

Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc.
Interrogatories for Markham Gateway

1. Reference: Exhibit L. EGD.MG.1, Page 1, paragraph 3.

Request:

- a. Please confirm that the review and Markham Gateway's evidence pertain to the Langstaff Gateway west of the CN Railway and does not include lands east of the CN Railway.
- b. Provide a detailed map identifying the areas referenced in Markham Gateway's evidence, including the "Richmond Hill/Langstaff Gateway Urban Growth Centre", the "company's lands" as well as the "Markham portion".

2. Reference: Exhibit L. EGD.MG.1, Page 2, paragraph 5.

Request:

- a. Please provide a map of the Richmond Hill/Langstaff Gateway Urban Growth Centre and identify the geographic limits of Markham Gateway's involvement.

3. Reference: Exhibit L. EGD.MG.1, Page 2, paragraph 6.

Preamble:

Page 1, paragraph 4 indicated that the lands and the Growth Centre were approved by the Region of York through amendments 183 and 184 to the Official Plan for the City of Markham. Those approved plans did not include consideration of garbage disposal collection piping, personal rapid train ("PRT"), underground pedestrian passageway and underground parking within the ROW.

Request:

- a. Has Markham Gateway completed an amendment for the secondary plans? Please provide the documentation substantiating stakeholder consultation and approval to incorporate garbage disposal collection piping, PRT, underground pedestrian passageway and underground parking within the ROW.
- b. If the above has not occurred, when will the amendment be carried out?

4. Reference: Exhibit L.EGD.MG.1, Page 2, paragraph 6.

Request:

- a. The original 30m ROW was planned to include local underground services.
Please compare the services identified in the original plan with the one submitted in Markham Gateway's evidence and list all incremental infrastructure.

5. Reference: Exhibit L. EGD.MG.1, Page 3, paragraph 10.

Preamble:

Exhibit L.EGD.MG.1, Page 3, paragraph 10 states:

"The types and extent of services which will be required in the 30 m ROW are not typical of any other roadway in Markham, the Region of York or the Greater Toronto Area. The services are far more space intensive owing to the high density development approved for the Growth Centre."

Request:

- a. When the requirement for utilities and structures within the ROW exceeds the expectation of the original design, is it standard practice to revisit the allocated width of the ROW?
6. Reference: Exhibit L.EGD.MG.1, Page 2, paragraph 7 (Langstaff Land Use & Built Form Master Plan - Appendix B, Street Sections – Circulation & Transit, page 83)

Request:

- a. Please confirm the City of Markham/York Region approved "Langstaff Land Use & Built Form Master Plan" as illustrated on pg. 83 does not show any requirement for the PRT, underground pedestrian passageway and underground parking to extend under the road.
7. Reference: Exhibit L.EGD.MG.1, Page 2, paragraph 7 (Langstaff Land Use & Built Form Master Plan (Appendix B, Street Sections – Circulation & Transit, page 85)

Request:

- a. Cross section over the CN tracks as illustrated on pg. 85 is part of the approved "Langstaff Land Use & Built Form Master Plan" and does not show an arched

concrete structure over the CN tracks. Please provide justification for changing the design to the new structure.

- b. Please confirm that Metrolinx has been consulted. If yes, please provide a copy of the consultation record.

8. Reference: Parks & Open Spaces section of the Langstaff Land Use & Built Form Master Plan

Request:

- a. The plan identifies the south side of the 30m ROW as south linear greenway having multi use creating a pedestrian and cycle supportive neighbourhood also acting as a landscape buffer for neighbouring land uses (Holy Cross cemetery). Does placement of the PRT override this identified requirement? If yes, what is the justification for overriding this?
- b. For all changes/deviations from the approved plan, has there been public consultation?
- c. Please confirm who has been consulted on the identified changes to the approved secondary plan.
- d. What is the process for changes to the master plan?
- e. Have any of those been reviewed/approved following the approved process? If not, what is the timeline/schedule to complete? If yes, please provide documentation.

9. Reference: Exhibit L.EGD.MG.1, Page 14 - Figure 3, Section 2.

Request:

- a. The retaining wall is located above the PRT structure. Please identify the engineering requirements that were considered with respect to loading and vibration.
- b. Please provide details of the proposed retaining wall.
- c. Please justify the current location of the PRT. Identify all other locations that were considered along with the reasons for rejection.

10. Reference: Exhibit L.EGD.MG.1, Page 2, paragraph 8, and Page 3, paragraphs 9 and 11.

Preamble:

At the April 5, 2013 meeting at the City of Markham, in attendance were representatives from Enbridge, the City of Markham, Condor Developments, Angus

Glen Developments and Shaeffer & Associates. It was recognized that there is a need for the GTA Project pipeline but there were concerns related to the proposed alignment in the South Boulevard. As noted in the meeting minutes, commitments were made to provide conceptual profiles of the South Boulevard to Enbridge for review by April 22, 2013. No documents were provided until June 28, 2013 in Exhibit L.EGD.MG.1 Appendix C as part of the regulatory proceeding.

Further, at the April 5, 2013 meeting, Enbridge indicated "There are no development setbacks associated with the pipeline, except some restrictions in the easement itself (6m wide). Enbridge can provide comment/propose mitigation to reduce potential constraints once development plans are reviewed."

Request:

- a. Have the plans and cross sections provided in the evidence been reviewed by engineers with experience in pipeline design and construction?
- b. Has Markham Gateway consulted with Enbridge on limitations and coordination of uses within the 6m easement prior to release of the easement?
- c. Based on review of the South Boulevard cross section by Enbridge, there are opportunities to allow the proposed GTA Project pipeline in the ROW. Is Markham Gateway willing to work with Enbridge to develop a mutually beneficial plan to accommodate Enbridge and the development's needs?
- d. Why were the plans and cross sections not provided to Enbridge and the City in a timely manner to allow Enbridge to comment and propose mitigation with respect to the 6m easement?
- e. Please provide minutes of meetings, relevant correspondence, drawings and presentations pertaining to south collector road ROW development plans and profiles since April 5, 2013 between Markham Gateway (and its consultants), City of Markham and all other stakeholders.

11. Reference: Exhibit L.EGD.MG.1, Page 3, paragraph 10.

Preamble:

All existing City of Markham ROWs are based on current requirements. Paragraph 10 states:

"The types and extent of services which will be required in the 30 m ROW are not typical of any other roadway in Markham, the Region of York or the Greater Toronto Area. The services are far more space intensive owing to the high density development approved for the Growth Centre."

Request:

- a. Please provide comparative examples of existing 30m ROW vs. proposed.
- b. Will the new design be required in any other proposed developments that Enbridge should be planning for?
- c. Will this require the City of Markham to develop new cross sections with all stakeholders?
- d. Did Markham Gateway and the City of Markham consider a wider ROW to accommodate the additional space intensive services and structures being proposed? If "no", why not?
- e. What is the process and expected timing for the development and approval of unique ROW cross sections and which stakeholders will be consulted?

12. Reference: Exhibit L.EGD.MG.1, Page 3, paragraph 11.

Request:

- a. Appendix C, Figures 2 & 3 also illustrates extensive parking areas within the Municipal ROW. Please provide the rationale for introducing parking structures within the ROW since the April 5, 2013 meeting.

13. Reference: Exhibit L.EGD.MG.1, Page 3, paragraph 12.

Preamble:

Enbridge proposes the following correction to the evidence. Enbridge did not 'reject' the location for the pipeline easement on the Parkway Belt utility corridor to the north of Hwy 407. Enbridge reviewed the lands within the Parkway Belt north of the Hwy 407 with respect to availability, and constructability and determined that due to existing development and structures, Transitway and MTO setbacks and Viva expansion, routing through this area was not feasible. This information was also provided at the April 5, 2013 meeting, an email response dated April 26, 2013 (Enbridge Correspondence Table found at Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1 – Attachment 5, Page 68, Line 14.), and at the June 12-13, 2013 Technical Conference.

Request:

- a. Has Markham Gateway reviewed Enbridge's list of route constraints that was provided April 26, 2013 and in the above noted evidence? Has feedback been provided to Enbridge on the list of route constraints?