

APPENDIX J

Future Commitments for a 3:1 Slope

Future Commitments for a 3:1 Slope

Discipline	Potential Effects	Future Work Commitments
Natural Environment	Revision of slope geometry may alter vegetation limits, toe of slope location, and may trigger additional encroachment into natural features or buffers.	- Reconfirm vegetation removal quantities and vegetation compensation requirements (if any). - Reassess/confirm impacts to: - Wetlands and determine compensation requirements with the TRCA - Significant Wildlife Habitat / candidate SWH - Species at Risk (SAR) habitat (if previously identified) - Review and update mitigation measures (erosion control, revegetation, slope stabilization), as necessary. - Confirm whether SAR screening remains unchanged or if additional desktop review or field verification is warranted.
Archaeology & Cultural Heritage	Previous background study and screening confirmed no known archaeological or cultural heritage resources within the project footprint.	- Confirm that the grading limits remain within the previously assessed study area boundaries. - If project footprint is to extend beyond areas previously assessed, conduct a gap analysis to determine if further studies are warranted. - Comply with mitigation measures outlined in Section 5.9.4 of the ESR Addendum.
Noise	A change to the ramp profile and grading does not generally alter noise emissions (traffic volumes, speeds, and alignment stay constant).	- Confirm there is no change in receptor exposure. - Complete a brief technical memorandum documenting no change in results to previous noise assessment (if warranted).
Air Quality	A change to the ramp profile and grading does not generally alter emissions tied to traffic operations, which are not changing.	- Confirm there is no change in emissions. - Complete a brief technical memorandum documenting no change in results to previous air quality assessment (if warranted).
Utilities	A change to slope may alter grading limits, which could affect depth of cover, access clearances, or potential conflicts with buried or overhead utilities along the ramp edge.	- Review updated grading and cross-sections against existing utility locates and as-built information. - Confirm minimum cover requirements are maintained for buried utilities. - Confirm that maintenance access to any utility infrastructure is not impeded. - Comply with mitigation measures outlined in Section 6.1.8 of the ESR Addendum.
Contamination	A change in slope geometry may result in additional cut/fill or different excavation depths, which can influence soil handling requirements, excess	- Review updated excavation extents against existing Phase One ESA / Phase Two ESA study areas. - Confirm whether the grading change: - Stays within previously assessed soil management zones, or - Extends into areas requiring additional sampling.

Discipline	Potential Effects	Future Work Commitments
	soil classification, and potential exposure to historical fill or contamination previously screened.	• If needed, conduct targeted supplemental soil sampling to refine soil handling and disposal classification. • Comply with mitigation measures outlined in Section 5.9.8 of the ESR Addendum.
Traffic	No additional traffic impact as geometry and capacity remain unchanged.	• Provide confirmation that there are no changes to traffic capacity analysis, access, or queueing and operational or safety impacts (if warranted).
Geotechnical	A change in slope does not generally change subsurface profile risks, however, slope stability implications and foundation design must be confirmed to meet MTO requirements.	• Share investigation plans with MTO to gain early alignment to derisk rework during the detailed design. • Confirm stability analysis for new side slope (i.e. 3:1) geometry. • Update slope stability modeling. • Reconfirm pavement structure recommendations. • Prepare detailed design Geotechnical Report.
Structural	No change assumed to the structural type, however, an update may be required for abutment / retaining interface or slope protection requirements.	• Update drawings accordingly.
Roadway	A 3:1 slope typically requires more horizontal space than a retaining wall, leading to more right-of-way need. Benching of the slope and ditches at the tie-in will require further design.	• Update new drawings in consultation with geotechnical, structural, SWM/Drainage, and others. • Reassess: ○ Property impact. ○ Utility impact. ○ Temporary and permanent erosion sediment control measures for the side slopes and ditches. ○ Clear zone requirement.
Stormwater Management & Drainage	A change in slope may modify runoff flow paths, ditch geometry, infiltration vs. conveyance balance, and may influence drainage structure sizing.	• Update grading plans and confirm drainage patterns. • Reassess: ○ Runoff volumes and minor/major system flows. ○ Erosion potential at outlets and slopes. ○ Need for additional slope armoring or ditch lining. • Confirm no net increase in uncontrolled discharge to receivers. • Review of additional water quantity control practices to address additional drainage areas outside of the Woodbine pond capacity. • Prepare updated SWM Report, figures, and mitigation/recommendations.