) Phase\Consultation\TPAP - Pre-Planning\Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Meeting Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-09</td>
<td>Joseph Muller (MTCS) <a href="mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca">Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>We look forward to hearing back from you.</td>
<td>Meetings\2018-02-02_MTO_OPP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-12</td>
<td>Joseph Muller (MTCS) <a href="mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca">Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Much appreciated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-12</td>
<td>Joseph Muller (MTCS) <a href="mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca">Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>I’m not able to attend [TAG] in person, nor to I see a teleconference option. My one observation is that, while much of the study area is in areas previously disturbed, the age of some portion of this can become of archaeological interest (my example being where the Waterloo LRT work exposed corduroy roads below King Street in portions of the corridor, impacting project schedules. The updated archaeology management plan for the City (recently drafted?) may prove useful for guidance on such potential resources.</td>
<td>On 2018-02-14 J. Ramsay responds: This particular session of TAG was highly technical with our direct utility partners relating to costing of utility/BRT conflicts. For that reason, we gave an out to the other TAG members not directly impacted by this matter. We appreciate your feedback and I’ve copied both City heritage staff and our consultant team for information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-15</td>
<td>Michael Nadeau (MTO) <a href="mailto:Michael.nadeau@ontario.ca">Michael.nadeau@ontario.ca</a> Robert Bakalarczyk (MTO) &lt;Robert@<a href="mailto:bakalarczyk@ontario.ca">bakalarczyk@ontario.ca</a>&gt; Dan Barber (MTO) <a href="mailto:Dan.barber@ontario.ca">Dan.barber@ontario.ca</a> Joan Zhao (Hydro One Networks Inc.) <a href="mailto:Joan.zhao@hydroone.com">Joan.zhao@hydroone.com</a></td>
<td>Meeting discuss opportunities to develop a Park N Ride Facility off Exeter Road on lands adjacent to the existing OPP Station and the Hydro One transmission corridor.</td>
<td>Minutes filed here: J:\37176_LondonRT_EA\5.0 Design (Work) Phase\Consultation\TPAP - Pre-Planning\Agency and Utilities\Meeting Notes\Hydro One\ 2018-02-12 HONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name(s)</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Email(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-21</td>
<td>Janette McDonald</td>
<td>Downtown London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Janette@downtownlondon.ca">Janette@downtownlondon.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Thomas</td>
<td>Downtown London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisa@downtownlondon.ca">lisa@downtownlondon.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Sercombe</td>
<td>Downtown London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew@downtownlondon.ca">andrew@downtownlondon.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerald Gallagher</td>
<td>Downtown London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gerald@downtownlondon.ca">gerald@downtownlondon.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Sheffield</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:nico@downtownlondon.ca">nico@downtownlondon.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob User</td>
<td>Convent Garden Market</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bobuser@conventmarket.com">bobuser@conventmarket.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>Upper Thames River Conservation Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-03-07</td>
<td>Rod Doyle</td>
<td>London Hydro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doyler@londonhydro.com">doyler@londonhydro.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>TPAP - Pre-Planning</td>
<td>Individual Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-03-07</td>
<td>Andrew Zuk</td>
<td>Bell Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Andrew.zuk@bell.ca">Andrew.zuk@bell.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>Yves Degassie</td>
<td>Special Project Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Assessment Services
MOECC
Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca

Thank you for coming to London last week to attend our Technical Advisory Group stakeholder session. As a follow up, our team would like to update you on the upcoming timeline for our Rapid Transit project.

We are presently wrapping up pre-planning activities with the Draft Environmental Project Report schedule to go before Council on Tuesday, April 10. Following Council endorsement of the Draft EPR, the complete report will be forwarded to MOECC for technical review later that same week. Our goal is to aim for late May to early June to issue Notice of Commencement and begin formal TPAP consultation.

We appreciate that your office needs time to assemble a technical review team and want to give you sufficient notice of our submission timeline.

2018-03-08
Yves Degassie
Special Project Officer
Environmental Assessment Services
MOECC
Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca

Regarding the timeline for the Notice of Commencement, as discussed with Margaret Parkhill, there is nothing that prevents a proponent from issuing a Notice of Commencement for a project. However due to the elections and the dissolution of the legislature at the call of the election (anticipated this May), there is no guaranty that a government will be in place to make decisions for the project. Therefore, I would

On 2018-04-04 J. Ramsay responds:

Thank you for your response. We appreciate the feedback. In the interim, we want to continue moving the project forward to be TPAP ready and further to that, I would like to advise you of a slight adjustment to our timing.
suggest not to issue any notice that will trigger a Minister’s review period until the end of the elections.
Please let me know if you would like to discuss this further.

The Draft EPR is now scheduled to go before London City Council two weeks later on April 24th, after which, the complete Draft EPR will be forwarded to MOECC for technical review. You should receive the report by April 27th.

We respect your team’s time and want to give you advance notice of our adjusted timeline for submission so that you are able to adjust available resources, as necessary, to complete the technical review within the anticipated 5-6 week timeline.

### Agency Consultation Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact Person(s)</th>
<th>Meeting Details</th>
<th>Minutes Filed Here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>Roderick Crichton</td>
<td>Meeting to address conflicts between existing LDE infrastructure and the future BRT routes.</td>
<td>J:\37176_LondonRT_EA\5.0 Design (Work) Phase\Consultation\TPAP - Pre-Planning\Individual Meetings\2018-03-08_London_District_Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London District Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Roderick.crichton@londonde.ca">Roderick.crichton@londonde.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-03-12</td>
<td>Rob Elliot</td>
<td>Meeting to review cost estimates to address conflicts between existing Union Gas infrastructure and the future BRT routes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:roelliot@uniongas.com">roelliot@uniongas.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-03-13</td>
<td>Jeff Davis</td>
<td>I’ve been made aware that City of London is considering locations for a future Park N’ Ride.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio Real Estate Manager</td>
<td>As one of the potential locations is in the area of the Crown lands/OPP detachment located at 823 Exeter Rd, could you please include me as the first point of contact for this location moving forward?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure Ontario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeff.davis@infrastructureontario.ca">jeff.davis@infrastructureontario.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-03-13</td>
<td>Andrew Zuk</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.zuk@bell.ca">andrew.zuk@bell.ca</a></td>
<td>On 2018-03-13 J. Heyninck wrote:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In reviewing Bell costs, we have a couple of requests:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it possible to break down the Bell costs for manhole replacements based on the degree of complication with costs adjusted accordingly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i.e. Minor: $ 500,000; Average: 1,000,000 and Complex: $ 1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As we go through the design and face decisions wrt to whether a particular manhole is an issue or not from an operational perspective – it would be beneficial to have an appreciation as to the extent of work anticipated. Surely not all manholes are going to be worth $ 1.0M to replace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are you able to provide a general breakdown for the costs with respect to labour and materials; it is generally a 60-40 or 50-50 split for these items?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-03-14</td>
<td>Abdul Salak</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Abdul.salak@rci.rogers.com">Abdul.salak@rci.rogers.com</a></td>
<td>Meeting to review cost estimates to address conflicts between existing Rogers infrastructure and the future BRT routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-03-15</td>
<td>Andrew Zuk</td>
<td>Bell Canada</td>
<td>Yes I can provide a further high level breakdown for the manhole relocation costs however I will not be able to compile this until next week. I can also look into a breakdown of labour vs. material costs and provide this information next week. I would expect the overall cost for the Bell relocations will be significantly lower than the provided quote given a significant amount of manholes downtown shown to be relocated will not be feasible given other utilities within the area. As for the high costs the physical structure of the manhole replacement is only a small portion of the anticipated work as we will be required to replace the cabling/conduit structure to adjacent manhole and transferring services from existing cable to new. This is a significant amount of work to provide a new path on each side of the new manhole to adjacent existing manholes as well as the new cabling and will account for a significant portion of the manhole relocation cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dylan McCarthy
NBM Engineering
dylanm@nbmengineering.com

Michael Jezerinac
NBM Engineering
mjjezerinac@nbmengineering.com

J:\37176_LondonRT_EA\5.0 Design (Work) Phase\Consultation\TPAP - Pre-Planning\Individual Meetings\2018-03-14_Rogers_Cable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Mailing list Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-04-05</td>
<td>Yves Degassie</td>
<td>Special Project Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca">Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Assessment Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOECC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-04-05</td>
<td>Monique van der Zanden</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Monique.vanderZanden@ontario.ca">Monique.vanderZanden@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Please update your contact list to replace Brian Goudeseune with Michael Swim as the contact for the Ministry of Transportation in regards to London's Bus Rapid Transit?</td>
<td>Mailing list updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-04-25</td>
<td>Yves Degassie</td>
<td>Special Project Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca">Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Please see attached, the draft EPR review instruction. Note that, in order to stick to the timelines, the City is required to provide this documentation no later than April 27, 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Assessment Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOECC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-04-26</td>
<td>Ian Fleming</td>
<td>Zayo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:utility.circulations@zayo.com">utility.circulations@zayo.com</a></td>
<td>Zayo has facilities in the areas indicated in the report. Please keep us informed as the project progresses so that we may mitigate impacts to our plant.</td>
<td>Added to the mailing list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-04-27</td>
<td>Yves Degassie</td>
<td>Special Project Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca">Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Please see attached for the updated list for the draft EPR circulation.           On 2018-04-27 J. Ramsay responds: thank you for forwarding the Draft EPR circulation list.  We have begun assembling the requested hard and digital copies for the Ministry reviewers identified in your correspondence and are aiming to have the materials delivered to the London and Toronto MOECC offices before close-of-business on Monday, April 30.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Assessment Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOECC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-04-27</td>
<td>Joan Zhao</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joan.zhao@HydroOne.com">joan.zhao@HydroOne.com</a></td>
<td>This is in response to your question of future plan on the underground facilities (W36/W37) in the vicinity where London BRT will be constructed. Please be advised currently Hydro One has no plan to replace W36/W37 in the next five years. Our preliminary finding is the u/g facilities were built in late 1970's, comprising of oil filled 230kV copper conductors inside 8” dia. steel casings. We trust that prior to construction you will take necessary actions, including confirming the exact spec. and undertaking test pits at selected locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-04-27</td>
<td>Andy Paterson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Andrew.Paterson@canadapostostrst.postescanada.ca">Andrew.Paterson@canadapostostrst.postescanada.ca</a></td>
<td>I was speaking with Heather a couple of days ago regarding possible impacts of the BRT on Canada Post’s delivery routes downtown and other areas. Heather was very helpful and I understand you have had some conversations with other Canada Post representatives from Real Estate. I spoke with them but our local mail collection and delivery group has some questions and would like to meet with your appropriate staff to discuss and get a better idea of any impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 2018-04-30 H. Beecroft responds: I will send through a meeting request to you shortly and you can forward to your team as needed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Email</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-04-30</td>
<td>Yves Degassie</td>
<td>Special Project Officer</td>
<td>New list _ Name changed- London District Supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOECC</td>
<td>[Letter attached with list of Ministry reviewers.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-07</td>
<td>Andy Paterson</td>
<td>Canada Post</td>
<td>Meeting held with Canada Post operational staff to review the 24 km BRT corridor and identify potential impacts and mitigation measures where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steve McCallum</td>
<td>Canada Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liz Morrison</td>
<td>Canada Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jason Simon</td>
<td>Canada Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hollman</td>
<td>Canada Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**London BRT: Pre-Transit Project Assessment Process**  
**Agency Consultation Summary Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
<th>Email(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-10</td>
<td>Susan Mark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.mark@tvdsb.ca">s.mark@tvdsb.ca</a></td>
<td>On 2018-05-10 A. Rammeloo emails: Thank you for meeting with us yesterday, it was very helpful. I have attached the digital file with the two options we reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlo Henriquez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:c.henriquez@tvdsb.ca">c.henriquez@tvdsb.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thames Valley District School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-11</td>
<td>Susan Mark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.mark@tvdsb.ca">s.mark@tvdsb.ca</a></td>
<td>Thanks for sending this, we will be reviewing it next week with senior administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thames Valley District School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2018-05-11 | Andy Patterson                       | andy.patterson@canadapost.ca                  | On 2018-05-11 J. Hodgins emails:  
Please find attached a summary of the meeting held between the City of London, IBI Group and Canada Post on May 7, 2018.  
Also, as discussed at the meeting, the most recent BRT design drawings can be found on our website: [https://www.shiftlondon.ca/brt_epr](https://www.shiftlondon.ca/brt_epr) (Appendix A). |
|            | Steve McCallum                       | steve.mccallum@canadapost.ca                  |                                                                                                            |
|            | Canada Post                          |                                               |                                                                                                            |
| 2018-05-14 | Mark Snowsell                        |                                               | On 2018-05-14 A. Rammeloo emails:                                                                                                                                   |
EEPAC requested that Rapid Transit circulate the draft EIS to the UTRCA for review of the water balance information, particularly at Site 6 Westminster Ponds. I have provided a link below to where it is posted online, it is Appendix G. As well, I would like to point your attention to the draft stormwater management report in Appendix L, and the geotechnical report in Appendix F, at the same link. Much of the discussion on water balance for Westminster Ponds is in the stormwater report. Any comments or concerns you have would be appreciated as we move forward in the TPAP process.

https://www.shiftlondon.ca/brt_epr

If you would like to meet to discuss this, please let me know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-16</td>
<td>Susan Mark</td>
<td>Carlos and I met with senior administration on Tuesday and the concept of Option 4 was the selected. When Carlos and I had met with yourself and Jaden, we had also highlighted the following regarding Option 4: Moving the road that connects with Sparton Street further to the west and possibly route it through the existing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.mark@tvdsb.ca">s.mark@tvdsb.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thames Valley District School Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos and I met with senior administration on Tuesday and the concept of Option 4 was the selected. When Carlos and I had met with yourself and Jaden, we had also highlighted the following regarding Option 4: Moving the road that connects with Sparton Street further to the west and possibly route it through the existing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name and Role</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2018-05-25 | Yves Dagssie, Special Project Officer, Environmental Assessment Services Section, Environmental Approvals & Permissions Branch, Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks | Board’s parking lots located on the west side of the 1250 Dundas.  
- Reconfiguration of this parking lot on the west side to accommodate the road.  
- Additional parking spaces on the north side of 1250 Dundas.  
- U-turn at Ashland Ave. intersection.  

Thanks, let us know next steps. Ideally, we would like to review more detailed drawings for Option 4 when they are completed.  

On 2018-07-25 J. Ramsay emails:  
Further to my voicemail from this morning, I wanted to follow up with you to check in on how the Draft EPR review is going and update you on our preparations for TPAP.  

We are preparing to issue the Notice of Commencement Thursday, June 7th which will allow the standard two week notice to host a PIC on Thursday, June 21st. It was important that our formal PIC be offered before school gets out so that it can provide a kick-off to TPAP consultation that will continue through the summer with weekly drop-in sessions.  

Can we arrange a time next week to connect to get a sense of whether there are any major comments coming back.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-25</td>
<td>Yves Dagssie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Yves.dagssie@ontario.ca">Yves.dagssie@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Sorry I missed your call. Please find below the timelines for the TPAP review as planned on July 11, 2017 (see attached).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please note that the purpose of the draft review is to avoid fundamental concerns or disagreement being raised at a later stage in the process. So far only the Noise and Vibration assessment has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lest connect on Monday to discuss this further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have a great weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for your response. We'll look forward to receiving comments around the anticipated date of June 7th per the schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further to the voicemail I just left for you, we’d like to go ahead and schedule a time to walk through the comments once they’re released. We are not available the weeks of June 11th and 18th, but the week of June 25th works well as I’m planning to be in Toronto for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Submission Phase - City of London Rapid Transit Project Assessment Process</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 City to contact the director of MOECC Approval Branch for a list of bodies to assist in identifying potential affected Aboriginal Communities.</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Aboriginal Consultation Delegation Letter Provided</td>
<td>September 18, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 City to communicate his intention of submitting draft EPR for review and comment and provide draft submission date to the MOECC Officer.</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Email Received</td>
<td>March 8, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

meetings anyways. This timing also works well, in that it will give our team some time to review the comments in advance of meeting, helping to support constructive discussion.

If you can let us know who you would like to include from your team and their availability the week of June 25th, we can make arrangements to host. I understand that IBI’s Toronto office is just around the corner from yours for those that can join in person and others can be conferenced in.
|   |   | London BRT: Pre-Transit Project Assessment Process  
   |   | Agency Consultation Summary Table  
   | 3 | Three (3) Weeks Period initiated for Project Officer to Finalised Project Team (Tech Team) for Draft Technical Review and Comment…  
   | 4 | MOECC officer to provide the City with instructions (Distribution List and draft EPR format requirements) on how to circulate the draft EPR to MOECC Technical reviewer.  
   |   | MOECC  
   |   | Provide  
   |   | April, 24, 2018  
   | 5 | City to send draft EPR to the list as per MOECC instructions  
   |   | City of London  
   |   | Received  
   |   | April 30, 2018  
   | 6 | Five (5) Weeks Draft EPR Review and Comment Period Initiated  
   | 7 | MOECC project team to send comments/rec ommendation on Draft EPR  
   | MOECC  
   | Anticipated  
   | June 7, 2018  

MOECC: Ministry of Environmental Change and Clean Energy

1. Three (3) Weeks Period initiated for Project Officer to Finalised Project Team (Tech Team) for Draft Technical Review and Comment…
2. MOECC officer to provide the City with instructions (Distribution List and draft EPR format requirements) on how to circulate the draft EPR to MOECC Technical reviewer.
3. City to send draft EPR to the list as per MOECC instructions.
4. MOECC project team to send comments/recommendation on Draft EPR.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-25</td>
<td>Mike Bloxam</td>
<td>Advisory Committee on the Environment</td>
<td>I’m the backup for ACE and plan to attend; however, I think we will be discussing at our meeting on June 6th to confirm representatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-05-29</td>
<td>Karina Černiavskaja</td>
<td>District Planner, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, Aylmer District</td>
<td>Could you please add <a href="mailto:mnrf.ayl.planners@ontario.ca">mnrf.ayl.planners@ontario.ca</a> to your distribution list.</td>
<td>On 2018-05-30 J. Ramsay responds: Certainly. Add <a href="mailto:mnrf.ayl.planners@ontario.ca">mnrf.ayl.planners@ontario.ca</a> to the mailing list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-06-01</td>
<td>Yves Dagssie</td>
<td>Special Project Officer, Environmental Assessment Services Section, Environmental Approvals &amp; Permissions Branch</td>
<td>The week of June 25 should work. Solange Desautels will be joining. I will provide the other attendees names once I have confirmed their availabilities.</td>
<td>On 2018-06-01 J. Ramsay responds: Thanks Yves. Have a great weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks <a href="mailto:Yves.dagssie@ontario.ca">Yves.dagssie@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Also find attached our Noise and Vibration comments in advance to our meeting for your review. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-06-05 Rod Doyle Senior Distribution Engineer London Hydro <a href="mailto:doyler@londonhydro.com">doyler@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td>Can you please forward to me a .pdf copy of the concept drawings illustrating the King &amp; Wellington St. BRT station. I'm unable to find a copy of the drawings and the FTP site is now closed.</td>
<td>On 2018-06-06 M. Cooper responds: Please find the attached pdf as per your request.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Ron,

The RT project will not be impacting Imperial’s pipeline, as it ends at Fanshawe College, approximately a block south and west of the pipeline.

Section 9.5.2 (pp.9-8 and 9-9) of the Rapid Transit Master Plan gives a high level overview of construction phasing:

https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/shiftlondon/pages/149/attachments/original/1500429630/LondonRTMP_Chapters9to11.pdf?1500429630

Please let me know if there is any other information I can provide for you.

Thanks,

Andrea

Hi Andrea, please let me know if your rapid transit project will be impacting Imperial’s pipeline in London. Also, what is your proposed construction schedule?

Thx,

Thx,

Ron

Ron Tourigny
Right of Way/Community Awareness Coordinator
100 Concession 5 East
Waterdown ON L8B 1K5
ron.tourigny@esso.ca P 587-476-1821 C 905-730-8818 F 905-689-3553
imperialoil.ca Twitter YouTube
Good afternoon Ron,

Please see the attached letter, which I am sending on behalf of Jennie Ramsay, Project Director, Rapid Transit.

Please send your response directly to me, as I will be scheduling upcoming meetings.

Regards,

Andrea

Andrea Rosebrugh
Manager I, Public Engagement, Rapid Transit
Environmental & Engineering Services
City of London

300 Dufferin Ave., P.O. Box 5035 | London ON N6A 4L9
arosebrugh@london.ca | www.london.ca
Agency comment tracking (utility)

Margaret Parkhill, P.Eng.

email margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com
tel +1 416 596 1930 ext 61578

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.

Brandon:

Below are the coordinates and password for IBI Group’s ftp site from which you can download the most recent version of the rapid transit corridor drawings.

I must emphasize that these drawings are at a conceptual level only and have been prepared as part of the Rapid Transit Master Plan. The drawings are provided for general information only and should not be used for design purposes.

The next phase of the project which will occur over the next few months will result in a further evolution of the design to a preliminary engineering design level. Further effort will be required by the design team to address utility and servicing issues as part of this process.

Please let me know if you have any issues with the ftp site or are unable to download the drawings.

Joe Heyninck P. ENG
Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001 fax +1 519 472 9354
September 12, 2017

Yves Dagssie
Special Project Officer
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
135 St. Clair Avenue West, 7th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M4V 1P5

RE: London’s Rapid Transit Initiative Update – Pre-Planning for TPAP

Dear Mr. Dagssie,

The London Rapid Transit Master Plan was approved by London’s City Council on July 25th, 2017. The City intends to proceed to the next study phase following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) (Ontario Regulation 231/08). We are currently preparing for the planning phase of the TPAP.

I am writing to you regarding your email sent to Margaret Parkhill on July 11th, 2017. Firstly, I would like to confirm that I will be the main point of contact for this project, and that all correspondence will be directed to you, as the Special Project Officer.

In your email, it was stated that the City should contact the MOECC Approval Branch for a list of bodies to assist in identifying potential affected Aboriginal communities. Your assistance in identifying Aboriginal communities would be greatly appreciated.

Additionally, the City wishes to communicate the preliminary proposed draft EPR submission date of January, 2018.

Finally, to efficiently and effectively engage with the many number of technical agencies involved in the project, the City of London is creating a Technical Agency Group, which will include representatives from other provincial and local agencies with interests or approvals along the approved rapid transit corridors.

It would be greatly appreciated if you, or a representative from the Ministry, could attend the Technical Agencies Group meetings. If you are unable to attend it would be appreciated if the selected individual had the authority to speak on behalf of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change in order to drive decision making at the meetings.

If you have any questions regarding the study, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Jennie Ramsay, P.Eng.
Project Director, Rapid Transit
City of London

Phone: (519) 661-2498, Ext. 5823
E-mail: jaramsay@london.ca
www.london.ca

c.c. Brian Hollingworth, P.Eng., IBI Group

Craig Newton, Regional Environmental Planner/EA Coordinator, MOECC
Good afternoon Yves,

Please see the attached letter, which I am sending on behalf of Jennie Ramsay, Project Director, Rapid Transit, City of London.

Please feel free to send your response directly to me, as I will be scheduling upcoming meetings.

Regards,

Andrea

Andrea Rosebrugh
Manager I, Public Engagement, Rapid Transit
Environmental & Engineering Services
City of London

300 Dufferin Ave., P.O. Box 5035 | London ON N6A 4L9
P: 519-619-4603
arosebrugh@london.ca | www.london.ca
Hi Andrea,

Attached is a map of the study area. The project description is as follows:

The London Bus Rapid Transit project aims to influence the City of London's future growth by implementing rapid transit to encourage higher density, infill development, the protection of prime agricultural land, and the creation of a more sustainable, vibrant and livable urban form. The preferred alternative is a 24-kilometre bus rapid transit network comprising 4 corridors that will run north, south, east and west of a Central Transit Hub, located near King Street and Wellington Street in downtown London. The network, which is proposed to include 35 stations, will be constructed in phases. The Rapid Transit bus fleet can be accommodated at existing London Transit Commission facilities. The proposed project requires many infrastructure improvements, including, but not limited to, road and intersection widening, roadway and intersection reconfigurations, modified traffic signal timing, structural improvements and/or potential widening of the bridges along the corridors, utility relocations, and the addition of bicycle lanes and wider sidewalks to enhance the pedestrian realm.

Please let me know if you need anything else.

Hailey

Afternoon Andrea:

Thank you for your email requesting that, the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change assist the City of London in identifying the potential affected Aboriginal communities.

In order to process your request, we would require the following information:

1. Description of the undertaking;
2. Map of the study area

Please let me know if you have any question.

Thank you

Yves Dagssie, PMP | Special Project Officer
Good afternoon Yves,

Please see the attached letter, which I am sending on behalf of Jennie Ramsay, Project Director, Rapid Transit, City of London.

Please feel free to send your response directly to me, as I will be scheduling upcoming meetings.

Regards,

Andrea

Andrea Rosebrugh  
Manager I, Public Engagement, Rapid Transit  
Environmental & Engineering Services  
City of London  
300 Dufferin Ave., P.O. Box 5035 | London ON N6A 4L9  
P: 519-619-4603  
arosebrugh@london.ca | www.london.ca
Hi Joe,

Thank you for the conceptual design drawings. We will not use them to make any design decisions. They will simply be used for a preliminary impact assessment to see what conflicts may arise in the final design.

Regards,

On Fri, Sep 8, 2017 at 2:25 PM, Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com> wrote:

Brandon:

Below are the coordinates and password for IBI Group’s ftp site from which you can download the most recent version of the rapid transit corridor drawings.

I must emphasize that these drawings are at a conceptual level only and have been prepared as part of the Rapid Transit Master Plan. The drawings are provided for general information only and should not be used for design purposes.

The next phase of the project which will occur over the next few months will result in a further evolution of the design to a preliminary engineering design level. Further effort will be required by the design team to address utility and servicing issues as part of this process.

Please let me know if you have any issues with the ftp site or are unable to download the drawings.

Joe Heyninck P. ENG
Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
From: Rosebrugh, Andrea [mailto:arosebrugh@london.ca]
Sent: September-14-17 3:14 PM
To: Dagssie, Yves (MOECC)
Subject: RE: London Bus Rapid Transit - Request for Aboriginal communities

Good afternoon Yves,

Thank you for responding to our request for participation. Attached is a map of the study area. The project description is as follows:

The London Bus Rapid Transit project aims to influence the City of London’s future growth by implementing rapid transit to encourage higher density, infill development, the protection of prime agricultural land, and the creation of a more sustainable, vibrant and livable urban form. The preferred alternative is a 24-kilometre bus rapid transit network comprising 4 corridors that will run north, south, east and west of a Central Transit Hub, located near King Street and Wellington Street in downtown London. The network, which is proposed to include 35 stations, will be constructed in phases. The Rapid Transit bus fleet can be accommodated at existing London Transit Commission facilities. The proposed project requires many infrastructure improvements, including, but not limited to, road and intersection widening, roadway and intersection reconfigurations, modified traffic signal timing,
structural improvements and/or potential widening of the bridges along the corridors, utility relocations, and the addition of bicycle lanes and wider sidewalks to enhance the pedestrian realm.

In addition to helping us identify potential affected Aboriginal communities, will you also be providing representation in the Technical Agencies Group for this project?

Regards,

Andrea

From: Dagssie, Yves (MOECC) [mailto:Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2017 4:14 PM
To: Rosebrugh, Andrea <arosebrugh@london.ca>
Cc: Newton, Craig (MOECC) <Craig.Newton@ontario.ca>; Desautels, Solange (MOECC) <Solange.Desautels@ontario.ca>
Subject: Re: London Bus Rapid Transit - Request for Aboriginal communities

Afternoon Andrea:

Thank you for your email requesting that, the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change assist the City of London in identifying the potential affected Aboriginal communities.

In order to process your request, we would require the following information:

1. Description of the undertaking;
2. Map of the study area

Please let me know if you have any question.

Thank you

Yves Dagssie, PMP | Special Project Officer
Environmental Assessment Services | Environmental Approvals Branch
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Rosebrugh, Andrea [mailto:arosebrugh@london.ca]
Sent: September-12-17 3:52 PM
To: Dagssie, Yves (MOECC)
Cc: Newton, Craig (MOECC)
Subject: Request for participation in Technical Agencies Group, Rapid Transit

Good afternoon Yves,

Please see the attached letter, which I am sending on behalf of Jennie Ramsay, Project Director, Rapid Transit, City of London.

Please feel free to send your response directly to me, as I will be scheduling upcoming meetings.
Regards,

Andrea

Andrea Rosebrugh
Manager I, Public Engagement, Rapid Transit
Environmental & Engineering Services
City of London

300 Dufferin Ave., P.O. Box 5035 | London ON N6A 4L9
P: 519-619-4603
arosebrugh@london.ca | www.london.ca
September 18, 2017

City of London
300 Dufferin Avenue
P. O. Box 5035
London, ON
N6A 4L9

Re: Transit Project Assessment Process - Identifying Interested Indigenous Communities

Dear Ms. Andrea Rosebrugh:

Thank you for your September 12, 2017 letter regarding the City of London Bus Rapid Transit Initiative (Project). In your letter you request that the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (ministry) provide assistance in identifying Indigenous communities who may have an interest in this Project.

As you are aware, the Government of Ontario (the "Crown") has a constitutional duty to consult Aboriginal communities when Crown project approvals could lead to an adverse impact on established or asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights. The Crown may use existing regulatory processes as a vehicle for fulfilling its constitutional duty, including an environmental assessment under Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act.

The Crown has a duty to consult communities when it knows about established or credibly asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights, and contemplates decisions or actions that could adversely affect them. Although the Crown remains responsible for ensuring the adequacy of consultation with potentially-affected Aboriginal communities, it may delegate procedural aspects of the consultation process to project proponents. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is delegating the procedural aspects of consultation to you through this letter.
List of Communities to Consult:

Based on the information you have provided and the Crown's preliminary assessment of Aboriginal community rights and potential Project impacts, the following communities must be consulted on the basis that they have or may have constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights that could be adversely affected by the Project:

- Aamjiwnaang First Nation
- Bkejwanong Territory (Walpole Island)
- Caldwell First Nation
- Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point
- Chippewas of the Thames First Nation
- Moravian of the Thames (Delaware Nation)
- Munsee-Delaware Nation
- Oneida Nation of the Thames

Consultation Activities:

Steps that you may need to take in relation to Aboriginal consultation for your Project are outlined in the “Code of Practice for Consultation in Ontario’s Environmental Assessment Process” which can be found at the following link: https://www.ontario.ca/document/consultation-ontarios-environmental-assessment-process

The ministry relies on consultation conducted by proponents when it assesses the Crown’s obligations and directs proponents during the regulatory process. The proponent’s responsibilities for procedural aspects of consultation include:

- Providing First Nation and/or Métis communities with information about the proposed project/activity including anticipated impacts, and information on timelines;
- Following up with First Nation and/or Métis communities to ensure they received project/activity information and that they are aware of the opportunity to express comments and concerns about the project. If you are unable to make the appropriate contacts (e.g. are unable to contact the Chief) please contact the appropriate Project Officer for further direction;
- Gathering information about how the project could adversely impact the relevant Aboriginal and/or Treaty rights (for example, hunting, fishing) or sites of cultural significance (for example, burial grounds, archaeological sites);
- Considering the comments and concerns provided by First Nation and/or Métis communities and providing responses;
- Where appropriate, discussing potential mitigation strategies with First Nation and/or Métis communities;
- 3 -

- Bearing the reasonable costs associated with these procedural aspects of consultation; and,
- Maintaining a Consultation Record and providing copies to the ministry.

**Notice of Commencement:**

The ministry is pleased that you intend to follow the transit project assessment process as per Ontario Regulation 231/08 for the Project. Please be advised that when you initiate the assessment process, a Notice of Commencement should be sent to Ms. Kathleen O’Neill, Director of Environmental Approvals Branch (EAB) and the ministry’s Regional Director for the region in which the Project is located, as well as to the Indigenous communities identified above. Prior to issuing a Notice of Commencement, proponents are encouraged to contact EAB, the ministry’s regional office and other government agencies to determine their level of interest in the Project.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me directly at (416) 314-7222 or by e-mail at Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca

Sincerely,

Yves Dagssie, Special Project Officer
Environmental Approvals Branch
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
Rod – I did set up an ftp site for London Hydro a month or so ago – regardless – we will be setting up something here in the next day or so and all utilities will be circulated including London Hydro. All drawings will be CAD files referenced to City of London UTM coordinates.

The survey base plan that the RT corridor designs have been presented on is based on a recent topographic survey completed by the City of London specifically for RT. It should be noted that the topo and property information is more accurate than the typical OBM level of mapping that is used by the City for preliminary engineering design. The pole locations and guy wires have all been picked-up through the topo survey and are clearly shown on the base plans. Underground utility information shown is based on information provided by each utility to the City of London. It is my understanding that the individual firms that completed the field work and topo surveys for the City attempt to verify the underground plant locations where possible through field checks of manhole locations, pedestals, dips on poles etc.. The underground information is not based on field locates.

IBI and WSP have developed the preliminary corridor design for the purposes of completing the Master Plan and this design has been superimposed over the based plan outlined above. The design team has not specifically identified or flagged any utility conflicts at this time.

You may see areas within the drawings where there are clear conflicts with hydro pole running lines. In some instances we may be able to avoid these conflicts by a slight shift in the alignment or a shift in the location of the sidewalks/pathways etc. This is all part of the process that we are now going through.

An email will be going out in the next day or two to all utilities with the coordinates and password for access to the ftp side.
From: Doyle, Rodney [mailto:doyler@londonhydro.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 05, 2017 4:57 PM
To: Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: Sunny Patel <patels@londonhydro.com>
Subject: CAD plans for SHIFT

Joe:

Can you please send us copies (of FTP) CAD version of the SHIFT plans. The only versions I can find shared previously are in .pdf.

Also, do your plans identify poles and guy wires in conflict?

**Rod Doyle, P.Eng.**

*Senior Distribution Engineer*

**London Hydro Inc.**

**Office:** 519-661-5800 ext. 4515

**Mobile:** 519-860-0390

**Email:** doyler@londonhydro.com

This correspondence may contain personal or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the e-mail and any attachments and notify London Hydro immediately.
Hi Joe,

I forwarded your request to the Head Office and will let you also upon hearing from them.

Joan Zhao
Sr. Real Estate Coordinator
Facilities & Real Estate
Hydro One Networks Inc.
T: (905) 946-6230 | F: (905) 946-6242
P.O. Box 4300 | Markham ON | L3R 5Z5
Courier: 185 Clegg Road | Markham ON | L6G 1B7
joan.zhao@hydroone.com

This e-mail message is intended only for the addressee. It contains privileged and/or confidential information. Any unauthorized copying, use or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If this message has been sent to you in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it without reading, copying or forwarding to anyone. Thank you.

From: Joe Heyninck [mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: Friday, October 06, 2017 2:35 PM
To: Joan
Cc: Margaret Parkhill; Peissel, Eric; Spahiu, Ardian
Subject: London Rapid Transit - Hydro One 230kv Conduit Structure

Joan:

We are currently working on the preliminary engineering design for the City of London’s Rapid Transit corridors.

One of the areas that we are coordinating from a design perspective, is the identification and resolution of potential utility conflicts with proposed rapid transit works.

Because of the size and significant of the infrastructure – there is one particular item that we are currently focusing on and that is the 230KV line owned by Hydro One that cuts across and/or runs along sections of the proposed rapid transit corridors.

We have been able to acquire some information on this facility from the City of London – however the drawings that we have received lack detail and clarity. They are a good starting point for identifying potential conflict areas however we would like to inquire as to whether better information is available – particularly as it may to relate to any underground vaults or chambers.

We are prepared to arrange for and obtain field locates if necessary, however any archive information or drawings that you have for this facility will help us focus our efforts in those areas where there exists a higher level of interest. The attached key plan, illustrates current areas of interest where additional information would be of benefit.

Are you able to assist is this regard?
Joe Heyninck P. ENG
Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001 fax +1 519 472 9354

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.
NOTE: Ce courriel peut contenir de l'information privilégiée et confidentielle. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez le mentionner immédiatement à l'expéditeur et effacer ce courriel.

This email and any attached files are privileged and may contain confidential information intended only for the person or persons named above. Any other distribution, reproduction, copying, disclosure, or other dissemination is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply email and delete the transmission received by you. This statement applies to the initial email as well as any and all copies (replies and/or forwards) of the initial email.
Joe,

As consulted, here is what we can share with you regarding HONI’s Transmission underground installations. Due to the mapping scales, it comes with several sheets, as inserted below. As for your chamber question, still waiting for an answer. Will let you know upon hearing back.

Thanks,

Joan Zhao
Sr. Real Estate Coordinator
Facilities & Real Estate
Hydro One Networks Inc.
T: (905) 946-6230 | F: (905) 946-6242
P.O. Box 4300 | Markham ON | L3R 5Z5
Courier: 185 Clegg Road | Markham ON | L6G 1B7
joan.zhao@hydroone.com
Joan:
Further to my recent email – please see a clearer version of the key plan. Also, I would like to inquire as to what the dots on the drawing represent. Could these be chambers? If so, is there information available on the design of these chambers.

Joe Heyninck P. ENG
Director - Office Lead
IBI GROUP
From: Peissel, Eric [mailto:Eric.Peissel@wsp.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 05, 2017 2:32 PM
To: Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>; Roberts, Sarah <sarah.roberts@wsp.com>; Ermatinger, Vincent <Vincent.Ermatinger@wsp.com>; Shea, Andrew <Andrew.Shea@wsp.com>
Subject: Conflicts with Hydro Line

Hello Joe

Please find attached where we conflict with Hydro, this is where we need the added details.

Cheers

Eric Peissel, MUP, MCIP, urb.
Vice President Transportation – Western Canada

T+ 1 438-843-7470
M+ 1 514-346-7336
wsp.com

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise subject to restricted disclosure under applicable law. This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies. You are receiving this communication because you are listed as a current WSP contact. Should you have any questions regarding WSP’s electronic communications policy, please consult our Anti-Spam Commitment at www.wsp.com/casl. For any concern or if you believe you should not be receiving this message, please forward this message to caslcompliance@wsp.com so that we can promptly address your request. Note that not all messages sent by WSP qualify as commercial electronic messages.

AVIS : Ce message, incluant tout fichier l'accompagnant (« le message »), peut contenir des renseignements ou de l'information privilégiés, confidentiels, propriétaires ou à divulgation restreinte en vertu de la loi. Ce message est destiné à l'usage exclusif du destinataire(s) voulu(s). Toute utilisation non permise, divulgation, lecture, reproduction, modification, diffusion ou distribution est interdite. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, ou que vous n’êtes pas un destinataire autorisé ou voulu, veuillez en aviser l’expéditeur immédiatement et détruire le message et toute copie électronique ou imprimée. Vous recevez cette communication car vous faites partie des contacts de WSP. Si vous avez des questions concernant la politique de communications électroniques de WSP, veuillez consulter notre Engagement anti-pourriel au www.wsp.com/lcap. Pour toute question ou si vous croyez que vous ne devriez pas recevoir ce message, prière de le transférer au conformitelcap@wsp.com afin que nous puissions rapidement traiter votre demande. Notez que ce ne sont pas tous les messages transmis par WSP qui constituent des messages électroniques commerciaux.
person or persons named above. Any other distribution, reproduction, copying, disclosure, or other dissemination is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply email and delete the transmission received by you. This statement applies to the initial email as well as any and all copies (replies and/or forwards) of the initial email.
Rob – that timing works for me. See you then. (will send out a formal meeting invite.)

Joe Heyninck P. ENG

Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001 fax +1 519 472 9354

-------

Ok, how about the 31st at 9:30 am at your office?

-------

Rob – sorry for the delay in getting back to you. Dates that currently work for me are ...the afternoon of the 26th or anytime on the 31st. The 31st works better for me but can make the 26th work.

Let me know – we can meet at our office where we can call up drawings on the screen – which may help.

Cheers.

Joe Heyninck P. ENG

Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001 fax +1 519 472 9354
Hi Joe, I have gone through the proposed routes and don’t foresee any major concerns. I was wondering if you had time available that we could go through my findings so that I could highlight a couple of areas that may have potential for conflict with your project. I am available Weds. the 18\textsuperscript{th} in the morning or Tuesday the 25\textsuperscript{th} anytime. Let me know if either of these dates happen to work for you.

Thanks,

Rob Elliott
Construction Project Manager
Union Gas Limited | An Enbridge Company
TEL: 519-667-4100 ext 5153512 | CELL: 519-495-5834 | roelliot@uniongas.com
109 Commissioners Rd. W., London, ON, N6A4P1
Canada’s Top 100 Employer

This email communication and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential and or proprietary information and is provided for the use of the intended recipient only. Any review, retransmission or dissemination of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this email in error, please contact the sender and delete this communication and any copies immediately. Thank you.
Agency tracking – meeting set.

Margaret Parkhill, P.Eng.

email margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com
tel +1 416 596 1930 ext 61578

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.
NOTE: Ce courriel peut contenir de l'information privilégiée et confidentielle. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez le mentionner immédiatement à l'expéditeur et effacer ce courriel.

Rob – that timing works for me. See you then. (will send out a formal meeting invite.)

Joe Heyninck P. ENG

Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001 fax +1 519 472 9354

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.
NOTE: Ce courriel peut contenir de l'information privilégiée et confidentielle. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez le mentionner immédiatement à l'expéditeur et effacer ce courriel.

Ok, how about the 31st at 9:30 am at your office?
Hi Joe,

I have gone through the proposed routes and don’t foresee any major concerns. I was wondering if you had time available that we could go through my findings so that I could highlight a couple of areas that may have potential for conflict with your project. I am available Weds. the 18th in the morning or Tuesday the 25th anytime. Let me know if either of these dates happen to work for you.

Thanks,

Rob Elliott
Construction Project Manager
Union Gas Limited | An Enbridge Company
TEL: 519-667-4100 ext 5135512 | CELL: 519-495-5834 | roelliott@uniongas.com
109 Commissioners Rd. W., London, ON, N6A4P1
Canada’s Top 100 Employer

This email communication and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential and or proprietary information and is provided for the use of the intended recipient only. Any review, retransmission or dissemination of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this email in error, please contact the sender and delete this communication and any copies immediately. Thank you.
Date: October 31, 2017  
Purpose: Utilities – Union Gas  

Attendees:  
Union Gas: Rob Elliott  
IBI Group: Joe Heyninck  
Matt Cooper  

Location: IBI Group Board Room  
Time: 9:30 a.m. – 10:30  

Items Discussed:  

- Purpose of meeting was to complete an overview of the impact on RT on Union Gas facilities and to discuss the best way forward wrt the exchange of information between Union Gas and IBI Group;  

- Rob Elliott (RE) advised that he has gone through the Master Plan drawings and has tried to look at where conflicts are likely to address – however a complete assessment has not been completed;  

- Joe Heyninck (JH) advised that IBI is currently undertaking a review of all utilities and municipal services within the corridors to flag conflicts based on initial criteria;  

- An example was extracted from the MP drawings to identify the type of items/conflicts that IBI will be looking at; IBI referred to the proposed station platform at Wonderland Road (east side) where an existing 200mm gas line will cut perpendicular to the platform. According to the design criteria that was developed, this type of facility should be relocated outside of the limits of the proposed station. Union Gas questioned the need for a full relocation and whether other measures could be undertaken to address any issues that the City may have with the gas line under the platform. Alternatives identified were: place a sleeve around the gas line; put in a vertical off-set to avoid any conflicts with footings; undertake a full relocation. In very general terms these types of measures would cost in the order of $10,000, $100,000 and $500,000 respectively.  

- It was agreed that once each conflict area was identified, there would need to be further discussion wrt the remedial measures that would need to be implemented. It is expected that each situation will be unique with varying solutions and costs. Through this exercise it will be necessary for both the City and the utility to identify what their individual needs and limitations with respect to what they can with.  

- It was noted that it would be beneficial to tabulate each conflict within a spreadsheet noting location and comments and expectations wrt to timing – similar to what is being done with the
municipal services. IBI advised that the intent is to have all conflicts mapped and identified by the end of next week (Nov 10th);

- Union Gas will review the corridor any growth or infrastructure renewal needs that they will have and this information will be incorporated into the spreadsheet;

- Both parties agreed that this was a useful meeting for setting the framework for getting the information required and what we need to do going forward.

These meeting notes were prepared by the undersigned who should be notified of any errors and/or omissions.
Rob – Let me know if you have any further comments.

Cheers;

Joe Heyninck P. ENG
Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON  N6H 1T3  Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001  fax +1 519 472 9354
From: Joe Heyninck  
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2017 9:51 AM  
To: joan.zhao@HydroOne.com  
Cc: Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>; Spahiu, Ardian <aspahiu@london.ca>  
Subject: RE: Conflicts with Hydro Line

Joan:

Further to my voice mail message today; I am following up to see what information that you have been able to obtain on the underground hydro vault dimensions for the facility in question.

From our perspective, this is getting to be an urgent situation as we are moving forward with rapid transit station/platform designs and need information on the size of these underground facilities to avoid significant and costly conflicts.

If there are no drawings; is it possible to obtain field locates and to have someone from Hydro One remove the covers on these vaults in order that we can obtain approximate dimensions?

Regards;

Joe Heyninck P. ENG  
Director - Office Lead  
IBI GROUP  
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West  
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada  
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001 fax +1 519 472 9354

It is confirmed that those are chambers.
From: ZHAO Joan  
Sent: Friday, October 13, 2017 5:26 PM  
To: 'Joe Heyninck'  
Cc: MINICHINI Gian; CANCILLA Enza  
Subject: RE: Conflicts with Hydro Line

Joe,

As consulted, here is what we can share with you regarding HONI’s Transmission underground installations. Due to the mapping scales, it comes with several sheets, as inserted below. As for your chamber question, still waiting for an answer. Will let you know upon hearing back.

Thanks,

Joan Zhao  
Sr. Real Estate Coordinator  
Facilities & Real Estate  
Hydro One Networks Inc.  
T: (905) 946-6230 | F: (905) 946-6242  
P.O. Box 4300 | Markham ON | L3R 5Z5  
Courier: 185 Clegg Road | Markham ON | L6G 1B7  
joan.zhao@hydroone.com
From: Joe Heyninck [mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: Friday, October 06, 2017 2:45 PM
To: ZHAO Joan
Subject: FW: Conflicts with Hydro Line

Joan:
Further to my recent email – please see a clearer version of the key plan. Also, I would like to inquire as to what the dots on the drawing represent. Could these be chambers? If so, is there information available on the design of these chambers.

Joe Heyninck P. ENG
Director - Office Lead
IBI GROUP
From: Peissel, Eric [mailto:Eric.Peissel@wsp.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 05, 2017 2:32 PM
To: Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>; Roberts, Sarah <sarah.roberts@wsp.com>; Ermatinger, Vincent <Vincent.Ermatinger@wsp.com>; Shea, Andrew <Andrew.Shea@wsp.com>
Subject: Conflicts with Hydro Line

Hello Joe

Please find attached where we conflict with Hydro, this is where we need the added details.

Cheers

Eric Peissel, MUP, MCIP, urb.
Vice President Transportation – Western Canada

T+ 1 438-843-7470
M+ 1 514-346-7336

wsp.com
-----Original Message-----
From: Joe Heyninck [mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2017 1:16 PM
To: ZHAO Joan
Cc: MINICHINI Gian; arosebrugh@london.ca; Margaret Parkhill

Joan;

I think we will work hard to avoid any conflicts with this utility as I am sure that the costs of any modifications will be quite high. It's too early at this stage to confirm 100% that any conflicts can be avoided.

The Technical Advisory Meeting is Wednesday. Anyone that deals with infrastructure planning could attend. If nobody from Hydro One is available we can touch base with Gian afterwards.

Regards;

Joe Heyninck

-----Original Message-----
From: joan.zhao@HydroOne.com [mailto:joan.zhao@HydroOne.com]
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2017 9:45 AM
To: Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: Gian.Minichini@HydroOne.com; arosebrugh@london.ca

No problem.

Joe, do you see possibility that this project will require modification/relocation of Hydro One's facilities? We wonder who else/which group from Hydro One would join the meeting (via call in) tomorrow, as Gian indicated he can't make it.

Thanks,

Joan Zhao SR/WA
Sr. Real Estate Coordinator
Facilities & Real Estate
Hydro One Networks Inc.
T: (905) 946-6230 | F: (905) 946-6242
P.O. Box 4300 | Markham ON | L3R 5Z5
Courier: 185 Clegg Road | Markham ON | L6G 1B7 joan.zhao@hydroone.com This e-mail message is intended only for the addressee. It contains privileged and/or confidential information. Any unauthorized copying, use or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If this message has been sent to you in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it without reading, copying or forwarding to anyone. Thank you.
-----Original Message-----
From: Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 5:11 PM
To: ZHAO Joan
Cc: MINICHINI Gian

*** Exercise caution. This is an EXTERNAL email. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ***

Thanks Joan for forwarding this information along.

-----Original Message-----
From: joan.zhao@HydroOne.com
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 9:44 AM
To: Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: Gian.Minichini@HydroOne.com

Joe,

See attached.

Joan Zhao SR/WA
Sr. Real Estate Coordinator
Facilities & Real Estate
Hydro One Networks Inc.
T: (905) 946-6230 | F: (905) 946-6242
P.O. Box 4300 | Markham ON | L3R 5Z5
Courier: 185 Clegg Road | Markham ON | L6G 1B7 joan.zhao@hydroone.com This e-mail message is intended only for the addressee. It contains privileged and/or confidential information. Any unauthorized copying, use or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If this message has been sent to you in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it without reading, copying or forwarding to anyone. Thank you.

This email and any attached files are privileged and may contain confidential information intended only for the person or persons named above. Any other distribution, reproduction, copying, disclosure, or other dissemination is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply email and delete the transmission received by you. This statement applies to the initial email as well as any and all copies (replies and/or forwards) of the initial email
Minutes

To/Attention | Notes to File | Date | November 20, 2017
From | Sandra Hayman | Project No | 37176

Subject | London Bus Rapid Transit  
- Environmental Discussions  
City of London (8th Floor Boardroom)  
Wednesday November 15, 2017  
1:30pm

Present | Ardian Spahiu (Rapid Transit Implementation)  
Ashley Rameloo (Rapid Transit Implementation)  
Mark Snowsell (UTRCA)  
Mark Shifflett (UTRCA)  
Erin Fitzpatrick (WSP)  
Linda McDougall (Planning-Environmental & Parks Planning)  
Joe Heyninck (IBI Group)  
Sandra Hayman (IBI Group)

Distribution | All Present  
Brian Hollingsworth (IBI)  
Margaret Parkhill (IBI)  
Andrew Shea (WSP)  
Vincent Ermatinger (WSP)  
Eric Peissell (WSP)  
Jennie Ramsay (City of London)

Item Discussed | Action By

1. **Project Update**
   - Master Plan is completed which finalized the BRT route. IBI/WSP is now looking at different options available within the BRT routes and working towards completion of the TPAP document.
   - PIC’s are occurring in December.
   - TPAP report to be completed in February/March 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Discussed</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Environmental Impact Study Update</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- January 2017-Subject Lands Status Report (SLSR) was completed and reviewed by Agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EIS Scoping meeting was held on April 10, 2017 with UTRCA, City of London, MOECC, IBI, and WSP representatives (MNRF and EEPAC were unable to attend). The comments received were used to scope the EIS and the 2017 field program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some of the BRT routes have been extended to address such items as Park &amp; Ride (Site 7 at the south end of Wellington Area). Ecological surveys were completed for new areas of the route, as well as areas where additional detail was required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A plan was distributed to show the 7 sites that are being included in the EIS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Timing: an EIS draft is proposed to be completed by the end of November for review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- L. McDougall noted that she will be away for in the month of December. Therefore review will not occur until January. She has 3 weeks to complete the review (therefore comments expected in third or fourth week of January).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Following City review and work to address comments, the document will be presented to EEPAC by WSP staff. It is expected that there will be at least one round of comments to address, and possibly present back to EEPAC before the EIS is accepted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The EIS team have had input to BRT items such as bridge widenings/rebuilds, etc., to minimize environmental impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The EIS team have also had contact with MNRF with respect to species at risk (SAR) within the study area. A meeting is scheduled for November 21, 2017 to discuss avoidance and mitigation measures, permitting and approvals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- L. McDougall expressed interest in attending this meeting if her schedule permits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Structures Crossing Watercourses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Western Road over Medway Creek (Site 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This will likely require a full replacement, however the option of just widening the existing bridge is still being looked at. The preferred option should be known within a couple weeks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An ESA is noted to exist on the west side. L. McDougall noted this to be a high profile ESA and impacts should be avoided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WSP has had some initial contact with MNRF regarding impacts to SAR (a number are known to occupy Medway Creek within the vicinity of the bridge).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It was noted in the meeting that widening of the bridge is planned on the east side of the current alignment, however, subsequent to the meeting, WSP noted that this is incorrect and widening is in fact proposed to the west, if the bridge is not replaced entirely. It was noted that more compensation would be necessary if work was on the west side. L. McDougall notes that we are likely to have more opposition from EEPAC and community if impacts to west are proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• UTRCA comments (some comments may be common to other bridge projects below)
  o Preference is to widen to the east, however any widening to the west should consider the existing retaining wall/erosion issues along the north side of the creek.
  o Consideration to be made with respect to removals/flow diversions/debris collection etc.
  o May need modelling work to confirm hydraulics and ensure there is no increase in floodlines. It was noted that there will likely be minimal impacts.
  o Erosion is a concern and an assessment will ultimately be required.
  o Western University is presently doing a lot of work on 2D flood modelling within the campus, on the Thames and Medway Creek. This work is well underway. (Aecom is doing modelling. Vic Cote is the University liaison).
  o The floodplain is noted to extend to the north side of Windermere Road on the NW corner, however questionable whether the roadway was included.
  o UTRCA is always looking for any opportunities for improvements.
  o UTRCA noted that they currently do not have terrestrial compensation guidelines.

3.2 University Drive Bridge (Site 4)

• This bridge is to be replaced and will be wider than existing (both the span and road width). In-water construction will occur.

• UTRCA comments:
  o This bridge is currently a sizable restriction on the Thames River.
  o A large desire to reduce flooding upstream (U/S) from Western University, City etc. Interaction is suggested with the university. J. Heyninck noted that there has been liaison and this will be added to future discussions.
  o UTRCA wish to improve hydraulic capacity but not at the expense of D/S issues. Erosion/scouring is currently a major concern in this area.
  o Other current projects in the area: There is currently an EA being done for the Broughdale dyke (just east of Richmond on SS of Thames River). Some options include extending the dyke.
  o UTRCA noted that replacement with a wider bridge will likely have minimal effect on D/S floodlines since U/S storage is not accounted for in the modelling.

• A discussion ensued regarding opening up the span significantly to alleviate flooding. This option requires consideration/trade-offs with respect to SAR, etc. WSP noted that they will be meeting with MNRF next week to discuss this site and other pertinent ones within the corridor.

• It was noted that a platform was proposed on the SW corner of Lambton Dr and University Drive. It is just outside of the floodplain, however UTRCA noted that the updated floodlines may change this.
3.3 Queens Avenue over Thames River (Site 2)

- No work is planned on the Kensington Bridge.
- Queen’s Ave Bridge: No instream works are proposed. There is only a small widening (less than 2m) proposed on the North side (deck only). No pier work
  - WSP noted that there are turtles and other SAR in this area.

3.4 Wellington Street over Thames River (Site 5)

- Existing structure to be maintained. A widening is proposed to the east including deck and piers. Therefore in-stream work is required. The existing piers are founded on piles.
- Existing pathway requires reconfiguration (NE quadrant) to accommodate widening and meet AODA requirements. This may also mean lowering of the pathway with nominal hydraulic effects.
- UTRCA noted that the latest hydraulic modelling shows more floodplain area on the north side than on the City’s mapping and should be consulted.
- Snapping turtles noted in area.
- L. McDougall noted that within the SOHO EIS, pathways have already been looked at within this area with respect to turtle habitat etc. Suggestion is to keep away from the nesting area…perhaps shift pathway to north. Jeff Bruin at the City has been involved with the pathways in this area and should be contacted for further information/coordination. It is possible that a redesign of this pathway is already underway. Coordination is recommended.
- WSP noted that this area has been identified on DFO mapping as critical mussel habitat. WSP did not see mussels in their areas during 2017 surveys. UTRCA noted that DFO will likely defer approvals to them. WSP will consult MNRF on how to proceed with future surveys and potential relocation activities to avoid impacts to mussels.
- IBI/WSP to look into the requirement for a “Permit to Occupy” for any bridge expansions. (New or revised permit?). E.Fitzpatrick to raise this question at MNRF meeting on November 21st.
- The requirement for approvals through the Navigable Waters Act is to be discussed with MNRF. Subsequent to the meeting, WSP noted that they will also determine from the MNRF if there are any requirements through the Lands and Rivers Improvement Act.

4. Work within Regulated Areas

4.1 Westminster Ponds (Site 6)

- IBI showed a drawing with the worst case scenario in this area with 3:1 slopes matching into the Ponds area and a 5m working area beyond this.
- In order to minimize impacts/encroachment into the Ponds Area, the City and UTRCA would prefer to see 2:1 slopes and the pathway pushed as close as possible to the curb line. IBI/WSP to show the Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) boundary on the drawing and work towards minimizing the encroachment.
Item Discussed

- UTRCA will be the approving authority on any mitigation/compensation measures.
- It was noted that a retaining wall was discarded early as an option (same or more impact during construction; poor aesthetics; high maintenance)
- UTRCA would like to explore compensation for wetlands first as opposed to enhancing along the Wellington corridor, though enhancement of terrestrial communities would be supported and encouraged as well
- Detailed inventory of existing trees was recommended along this stretch of corridor. WSP indicated that some of this work has already been carried out.
- S. Hayman noted that stormwater from the existing Wellington corridor feeds the Ponds. The BRT design will take into consideration continuing to feed the ponds with a similar, proportional amount of stormwater in order to attain an approximate water balance. An oil/grit separator or similar structure would provide quality control prior to discharge into the Ponds. The remainder of the stormwater would be directed to an existing storm sewer just north of Southdale Rd. Some type of adjustable weir structure could help divert more or less water into the Ponds as required.
- L. McDougall suggested that other LID type methods should be considered along here as well as throughout the entire BRT corridor where possible.
- Currently there are road salts entering the Ponds area. This would not be worsened as part of this project. As there are no SWM/LID measures known to take salt out of stormwater, City salt application along this stretch of roadway should be considered (the City may already have measures in place).
- S. Hayman noted that according to previous reports, the Ponds are currently fed mainly by surface water as opposed to groundwater. Therefore the water balance runoff component is most critical as opposed to infiltration.

4.2 Potential Park & Ride near Exeter Road (Site 7)

- A parking area and a potential expansion area has been identified near the existing OPP station on Exeter Road at Bessemer Rd. The Murray Drain runs along the south side.
- WSP has performed a complete set of surveys in the area. It was noted that a wooded area has been cleared out, by others, and therefore does not have many environmental constraints.
- UTRCA comments:
  - This is within floodplain area. Their policies state that there is to be no new development within the floodplain.
  - The culvert under Wellington Rd is a major constriction. Replacement of this culvert may help relieve this. Hydraulics/Hydrology in this area is complicated and a fairly detailed analysis would be required before UTRCA would consider this option.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Discussed</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o The flood fringe would have to be identified better in this area. Whether parking would be allowed is more a function of flow depth and velocity as opposed to the area between the 100 year and 250 year storm floodlines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This area will be discussed further with the OPP first before it is considered an option.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It was noted that multiple sites have already been looked at within this area as a Park &amp; Ride facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Oxford Street West at Mud Creek (Site 1)

- A separate meeting will be held to discuss this area as there are other stakeholders to be considered.

These meeting notes were prepared by Sandra Hayman of IBI Group who should be notified of any errors or omissions as soon as possible.

SH/
Date: January 16, 2018  
Date of meeting: January 16, 2018  
Location: City Hall, 300 Dufferin Ave  
Time: 1:00 p.m.–2:30 p.m.  
Purpose: The meeting was with London Hydro to review conflicts between existing LH infrastructure and the future BRT routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
<th>Role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Rammeloo</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arammelo@London.ca">arammelo@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Manager of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardian Spahiu</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aspahiu@london.ca">aspahiu@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaden Hodgins</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhodgins@london.ca">jhodgins@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer-in-Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Heyninck</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com">JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Doyle</td>
<td>London Hydro (LH)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doyler@londonhydro.com">doyler@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td>Senior Distribution Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny Patel</td>
<td>London Hydro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patels@londonhydro.com">patels@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td>Distribution Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyan Brkic</td>
<td>NBM Engineering (NBM)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:boyanb@nbmengineering.com">boyanb@nbmengineering.com</a></td>
<td>Electrical Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davor Alisic</td>
<td>NBM Engineering</td>
<td><a href="mailto:davora@nbmengineering.com">davora@nbmengineering.com</a></td>
<td>Electrical Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISTRIBUTION:** All Attendees and the following: Jennie Ramsay (RT), Brian Hollingsworth (IBI), Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP)
London Hydro introduced representatives from NBM Engineering who have been retained by London Hydro to assist them with this project. London Hydro noted that NBM has worked on other similar projects and has a considerable amount of experience with RT projects in the GTA.

NBM noted that they have also been retained by Rogers to prepare similar impacts and costs wrt to their cable plant.

It was noted that base mapping of the RT corridors and a spreadsheet identifying conflict areas was previously provided to London Hydro for their review and work on this project.

IBI advised that the drawings and spreadsheet summary of conflicts was based on the approved BRT master plan concepts which were completed last spring. The design of the RT corridors has continued to evolve since that time. Due to the time constraints, it was important to get as much design information into the hands of utility companies as early as possible in order that they could start their own review and analysis.

Going forward, adjustments may be necessary as the corridor designs continue to evolve. Notwithstanding that changes will be forthcoming, it is anticipated that given the overall 24 km of RT corridor, the majority of the design revisions which will impact utilities will be localized.

Areas where more significant changes are anticipated include:

- Oxford St from Platt’s to Wharncliffe – impacts on both sides of road; BRT design in this area not finalized; London Hydro will be impacted;
- Richmond Street – north of Oxford to the University gates; 2 lanes vs 4 lanes;
- Dundas St East – concern about impact to existing overhead hydro - may need to look at underground to avoid conflict with building face;
- Wellington Curve – design options still being evaluated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>London Hydro introduced representatives from NBM Engineering who have been retained by London Hydro to assist them with this project. London Hydro noted that NBM has worked on other similar projects and has a considerable amount of experience with RT projects in the GTA. NBM noted that they have also been retained by Rogers to prepare similar impacts and costs wrt to their cable plant.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It was noted that base mapping of the RT corridors and a spreadsheet identifying conflict areas was previously provided to London Hydro for their review and work on this project. IBI advised that the drawings and spreadsheet summary of conflicts was based on the approved BRT master plan concepts which were completed last spring. The design of the RT corridors has continued to evolve since that time. Due to the time constraints, it was important to get as much design information into the hands of utility companies as early as possible in order that they could start their own review and analysis. Going forward, adjustments may be necessary as the corridor designs continue to evolve. Notwithstanding that changes will be forthcoming, it is anticipated that given the overall 24 km of RT corridor, the majority of the design revisions which will impact utilities will be localized. Areas where more significant changes are anticipated include:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
3

Of interest at this stage of the project is:

- Identification of RT related conflicts;
- Cost estimates of relocation requirements;
- Identification of any major works that could have an impact on schedule;
- Identification of any property requirements.

4

The RT team noted that there will be a PIC January 24th, 2018; After that PIC, it is expected that all the public comments will be received and consolidated which will take approximately two weeks. Over this time period, the design team will be working to resolve any outstanding design issues and to develop a technically preferred design. Final adjustments relating to utility conflicts will likely need to be made shortly thereafter with the final product due early March.

The RT design team is working to obtain first draft cost estimates and property requirements from each utility by February 16, 2018.

London Hydro indicated that their consultant is well through their design analysis and that they should be able to provide their initial cost estimates and property requirements by the February 16th date.

5

London Hydro inquired about the need and ability to relocate underground facilities particularly hydro vaults in the downtown area.

It was noted that the starting point for discussion would be to assume that facilities will need to be relocated per the original design criteria and the initial cost estimates should be based on those assumptions. The next step would be to evaluate the cost implications of major items to the overall project budget.

In evaluating relocation alternatives, it will be necessary to understand what the operational aspects are for the facilities in question – ie how often are work crews accessing a chamber?; for how long?; time of day? – are off-hours (night-time) operations feasible? Discussions regarding the design alternatives will no doubt be on-going however, it is important to obtain first order estimates for relocation costs in order to complete evaluations.

6

London Hydro / NBM advised that they have completed an initial assessment of the conflicts and relocation requirements; They noted that it is important for the City to recognize that the relocations may extend beyond just the areas identified by IBI Group. They noted that it will be necessary to strike consistent alignments for pole relocations; also some sections may require overhead plant to be buried in areas that were not identified by IBI Group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Details of Cost Sharing between City of London and London Hydro have not been worked out. It was suggested City should carry 100% cost into their estimate as worst case scenario; The City advised that they will use existing cost sharing agreements with utilities as a starting point.</th>
<th>Cost Sharing to be discussed at a higher level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>London Hydro is to identify property requirements however property costs are not to be included in their estimate. The City will take the property information and include it with their own evaluation of property costs.</td>
<td>LH/CoL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IBI noted that would be beneficial if London Hydro would review their existing plant mapping and compare to the base plan information that the RT team is working off and provide any revisions/updates necessary.</td>
<td>LH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It was noted that the information provided by London Hydro will follow the templates provided by IBI/CoL – with each element identified within the spreadsheet being costed separately. Further, appropriate allowances for engineering and design as well as contingencies will be included in the estimates. Estimating allowances and contingencies are to be identified either as a percentage or lump sums where appropriate. Restoration cost are to be included for all underground works.</td>
<td>LH/NBM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing represents the writer’s understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.

Minutes Prepared by:

Jaden Hodgins
Engineer-in-Training
Rapid Transit / City of London
jhodgins@london.ca

Joe Heyninck
London Office Lead
IBI Group
jheyninck@ibigroup.com

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
Joe and Jennie:

The Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) meeting on October 5, 2017 requested feedback on nine focus areas.

London Hydro wants to emphasize our concerns with the amount of resources, costs, cash flow, and project scheduling required for the BRT/SHIFT. Our engineering manager will be attending the November 22nd meeting to discuss these concerns in more detail.

Outlined below is London Hydro's initial (high-level) comments for the nine focus areas.

**Overall Comment**

- We are assuming maintenance holes (MHs) within or encroaching near the BRT lanes are not in conflict since they are not within the BRT station ramps.
- The details outlined below may change during detailed design.

1. **Western University**
   - The electrical distribution within Western's property is owned and operated by Western. Please check with Western how the BRT plan affects their plant.
   - At Richmond St., London Hydro will require to relocate poles on both sides of Richmond St. Easements will be required on all properties on the east side of Richmond St.

2. **Richmond St. North**
   - Question: Is the City of London placing streetlights along Richmond? If yes, is the City willing to share pole locations with London Hydro?
   - London Hydro will require to relocate all poles on the west side closer to the property lines but no easements are required.
   - London Hydro will require to build a new pole line on the east side.
   - Tree trimming or removals (depending on specific circumstances) will be required throughout the area.
   - Clearances between buildings through Huron St. intersection may require burying plant. Easements will be required on both sides of Richmond St. north of Huron St.

3. **Richmond Row**
   - Some maintenance holes (MH) are in the BRT lanes.
   - One MH is in a proposed parking lane. We are assuming this location is not in conflict since it's not within a BRT station ramp.

4. **Downtown**
Some maintenance holes (MH) are in the BRT lanes.
- One transformer vault is in a proposed parking lane. Relocating this will be very difficult. Lowering the grade to accommodate street parking may require lowering the vault grade.
- One MH is located within a planned station ramp at northeast corner of Queens Ave. and Clarence St. Relocating this MH will be costly. We are assuming our running line under the BRT station ramp can remain in place.

5. **Forks of The Thames**
- MHs are in the south side (east bound) BRT lane.
- London Hydro will require to property and easements to relocate a pad-mounted transformer located on the south side of Museum London to accommodate the "shared street concept" scope.

6. **Wellington South**  (Thames River to Baseline)
- London Hydro will require to rebuild, and add, concrete duct structure across Wellington bridge.
- MH south of bridge is encroaching northbound BRT lane.
- Poles on cross-streets will require relocating further away from Wellington Rd.
- Easements are required for guying on 161 Grand Ave.
- **Question:** If poles south of Grand Ave. on the west side of Wellington require any further movement west, then London Hydro will require to bury the plant.

- For the identified property impacts:
  - Between Grand Ave. and Raywood Ave. will require easements for equipment and burying plant. Each building remaining will require work at each site to convert the service.
  - Between Alexandra St. and Wetter Ave.:
    - West side will require easements for equipment and burying plant. Each building remaining will require work at each site to convert the service to underground supplied.
    - East side could be resupplied from rear yards. Each property will require work. Further engineering investigation is needed.
    - Easements are required for relocated plant at 712 Wetter Ave.
  - Between Wetter Ave. and Baseline Rd.
    - London Hydro will require to bury its plant as a duct and MH system.
    - Easements will be required for equipment.
    - Each building remaining will require work at each site to convert the service to underground supplied.

7. **Old East Village**
- Relocate north side pole line to south side of road or bury plant.
- A duct and MH system is required if burying plant.
- Each property will require work to convert the service to underground supplied if eliminating pole line.
- Pole relocation required at Ontario St. station/ramp.
- A section of poles on King St. just west of Ontario St. should be transferred to City of London ownership since the poles are strictly for street-lighting.

8. **Potential Park 'N' Ride**
- **Question:** Is the City of London obtaining property rights from White Oaks Mall on the west side? London Hydro would require to relocate the pole line through the parking lot's easterly car parking spots that front Wellington Rd.
- London Hydro will relocate pole lines on both sides of Wellington Rd. (assuming no property restrictions on west side).
- Easements will be required on the west side. Pole line will be relocated to private property.
- If west side pole line cannot be relocated due to property restrictions, then we London Hydro will require to bury plant. Spot easements will be required for equipment.

9. **Fanshawe College**
- Pole line west of Ayreswood Ave. can be relocated further south but will require easements from 850 Highbury Ave.
- All plant between Ayreswood Ave. and east of Second St. will require to be relocated to underground as a duct and MH system.
  - Various easements will be required from a number of properties for equipment placement.

**Rod Doyle**, P.Eng.

*Senior Distribution Engineer*

**London Hydro Inc.**

**Office:** 519-661-5800 ext. 4515

**Mobile:** 519-860-0390

**Email:** doyler@londonhydro.com

This correspondence may contain personal or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the e-mail and any attachments and notify London Hydro immediately.
Tiffany Chan

To: Margaret Parkhill
Subject: RE: Hydro One

-----Original Message-----
From: Joe Heyninck [mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2017 1:16 PM
To: ZHAO Joan
Cc: MINICHINI Gian; arisebrugh@london.ca; Margaret Parkhill

Joe Heyninck

-----Original Message-----
From: joan.zhao@HydroOne.com [mailto:joan.zhao@HydroOne.com]
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2017 9:45 AM
To: Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: Gian.Minichini@HydroOne.com; arisebrugh@london.ca

Joan;

I think we will work hard to avoid any conflicts with this utility as I am sure that the costs of any modifications will be quite high. It's too early at this stage to confirm 100% that any conflicts can be avoided.

The Technical Advisory Meeting is Wednesday. Anyone that deals with infrastructure planning could attend. If nobody from Hydro One is available we can touch base with Gian afterwards.

Regards;

Joe Heyninck

No problem.

Joe, do you see possibility that this project will require modification/relocation of Hydro One's facilities? We wonder who else/which group from Hydro One would join the meeting (via call in) tomorrow, as Gian indicated he can't make it.

Thanks,

Joan Zhao SR/WA
Sr. Real Estate Coordinator
Facilities & Real Estate
Hydro One Networks Inc.
T: (905) 946-6230 | F: (905) 946-6242
P.O. Box 4300 | Markham ON | L3R 5Z5
Courier: 185 Clegg Road | Markham ON | L6G 1B7 joan.zhao@hydroone.com This e-mail message is intended only for the addressee. It contains privileged and/or confidential information. Any unauthorized copying, use or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If this message has been sent to you in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it without reading, copying or forwarding to anyone. Thank you.
-----Original Message-----
From: Joe Heyninck [mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 5:11 PM
To: ZHAO Joan
Cc: MINICHINI Gian

*** Exercise caution. This is an EXTERNAL email. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ***

Thanks Joan for forwarding this information along.
-----Original Message-----
From: joan.zhao@HydroOne.com [mailto:joan.zhao@HydroOne.com]
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 9:44 AM
To: Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: Gian.Minichini@HydroOne.com
Importance: High

Joe,

See attached.

Joan Zhao SR/WA
Sr. Real Estate Coordinator
Facilities & Real Estate
Hydro One Networks Inc.
T: (905) 946-6230 | F: (905) 946-6242
P.O. Box 4300 | Markham ON | L3R 5Z5
Courier: 185 Clegg Road | Markham ON | L6G 1B7 joan.zhao@hydroone.com This e-mail message is intended only for the addressee. It contains privileged and/or confidential information. Any unauthorized copying, use or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If this message has been sent to you in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it without reading, copying or forwarding to anyone. Thank you.

This email and any attached files are privileged and may contain confidential information intended only for the person or persons named above. Any other distribution, reproduction, copying, disclosure, or other dissemination is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply email and delete the transmission received by you. This statement applies to the initial email as well as any and all copies (replies and/or forwards) of the initial email.
## JOB TITLE
London Rapid Transit

## PROJECT NUMBER
141-21085-00

## DATE
21 November 2017

## TIME
10:30 am to 12:15 pm

## VENUE
Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, Aylmer District Office

## SUBJECT
London RT - SAR considerations / permitting requirements

## CLIENT
City of London

## PRESENT
Karina Cerniavskaja (MNRF), Laura Warner (MNRF), Kathryn Markham (MNRF), Adam Kennedy (MNRF), Kim LeBrun (WSP) and Erin Fitzpatrick (WSP)

## NOT PRESENT
Linda McDougall (City of London)

## DISTRIBUTION
MNRF Planners, City of London, and IBI/WSP team

### KEY POINTS OF DISCUSSION

#### 1.0 UPDATE ON PROJECT TIMELINES AND EIS

1.1 EF – provided an overview of the work done to date in the preparation of the SLSR and updates completed during 2017. Explained that we are currently working with approximately 10% design and that the intent of the discussion with MNRF is to better understand the constraints and potential permitting requirements with respect to Species at Risk (SAR) within the study area.

#### 2.0 STRUCTURES CROSSING WATERCOURSES (SAR HABITAT)

2.1 **Queens Avenue over Thames River (Site 2)**
- EF – this bridge is to be widened slightly to the north, but will not require in-water works. WSP is aware of Spiny Softshell, Northern Map Turtle Snapping Turtle and aquatic species at risk at this site.
- KM – confirmed that if in-water works can be avoided, there is no need for permitting. Recommendations should include standard avoidance and mitigation measures. In particular, storage and staging areas are to be surrounded by exclusion fencing, and workers are to ensure that gravel is not stored in an area where the turtles are likely to nest. Workers are also to undergo awareness training of the species at risk they are potentially to encounter.
- EF – noted that there were no Barn Swallows observed on the Queens Ave bridge, though a large colony is present on the Kensington Bridge.
- KM – recommended that surveys for Barn Swallow be completed for the Queens Ave bridge in advance of the proposed works (one season prior is best). If Barn Swallows are nesting,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All action items will be addressed by in the EIS or later stages of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the proponent may proceed under the registration process (refer to Ontario Regulation 242/08)

- AK – raised issue surrounding Public Lands Act / Lands and Rivers Improvement Act. Adam indicated that each bridge should have an authorization / Licence to Occupy (Lto), which is held by the City. He advised that it is best to write a letter listing all sites where modifications to the bridges are proposed, including current Licence of Occupation number, and request that the MNRF confirm that the proposed works are acceptable based on the terms and conditions of the authorization such that a new or modified Lto is not required.

2.2 Western Road over Medway Creek (Site 3)
- EF – options to widen the bridge have been explored, but the current thinking is that a full replacement will have to occur. While it is a full replacement, it will effectively widen the bridge to the west, maintaining the existing footprint to the east.
- EF - SAR known to occupy this area include: Spiny Softshell, Northern Map Turtle, Snapping Turtle, Queensnake, Aquatic SAR including Black Redhorse, Silver Shiner and Wavy-rayed lampmussel.
- KM confirmed the above list of species, and noted that Regulated Habitat for Queensnake occurs within the general vicinity. A description of the regulated habitat is available online for reference. With respect to the Site and implications for the project, review of the mapping and additional consultation with UTRCA will be required to determine the type of habitat to be impacted by the proposed works.
- KM confirmed that aquatic SAR at this site are only listed provincially (at this time) so SARA does not apply and the DFO is therefore unlikely to be involved. Provincial and federal listings should be monitored / checked over the course of the project to ensure changes are documented and appropriately addressed.
- KM recommended that WSP review applicable policies under O. Reg. 242/08 for Wavy-rayed Lampmussel and other aquatic SAR, as applicable. For fish, habitat classification at the site should follow general habitat guidelines.
- KM - The need for a permit for SAR at this site, including Wavy-rayed Lampmussel, will likely come down to the extent of impact and scope of in-water works (e.g. need for dredging, footprint of proposed works). At detailed design, MNRF will be better able to determine whether an Overall Benefit (OB) Permit or Letter of Advice (LOA) will be appropriate for this site. Efforts should be made during detailed design to minimize the extent of impacts. Avoidance and mitigation measures, including timing windows and exclusion from the work area, should be included in the EIS.
- EF requested clarification on timelines for permitting
- KM advised that a perfect application (i.e., best case scenario) may result in a permit in 6 months. Recommended that consultation with MNRF to determine permitting requirements should occur 1.5 to 1.0 years from date of the proposed works to ensure there is sufficient time to work through the permit process. One year is generally recommended to avoid changes to regulations or species listings during the interim.
- KM – if a permit is required, the MNRF will consider all species impacts and compensation under a single permit

2.3 University Drive Bridge (Site 4)
- EF – a complete replacement of the structure is proposed here. The new bridge will be wider, with expansions to the north and south. To alleviate a pinch point in the floodplain, the team is proposing to increase the bridge span by moving the abutments further apart. Increasing the span is likely to have a greater impact on the banks and surrounding lands, including the Kentucky Coffeetree adjacent to the northeast abutment. EF explained that the intention is to use a pre-fabricated bridge to decrease the duration of the works on-site. The design requires construction of two piers at the waters’ edge.
- EF – noted that the SAR concerns at Site 4 are very similar to those for Site 3 (Spiny Softshell, Queensnake, aquatic SAR, Kentucky Coffeetree)
- KM – indicated that Kentucky Coffeetree is protected whether planted or not. Critical habitat is considered to be lands within a 20 m radius of the stem as per the federal recovery strategy, and as such, works within 20 m is considered harm. As this is a small tree, transplantation is a good option if impacts are unavoidable.
—— As with Site 3, the need for a permit will be determined by MNRF once the extent of the impacts are known (i.e., detailed design).
—— KM noted several ideas for overall benefit permits, if required, including Outreach program to educate local fisherman about Spiny Softshell turtles. Intention is to increase awareness and decrease turtle injuries and deaths. Another benefit may be to acquire and protect lands that have been identified as critical habitat.

2.4 SAR Trees in University of Western Ontario property
—— EF described observations of Kentucky Coffeetree and Butternut within the UWO property along Lambton Drive. The two Butternuts have tags that link them to the Sherwood Fox Arboretum.
—— KM recommended that if there are to be impacts to the trees then first step is to check arboretum records to determine if the Butternut were planted. If planted, not protected by the ESA. If not planted, have them assessed by a Butternut Health Assessor to determine their rank. If works are minor, likely not an issue considering the manicured and developed nature of the surrounding habitat. Removal should be avoided. If some impacts are considered to occur, planting of Butternut elsewhere on campus or general area is recommended.
—— Tree protection fencing would be suitable for protection of trees adjacent to the ROW where changes are limited to works to road surface (e.g., the clump of Kentucky Coffeetrees further west).

2.5 Wellington Street over Thames River (Site 5)
—— EF – this bridge is to be widened to the east and will require in-water works. They expect that they will require 3 to 7 months of work in the dry. Works will also involve alteration to the trail system to meet accessibility requirements. We are aware of snapping turtle nesting habitat to the northeast.
—— KL - This reach of the Thames is flagged by DFO as critical habitat – additional consultation is required to confirm presence of critical habitat at the site and permitting requirements under SARA.
—— KM advised that WSP review O. Reg. 242/08 for habitat descriptions and thresholds of disturbance for Wavy-rayed Lampmussel. Additional surveys are not required. Depending on the extent of impacts it may be possible to follow the registration process with appropriate mitigation and a mussel relocation program, otherwise Overall Benefit Permit will be required.
—— KM recommending excluding turtles from the work area. Avoid work during nesting period. Remove vegetation on the banks outside of the hibernation period. Avoid dewatering during the winter months. For turtles, it is likely best to start dewatering after spring emergence, but timing windows for fish, birds, etc. will have to be considered as well.

3.0 GENERAL OVERVIEW OF OTHER SITES

3.1 Mud Creek at Oxford Street West (Site 1)
—— EF noted that WSP did not have observations of THR or END species at this site. The recently finalized Mud Creek Subwatershed EA recorded bats (Northern Myotis and Little Brown Myotis) at the site. Tree removal along ROW is likely to be required for RT works.
—— KM recommended avoidance measures for cavity trees – specifically, removal outside of the bats’ active period. Tree removal is to occur between October 1st and March 31st.

3.2 Westminster Ponds ESA (Site 6)
—— EF explained that widening of the road is proposed along the west side of the Westminster Ponds / Pond Mills ESA. For the most part, encroachment is limited to thicket and cultural woodland communities; however, some grading is expected within the boundaries of the PSW. EF posed the question of whether or not the boundary of the PSW should be re-staked to determine appropriate compensation. EF also asked if anyone knew when the wetland was staked.
### MEETING NOTES

- KM advised that she did not know when the wetland was staked. Other MNRF staff did not know either.
- KM indicated that re-staking could be completed; however, it is typically requested by the proponent, if they feel there is something to gain. KM also indicated that we could request the wetland boundary information including date of survey) if WSP felt an update was warranted.
- KM recommended screening for cavity trees if woodland removal is proposed.

#### 3.3 Exeter Road Park ‘n Ride (Site 7)

- EF described the work program completed during 2017 for this site (breeding bird surveys, three season vegetation, aquatic habitat mapping and community surveys) and showed location of the proposed development within the manicured area of the property. EF noted that Monarch caterpillars and adults, as well as Eastern Meadowlark, were observed within the cultural meadow in the eastern portion of the site.
- KL noted that habitat in Murray Drain is not consistent with Silver Shiner habitat. KM confirmed.
- Due to location of the proposed development, MNRF did not have any concerns. KM noted that a caveat should be included in the EIS regarding the potential up-listing of Monarch at some point over the course of the project.

### 4.0 OTHER DISCUSSION POINTS

#### 4.1 Chimney Swift

- KM recommended reviewing the Swift Watch data as they have a fairly comprehensive list of nesting sites.
- EF indicated that WSP received comments from Switch Watch and that a screening of properties with the potential to be expropriated and subsequently altered/demolished was undertaken during 2017.

#### 4.2 Follow-up under Public Lands Act

- Letter should be submitted to the MNRF.Ayl.Planners@ontario.ca address for distribution to appropriate staff. Expectation is that MNRF will indicate which crossings are under which jurisdiction and then provide a LOA on which site may require a new/updated LOA versus which ones can be managed under the existing repairs and maintenance clause.
From: Brian Hollingworth  
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 5:01 PM  
To: Muller, Joseph (MTCS) <Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca>  
Cc: Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>  
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

If you can provide comments by January 26th that would be great. Sooner would be even better.

Thanks for point out the image issue.

From: Muller, Joseph (MTCS) [mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca]  
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 1:43 PM  
To: Brian Hollingworth <bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com>  
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

Thanks Brian – is there any deadline for comments? I took a quick look but couldn’t find one. As well, from pages 11-on to the end of the file, images in the Archaeology-Heritage PDF are inverted. Take care,

Joe

Joseph Muller, RPP, MCIP

Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Culture Division | Programs and Services Branch | Heritage Program Unit

401 Bay Street, Suite 1700  
Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7

Tel. 416.314.7145 | Fax. 416.212.1802

From: Brian Hollingworth [mailto:bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com]  
Sent: November 27, 2017 10:36 AM  
To: ahunt@mlems.ca; annettt@thamesriver.on.ca; Brodeur, Ghislaine (MCI); Cairns, Melody (MNRF); creightonc@thamesriver.on.ca; roderick.crichton@londonde.ca; Dagssie, Yves (MOECC); doyler@londonhydro.com; Jennifer_Benedict@cpr.ca; roelliot@uniongas.com; utility.circulations@zayo.com; Graham Harkness, Jennifer (MTO); peter.gregoire@zayo.com; sharding@london.ca; JKobarda@London.ca; sally.kuipers@bell.ca; plane@sun-canadian.com; Levecque, Heather (MIRR); stefan.linder@cn.ca; wesley.logan@gwrr.com; Christopher.Mackie@mlhu.on.ca; pmarten@sun-canadian.com; bernie.mccall@mlhu.on.ca; gian.minichini@hydroone.com; Muller, Joseph (MTCS); Nadeau, Michael (MTO); Gillingham-Nina.gillingham@rci.rogers.com; patels@londonhydro.com; janet.rae@rci.rogers.com; Abdul.salak@rci.rogers.com; bshewfelt@start.ca; SNOWSELLM.UTRCA_PO_UT_MAIN@thamesriver.on.ca; frederic.sua@telus.com; ron.touringy@esso.ca; VerscheureB.UTRCA_PO_UT_MAIN@thamesriver.on.ca; Wilson, Mitch (MNRF); joan.zhao@hydroone.com; andrew.zuk@bell.ca
Good Morning,

Please find attached a Notice of Public Information Centre #5 for the City of London’s Bus Rapid Transit System.

Regards,
Brian Hollingworth
SHIFT Consultant Project Manager
Hi Bill,

The Bus Rapid Transit Plan is currently reviewing options for BRT turnaround for each of the four transit nodes in the north, south, east and west. Turnaround options under review for the South leg of the BRT system include options where bus turning at the end of the route would be accommodated within a Park and Ride facility.

For all legs of the BRT network, in particular the turnarounds at the far ends of the system, we are encouraging the use of connecting local routes to feed riders into the spine of rapid transit.

Jennie.
Hello Marcel,

I tried calling to respond to your voice message on but was unable to find your extension in the directory. Admin sent me to the 644-1930 number but I had the same issue.

Please feel free to send me any questions via email to shift@london.ca. I am out of the office starting tomorrow, returning on January 8th.

Merry Christmas.

Jennie Ramsay, P.Eng
Project Director, Rapid Transit
Environmental & Engineering Services
City of London

300 Dufferin Ave., P.O. Box 5035 | London ON N6A 4L9
P: 519.661.CITY(2489) x 5823 | Fax: 519.661.3501
jaramsay@london.ca | www.london.ca
Subject: RE: London Rapid Transit - London Hydro Utility Relocations

From: Joe Heyninck [mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: January 2, 2018 4:42 PM
To: Davor Alisic <davora@nbmengineering.com>
Cc: Matt Cooper <matt.cooper@ibigroup.com>; Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>
Subject: London Rapid Transit - London Hydro Utility Relocations

Davor:

Matt Cooper forwarded to me a copy of your email and your request for any updates regarding areas “Under Review”.

A number of design options for these areas are under consideration – some of which are being presented to the public for review and feedback. Generally speaking, most of the areas in question will not be resolved until the middle or late January. As updates become available, we will forward the information along.

Joe Heyninck P. ENG

Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001 fax +1 519 472 9354

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.
NOTE: Ce courriel peut contenir de l'information privilégiée et confidentielle. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez le mentionner immédiatement à l'expéditeur et effacer ce courriel.

This message is confidential. If you have received it by mistake, please let us know by e-mail reply and delete it from your system; you may not copy this message or disclose its contents to anyone.
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LONDON'S BUS RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

37176

37176
January 4, 2018

Carlos Simoes
Manager of Ontario Real Estate
Canada Post
carlos.simoes@canadapost.postescanada.ca

RE: Bus Rapid Transit on Highbury Avenue

The City of London is currently undertaking an Environmental Assessment for the implementation of a Bus Rapid Transit system. Phases 1 and 2 of the Environmental Assessment were satisfied by the approval of the London Rapid Transit Master Plan by London City Council on July 25th, 2017. The Rapid Transit Master Plan defined the Rapid Transit network, including which streets will have dedicated lanes for transit, and that buses are the preferred transit technology.

The City is currently undertaking the pre-planning activities in preparation for the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) (Ontario Regulation 231/08). This work includes the development and evaluation of design alternatives for the approved Bus Rapid Transit network. We are also completing technical studies to assess potential impacts, identify mitigation and monitoring requirements. Consultation with stakeholders and property owners is an important part of the process.

We have identified five Canada Post facilities along the approved Bus Rapid Transit network, as shown in the map below:

1. London Letter Carrier Depot 4, 720 Proudfoot Lane
2. London Letter Carrier Depot 6, 300 Wellington Street
3. Postal Station, 387 Wellington Road South, Unit 387A
4. London Processing Facility, 951 Highbury Avenue
5. London Divisional Office, 955 Highbury Avenue
For the first three facilities, potential impacts may include changes to traffic patterns during construction, and changes to access after construction.

For the facilities on Highbury Avenue, potential impacts may include property required to widen Highbury Avenue to accommodate dedicated transit lanes.

Attached are the conceptual engineering designs for the roads adjacent to each of the above-noted properties.

We would like to meet with you to review the design, and in particular along Highbury Avenue and potential impacts to Canada Post facilities. Please contact me at the number below, or Heather Beecroft at 519-661-2489 Ext. 3518, to arrange a meeting at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Jennie Ramsay, P.Eng.
Project Director, Rapid Transit
City of London

Phone: (519) 661-2489, Ext. 3518
E-mail: jaramsay@london.ca

c.c. Brian Hollingworth, P.Eng., IBI Group

The Corporation of the City of London
www.london.ca
Good afternoon Carlos,

Please see the attached letter from Jennie Ramsay regarding Bus Rapid Transit on Highbury Avenue.

Thank you,

Heather Beecroft

Administrative Assistant
Rapid Transit Implementation
City of London

300 Dufferin Avenue PO Box 5035 London, ON N6A 4L9
P: 519.630.1780
hbeecroft@london.ca | www.london.ca
Date: January 15, 2018  Project: Bus Rapid Transit
Date of meeting: January 15, 2018  Project Number: TS1430
Location: City Hall, 300 Dufferin Ave
Time: 2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Purpose: Meeting with Union Gas to review conflicts between existing Union Gas infrastructure and the future BRT routes.

Attendees: Organization: E-Mail: Role:
Ashley Rammeloo  City of London  arammelo@London.ca  RT Manager of Engineering
Ardian Spahiu  City of London  aspahiu@London.ca  RT Engineer
Jaden Hodgins  City of London  jhodgins@London.ca  RT Engineer-in-Training
Joe Heyninck  IBI Group  JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com  Consulting Engineer
Rob Elliot  Union Gas  roelliot@uniongas.com  Construction Project Manager

DISTRIBUTION: All Attendees and the following: Jennie Ramsay (RT), Brian Hollingsworth (IBI), Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP)

Item | Details | Action By
--- | --- | ---
1 | Rapid Transit project team and Union Gas reviewed the “Private Utilities Conflicts” excel spreadsheet, which highlights all conflicts between Union Gas plant and planned RT infrastructure (BRT lanes, stations, etc.). Of interest at this stage of the project is:  
- Identification of RT related conflicts;  
- Cost estimates of relocation requirements;  
- Identification of any major works that could have an impact on schedule;  
- Identification of any property requirements. Utility coordination work will continue beyond the current exercise to ensure that all growth or infrastructure renewal works are coordinated with proposed RT corridor works. | N/A

2 | Union Gas was previously requested to prepare high-level cost estimates to relocate all required Union Gas plant in conflict. Rob presented his first draft of the cost estimates, which amounted to approximately $4,000,000.00 which does | N/A

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not include provision for road reinstatement or complex traffic control, but does includes Union Gas’ 20% contingency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RT project team requested that Rob go back and check for any property requirements required for RT-related Union Gas work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Currently there are no major conflicts (“showstoppers”) identified with Union Gas which would result in very high cost or delays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Details of Cost Sharing between City of London and Union Gas have not been worked out. It was suggested City should carry 100% cost into their estimate as worst case scenario; Ardian advised that City will expect to use existing franchise agreements 35%(City) / 65%(Union Gas) cost sharing split as a starting point, as per previous projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rob will continue to refine his cost estimates and provide a breakdown of costs for each gas main relocation project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The City advised that the drawings provided to Union Gas were from BRTMP and the design has continued to evolve. Also, it was noted that the major 200mm gas main impact at Richmond/Fanshawe Park Road will not fall under BRT, but rather Fanshawe Park Road EA project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Joe advised that some of the mapping/records that IBI and the City have of Union Gas plant may be out of date. It would be beneficial if Union Gas would review their existing plant mapping and compare to the base plan information that the RT team is working off and provide any revisions/updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RT and Union gas discussed the benefits of access to gas valves being located within BRT lanes – i.e., during night, no BRT and dedicated lanes would be empty, and this may be ideal time for Union Gas to conduct annual inspection of their 2000+ emergency valves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RT/IBI advised that they would like to finalize all of the utility conflict information (list of conflicts, costs, etc.) by February 16, 2018. Rob indicated that this should not be an issue as they have completed much of the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The foregoing represents the writer’s understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.

Minutes Prepared by:

Jaden Hodgins
Engineer-in-Training
Rapid Transit / City of London
jhodgins@london.ca

Joe Heyninck
London Office Lead
IBI Group
jheyninck@ibigroup.com

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
Hi Jennie,

I received your email from Carlos Simoes. He is our Facility Manager for Central Canada and I am responsible for the Real Estate Planning for Central.
I left you a voicemail as well, wasn’t sure which is the best way to connect.
I understand that you would like to meet which is no problem but this week is not good for me. Next week is a bit better, and right now I think Wednesday may be my only available day. Otherwise the following week looks better.

Let me know what works for you and hopefully we can find a common date/time to connect. Please keep in mind that I live in the GTA area so I will need some time to make the drive to London.

Thanks and look forward to hearing from you.

...Kristine Lowe

From: Beecroft, Heather mailto:hbeecroft@london.ca
Sent: January-12-18 4:06 PM
To: SIMOES, Carlos <carlos.simoes@canadapost.postescanada.ca>
Subject: Bus Rapid Transit on Highbury Avenue
Date: January 16, 2018  
Date of meeting: January 16, 2018  
Location: City Hall, 300 Dufferin Ave  
Time: 1:00 p.m.–2:30 p.m.  
Purpose: Meeting with London Hydro to review conflicts between existing LH infrastructure and the future BRT routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
<th>Role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Rammeloo</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arammelo@London.ca">arammelo@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Manager of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardian Spahiu</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aspahiu@london.ca">aspahiu@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaden Hodgins</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhodgins@london.ca">jhodgins@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer-in-Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Heyninck</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com">JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Doyle</td>
<td>London Hydro (LH)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doyler@londonhydro.com">doyler@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td>Senior Distribution Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny Patel</td>
<td>London Hydro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patels@londonhydro.com">patels@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td>Distribution Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyan Brkic</td>
<td>NBM Engineering (NBM)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:boyanb@nbmengineering.com">boyanb@nbmengineering.com</a></td>
<td>Electrical Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davor Alisic</td>
<td>NBM Engineering</td>
<td><a href="mailto:davora@nbmengineering.com">davora@nbmengineering.com</a></td>
<td>Electrical Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISTRIBUTION:** All Attendees and the following: Jennie Ramsay (RT), Brian Hollingsworth (IBI), Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP)

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>London Hydro introduced representatives from NBM Engineering who have been retained by London Hydro to assist them with this project. London Hydro noted that NBM has worked on other similar projects and has a considerable amount of experience with RT projects in the GTA. NBM noted that they have also been retained by Rogers to prepare similar impacts and costs wrt to their cable plant.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2    | It was noted that base mapping of the RT corridors and a spreadsheet identifying conflict areas was previously provided to London Hydro for their review and work on this project. IBI advised that the drawings and spreadsheet summary of conflicts was based on the approved BRT master plan concepts which were completed last spring. The design of the RT corridors has continued to evolve since that time. Due to the time constraints, it was important to get as much design information into the hands of utility companies as early as possible in order that they could start their own review and analysis. Going forward, adjustments may be necessary as the corridor designs continue to evolve. Notwithstanding that changes will be forthcoming, it is anticipated that given the overall 24 km of RT corridor, the majority of the design revisions which will impact utilities will be localized. Areas where more significant changes are anticipated include:  
  - Oxford St from Platt's to Wharncliffe – impacts on both sides of road; BRT design in this area not finalized; London Hydro will be impacted;  
  - Richmond Street – north of Oxford to the University gates; 2 lanes vs 4 lanes;  
  - Dundas St East – concern about impact to existing overhead hydro - may need to look at underground to avoid conflict with building face;  
  - Wellington Curve – design options still being evaluated. | N/A |
Of interest at this stage of the project is:

- Identification of RT related conflicts;
- Cost estimates of relocation requirements;
- Identification of any major works that could have an impact on schedule;
- Identification of any property requirements.

The RT team noted that there will be a PIC January 24th, 2018; After that PIC, it is expected that all the public comments will be received and consolidated which will take approximately two weeks. Over this time period, the design team will be working to resolve any outstanding design issues and to develop a technically preferred design. Final adjustments relating to utility conflicts will likely need to be made shortly thereafter with the final product due early March.

The RT design team is working to obtain first draft cost estimates and property requirements from each utility by February 16, 2018.

London Hydro indicated that their consultant is well through their design analysis and that they should be able to provide their initial cost estimates and property requirements by the February 16th date.

London Hydro inquired about the need and ability to relocate underground facilities particularly hydro vaults in the downtown area.

It was noted that the starting point for discussion would be to assume that facilities will need to be relocated per the original design criteria and the initial cost estimates should be based on those assumptions. The next step would be to evaluate the cost implications of major items to the overall project budget.

In evaluating relocation alternatives, it will be necessary to understand what the operational aspects are for the facilities in question – ie how often are work crews accessing a chamber?; for how long?; time of day? – are off-hours (night-time) operations feasible? Discussions regarding the design alternatives will no doubt be on-going however, it is important to obtain first order estimates for relocation costs in order to complete evaluations.

London Hydro / NBM advised that they have completed an initial assessment of the conflicts and relocation requirements; They noted that it is important for the City to recognize that the relocations may extend beyond just the areas identified by IBI Group. They noted that it will be necessary to strike consistent alignments for pole relocations; also some sections may require overhead plant to be buried in areas that were not identified by IBI Group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Details of Cost Sharing between City of London and London Hydro have not been worked out. It was suggested City should carry 100% cost into their estimate as worst case scenario; The City advised that they will use existing cost sharing agreements with utilities as a starting point.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cost Sharing to be discussed at a higher level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>London Hydro is to identify property requirements however property costs are not to be included in their estimate. The City will take the property information and include it with their own evaluation of property costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH/CoL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IBI noted that would be beneficial if London Hydro would review their existing plant mapping and compare to the base plan information that the RT team is working off and provide any revisions/updates necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It was noted that the information provided by London Hydro will follow the templates provided by IBI/CoL – with each element identified within the spreadsheet being costed separately. Further, appropriate allowances for engineering and design as well as contingencies will be included in the estimates. Estimating allowances and contingencies are to be identified either as a percentage or lump sums where appropriate. Restoration cost are to be included for all underground works.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH/NBM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing represents the writer’s understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.

Minutes Prepared by:

Jaden Hodgins      Joe Heyninck
Engineer-in-Training    London Office Lead
Rapid Transit / City of London    IBI Group
jhodgins@london.ca    jheyninck@ibigroup.com

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
Tiffany Chan

Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

From: Muller, Joseph (MTCS) [mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 3:31 PM
To: Brian Hollingworth <bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com>
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

Hello Brian:

I have taken a look at the PIC materials as posted, and attach prior comments for background. I do note that the focus on cultural constraints for built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes as outlined in the archaeology-heritage mapping is on previously identified listed and designated properties, and previously identified heritage conservation districts. Included in the scope of environmental assessments is the identification and evaluation of properties and landscapes of potential cultural heritage value or interest (and as noted in my letter of September 18, 2017). Have you any updates on my prior comments (which I’m reiterating here)?

As well, I note that for the segment of Oxford between Wharncliffe and Platt’s Lane, 7 listed and 1 designated properties will be impacted regardless as to the alternative selected. Can you describe the nature of these impacts? What will be the timing of heritage impact assessments on these properties, if warranted?

Please contact me if you have any questions or would like to further discuss the file/project. Thank-you for your assistance,

Joe

Joseph Muller, RPP, MCIP

Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Culture Division | Programs and Services Branch | Heritage Program Unit

401 Bay Street, Suite 1700
Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7

Tel. 416.314.7145 | Fax. 416.212.1802

From: Brian Hollingworth [mailto:bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: December 18, 2017 5:01 PM
To: Muller, Joseph (MTCS)
Cc: Margaret Parkhill
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

If you can provide comments by January 26th that would be great. Sooner would be even better.

Thanks for point out the image issue.
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

Thanks Brian – is there any deadline for comments? I took a quick look but couldn’t find one. As well, from pages 11-on to the end of the file, images in the Archaeology-Heritage PDF are inverted. Take care,

Joe

Joseph Muller, RPP, MCIP

Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Culture Division | Programs and Services Branch | Heritage Program Unit

401 Bay Street, Suite 1700
Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7

Tel. 416.314.7145 | Fax. 416.212.1802

From: Brian Hollingworth [mailto:bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 27, 2017 10:20 AM
To: ahunt@mlems.ca; annett.thamesriver.on.ca; Brodeur, Ghislaine (MCI); Cairns, Melody (MNRF); creightonz@thamesriver.on.ca; roderick.crichton@london.de.ca; Dagssie, Yves (MOECC); doyler@londonhydro.com; Jennifer_Benedict@cpr.ca; roelliot@uniongas.com; utility.circulations@zayo.com; Graham Harkness, Jennifer (MTO); peter.gregoire@zayo.com; sharding@london.ca; JKobarda@London.ca; sally.kuipers@bell.ca; plane@sun-canadian.com; Levecque, Heather (MIR); stefan.linder@cn.ca; wesley.logan@gwrr.com; Christopher.Mackie@mlhu.on.ca; bernie.mccall@mlhu.on.ca; gian.minichini@hydroone.com; Muller, Joseph (MTCS); Nadeau, Michael (MTO); Gillingham-Nina.gillingham@rci.rogers.com; patels@londonhydro.com; janet.rae@rci.rogers.com; Abdul.salak@rci.rogers.com; bhewfelt@start.ca; SNOWSELLM.UTRCA_PO.UT_MAIN@thamesriver.on.ca; frederic.sua@telus.com; ron.tourigny@esso.ca; VerscheureB.UTRCA_PO.UT_MAIN@thamesriver.on.ca; Wilson, Mitch (MNRF); joan.zhao@hydroone.com; andrew.zuk@bell.ca
Cc: Shift; Ramsay, Jennie
Subject: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

Good Morning,

Please find attached a Notice of Public Information Centre #5 for the City of London’s Bus Rapid Transit System.

Regards,
Brian Hollingworth
SHIFT Consultant Project Manager
Hi Joe,

Thanks for following up. We are in the process of drafting the Cultural Heritage Screening Report, and updating the Stage 1 & 2 archaeology assessment. The draft reports will go to London’s Advisory Committee on Heritage for review and comment in February. Once in a final draft form, we will circulate to you for review and comment.

Regarding the segment of Oxford between Wharncliffe and Platt’s Lane, this section is likely to be the last portion constructed, which would be between 2025 and 2028. Note that we are reviewing the implementation schedule in context with other capital improvement plans across the City, and will have an updated construction phasing plan in the draft Environmental Project Report.

Regards,

Brian Hollingworth

---

I will consult with our heritage planner and provide an answer.

---

Hello Brian:

I have taken a look at the PIC materials as posted, and attach prior comments for background. I do note that the focus on cultural constraints for built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes as outlined in the archaeology-heritage mapping is on previously identified listed and designated properties, and previously identified heritage conservation districts. Included in the scope of environmental assessments is the identification and evaluation of properties and landscapes of potential cultural heritage value or interest (and as noted in my letter of September 18, 2017). Have you any updates on my prior comments (which I’m reiterating here)?

As well, I note that for the segment of Oxford between Wharncliffe and Platt’s Lane, 7 listed and 1 designated properties will be impacted regardless as to the alternative selected. Can you describe the nature of these impacts? What will be the timing of heritage impact assessments on these properties, if warranted?
Please contact me if you have any questions or would like to further discuss the file/project. Thank-you for your assistance,

Joe

Joseph Muller, RPP, MCIP

Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Culture Division | Programs and Services Branch | Heritage Program Unit

401 Bay Street, Suite 1700
Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7

Tel. 416.314.7145 | Fax. 416.212.1802

From: Brian Hollingworth [mailto:bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: December 18, 2017 5:01 PM
To: Muller, Joseph (MTCS)
Cc: Margaret Parkhill
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

If you can provide comments by January 26th that would be great. Sooner would be even better.

Thanks for point out the image issue.

From: Muller, Joseph (MTCS) [mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca]
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 1:43 PM
To: Brian Hollingworth <bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com>
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

Thanks Brian – is there any deadline for comments? I took a quick look but couldn’t find one. As well, from pages 11-on to the end of the file, images in the Archaeology-Heritage PDF are inverted. Take care,

Joe

Joseph Muller, RPP, MCIP

Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Culture Division | Programs and Services Branch | Heritage Program Unit

401 Bay Street, Suite 1700
Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7

Tel. 416.314.7145 | Fax. 416.212.1802

From: Brian Hollingworth [mailto:bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: November 27, 2017 10:36 AM
To: ahunt@mlems.ca; annettt@thamesriver.on.ca; Brodeur, Ghislaine (MCI); Cairns, Melody (MNRF); creightonc@thamesriver.on.ca; roderick.crichton@londonde.ca; Dagssie, Yves (MOECC); doyler@londonhydro.com;
Good Morning,

Please find attached a Notice of Public Information Centre #5 for the City of London’s Bus Rapid Transit System.

Regards,

Brian Hollingworth
SHIFT Consultant Project Manager
January 4, 2018

Carlos Simoes
Manager of Ontario Real Estate
Canada Post
Carlos.Simoes@canadapost.com

RE: Bus Rapid Transit on Highbury Ave

The City of London is currently undertaking a Bus Rapid Transit system. Phases 1 and 2 of the approval of the London Rapid Transit Master Plan defined the Rapid Transit Master Plan defined the Rapid Transit system's requirements, including dedicated lanes for transit, and that buses serve the system. The City is currently undertaking the pre-
Good afternoon Carlos,

Please see the attached letter from Jennie Ramsay regarding Bus Rapid Transit on Highbury Avenue.

Thank you,

Heather Beecroft
Administrative Assistant
Rapid Transit Implementation
City of London

300 Dufferin Avenue PO Box 5035 London, ON
N6A 4L9
P: 519.630.1780
hbeecroft@london.ca | www.london.ca
Date: January 30, 2018  
Date of meeting: January 30, 2018  
Location: City Hall, 300 Dufferin Ave  
Time: 2:30 p.m.–3:30 p.m.  
Purpose: The meeting was with Bell Canada to review conflicts between existing Bell infrastructure and the future BRT routes.

Attendees: | Organization: | E-Mail: | Role: |
---|---|---|---|
Ashley Rammeloo | City of London (CoL) | arammelo@London.ca | RT Manager of Engineering |
Ardian Spahiu | City of London | aspahiu@London.ca | RT Engineer |
Jaden Hodgins | City of London | jhodgins@London.ca | RT Engineer-in-Training |
Joe Heyninck | IBI Group (IBI) | JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com | Consultant |
Andrew Zuk | Bell Canada (Bell) | andrew.zuk@bell.ca | Structures Manager |

**DISTRIBUTION:** All Attendees and the following: Jennie Ramsay (RT), Brian Hollingsworth (IBI), Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP)

### Item Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | It was noted that base mapping of the RT corridors and a spreadsheet identifying conflict areas was previously provided to Bell for their review and work on this project.  

IBI advised that the drawings and spreadsheet summary of conflicts was based on the approved BRT master plan concepts which were completed last spring. | N/A |
The design of the RT corridors has continued to evolve since that time. Due to the time constraints, it was important to get as much design information into the hands of utility companies as early as possible in order that they could start their own review and analysis.

Going forward, adjustments may be necessary as the corridor designs continue to evolve. Notwithstanding that changes will be forthcoming, it is anticipated that given the overall 24 km of RT corridor, the majority of the design revisions which will impact utilities will be localized.

Areas where more significant changes are anticipated include:

- Oxford St from Platt’s to Wharncliffe – impacts on both sides of road; BRT design in this area not finalized; London Hydro will be impacted;
- Richmond Street – north of Oxford to the University gates; 2 lanes vs 4 lanes;
- Dundas St East – concern about impact to existing overhead hydro - may need to look at underground to avoid conflict with building face;
- Wellington Curve – design options still being evaluated.

Of interest at this stage of the project is:

- Identification of RT related conflicts;
- Cost estimates of relocation requirements;
- Identification of any major works that could have an impact on schedule;
- Identification of any property requirements.

The RT team noted that a PIC was held January 24th, 2018; It is expected that within the next couple of weeks all the public comments will be received and consolidated. Over this time period, the design team will also be working to resolve any outstanding design issues and to develop a technically preferred design. Final adjustments relating to utility conflicts will likely need to be made shortly thereafter with the final product due early March.

The RT design team is working to obtain first draft cost estimates and property requirements from each utility by February 16, 2018.

Bell indicated that the time frames are tight but they will have some level of cost estimate by the February 16th date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Page 3</strong></th>
<th><strong>City of London</strong></th>
<th><strong>IBI Group</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **5** | IBI noted the need for Bell to liaise with London Hydro to confirm where LH will be relocating their hydro poles as these relocations will no doubt have a significant impact on aerial Bell cable. |

| **6** | Bell inquired about the need and ability to relocate underground facilities particularly chambers in the downtown area. It was noted that the starting point for discussion would be to assume that facilities will need to be relocated per the original design criteria and the initial cost estimates should be based on those assumptions. The next step would be to evaluate the cost implications of major items to the overall project budget. In evaluating relocation alternatives, it will be necessary to understand what the operational aspects are for the facilities in question – ie how often are work crews accessing a chamber?; for how long?; time of day? – are off-hours (night-time) operations feasible? Discussions regarding the design alternatives will no doubt be on-going however, it is important to obtain first order estimates for relocation costs in order to complete evaluations. |

| **7** | Bell advised that they have partially completed their assessment of impacts and costs. They expressed concern regarding the time lines and the level of detail required for the estimates. It was noted that it was important to obtain first order estimates from by February 16th. Bell advised that they should be able to cover off most of the items and that they will submit whatever they have by that date. It was noted that details of regarding cost sharing between City of London and utilities have not been worked out. The City advised that they will use existing cost sharing agreements with utilities as a starting point. |

| **8** | Bell was requested to identify any property requirements however property costs are not to be included in their estimate. The City will take the property information and include it with their own evaluation of property costs. Restoration costs are to be included for any underground works; Engineering/design and appropriate contingencies should also be included. Cost estimates at this time are to deal strictly with RT conflict items and not infrastructure renewal or growth items. These items will eventually be required as part of the overall planning and design of the project. |

---

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBI noted that would be beneficial if Bell could review their existing plant mapping and compare to the base plan information that the RT team is working off and provide any revisions/updates necessary.</td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was noted that the information provided by London Hydro will follow the templates provided by IBI/CoL – with each element identified within the spreadsheet being costed separately. Further, appropriate allowances for engineering and design as well as contingencies will be included in the estimates. Estimating allowances and contingencies are to be identified either as a percentage or lump sums where appropriate. Restoration cost are to be included for all underground works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The foregoing represents the writer’s understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.*

Minutes Prepared by:

Joe Heyninck  
London Office Lead  
IBI Group  
jheyninck@ibigroup.com
Meeting Date: January 31, 2018  
Location: 355 Wellington Street, Suite 245, London, ON  
Time: 10:00am – 11:30pm  
Purpose: Meeting with Citi Plaza representatives to provide an update on the BRT project and review conceptual design options for the downtown area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennie Ramsay</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jaramsay@london.ca">jaramsay@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaden Hodgins</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhodgins@london.ca">jhodgins@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer-in-Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Heyninck</td>
<td>IBI Group</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jheyninck@ibigroup.com">jheyninck@ibigroup.com</a></td>
<td>Consulting Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Wludyka</td>
<td>Citi Plaza / Avison Young</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bonnie.wludyka@avisonyoung.com">bonnie.wludyka@avisonyoung.com</a></td>
<td>Senior Property Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Huggins</td>
<td>Citi Plaza / Avison Young</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tim.huggins@avisonyoung.com">tim.huggins@avisonyoung.com</a></td>
<td>Operations Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Dixon</td>
<td>Citi Plaza / Avison Young</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tim.dixon@avisonyoung.com">tim.dixon@avisonyoung.com</a></td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISTRIBUTION:** All Attendees and the following: Brian Hollingsworth (IBI), Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP), Vincent Ermatinger (WSP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The <strong>City</strong> provided a general update on the project and presented the latest conceptual design plans for the downtown area and particularly the area in the vicinity of Citi Plaza &amp; the King/Wellington Intersection.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
Upon reviewing the proposed design, Citi-Plaza representatives identified areas of concern/interest from their perspective in operating the Citi-Plaza:

- the lack of a dedicated right turn lane off King Street onto Wellington;
- access / egress from underground parking off King Street and loading areas (especially during construction);
- the configuration of the proposed new platform at King and Wellington;
- the number of buses being staged at this location;
- noise and vibration from buses and impact on overhead offices;
- ventilation intakes within proximity to the platform;
- security in the vicinity of platforms;
- concern about confined platform areas and ability of pedestrians to move about along the adjacent sidewalk;
- platform amenities – will there be security cameras; heating; emergency buttons; needle drop boxes;
- the staging of buses at the Citi-Plaza platforms;
- maintenance and cleanliness at platforms;
- branding of individual stations and will they be able to have input.

The City of London advised that they are aware of many of the design issues and many of the items raised have been addressed. Particularly items relating to the platform designs – eg security issues, cameras etc. Although platforms at this stage of the project are only being developed to a preliminary engineering design level, many of the amenities identified by the Citi Plaza will be incorporated into the final design of the platforms. The proposed platform at Citi-Plaza will be an open concept design located under the overhead crossing structure. The design team is aware of the heavy pedestrian movement in this area and the platform facilities will be designed to accommodate both transit users and pedestrian.

IBI advised that transit specialists will look at noise and emissions issues as well as the proximity of the ventilation intakes to the proposed platforms.

The City advised that while the Citi-Plaza platform will be a busy location servicing as a transfer point between the two legs of the RT system as well as local transit – buses will not be “staging” at this location.

The BRT platforms will be maintained at a high standard – increased frequency of with power washing and garbage collection.

The process for development of branding at platform locations will include opportunities for public participation and certainly the Citi-Plaza platforms will need to be developed in consultation with Citi-Plaza owners.

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
The foregoing represents the writer’s understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.

Minutes Prepared by:

Joe Heyninck
IBI Group
jheyninck@ibigroup.com
Date of meeting: January 31, 2018

Location: City Hall
         9th Floor Board Room

Time: 2:00 p.m.–3:30 p.m.

**Purpose:** The meeting was with Canada Post to discuss Canada Post properties located along the 24 km of proposed RT corridor and identify potential impacts and mitigation measures where appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
<th>Role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennie Ramsay</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jaramsay@london.ca">jaramsay@london.ca</a></td>
<td>Director of London Bus Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardian Spahiu</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aspahiu@london.ca">aspahiu@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Rammelloo</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arammeloo@London.ca">arammeloo@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Manager of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Heyninck</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com">JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Lowe</td>
<td>Canada Post</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kristine.Lowe@canadapost.ca">Kristine.Lowe@canadapost.ca</a></td>
<td>Director, Real Estate Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Sirenko</td>
<td>Canada Post</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Nicholas.Sirenko@canadapost.ca">Nicholas.Sirenko@canadapost.ca</a></td>
<td>Head Traffic Section West Region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISTRIBUTION:** All Attendees and the following: Jennie Ramsay (RT), Brian Hollingsworth (IBI), Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP)

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
Jennie Ramsay provided background on the London Rapid Transit project and the current status of the project.

It was noted that there are a number of Canada Post facilities located along the 24 km route – some of which are operations at a property that is leased by Canada Posts and others at sites that are owned.

Sites noted:
- Oxford Street West / 720 Proudfoot;
- Wellington Road at Horton Street;
- Wellington Road at
- Highbury Avenue:

The City completed a walk-through of each of the corridors in the vicinity of the each of the Canada Post sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jennie Ramsay provided background on the London Rapid Transit project and the current status of the project. It was noted that there are a number of Canada Post facilities located along the 24 km route – some of which are operations at a property that is leased by Canada Posts and others at sites that are owned. Sites noted: • Oxford Street West / 720 Proudfoot; • Wellington Road at Horton Street; • Wellington Road at • Highbury Avenue: The City completed a walk-through of each of the corridors in the vicinity of the each of the Canada Post sites.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>720 Proudfoot: Canada Post advised that this is a local distribution hub; there are large 5 ton vehicles that access the site (not tractor trailers) that deliver to the site in the early morning hours; from that point – from 6 am to 6 pm, both personal and delivery vehicles access the site. They estimate that the total number of staff and delivery vehicles to be less than 100 per day (actual numbers can be provided if necessary). The most significant issue that they see at this site is access. Delivery at this site is based on a time values routes – so any disruption that could significantly impact on delivery times originating at this location would be of a concern to Canada Post. Access to this site is currently provided directly off Oxford Street. The future development of rapid transit would result in a median being constructed down the centre of Oxford Street which would mean that access into the site off Oxford would be restricted to right-in / right-out only. Canada Post advised that using the main access off Proudfoot is not an option from their perspective given how busy that access is from Good Life and the bowling alley.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
The City noted that U-turns would be allowed at Proudfoot and at Beaverbrook – which although these points are slightly farther away for vehicles heading east from the site and arriving from the west – making U-turns at these points does provide drivers with a protected and safer turn and will not significantly add to delivery times. Canada Post indicated that this would appear to be a reasonable option.

300 Wellington:

This terminal services the downtown area.

Access to this site off Wellington is currently restricted to right-in / right out. Proposed changes on Wellington will reconfigure this access slightly and it will remain as right-in / right-out only. There will also be impacts to the parking on the west of the building.

Canada Post advised that most of their vehicles use Bathurst, Waterloo and Horton. They do not see that there will be any impacts to their delivery operations.

Canada Post currently does not occupy the west end of the building and they will not be impacted by any loss of parking in this area.

387 Wellington:

This location is strictly retail. Impacts would be the same for any other operation within the mall site. No significant issues at this location.

Highbury Avenue:

There are three distinct operations at this site:

- the site serves as a major regional hub which services London and region from which all mail is processed;
- local distribution and delivery;
- administration.

The sites functions 24/7 with tractor trailers making deliveries to the site at all times of the day.

Canada Post would be concerned about any modifications that would have an impact into access at this site.
The City noted that with the development of the lands on the east side of Highbury and the implementation of RT; the existing access to the Canada Post side would line up with a future roadway to the east and the intersection would become signalized. The net impact to the Canada Post side would be improved access.

The widening of Highbury Avenue could have an impact on Canada Post lands with a slight encroachment what is now a grassed boulevard area. Canada Post advised that there only major concern would be access by tractor-trailers into there processing facility. They would need to be able to make the turns off Highbury and through the controlled gate-house access. Depending on truck turning analysis – the gatehouse may need to be relocated to accommodate the movement.

IBI enquired about whether the London Hydro poles located along the west side of Highbury are located within an easement on Canada Post lands. Canada Post was not aware of an easement but could investigate and advise if necessary.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>Canada Post advised that any future property negotiations would be a straight forward process and they did not see any significant issues provided their operational concerns were addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The foregoing represents the writer’s understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.*

Minutes Prepared by:

Joe Heyninck  
London Office Lead  
IBI Group  
jheyninck@ibigroup.com

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
Subject: RE: London RT - Meeting with Bell / Meeting Notes

From: Joe Heyninck
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 4:38 PM
To: Andrew.zuk@bell.ca
Cc: Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>; Hodgins, Jaden <jhodgins@london.ca>

Andrew:

Please see attached meeting notes. Let me know if you have any comments.

Joe Heyninck P. ENG

Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001 fax +1 519 472 9354

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.
NOTE: Ce courriel peut contenir de l'information privilégiée et confidentielle. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez le mentionner immédiatement à l'expéditeur et effacer ce courriel.
Subject: RE: London Rapid Transit - London Hydro Utility Relocations

From: Joe Heyninck
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 4:36 PM
To: Davor Alisic <davora@nbmengineering.com>
Cc: Matt Cooper <matt.cooper@ibigroup.com>; Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>; Boyan Brkic <boyanb@nbmengineering.com>; Rod Doyle <doyler@londonhydro.com>; Patel, Sunny <patels@londonhydro.com>; Ashley Rammelloo (arammelo@london.ca) <arammelo@london.ca>; Spahiu, Ardian <aspahiu@london.ca>
Subject: RE: London Rapid Transit - London Hydro Utility Relocations

Davor – we are currently going through our drawings to highlight those areas under review. Having said that, we do not want to impact on the delivery of information for the 16th of February. Adjustments, where necessary, will be made after that date.

Joe Heyninck P. ENG
Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001 fax +1 519 472 9354

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.
NOTE: Ce courriel peut contenir de l'information privilégiée et confidentielle. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez le mentionner immédiatement à l'expéditeur et effacer ce courriel.

From: Davor Alisic <davora@nbmengineering.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 5:11 PM
To: Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: Matt Cooper <matt.cooper@ibigroup.com>; Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>; Boyan Brkic <boyanb@nbmengineering.com>; Rod Doyle <doyler@londonhydro.com>; Patel, Sunny <patels@londonhydro.com>
Subject: RE: London Rapid Transit - London Hydro Utility Relocations

Hi Joe,

Do you have any updates regarding the areas under review, we just want to make sure that we are able to meet your proposed deadline.

Thanks in advance,
Davor

From: Davor Alisic
Sent: January 24, 2018 2:04 PM
To: 'Joe Heyninck' <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: 'Matt Cooper' <matt.cooper@ibigroup.com>; 'Margaret Parkhill' <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>; Boyan Brkic
Hi Joe,

Just wanted to follow up regarding areas under review. Let me know if anything has changed.

Thanks,
Davor

---

From: Davor Alisic
Sent: January 2, 2018 6:12 PM
To: 'Joe Heyninck' <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: Matt Cooper <matt.cooper@ibigroup.com>; Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>; Boyan Brkic <boyanb@nbmengineering.com>
Subject: RE: London Rapid Transit - London Hydro Utility Relocations

Hi Joe,

Thanks for clarifying.

Regards,
Davor

---

From: Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Sent: January 2, 2018 4:42 PM
To: Davor Alisic <davora@nbmengineering.com>
Cc: Matt Cooper <matt.cooper@ibigroup.com>; Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>
Subject: RE: London Rapid Transit - London Hydro Utility Relocations

Davor:

Matt Cooper forwarded to me a copy of your email and your request for any updates regarding areas “Under Review”.

A number of design options for these areas are under consideration – some of which are being presented to the public for review and feedback. Generally speaking, most of the areas in question will not be resolved until the middle or late January. As updates become available, we will forward the information along.

Joe Heyninck P. ENG

Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001 fax +1 519 472 9354

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.
NOTE: Ce courriel peut contenir de l’information privilégiée et confidentielle. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez le mentionner immédiatement à l’expéditeur et effacer ce courriel.
This message is confidential. If you have received it by mistake, please let us know by e-mail reply and delete it from your system; you may not copy this message or disclose its contents to anyone.
Tiffany Chan

Subject: RE: London RT - Meeting with Bell / Meeting Notes

From: Zuk, Andrew [mailto:andrew.zuk@bell.ca]
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 11:32 AM
To: Joe Heyninck <JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>; Hodgins, Jaden <jhodgins@london.ca>
Subject: RE: London RT - Meeting with Bell / Meeting Notes

Hi Joe,

Thank you for providing the meeting minutes. I do not have any comments on the minutes.

I reached out to London Hydro after our meeting and their consultant stated they can provide their information at the earliest the beginning of next week. I’m currently compiling the Bell high level cost estimate based on the Bell conflict spreadsheet and drawings. I will incorporate as much of the costs associated to the London Hydro work once provided and have the overall estimate to you no later than February 16th.

Andrew Zuk, EIT
Structure Manager, Network Provisioning
100 Dundas Street, Floor 4
London, Ontario N6A 5B6
T: 519.850.5977 C: 519.281.3624

From: Joe Heyninck [mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 4:38 PM
To: Zuk, Andrew <andrew.zuk@bell.ca>
Cc: Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>; Hodgins, Jaden <jhodgins@london.ca>
Subject: London RT - Meeting with Bell / Meeting Notes

Andrew:

Please see attached meeting notes. Let me know if you have any comments.

Joe Heyninck P. ENG
Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001  fax +1 519 472 9354

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.
NOTE: Ce courriel peut contenir de l'information privilégiée et confidentielle. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez le mentionner immédiatement à l'expéditeur et effacer ce courriel.
Subject: RE: London RT - Park N’ Ride

From: Joe Heyninck
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2018 3:55 PM
To: Haight, Steve (OPP) <Steve.Haight@opp.ca>
Cc: Margaret Parkhill <margaret.parkhill@ibigroup.com>; Jennie Ramsay (jaramsay@london.ca) <jaramsay@london.ca>; Spahiu, Ardian <aspahiu@london.ca>

Subject: London RT - Park N’ Ride

Staff Sergeant Haigth:

Please find attached digital versions of the two figures that we presented at today’s meeting.

We look forward to hearing back from you.

Regards;

Joe Heyninck P. ENG

Director - Office Lead

IBI GROUP
Suite 203 - 350 Oxford Street West
London ON N6H 1T3 Canada
tel +1 519 472 7328 ext 63001 fax +1 519 472 9354

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.

NOTE: Ce courriel peut contenir de l’information privilégiée et confidentielle. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez le mentionner immédiatement à l’expéditeur et effacer ce courriel.
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

From: Muller, Joseph (MTCS) [mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca]
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2018 12:04 PM
To: Brian Hollingworth <bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com>
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

Thanks Brian, much appreciated. Take care,

Joe

Joseph Muller, RPP, MCIP
Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Culture Division | Programs and Services Branch | Heritage Program Unit

401 Bay Street, Suite 1700
Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7

Tel. 416.314.7145 | Fax. 416.212.1802

From: Brian Hollingworth [mailto:bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: January 26, 2018 3:56 PM
To: Muller, Joseph (MTCS)
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

Hi Joe,

Thanks for following up. We are in the process of drafting the Cultural Heritage Screening Report, and updating the Stage 1 & 2 archaeology assessment. The draft reports will go to London’s Advisory Committee on Heritage for review and comment in February. Once in a final draft form, we will circulate to you for review and comment.

Regarding the segment of Oxford between Wharncliffe and Platt’s Lane, this section is likely to be the last portion constructed, which would be between 2025 and 2028. Note that we are reviewing the implementation schedule in context with other capital improvement plans across the City, and will have an updated construction phasing plan in the draft Environmental Project Report.

Regards,

Brian Hollingworth
To: 'Muller, Joseph (MTCS)' <Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

I will consult with our heritage planner and provide an answer.

From: Muller, Joseph (MTCS) [mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 3:31 PM
To: Brian Hollingworth <bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com>
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

Hello Brian:

I have taken a look at the PIC materials as posted, and attach prior comments for background. I do note that the focus on cultural constraints for built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes as outlined in the archaeology-heritage mapping is on previously identified listed and designated properties, and previously identified heritage conservation districts. Included in the scope of environmental assessments is the identification and evaluation of properties and landscapes of potential cultural heritage value or interest (and as noted in my letter of September 18, 2017). Have you any updates on my prior comments (which I’m reiterating here)?

As well, I note that for the segment of Oxford between Wharncliffe and Platt’s Lane, 7 listed and 1 designated properties will be impacted regardless as to the alternative selected. Can you describe the nature of these impacts? What will be the timing of heritage impact assessments on these properties, if warranted?

Please contact me if you have any questions or would like to further discuss the file/project. Thank-you for your assistance,

Joe

Joseph Muller, RPP, MCIP
Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Culture Division | Programs and Services Branch | Heritage Program Unit

401 Bay Street, Suite 1700
Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7

Tel. 416.314.7145 | Fax. 416.212.1802

From: Brian Hollingworth [mailto:bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: December 18, 2017 5:01 PM
To: Muller, Joseph (MTCS)
Cc: Margaret Parkhill
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

If you can provide comments by January 26th that would be great. Sooner would be even better.

Thanks for point out the image issue.

From: Muller, Joseph (MTCS) [mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca]
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 1:43 PM
To: Brian Hollingworth <bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com>
Subject: RE: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

Thanks Brian – is there any deadline for comments? I took a quick look but couldn’t find one. As well, from pages 11-on to the end of the file, images in the Archaeology-Heritage PDF are inverted. Take care,

Joe

Joseph Muller, RPP, MCIP

Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Culture Division | Programs and Services Branch | Heritage Program Unit

401 Bay Street, Suite 1700
Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7

Tel. 416.314.7145 | Fax. 416.212.1802

From: Brian Hollingworth [mailto:bhollingworth@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: November 27, 2017 10:36 AM
To: ahunt@mlms.ca; annettta@thamesriver.on.ca; Brodeur, Ghislaine (MCI); Cairns, Melody (MNRF); creightonc@thamesriver.on.ca; roderick.crichton@londonde.ca; Dagssie, Yves (MOECC); doyler@londonhydro.com; Jennifer_Benedict@cpr.ca; roelliot@uniongas.com; utility.circulations@zayo.com; Graham Harkness, Jennifer (MTO); peter.gregoire@zayo.com; sharding@london.ca; JKobarda@London.ca; sally.kuipers@bell.ca; plane@sun-canadian.com; Levecque, Heather (MIRR); stefan.linder@cn.ca; wesley.logan@gwrr.com; Christopher.Mackie@mlhu.on.ca; pmarten@sun-canadian.com; bernie.mccall@mlhu.on.ca; gian.minichini@hydroone.com; Muller, Joseph (MTCS); Nadeau, Michael (MTO); Gillingham-Nina.gillingham@rci.rogers.com; patels@londonhydro.com; janet.rae@rci.rogers.com; Abdul.salak@rci.rogers.com; bshewfelt@start.ca; SNOWSELLM.UTRCA_PO.UT_MAIN@thamesriver.on.ca; frederic.sua@telus.com; ron.tourigny@esso.ca; VerscheureB.UTRCA_PO.UT_MAIN@thamesriver.on.ca; Wilson, Mitch (MNRF); joan.zhao@hydroone.com; andrew.zuk@bell.ca
Cc: Shift; Ramsay, Jennie

Subject: City of London - Notice of Public Information Centre for the Bus Rapid Transit System

Good Morning,

Please find attached a Notice of Public Information Centre #5 for the City of London’s Bus Rapid Transit System.

Regards,

Brian Hollingworth
SHIFT Consultant Project Manager
Date of meeting: February 9, 2018
Location: OPP Station
Exeter Road, London
Time: 1:30 p.m.–2:30 p.m.

Purpose: The meeting was with OPP and MTO to discuss opportunities to develop a Park N Ride Facility off Exeter Road on lands adjacent to the existing OPP Station and the Hydro One transmission corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
<th>Role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennie Ramsay</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jaramsay@london.ca">jaramsay@london.ca</a></td>
<td>Director of London Bus Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardian Spahiu</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aspahiu@london.ca">aspahiu@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Sones</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:asones@london.ca">asones@london.ca</a></td>
<td>Stormwater Management Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Heyninck</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com">JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Nadeau</td>
<td>MTO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Michael.Nadeau@ontario.ca">Michael.Nadeau@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Manager of Engineering West Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bakalarczyk</td>
<td>MTO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robert.Bakalarczyk@ontario.ca">Robert.Bakalarczyk@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Head Traffic Section West Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Barber</td>
<td>MTO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dan.Barber@ontario.ca">Dan.Barber@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Head, Corridor Management West Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Haight</td>
<td>OPP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steve.haight@opp.ca">steve.haight@opp.ca</a></td>
<td>Detachment Manager, Middlesex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRIBUTION: All Attendees and the following: Jennie Ramsay (RT), Brian Hollingsworth (IBI), Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP)

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CoL provided background on the London Rapid Transit project and the current status of the project. It was noted that at an early stage of the project, the benefits of a Park N' Ride facility on the south leg of the system were identified and a number of locations in the vicinity of Wellington Road and the 401 were investigated. At one point it was thought that the OPP would be moving and the existing OPP site would be a suitable location of a Park N' Ride facility. It was later learned that OPP would not be leaving the site, however the design team recognized that there was a considerable amount of vacant land in and around the OPP site including the area under the Hydro One corridor which appeared to hold significant potential to be developed into a Park N' Ride facility. This meeting was convened to discuss the design proposal for the first time with the OPP and to gain initial feedback as to whether the type of facility being considered would be problematic for the OPP and what if any concerns they would have with such a facility being located adjacent to or near the OPP station.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IBI presented two drawings that illustrated the area under consideration and the type of facility being considered for the site. It was noted that the concept presented is an early representation based on a relatively small parcel of land adjacent to the OPP side. The concept only allowed for three buses and approximately 35 to 40 parking spots with little potential for expansion. The current plan would be for a larger site potentially accommodating more buses with an ability to expand as the popularity of the service grew. Consequently the potential of using the adjacent Hydro One corridor is also being considered. Notwithstanding that there is a considerable amount of vacant land in this area, there are a number of constraints related to the adjacent drain as well as natural heritage issues. Initial meetings have been held with the UTRCA to review flood plain and regulated areas which encompass much of the land and it is understood that additional work will be necessary to address these issues. Natural heritage issues generally apply to lands to the east of the OPP station.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTO</td>
<td>MTO advised that they are currently reviewing the need for commuter parking facilities along the 401 corridor and the area in the vicinity of Wellington Road has been identified as a prime location for a Ride Share site. Their study will not be completed until the summer of 2018, however based on their experience in the K-W area that they estimate that they would be looking for a site that could accommodate as many as 120 parking sites. Given this, they see an opportunity of working with the City of London in the development of a site that would serve both a Ride Share and Park N’ Ride function.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPP</td>
<td>Staff Sergeant Haight indicated that this is the first time he is hearing about this type of development in the area. It will be necessary for OPP to review the proposal with input from other internal departments. He will take the concept drawings provided and will get back to the SHIFT team with any comments that OPP may have. He indicated that from what he can see, initial concerns from an OPP perspective would relate to access and security. He also noted that they are shy on space themselves wrt parking and that they may be looking to expand their parking in the future. He inquired about the timing for implementation and was advised that RT will be implemented over the next 10 years with the 4 legs of the system being implemented commencing downtown, then the east, then north, then south and lastly to the west. Generally it should be expected that the Wellington corridor would be developed in the next 5 to 7 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTO/CoL</td>
<td>The City advised that they will be meeting with Hydro One (HONI) on Monday, February 12th to discuss utilizing Hydro One corridor for a Park N’ Ride facility. There are a number of precedents for using hydro corridors for these types of facilities but to date there have not been any discussions with Hydro One. MTO advised that they have developed similar facilities on HONI lands. Given their previous experience with these types of sites, it was agreed that it would be beneficial if MTO could attend the meeting with HONI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoL</td>
<td>Now that a connection has been made, the City will keep OPP informed of the results of any discussions with HONI and UTRCA which may impact on the discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.

Minutes Prepared by:

Joe Heyninck
London Office Lead
IBI Group
jheyninck@ibigroup.com

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
Date of meeting: February 12, 2018
Location: Central Library
251 Dundas Street
Time: 12:00 p.m.–1:30 p.m.

Purpose: The meeting was with Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI) to discuss opportunities to develop a Park N Ride Facility off Exeter Road on lands adjacent to the existing OPP Station and the Hydro One transmission corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
<th>Role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennie Ramsay</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jaramsay@london.ca">jaramsay@london.ca</a></td>
<td>Director of SHIFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardian Spahiu</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aspahiu@london.ca">aspahiu@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaden Hodgins</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhodgins@london.ca">jhodgins@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer in Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Heyninck</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com">JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Nadeau</td>
<td>MTO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Michael.Nadeau@ontario.ca">Michael.Nadeau@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Manager of Engineering West Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bakalarczyk</td>
<td>MTO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robert.Bakalarczk@ontario.ca">Robert.Bakalarczk@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Head Traffic Section West Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Barber</td>
<td>MTO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dan.Barber@ontario.ca">Dan.Barber@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>Head, Corridor Management West Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Zhao</td>
<td>HONI</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joan.Zhao@HydroOne.com">Joan.Zhao@HydroOne.com</a></td>
<td>Sr. Real Estate Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan White</td>
<td>HONI</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dan.White@HydroOne.com">Dan.White@HydroOne.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Wu</td>
<td>HONI</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Philip.Wu@HydroOne.com">Philip.Wu@HydroOne.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRIBUTION: All Attendees and the following: Ashley Ramelloo(CoL), Brian Hollingsworth (IBI),
Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | CoL provided background on the London Rapid Transit project and the current status of the project. It was noted that at an early stage of the project, the benefits of a Park N’ Ride facility on the south leg of the system were identified and a number of locations in the vicinity of Wellington Road and the 401 were investigated. At one point it was thought that the OPP would be moving and the existing OPP site would be a suitable location of a Park N’ Ride facility. It was later learned that OPP would not be leaving the site, however the design team recognized that there was a considerable amount of vacant land in and around the OPP site including the area under the Hydro One corridor which appeared to hold significant potential to be developed into a Park N’ Ride facility. It was noted that MTO has also expressed interest in a commuter facility at this location and is in the process of completing a study on such a facility. The CoL and IBI convened this meeting to discuss the Park N’ Ride design proposal for the first time with the HONI. The purpose of the meeting is to:  
- gain initial feedback as to whether the type of facility being considered would be problematic for HONI;  
- identify what if any concerns HONI would have with such a facility being located in and around their corridor and facilities;  
- identify a process for moving forward. | N/A |
<p>| 2    | HONI noted that the subject corridor is heavily developed – they have 7 major circuits (6x30kV and 1x15KV); the corridor is currently under a “Notice of Project” which means that there will be a significant amount of maintenance and system improvements through this corridor over the next 2 years. After this period it is likely that except for typical maintenance issues, there would not be any major upgrades or construction within the corridor for the foreseeable future. | CoL/MTO/HONI |
| 3    | HONI inquired about the use of other areas in the same general vicinity – i.e. areas to the south, north and east. IBI advised that a number of areas were investigated including areas south of the 401 as well as areas within the immediate proximity to the Exeter Road/OPP site. Each of the other areas either had logistical issues relating to BRT/access or environmental constraints. | N/A |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HONI advised that should there be an agreement on the development of a parking facility on the current HONI lands, the agreement would take the form of a licensing agreement with either the City or MTO. HONI has similar arrangements in other areas – mainly in the GTA area where they have agreements with MTO. Typically licensing agreements are for 5 year periods with repeated renewals.</td>
<td>CoL/MTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HONI advised that there is a specific process that must be followed with several conditions being met. The major issues are:</td>
<td>CoL/MTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An environmental due diligence needs to be completed;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• HONI will circulate the package to internal stakeholders for feedback;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The information will then be sent to Infrastructure Ontario (IO) who will then review the proposal; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IO will manage the proposal and will guide the City or MTO (depending on who the agreement is to be with) through the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MTO indicated that they would liaise with the City w.r.t. to who would be in the best position to enter into an agreement with HONI.</td>
<td>MTO/CoL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HONI advised that there are a number of technical issues that need to be worked out including:</td>
<td>CoL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Temporary access during construction; permanent access for Hydro One maintenance vehicles once the facility is constructed;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access and movement through the site will need to be confirmed with turning templates for large mobile (120 tonne) crane;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• System safety and integrity will be key from Hydro One’s perspective; there are a number of specific parameters for clearance of overhead lines which will need to be addressed; some of these parameters can be very restrictive due to the high voltage in the lines and the amount of fluctuation in the sag in the lines;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Generally speaking there cannot be any structures or parking areas within 15m from any part of a tower.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minutes Prepared by:

Joe Heyninck  
London Office Lead  
IBI Group  
jheyninck@ibigroup.com
Hi Joe,

This particular session of TAG was highly technical with our direct utility partners relating to costing of utility/BRT conflicts. For that reason, we gave an out to the other TAG members not directly impacted by this matter.

We appreciate your feedback and I’ve copied both City heritage staff and our consultant team for information.

Thanks, Jennie.

Jennie Ramsay, P.Eng
Project Director, Rapid Transit
Environmental & Engineering Services
City of London

300 Dufferin Ave., P.O. Box 5035 | London ON N6A 4L9
P: 519.661.CITY(2489) x 5823 | Fax: 519.661.3501
jaramsay@london.ca | www.london.ca

Hello:

I’m not able to attend in person, nor to I see a teleconference option. My one observation is that, while much of the study area is in areas previously disturbed, the age of some portion of this can become of archaeological interest (my example being where the Waterloo LRT work exposed corduroy roads below King Street in portions of the corridor, impacting project schedules. The updated archaeology management plan for the City (recently drafted?) may prove useful for guidance on such potential resources. Thanks for keeping me in the loop, and take care,

Joe
Technical Agencies Group (TAG)  

Agenda

1. Update on Project Status
2. Utility Review/Coordination Update
3. City Utility Relocation Process
4. Rapid Transit and Utilities in Other Municipalities
5. Discussion and Questions
6. Next Steps

Note: This meeting is focused on **utility impacts and coordination** in general and not all invitees are required to attend if these topics do not apply to them. An additional TAG meeting will be held in early March
Date: Feb. 21, 2018  
Date of meeting: Feb. 27, 2018  
Location: Downtown London Office  
123 King St  
Time: 10:00am – 12:00pm  
Purpose: Meeting with Downtown London, Covent Garden Markey and Nicholson Sheffield to provide an update on the BRT project and review conceptual design options for the downtown area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennie Ramsay</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jaramsay@london.ca">jaramsay@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaden Hodgins</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhodgins@london.ca">jhodgins@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer-in-Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Heyninck</td>
<td>IBI</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jheyninck@ibigroup.com">jheyninck@ibigroup.com</a></td>
<td>Consulting Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janette MacDonald</td>
<td>Downtown London (DTL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janette@downtownlondon.ca">janette@downtownlondon.ca</a></td>
<td>CEO and General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Thomas</td>
<td>Downtown London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisa@downtownlondon.ca">lisa@downtownlondon.ca</a></td>
<td>Public Realm Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Sercombe</td>
<td>Downtown London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew@downtownlondon.ca">andrew@downtownlondon.ca</a></td>
<td>Marketing Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Gallagher</td>
<td>Nicholson Sheffield (NS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Usher</td>
<td>Covent Garden Market (CGM)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bobusher@coventmarket.com">bobusher@coventmarket.com</a></td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRIBUTION: All Attendees and the following: Brian Hollingsworth (IBI), Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP), Vincent Ermatinger (WSP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The City provided a general update on the project and presented the latest conceptual design plans for the downtown area. The draft EPR will go to</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council on April 9th. Renderings have been prepared to show people what BRT will look like in strategic areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nicholson Sheffield (NS) expressed concern about a reduction in parking spaces in the downtown area from the BRT project.</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>IBI</strong> noted that we have attempted to maintain on-street parking as much possible through the conceptual design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convent Garden Market (CGM) expressed concern about vehicles parking in the through lanes and blocking through traffic – especially on King St beside the CGM where this is an existing issue.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>IBI</strong> noted that we have looked at ways to reconfigure the loading and access areas around the market, and there are not any good options, but other options were looked at.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CGM noted that retail sales in the market are up significantly since 2003, and merchants are having trouble with managing deliveries with high sale volumes. Currently, trucks parking on King St. in the loading area, and often a second truck parks in the through lane adjacent to the loading lane (blocking through lane).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>IBI</strong> added that the current loading area is not ideal at all in existing conditions and it also impacts the accessible access to CGM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CGM stated that they do not know how to make modifications to the building to accommodate improved loading operations.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CGM noted that 53% of revenue comes from underground parking.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City has heard concern about lack of right turn lanes in the downtown core; recognizes that many drivers will use the BRT lanes for shared right turn lanes; <em>City</em> is investigating the possibility of removing the painted lane to clearly provide right turn lanes for general traffic. For example, allow right turns at Richmond and Clarence within the dedicated BRT lanes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>City</em> noted that like in the downtown of many other cities with turning restrictions, drivers will learn which ways to go; <em>City</em> is working to engineer these turning movements for as many scenarios as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>City</strong> noted that local transit service will be using BRT lanes within the downtown couplet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>NS</strong> suggested that the City consider watching the drop-off/pick-up location on Queens Ave at the London Life building during a.m. and p.m. peak times, since BRT may disrupt this busy operation. <strong>City</strong> advised they have met with London Life to understand and address their concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10   | **Downtown London (DTL)** advised that their overall preference is for BRT to be placed on York St rather than King St.  
DTL also expressed their dissatisfaction with London Transit Commission (LTC); DTL thinks the general population does not like LTC and there may be an issue with getting ridership on LTC. **DTL** feels that LTC is uncooperative and draconian; **DTL** suggests that LTC should provide a quote to convince people that they are working and collaborating with the City. |
| 11   | **DTL** stated that they constantly see tractor trailers making deliveries to CGM on King St.  
**CGM** advised that they can undertake an unbiased review to quantify the number of large trucks making deliveries on a daily basis. |
| 12   | **City** held a discussion about local transit integration, feeder routes, etc: yes, LTC is committed to changing/reconfiguring their routes in conjunction with BRT.  
**IBI** added that this will be a dynamic process, and bus routes can be changed to optimize RT and local transit. |
| 13   | **NS** suggested that maybe CGM could consider doing loading operations from Talbot St.  
**CGM** objected that this would “kill” their business and ruin festivals and activities that occur in the market square along Talbot St. |
| 14   | **DTL** and **CGM** have major concerns with the CGM’s truck/delivery access; there |

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | has been a lot of growth and no improvements to access/delivery facilities. **IBI** requested to know what kind of trucks and when they arrive, on average. *(as per item #11, **CGM** to provide some statistics on delivery vehicles using **CGM**)*  
**CGM** said scheduled deliveries are a challenge for vendors/merchants because they are small businesses and cannot demand a specific delivery time. |   |
| 15 | **NS** asked about loading operations for the Museum.  
**IBI** responded that they have met with the museum; discussion about how front of delivery truck sticks out and obstructs traffic when offloading; may need to consider detaching the cab and park when offloading operations occurring. | **N/A** |
| 16 | **DTL** requested that using Market Lane for loading be investigated.  
**CGM** noted that Royal Bank uses Market lane approx. 4-5 times per week. | City & **IBI** to investigate Market Ln option |
| 17 | **CGM** wants to know about timelines for BRT and other work in the downtown area; added that several tenants are not signing long-term leases in **CGM** for the reason of not knowing the future construction impacts and timing.  
**City** will provide a Civic Works Committee report which outlines timing and coordination for several downtown construction projects between 2018 and 2022. | City to circulate CWC report from Nov 2017 (done) |
|   | **DTL** wants to know what the mitigation plan is for construction impacts.  
**City** advised that there is not CIP/compensation for business losses (noted that cannot use federal or municipal funds for this); communication will be key. | **N/A** |

The foregoing represents the writer’s understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
Minutes Prepared by:

Jaden Hodgins
Engineer-in-Training
Rapid Transit / City of London
519-630-2736
**Date of meeting:** March 7, 2018  
**Location:** IBI Group Offices  
350 Oxford St. West  
**Time:** 10:00 am – 12:00 noon  
**Purpose:** Meeting with London Hydro to review cost estimates provided by LH to address conflicts between existing LH infrastructure and the future BRT routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
<th>Role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Rammeloo</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arammelo@London.ca">arammelo@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Manager of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardian Spahiu</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aspahiu@London.ca">aspahiu@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaden Hodgins</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhodgins@London.ca">jhodgins@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer-in-Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Van Eyk</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jvaneyk@London.ca">jvaneyk@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Heyninck</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com">JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Cooper</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Matt.Cooper@IBIGroup.com">Matt.Cooper@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Doyle</td>
<td>London Hydro (LH)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doyler@londonhydro.com">doyler@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td>Senior Distribution Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny Patel</td>
<td>London Hydro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patels@londonhydro.com">patels@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td>Distribution Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagoda Borovickic</td>
<td>London Hydro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:borovicj@londonhydro.com">borovicj@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td>Manager Design Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismail Sheikh</td>
<td>London Hydro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sheikhi@londonhydro.com">sheikhi@londonhydro.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | IBI Group walked through the cost estimates that had been submitted by London Hydro February 20, 2018 going through section by section of the north, south, east and west legs of the RT corridors. It was noted that there were two areas where London Hydro had assumed that there would be relocations where relocations would not be required:  
  - Richmond Street north – between University Drive and Western Road;  
  - Wharncliffe Road between Oxford Street and Riverside Drive.  
  It was noted that there will be some relocations in transitional areas for each of these areas however there will not be RT related works along the balance of either of the above noted sections. | LH |
| 2    | London Hydro advised that in assessing the relocations, their first approach was to replace “like for like” – ie aerial plant with aerial and underground with underground – however that was not always possible either due to conflicts with building setbacks or property constraints. London Hydro also noted that there is a practical limit for establishing the limits of both aerial and underground relocations which they generally took to be a distance of approximately 500 m – ie it would not be practical to switch back and forth between aerial and underground for sections less than 500 m. | N/A |

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Page 3</strong></th>
<th><strong>CITY OF LONDON</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **3** | Through discussions with London Hydro and IBI Group, there were a number of areas where the decision to either go aerial or underground or the extent of relocations should be revisited. London Hydro advised that they would review and make any appropriate adjustments. IBI Group prepared a spreadsheet with section by section comments (copy attached to meeting minutes). |
| **4** | IBI Group advised that the design for the RT corridors have continued to evolve since the original drawings were presented to London Hydro. There was a brief description of where the major changes have occurred – however it was noted that for the most part, the areas of conflict that were previously identified remain unchanged; IBI Group advised that they will upload revised drawings to the ftp site and it was requested that London Hydro review the drawings and identify appropriate design changes and related cost implications. |
| **5** | London Hydro advised that in the Downtown area they had assumed that they would require significant upgrades to their entire underground infrastructure within the RT corridors. A lump sum dollar figure for this work was included in their cost estimate for RT related works.  

This approach was questioned by the City noting that the current exercise is to identify only those works that will be necessary due to RT related conflicts.  

London Hydro questioned whether all utilities were to be relocated in order to be compatible with future LRT. The City advised that given the uncertainties, the timing and the fact that LRT will require significant reconstruction of the corridors to accommodate rails and electrification that the approach at this time is not to relocate all underground services and utilities to be compatible with future LRT.  

The City advised that London Hydro will need to review the overall approach for works in the downtown area and that just those items directly related to RT should be carried forward in the cost estimates. |
| **6** | IBI Group identified an issue in the Wellington / King area – particularly the area in and around the proposed platform on the southwest corner of the intersection.  

It was noted that the plan is for a large platform/station to be located on the south side of King Street under the Citi Plaza overhead structure. The “as constructed” drawings for this area indicate that there is a significant amount of underground hydro in the vicinity of this proposed platform. The infrastructure in this area includes a number of underground vaults and recently constructed hydro conduits and manholes. A drawing illustrating the proposed platform as well as the underground facilities in this area was presented for discussion. |

---

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
London Hydro confirmed the extent of underground infrastructure in the area was correct and noted that some of the facilities in this area are likely related to the servicing of the Citi Plaza mall and may be privately owned and controlled.

It was also noted that items such as underground vaults with transformers need to be ventilated and need to be accessible for maintenance purposes. They typically have some level of removable cover in order to allow heavy equipment to be removed and replaced within these vaults. It was also noted that these vaults represent a level of hazard. Although the extent of hazard/risk is relatively low – they are not areas where you want to have large numbers of people gathering or hanging about.

IBI noted that a number of locations have been investigated and evaluated for the proposed RT platform and there are no other viable options in this area. The net result is that it will be necessary to look at what work needs to be done to provide alternative servicing to the mall and also to relocate the underground infrastructure in and around the proposed platform.

London Hydro advised that they likely have more detailed information on the servicing of the mall and what type of facilities are in the vaults in question.

London Hydro will review the underground servicing in this area and will advise on the needed relocation works and related costs.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The City advised that time is of the essence in moving forward and developing overall project costs including all related utility costs. London Hydro indicated that there was a lot of information to go through and they would get back to the City with revised work plan and costs as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>London Hydro inquired about cost sharing - The City advised that they will use existing cost sharing agreements with utilities as a starting point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing represents the writer’s understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.

Minutes Prepared by:

Joe Heyninck
IBI Group
jheyninck@ibigroup.com

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
**Date of meeting:** March 7, 2018

**Location:** IBI Group Office
350 Oxford Street West

**Time:** 1:00 p.m.–2:00 p.m.

**Purpose:** Meeting with Bell to review cost estimates provided by Bell to address conflicts between existing Bell infrastructure and the future BRT routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
<th>Role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Rammeloo</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arammelo@London.ca">arammelo@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Manager of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardian Spahiu</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aspahiu@London.ca">aspahiu@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaden Hodgins</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhodgins@London.ca">jhodgins@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer-in-Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Van Eyk</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jvaneyk@London.ca">jvaneyk@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Heyninck</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com">JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>RT Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Cooper</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Matt.Cooker@IBIGroup.com">Matt.Cooker@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>RT Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Zuk</td>
<td>Bell Canada (Bell)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.zuk@bell.ca">andrew.zuk@bell.ca</a></td>
<td>Structures Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project:** Bus Rapid Transit

**Project Number:** TS1430

**Author:** Joe Heyninck, IBI Group

**DISTRIBUTION:** All Attendees and the following: Jennie Ramsay(RT), Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP)

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
IBI Group walked through the cost estimates that had been submitted by Bell on February 20, 2018.

It was noted that the costs provided by Bell are pretty generalized – i.e., a uniform costs for manhole replacements; unit costs for underground installations and pedestal relocations. The unit costs for the smaller items were not an issue however the manhole relocation costs were significant and the costs were questioned by IBI and the City.

Bell noted that the unit costs for manholes were based on their experience in K-W with the LRT project; Bell also advised that the costs do not just include the manhole structure but also the replacement of related lengths of cable, conduit and splicing costs.

The costs provided can vary by up to +/- 50% depending on what cable facilities are in the manholes but Bell believes that costs provided represent a fair average costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IBI Group walked through the cost estimates that had been submitted by Bell on February 20, 2018. It was noted that the costs provided by Bell are pretty generalized – i.e., a uniform costs for manhole replacements; unit costs for underground installations and pedestal relocations. The unit costs for the smaller items were not an issue however the manhole relocation costs were significant and the costs were questioned by IBI and the City. Bell noted that the unit costs for manholes were based on their experience in K-W with the LRT project; Bell also advised that the costs do not just include the manhole structure but also the replacement of related lengths of cable, conduit and splicing costs. The costs provided can vary by up to +/- 50% depending on what cable facilities are in the manholes but Bell believes that costs provided represent a fair average costs.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bell noted that they have 6 standard sizes for manholes with wall thicknesses around 300mm – manholes are not usually more than 2.0m deep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The City/IBI advised that due to the costs involved in relocating facilities, there may need to be further analysis around individual locations wrt the costs and impact on RT and whether a particular facility should be relocated or not. IBI/City advised that they would go through the conflicts that had been previously identified to identify those areas where the impact on RT would be significant and whether reasonable “detouring” alternatives were available. IBI/City advised that before informed decisions can be made with respect to balancing the costs with the impact – it would be necessary to obtain some refinement of the costs with respect to individual manholes – i.e. within the range of costs provided by Bell could Bell advise as to whether a particular installation is within the high / mid / low range of the costs.</td>
<td>IBI/CoL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IBI Group advised that the design for the RT corridors have continued to evolve since the original drawings were presented to Bell. There was a brief description of where the major changes have occurred – however it was noted that for the most part, the areas of conflict that were previously identified remain unchanged. IBI Group advised that they will upload revised drawings to their ftp site; it was requested that Bell review the drawings and identify appropriate design changes and related cost implications.</td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The City advised that time is of the essence in moving forward and developing overall project costs including all related utility costs. Bell advised that they would be able to provide some level of refinement for manhole relocation costs within a couple of weeks.</td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bell inquired about cost sharing - The City advised that they will use existing cost sharing agreements with utilities as a starting point.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bell was requested to identify any property requirements however property costs are not to be included in their estimate. The City will take the property information and include it with their own evaluation of property costs.</td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.

Minutes Prepared by:

Joe Heyninck
London Office Lead
IBI Group
jheyninck@ibigroup.com

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
Date of meeting: March 8, 2018
Location: IBI Group Office
350 Oxford Street
West
Time: 9:00 a.m.–10:00 a.m.
Purpose: Meeting with London District Energy to address conflicts between existing LDE infrastructure and the future BRT routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Organization:</th>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
<th>Role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josh Van Eyk</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ivaneyk@london.ca">ivaneyk@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Cooper</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Matt.Cooper@IBIGroup.com">Matt.Cooper@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>RT Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick Crichton</td>
<td>London District Energy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Roderick.Crichton@londonde.ca">Roderick.Crichton@londonde.ca</a></td>
<td>Chief Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRIBUTION: All Attendees and the following: Jennie Ramsay (RT), Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LDE provided approximate location of their chill/stream lines in vicinity of the RT corridors.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As per LDE direction, IBI updated their CAD drawing files to reflect this information – in most instances it was a matter of properly identifying facilities that had been picked up in the field but were not identified properly as being LDE infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
IBI advised that conflicts had not been previously identified as LDE infrastructure was not known to exist in many of the core areas due to the lack on detail on the base drawings. A quick review of the mapping was completed and conflict areas were identified in the meeting.

The most significant conflict area was the NE corner of Wellington and King Street in the vicinity of the proposed platform as there is a steam line and an underground chamber at this location.

LDE is to review and will provide a cost estimate for relocating their infrastructure in this area; they will target having the cost estimate by March 16th.

Per recent discussions with Union Gas, one of the biggest challenges in this area is finding a clear running line for relocated facilities.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IBI advised that the design for the RT corridors have continued to evolve.</td>
<td>LDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBI Group advised that they will upload the most recent design drawings to their ftp site; it was requested that LDE review the drawings and identify any additional conflict areas and related cost implications.</td>
<td>IBI/LDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There was a brief discussion regarding cost sharing. The City advised that the standard utility cost sharing agreements would be applied.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing represents the writer’s understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.

Minutes Prepared by:

Matt Cooper
IBI Group
Matt.Cooper@IBIGroup.com

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
Good Morning Yves,

Thank you for coming to London last week to attend our Technical Advisory Group stakeholder session. As a follow up, our team would like to update you on the upcoming timeline for our Rapid Transit project.

We are presently wrapping up pre-planning activities with the Draft Environmental Project Report schedule to go before Council on Tuesday, April 10. Following Council endorsement of the Draft EPR, the complete report will be forwarded to MOECC for technical review later that same week. Our goal is to aim for late May to early June to issue Notice of Commencement and begin formal TPAP consultation.

We appreciate that your office needs time to assemble a technical review team and want to give you sufficient notice of our submission timeline.

Thank you and please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Jennie.
Date of meeting: March 12, 2018
Location: IBI Group Office
350 Oxford Street West
Time: 1:00 p.m.–2:00 p.m.
Purpose: Meeting with Union Gas to review cost estimates to address conflicts between existing Union Gas infrastructure and the future BRT routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
<th>Role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Rammeloo</td>
<td>City of London (CoL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arammelo@London.ca">arammelo@London.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Manager of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Van Eyk</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jvaneyk@london.ca">jvaneyk@london.ca</a></td>
<td>RT Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Heyninck</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com">JHeyninck@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>RT Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Cooper</td>
<td>IBI Group (IBI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Matt.Cooper@IBIGroup.com">Matt.Cooper@IBIGroup.com</a></td>
<td>RT Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Elliot</td>
<td>Union Gas</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roelliot@uniongas.com">roelliot@uniongas.com</a></td>
<td>Construction Project Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRIBUTION: All Attendees and the following: Jennie Ramsay (RT), Margaret Parkhill (IBI), Eric Peissel (WSP), Andrew Shea (WSP)

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IBI Group walked through the cost estimates that had been submitted by Union Gas on February 13, 2018. Union Gas provided relatively detailed costs given the state of the current design. IBI / City advised that they have reviewed the costs and have very few questions concerning the numbers provided. The overall costs for Union Gas are not out of line with what was anticipated. Union Gas advised that there are some areas where they will be looking to replace / upgrade their infrastructure at their own costs and these works will need to be coordinated with RT. Union Gas expressed concern regarding the amount of infrastructure in the King/Wellington area – especially in the vicinity of the Wellington (N) platform. The conflict drawings had noted that there is an existing 200mm gas main running parallel and under the proposed platform. Although Union Gas has included the relocation of this line in their estimates, one of their main concerns is about available running lines in this very congested area.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IBI Group advised that the design for the RT corridors have continued to evolve since the original drawings were presented to Union Gas. There was a brief description of where the major changes have occurred – however it was noted that for the most part, the areas of conflict that were previously identified remain unchanged. IBI Group advised that they will upload revised drawings to their ftp site; it was requested that Union Gas review the drawings and identify appropriate design changes and related cost implications.</td>
<td>IBI/UG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The City advised that time is of the essence in moving forward and developing overall project costs including all related utility costs. Union Gas advised that they would identify any significant changes within the next few days.</td>
<td>UG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There was a brief discussion regarding cost sharing. Union Gas advised that they expected that the standard utility cost sharing agreements would be maintained.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The foregoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the author.

Minutes Prepared by:

Joe Heyninck
London Office Lead
IBI Group
jheyninck@ibigroup.com

Any omissions or errors in these notes should be forwarded to the author immediately.
Morning Jennie

New list _ Name changed- London District Supervisor

Thank you

Yves Dagssie, PMP ® | Special Project Officer
Environmental Assessment Services Section | Environmental Approvals & Permissions Branch
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change | 135 St. Clair Ave. W, 7th Floor, Toronto ON M4V 1P5
T: 416.314.7222 | F: 416.314.8452 | E: Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Hi Yves,

Thank you for forwarding the Draft EPR circulation list.

We have begun assembling the requested hard and digital copies for the Ministry reviewers identified in your correspondence and are aiming to have the materials delivered to the London and Toronto MOECC offices before close-of-business on Monday, April 30.

We greatly appreciate the Ministry’s review and feedback to confirm London’s Draft Environmental Project Report meets established requirements and to help support a smooth TPAP.

Jennie.

Jennie Ramsay, P.Eng
Project Director, Rapid Transit
Environmental & Engineering Services
City of London

300 Dufferin Ave., P.O. Box 5035 | London ON N6A 4L9
P: 519.661.CITY(2489) x 5823 | Fax: 519.661.3501
jaramsay@london.ca | www.london.ca
Hello Jennie and Andrea,

Please see attached for the updated list for the draft EPR circulation.

Thank you

Yves Dagssie, PMP | Special Project Officer
Environmental Assessment Services Section | Environmental Approvals & Permissions Branch
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change | 135 St. Clair Ave. W, 7th Floor, Toronto ON M4V 1P5
T: 416.314.7222 | F: 416.314.8452 | E: Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca

Ms. Jennie,

Thank you for your email.

Please see attached, the draft EPR review instruction. Note that, in order to stick to the timelines, the City is required to provide this documentation no later than April 27, 2018.

Please let me know if you have any question or concerns.

Thank you

Yves Dagssie, PMP | Special Project Officer
Environmental Assessment Services Section | Environmental Approvals & Permissions Branch
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change | 135 St. Clair Ave. W, 7th Floor, Toronto ON M4V 1P5
T: 416.314.7222 | F: 416.314.8452 | E: Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca

From: Ramsay, Jennie [mailto:jaramsay@London.ca]
Hi Yves,

Thank you for your response. We appreciate the feedback. In the interim, we want to continue moving the project forward to be TPAP ready and further to that, I would like to advise you of a slight adjustment to our timing.

The Draft EPR is now scheduled to go before London City Council two weeks later on April 24th, after which, the complete Draft EPR will be forwarded to MOECC for technical review. You should receive the report by April 27th.

We respect your team's time and want give you advance notice of our adjusted timeline for submission so that you are able to adjust available resources, as necessary, to complete the technical review within the anticipated 5-6 week timeline.

Please call if you have any questions. Thank you.
Please let me know if you would like to discuss this further.

Thank you

Yves Dagssie, PMP® | Special Project Officer
Environmental Assessment Services Section | Environmental Approvals & Permissions Branch
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change | 135 St. Clair Ave. W, 7th Floor, Toronto ON M4V 1P5
T: 416.314.7222 | F: 416.314.8452 | E: Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Ramsay, Jennie [mailto:jaramsay@London.ca]
Sent: March-08-18 9:33 AM
To: Dagssie, Yves (MOECC)
Cc: Soldo, Edward; Margaret Parkhill; Brian Hollingworth
Subject: London's Rapid Transit Initiative - MOECC Submission Timeline

Good Morning Yves,

Thank you for coming to London last week to attend our Technical Advisory Group stakeholder session. As a follow up, our team would like to update you on the upcoming timeline for our Rapid Transit project.

We are presently wrapping up pre-planning activities with the Draft Environmental Project Report schedule to go before Council on Tuesday, April 10. Following Council endorsement of the Draft EPR, the complete report will be forwarded to MOECC for technical review later that same week. Our goal is to aim for late May to early June to issue Notice of Commencement and begin formal TPAP consultation.

We appreciate that your office needs time to assemble a technical review team and want to give you sufficient notice of our submission timeline.

Thank you and please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Jennie.

Jennie Ramsay, P.Eng
Project Director, Rapid Transit
Environmental & Engineering Services
City of London

300 Dufferin Ave., P.O. Box 5035 | London ON N6A 4L9
P: 519.661.CITY(2489) x 5823 | Fax: 519.661.3501
jaramsay@London.ca | www.london.ca
April 25, 2018

Dear Ms. Jennie Ramsay:

Thank you for your email dated April 5, 2018 requesting that the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) carry out a review of the City of London Bus Rapid Transit draft Environmental Project Report (EPR). I am pleased to provide you with the following response.

The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change is committed to working with the City of London to facilitate the timely review of the draft EPR documentation. The Ministry will therefore carry out a review of the draft to determine whether the draft documentation meets the requirements and expectations set forth in the Ministry’s Guide: Ontario’s Transit Project Assessment Process and the requirements set forth in Ontario Regulation 231/08, Transit Projects and Greater Toronto Transportation Authority Undertakings.

In order to facilitate the review of the draft EPR, the City is requested to provide the following Ministry reviewer with the identified number of copies (hard and electronic copies of both the main report and the appendices) of the draft EPR, that they require to complete their review, by no later than April 27, 2018:

Mr. Craig Newton, Regional Environmental Planner- Air, Pesticides & Environmental Planning
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
Southwestern Region
Technical Support Section 733 Exeter Road,
London ON, N6E 1L3
One hard copy and one electronic copy (Memory Stick)

Ms. Jason Lehouillier, Supervisor, Water Unit
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
Southwestern Region
Technical Support Section
733 Exeter Road
London ON, N6E 1L3
One hard copy and one electronic copy (Memory Stick)

Ms. Dan Cromp, Supervisor, London District Office
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
Southwestern Region
733 Exeter Road
London ON, N6E 1L3
One hard copy and one electronic copy (Memory Stick)
Ms. Todd Fleet, District Engineer  
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change  
Southwestern Region  
Technical Support Section  
733 Exeter Road  
London ON, N6E 1L3  
One hard copy and one electronic copy (Memory Stick)

Mr. Header Merza, Senior Noise Engineer  
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change  
Environmental Assessment & Permissions Division  
Approval Services Section – Noise  
135 St. Clair Avenue West, 1st Floor  
Toronto ON M4V 1P5  
One hard copy and one electronic copy (Memory Stick)

Mr. Yves Dagssie, Special Project Officer  
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change  
Environmental Approvals Branch  
Project Coordination UNIT 1  
135 St Clair Avenue West, Floor 1 Toronto ON M4V 1P5  
One hard copy and one electronic copy (Memory Stick)

For the purposes of carrying out the review of the City of Ottawa’s draft EPR, the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change will require a minimum of five weeks to complete the review. The Ministry will therefore provide any comments on the draft EPR documentation to the City by no later than June 8, 2018.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me directly at (416) 314-7222 or by e-mail at Yves.Dagssie@ontario.ca

Yours sincerely,

Yves Dagssie, Special Project Officer  
Environmental Approvals Branch  
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
Hi Christine/Courtney,

Sorry for the delay – a copy of the presentation is attached.

Jennie will also bring a copy with her on a USB, and we have printed 11 copies.

Thank you,

Heather Beecroft
Administrative Assistant
Rapid Transit Implementation
City of London

Hi Heather,

Monday would be better, but Tuesday by noon. We normally have a cut off the Friday before, but our committee has been waiting for this information.

Christine

Get Outlook for Android

Hi

5:30 works, no problem at all.

When should we aim to email you the presentation by?

Thank you again!

Heather Beecroft
Administrative Assistant
Rapid Transit Implementation
City of London

300 Dufferin Avenue PO Box 5035 London, ON N6A 4L9
P: 519.630.1780
hbeecroft@london.ca | www.london.ca

Sent from my iPhone

On May 30, 2018, at 1:20 PM, Christine James <cjames@aamjiwnaang.ca> wrote:

Hi Heather,

We have a conflict at 5, could you be ready for 5:30?
And could you also email me a copy of your presentation and bring 11 copies for our committee?
Yes the meeting is at our Band Office – 978 Tashmoo Ave, sign in on the clip board and have a seat in the lobby. Courtney or I will be out to get you around 5:30.

Sincerely,

Christine James
Environment Consultation Worker
Aamjiwnaang First Nation
978 Tashmoo Avenue
Sarnia, ON N7S 1H5
Phone: 519-336-8410 ext 222
cjames@aamjiwnaang.ca
www.aamjiwnaangenvironment.ca
Hi Christine/Courtney,

Thank you again for welcoming us to attend a meeting. Our staff would like to attend on June 5, 2018 at 5:00 pm. 30 minutes should be sufficient; we will plan for 15 minutes of presentation, followed by questions and discussion.

I will advise them to go to the Band Administration Building (978 Tashmoo Avenue, Sarnia. ON N7T 7H5).

Is there anything else I should let them know?

Heather Beecroft
Administrative Assistant
Rapid Transit Implementation
City of London

Hi Heather, I just wanted to confirm whether or not you have been able to schedule a presentation time for the Aamjiwnaang Environment Committee. They have been requesting for this follow up since late March. We have just received another notice dated May 14, 2018. The dates and times for June are listed below in the email below.

Sincerely,

Christine James
Environment Consultation Worker
Aamjiwnaang First Nation
978 Tashmoo Avenue
Sarnia, ON N7T 7H5
Phone: 519-336-8410 ext 222
cjames@amjiwnaang.ca
www.amjiwnaangenvironment.ca
www.facebook.com/AamjiwnaangEnvironment

Good Afternoon, Heather,

I apologize for not replying sooner. I am truly sorry.

Below is a list of dates for the Environment Committee. The committee meets twice per month. Please select a date and time that works best for you. (Please keep in mind that our committee meetings tend to fill up rather quickly)

1. April 17, 2018
   a. 5:30 pm
2. May 15, 2018
   a. 5:30 pm
3. June 5, 2018
   a. 5:00 pm
   b. 5:30 pm
4. June 19, 2018
   a. 5:00 pm
   b. 5:30 pm

Presentations are scheduled for 30 minutes, if you require additional time. Please let me know. Our meetings are held at the Band Administration Building (978 Tashmoo Avenue, Sarnia, ON N7T 7H5).

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thank you,

Courtney Jackson
Good morning,

I am just following up regarding my email below

The Rapid Transit Team would be happy to meet with your environment committee.

Heather Beecroft
Administrative Assistant
Rapid Transit Implementation
City of London

---

Good morning Courtney,

As requested by Christine James I would like to work with you to schedule a time for our Project Team to meet with your environment committee.

Could you please provide me with some dates/times that would work for your group. If possible could you please also provide me with a list of the committee members?

Thank you,

Heather Beecroft
Administrative Assistant
Rapid Transit Implementation
City of London

300 Dufferin Avenue PO Box 5035 London, ON N6A 4L9
P: 519 630 1780
hbeecroft@london.ca www.london.ca
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT

Aamjiwnaang First Nations
June 5, 2018
How we got here

SmartMoves 2030 → Rapid Transit Master Plan

The London Plan → Draft Environmental Project Report
BRT for London

- New jobs and opportunities
- $270 million in direct and indirect wage benefits
- Inspire city building
- High-capacity buses
- Less greenhouse gas emissions
- More choices for Londoners
WHAT IS BUS RAPID TRANSIT?

DEDICATED LAINES
FREQUENT SERVICE
INTEGRATED TRANSIT NETWORK
KEY DECISIONS

- January 2015
  Work starts on Rapid Transit Master Plan (RTMP)

- May 2017
  Council approves BRT network

- July 2017
  Council approves RTMP and Business Case

- May 8, 2018
  Council approves BRT design
WHY BUS RAPID TRANSIT?
THE APPROVED BRT DESIGN

NORTH-EAST ROUTE
SOUTH-WEST ROUTE
DOWNTOWN COUPLETT
## Key aspects of BRT designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24 Km network</th>
<th>Dedicated lanes</th>
<th>centre-running vs curbside lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revitalizing 24 km of main roads that serve as gateways into our city.</td>
<td>Lanes that only buses can travel on - for more reliable service.</td>
<td>19.5 km of centre-running lanes and 3 km of curbside lanes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wellington Road at Commissioners Road (looking north)
Richmond Street at Grosvenor Street (looking north)
Wellington Street at King Street (looking northwest)
King Street at Talbot Street
Draft EPR

- Outlines Recommended Preliminary Design
- Identifies existing conditions
- Provides recommendations to minimize or mitigate impacts
- Includes complete record of consultation and supporting technical studies

Recommendations presented to the public at five Open House events in February and March 2018
Transit Project Assessment Process

120 Days
TPAP Consultation Period
- Consult with the public, property owners, businesses, regulatory agencies and First Nations communities.
- Prepare final Environmental Project Report.

What's next

Spring/Summer 2018
Technical review of EPR and beginning of TPAP

Spring/Summer 2018
Ongoing public consultation

Fall 2018
30-day public review of Final EPR

Fall 2018
35 days for Minister to consider the project
Focus of consultation


Where will Rapid Transit run? 2017

How will it work? Late 2017

Recommended design Spring 2018

Fine tune approved design Summer 2018

Detailed design 2019

HOW THE PUBLIC CAN SHAPE BRT?

- TPAP consultation 2 public events and 10 “Transit Tuesday” sessions to give feedback on Council-approved designs

- Up next Individual and neighbourhood consultations to develop detailed design
**KEY CONSIDERATIONS**

Matters of Provincial Importance must be considered during the Transit Project Assessment Process, following Ontario Regulation 231/08.

| Natural Heritage | • Park, conservation reserve or protected area  
|                  | • Extirpated, endangered, threatened, or species of special concern and their habitat  
|                  | • Wetland, woodland, habitat of wildlife or other natural heritage area  
|                  | • Area of natural or scientific interest  
|                  | • Stream, creek, river, or lake containing fish and their habitats  

| Hydrology | • Area or region of surface water or groundwater or other important hydrological feature  
|          | • Areas that may be impacted by a known or suspected on or off-site source of contamination  

| Heritage & Archaeology | • Protected heritage properties  
|                       | • Built heritage resources  
|                       | • Cultural heritage landscapes  
|                       | • Archaeological resources and areas of potential archaeological interest  

| Indigenous Relations | • Constitutionally protected Indigenous or treaty rights and areas of concern  

HYDROLOGY
The design strives to stay within the existing municipal road allowance to minimize impacts.

WORK COMPLETED:
• Geotechnical engineering and contamination assessment completed
• Water quantity and water balance calculation completed

IMPACTS:
• No areas of significant potential for contamination at BRT stop locations - low to moderate risks related to subsurface conditions are expected at a limited number of sites
• Nominal increase in impervious area as a result of the project

MONITORING AND MITIGATION:
• Construction at or near groundwater may require treatment of dewatering discharge
• Active remediation is likely not warranted given nominal depth of excavation for project

You can review the findings in more detail in the Appendices provided.