HIGHWAY 7 CORRIDOR & VAUGHAN NORTH-SOUTH LINK PUBLIC TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS

SUMMARY LISTING OF EA COMPLIANCE DOCUMENTATION
FOR

H3 SEGMENT
YONGE STREET (RICHMOND HILL CENTRE) TO BIRCHMOUNT ROAD
December 2015

Legend

Completion Status		Notes
On-going / In progress		Work has begun on this item but not completed
Completed		All work completed for this item.
Future Work		No work has begun on this item.
No Action Required		No action is required to meet commitments
Does not apply		Does not apply to segment H3.
Review Status (MMM)		**Notes**
Any column	**Bold and Underlined**	If multiple components exist for an item, this shows which of the components were reviewed.
Review column	**No**	Not reviewed at this time
	Yes	Reviewed
Review Results column	**EF (year)**	**Evidence Found** means that the evidence provided reasonably shows that a compliance action (i.e., something done to address a compliance item) has been undertaken.
	EFC (year)	**Evidence Found of Change** means that the evidence provided reasonably shows that a compliance action has been undertaken but the action is a change from the compliance item.
	NSE (year)	**Not Sufficient Evidence** means that the evidence provided although applicable to the compliance action, is not adequate to reasonably show that the compliance action has been undertaken.
	ENF (year)	**Evidence Not Found** means that evidence has either not been provided or that the evidence does not appear related to the compliance action.
	Unclear (year)	Further explanation requested
	Closed	All item in the condition / commitments have been closed – no further action
	Ops/Future	Design and Construction Phase items closed and all remaining (non-closed) items occur in operations (e.g., monitoring) or is to address outside current project.

Table of Contents

NOTE: A separate Annual Compliance Report has been prepared for the section of H3 from Birchmount Road to Kennedy Road (H3.4), as this is a separate project at a different stage of completion.

Glossary

AADT – Annual Average Daily Traffic
AAQC – Ambient Air Quality Criteria
ACR – Annual Compliance Report
AODA - Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act
AQ – Air Quality
BHF – Built Heritage Features
BRT – Bus Rapid Transit
CEAA – Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
CLU – Cultural Landscape Units
CMP – Compliance Monitoring Program
CN – Canadian National Railway
CoA – Certificate of Approval
CP – Canadian Pacific Railway
CPAC – Cycling and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
DBCR – Design Basis and Criteria Report
DD – Detail Design
DFO – Fisheries and Oceans Canada
DSC - Development Services Committee
EA – Environmental Assessment
EAA – Environmental Assessment Act
EAAB – Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch
EBL – Eastbound Left
EBR – Eastbound Right
EBT – Eastbound Through
ERS – Emergency Response Services
GhG – Greenhouse Gases
Gov't – Government
GTA – Greater Toronto Area
HADD – Harmful Alternation, Disruption or Destruction
Hwy - Highway
IFC – Issued For Construction
LOS – Level of Service
LRT – Light Rail Rapid Transit
LRTP – Long Range Transportation Plan
MNR – Ministry of Natural Resources
MOE – Ministry of the Environment
MTO – Ministry of Transportation
NBL – Northbound Left
NBT – Northbound Through
OE – Owner Engineer
OGS – Oil Grit Separator
OSAA – Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs
PCC – Public Consultation Centre
PE – Preliminary Engineering
QSD – Quick Start Design
ROW – Right-of-way
RT – Rapid Transit
RTOR – Right-Turn-On-Red
SBL – Southbound Left
SBR – Southbound Right
SBT – Southbound Through
SWM - Storm Water Management
SWMP – Storm Water Management Plan
TAC – Technical Advisory Committee
TCP – Transportation Conversion Plan
TRCA – Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
TS – Technical Support
TSP - Total Suspended Particles
TTC – Toronto Transit Commission
WB – Westbound
WBL – Westbound Left
WBT – Westbound Through
VCC – Vaughan Corporate Centre
YR – York Region
YRRTC – York Region Rapid Transit Corporation
YRT – York Region Transit
YSS – Yonge Street Subway
YSSC - Yonge Street Subway Communications

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of the Program					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	**Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
1.	CMP Section 1.0 - "…The ACR documentation will be made available to the MOE, or its' designate upon request, in a timely manner during an on-site inspection or audit …"	York Region	Status – ongoing. CMP/ACR documentation will be provided to MOE annually.	Letter from MOE, April 1, 2010, acknowledging receipt of 2009 ACR Letter from MOE, January 10, 2011, acknowledging receipt of 2010 ACR Letter from MOE, March 1, 2012, acknowledging receipt of 2011 ACR (ID#8907), and Region's letter in response to MOE comments (ID#8908) Supplemental letter from Region, December 21, 2012 responding to 2011 ACR comments (ID#9619), and letter from MOE, January 16, 2013, acknowledging receipt of 2012 ACR (ID#9616) Letter from MOE, January 30, 2014, acknowledging receipt of 2013 ACR (ID#9952), **Letter from MOE, March 24, 2015 acknowledging receipt of 2014 ACR (ID#10158)**	**Yes**	EF (2011) EF (2012) EF (2013) EF (2014) **EF (2015)**	2011 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE, these will be reviewed each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2012 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE, these will be reviewed each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2013 ACR: evidence listed (ID#9619 & ID#9616) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Evidence listed was found to acknowledge receipt of the 2013 ACR. **2015 ACR: Evidence listed was found to acknowledge receipt of the 2014 ACR.**
2.	CMP Section 1.2 - "Vaughan N-S Link segment of the undertaking is not included in this CMP…"	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	**Closed (2014)**	2014: Colour updates to better reflect status

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of the Program					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	**Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
3.	CMP Section 1.3 - "Modified alignment required at IBM / Cedarland Avenue" "… In January 2008, Regional Council endorsed a modified alignment along Cedarland Drive and Warden Avenue as a local refinement to the undertaking approved in the EA. … An amendment report will be prepared and submitted for approval following the process described in section 6.0 of this CMP."	York Region	Status – completed The Final Cedarland Alignment Modification Report was submitted to MOE on February 2010 as Appendix 4 of the 2009 Annual Compliance Report. MOE's comments on this alignment are addressed below as part of Appendix 4.This modification is being carried forward as the preferred design during the Detail Design Phase.	Highway 7 & Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA Compliance Monitoring Report – Appendix 4 (ID# 4703) Cedarland Alignment Modification Report –(ID# 3018)	No	EF 2009	3018 -Response to comments on the draft report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report are provided in Appendix 4 of this Table. To review these changes, the final report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report (June 2009) was reviewed. This final report will be used to verify the condition provided in the main table.
4.	CMP Section 1.4 - "Cornell Terminal site plan is evolving post EA approval" "…Since approval of the EA, progress has been made in the development of what is now known as the Cornell Transit Terminal. … Once the Cornell Terminal site plan is complete, it will be documented in the ACR."	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment Master planning of the property known as Block 11 of the Cornell Secondary Plan is underway in order to identify potential Cornell Terminal locations. The Cornell Terminal site plan is not yet complete.	Block Plan Configuration Alternatives Scenarios and related documents - CT 2.5 (ID# 2904, 3416, 3004, 3005, 3006 etc.)	No	**Closed (2014)**	2013 ACR: noted that this item does not apply to the H3 segment. 2014: Colour updates to better reflect status

Section 2.0 - Monitoring of Conditions of Approval						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	MOE Condition of EAA approval	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and description of how the condition has been addressed	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
5.	1.0 General Conditions 1.1 The Proponent shall comply with all the provisions of the EA submitted to the MOE which are hereby incorporated by reference except as provided in these conditions and as provided in any other approvals or permits that may be issued.	York Region/ECM - (more specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting for all cells in this column).	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status - ongoing. CMP/ACR documentation will be provided to MOE annually. This condition will be addressed once all commitments have been met.	Letter from MOE, April 1, 2010, acknowledging receipt of 2009 ACR Letter from MOE, January 10, 2011, acknowledging receipt of 2010 ACR Letter from MOE, March 1, 2012, acknowledging receipt of 2011 ACR(ID#8907), and Region's letter in response to MOE comments (ID#8908) Supplemental letter from Region, December 21, 2012 responding to 2011 ACR comments (ID#9619), and letter from MOE, January 16, 2013, acknowledging receipt of 2012 ACR (ID#9616) Letter from MOE, January 30, 2014, acknowledging receipt of 2013 ACR (ID#9952), **Letter from MOE, March 24, 2015 acknowledging receipt of 2014 ACR (ID#10158)**	**Yes**	EF (2011) EF (2012) EF (2013) **EF (2014)** **EF (2015)**	2011 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE, these will be reviewed each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2012 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE, these will be reviewed each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2013 ACR: evidence listed (ID#9619 & ID#9616) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. **2014: Evidence listed was found to acknowledge receipt of the 2013 ACR.** **2015 ACR: Evidence listed was found to acknowledge receipt of the 2014 ACR.**
6.	1.2 These proposed conditions do not prevent more restrictive conditions being imposed under other statutes.	York Region	As applicable	Status - ongoing. More restrictive conditions imposed under other statutes is not foreseen at this time.		**Yes**		2014: No change – nothing to review – remains on -going. **2015 ACR: No change – nothing to review – remains on -going.**

Section 2.0 - Monitoring of Conditions of Approval						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	MOE Condition of EAA approval	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and description of how the condition has been addressed	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
7.	2.0 Public Record 2.1 Where a document is required for the Public Record, it shall be provided to the Director for filing with the Public Record maintained for this undertaking. Additional copies of such documents will be provided by the Proponent for public access at: a) The Regional Director's Office; b) The Clerks offices of the Regional Municipality of York; c) The Town of Richmond Hill; d) The Town of Markham; and e) The City of Vaughan; f) Richmond Hill Central Library; g) Unionville Library; and h) Ansley Grove Library. These documents may also be provided through other means as considered appropriate by the Proponent and acceptable	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status - ongoing. To be completed with the filing of the last ACR. [1] The MOE has received and approved the Compliance Monitoring Program dated August, 2008. [2] The 2009 ACR was submitted to MOE in February 2010 to be placed on public record. [3] The CMP is posted on York Regions (york.ca) website. [4] The 2011 ACR was submitted to MOE in February 2012 to be placed on public record.[5] The 2012 ACR was submitted to the MOE in December 2012 and copies provided to the ministry for the public record [6] The 2013 ACR was submitted to MOE and the MOE	MOE Compliance Monitoring Program letter of approval – Y2H3 4.7 (ID# 3706) [2] Highway 7 & Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA Compliance Monitoring Report, July 6, 2009 (ID# 4703) [3] Letter from MOE, April 1, 2010, acknowledging receipt of 2009 ACR [3] Letter from MOE, January 10, 2011, acknowledging receipt of 2010 ACR [5] Letter from MOE, March 1, 2012, acknowledging receipt of 2011 ACR (ID#8907) [6] Letter from MOE, January 16, 2013, acknowledging receipt of 2012 ACR (ID#9616) [7] http://www.vivanext.com/files/EnvironmentalAssessments/Compliance%20Reports/H2%20and%20H2VMC-RPT-Q-ENV-020302-EA%20Compliance%202013-R04-2013-12-23-SGH-FINAL.pdf [7] Letter from MOE acknowledging receipt of 2013 ACR, dated January 30, 2014(ID#9952) [7] Letters provided to Markham, Vaughan, Richmond Hill and York Region Clerks Offices, Libraries (ID#9943, 9944, 9945)).	**Yes** EF 2009 EF 2010 EF 2009 [3] EF 2011	[5] EF (2012) [6] EF (2013) **[7] EF (2014)** [**[7] EF (2015)**	[2] 3706- Hard Copy of Letter (29-Dec-08) Letter from MOE dated April 1, 2010 shows the ACR was received by MOE on February 25, 2010. This should be added to table. [4] The CMP (Aug 08) was found on York Regions york.ca website. 2011 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE [3], these will be reviewed each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2012 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE [5], these will be reviewed each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2013 ACR: evidence listed (ID#9616) for assertion [6] was found to support how the condition was addressed. [7] 2014: Evidence listed was found to acknowledge receipt of the 2013 ACR.

Section 2.0 - Monitoring of Conditions of Approval						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	MOE Condition of EAA approval	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and description of how the condition has been addressed	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
	to the Director.			acknowledged receipt on January 30, 2014. Copies of the 2013 ACR were provided to Markham, Vaughan, Richmond Hill and York Region on December 23, 2013 and posted online. [7] **The 2014 ACR was submitted to MOE and MOE acknowledged receipt on March 24, 2015. Copies of the 2014 ACR were also provided to Markham, Vaughan, Richmond Hill and York Region Clerks Offices and Libraries. [8]**	**[8] Letter from MOE, March 24, 2015 acknowledging receipt of 2014 ACR (ID#10158)** **[8] Letters provided to Markham, Vaughan, Richmond Hill and York Region Clerks Offices, Libraries (ID#10163, 10164)**			**2015: Evidence [8] was found to acknowledge receipt of the 2014 ACR at listed offices and libraries.**

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
8.	3.0 Compliance Monitoring and Reporting 3.1 The Proponent shall prepare and submit to the Director for review, comment and for placement on the Public Record an Environmental Assessment CMP as committed to in section 11.4 of the EA. The CMP shall be submitted no later than one year from the date of approval of the undertaking, or 60 days before the commencement of construction, whichever is earlier. A statement must accompany the CMP when submitted to the Director indicating that it is intended to fulfill this condition. The CMP, as may be amended by the Director, shall be carried out by the Proponent.	York Region	Design stage (Timing as specified in condition 3.1)	Status – **Complete**. CMP submission requirements addressed with the approval of the CMP. Carrying out of the CMP will be ongoing until the final ACR. The date of the approval of the EA for the undertaking was November 9, 2006. The final CMP was submitted to the Acting Director, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch on August 18, 2008 and approved on December 29, 2008. The first ACR was submitted to MOE in February 2010 and will be followed by annual updates as specified in the CMP.	MOE Compliance Monitoring Program letter of approval – (ID# 3706) EA Compliance Monitoring Program August 2008 (ID# 3683) MOE letter of approval of Hwy 7 EA - (ID# 4039) Notice of Submission of CMP – (ID# 4121) York Region letter of submission of final CMP – (ID# 4157, 4158) MOE email confirmation of receipt of CMP - August 20, 2008 - (ID# 3150) Highway 7 & Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA Compliance Monitoring Report , July 96, 2009 (ID# 4703) Letter from MOE, April 1, 2010, acknowledging receipt of 2009 ACR Letter from MOE, January 10, 2011, acknowledging receipt of 2010 ACR Letter from MOE, March 1, 2012, acknowledging receipt of 2011 ACR (ID#8907) Letter from MOE, January 16, 2013, acknowledging receipt of 2012 ACR (ID#9616) Letter from MOE acknowledging receipt of 2013 ACR, dated January 30, 2014 (ID#9952)	**Yes**	EF 2009 EF 2010 EF (2011) EF (2012) EF (2013) **EF (2014)**	3706- Hard Copy of Letter (29-Dec-08) Letter from MOE dated April 1, shows the ACR was received by MOE on February 25, 2010. This should be added to table. 2011 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE, these will be reviewed each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2012 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE, these will be reviewed each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2013 ACR: evidence listed (ID#9616) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Evidence listed was found to acknowledge receipt of the 2013 ACR.

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored		Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
					CMP was submitted MOE on August 18, 2008 and approved on December 29, 2008 as reported and verified by ECM. MOE acknowledgement of receipt of Annual Compliance Reports will continue to be reported under Item 1.	**Letter from MOE, March 24, 2015 acknowledging receipt of 2014 ACR (ID#10158)**		**EF (2015) Closed**	**2015: Evidence listed was found to support that the CMP was approved by MOE. This item is closed.**
9.	3.2	The Proponent shall provide a copy of the CMP to those agencies, affected stakeholders and/or members of the public who expressed an interest in the activity being addressed or being involved in the subsequent work no later than one year from the date of approval of the undertaking, or 60 days before the commencement of construction, whichever is earlier. If the Director amends the CMP, the Proponent shall ensure that the amended copy of the CMP is provided to those agencies, affected stakeholders and/or members of the public who expressed an interest in the activity being addressed or being involved in a timely manner.	York Region	Design stage (Timing as specified in condition 3.1)	Status – completed Condition addressed with the approval of the CMP and circulation to affected/interested stakeholders.	EA Compliance Monitoring Program August 2008 – (ID# 3683) York Region letter of submission of final CMP (ID# 4157, 4158) MOE Compliance Monitoring Program letter of approval (ID# 3706)	No	EF 2009 EF 2009 Closed (2009)	4157 – dated 18-Aug-08 4158 – dated 31-Oct-08 3706- Hard Copy of Letter (29-Dec-08)
10.	3.3	The Proponent shall prepare a CMP in order to provide a framework for the monitoring of the Proponent's fulfillment of the conditions of approval as set out in this Notice of Approval, and the fulfillment of the provisions of the	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status - **complete** Condition addressed with submission of the CMP for approval and as carried out by the Proponent until the final ACR.	EA Compliance Monitoring Program August 2008 (ID# 3683) York Region letter of submission of final CMP (ID# 4157, 4158)	**Yes**	EF 2009 EF 2010	3706- Hard Copy of Letter (29-Dec-08) Letter from MOE dated April 1, 2010 provides sufficient evidence that the ACR was received by MOE on February 25, 2010. This should be added to table.

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
	EA for mitigation measures, built-in attributes to reduce environmental effects, public and Aboriginal community consultation, additional studies and work to be carried out, and for all other commitments made during the preparation of the EA and the subsequent review of the EA.			The first ACR was submitted to MOE in February 2010 and will be followed by annual updates as specified in the CMP. **CMP was submitted MOE on August 18, 2008 and approved on December 29, 2008 as reported and verified by ECM in Item 8. MOE acknowledgement of receipt of Annual Compliance Reports will continue to be reported under Item 1.**	MOE Compliance Monitoring Program letter of approval (ID# 3706) Highway 7 & Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA Compliance Monitoring Report July 6, 2009 (ID# 4703) Letter from MOE, April 1, 2010, acknowledging receipt of 2009 ACR Letter from MOE, January 10, 2011, acknowledging receipt of 2010 ACR Letter from MOE, March 1, 2012, acknowledging receipt of 2011 ACR (ID#8907) Letter from MOE, January 16, 2013, acknowledging receipt of 2012 ACR (ID#9616) Letter from MOE acknowledging receipt of 2013 ACR, dated January 30, 2014 (ID#9952) **Letter from MOE, March 24, 2015 acknowledging receipt of 2014 ACR (ID#10158)**		EF (2011) EF (2012) EF (2013) EF (2014) **EF (2015) Closed (2015)**	2011 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE, these will be reviewed each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2012 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE, these will be reviewed each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2013 ACR: evidence listed (ID#9616) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Evidence listed was found to acknowledge receipt of the 2013 ACR. **2015:CMP is a one-time submission. Confused in pervious ACR with the ACR submission. Evidence listed was found to acknowledge receipt of the CMP. This item is closed**
11.	3.4 The CMP shall at a minimum: a) set out the purpose, method and frequency of activities to	York Region	Status – completed	Status – completed	May 5, 2006 Proponent's letter and attachments included in EA Compliance Monitoring Program August 2008 (ID#	No	EF (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence cited (ID# 3706) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
	fulfill compliance; b) provide a framework for recording and documenting results through the ACR; c) describe the actions required to address the commitments; d) provide an implementation schedule for when commitments shall be completed; e) provide indicators of compliance; and f) Include, but not be limited to, a consideration of the commitments outlined in Tables 10.4-1 to 10.4-4 and Tables 11.3-1 to 11.4-2 in the EA, and Proponent's letter and attachments dated May 5, 2006 (included in Appendix E)		Condition addressed with the approval of the CMP.	Condition addressed with the approval of the CMP.	3683) MOE Compliance Monitoring Program letter of approval (ID# 3706)		Closed (2011)	
12.	3.6 The Proponent shall prepare an ACR which describes the results of the CMP and shall do so annually. 3.7 The Proponent shall submit each ACR to the Director for review and comment and for placement on the Public Record. 3.8 The timing for the submission of the ACRs shall be set out in the	York Region	Design, Construction and Operation as specified	Status – ongoing. The first ACR was submitted to MOE in February 2010 [1] and will be followed by annual updates [2] as specified in the CMP.	Highway 7 & Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA Compliance Monitoring Report July 6,2009 (ID# 4703)[1] Letter from MOE, April 1, 2010, acknowledging receipt of 2009 ACR Letter from MOE, January 10, 2011, acknowledging receipt of 2010 ACR	**Yes**	EF 2010 EF (2011)	2010 ACR: Letter from MOE dated April 1, 2010 provides sufficient evidence that the ACR was received by MOE on February 25, 2010. This should be added to table. 2011 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE, these will be reviewed each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2012 ACR: As this item is ongoing with annual ACRs provided to MOE, these will be reviewed

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
	CMP, including the timing for submission of the first ACR. 3.9 The Proponent shall submit ACRs until all applicable conditions of approval and commitments of the EA are satisfied or until the Director notifies the Proponent that no further reports are warranted. 3.10 When all conditions have been satisfied, the Proponent shall indicate in the ACR that this is its final submission.				Letter from MOE, March 1, 2012, acknowledging receipt of 2011 ACR (ID#8907) Letter from MOE, January 16, 2013, acknowledging receipt of 2012 ACR (ID#9616) Letter from MOE acknowledging receipt of 2013 ACR, dated January 30, 2014 (ID#9952) **Letter from MOE, March 24, 2015 acknowledging receipt of 2014 ACR (ID#10158)**		EF (2012) EF (2013) EF (2014) **EF (2015)**	each year until the final ACR is submitted. At that point this item may be completed. 2013 ACR: evidence listed (ID#9616) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Evidence listed was found to acknowledge receipt of the 2013 ACR. **2015 ACR: Evidence listed was found to acknowledge receipt of the 2014 ACR.**
13.	4.0 Transit Technology 4.1 The Proponent shall prepare a TCP that identifies how, when and if the undertaking will convert from a Bus Rapid Transit System (BRT) to a Light Rail Rapid Transit (LRT).	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status – future Timing for technology review identified as 2012 (EA Section 5.2.2.3). A draft Transition Plan was prepared and submitted on March 02, 2007 and is under review as part of the ongoing Network Plan update. **The potential future evolution from Bus Rapid Transit to higher capacity Light Rail Rapid Transit is not being planned at this time, and is ultimately dependant on significant growth in transit ridership and available funding in the future, and at least not expected within the 2031**	Draft Transition Plan, March 2, 2007. (ID#910) Correspondence from York Region to MOE, December 21, 2012 (ID# Y-2013-102) **Letter from York Region, April 3, 2012, responding MOE comments. (ID#8908)**	No	EF 2009 Ops / Future (2014)	910 - Network connectivity is discussed in Section 4.6.1 of Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 2013 ACR: item noted as future work. 2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly"**

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
				horizon. No Technology Conversion Plan will be finalized until new information on this issue become available				
14.	4.2 The Proponent shall submit copies of the final TCP to the Regional Director for review and comment and to the Director for placement in the Public Record file. 4.3 The Proponent shall notify the Director and Regional Director 30 days before the technology conversion is to occur.	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status –future Pending as per condition 4.1.	Correspondence from York Region to MOE, December 21, 2012 (ID# Y-2013-102)	No	Ops / Future (2014)	2013 ACR: item noted as future work. 2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
15.	4.4 The TCP shall include an implementation schedule. 4.5 The TCP shall include information about ridership levels and compatibility of the corridor with other transit systems. 4.6 Further to Section 5.2.2.3 of the EA, which outlines that converting from BRT to LRT is dependent on other transit initiatives being developed, a copy of the TCP shall be provided to the City of Toronto, the Toronto Transit Commission, the Town of Richmond Hill, the City of	York Region	Prior to conversion from BRT to LRT technology as required	Status –future Pending as per condition 4.1.	Correspondence from York Region to MOE, December 21, 2012 (ID# Y-2013-102)	No	Ops / Future (2014)	2013 ACR: item noted as future work. 2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
	Vaughan, and the Town of' Markham for review and comment. The Proponent shall provide these stakeholders a minimum 30-day comment period.							
16.	5.0 Air Quality 5.1 The Proponent shall prepare a comprehensive Air Quality Assessment Report to address the air quality impacts of the Region's transportation projects. The study area for the air quality report will be determined by the Proponent in consultation with the Regional Director.[1] 5.2 Copies of the Air Quality Assessment Report shall be submitted to the Regional Director for review and comment and to the Director for placement in the Public Record file.[2] 5.3 The Air Quality Assessment Report shall be submitted to the Regional Director prior to any construction beginning on the undertaking, including site preparation.[3]	York Region	Design Stage	Status –completed An updated Air Quality Impact Assessment Report for a Study Area Bounded by Hwy50 to York Durham Line was completed in April 2011 using the CAL3QHCR dispersion model as required in the terms and conditions for the Hwy 7 Corridor & Vaughan North-South Assessment Compliance Monitoring Program (CMP). The purpose of the Study was to assess the cumulative air quality effects that may arise due to the proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) undertaking.[1] As per MOE request, copies of the Air Quality Report were submitted to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch. The MOE noted via letter that it had accepted the Air Quality Assessment report on June 17, 2011 and is satisfied that Condition 5.4 of the EA Notice of Approval has been addressed. [2]	Final Air Quality Report (2011-04-29) (ID#7270)[1] March 8, 2011 Letter of Submission to MOE (ID#7398] MOE Letter of Acceptance, June 17, 2011 (ID#7713)[2].	No	[1] EF (2011) [2] EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2010 ACR: Appendix C, page 13 Task 3.3: Environmental Services includes a provision for an Air Quality Study. 2011 ACR: [1,2] The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID#7270, 7713) was found to support the assertions [1,2] on how the condition was addressed.
17.	5.4 The Air Quality Assessment Report shall, at a minimum,	York Region	Design Stage	Status – completed	Final Air Quality Report (2011-04-29) (ID#7270)	No	[1-13] EF	2010 ACR: Appendix C, page 13 Task 3.3: Environmental Services includes a provision

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
	include the following: a) A comparison of predicted contaminant concentrations with all available Ontario Regulation 419/05 Air Pollution - Local Air Quality Regulation Schedule 3 standards, ministry's ambient air quality criteria and proposed Canada Wide Standards for: Carbon Monoxide (CO), Nitrogen Oxides (NOx), Particulate Matter - Total Suspended Particulates (TSP) as well as PM10 and PM2.5, and selected Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs);[1] b) Assessment of the study area, as determined in condition 5.1, consisting of a comparison between the background contaminant concentration levels and anticipated contaminant concentration levels resulting from the project, including future traffic volumes;[2] c) A broad-based air quality impact mitigation plan which will assist in reducing contaminant concentrations that exceed appropriate criteria/standards expected to result from construction/implementation of the project;[3] d) Development of project contaminant emission rates using a base year and future years as required[4]			An updated Air Quality Impact Assessment Report for a Study Area Bounded by Hwy50 to York Durham Line was completed in April 2011 using the CAL3QHCR dispersion model as required in the terms and conditions for the Hwy 7 Corridor & Vaughan North-South Assessment Compliance Monitoring Program (CMP). The purpose of the Study was to assess the cumulative air quality effects that may arise due to the proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) undertaking. [1-11] As per MOE request, copies of the Air Quality Report were submitted to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch[12] The MOE accepted the air quality assessment report on June 17, 2011 and is satisfied that Condition 5.4 of the EA Notice of Approval has been addressed. [13]	March 8, 2011 Letter of Submission to MOE (ID#7398) MOE Letter of Acceptance, June 17, 2011 (ID#7713)[1-13]		(2011) Closed (2011)	for an Air Quality Study. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID#7713) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
	e) Use of appropriate Emission and Dispersion Models (e.g. Mobile 6, US EPA CAL3QHCR, Aermod);[5] f) Use of five years of meteorological data (including surface and upper air data);[6] g) Definition of roadway links as necessary;[7] h) Calculation of predicted contaminant concentrations at nearby sensitive receptors;[8] i) Traffic volume data[9] j) Detailed presentation of predicted data (including model input data); and,[10] k) Presentation of conclusions and recommendations.[11]							
18.	6.0 Complaints Protocol 6.1 [1] Prior to construction the Proponent shall prepare a Complaints Protocol [2] on how it will deal with and respond to inquiries and complaints received during the construction and operation of the undertaking. The Proponent shall submit the protocol to the Regional Director, District Manager, Town of Markham, Town of Richmond Hill and the City of Vaughan for review and comment [3]. The Complaints Protocol shall be	York Region / Contractor	Design	Status - completed [2009 ACR]Pending submission prior to construction. [1] According to the H3 Work Scope, the construction coordinator will track and report all complaints and issues related to construction activity to YRRTC. When the contractor cannot immediately resolve the complaint, they will contact YRRTC's Community Liaison Specialist who will coordinate a resolution and/or response.	[1] Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October1, 2010 (ID# 6564)	No	[1] EF (2010) [2,3,4] EF (2011) Closed (2011)	[1] 6564 – Page 21, Section 3.10.5.2 Construction Coordinator is taken as evidence for this assertion. 2011 ACR: [2] The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. [3,4] There was no evidence found in the document provided that the complaints protocol was submitted to stakeholders and placed on public record. Additional evidence provided (Dale Albers

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
	placed on the Public Record [4].			A Complaints Protocol will be developed during detailed design based on the above guidelines and will be submitted to the required agencies for review and comment. [2] A complaints protocol was developed in association with YRRTC's communications group. [3,4] MOE Approval of condition 6.1 and notification of placing on public record.	[2] Appendix CO2 Incident Management_August 26 2011_R1_1_Issued_FC (ID #8061) Dale Albers letter.Nov12 2009.EA06-02-06 [3,4](ID#8908)			letter.Nov12 2009.EA06-02-06) was found to support the assertion [3,4] on how the condition was addressed.
19.	7.0 Amending the Design of the Undertaking 7.1 If the Proponent determines that there is a minor modification and that modification does not alter the expected net effects of the undertaking, the procedure set out in section 11.5 in the EA applies to this modification. [1,3] 7.2 Notwithstanding condition 7.1, section 11.5 of the EA does not apply where there is a change to the undertaking within the meaning of section 12 of the EAA.[2] 7.3 The Proponent shall consult with EAAB to determine the appropriate steps if there is	York Region	Design	Status - **Completed**. Minor changes, if any, dealt with during design are described under item 67 below. [1] An EA amendment report subtitled "Response to Conditions of Approval – Vaughan N-S Link Subway Alignment Optimization" was approved by the Minister of the Environment on April 4, 2008.[2] The TTC has prepared a separate CMP for the Spadina Subway Extension Project and is responsible for compliance monitoring related to the Vaughan N-S Link segment of the undertaking. No other changes requiring a major amendment have been identified during design. See also item 68 below.	MOE letter of approval of the undertaking - Vaughan N-S Link Subway Alignment Optimization (ID# 4160)[2] Cedarland Alignment Modification Report –June 2009. (ID# 3018 [3] Refer to Item 1 for evidence of MOE letters acknowledging receipt of ACR.	Yes	[1] EF (2011) [2] EF (2011) [3] EF (2011) EF 2010 [1] EF (2013)	2011 ACR: [1, 2, 3] The evidence provided (ID# 4160, 3018) in the 2011 ACR was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Letter from MOE dated April 1, 2010 shows the ACR was received by MOE on February 25, 2010. This should be added to table. 2013 ACR: evidence listed in Item 1 (ID#9616) was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. 2014: No minor changes where provided.

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored		Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
		uncertainty as to application of conditions of approval 7.1 or 7.2.			The Final Cedarland Alignment Modification Report was submitted to MOE on February 2010 as Appendix 4 of the 2009 Annual Compliance Report. [3] **Design is now complete and the segment is now operational. No further design changes have been incorporated in 2015. Refer to Items 67 and 68.**			Closed (2015)	**2015: No minor changes where provided. With the end of design, this item is closed**
20.	8.0	Selection of the optimum location for the subway alignment (not applicable for the undertaking covered under this CMP).	York Region	Design Stage	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment. Subway Alignment Report was approved by the Minister of the Environment on April 4, 2008 (see CMP prepared by TTC / York Region for the Spadina Subway Extension).		No	Closed (2014)	2013 ACR: it is noted that this item does not apply to the H3 segment. 2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
21.	9.1	If a Stage 2 archaeological assessment is required to be prepared and aboriginal archaeological resources are encountered during the preparation of that Assessment, the Proponent shall provide a copy of that assessment to the Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec and any additional relevant First Nations as identified [1] by the archaeologist, based on the findings of that assessment. 9.2 The Proponent shall provide the	York Region	Design	Status – completed A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment was undertaken for the H3 segment and concluded that at the historic Brown's Corners Cemetery, a Cemetery Investigation was to be undertaken in the Highway 7 ROW in front of the cemetery. The Stage 2 Assessment also concluded that no additional archaeological assessment is required for the remainder of the study corridor and these areas can be considered clear of further archaeological concern. The Cemetery Investigation at Brown's	Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detail Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario, Revision 1(ID#7109) Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance into the Provincial Register of Reports of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detail Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road	No	[1,2] EF (2011) Closed (2011)	[1,2] The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID#7397,7913) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.

Section 1.0 – Background & Purpose of The Program						Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Stage condition will be addressed	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed 2015	Review Results	Notes
	Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec and any other relevant First Nation as warranted by the Stage 2 findings with 30 days to provide comments on the Stage 2 Assessment and the opportunity to reasonably participate in the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment if the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment is required in relation to aboriginal archaeological resources. [2]			Corners United Church Cemetery found that all lands in the public Highway 7 ROW in front of the Brown's Corners Cemetery can be considered clear of archaeological concern, and no further archaeological assessment is required. The Ministry of Tourism and Culture accepted each of these findings. [1] Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec was notified of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment findings via notification dated January 28, 2011 sent in French (the preferred language of communication) [2] Notice of the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment findings were sent to the Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec on May 30, 2011.	Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7108) Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3 Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town [City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535) Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance into the Provincial Registry of Reports of the Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3 Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town [City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535) [1,2] Huron-Wendat First Nation notification letters (ID# 7397 & 7913)			

Section 3.0 – Compliance Management and Responsibilities					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
22.	CMP Section 3.2.1 - Following the execution of a contract for final design and construction, the design-build contractor will be responsible for all further actions to meet design-related commitments during its completion of the detailed design [1]. Design solutions developed, including mitigation and consultation procedures followed will be subject to review and approval by York Region staff. [2] The contract provisions will include a copy of the CMP and special contract provisions will be added to ensure commitments outlined in the CMP are fulfilled, including commitments to further studies and consultation as applicable	York Region / Contractor	Status – **completed** [1] Contractor's Scope of Work 3.13.3 contains provisions for monitoring the requirements of the CMP. [2] Environmental monitoring is described in the Contractor's Environmental Management Plan.	[1] Final Scope of Work (KED) - H3 viva Next, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave, October 1, 2010. (ID#6564) [2] Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) [2] Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001)	No	[1] EF 2010 [2] EF (2011) [2] EF (2012) Closed (2012)	[1] 2010 ACR: Scope of Work Section 3.13.3 refers to Schedule 7: Approvals Matrix 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR [2] was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. While the CEMP does describe monitoring activities, there does not appear to be any direct reference to conditions outlined in the CMP. However. The CEMP does say that it will comply corporate and client requirements. We understood this to include monitoring activities. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR [2] was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Items [1] and [2] were reviewed previously and closed. Suggest that the status be updated.
23.	CMP Section 3.2.2 - The Contractor will be responsible for meeting CMP requirements during construction. In accordance with stipulated contracting arrangements, the party contracted to carry out the construction will be required to meet all commitments related to the mitigation of construction effects [1] while the Region or its consultants will monitor the contractor's actions. [2]	York Region / Contractor	Status – **completed** Contractor's Scope of Work 3.13.3 contains provisions for monitoring the requirements of the CMP. [1] Environmental monitoring is described in the Contractor's Environmental Management Plan.	Final Scope of Work (KED) - H3 viva Next, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave, October 1, 2010. (ID#6564) [1] Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) [1] Environmental Management Plan 2012	No	EF 2010 [1] EF (2011) [1] EF	2010 ACR: Scope of Work Section 3.13.3 refers to Schedule 7: Approvals Matrix 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR [1] was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. [1] is recognized as the first step in an ongoing process. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR [2] was found to support the assertion on

Section 3.0 – Compliance Management and Responsibilities					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				(H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001)		(2012) Closed (2012)	how the condition was addressed. 2014: Items [1] and [2] were reviewed previously and closed. Suggest that the status be updated.
23A	CMP Section 3.2.3 – Once construction is complete and rapid transit service operations commence on the project, York Region will assume responsibility for monitoring the effects of operations and maintenance in accordance with the CMP requirements.	York Region	Status – **Completed** **This is a general requirement. Monitoring will be via specific items in this table.**		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
24.	CMP Section 4.1 - Ability of infrastructure design to maximize safety for vehicles [1] and pedestrians [2] and of streetscaping plan [3] to enhance corridor and community environment;	York Region	Status – completed Vehicle Safety:[1] DBCR deals with road design standards and vehicle safety - Section 3.7 Roadside Safety. Pedestrian Safety:[2] Architectural drawings show platform and canopy design. The DBCR addresses pedestrian safety, for example: Guardrail / Railings (Section 4.5 & 4.15), Safety and Security Guidelines (Section 4.9.4), Placement of Streetscape Elements (Section 4.9.8), Crosswalks (Section 4.21), Public Telephone (Section 4.22), etc. Streetscaping Plan:[3] DBCR examples: Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), etc. [2011 ACR] Detail design will incorporate these requirements. Detail design has incorporated these requirements. [1,2,3] Streetscaping Elements incorporated	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551)[1,2,3] H3 Preliminary Drawings (Civil, Architectural, Landscape, etc.) (ID# 4183)[1,2,3] [1,2,3]H3 Detailed Design New Construction Plans H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403 (ID#8909) [1,2,3]Town[City] of Markham and Town of Richmond Hill Design Charette, April 6, 2011.(ID#8903) [2,3] Streetscape Design Layout Plans H3-DWG-R-LND-080407 (ID#9633) [1,2] H3 Detailed Design Traffic Signal IFC Plans H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303 (ID#9632) [1,2] H3 Detailed Design Pavement Markings and Signage IFC Plans H3-DWG-R-CIV-080405 (ID#9630) [2] H3 Station Platform Design H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508 (ID#9634)	No	EF 2009 EF 2009 [1,2,3] EF (2012)	ACR 2009 3551 - TASK 4.12: TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (H3) HIGHWAY 7 - YONGE STREET CONNECTOR RAMP TO SOUTH TOWN CENTRE BOULEVARD (SEPTEMBER 2008) is not cited in the “status and description” part) 4040 -Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 includes Section 4.10 Streetscape design guidelines plus several references to pedestrian and roadside safety 4183 - CD labelled VivaNext H3 Transit Improvements 30% submission Yonge to Warden Task 4.1 Cover memo indicated drawings – did not have software to open drawing files 3354 – TASK 4.12: TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (H3) HIGHWAY 7 - YONGE STREET CONNECTOR RAMP TO SOUTH TOWN CENTRE BOULEVARD REPORT SEPTEMBER 2008 not clear what this document is meant to demonstrate 2012 ACR: Elements of the DBCR as listed in the Status column were found in the Design Charette document (ID 8903) and were looked for in random drawings (ID 8909) to confirm their incorporation into detail design. Guiderail was found in drawing H3-DWG—R-CIV-

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			in Streetscape Design plans[2,3]. Traffic Signal[1,2], Pavement Marking and Signage drawings incorporate safety elements for vehicles and pedestrians. Architectural Elements[2] All platforms contain guards along the backside of the platform facing the roadway. These guards have been designed according to the Ontario building code. They also have been designed in accordance with jersery barrier requirements from the roadway. From the crosswalk, handrails and guards have been provided along a ramp up to the platform surface. At the secondary crossing at the bottom of the ramp, there are also handrails that are utilized to guide people to cross the road and prevent them from accidentally walk over to the roadway. In case of accident happened at the intersection, pedestrians will be provided in the result of a curved concrete wall.			[1,2,3] EF (2013) Closed (2013)	080403-103-C02. Crosswalks were found in drawing H3-DWG-R-CIV-080405-102-C00. Glass Guard and Handrail was found in document a different folder (ID 7921) in document H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508-302-C03. Streetscaping elements were found in a different drawing folder (H3-DWG-R-LND-080407_Streetscape Planting) and should be added to the compliance document reference column. 2013 ACR: Numbering revised for clarity.. Evidence provided was found to support the assertion [1,2,3] on how the condition was addressed. The safety provisions found in the drawings provided include: Crosswalks, Emergency Call Cuttons, Blue Emergency Lights, Stainless Steel Guards, CCTV camera, Glass Guards and Handrails, and Curved Concrete Walls.

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			CPTED principles have been utilized on the design, numerous security devise such CCTV, emergency call box, flash blue strobe light, and PA system to alert emergency vehicles. Illumination levels are even and consistent. Variable message signs provide system and rider bulletin and bus schedule information. Illuminated map case on the platform provides route information.				
25.	CMP Section 4.1 - Application of design standards that permit future conversion to LRT technology;	York Region	Status – completed The DBCR addresses this requirement, for example BRT Standards (Section 2.0), Stations (Section 3.2), etc. [2011 ACR] Detail Design will incorporate these requirements. Detail Design was undertaken for a BRT service so as not to preclude a future LRT service (Section 1.0 of the Update to H3 Design Basis Report). H3 IFC drawings and H3 Record drawings show that platforms are long enough to accommodate two articulated buses, or an LRT vehicle.	H3 PE Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 5337) H3 PE Design Basis and Criteria Report, Update to Dec 2009, November 2011. (ID#8035) H3 Detailed Design New Construction Plans H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403 (ID#8909) H3 Record Drawings(ID#9499)	No	EF 2009 EF (2012) EF (2013) Closed (2013)	Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 includes Section 1.4.2 and Section 2 2012 ACR: the update to the DBCR indicates no change to the original DBCR, therefore there is no change to the review results. 2013 ACR: Numbering revised for clarity.. Evidence provided was found to support the assertion that the platforms are long enough to accommodate a LRT (for review, assumed 30 m LRT).
26.	CMP Section 4.1 - Effectiveness of infrastructure	York Region	Status- completed		No	EF 2009	910 - Network connectivity is discussed in

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
	design [1]and service plans[2] in enhancing connectivity to local and inter-regional transit services;		[1]Effectiveness of infrastructure design: Discussions with YRT during the Detail Design process covered connectivity with local and inter-regional transit services. [2] Effectiveness of service plans: The Transition Plan – Draft (March 2, 2007), Section 4.6.1 - The Evaluation of Qualitative Measures – Includes a discussion of Network Connectivity. [2] The potential future evolution from Bus Rapid Transit to higher capacity Light Rail Rapid Transit is not being planned at this time, and is ultimately dependant on significant growth in transit ridership and available funding in the future, and is not expected within the 2031 horizon. No Technology Conversion Plan will be finalized until new information on this issue becomes available. Network connectivity is also discussed in Section 4.6.1 of Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 [1]	Draft Transition Plan, March 2, 2007. (ID#910)[2] Letter from York Region, April 3, 2012, responding MOE comments, April 3, 2012.[2](ID#8908) H3 Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551)[1] [1] H3 Streetscape Design Layout Plans IFC H3-DWG-R-LND-080407 [ID#9633]: • Curbside stations, Chalmers to Warden – Sheets 107-144 [1] H3 Architectural Drawings – Wayfinding IFC H3-DWG-F-ARC-080509 [ID#9631]: • Map case – Sheet 027		[2] EF (2012) [1,2] EF (2013) Closed (2013)	Section 4.6.1 of Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR [2] was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: Numbering revised for clarity. For item [1] effectiveness of infrastructure design, evidence is provided (e.g., [ID Y-2013-004] and [ID#9631])on how is the infrastructure design enhancing connectivity to local and inter-regional transit services) For item [2] effectiveness of service plans, the evidence provided (ID8908) supports that no . No Technology Conversion Plan will be finalized.

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			[1] Local transit stops are provided on the curbside at intersections where median Viva BRT stations are located on corridors where local transit service is provided. Signalized pedestrian crossings and cross-walk treatment provide wayfinding. Maps showing interconnectivity are provided at all median Viva BRT stations. Elevator/stair towers provide interconnection between the grade separated Bayview Avenue and Highway 7.	[1] Photograph of Information Centre/Map Case at Median BRT station [ID Y-2013-004] [1] H3 Permanent Traffic Signals Layout IFC H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303 (ID#9632) • Signalized pedestrian crossings • Crosswalk treatment [1] H3 Architectural Drawings Site Plans – Bayview Towers IFC H3-DWG-F-ARC-080503 [ID#9631]: • Site Plans, North and South Towers with pedestrian walkway to Bayview Avenue			
27.	CMP Section 4.1 - Simulation of intersection performance to verify transit service reliability and effects on general traffic [1-3];	York Region	Status –complete [1] DBCR - Section 3.9 Traffic Analysis outlines intersection performance goals. [2,3] Other traffic analysis reports support capacity measurements and operating characteristics at intersections. [3] The most recent Intersection Operations Study – Alternative Intersection Operation Analysis Report, June 15, 2011 used Syncro and Vissim to model operational impacts and make recommendations on design for the purposes of supporting pedestrian and transit goals.	[1] H3 Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) [2] Traffic Impact Analysis (H3) Highway 7 – Yonge Street Connector Ramp to South Town centre Boulevard – Y2H3 4.12 (ID# 3354 & 4021) [3] Intersection Operations Study – Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis Report, June 15, 2011 (ID# 7450)	No	[1,2] EF 2009 [3] EF (2011) Closed (2013)	2009 ACR: Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 includes Section 3.1.4 makes reference to an Appendix under separate cover which appears to be Traffic Impact Analysis (H3) Highway 7 – Yonge Street Connector Ramp to South Town centre Boulevard – Y2H3. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID#7450) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
28.	CMP Section 4.1 - Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment;	York Region	Status – completed A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment was undertaken for the H3 segment [1] and concluded that at the historic Brown's Corners Cemetery, a Cemetery Investigation was to be undertaken in the Highway 7 ROW in front of the cemetery. The Stage 2 Assessment also concluded that no additional archaeological assessment is required for the remainder of the study corridor and these areas can be considered clear of further archaeological concern. The Cemetery Investigation at Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery found that all lands in the public Highway 7 ROW in front of the Brown's Corners Cemetery can be considered clear of archaeological concern, and no further archaeological assessment is required. The Ministry of Tourism and Culture accepted each of these findings. Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec was notified of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment findings via notification dated January 28, 2011 sent in French (the preferred language of	[1] Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detail Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario, Revision 1(ID#7109) [1] Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance into the Provincial Register of Reports of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detail Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7108) Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3 Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535) Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance into the Provincial Registry of Reports of the Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3 Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535)	No	EF 2010 [1] EF (2011) Closed (2013)	2010 ACR: 6550 - Appendix C, Task 3.3 Environmental Services (p. 13) satisfies this condition. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID#7109, 7108) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Bolding and underline was removed for items not reviewed.

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			communication) Notice of the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment findings were sent to the Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec on May 30, 2011.	Huron-Wendat First Nation notification letters (ID# 7397 & 7913)			
29.	CMP Section 4.1 - Inclusion of measures to mitigate construction effects on [i] residences, [ii] businesses, [iii] road traffic and [iv] pedestrians in contract specifications; [1-4]	York Region / Contractor	Status –**completed** Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 Section 4.8- Detail Design Phase states that "Protection, relocation and or replacement in kind of existing elements disturbed by construction including but not limited to landscaping, sidewalks, curb ramps, shelters and street furniture" [1] The H3 Detail Design Work Plan – Final Version also sets out that a Traffic Management Plan for construction will be prepared by contractor during detail design.[2] In addition, Construction Staging Plans will be produced by contractor prior to the commencement of construction. These plans will illustrate construction access, access to adjacent properties, lane closures and pedestrian access.[3]	Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 – Y2H3 4.02 (ID# 3551)[1] H3 Detail Design Work Plan – Final Version September 17, 2010 – (ID# 6550)[2] Y2H3 Draft Constructability / Construction Staging Report (ID# 3358) [3] [4] Construction Staging Plans (ID#8061)– H3-DWG-R-CIV-080401-002-C00 H3-DWG-R-CIV-080401-003-C00 H3-DWG-R-CIV-080401-004-C02 H3-DWG-R-CIV-080401-005-C00 H3-DWG-R-CIV-080401-006-C01	No	[1-3] EF 2010 [4] EF (2011)	2009 ACR: [1-2] NSE 2009 It was not clear that "Traffic management concepts and plans have been developed". [3] Measures to mitigate construction effects on residences, businesses, road traffic and pedestrians mentioned in Y2H3 Draft Constructability / Construction Staging Report (undated but provided 3-Oct-08) including general description of measures to mitigate construction effects on residences, businesses, road traffic and pedestrians [1] Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 – Y2H3 4.02 (ID# 3551) and Enterprise / Civic Mall Supplement) 3.10.13 Construction Specifications only references generally the primary, secondary and tertiary construction specification for the project It does not explicitly address construction effects. Section 4.8 Detail Design Phase States that "Protection, relocation and or replacement in kind of existing elements disturbed by construction including but not limited to landscaping, sidewalks, curb ramps, shelters and street furniture"

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			Construction staging plans were produced prior to commencing construction and are revised as required to suite construction methodology and project requirements. [4] [[4] [A] Lane Closure Permits outlining the temporary traffic conditions have been developed for the work-to-date to mitigate impacts to highway traffic.	H3 DWG-R-CIV-080401-007-C02 [4] [A] H3 Lane Closure Permits 2014 (KED ID #2014-009)		[4] [A] EF (2014) Closed (2014)	Enterprise / Civic Mall Supplement) No information regarding construction mitigation was found. [1-3] 2010 ACR: In discussion with the Owner Engineer it was made clearer that documents and plans refer to what was described in document 3551. 2011 ACR: [4] The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (Construction Staging Plans) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. [4] [A] 2014: Numbering added for clarity Item [I] The evidence provided supports inclusion of measures to mitigate construction effects on residences, businesses, road traffic and [4] pedestrians in contract specifications; Suggest that this item status be changed to closed.
30.	CMP Section 4.1 - Opportunities to obtain input from [i[affected communities, [ii} First Nations and [iii] heritage associations;	York Region	Status – **Completed** "Open House" format public consultations were held on June 17 & 18 2008 (#1) and November 26, 2008 (#2) during PE design. Notices of public consultation opportunities, including newspaper advertising, postcards, individual letters, etc.	June 17 & 18 2008 "Open House" #1 – Y2H3 2.04 (Presentation ID# 2830) November 26, 2008 "Open House" #2 – Y2H3 2.03 (Canopy Movie ID# 4090), Y2H3 2.04 (Boards ID# 3823), Newspaper advertising – (ID# 2865), YSS (ID# 3754), Postcard (ID# 2863), PCC card YSSC (ID# 4047)	No	EF 2009 EF 2009 EF 2009 EF 2009	2830 – PIC presentation June 17 & 18 2008 4090 – Movie on CD (26-Nov-08) (not opened-software problem) 3823 - Boards on CD (26-Nov-08) 2865- Article 18-Jun 3754 – Vaughan Citizen Article 16-Nov-05 2863 - Postcard 4047 - PCC card

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			Presentations to miscellaneous community groups, such as YR Chambers of Commerce, Vaughan Corporate Centre Advisory Committee, Richmond Hill Community Fair, etc. Hwy 7 EA Notice of submission of CMP for public review and comment. [ii] H3 Detail Design Work Plan provides for notices of public consultation opportunities to First Nations that have expressed their wish to be kept informed of the implementation of the undertaking; and to circulation of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report to all First Nations that have asked to be kept informed of the outcome of any archaeological investigations during the design and contraction phases. [i] The contractor and YRRTC staff will organize a meeting to present the design to the affected residents and property owners in an "Open House" format via pre-construction information centre. [i] Pre-construction public information centre held on March	Individual letters of notification and mailing lists for H3 PE Design "Open Houses" (ID# 4231 & 4232) YR Chambers of Commerce May 27, 2008 (Presentation ID# 2687), VCC Advisory Committee April 24, 2008 - (Presentation ID# 2536), Richmond Hill Community Fair - (Presentation ID# 4228), etc. Notice of Submission of CMP (ID# 4121) and CMP distribution lists to First Nations, Government Review Team and other stakeholders (ID# 4122, 4123, 4124, 4125) H3 Detail Design Work Plan – Final Version September 17, 2010 – (ID# 6550) Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564) Presentation Materials, Display Boards (Y2014-002). Report to YRRTC Board describing March		EF 2009 EF 2009 EF 2010 [i] EF (2014) [ii][iii] EF Closed	4231 – letter dated 30-May-08 4232 – letter dated 19-Nov-08 YR Chambers of Commerce May 27, 2008 – Y2H3 2.04 (Presentation ID# 2687) VCC Advisory Committee April 24, 2008 - Y2H3 2.04 (Presentation ID# 2536), Richmond Hill Community Fair - Y2H3 4.07 (Presentation ID# 4228) Notice of Submission of CMP – Y2H3 4.7 (ID# 4121) 22-Aug-08 4122 – email distribution list 16-Mar-09 4123 – First nations contact MOE 16-Mar-09 4124 – GRT CMP 4125 – Stakeholder Contact list 6564 – Appendix C Task 3.3 Environmental Services (p.13 & 14) satisfy this condition. 2014: No Evidence was provided to support the following assertions: [a] notices of public consultation opportunities to First Nations [b] The contractor and YRRTC staff will organize a meeting Upon clarification, additional was provided that supports item[i] – public consultation. Items ii (First Nations) and item [ii] heritage districts remains ongoing. <u>THESE ITEM NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED IN 2015.</u> 2014: No Evidence was provided to support the following assertions: [a] notices of public consultation opportunities to First Nations [b] The contractor and YRRTC staff will

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			2011. **[i] Open houses were held in 2011 for community input as described above.** **[ii] Huron-Wendake First Nations were contacted when copies of the Stage 2 and Stage 3 archaeology reports were provided in 2011 (see Item 28) and offered the opportunity to consult regarding the project. No response was received.** **[iii] There are no heritage districts within the H3 corridor.**	2011 public information session with photo (Y2014-002) **[iii] Figure from Appendix A of the Cultural Heritage Report, Appendix I of the Environmental Assessment, annotated (ID Y2015-001)**			organize a meeting Upon clarification, additional was provided that supports item[i] – public consultation. Items ii (First Nations) and item [ii] heritage districts remains ongoing. THESE ITEM NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED IN 2015. 2015 ACR: Evidence provided (Y2015-001) supports assertion regarding item [iii] heritage districts. It is recognized that lack of response for Item [ii] First Nations cannot be supported by documentation. This was supported by discussion with Owner Engineer (OE). All items are closed
31.	CMP Section 4.1 - Inclusion of built-in attributes to mitigate adverse effects in design solutions;	York Region	Status –**completed** See Appendix One for monitoring for Built In Attributes		No	Close (2014)	See cross-referenced column. May be simpler to close this one as it provides no added benefit.
32.	CMP Section 4.1 - Adoption of design solutions that mitigate effects on surface water quality and quantity and aquatic habitat at watercourse crossings;	York Region	Status –completed H3DBCR Provides for a Transition Zone or continuity strip (Section 3.15) –eco pavers allow for water percolation improving quality and reducing quantity. The median island also includes softscape wherever possible to achieve same. The detail design also includes oil grit separators to treat runoff from impervious areas ensuring a net	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230)	No	EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2009 ACR: ECF 2009 but not for entire project area. DBCR: - The Transition zone or the continuity strip (Section 4.20.1) - eco pavers allow for water percolation improving quality and reducing quantity. The median island also includes softscape wherever possible to achieve same. Draft Drainage & Hydrology Report Highway 7 Corridor (H3) – Y2H3 4.05 (ID# 3230) - Hwy 404 to Kennedy report in progress. DRAINAGE & HYDROLOGY REPORT

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			improvement in runoff quality for all release points. In particular, sections 2.5, 2.6, and 2.3 of the Final Drainage Study include provisions for water quality and aquatic habitat. Details of the design are also included.				HIGHWAY 7 CORRIDOR - H3 SEGMENT 2: HIGHWAY 404 to WARDEN AVENUE (March 2009) Section 5.1 Several Oil Grit Separator units are recommended along the study area in order to provide enhanced quality treatment for a runoff volume equivalent to the runoff generated by all new impervious areas June 9, 2009 Memo H3 – Warden Avenue/Enterprise Boulevard Drainage Report Section 5.0 Mitigation Measures lists mitigation measures will be including storm sewer system, pollution removal will be enhanced through the use of vegetation, continued use of existing in-line oil/grit separator at the Warden Avenue and Enterprise Boulevard intersection. The PDF of the Yonge to 404 is not on the network but this report has been submitted so we have hard and electronic in the Rapidco office. The Birchmount to Kennedy report has not been submitted yet. 2010 ACR: ECF 2010 - 3230 – sections 2.5, 2.6, and 2.3 include provisions for water quality and aquatic habitat. Details of the design are also included. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 3230) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
33.	CMP Section 4.1 - Procedures to obtain regulatory approvals [1] and input from municipal departments.[2]	York Region / Contractor	Status – **Completed** The DBCR outlines several approval requirements - Section 6 Approvals and Permits.[1] In addition, preliminary consultation with municipalities regarding design approvals commenced during the PE design phase. The Town [City] of Markham has provided comments on early PE Design drawings. Municipalities have been consulted on the Viva Canopy design [2]. York Region has participated in bi-weekly meetings with Town [City] of Markham staff regarding the Enterprise / Civic Mall segment design.[3] The formal municipal approval process will begin at the commencement of the Detail Design phase.[5] Presentations to Markham Development Services Committee [6] and Richmond Hill [7] Consultations have begun with TRCA and a file has been opened with TRCA for H3.[8] At a meeting on June 24, 2010, TRCA staff indicated that, based on	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) MRC Memo, January 14, 2009 – Markham comments on initial submissions of PE Drawings – (ID# 3784) Consultation with municipalities on the Viva Canopy design (ID# 4233) List of municipal consultations (ID# 4234) Markham DSC February 2008, September 2008, December 2008, Richmond Hill January 2008 (ID# 4229, 4230, 4227, 4235) Record of TRCA Meeting 2009-0304 (ID# 4219) Minutes of Meeting: TRCA with York Consortium – June 24, 2010 (ID# 6386) Navigable Waters Determination Letter. August 25, 2010.(ID#6429) Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564)	No	EF 2009 EF 2010 [1,2] EF (2013) Closed (2013)	ACR 2009: MRC Memo, January 14, 2009 – Markham has comments January 9,2009 Re: Highway 7 Transit Improvement Design comments CD provided labelled Canopy Consultation Town of Markham 4229 - Presentation 12-Feb-08 Civic Mall Shared Space Principles 4230 – Presentation VivaNext 23-Sep-08 4227 – Presentation Hwy 7 Rapidways Richmond Hill 4235 – Council Meeting Rapid Transit Update Presentation 14-Jan-08 16-Apr-09 cover email 4219 - Memo – Permits and Approvals for Viva H3 Drainage 4-Mar-09 ACR 2010- The meeting minutes provided confirm that TRCA officials determined that the provisions of the NWPA do not apply. ACR 2013: Numbering added for clarity. The evidence provided (ID9635) supports that there is a procedures to [1] obtain regulatory approvals and input from municipal departments. This item remains ongoing.

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			the information provided, the effects of the proposed works in these segments could be mitigated and that consequently, a Letter of Advice would be acceptable, since a HADD should not result at any crossing. Navigable Waters Determination Request – concluded that there were no Navigable Waters designations. [2012]During Detail Design and construction, the contractor is responsible for all permits and regulatory and other approvals required for any facilities proposed to be constructed by the contractor. In the event that a permit should be applied for by the Region, contractor will provide all the necessary information and assistance required to obtain the approval. Procedures to obtain regulatory approvals [1] and input from municipal departments [2] during final design and construction are included in the Design-Build Agreement. **[1], [2] Procedures are included in the DBA, as noted immediately above.**	[1] [2] Design-Build Agreement for H.3.1 and H.3.2. November 16, 2010. (ID#9635) • Schedule 2, GC 3.2, 3.3, 6.4 • Schedule 3, Section 3.10.1, 3.10.2 • Schedule 3, Appendix C, Tasks 1.1, 3.1, 3.2, 7.5, 8.1, 8.6, 8.7			

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
34.	CMP Section 4.2 – In general terms commitments to be monitored include … … Contractor compliance with the measures stipulated in the technical specifications and contract conditions to mitigate construction effects on the natural environmental features within the influence of the works; (Refer also to Section 5 – Table 5.2 below for specific items to be monitored)	York Region / Contractor	Status - **Completed** Environmental monitoring by the Contractor is described in the Environmental Management Plan. Refer to Table 5.2 for details on how specific requirements are being monitored. **Reporting is provided in Section 5, Table 5.2.**	Environmental Management Plan 2011(H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001)	Yes	EF (2011) EF (2012) EF (2014) **EF (2015)**	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: Evidence was provided to show monitoring – see Table 5.2 for status of individual items **2015 ACR: As all monitoring items are closed, this item is closed**
35.	CMP Section 4.2 – In general terms commitments to be monitored include … … Contractor compliance with the measures stipulated in the technical specifications and contract conditions to mitigate construction effects on community activities such as pedestrian and vehicular circulation[1], access and ambient noise [2] and air quality levels [3]; (Refer also to Section 5 – Table 5.2 below	York Region / Contractor	**Status – Completed** Environmental monitoring by the Contractor is described in the Environmental Management Plan. Construction activity impact on community activities mitigated through lane closure staging and communications to the public. Contractor conducts Weekly Environmental Checklists to ensure compliance with all permits, laws, and regulations.	Environmental Management Plan 2011(H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) Noise Monitoring Logs 2012(H3-ENV-LOG-NOISE-NS)(KED ID#2012-003)	**Yes**	EF (2011)	2011 ACR: We understand this condition to mean the contractor will be monitoring the measures stipulated. The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was not found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed in its entirety. Specifically, Section 5 – Table 5.2 (below) does not

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
	for specific items to be monitored)		**Construction was completed in 2015.**	Construction Equipment Monitoring Log 2012(H3-ENV-INR-CEI-2012)(KED ID#2012-004) Communications Documents: - H3-Comm-Public Construction Bulletins-2011-12-23 - H3-COMM-Lane Closures and Stage 4-2011-12-19 - H3-Comm-Pedestrian Detour BVW-2011-12-15 Construction Staging Plans(ID#8061): - H3-DWG-R-CIV-080401-002-C00 - H3-DWG-R-CIV-080401-003-C00 - H3-DWG-R-CIV-080401-004-C02 - H3-DWG-R-CIV-080401-005-C00 - H3-DWG-R-CIV-080401-006-C01 - H3 DWG-R-CIV-080401-007-C02 Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) **Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**		EF (2012) [2,3] EF (2014) **[2,3] EF (2015) All items closed**	appear to include pedestrian and vehicular circulation and access. Additional evidence provided (Communications Documents, Construction Staging Plans) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: Weekly environmental checklist support items [2] noise and [3] ambient air quality will be monitored. [1] vehicle and pedestrian reviewed in 2012 and not reviewed again. **2015 ACR: Weekly environmental checklist support items [2] noise and [3] ambient air quality were monitored. These items are closed with the completion of construction. [1] vehicle and pedestrian was closed in 2012.**

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	**Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during Construction**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
36.	CMP Section 4.2 – In general terms commitments to be monitored include … … Compliance [1], by all parties to construction contracts responsible for public safety and construction management and administration, with the procedures [2] established to manage and mitigate effects on the natural or social environment of accidents or incidents during construction activities; (Refer also to Section 5 – Table 5.2 below for specific items to be monitored)	York Region / Contractor	Status – **Completed** Accidents and incidents are managed as per the Incident Management Protocol. **Reporting is provided in Section 5, Table 5.2.**	Environmental Management Plan 2011(H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) Appendix CO2 Incident Management_August 26 2011_R1_1_Issued_FC(ID#8061) VPGM-PM-LET-2013-AUG-14-dm-KED re Incident Mgt Protocol (KED ID# 2013-001)	Yes	EF (2011) EF (2012) [1,2] EF (2013) **EF (2015) Closed (2015)**	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (Appendix CO2 Incident Management_August 26 2011_R1_1_Issued_FC) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2013 ACR: The evidence provided (ID2013-001) was found to support items [1,2] regarding monitoring of compliance and procedures. **2015 ACR: The evidence provided for Section 5 Table 5.2 was found to support the monitoring in construction. With the completion of construction, this item is closed.**

Section 4.0 – Program Scope – General Commitments					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
36A	CMP Section 4.2 – In general terms commitments to be monitored include … … Compliance, by all agencies responsible for safety and operation and maintenance, with the procedures established to manage and mitigate effects on the natural or social environment of accidents or incidents during operation and maintenance activities. (Refer also to Section 5 – Table 5.3 below for specific items to be monitored)		Status – **Completed** **York Region has formalized plans in place to deal with emergencies caused by people, technology and nature. They help protect residents and businesses in case of an emergency. Refer to http://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/yorkregion/yr/emergencies.**	**The Regional Municipality of York, Emergency Plan and Annexes, 2014 and Spill Response Team Overview, York Region Roads and Traffic Operations Branch, Transportation Services (ID# YORK-#6374024)**	No	EF (2015) Closed (2015)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status** **2015: Numbering added for clarity. Evidence provided (ID# YORK-#6374024) to support the assertion regarding established procedures. It is assumed that York Region will comply with their procedures during operation and maintenance activities.**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
37.		The Proponent shall comply with all the provisions of the EA submitted to the MOE which are hereby incorporated by reference except as provided in these conditions and as provided in any other approvals or permits that may be issued. This also includes the summaries of commitments for additional work, built in attributes and monitoring identified in Tables 10.4-1 to 10.4-4 and Tables 11.3-1 to 11.4-2 of the EA and Proponent's letter and attachments dated May 5, 2006.	York Region	Status –**completed** Refer to tables in Appendix 1 of this document for monitoring against Tables 10.4-1 to 10.4-4. Issues in Table 11.3-1 are monitored through items 38-57 below. Table 5.2 of the Compliance Monitoring Program incorporates Table 11.4-1 of the EA (relates to construction) and is added to Section 5 of this document for monitoring Issues in Table 11.4-2 relate to the operations stage and are not monitored in this document. Refer to Appendix 2 and 3 for monitoring in regard to responses to the Government Review Team and the Public respectively			**No**	EF 2009 **EF (2014)** **Closed (2015)**	Discussed in referenced Appendix or section 2014: Discussed in referenced Appendix or section. Could be changed to closed and as it provides no benefit to keep open. **2014 ACR: "Closed added as per 2014 ACR**
38.	Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat	EA Reference - Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Appendix D CMP I.D. # 1.1 - All culverts / bridge modifications regarding potential Harmful Alterations, Disruption or Destruction of fish habitat, compensation	York Region	Status – Completed At a meeting on June 24, 2010, TRCA staff indicated that, based on the information provided, the effects of the proposed works in these segments could be mitigated and that consequently, a Letter of Advice		Record of TRCA Meeting 2009-0304 (ID# 4219)[1] Minutes of Meeting: TRCA with York Consortium – June 24, 2010 (ID# 6386)[1]	No	EF 2009 [1] EF	2009 ACR: 4219 - Memo – Permits and Approvals for Viva H3 Drainage 4-Mar-09 [1] 2010 ACR: The meeting minutes provided

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
		under the Fisheries Act [1] and identification of additional watercourses during the detailed design phase will be reviewed and approved by TRCA to ensure the compliance to their requirements.[2-7,8,9,10,11]		would be acceptable since a HADD should not result at any crossing. [1] TRCA has reviewed and approved two applications for culverts/bridge modifications related to H3 [2,3,4,5,6,7] and is currently reviewing three in order to ensure compliance. [4,5,6] TRCA has approved four applications for culverts/ bridge modifications related to H3 [2,3,4,5,6,7,10,11] MNR approved [8] the proposed mitigation plan[9] in order to minimize potential adverse effects on the endangered species Redside Dace as per Section 23.1 of Reg. 242/08 of the *Endangered Species Act 2007* at the sites. The flow of the watercourse, and fish passage, shall be maintained throughout construction.		[2] Permit No: C-110565 to alter a Watercourse on German Mills Tributary across Hwy 7 east of Pond Drive, Town of Richmond Hill, Don River Watershed (ID#42344)(ID#7668) [3] Permit No: C-1106040 to alter a Watercourse on German Mills Tributary across Hwy 7, 400 m west of Hwy 404 in Town of Richmond Hill, Don River Watershed (ID#42345)(ID#7761) [4] [2011 ACR] (CV3) September 15, 2011 Response to TRCA Comments on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project – H3- Rouge Beaver Creek crossing at Hwy 7, 110 m east of Frontenac –Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, CFN 42346 (ID #7820) [4] Permit No: C-120004 to extend existing culvert at Beaver Creek Crossing at Highway 7 east of Frontenac, City of Markham, Rough River Watershed(ID#8622)		2010 [2,3] EF (2011) [4-9] EF (2012) [10,11] EF (2013)	confirm that TRCA officials determined that the provisions of the NWPA do not apply. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 42344,42345) was found to support the assertions [2,3] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions [4-9] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2013 ACR: the evidence provided was found to support the assertion [10,11] on how the condition was addressed.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						[5] Revision to Permit No: C-120004 (ID#8774) [6] [2011 ACR] (Apple Creek) September 14, 2011 Response to TRCA Comments on Ont. Reg. #116/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alternatives to Shorelines and Watercourses Application 0279/09/MARK Apple Creek/Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and Warden Ave. Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, CFN 42347 (ID#7848) [6] Permit No: C-120145 to widen existing Highway 7 bridge spanning Apple Creek (Rouge River) Crossing at Highway 7 and Warden Avenue, City of Markham, Rouge River Watershed (ID#8378) [7] [2011 ACR] (Warden) September 19, 2011 Response to RRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project –H3-Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and warden-Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York CFN45915 (ID# 7902)			

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						[7] Permit No. C-120363 to widen Warden Avenue from Cedarland Drive to Enterprise Boulevard including the widening of existing bridge across the Rouge River at Highway 7 and Warden Avenue, City of Markham, Rouge River Watershed (ID#8653) [7] TRCA Permit C-130973R, reissuance of previous Warden Avenue Permit to widen Warden Avenue from Cedarland Drive to Enterprise Boulevard including the widening of existing bridge across the Rouge River at Highway 7 and Warden Avenue, City of Markham, Rouge River Watershed, December 13, 2013.(ID#9947) [8] MNR letter of approval on proposed mitigation plan for the widening of Apple Creek Bridge and Warden Avenue Bridge dated July 6, 2012 (ID#8904) [9] Redside Dace Mitigation Report vivaNext Highway 7, Apple Creek and Warden Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation and Widening, July 6, 2012, and appendices (ID#8904) [10]Permit No. 130286 to widen Highway 7 at Apple Creek, City of Markham,		[7] EF: 2014 Closed (2015)	2014: [7] Documentation provided is only for 2012 MTO not a TRCA permit dated December 13, 2013. Subsequently, the correct document was uploaded. Review result changed to evidence found to support that the TRCA reissued the permit for Rouge River at Hwy 7. **2015 ACR: Confirmed with OE that all permits have been obtained. Item closed .**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						Rouge River Watershed. May 9, 2013. (ID#9533) [11] Permit No. C-120004. Request for Extension to Fisheries Timing Window, Beaver Creek Crossing at Highway 7, City of Markham. May 6, 2013.(ID#9629)			
39.		Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Appendix D CMP I.D. # 1.2 - For the proposed crossing at Rouge River between Town Centre Boulevard and Warden Avenue, a meander belt analysis [1] will be carried out and a 100-year erosion limit [2] will be determined during the preliminary & detailed design phases to meet TRCA's approval [3,4,5] in determining the sizing of the bridge span.	York Region	Status - completed The design provides for crossing of the Rouge River on Warden Avenue, requiring 11m of bridge widening. The Cedarland Alignment Modification Report sets out the 100 year erosion limit and responses to TRCA comments. [2] [2011 ACR] TRCA is reviewing application for the Warden crossing. TRCA has approved application for the Warden crossing.[3] MNR approved [4] the proposed mitigation plan[5] in order to minimize potential adverse effects on the endangered species Redside Dace as per Section 23.1 of Reg. 242/08 of the *Endangered Species Act 2007* at the sites. The flow of the		Cedarland Alignment Modification Report June 2009. (ID# 3018)[1] [2011 ACR] (Warden) September 19, 2011 Response to RRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project –H3-Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and warden-Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York CFN45915 (ID# 7902) [3] Permit No. C-120363 to widen Warden Avenue from Cedarland Drive to Enterprise Boulevard including the widening of existing bridge across the Rouge River at Highway 7 and Warden Avenue, City of Markham, Rouge River Watershed (ID#8653) [4] MNR letter of approval on proposed	**No**	EF 2010 [1,3,4,5]	2009 ACR: ENF 2009 - No evidence was found in the cited report to suggest that a meander belt analysis was or will be carried out or a 100-year erosion limit was or will be will be determined. If these assessments are no longer needed, then the table should be modified appropriately. 3018 -Response to comments on the draft report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report are provided in Appendix 4 of this Table. To review these changes, the final report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report (June 2009) was reviewed. This final report will be used to verify the condition provided in the main table. 2010 ACR: The meeting minutes provided confirm that TRCA officials determined that the provisions of the NWPA do not apply. 2011 ACR: Bolding and underlining removed as this item was not reviewed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				watercourse, and fish passage, shall be maintained throughout construction. A meander belt analysis is included in the mitigation plan[1]. All permits and approvals were received for this crossing in 2012 – see [3] and [4].		mitigation plan for the widening of Apple Creek Bridge and Warden Avenue Bridge dated July 6, 2012 (ID#8904) [5] Redside Dace Mitigation Report vivaNext Highway 7, Apple Creek and Warden Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation and Widening, July 6, 2012, and appendices (ID#8904) [1] Technical Memorandum - Rouge River Fish Passage Restoration in Association with Highway 7 Widening for vivaNext, Markham, ON – an appendix from Redside Dace Mitigation Report vivaNext Highway 7, Apple Creek and Warden Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation and Widening, July 6, 2012. (ID#8904)		EF (2012) Closed (2013)	ACR was found to support the assertions [1,3,4,5] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2013 ACR: Status changed to complete
40.		Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Appendix D CMP I.D. # 1.3 - Discussion with TRCA carried out to determine if a HADD will occur at one culvert extension, and if so, to secure a Fisheries Act authorization.	York Region	Status – completed Table 7 of Appendix D of the EA identifies locations of potential HADD (Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction of fish habitat). At a meeting on June 24, 2010, TRCA staff indicated that, based on the information provided, the effects of the proposed works in these segments could be mitigated and that		Minutes of Meeting: TRCA with York Consortium – June 24, 2010 (ID# 6386)	No	EF 2009 EF 2010 Closed (2010)	2009 ACR: 3018 - Response to comments on the draft report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report are provided in Appendix 4 of this Table. To review these changes, the final report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report (June 2009) was reviewed. This final report will be used to verify the condition provided in the main table. 2010 ACR: The meeting minutes provided confirm that TRCA officials determined that the provisions of the NWPA do not apply.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				consequently, a Letter of Advice would be acceptable as a HADD should not result at any crossing. No HADD was identified during the Detail Design of Phase 1 of the Enterprise / Civic Mall section west of Birchmount Avenue.					There is no explicit reference to the Enterprise Civic Mall section west of Birchmount Avenue.
41.		Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Appendix D CMP I.D. # 1.4 - Any proposed in-stream work and site-specific mitigation measures carried out as outlined in Table 7 of the Natural Science Report [1-4]	York Region	Status –completed Provision for site-specific measures are being made during the TRCA permitting process. For the Tributary of German Mills Creek 35+351 and 36+463 , TRCA has issued permits that include the site specific mitigation measures as noted in Table 7.[1,2] For the Tributary of Beaver Creek at 37+492 appropriate Rip Rap and Oil Grit separators are included in the design. This crossing was included in the TRCA application for the Beaver Creek crossing at 37+789 noted below. [2011 ACR] For the Beaver Creek crossing at 37+789, TRCA is currently reviewing a permit application that includes all of the		Permit No: C-110565 to alter a Watercourse on German Mills Tributary across Hwy 7 east of Pond Drive, Town of Richmond Hill, Don River Watershed (ID#42344)(ID#7668)[1] Permit No: C-1106040 to alter a Watercourse on German Mills Tributary across Hwy 7, 400 m west of Hwy 404 in Town of Richmond Hill, Don River Watershed (ID#42345)(ID#7761) [2] [2011 ACR] (CV3) September 15, 2011 Response to TRCA Comments on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project – H3- Rouge Beaver Creek crossing at Hwy 7, 110 m east of Frontenac –Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, CFN 42346 (ID #7820)[3]	**Yes**	[1,2] EF (2011) [3-8] EF (2012) [6,7] EF (2013)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 42344,42345) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. It was noted that the TRCA is currently reviewing permit applications for assertions [3,4]. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions [3-8] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2013 ACR: Numbering changed for clarity. The evidence provided was found to support the assertion [6,7] on how the condition was addressed.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				noted site specific mitigation measures as outlined in Table 7.[3] For the Beaver Creek crossing at 37+789, TRCA approved the permit application on January 4, 2012[3], and the revision to permit on May 8, 2012[5] that includes all of the noted site specific mitigation measures as outlined in Table 7 [2011 ACR] For the Upper Rouge River Crossing at 38+693, TRCA is currently reviewing a permit application that includes all of the noted site specific mitigation measures as outlined in Table 7.[4] For the Upper Rouge River Crossing at 38+693, TRCA approved the permit application on March 20, 2012[4] that includes all of the noted site specific mitigation measures as outlined in Table 7.[4] For the Warden Bridge Widening, TRCA approved the permit application on June 4, 2012[6] that includes all of the noted site specific mitigation measures as outlined in Table 7.		[3] Permit No: C-120004 to extend existing culvert at Beaver Creek Crossing at Highway 7 east of Frontenac, City of Markham, Rough River Watershed(ID#8622) [5] Revision to Permit No: C-120004 (ID#8622) [2011 ACR] (Apple Creek) September 14, 2011 Response to TRCA Comments on Ont. Reg. #116/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alternatives to Shorelines and Watercourses Application 0279/09/MARK Apple Creek/Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and Warden Ave. Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, CFN 42347 (ID#7848)[4] [4] Permit No: C-120145 to widen existing Highway 7 bridge spanning Apple Creek (Rouge River) Crossing at Highway 7 and Warden Avenue, City of Markham, Rouge River Watershed (ID#8378) [6] Permit No. C-120363 to widen Warden Avenue from Cedarland Drive to			

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				MNR approved[7] the proposed mitigation plan[8] for the widening of Apple Creek Bridge and Warden Avenue Bridge over the Rouge River in order to minimize potential adverse effects on the endangered species Redside Dace as per Section 23.1 of Reg. 242/08 of the *Endangered Species Act 2007* at the sites. The flow of the watercourse, and fish passage, shall be maintained throughout construction. TRCA has approved the applications for Apple Creek Bridge[6] and Beaver Creek Extension to Fisheries Timing Window[7].		Enterprise Boulevard including the widening of existing bridge across the Rouge River at Highway 7 and Warden Avenue, City of Markham, Rouge River Watershed (ID#8653); [2014] TRCA Permit C-130973R, reissuance of previous Warden Avenue Permit to widen Warden Avenue from Cedarland Drive to Enterprise Boulevard including the widening of existing bridge across the Rouge River at Highway 7 and Warden Avenue, City of Markham, Rouge River Watershed, December 13, 2013.(ID#9947) [7] MNR letter of approval on proposed mitigation plan for the widening of Apple Creek Bridge and Warden Avenue Bridge dated July 6, 2012 (ID#8904) [8] Redside Dace Mitigation Report vivaNext Highway 7, Apple Creek and Warden Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation and Widening, July 6, 2012, and appendices (ID#8904). [6]Permit No. 130286 to widen Highway 7 at Apple Creek, City of Markham, Rouge River Watershed. May 9, 2013. (ID#9533)		[6] EF (2014) **EF (2015) Closed (2015)**	[6] Documentation provided is only for 2012 MTO not a TRCA permit dated December 13, 2013. Subsequently, the correct document was uploaded. Review result changed to evidence found to support that the TRCA reissued the permit for Rouge River at Hwy 7. **2015 ACR: Evidence provided in the Env. Checklist 2015-016 shows that no instream works were undertaken in 2015. With the completion of construction, this item is closed.**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						[7]Permit No. C-120004. Request for Extension to Fisheries Timing Window, Beaver Creek Crossing at Highway 7, City of Markham. May 6, 2013. (ID#9629) **Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**			
42.	Vegetation and Wetlands	Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Appendix D CMP I.D. # 3.1 - Edge Management Plan[1] and Tree Preservation Plans[2][3] will be prepared during the detailed design to mitigate impacts to adjacent natural features, as well as the preparation of detailed compensation and restoration plans to strive to provide for a net improvement to existing condition. TRCA guidelines for Forest Edge Management Plans and Post-Construction Restoration will be followed.	York Region	Status –completed [2011 ACR] A tree preservation plan and edge management plan will be prepared for the H3 segment during Detail Design. The Edge Management Plan[1] and Tree Preservation Plans[2][3] have been completed.		H3 Detail Design Work Plan – Final Version September 17, 2010 (ID# 6550) [1] CV1 Edge Management Plan April 20, 2011(ID#7197); CV2 Edge Management Plan April 20, 2011(ID#7198); Beaver Creek, Apple Creek Bridge, and Warden Bridge Edge Management Plans were part of the TRCA permit applications for Beaver Creek May 19, 2011(ID#7339), Apple Creek Bridge April 19, 2011(ID#7196), Warden Bridge May 20, 2011(ID#7332). [2] Tree Preservation Plans (ID#8909): H3-DWG-Q-ENV-030201-001 to 304 [3] H3 Detail Design Tree Preservation Report, November 02, 2011(ID#7996).	No	[1,2,3] EF (2012) Closed (2012)	2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions [1,2,3] on how the condition was addressed.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
43.	Groundwater Resources	Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Appendix D CMP I.D. # 4.1 - In the event the shallow or upward groundwater movement becomes an issue due to the construction of subway during the detailed design stage, TRCA's hydrogeologist will be consulted.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment To be addressed during design and construction of the Spadina Subway Extension, covered under a separate CMP			No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
44.		Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Appendix D CMP I.D. # 4.2 - For wells that remain in use, if any, a well inspection will be conducted prior to construction to establish baseline conditions and to confirm the relationship of the widened roadway to existing active water well will not have an adverse effect on water quality [1]. If it does, a contingency plan will be developed[2]. In the event that wells are required to be closed, closure will proceed in accordance with O.Reg.903 of the Ontario Water Resource Act [3]. If the widened roadway has adverse effects on the	York Region / Contractor	Status – completed EA Appendix D, Section 4.2.3 & 2.2.5 – Large majority of wells historically documented are no longer active. However, additional water supply wells that are unregistered in the MOE database may exist. The H3 Detail Design Work Plan and the Scope of Work makes provision for well identification, inspection and monitoring. [1] Well identification report was completed in 2010-11-15.[1] By reference to H3DD Work Plan Task 3.3, Contractor commits to well monitoring program as set out by YC2002.		H3 Detail Design Work Plan – Final Version September 17, 2010 (ID# 6550)[1] Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564)[1] [1] Final Well Study Report_R00_2010-11-15-KR Well Locations Map (ID#6672) [1,2,3] Permit to Take Water Applications(ID#8061): - H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW Application Warden Bridge-2011-07-29 - H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW Application Culverts-2011-07-29 - H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW-	No	[1] EFC (2011) [1] EF (2011) [1,2,3] EF	2010 ACR: Assertion [1] NSE Task 3.3 includes provisions for the identification and inspection of wells but does not include a provision for a well monitoring program. 2011 ACR: Assertion [1] remains NSE from the 2010 ACR. No additional evidence has been provided to address this. From the revised comments monitoring consistent with the Permit to Take Water is recognized although still not explicit in the reference documents. [2] The evidence cited in the 2011 ACR (6672) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (PTTW Applications – Warden, Culverts, Apple Creek) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
		active well on water quality, a contingency plan will be developed [2].		[1,2,3] Construction activities identified as potential impacts to water wells were reviewed for impacts to nearby wells during Permit to Take Water applications to MOE and deemed as having no impact by consultant. No wells were identified for inspection or monitoring at this time through analysis of water taking activities that could impact wells. Since no wells were identified and permits have been issued, contingency plans and ongoing monitoring are not required.		Application Apple Creek Bridge- 2011-07-29 [1,2,3] Permits to Take Water (KED ID# 2013-002)		(2013) Closed (2013)	2013 ACR: numbering revised for clarity. The evidence provided was found to support the assertions [1-3] on how the condition was addressed.
45.		Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Appendix D CMP I.D. # 4.3 - For subway extension, a subsurface investigation will be conducted during preliminary and detail design to identify groundwater and soil conditions. Impact assessment and mitigation measures will be performed at that time to address any issues related to groundwater quality and quantity.	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment To be addressed during design and construction of the Spadina Subway Extension, covered under a separate CMP.			No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
46.	Surface Water	Sect. 9.6, Chapter 11, Table	York Region	**Status – Completed [1] Future**		[1] Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for	No	EF 2009 –	2009 ACR: Draft Drainage & Hydrology Report

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
	Resources	11.3-1, Appendix D & G CMP I.D. # 5.1 - A detailed Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) will be developed in accordance with the MOE's Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (2003) and Guidelines for Evaluating Construction Activities Impacting on Water Resources. [1] This SWMP will outline monitoring [2] & maintenance [3] commitments for SWM facilities constructed as part of this undertaking.		**Work [2,3]** A Final Drainage Study was prepared during preliminary engineering and contains the overall provisions for storm water management. [1] These provisions are being further refined on a site by site basis as part of the Detail Design process. Monitoring and maintenance commitments are outlined in the MOE and TRCA permit applications for each of the water crossings, storm sewer changes and application for oil grit separators [2,3]. TRCA also provided a letter to QSD noting their approval in principle of the stormwater management plan as part of the Drainage Study. [1]		Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230) [2] MOE OGS and Sewer Permits (ID# 7738 for sewers Bayview to 404 and 7939 for OGS 1&2 at Pond Drive in Twn RH and Commerce Valley Drive in Markham) [3] TRCA Permits (see item 41 above for list) May 19, 2011 Letter from TRCA to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan.[#7646] [2] MOE OGS and Sewer Permits - for OGS 1&2 at Pond Drive in Twn RH and Commerce Valley Drive in Markham (MOE CoA #8613-8KDKP5 for Oil Grit Separator (OGS) Units 1 and 2)(ID#7939) MOE ECA #4749-8TVGNR. Storm Sewer on Hwy 7 between Montgomery to Town Centre Blvd. May 4, 2012.(ID#9655) MOE ECA #5330-8UYN2V. Storm Sewer on Hwy 7 between Woodbine and Montgomery. June 15, 2012.(ID#9656)		draft completed for some sections [1] EF 2010 [2,3] EF (2011)	Highway 7 Corridor (H3) – Y2H3 4.05 (ID# 3230) - Hwy 404 to Kennedy report in progress. DRAINAGE & HYDROLOGY REPORT HIGHWAY 7 CORRIDOR - H3 SEGMENT 2: HIGHWAY 404 to WARDEN AVENUE (March 2009) June 9, 2009 Memo H3 – Warden Avenue/Enterprise Boulevard Drainage Report The Birchmount to Kennedy report has not been submitted yet. 2010 ACR: [1] Drainage study complete. The Owner Engineer, asserted that SWM facilities are an EA condition and would be a requirement for the entity undertaking the construction and/or operation / maintenance. We accept this assertion and as such are not expecting that the EA conditions applicable to detailed design, construction and operation / maintenance be reflected in the PE documents. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7738, 7939, Item #41) was found to support the assertions [2,3] that the condition was addressed. The evidence does not explicitly state the monitoring and maintenance conditions; however, it is a

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						MOE ECA #5676-8MBM2J. Stormwater management works at Hwy 7/Allstate and Hwy 7/Frontenac. October 6, 2011.(ID#9657) MOE ECA #6297-8NMR5Z. Storm sewers on Hwy 7 between Hwy 404 and Allstate. November 18, 2011.(ID#9658)		[2] EF (2013) Ops	Certificate of Approval from MOE. It is also acknowledged that the SWMP has been approved in principle by TRCA and will be reviewed when final approval is provided. 2013 ACR: evidence provided was found to support the assertion that the ECAs have been obtained, which supports [1] the SWMP meets MOE requirements. However, within the documents provided, evidence for *monitoring [2] & maintenance [3] commitments for SWM facilities constructed as part of this undertaking* was not found. This remains ongoing. 2014: No change from 2013 Outstanding item is for *monitoring [2] & maintenance [3] commitments for SWM facilities constructed as part of this undertaking* Suggest status could be change to Future Work **2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly"**
47.		Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Appendix D & G CMP I.D. # 5.2 - Water quality	York Region	Status –completed [1] Water quality treatment will be provided by oil grit separators		[1] Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230)	No	EF 2009	2009 ACR: Maple Road to Hwy 404 (Aug-08) DRAINAGE & HYDROLOGY REPORT HIGHWAY 7 CORRIDOR - H3 SEGMENT 2: HIGHWAY 404 to WARDEN AVENUE (March

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
		controls up to the MOE water quality guideline of Enhanced Level (80% total suspended solids removal) required for areas where an increase in impervious surface is observed. [1,2]		capable of removing 80% of total suspended solids. [1] The Final Drainage Study includes the storm water management plan with the requirement for oil grit separators in areas where there is an increase in impervious surface. This requirement is being carried forward in Detail Design currently underway. [2] TRCA also provided a letter to QSD noting their approval in principle of the stormwater management plan as part of the Drainage Study.		[2] May 19, 2011 Letter from TRCA to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan.[#7646] [2] TRCA Permits (see item 41 above for list) [1] MOE ECA (see item 46 above for list)		EF 2009 [1] EF 2010 [2] EF (2011) **EF (2013)** **Closed (2013)**	2009) Section 5.1 Several Oil Grit Separator units are recommended along the study area in order to provide enhanced quality treatment for a runoff volume equivalent to the runoff generated by all new impervious areas Memo – Permits and Approvals for Viva H3 – Drainage 4-Mar-09 2010 ACR: 3230 – Section 9.2 confirms this as the recommended treatment level. 2011 ACR: It is acknowledged that the SWMP has been approved in principle by TRCA and will be reviewed for completion when final approval is provided. Item status should be changed to 'Ongoing' until final approval and review. 2013 ACR: Bold and underline added. Evidence is provided that the item is complete
48.		Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Section 9.6 CMP I.D. # 5.3 - An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan developed to manage the flow of sediment into storm sewers	York Region	Status – Complete To be finalized in the Detail Design phase. Component Environmental Management Plan for Sediment and		Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230) Environmental Management Plan 2011(H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-	No	EF (2011) EF (2012) Closed	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
		and watercourses and to monitor erosion and sedimentation control measures during construction.		Erosion Control included in Contractor's Environmental Management Plan.		ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) Weekly Environmental Inspection Checklist (H3-ENV-INR-WK-2012)(KED ID#2012-002) Weekly Environmental Inspection Checklist (H3-ENV-INR-WK-2013)(KED ID#2013-003)		(2012)	2013 ACR: Item not reviewed as it is already complete.
49.	Contaminated Soil	Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Proponent Response to Government Review Team Comments, Appendix F CMP I.D. # 7.1 - In the event contaminated sites are identified after construction activities begin, the contingency plan prepared to outline the steps that will be taken to ensure that contaminant release will be minimized and appropriate clean-up will occur. The site clean-up procedure of the plan compliance with the MOE's	York Region / Contractor	Status – ongoing Contingency planning to address contaminated sites is part of the H3 work plan during the Detail Design phase. [1] Component Environmental Management Plan for Hazardous Waste Management is included in the Environmental Management Plan. Sites identified with potential contamination are being investigated further.		Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564) Draft Pavement Design Report: New Median Rapidway Along Highway 7, from Yonge Street to Town Centre Boulevard. A length of approximately 9.0 km Region of York Ontario. Jun 17, 2010. (ID#4635). Environmental Management Plan 2011(H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) (ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012	Yes	EF (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to partially support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. There was no evidence found that the "site clean-up procedure of the plan compliance with the MOE's Brownfield's legislation and the Record of Site Condition Regulation (O.Reg. 153/04)". The item remains ongoing until completion of construction. Additional evidence provided (074159-M4 Project Update 4 of Assignment #2 for Viva H3 ESA, 963-1101 PH 2 Site 1 - 8510 Woodbine Avenue, Markham, Ontario, 963-1101 PH 2 Site 2 - 3083 Highway 7, Markham, Ontario) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
		Brownfield's legislation and the Record of Site Condition Regulation (O.Reg. 153/04)[1]		**Several sites were encountered and managed in accordance with the protocol. Final reports for H3 contaminated sites (including details on material quantity, handling and disposal) are being compiled in final form and will be reported in 2016.**		(H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) 074159-M4 Project Update 4 of Assignment #2 for Viva H3 ESA 963-1101 PH 2 Site 1 - 8510 Woodbine Avenue, Markham, Ontario 963-1101 PH 2 Site 2 - 3083 Highway 7, Markham, Ontario [1] VD1-ENV-MEM-001-2013-03-18-FINAL-Contaminant Protocol (KED ID# 2013-004)		EF (2012) **EF (2013)** **ENF (2014)** **ENF (2015)**	2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2013 ACR: numbering was added for clarity. The evidence provided was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. 2014: We understand from the OE that contaminated materials were encountered and that they were managed appropriately and in accordance with remedial action plans. However, the documentation was not provide for this review. The documentation will need to be provided for the 2015 review. **2015: The items remains ENF** 2015: We understand from the OE that the final documentation is nearly complete but was not available for this review. This item remains ENF.
50.		Chapter 11, Table 11.3-1, Proponent Response to Government Review Team Comments, Appendix F CMP I.D. # 7.2 - Health Canada's Federal	York Region	Status – **Completed** To be obtained during Detail Design, as required.		**Health Canada Contaminated Sites Program "Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada", Parts I-IV and Supplementals (ID Y2015-003)**	No	ENF (2014) **EF (2015) Closed**	2014: Evidence was not found that this document was obtained. **2015 ACR: Evidence was found that this document was obtained.**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
		Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada will be obtained.						(2015)	
51.	Effects on Businesses and Other Land Uses	Section9.1.8, Chapter11, Table 11.3-1 CMP I.D. # 9.1 - The parking need assessment and management study developed.	York Region	Status –**Completed** Work was conducted during the PE design phase and is ongoing. [2011 ACR] Further work on the Commuter Park & Ride Strategy will be carried out in 2014-2015. **York Region Rapid Transit Corporation has completed a Commuter Park & Ride Strategy and will be proceeding with implementation as need and funding are confirmed.**		Eight Steps to A Viva Park-and-Ride Strategy (ID#1037) Memo - Viva Cornell Terminal Park-and-Ride Development – Preliminary Analysis of Alternatives – (ID#1117) Memo - To: Terry Gohde From: Al Raine Re: VIVA Park-and-Ride Initiative Dates: September 29, 2006 (ID#1739) Commuter Park N Ride Strategy Work Plan Description (ID#978) Technical Memorandum – Park-and-Ride Best Practices (Draft) – January 25, 2008 (ID#2232) Technical Memorandum – Park-and-Ride Siting Criteria and Methodology - (Draft) – February 29, 2008 - (ID#2363) – etc. vivaNext Bus Rapid Transit Park and Ride Strategy Update - Report No. 9 of the Rapid Transit Public/Private Partnership Steering Committee - Regional Council Meeting of November 20, 2008 **York Region Rapid Transit Corporation, Commuter Park & Ride Strategy, Final Report, June 2010 (ID Y2015-004)**	Yes	EF 2009 **EF (2015) Closed (2015)**	ACR 2009: 1037 -Eight Steps to A Viva Park-and-Ride Strategy (29-Mar-09). 1739 - Memo 29-Sep- 06 (hard copy) 2014: TO BE REVIEWED IN 2015 **2015: Evidence provided (Y2015-004) was found to support the assertion regarding parking need and management.**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						The Council of the Regional Municipality of York, Revised Agenda, Tuesday, May 20, 2010 (annotated to highlight relevant information) (ID Y2015-004) **Council of the Regional Municipality of York, Minutes of Council, May 20, 2010 (annotated to highlight relevant information) (ID Y2015-004)**			
52.	Archaeological Resources	Table 11.3-1 and proponent Response to Government Review Team Comments, Appendix J. CMP I.D. # 10.1 - Completion of a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment [1] and procedure for continued consultation with the Ministry of Culture [2,5]. Records of consultation with First Nations [3,4].	York Region	Status – completed A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment was undertaken for the H3 segment and concluded that at the historic Brown's Corners Cemetery, a Cemetery Investigation was to be undertaken in the Highway 7 ROW in front of the cemetery. The Stage 2 Assessment also concluded that no additional archaeological assessment is required for the remainder of the study corridor and these areas can be considered clear of further archaeological concern. [1] The Cemetery Investigation at Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery found that all lands in the public Highway 7 ROW in front of the		[1] Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detail Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario, Revision 1(ID#7109) [2] Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance into the Provincial Register of Reports of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detail Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7108) Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3	No	EF 2010 [1-5] EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2010 ACR: 6550 - Appendix C Task 3.3 Environmental Services (p. 13 & 14) satisfies the condition. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7109, 7108, 7535, 7397, and 7913) was found to support the assertion on how the conditions [1-5] were addressed.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				Brown's Corners Cemetery can be considered clear of archaeological concern, and no further archaeological assessment is required. The Ministry of Tourism and Culture accepted each of these findings. [2,5] [3] Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec was notified of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment findings via notification dated January 28, 2011 sent in French (the preferred language of communication) [4] Notice of the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment findings were sent to the Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec on May 30, 2011.		Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535) [5] Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance into the Provincial Registry of Reports of the Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3 Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535) [3,4] Huron-Wendat First Nation notification letters (ID# 7397 & 7913)			
53.	Agriculture	CMP I.D. # 12.1 - A policy to protect agriculture lands during construction will be developed during the detailed design phase.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment Relates to the Agricultural lands east of 9th Line.			No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
54.	Others	Section 9.1.5 CMP I.D. # 13.1 - MTO will be consulted and their approval	York Region / Contractor	Status-no action required H3 Design team is currently not pursuing this option but rather one		Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (ID# 3881)	No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
		will be sought in any modifications to the CAH bridges, and the grade separated option (C-B2) through Hwy 404 interchange when required.		that considers a reversible single rapid transit lane under the 404 bridge					
55.		Section 9.1.5 CMP I.D. # 13.2 - The Highway 427 Extension Preliminary Study will be obtained during detailed design once they are finalized. MTO will be consulted in the design of Highway 7 structure over Highway 427.		Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment			No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
56.		CMP I.D. # 13.3 - Public concerns/ complaints will be address through public consultation centres during detailed design phase [1]. As well, public relation staff will address complaints regarding construction and operations of the transitway.[2] The received concerns/ complaints will be circulated to appropriate department for action [3].	Contractor	Status – **completed** A Complaints Protocol will be developed during Detail Design. Public concerns have been addressed through public consultation centres during PE Design [1]and, if necessary, will be addressed through public consultation centres during the Detail Design phase as well. [2] Complaints protocol developed with YRRTC and addressed using Incident Management Protocol.		June 17 & 18 2008 "Open House" #1 – (ID# 2830), [1] November 26, 2008 "Open House" #2 – (Canopy Movie ID# 4090), (Boards ID# 3823), [1] Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564) [1] [2] Appendix CO2 Incident Management_August 26 2011_R1_1_Issued_FC(ID#8061) [2,3] VPGM-PM-LET-2013-AUG-14-dm-KED re Incident Mgt Protocol (KED	**Yes**	EF 2009 EF 2009 [1] EF (2011)	2009 ACR: 2830 – PIC presentation (17& 18-Jun-08) 2009 ACR: 4090 – Movie on CD (26-Nov-08) (not opened- software problem) 3823 - Boards on CD (26-Nov-08) 2011 ACR: [1] The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (Appendix CO2 Incident Management_August 26 2011_R1_1_Issued_FC) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. The item should be changed to 'Ongoing' as condition [2] applies during construction and operations.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				[3] CRM Database summarizing public comments, complaints and issues received through September 2015 (note, revenue service commenced in January 2015).		ID# 2013-001) [2,3] Letter from YRRTC to MOE re Complaints Protocol - October 1, 2009 (ID# Y-2013-105) **[3] CRM Database (ID Y2015-005)**		[2,3] EF (2013) **ENF (2014)** **EF (2015)** **Closed (2015)**	2013 ACR: Evidence found *YRRTC's Community Liaison Procedures,* Items [2,3] is ongoing. 2014: Items [1] was closed in 2011 The OE states that comments have been received and logged into the CRM. However, no evidence was provided to support this (Items [2 and3]). This evidence to be provided for 2015 ACR. **2015 ACR: The evidence provided (Y2015-005) to support assertions regarding Item [2,3]. It is assumed that York Region will continue to implement the protocol through O/M phase. Item is closed**
57.		Section 13.9.4 CMP I.D. # 13.4 - During the preliminary [1] and detailed [2] design phases, the Cycling and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CPAC) will be consulted regarding the cyclist and pedestrian treatments.	York Region / Contractor	Status – **Completed** This commitment relates to the Highway 7 widening between Warden Avenue and Sciberras Road. The widening work east of Warden is a separate project that will be progressed by York Region. It has not been designed as yet, or programmed for construction. **The widening project east of Warden incorporates cycling facilities which were design in collaboration with CPAC. Refer to http://www.markham.ca/wps/portal/**		Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) Typical cross section –H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-303-C00(ID#7494) **2013 CPAC Business Plan, various CPAC meeting minutes and CPAC Terms of Reference (ID# YORK-#6373153)**	Yes	[1] EF (2011) Ops / Future (2014) EF (2015) All items closed	2009 ACR: ENF No evidence was found in the cited report to suggest that the Cycling and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CPAC) was consulted regarding the cyclist and pedestrian treatments 2010 ACR: ENF No new evidence provided for 2010 review. 2011 ACR: No evidence was found in the evidence provided (ID# 7494) to suggest that the Cycling and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CPAC) was consulted during preliminary design regarding the cyclist and pedestrian treatments.[1]

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				Markham/MunicipalGovernment/ CouncilCommitteeMeetings/ sa-mkmboardcommlisting/ mkmboardcommlistingc/.					2012 ACR: additional information provided by the Owner Engineer clarified that it was concluded that the commitment related to the Highway 7 widening from Warden to Sciberras, was included in the rapid transit EA in Chapter 13. The widening work east of Warden is a separate project that will be progressed by York Region. It has not been designed as yet, or programmed for construction. This changed the 2011 review. 2013 ACR: no review was completed for this item as the updated status was noted in the previous ACR. **2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status** **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (6373153) and found on website (CPAC meeting minutes Feb 28, 2008) support assertion that CPAC was consulted. This item is closed.**
58.	Community vistas and street and neighbourhood aesthetics	Sections 9.6 and 10.4.2, and Proponent's Response to Government Review Team Comments CMP I.D. # 13 - Development of a comprehensive streetscaping plan to mitigate adverse effects on residential and pedestrian environment.	York Region	Status – complete The DBCR incorporates streetscaping recommendations in the Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), and General Guidelines (Section 4.9) [Examples of design features to		Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009.(ID# 3551) H3 Detail Design Work Plan – Final Version September 17, 2010 (ID# 6650) [2012]Streetscape Design Layout Plans 080407 (ID# 8909)	No	EF 2009	The DBCR incorporates streetscaping recommendations: Section 4.10 and Section 4.11 plus others

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				mitigate adverse effects on residential and pedestrian environment include the incorporation of plantable median islands and a reduction of lane widths consistent with the intent of developing Highway 7 from a suburban highway to an urban street. Examples of design features to mitigate adverse effects on residential and pedestrian environment include pedestrian sidewalks that are free of obstructions, typically 2 m wide, paved in a hard surface in compliance with Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) guidelines and lined with street trees and ornamental plant material.[1] Also, plantable median islands [2] and a reduction of lane widths [3] has been incorporated which is consistent with the intent of developing Highway 7 from a suburban highway to an urban street.[2] The H3 Detail Design Work Plan indicates that consultation will occur with the Town [City] of Markham [4] to ensure that the streetscaping, urban design and boulevard treatments are		[1-3] H3 Streetscape Design Layout Plans IFC H3-DWG-R-LND-080407 [ID#9633] [4] Town of Markham Comments on 60% Design (CRS-013) and 90% Design (CRS-049 for West of Highway 404 and CRS-125 for East of Highway 404) (ID# Y-2013-100) [5] Town of Richmond Hill Comments on 60% Design (CRS-013) and on 90% Design (CRS-049) (ID# Y-2013-101)		EF 2009 EF 2009 EF 2010 [1 to 3] EF 2012 [5] ENF 2012	2830 – PIC presentation June 17 & 18 2008 4090 – Movie on CD (26-Nov-08) (not opened-software problem) 3823 - Boards on CD (26-Nov-08) 2010 – 6550 – Appendix C Task 7.5 Conceptual Design (p 24) confirms the condition. 2012 ACR: Condition numbering was added for clarity. No evidence was provided to support the assertions [1] design features to mitigate adverse effects and [2] **a suburban highway to an urban street.** When asked, YC provided the compliance document reference of "Work package 080407 Streetscape (ID# 8909)". This should be added to the column "Compliance Document Reference". This evidence was found to support assertion [1] regarding sidewalks etc. , [2] plantable median and [3] reduced lane widths. No evidence was provided to support the assertions [5] regarding consulting Town of Richmond Hill. YC noted that OE organized meetings with municipalities in order to obtain comments on streetscape design. OE / York

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				effectively considered in the final design of this segment. Town of Richmond Hill will also be consulted [5].				[4,5] EF (2013) Closed (2013)	Region will provide this evidence 2013 ACR: Evidence provided was found to support the assertions [4,5] on how the condition was addressed.
59.	Traffic and Pedestrian circulation and access during construction	EA Section 10.6 and Proponent's Response to Gov't Section 9.6 and Proponent's Response to Gov't Review Team Comments CMP I.D. # 14 - Development of a comprehensive Construction and Traffic Management Plan [i] including consultation with school board officials [ii] to ensure safe, uninterrupted access to schools affected by the works [iii].	York Region / Contractor	Status - **Completed** The H3 Scope of Work outlines that a Traffic Management Plan will be submitted for review and approval by YRRTC and the local municipalities having jurisdiction. [1] Temporary traffic signal drawings (80302) have been prepared as well as reports which address traffic impacts during construction. [2,3] It was confirmed that there are no schools within the limits of the project which are accessed from Highway 7 within the H3 segment, therefore no consultation was required. Final paving on Town Centre Boulevard in Spring 2015 may have an indirect impact on Unionville High School, and the school will be consulted accordingly. **[1] TMP provided in 2012 (ID 9973).**		Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave –October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564) [1] Refer to H3 Temporary Traffic Signal drawings (080302) (ID#9973) [1] Traffic Impacts During Construction Study Report – MTO Section, April 12, 2012 (ID#8456) H3 Construction Staging Impact Studies (040101): Parts 1-5, 2011-10-20; Parts 6-7, 2011-12-16; Parts 8-14, 2012-05-29. (ID#7046) [2, 3] Excerpt from York Region School Locator for the H3 corridor (Y2014-001) **[2, 3] Email correspondence from York Region District School Board regarding temporary provisions during Town Centre Boulevard**	**Yes**	EF 2010 **[ii] EF (2014)** **[I,iii] EF**	2009 ACR: NSE: Y2H3 Draft Constructability / Construction Staging Report – Y2H3 include minimal conceptual traffic management (e.g., "Install temporary vehicular and pedestrian measures. Provide at least two thru lanes for vehicles, in both directions. Provide temporary sidewalks (asphalt or compacted granular) with snow fence along its path and proper signage. Provide access to neighbouring businesses"). Suggest either the table be revised or alternative documents provided. 2010 ACR: Section 3.17 of the final Scope of Work (6564) identifies provisions for construction staging and traffic management. 2014: All three document under ID9973 are MTO building permits and not traffic signal drawing files. Subsequently, the correct documents were provided and the result changed to EF for item [i]. Items [ii] and [iii] relate to consultation with school board officials and safe uninterrupted access to schools affected by the works.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				[2,3] Regarding Town Centre Boulevard, arrangements were made to modify bus/student access during reconstruction in 2014.		**construction, March 11, 2014 (ID Y2015-006)**		**(2015) All items closed (2015)**	Subsequently, reference document provided supports that there are no schools within the limits of the work. Items [i] and [iii] remain ongoing until Town Centre Boulevard impacts have been determined. **2015 ACR: Item [ii] was closed in 2014. Evidence provided (Y2015-006) supports the assertion regarding items [i] and [iii].** **With the completion of construction, this item is closed.**
60.	Safety of traffic and pedestrian circulation and access during rapid transit operations	Section 9.6 and Government Review Team Comment response CMP I.D. # 15 - Infrastructure design features, built-in safety measures and operating procedures adopted in the preparation of the detailed design solution.[1] Analysis of the need for speed limit reductions to address safety concerns.[2] Inclusion of numerical countdown pedestrian lights in detailed design.[3,4,5,6,7]	York Region	Status – completed The DBCR includes provision for built-in safety features including station platform railings, station canopy rear wall, station canopy, station platform edge treatment and platform height, etc.[1] The DBCR indicates provisions to be made with respect to speed limit (DBCR Sections 2.0 BRT Standards,). [2] The DBCR recommends the installation of countdown signals (DBCR Section 3. 2.4 Platform Safety).[3] [2011 ACR]The Region is in receipt of the analysis on split phased		Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551)[1,2,3] INTERSECTION OPERATIONS STUDY – Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis, June 15, 2011(ID# 7450)[4] [2011 ACR]Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis Meeting Minutes, July 7, 2011 (ID#7912)[5] [6] Comparative Traffic Analysis – Dual	No	[1,2,3,4,5] EF (2011) EF (2012) [3-7] EF (2013) Closed (2013)	2011 ACR: [1-5] The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 3551, 7450) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: Evidence was found in H3-00000-T-0902-30 ID#4183 Pt. 1 of 2 to sufficiently support the assertions in respect to "Inclusion of numerical countdown pedestrian lights in detailed design". The Compliance Document Reference column should be updated to include this document. Assertions [6,7] refer to construction and are therefore not applicable to the condition during operations. These were not reviewed. 2013 ACR: ID#4183 was added to the Compliance Document Reference column as per the 2012 ACR. Document ID9632 was bolded and underlined and indicated that it supports assertions [3,4,5,6,7]. These were

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				pedestrian signalling with countdown and has indicated that it is still under review.[4,5] Under the stage 4 intersection construction staging, a 2-stage pedestrian crossing operation along with protected only left turn phases on Highway 7 have been implemented.[6] Pedestrian count-down signals are implemented throughout temporary construction staging and are proposed for the permanent condition.[7] Station platform glass guards on top of station canopy rear wall, railings, station canopy rear wall, station canopy, station platform edge treatment and platform height have been provided in the IFC documents [1]. Speed limit reductions have been incorporated on Council authorization [2]. Countdown signals have been provided at signalized intersections [3,4,5,6,7].		Left Turn Lanes and Single Left Turn Lane, Apr 18, 2011. (ID#7190) [7] INTERSECTION OPERATIONS STUDY– Highway 7 at Fairburn Drive/ Montgomery Court, Oct 17, 2011. (ID#7936) [2012]H3-00000-T-0902-30 (ID#4183) Pt. 1 of 2 H3 Architectural Drawings – Station Platforms IFC H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508 [ID# Y-2013-106] [1] Council Report on Speed Limit Reductions, April 21, 2011 (ID# Y-2013-107) [2] H3 Permanent Traffic Signals Layout IFC H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303 (ID#9632) [3,4,5,6,7]			bolded and underlined for clarity.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
61.	Interface with MTO future 407 Transitway undertaking	Proponent's Response to Government Review Team Comments CMP I.D. # 17 - Consultation with MTO staff during the detailed design and construction phase to provide coordination and ensure protection for appropriate interface between projects[1-4,5].	York Region	Status – completed There are two locations where the project interfaces with the future 407 Transitway: • MTO was consulted regarding the future 407 Transitway at Yonge during the Yonge Subway Extension Transit Project Assessment Process and design of the interface will be carried out as part of the Yonge Subway design. • MTO was consulted regarding the design of the elevator/stair tower on the south side of Highway 7 at Bayview to ensure that the future 407 Transitway can be accommodated. The issuance of permits by MTO to construction the tower demonstrates their agreement that the implementation of the future 407 Transitway has been provided for. The MTO Encroachment Permit to Highway 407 at Highway 7 and Bayview Avenue to construct a retaining wall to permit future construction of the proposed Highway 407 Transitway was approved on		[1] Encroachment Permit No: EC-2011-20T-359 to construct and maintain retaining wall within Highway 7 ROW adjacent to the Highway 407 E-N/S Ramp at Bayview Avenue for the proposed Bus Stop for VIVA station in the City of Markham, Region of York.(ID#8237) [2]Building and Land Use Permit No: BL02011-20T-403 to construct a structure for elevator and stairways and bus platforms with canopy and walkway on the north side of Highway 7 and east of Bayview Avenue in the City of Markham, Region of York.(ID#8905) [3]Building and Land Use Permit No: BL02011-20T-362 to construct a structure for elevator and stairways and bus platforms with canopy and walkway	No	ENF (2009, 2010) [1-5] EF (2012) [6,8] EF (2013) Closed (2013)	2009 ACR: No documents have been cited to substantiate this claim. Suggest either the table be revised or documents provided. 2010 ACR: No new evidence has been provided. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2013 ACR: evidence provided was found to support the assertions [6,8] on how the condition was addressed.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.1 Monitoring During Design							Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Environmental Element	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Requirements at Construction Stage of Project	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				January 3, 2012[1]. The MTO Building and Land Use Permit to construct a structure for elevator and stairways and bus platforms with canopy and walkway on the north side of Highway 7 and east of Bayview Avenue was approved on February 22, 2012[2]. The MTO Building and Land Use Permit to construct a structure for elevator and stairways and bus platforms with canopy and walkway on the south side of Highway 7 and east of Bayview Avenue was approved on February 22, 2012[3]. The MTO Sign Permit to construct 'v' signs on the Bayview Towers was approved on May 25, 2012[4].		on the south side of Highway 7 and east of Bayview Avenue in the City of Markham, Region of York.(ID#8906) [4]Sign Permit No: SG-2012-20T-63 (ID#8825)			

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.2 Construction Monitoring										Contractors Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
62	Noise generated by construction activities	To ensure noise levels comply with Municipal by-laws [1] and construction equipment complies with NPC-115 noise emission standards [2].	Site measurements of levels produced by representative equipment / activities [i]	At time of introduction of equipment/ activities producing significant noise level with potential to disturb sensitive areas. [ii]						**Status - Completed** [1] Noise mitigation addressed in Contractor's Environmental Management Plan – Component Environmental Management Plan for Noise Monitoring. [2] Bylaw exemption provided by Town [City] of Markham for construction activities. Construction equipment that could generate significant noise will be introduced in 2012 and is to be tested for	[1] Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) [1] Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) [1] Noise Monitoring Log (H3-ENV-LOG-NOISE-NS)KED ID#2012-003)	Yes	[1,2] EF (2011) [1] EF (2012)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to support the assertion on how the condition [1] was addressed. Evidence was not found to support the assertion on how the condition [2] was addressed. Additional evidence provided (H3-Noise Bylaw Exemption-18186398017) was found to support the assertion [2] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions [1] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.2 Construction Monitoring										Contractors Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
										compliance with NPC-115. [1] Noise Bylaw Exemption extensions were issued by the Town [City] of Markham from 2014-04-17 to 2014-10-31 Permit no. 14 113063 and from 2014-07-08 to 2014-12-31 Permit no. 14 123672. [1][2] Weekly Environmental Checklist section 4.4 Municipal Compliance **[1,2] Weekly Environmental Checklist section 4.4 Municipal Compliance**	[2] H3-Noise Bylaw Exemption-18186398017 [1] Noise Bylaw Exemptions 2014 (KED ID #2014-007) [1][2] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) **H3_ENV_ToRH_Noise Exemption Permit_2015-05-15_CP (KED ID# 2015-013).** **Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-**		[2] ECF (2014) [i][ii] Unclear (2014) **[i][ii] EF (2015) Closed (2015)**	[2] 2014: Numbering modified for clarity. Noise bylaw exemptions provided. [i][ii]2014: Weekly environmental checklist provided. However, it is unclear how site measurements of levels (checklist only for "evidence of excess noise") produced by representative equipment / activities are taken at time of introduction of equipment/ activities [ii] **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (Y2015-006 and -017) support the assertion regarding items [i][ii]. This item is closed with the completion of construction.**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.2 Construction Monitoring										Contractors Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
										includes verification that excessive noise is not being generated during construction activities, e.g. unnecessary use of back up alarms, banging of buckets etc. **[1,2] During the introduction of piling operations, which have the potential to produce significant noise levels, and have a potential to disturb sensitive areas noise monitoring was conducted to ensure compliance.**	**016)** **[1,2] H3-ENV-LOG-NOISE-NS (KED ID# 2015-017)**			
63	Effect of construction	To confirm that local air	Regular inspections of site	Monthly during construction						**Status - Completed**		**Yes**	NSE (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.2 Construction Monitoring										Contractors Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
	activities on air quality(dust, odour,)	quality is not being adversely affected by construction activity	dust control measures [1] and of construction vehicle exhaust emissions [2]	seasons.						Air Quality addressed in Contractor's Environmental Management Plan. Monitoring of dust control included in Weekly Environmental Checklist for site conditions. Construction vehicle exhaust emissions to be tested. Weekly Environmental Checklist section 2.0 Environmental Control Measures	Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) Construction Vehicle Monitoring (H3-ENV-INR-CEI-2012)(KED ID#2012-004) Weekly Environmental Inspection Checklist (H3-ENV-INR-WK-		EF (2012) [1] [2] EF (2014)	(H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was not found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Specifically, there is no evidence found for inspection of construction vehicle exhaust emissions. Additional evidence provided with respect to dust. Status column was updated to show that Construction Vehicle Exhaust Emissions to be tested. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided (KED ID#2012-004) in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: Numbering added for clarity. Weekly environmental checklist includes [1] and [2]. Ongoing.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.2 Construction Monitoring										Contractors Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
											2012)(KED ID#2012-002) Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) **Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**		**[1] [2] EF (2015)** **Closed (2015)**	**2015 ACR: Evidence provided (2015-016: Weekly environmental checklist) supports assertion. These items are closed with the completion of construction.**
64	Condition of heritage homes adjacent to transitway alignment	To determine if any damage/deterioration is due to construction activity	Pre-construction inspection to obtain baseline condition and monitoring during nearby construction	As required by construction schedule for work adjacent to heritage features.						Status – Completed As per the Cultural Heritage Resource Report in the EA, there are no heritage homes in the H3 segment.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: No evidence provided to support that baseline was done or monitoring. Subsequently clarification provided by OE indicated that are no heritage homes in H3. This item is closed.
65	Effect of construction on water quality and quantity in	To confirm that water quality is not being	Monitor sediment accumulation [1] after rain events during	After first significant rain event						**Status - Completed**	Environmental	**Yes**	EF (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.2 Construction Monitoring										Contractors Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
	watercourses	adversely affected by construction activity	construction to ensure that the proposed mitigation measures in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan have been satisfied.							Water Quality addressed in Contractor's Environmental Management – Component Environmental Management Plan for Sediment and Erosion Control. [A] Weekly Environmental Checklist section 2.0 Environmental Control Measures and Section 4.0 Compliance for Permits, Authorizations and Licenses. [B] Water quality sampling is conducted weekly to ensure mitigation measures are	Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) [A] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) [B] Water Quality Data 2014 (KED ID #2014-011) [C] Water Quality Monitoring		EF (2012) EF (2014) EF (2015)	support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: Weekly environmental checklist [A] and [B][C] water quality data and monitoring map provided, while showing monitoring of ESC and suspended sediment , does not support that sediment accumulation is being monitored [1]. OE clarified that "functional". includes not choked with sediment. It is suggested that for the 2015 ACR the description column be updated to make that connection. **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (2015-016;**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.2 Construction Monitoring										Contractors Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
										functioning as intended at [C] Watercourse crossings where work is active. **[B, C] Turbidity Monitoring (NTU's) was conducted prior to December 2014, and did not continue after works surrounding watercourses were complete. During 2015 Water Quality was evaluated visually to ensure that the watercourses were functioning as intended ie/ not choked with sediment.**	Map 2014 Rev 00,01 (KED ID #2014-010) **[A] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**		Closed (2015)	**Weekly environmental checklist) supports assertions regarding monitoring. This item is closed with the completion of construction.**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.2 Construction Monitoring										Contractors Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
66	Effect of construction on boulevard trees	To ensure the survival of boulevard trees	[2] Inspection of protective measures [i] and [1] monitoring of work methods near trees [ii]	[1,2] Prior to commencement of work [iii] and [1] bi-weekly [iv] during work activities.						**Status - Completed** [1] Tree inspection addressed in Contractor's Environmental Management Plan – Weekly Checklist. [2] Tree Preservation and Inventory completed for construction impacts to nearby trees. [1] Weekly Environmental Checklist section 4.4 Municipal	[1] Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) [1] Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) [1] Weekly Environmental Inspection Checklist (H3-ENV-INR-WK-2012)(KED ID#2012-004) [2] H3-RPT-Q-ENV-030201_TREE	Yes	[1,2] EF (2011) [1] EF (2012)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was not found to support the assertion on how the condition [1] was addressed. The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-RPT-Q-ENV-030201_TREE PRESERVATION REPORT_R04_2011-11-02) was found to support the assertion on how the condition [2] was addressed. Additional evidence provided (H3-Sample of Weekly Checklists-2012-01-21) was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions [1] on how the condition was addressed. The document H3-ENV-INR-WK-2012 was not located in

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.2 Construction Monitoring										Contractors Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
										Compliance **[iii] QSD Design Work Package: '030201 - Tree Inventory and Preservation' was completed prior to commencement of construction activities**	PRESERVATION REPORT_R04_2011-11-02 (ID#8061) [1] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) **[1] [iii] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)** **[iii] H3-Sample Tree Inventory_DWG_Inventory List (KED ID# 2015-018)**		**[i][ii][iv] EF (2014)** **[i-iv] EF (2015)** **All items closed (2015)**	folder "KED ID#2012-004" but was found in folder "KED ID#2012-002". This should be updated in the table. Item remains ongoing. [i] [ii] [iv] 2014: Weekly environmental checklist [1] supports monitoring. For ACR 2015 –Item [iii] inspection is done *prior to commencement of work* should be addressed. **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (2015-016: Weekly environmental checklist) supports assertion for items[i] [ii] [iv]. All items are closed with the completion of construction.** **Evidence provided for item [iii] inspection is done prior to commencement of work(21015-018) supports the assertion**

)

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
501	Noise generated by operation and maintenance activities	To ensure noise levels comply with Municipal by-laws	Pass-by and idling measurements of levels produced by representative vehicles/ activities	Initially after revenue service is introduced and in response to concerns or after any major increase in service frequency						Status – Future work		No	Ops / Future (2014)	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly**
502	Effect of rapid transit operations on local air quality (pollutants, odour)	To confirm that local air quality is not being adversely affected by transit vehicle activity at terminals/ facilities	Regular inspections of measures and of transit vehicle exhaust emissions	Initially after facilities are placed into service and at five-year intervals during vehicle life						Status – does not apply to H3 There are no transit terminals/ facilities on the H3 segment.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
503	Effect of rapid transit operations on	To assess the effectiveness of improved public	Ridership growth surveys and transit mode split	Findings to be included in the Annual						Status – Future work		No	Ops / Future (2014)	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
	GHGs emitted per commuting person-trips	transit as a commuting choice in reducing GHG emissions in the corridor	data analysis to derive GHG emission reductions.	Compliance Reports										formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly**
504	Condition of heritage homes adjacent to transitway operations	To determine if any damage/ deterioration is due to vibrations produced by transit vehicles	Post-construction inspection to obtain baseline condition and monitoring during pass-by operations	Initially after revenue service is introduced and in response to concerns or after any major increase in service frequency						Status – **Does not apply to the H3 segment** **As per the Cultural Heritage Resource Report in the EA, there are no heritage homes in the H3 segment.**	**Cultural Heritage Report (ID YH3-2015-001)**	Yes	EF (2015) Closed (2015)	**2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status** **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (YH3-2015-001) supports the assertion of no cultural heritage features. This item is closed.**
505	Traffic Operation	To confirm that the traffic operation is not adversely affected	Post-construction traffic study	Initially after revenue service is introduced and at a regular interval						Status – **Completed** **An operational review traffic**	**Traffic Signals**	Yes	Ops / Future (2014)	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				afterward						**study was performed after the commencement of revenue service and York Region continues to monitor and undertake a signal coordination review along the corridor every 2-3 years.**	**and Corridor Travel Times Monitoring Mandate (ID YORK-#6373090)** **Early Handover Operational Review, H3 Early Handover Operational Fine Tuning Report, October 7, 2013 (ID# YORK-#6375363)**		**EF (2015)** **Closed (2015)**	changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (6375363) supports the assertion of a post-construction study being completed. Evidence provided (6373090) support the assertion that York Region will undertake traffic monitoring. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake monitoring at intervals stated as traffic monitoring is part of its mandate. This item is closed.**
506	Effect of snow and ice removal on water quality in corridor watercourses	To confirm that water quality is not being adversely affected by transitway and vehicle maintenance activities	Monitor sediment accumulation in storm water management facilities	During major storm events up to five times per year						Status – **Complete** **Current York Region road maintenance practices dictate that all York**	**Tender Documents (ID# YORK-#6373975):** • **Oil-Grit Separator**	Yes	Ops / Future (2014) **EF (2015) Closed (2015)**	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: Evidence**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
										Region Oil-Grit Separators are inspected annually for sediment accumulation, servicing and cleaning.	• Structure Inspection and Assessment Services At Various Locations Within the Regional Municipality of York • Oil-Grit Separator Structure Cleaning Including Disposal of Collected Liquid and Solid Materials at Various Locations in the Regional Municipali			provided (6373975) supports the assertion that SWM inspections are routinely undertaken by York Region elsewhere. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake this monitoring within H3. This item is closed.

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
											ty of York			
507	Effect of operations and maintenance on boulevard trees	To ensure the survival of boulevard trees	Inspection of protective measures and monitoring of work methods near trees	Annually						Status – **Completed** **York Region has contracted staff for inspection, maintenance and watering of the streetscape plantings.**	**York Region contract specifications for landscape maintenance (ID# YORK-#6374042)**	Yes	Ops / Future (2014) **EF (2015) Closed (2015)**	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (6374042) supports the assertion that maintenance of streetscaping vegetation is undertaken routinely by York Region elsewhere. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake this within H3. This item is closed.**
508	Effect of operations of RT on intersection operation and access to minor side streets and properties along Yonge Street using U-turns	To ensure acceptable level of service at intersections and accessibility to minor side streets and properties along Yonge Street	Monitor intersection performance and conflict potentials. Prohibit Right Turns on Red movements from the side street at	Initially after introduction of RT service and during the Region's regular assessment of intersection performance						**Status – Completed** **There is sufficient space to conduct the U-turn on the fully protected advance**	**Summary along Highway 7 for Right Turn On Red (RTOR) (ID#**	Yes	Ops / Future (2014) **EF (2015) Closed (2015)**	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (6373418)**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			these locations if necessary							**east/west left-turn since Highway 7 is a three lane arterial road and right-turning motorist from minor street are able to adapt and gauge this U-turn maneuver. Traffic Signal Operations staff continues to monitor and make any necessary signal timing adjustments**	**YORK-#6373418)**			**supports the assertion of a post-construction study being completed and that York Region will undertake regular assessment of performance . It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake the assessments stated as traffic monitoring is part of its mandate. This item is closed.**
509	Effect of RT operation and intersection modifications on traffic infiltration through neighbourhood roads	To identify any increase in the use of neighbourhood roads by non-resident traffic as an alternative to left turn access restrictions	"Before and after" traffic volume observations on affected roadways to determine any change in infiltration levels	Before commencement of construction and six months after introduction of RT service						Status – **Ongoing** **Analysis is in progress.**		No		**2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity** **Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
510	Increased mobility choice	To verify the convenience of	Review of effectiveness of	After six months of RT service						Status – **Completed**		**Yes**	Ops / Future	2014: Bold and underline removed under status

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
	due to rapid transit service introduction and local transit connectivity	the inter-connection between rapid transit service and reconfigured local feeder service	local service plans in terms of growth of transfers and response to customer requests/ complaints	and annually thereafter						**Review of the effectiveness of local services plans in terms of growth of transfers and response to customer requests/ complaints is managed by York Region and are included in the York Region Transit 5 year service plan.**	**York Region Transit, Five Year Service Plan (ID# YORK-#6375406)**		(2014) **EF (2015) Closed (2015)**	column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (6375406) supports the assertion that monitoring is to be undertaken including at 6 months and yearly by York Region. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake this. This item is closed.**
511	Effect of RT operations on public safety in the right-of-way and in station zones	To confirm the effectiveness of safety measures incorporated in the transit infrastructure design and pedestrian access facilities	Review of accident reports and statistics to establish whether cause is transit related	In response to specific incidents as required and in Annual Compliance Reports						Status – **Completed** **York Region's goal is to reduce the number and severity of collisions that happen on Regional roads. The safety of all**	**York Region Standard Practice, Monitor Accidents, Traffic Safety Review of Pedestrian**	**Yes**	Ops / Future (2014) **EF (2015) Closed**	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (6373581) supports the assertion that monitoring is**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
										Regional roads and intersections is appraised yearly. Based on the results, York Region can see which roads and intersections can be improved. Refer to http://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/transportation/yr/traffic/trafficsafetyprogram.	**and RTOR; and 2015 Annual Traffic Safety Report (ID# YORK-#6373581)**		**(2015)**	**undertaken routinely by York Region annually elsewhere. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake this within H3. This item is closed.**
512	Streetscaping, neighbourhood aesthetics and community vistas	To confirm that landscaping, station and transitway features continue to enhance the community environment in the corridor	Inspection of landscaping **[1]** by Region arborist and streetscaping features **[2]** by maintenance personnel	Twice annually or in response to specific complaints about plant health, graffiti, cleanliness						Status – **Completed** **[1] York Region has contracted staff for inspection, maintenance and watering of the streetscape plantings.**	**[1] York Region contract specifications for landscape maintenance (ID# YORK-#6374042)**	**Yes**	Ops / Future (2014) **[2] EF (2015)** **[1] Unclear**	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (6374042) supports the assertion that [2] maintenance of streetscaping vegetation is undertaken routinely by**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
													(2015)	**York Region elsewhere. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake this within H3. Item [2] is closed. It is unclear how Item [1] Inspection of landscaping by Region arborist has been undertaken.**
513	Provision of median crossing for Emergency Response Services vehicles	To ensure the operation of the ERS vehicles	Obtain feedback from ERS staff on performance of access provisions	Initially after completion of access [1] facilities and through regular consultation with the emergency services [2]						Status – **Ongoing** **York Region continues to collaborate with Emergency Response Services on various ongoing VivaNext projects and therefore maintains the same level of communication with ERS which was consistent throughout the design and construction of H3. ERS is free to**	**Email from M. Hum (YRRTC) regarding EMS input, November 5, 2015 (ID# YORK-#6375292)**	**Yes**	Ops / Future (2014) **[2] EF (2015**	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (6375292) supports the assertion that Item [1] ERS staff have provided feedback initially. Item [1] is closed. Item [2] regular consultation with ERS remains ongoing/open .**

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
										continue to provide feedback/complications as they arise. There has been no complications noted since operation.				
514	Utilization of Community Facilities	To confirm that rapid transit is increasing usage of facilities due to improved access	Obtain registration data from facilities served (up to three)	Review registration data annually for a period of 5 years after start-up						Status – Future work		No	Ops / Future (2014)	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly**
515	Change in existing land use patterns to	To confirm that municipal development	Monitor re-development activity to control	Review municipal data on						Status – Future work		No	Ops / Future (2014)	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with

Section 5.0 - Actions Required to Address Commitments - Table 5.3 Operations and Maintenance Monitoring										York Region's Notes		Compliance Review (MMM)		
Construction and Compliance Monitoring					Specific information to be added by ECM with annual compliance reporting (for all cells in these columns).									
Item	Environmental Effect	Purpose of Monitoring	Monitoring Method	Monitoring Frequency	Changes to Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Agency Responses and Dates	New Mitigation Protection and/or Monitoring	Date of Permit Approval or Authorization	Record of Compliance (ECM Signature and Date)	Status and Description of how commitments have been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
	transit oriented development may not be attainable or may be inappropriate	approvals and zoning are realizing the benefit of improved transit and encouraging development compatible with existing neighbourhoods	overall increase in and type of development density	redevelopment/ development levels annually for a period of 10 years after start-up										formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly**
516	Effect of an increase in business activity on the urban form	To determine whether business activity along the corridor increases and whether resulting intensification meets urban form objectives.	Monitor business activity, urban form and economic conditions in the corridor	Review building applications and permits and economic influences annually for 10 years after start-up						Status – Future work		No	Ops / Future (2014)	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly**

Section 6.0 – Modifying the Design of The Undertaking					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
67.	CMP Section 6.0 - In the event that there is a minor change to the design of the undertaking which does not adversely impact the expected net environmental effects of the undertaking, these changes will be considered minor and documented in the annual compliance report [1-8,9]. CMP Section 6.0 – "… a required modification to the transitway alignment and station location in the area of the IBM campus in Markham has been identified. The modified alignment is a local refinement to the undertaking approved in the EA and an amendment report will be submitted specifically documenting the design modification."	York Region	Status- **Completed** Minor changes to the design of the undertaking during H3 PE Design have included: - Minor changes to intersection approaches / configurations supported by the requisite traffic modelling;[1] - Minor reductions in general purpose lane widths;[2] - Minor adjustments to Rapidway alignments to minimise environmental impacts.[3] - Cross sections adjusted where possible to provide for bicycle lanes and maximize median green space.[4] - A single lane Rapidway with transit signal is proposed for the Highway 404 crossing. [5] - A Cedarland Alignment Modification Report has been finalised following receipt of MOE and TRCA comments – see Appendix 4 and 5 for monitoring.[6] - Additional median station provided at Times Avenue / Valleymede Drive intersection.[7] - Minor change from 80km/h in some locations along Hwy 7 to 60 km/h throughout corridor[8] - Revision to the storm sewer design to eliminate a proposed outlet to the Rouge River [9]	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551)[1,3,4,8] York Region's Towards Great Urban Streets, Final Report December 2008 sets out requirements for the Highway 7 corridor in Section 3.3 and Section 10 (page 3) that recommend 3.3m lane widths.http://www.york.ca/departments/transportation+and+works/roads/to_grt_regl_str_guide.htm [2i](ID#8910) Urban Street Design Guidelines: Priority List Development Technical Memorandum, August 24, 2011 and Urban Street Design Standards_MASTER-2011-04-11 GNC_Rev 12.exl.(ID# 7235). IFC drawings, typical cross section H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-302-C00.(ID# 7494)[2ii] Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (ID# 3881)[5] Cedarland Alignment Modification Report – Y2H3 6.03, June 2009. (ID# 3018)[6] Memo - Station Location Optimization (ID # 640). Other supporting documents (ID # 639 & 689)[7] ID # 8013 - H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-109-C01, ID # 8013 - H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-110-C02 [7] ID # 8035 - H3_RPT_MGT_040601_Update to H3	**No**	[5] EF 2009 for mixed traffic [1,2,3,4,6,7, 8] EF (2011) [9] EF (2012)	2009 ACR: [5] Final Report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report used. 2011 ACR: [1,2,3,4,6] The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 3551) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 640, 639, 689, 3551) was not found to support the assertions [7,8] on how the condition was addressed. Additional evidence provided (ID # 8013,8035) was found to support the assertion [7,8] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was not found to support the assertions [9] on how the condition was addressed. Revision notes in the drawings provided in the Compliance Document Reference column did not show elimination of a proposed stormwater outlet to the Rouge River. When asked, YC provided the 60% design, H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-146-B01 (ID6903), which shows two outlets to the Rouge River which YC says have been subsequently eliminated (as shown on sheet 146 of the 80403 (ID# 8909) work package for the final version of the civil storm design). This supports the assertion [9] regarding elimination of the storm sewer. The document H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-146-B01

Section 6.0 – Modifying the Design of The Undertaking					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			Detail design work was substantially completed in 2013, but this item has remained open throughout the construction phase in case of any design modifications resulting from construction issues. No further design modifications were required in 2014 or 2015, and this item is now complete.	Design Basis Report - 2011-11-122_R00 [8] [9] New Construction Plans (ID#8909) H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-135-C01 H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-137 H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-139-C00 H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-141-C00 H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-143-C00 H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-144-C00 H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-146-C00		Closed	(ID6903) should be added to the Compliance Document References column. 2013 ACR: D6903 has been added to the Compliance Document Reference column as per the 2012 ACR. **2014: No additional modifications reported.** **2015 ACR: With the completion of design, this item is closed.**
68.	CMP Section 6.0 - In the event that there is a change to the design of the undertaking that results in a material increase in the expected net environmental effects of the undertaking, the process set out in the CMP for modifying the design of the undertaking (including submission of an amendment report to the MOE) will be followed.	York Region	Status – **Complete** An EA amendment report subtitled "Response to Conditions of Approval – Vaughan N-S Link Subway Alignment Optimization" was approved by the Minister of the Environment on April 4, 2008. No other changes requiring a major amendment have been identified during Detail Design to date. See also item 19 above. **No changes requiring a major amendment have been identified during Detail Design, which is now complete.**	MOE letter of approval of the undertaking - Vaughan N-S Link Subway Alignment Optimization (ID# 4160)	Yes	Closed	**2014: No additional modifications reported.** **2015 ACR: With the completion of design, this item is closed.**

Section 7.0 – Consultation					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
69.	CMP Section 7.1.1- One "Open House" format public consultation opportunity on completion of the preliminary design development work for each segment of the transitway planned for construction as a stand-alone component of the project implementation. The open house will take place at a location within the limits of the segment to be implemented and the design solution presented and modified as necessary to address public comment, will be the basis for the detailed design.	York Region	Status - completed "Open House" format public consultations were held on June 17 & 18 2008 (Premiere Ballroom and Convention Centre - 9019 Leslie Street) and November 26, 2008 (Premiere Ballroom and Convention Centre - 9019 Leslie Street) during PE design. No design modifications were required to address public comments received at the "Open House" format public consultations. The contractor and YRRTC staff will organize a meeting to present the design to the affected residents and property owners in an "Open House" format via pre-construction information centre.	June 17 & 18 2008 "Open House" #1 (Presentation ID# 2830), November 26, 2008 "Open House" #2 (Canopy Movie ID# 4090), (Boards ID# 3823), Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564)	No	EF 2009 EF 2010 Closed (2010)	2830 – PIC presentation June 17 & 18 2008 4090 – Movie on CD (26-Nov-08) (not opened- software problem) 3823 - Boards on CD (26-Nov-08) 6564 – Section 3.10.2.1 Pre-Construction Info Centre satisfies this condition.
70.	CMP Section 7.2.1 - The findings of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and any subsequent assessments will be circulated to all affected stakeholders and First Nations that have asked to be kept informed of the outcome of any archaeological investigations during the design [1,2] and construction phases [3].	York Region	Status **– Completed** A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment was undertaken for the H3 segment and concluded that at the historic Brown's Corners Cemetery, a Cemetery Investigation was to be undertaken in the Highway 7 ROW in front of the cemetery. The Stage 2 Assessment also concluded that no additional archaeological assessment is required for the remainder of the study corridor and these areas can be considered clear of further archaeological concern. The Cemetery Investigation at Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery found that all lands in the public Highway 7 ROW in front of the Brown's Corners Cemetery can be considered clear of archaeological concern, and no further archaeological assessment is	Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detail Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario, Revision 1(ID#7109) Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance into the Provincial Register of Reports of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detail Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7108)	Yes	EF 2010 [1,2] EF (2011)	6550 – Appendix C Task 3.3 Environmental Services (p 14) satisfies the condition. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7397, 7913) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [1,2] was addressed. It is unclear how this item is completed given notification requirements extend into the construction stage. We suggest that the status of this item should be changed to 'Ongoing' Bolding and underline were removed. Additional comments and change of status allows for the removal of the UNCLEAR

Section 7.0 – Consultation					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			required. The Ministry of Tourism and Culture accepted each of these findings. [1] Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec was notified of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment findings via notification dated January 28, 2011 sent in French (the preferred language of communication) [2] Notice of the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment findings were sent to the Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec on May 30, 2011. **[3] Construction is complete. No archaeological sites were found during construction.**	Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3 Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535) Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance into the Provincial Registry of Reports of the Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3 Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535) [1,2] Huron-Wendat First Nation notification letters (ID# 7397 & 7913)		Closed	review result. 2014: Items [1,2] are closed and not reviewed. No archaeological investigations during construction were reported [3]. **2015 ACR: With the completion of construction, this item is closed.**
71.	CMP Section 7.2.1 - The Region and/or designate will consult and respond to First Nations concerns regarding its findings on the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment. The Region and/or designate will obtain any necessary approvals and conduct any additional studies that may be required as a result of the findings and recommendations of the Stage 2 Assessment.	York Region	Status- Completed See item #70 above		No	EF 2010 EF (2011) Closed (2011)	6550 – Appendix C Task 3.3 Environmental Services (p 14) satisfies the condition. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7397, 7913) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.

Section 7.0 – Consultation					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	**Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
72.	CMP Section 7.2.2 - Notices of public consultation opportunities will be sent to First Nations that wish to be kept informed of the implementation of the undertaking. Should First Nations wish to be kept informed of the study and any additional work the Region will consult and notify First Nations in the manner in which they wish to be notified and/or consulted. This could vary from sending notices to attending meetings. [1]	York Region	**Status - Completed** Hwy 7 EA Notice of submission of CMP for public review and comment. Notices of "Open House" format public consultation opportunities were provided through newspaper advertising. The H3 Detail Design Work Plan provides for notices of public consultation opportunities to First Nations that have expressed their wish to be kept informed of the implementation of the undertaking; and for circulation of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report to all First Nations that have asked to be kept informed of the outcome of any archaeological investigations during the design and construction phases. [1] See Item 70 above for notices to First Nations **Construction is complete. No archaeological sites were found during construction and therefore no further consultation with First Nations was required. Also refer to Item 30.**	Notice of Submission of CMP ID# 4121) and CMP distribution lists to First Nations (ID# 4123) Newspaper advertising – (ID# 2865), YSS (ID# 3754) H3 Detail Design Work Plan – Final Version September 17, 2010 (ID# 6550)	**Yes**	EF 2009 EF 2009 EF 2010 [1] EF (2011) Closed	4121 - Notice of Submission of CMP 22-Aug-08 4123 – First nations contact MOE 16-Mar-09 2865- Article 18-Jun 3754 – Vaughan Citizen Article 16-Nov-05 6550 – Appendix C Task 3.3 Environmental Services (p 14) satisfies the condition. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7397, 7913) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [1] was addressed. **2014: No archaeological investigations during construction were reported, so no notification requirements [3].** **2015 ACR: With the completion of construction, this item is closed.**

Section 7.0 – Consultation					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
73.	CMP Section 7.1.2 - One "Open House" format public information centre prior to commencement of construction to present the construction staging and methods to be adopted including temporary works and methods to maintain traffic and pedestrian access and circulation, protect the existing natural and built environment and minimize noise, vibration and air pollution during construction	York Region / Contractor	Status – Complete The contractor and YRRTC staff will organize a meeting to present the design to the mitigated residents and property owners in an "Open House" format via pre-construction information centre. This is a public information session and will only be focused on constructability issues and not final design. A public meeting was held on March 23, 2011 in advance of construction.	Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564) March 2011 Public Meeting – Presentation Materials, Display Boards (Y2014-002). Report to YRRTC Board describing March 2011 public information session with photo (Y2014-002)	No	**EF (2014)** **Closed (2014)**	**2014: No evidence provided that this items has been met. Subsequently, the OE provided evidence which supports the assertion that a public meeting was held in March 2011 prior to the start of construction. This Item is closed**
74.	CMP Section 7.1.2 - Availability of a "Community Relations Officer" throughout the construction period to provide information to, consult with and respond to complaints from, property and business owners and the general public. This Officer will prepare a protocol for dealing with and responding to inquiries and complaints during the construction and subsequent operation [1]. The protocol will be submitted to the MOE for placement on the Public Record prior to commencement of construction [2].	York Region / Contractor	Status – completed The Contractor's Construction Coordinator and the Region's Community Relations Specialist will work together in order to identify and discuss day-to-day construction activity, potential community impacts, on-site communication needs, public issues, milestones, etc. The Construction Coordinator is to log, track and promptly report all complaints and issues related to construction activity to YRRTC. In addition, the Coordinator will interact with property owners and businesses, in the immediate vicinity of active construction work to mitigate impacts and resolve construction-related concerns. Contractor's Communications Manager logs and tracks complaints and construction-related issues as per the developed Incident Management Protocol.	Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564) [1] Appendix CO2 Incident Management_August 26 2011_R1_1_Issued_FC (ID#8061) VPGM-PM-LET-2013-AUG-14-dm-KED re Incident Mgt Protocol (KED ID# 2013-001) Letter from YRRTC to MOE re Complaints Protocol - October 1, 2009 (ID#Y-2013-105)	No	[1] EF (2011) **[1] EF (2013)** **Closed (2013)**	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (Appendix CO2 Incident Management_August 26 2011_R1_1_Issued_FC) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [1] was addressed. Note: some bold and underline formatting was removed for clarity. 2013 ACR: the evidence provided (ID# 2013-105) for assertion [1,2] was found to be sufficient to address the conditions.

Section 7.0 – Consultation					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during Construction	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
74A	CMP Section 7.1.3 – York Region Transit consults on a regular basis with the public through Open Houses at which they provide information on planned system expansion and modifications and respond to questions and complaints concerning existing operations. These forums will provide the opportunity to inform the public of the results of monitoring of EA commitments as well as to obtain feedback from the public on the effectiveness of environmental mitigation measures incorporated into the design and operations of the undertaking.	York Region	Status – **Completed** **Review of the effectiveness of local services plans in terms of growth of transfers and response to customer requests/complaints is managed by York Region and are included in the York Region Transit 5 year service plan.**	**York Region Transit, Five Year Service Plan (ID# YORK-#6375406)**	No	Ops / Future (2014) **EF (2015)** **Closed (2015)**	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: It is assumed that York Region will implement and update their 5-Year Transit Plan This item is closed.**
74B	CMP Section 7.1.3 – At any time during operation of the undertaking, the public will have the opportunity to lodge complaints or make inquiries by contacting York Region Transit's Customer Service Representative by telephone or their e-mail contact service using the information provided on their website www.yrt.ca.	York Region	Status – **Completed** **Complaints or inquires may be lodged by contacting York Region Transit's Customer Service Representative by telephone or their e-mail contact service using information provided on www.yrt.ca.**	**YRT Customer Service Protocol (ID# YORK-#6373206)**	No	Ops / Future (2014) **EF 2015** **Closed 2015**	2014: Bold and underline removed under status column to be consistent with formatting / clarity Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (6373206) supported that a complainants process exists (both telephone and email) It is assumed that York Region will continue to implement this process. This item is closed.**

Section 8.0 – Program Schedule – section irrelevant to ACR

Section 9.0 - Submission and Circulation of the CMP					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
75.	CMP Section 9.0 - In order to fulfill the Condition of Approval requiring submission of a CMP, this document [CMP] is submitted to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB) of the Ministry of the Environment for review and approval.	York Region	Status – completed CMP submission requirements addressed with the approval of the CMP. The final CMP was submitted to the Acting Director, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch on August 18, 2008 and approved on December 29, 2008.	MOE Compliance Monitoring Program letter of approval –(ID# 3706) EA Compliance Monitoring Program August 2008 (ID# 3683) MOE email confirmation of receipt of CMP - August 20, 2008 (ID# 3150)	No	EF 2009 Closed (2009)	3706- Hard Copy of Letter (29-Dec-08)
76.	CMP Section 9.0 - Following approval it [CMP] will be provided to the Director for filing with the Public record maintained for the undertaking. Accompanying the CMP submitted to the Director will be a statement indicating that the CMP is intended to fulfill Condition 3 of the Conditions of Approval.	York Region	Status – completed CMP submission requirements addressed with the approval of the CMP. The letter of submission includes a statement indicating that the CMP is intended to fulfill Condition 3 of the Conditions of Approval.	MOE Compliance Monitoring Program letter of approval – (ID# 3706) York Region letter of submission of final CMP (ID# 4157, 4158)	No	EF 2009 EF 2009 Closed (2009)	3706- Hard Copy of Letter (29-Dec-08) 4157 – dated 18-Aug-08 4158 – dated 31-Oct-08
77.	CMP Section 9.0 - Additional copies [following approval] will be provided by the Proponent for public access as specified in condition of approval 2.1.	York Region	**Status - completed** Refer to item 7 of this document.		Yes	Closed	**2014: Suggest this item be closed and Item 7 be used to track the condition.**
78.	CMP Section 9.0 - The CMP will be made available to agencies, affected stakeholders and/or members of the public [1,2] who expressed an interest in activities being addressed in the CMP or being involved in subsequent work [3].	York Region	Status – completed Condition addressed with the approval of the CMP and circulation to affected/interested stakeholders.	[3] York Region letter of submission of final CMP (ID# 4157, 4158) [1] Notice of Submission of CMP (ID# 4121) and [2] CMP distribution lists to First Nations, Government Review Team and other stakeholders (ID# 4122, 4123, 4124, 4125)	No	[1-3] EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 4157, 4158, 4121, 4122, 4123, 4124, 4125) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.
79.	CMP Section 9.0 - Copies of the CMP will be provided to those agencies/interested	York Region	Status – completed	York Region letter of submission of final (ID# 4157, 4158)	No	EF 2009	4122 – email distribution list 16-Mar-09 4123 – First nations contact MOE 16-Mar-09

Section 9.0 - Submission and Circulation of the CMP					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
	groups identified in Table 11.3-1 of the EA. A notice will be sent to all other agencies involved during the EA and to other stakeholders who identified an interest by providing comments during public review of the EA or EA review. The notice will advise that the CMP is available on the Region's website or hard copy on request. A copy of the stakeholder list will be provided to MOE for the public record submission of the CMP and subsequent ACR's.		Condition addressed with the approval of the CMP and circulation to affected/interested stakeholders.	Notice of Submission of CMP (ID# 4121) and CMP distribution lists to First Nations, Government Review Team and other stakeholders (ID# 4122, 4123, 4124, 4125)		Closed (2009)	4124 – GRT CMP 4125 – Stakeholder Contact list
80.	CMP Section 9.0 - The CMP will be available for public information on the Proponent's website at www. vivayork.ca	York Region	Status - completed The CMP is posted on York Regions york.ca website.		No	EF 2010 Closed (2010)	Now www.vivanext.com

Section 10.0 – Annual Compliance Report – section not applicable to ACR

Section 11.0 - Other Documents required by the Conditions of Approval					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
81.	Ridership Monitoring Program: CMP Section 11.1 - York Region will prepare the results of its Ridership Monitoring Program [1] as committed in Section 5.2.2.3 of the EA and EAA Condition 4.1. The Ridership Monitoring Program will be provided to the City of Toronto, GO Transit, Ministry of Transportation, TTC, the Towns of Markham and Richmond Hill and the City of Vaughan for review [2].	York Region York Region Transit	Status **[1]**- ongoing **Status [2] – Future Work** Relates to Section 5.2.2.3, Step 3, of the EA. The ridership monitoring period is 2007 – 2011 and the major review will take place in 2012. In the meantime ridership monitoring is ongoing by York Region Transit. 2013 - The proposed major review in 2012 outlined in Section 5.2.2.3, Step 3 of the EA is based on the rapid transit improvements "Network Alternative A1" being constructed and operating by 2010. Funding timing has resulted in implementation later than planned at the time of the EA (2013-2019 on the funded Highway 7 segments), therefore a major update in 2012 is no longer relevant. An updated monitoring program reflecting the current timelines and meeting the intent of the EA will be developed and reported in the 2014 ACR. Ridership monitoring is ongoing. 2014 – As per Condition 4.1, the Ridership Monitoring Program is tied to the Technology Conversion Plan described in Item 82, which is not being progressed at this time. Section 5.2.2.3 noted a review of ridership for the Highway 7 rapid transit system described in the EA two years following implementation, to encompass three years before and two years after commencement of service. The Highway 7 rapid transit system will not be fully implemented for many years. The H3 segment will be completed in early 2015, and therefore the detailed review of this corridor is in early 2017, and will be provided to the	YRT\Viva 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary, YRT\Viva 2007 Ridership Summary - Specialized Services – Mobility Plus, Viva Monthly Operations Summary December 2007 Y1 8.02 (ID#'s 3106, 3107, 3108) York Region Transit/Viva Ridership Summaries – 2005 to 2012 (ID# Y-2013-103) Ridership Monitoring Reports to York Region Council – November 2013 to July 2014 (ID #Y2014-003)	Yes	EF 2009 EF (2013) EF [1] (2014)	3106 – 2007 Ridership Summary Specialized Services 3107 – 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary and monthly Ridership Summary 3108 – Viva Operations Monthly Summary 2013 ACR: the evidence provided was found to support the assertion on how the condition is met. Item remains ongoing to 2014 as timelines have been altered. 2014: Bold and underlining and numbering was added. No evidence was found to support the assertion that an updated monitoring program was developed and reported in this ACR. Subsequently, the Status column was updated to indicate that monitoring is ongoing (with evidence provided to support this) but providing the information is part of future consultation. Status for Item [1] monitoring is ongoing, status for Item [2] should be changed to future.

Section 11.0 - Other Documents required by the Conditions of Approval					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			stakeholders noted. Ridership data is being collected monthly and will be input to that review. As such, this is future (post-construction) work.				
82.	Technology Conversion Plan CMP Section 11.2 - A Technology Conversion Plan will be prepared to identify when and if conversion from a bus rapid transit (BRT) system to a Light Rail Transit (LRT) system will occur [1,2].	York Region	Status – **Future Work** A draft Transition Plan[1] was prepared and submitted on March 02, 2007 and is presently under review as part of the ongoing Network Plan update. Transit Network Analysis is ongoing including LRT / subway technology conversion considerations. [2] The potential future evolution from Bus Rapid Transit to higher capacity Light Rail Rapid Transit is not being planned at this time, and is ultimately dependant on significant growth in transit ridership and available funding in the future, and at least not expected within the 2031 horizon. No Technology Conversion Plan will be finalized until new information on this issue become available	[1] Draft Transition Plan, March 2, 2007. (ID#910) [2] Letter from York Region, April 3, 2012, responding MOE comments. (ID#8908)	No	EF 2009 EF (2012) Ops / Future (2014)	2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: Suggest changing status to future.
83.	CMP Section 11.2 - If conversion is found to be required prior to 2021, the Plan will include an implementation schedule.	York Region	Status -future The draft Transition Plan included general indications of alternative schedules. Transit Network Analysis is ongoing including LRT / subway technology conversion considerations.	Draft Transition Plan, March 2, 2007. (ID#910)	No	Ops / Future (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
84.	CMP Section 11.2 - The Ridership Monitoring Program[1] and Technology Conversion Plan[2] will be placed on the public record file at the EAAB and the MOE's Central Regional Office. A copy of these documents will also be provided to the City of Toronto, TTC, GO Transit, the Ministry of Transportation, the Towns of	York Region York Region Transit	Status –**Future Work** [2] The potential future evolution from Bus Rapid Transit to higher capacity Light Rail Rapid Transit is not being planned at this time, and is ultimately dependant on significant growth in transit ridership and available funding in the future, and at least not expected within the 2031 horizon. No Technology	YRT\Viva 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary, YRT\Viva 2007 Ridership Summary - Specialized Services – Mobility Plus, Viva Monthly Operations Summary December 2007 YC 8.02 (ID#'s 3106, 3107, 3108)[1] [2]Letter from York Region, April 3,	No	EF (2012) Ops / Future (2014)	ACR 2012: 3106 – 2007 Ridership Summary Specialized Services 3107 – 2007 Revenue Ridership Summary and monthly Ridership Summary 3108 – Viva Operations Monthly Summary 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions on how the condition was

Section 11.0 - Other Documents required by the Conditions of Approval					Compliance Review (MMM)		
Item	Mitigation Measure / Commitment to be Monitored	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
	Markham and Richmond Hill and the City of Vaughan for review.		Conversion Plan will be finalized until new information on this issue become available.	2012, responding MOE comments.(ID#8908)			addressed. Item remains ongoing. **2014: Suggest changing status to future.**
85.	Complaints Protocol CMP Section 11.3 - Prior to construction, the Region will prepare a protocol on how it will deal with and respond to inquiries and complaints received during the construction and operation of the undertaking [1]. The protocol will be submitted to the Central Region Director for placement on the Public Record [2].	York Region	Status - **completed** Protocol will be prepared during the Detail Design phase. A Complaint Protocol will be developed during Detail Design and will be submitted to the required agencies for review and comment. [1] Complaints Protocol developed as part of the Incident Management Protocol.	Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564) [1] Appendix CO2 Incident Management_August 26 2011_R1_1_Issued_FC (ID#8061) [2] Dale Albers letter.Nov12 2009.EA06-02-06(ID#8908)	No	[1,2] EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (Appendix CO2 Incident Management_August 26 2011_R1_1_Issued_FC) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [1] was addressed. Evidence was not provided to support the assertion on how the condition [2] was addressed. Also, see item 74 as it is very similar and has a Status of "ongoing". Additional evidence provided (Dale Albers letter.Nov12 2009.EA06-02-06) was found to support the assertion [2] on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Item 74 is similar and closed, Suggest changing status to closed

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor And Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-1 Effects and Mitigation for Mobility												Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																	
A1 (a)	Maximize Inter-regional and local transit connectivity	Connections to inter-regional services and future gateways	✓		✓	Highway 7 & Highway 50	Opportunity to connect to a Brampton Rapid Transit Initiative "AcceleRide" to improve the inter-regional transit network.	Highway 7 transitway will provide a direct connection from western York Region to the Region of Peel. It also provides a direct connection from York University to the Region of Peel.	Increased potential for infill development around the regional boundary.	None	Positive effect	Monitor the ridership and the performance of the connection to the Region of Peel.	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
(b)		Connections to inter-regional services and future gateways	✓		✓	At 400 series highways, e.g. Highways 427, 400, 404 & 407	Opportunity to connect to MTO's future rapid transit services on the 400 series highways to improve the inter-regional transit network.	Highway 7 transitway will provide additional stations for transfers.	Increased potential for infill development around these transfer points.	None	Positive effect	Monitor the ridership and the needs to provide additional stations as warranted by the future rapid transit services.	York Region	Status – future Opportunities to connect to MTO's Highway 407 Transitway at the Richmond Hill Centre have been explored through the Yonge Subway Extension and Highway 407 Transitway Transit Project Assessments. No additional stations added during H3 Design for the purpose of connections to inter-regional services and future gateways. Ridership monitoring is ongoing. See item 81 of this document.		No	Ops / Future (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
(c)		Connections to inter-regional services and future gateways	✓		✓	York University	Opportunity to connect to the City of Toronto and improve ridership on these transit services.	Vaughan North-South Link will provide a direct connection to the York University and to the future TTC rapid transit connecting the Toronto system prior the implementation of subway extension.	Increased potential for infill development around this transfer point.	None	Positive effect	Monitor the ridership and the performance of the connection to Toronto.	York Region	Status – Does not apply to H3 segment Ridership monitoring is ongoing. See item 81 of this document.		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor And Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-1 Effects and Mitigation for Mobility													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
A1 cont'd (d)		Connections to inter-regional services and future gateways	✓		✓	Proposed Richmond Hill Centre Intermodal Station	Better connection to GO Stations and future provincial inter-regional 407 Transitway station will improve ridership on all transit services	Highway 7 transitway will provide a direct connection to GO Rail's Richmond Hill Line at the proposed Richmond Hill Centre Intermodal Station. It will also have a connection to York's Yonge Street transitway and the future provincial transit corridor along Highway 407.	Increased potential for infill development around Richmond Hill Centre Intermodal Station	None	Positive effect	Monitor ridership and the performance of the connection to GO Langstaff Station	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment.		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
(e)		Connections to inter-regional services and future gateways	✓		✓	Unionville GO Station	Connection to Unionville GO Station will improve York's transit network.	A pedestrian walkway will be provided to transfer the transitway passengers to the Unionville GO Station. This will provide a fast and reliable service from the future Markham Centre to the City of Toronto or northern York Region via the GO Rail's Stouffville Line.	Increased potential for infill development around this transfer point.	None	Positive effect	Monitor the ridership and the performance of the connection to Unionville GO Station.	York Region	Status – **Does not apply to the H3 segment** PE Design of the connection to Unionville GO Station has not yet commenced. Ridership monitoring is ongoing. See item 81 of this document. **Unionville GO Station is not within the limits of the H3 Segment.**		No	Closed	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor And Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-1 Effects and Mitigation for Mobility													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1]			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation								
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
(f)		Compatibility with proposed local network	✓		✓	Entire Corridor	Inconvenient transfer between local transit and Highway 7 Rapid Transit may discourage transit ridership.	Stations generally located on north-south local transit routes ensuring convenient transfers between services. Integrated fare system proposed.	Project may change the configuration of local transit.	Local services configured as grid where practical, to provide both community coverage and feeder roles	Positive effect	Regular review of effectiveness of local service plans.[1]	York Region	Status – **Complete** Regular review of effectiveness of local service plans is an ongoing YRT task. YRT evaluates local service connections and implements network changes annually. **Review of the effectiveness of local services plans in terms of growth of transfers and response to customer requests/complaints is managed by York Region and are included in the York Region Transit 5 year service plan.**	2015 Annual Service Plan (Y2014-004) – refer to Objectives on p10 of Executive Summary 2014 Annual Service Plan (Y2014-005) Transit Service Guidelines (Y2014-006) **York Region Transit, Five Year Service Plan (ID# YORK-#6375406)**	Yes	**EF (2014)** EF 2015 Closed (2015)	**2014: Numbering added. Evidence not provided to support that regular review of effectiveness of local service plans is an ongoing. Subsequently, additional documentation was provided that supports that YRT evaluates local service connections.** **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (6375406) was found to support the assertion that York Region is monitoring local service plans. It is assume that York Region will follow and update their plan. This item is closed.**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor And Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-1 Effects and Mitigation for Mobility												Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																	
A2 (a)	Maximizes speed and ride comfort and minimizes safety risks and maintenance costs with optimized alignment geometry.	Grade at station in excess of LRT standard of max. 1.0%.	✓		✓	Eastbound platform on Highway 7 at Chalmers Rd./ South Park Rd.	Running way grade at platforms is 2.49%. LRT should have the minimum climbing grade after stopping to load/unload passengers.	Grade through station will have to be modified locally resulting in a vertical separation from adjacent traffic lanes if LRT technology is introduced.	Minor retaining walls through station.	Incorporate safety barriers where required.[1]	Significant		York Region	Status – Completed H3 PE Design was undertaken for a BRT service so as not to preclude a future LRT service – redesign runningway as required once LRT is needed. [2011]The platform at this intersection is designed at 1.5% and may require future modification if LRT technology is introduced. The same design approach was carried through Detail Design. The Eastbound platform grade is designed at 2.15%. Architectural record drawings show barrier wall and safety railings to separate pedestrians on platforms from adjacent traffic lanes and accommodate step in canopy to accommodate grade difference. The need for grade adjustments and minor retaining walls will be assessed in future if LRT conversion is considered.	PE Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 5337) Drawing H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-105-C01 (ID#7582) ID # 7921 - H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508-302-C03 ID # 7921 - H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508-303-C03 Elevation drawing with barrier wall and handrail highlighted Drawing H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508-402-D00 (Y2014-007) Barrier wall and handrail details Drawing H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508-608-D00 (Y2014-007)	Yes	EF 2009 EF (2011) EF (2012) **EF (2014)**	2011 ACR: Evidence provided does not include the intersection listed in this item. Additional evidence provided (ID# 7921) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: Evidence was found in support of the assertion that the same design approach was carried through Detail Design as the evidence provided has not been changed since the 2011 ACR. Note: it appears the Eastbound platform grade is 2.15% and not 1.5% as reported in the status column. The 1.5% grade appears to be referencing the westbound platform at this location. 2013 ACR: correction of grade noted **2014: No evidence found how safety barriers have been incorporated. Subsequently, additional explanation and documentation was provided. The result was changed to EF as the new evidence provided supports the new assertion that the safety barriers have been incorporated.**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor And Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-1 Effects and Mitigation for Mobility													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1]			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation								
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
(b)		Grade at station in excess of LRT standard of max. 1.0%.	✓		✓	Westbound platform on Highway 7 at West Beaver Creek Rd./ Commerce Valley Dr. W	Running way grade at platforms is 2.13%. LRT should have the minimum climbing grade after stopping to load/unload passengers.	Grade through station will have to be modified locally resulting in a vertical separation from adjacent traffic lanes if LRT technology is introduced.	Minor retaining walls through station.	Incorporate safety barriers where required.[1]	Significant		York Region	Status – Completed H3 PE Design was undertaken for a BRT service so as not to preclude a future LRT service – redesign runningway as required once LRT is needed. The Westbound platform at this location has been designed at a 2.25% grade which may require modification if LRT technology is introduced. The same design approach was carried through Detail Design. Architectural record drawings show barrier wall and safety railings to separate pedestrians on platforms from adjacent traffic lanes and accommodate step in canopy to accommodate grade difference. The need for grade adjustments and minor retaining walls will be assessed in future if LRT conversion is considered.	**PE** Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 5337) H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-113-C01 (ID#7806) ID # 7921 - H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508-302-C03 ID # 7921 - H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508-303-C03 Elevation drawing with barrier wall and handrail highlighted Drawing H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508-407-D00 (Y2014-007) Barrier wall and handrail details Drawing H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508-608-D00 (Y2014-007)	No	EF (2011) **EF (2014)**	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (7806) was not found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. The drawings reference another drawing for details on station platforms which was not provided. Additional evidence provided in item A2 above (ID# 7921) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Status should be changed to 'ongoing'. **2014: No evidence found how safety barriers have been incorporated. Subsequently, additional explanation and documentation was provided. The result was changed to EF as the new evidence provided supports the new assertion that the safety barriers have been incorporated.**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor And Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-1 Effects and Mitigation for Mobility													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
A2 cont'd (c)		Grade at station in excess of LRT standard of max. 1.0%.	✓		✓	Both platforms on Highway 7 at East Beaver Creek Rd./ Commerce Valley Dr. E	Running way grade at platforms is 2.97%. LRT should have the minimum climbing grade after stopping to load/unload passengers.	Grade through station cannot be modified due to the close proximity of the next intersection.	Station grade exceeding desirable LRT maximum will remain.	None practical	Significant – LRT operation speed reduced.	Speed impact will be analysed during LRT system design.	York Region	Status –**completed** H3 PE Design was undertaken for a BRT service so as not to preclude a future LRT service – analyse LRT operational speed impacts once LRT is needed. The West platform is design at a 3.00% grade at this location and the East platform is at 2.65% both of which may require modification if LRT technology is introduced. The same design approach was carried through Detail Design.	PE Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 5337) H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-117-C01(ID#7582) ID # 7921 - H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508-302-C03 ID # 7921 - H3-DWG-F-ARC-080508-303-C03	**Yes**	EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (7806) was not found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. The drawings reference another drawing for details on station platforms which was not provided. Additional evidence provided (ID# 7921) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. **2014: 2011 review found that evidence supported assertion. Consider closing this item.**
(d)		Grade at station in excess of LRT standard of max. 1.0%.	✓		✓	Both platforms on Highway 7 at McCowan Road	Running way grade at platforms is 2.56%. LRT should have the minimum climbing grade after stopping to load/unload passengers.	Grade through station will have to be modified locally resulting in a vertical separation from adjacent traffic lanes if LRT technology is introduced.	Minor retaining walls through station.	Incorporate safety barriers where required.	Significant		York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment.		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
A3	Maximize operational efficiency of maintenance and storage facility	N/A - Maintenance & storage facility included in Yonge St. Corridor EA Undertaking.				N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor And Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-1 Effects and Mitigation for Mobility													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1]			Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures			Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			P	C	O			Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation								
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
A4	Increase attractiveness of rapid transit service	Travel time and service reliability	✓		✓	Entire Corridor	Adjustments to signal timing to achieve progression and minimize delay to rapid transit.	Micro-simulation of rapid transit operation and general traffic movements during detailed design will be used to optimize signal timing Transit speed will be increased to maximum achievable with reasonable intersection operation.[1]	Delay to transit or intersecting traffic may be unacceptable. May affect intersection capacity for general traffic movements.	Modification of inter-section signal timing.	Moderately significant	Pursue an on-going intersection performance monitoring program [2]	York Region	**Status [1] - Completed** **Status [2] - Completed** [1] Section 3.3.6 of the DBCR Traffic Analysis - A VISSIM micro-simulation traffic model was used to simulate traffic flows not only at the traffic signal junctions but also through the links of the traffic system. The model was used to assess the impacts of traffic conditions on transit vehicles as they progressed through the Rapidway [1] Section 3.1.3 of the DBCR – Traffic Signal Technology – controlled transit priority at all major intersections [1] H3 Work Plan – Task 8.5 - A detailed traffic signal design will be prepared for each of the intersections listed in the report as part of the 60%, 90% and IFC submittals. **[2] York Region continues to monitor and undertakes a signal coordination review along this corridor every 2-3 years.**	[1] Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) [1] H3 Detail Design Work Plan – Final Version September 17, 2010 – (ID# 6550) **[2] Traffic Signals and Corridor Travel Times Monitoring Mandate (ID YORK-**	**Yes**	EF 2009 Ops / Future (2014)	2009 [1] ACR: Found in Appendix A (under separate cover) TASK 4.12: TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (H3) HIGHWAY 7 - YONGE STREET CONNECTOR RAMP TO SOUTH TOWN CENTRE BOULEVARD (Sept 2008) **2014: Numbering added for clarity. Item [1] is closed. Item [2] is in operations. Suggest updating status to future work**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor And Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-1 Effects and Mitigation for Mobility													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE A: To improve mobility by providing a fast, convenient, reliable and efficient rapid transit service																		
															#6373090)			
A5	Locate stations to maximize ridership potential and convenience of access for all users	Residents/Employees within walking distance of station locations. Accessibility of stations/transit system.			✓	Entire Corridor	Stations at locations with automobile-oriented land use could discourage rapid transit use.	Station locations selected to serve supportive land use. Facilities designed with weather protection, direct barrier-free access and attractive streetscapes within surrounding residential neighbourhoods.	Continued dependence on automobile if land use objectives not achieved	Greater emphasis on supportive land use	Positive effect	Regular review of land use and new or infill development potential during detailed design phases for transitway and stations.	York Region	Status – **Completed** York Region has developed guidelines for assessing potential locations for new viva stations. No new development applications have been received for the H3 corridor since the design-build phase commenced. The station location guidelines will be applied if/when new applications are received. **The EA Report identifies station locations and locations for future stations based on areas where new development could be accommodated. Implementation is proceeding accordingly. Station locations meet minimum spacing standards described in the EA. YRT has adopted these criteria and will apply these if new development is planned in areas where stations are not currently shown or protected for in the EA.**	Memo - Station Location Optimization (ID # 640). Other supporting documents (ID # 639 & 689) **YRT/Viva 2015 Annual Service Plan, Sept 2014 – Section 3, Transit Service Guidelines, page 36 (ID YH3-2015-007)**	No		2009 ACR: Evidence does not support that guide lines have been developed. 640 – Briefing and email no memo 639 – Email 689 – drafts of presentation and emails 2010 ACR: no new evidence provided. 2011 ACR: No new evidence provided. Status was clarified to 'Ongoing'. Evidence provided (ID# 689) supports that this item is ongoing. **2014: Evidence has not been provided that reviews of land use and new or infill development potential during detailed design has occurred. However, OE stated that to the best of their knowledge, no new applications were received.**

Notes: P – Pre construction, C – Construction, O – Operation

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-2 Effects and Mitigation for Social Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations [A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
B1 (a)	Minimize adverse effects on and maximize benefits for communities in corridor	Potential displacement of community features		✓	✓	Entire Corridor	Potential displacement or loss of unique features.	Avoid known distinct community features to minimize impact; incorporate landscaping and furniture into streetscape [1] to enhance corridor and community environment.	None expected	None expected	Negligible	Future community consultation	York Region	Status – completed [2011 ACR] H3 PE Design is based on guidelines which include Streetscape Design Guidelines - Section 4.8 of the DBCR "Open House" format public consultations were held as described under item 30 of this document. See also Item 69 above H3 Detail Design is completed and is in compliance with Streetscape Design Guidelines - Section 4.8 of the DBCR, in addition to York Region, City of Markham, and Town of Richmond Hill Urban Design Guidelines.	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. ID# 3551) Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564) H3 Streetscape Design Layout Plans IFC H3-DWG-R-LND-080407 (ID#9633)	No	EF 2009 EF 2010 ENF (2012) **[1] EF (2013)** **Closed (2013)**	2012 ACR: No evidence was provided to support assertion [1]. 2013 ACR: the evidence provided was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed.
(b)		Effect on community cohesion			✓	Entire corridor	Highway 7 may be perceived as a 'highway-like road, which in turn with the introduction of transit service vehicles, could create an unfriendly environment for pedestrians.	Design transitway to facilitate safe pedestrian road crossings with median refuge[1]. Improved streetscaping in order to create a friendlier pedestrian environment.[2]	During initial operation, vehicle/pedestrian incidents may occur due to the introduction of new traffic facilities and patterns.	Emphasis on education programs, signage, and stricter enforcement.	Negligible	Continue to monitor traffic behaviour and causes of incidents involving pedestrians.[3]	York Region	Status **[1, 2] – completed** **Status [3] – completed** Design Basis report makes provision for pedestrian friendly design and streetscaping. [1] and [2] have been incorporated into design and are now complete.	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) H3 Streetscape Design Layout Plans IFC H3-DWG-R-LND-080407 (ID#9633) Sheets 107, 108,	**Yes**	EF 2010 [1] [2] EF	2009 ACR: ENF Document that provides evidence of open house not provided 2010 ACR: Evidence provided under item 30 of this document includes open house documentation held on June 17 and 18, 2008 (2830) and Nov 26, 2008 (4090 & 3823) 2013 ACR: unclear. Evidence

														Refer to Streetscape Design Layout Plans. [3] is post-construction monitoring (future work) **[3] York Region's goal is to reduce the number and severity of collisions that happen on Regional roads. The safety of all Regional roads and intersections is appraised yearly. Based on the results, York Region can see which roads and intersections can be improved. Refer to http://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/transportation/yr/traffic/trafficsafetyprogram.**	110, 113, 115, 117, 124, 125, 127, 128, 130, 133, 136, 140, [1] and Sheets103-144 [2] **[3] York Region Standard Practice, Monitor Accidents, Traffic Safety Review of Pedestrian and RTOR; and 2015 Annual Traffic Safety Report (ID# YORK-#6373581)**		(2013) **[1] [2] EF (2014)** Ops / Future (2014)	ID9633) was provided with bold and underline but no assertions are made. **2014: Evidence not provided. No evidence is bolded and underlined (new evidence). Assuming ID9633 is the Street Design layout plans refered to in Status column, these documents were not provided. Subsequently, the documents were added for ID 9633., and wording was changed in the status column. Item [1] and [2] are closed. Item [3] is future work**
(c)		Community facility utilization			✓	Entire corridor	Improved transit access could increase demand on facilities and services within the corridor.	Municipality can expand services and facilities through the increased development charge revenue.	Community facility expansion could impact stable existing communities.	Include mitigation measures in community facility expansion.	Positive effect	Monitoring of registration levels at the various facilities.	York Region	Status- future		No	Ops / Future (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
B2 (a)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation	Reduction in main street intersection capacities due to rapid transit operations			✓	Highway 50	Implementation of rapid transit reduces the intersection capacity after future growth.	A dedicated WB transit phase of 10s and a WB transit left turn have been introduced.	Under 2021 considerations, EBL, WBT & SBT will operate at capacity in the AM peak hour, and; EBL, WBT, NBT & SBL will operate at capacity in the PM peak hour. The impact of the RT system on the intersection will be negligible as the transit vehicle will operate in conjunction with	Under 2021 considerations, the addition of a WB protected left turn phase should be considered.	Significant	Monitoring required for WB protected left turn phase.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	EF 2009 Closed (2014)	4.11.1 Appropriateness, Scale, Modularity. The design of the various streetscape elements must prioritize the needs of pedestrians…" 2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status

									the WBL.								
(b)					✓	New Mid-block Road	Under 2021 considerations, EBL, EBT & WBT will operate at capacity in the AM peak hour. The SBL will operate at capacity in the PM peak hour.	Pedestrian split phasing should be considered in detailed design phase.	None expected	None required.	Significant	Monitoring required for pedestrian split phasing.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
(c)					✓	Hwy 427 N-E/W Off-Ramp	Under 2021 considerations, WBT will approach capacity in AM peak hour, and; no capacity constraints are expected in the PM peak hour.	None required.	None expected	None required.	Insignificant	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
(d)					✓	Hwy 427 S-E/W Off-Ramp	Transit vehicles will experience delay due to heavy ramp traffic volumes.	Cycle length has been increased from 90 seconds to 120 seconds to accommodate the heavy volumes on the off ramp.	The ramp movements require more green time to maintain acceptable operating conditions.	Transit signal priority could be considered during the detailed design phase.	Moderately Significant	Monitoring required for active transit signal priority.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
B2 cont'd (e)					✓	Roybridge Road/ Vaughan Valley Boulevard	Implementation of RT reduces the intersection capacity.	N-S main phase has been increased to accommodate pedestrian crossing time.	The time for E-W main street movements will be reduced. WBT movements will operate at or near capacity.	Future pedestrian volumes should be monitored over time to determine the opportunity to provide a 2-stage crossing for pedestrians & thus allocate additional green time to the E-W main phase.	Moderately Significant	Monitoring required for 2-stage crossing.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
(f)					✓	Highway 27	Implementation of RT reduces the intersection	N-S green time has been increased to accommodate the minimum pedestrian crossing	WBL will operate at capacity in the AM peak hour.	None required	Moderately Significant	None required	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status

							capacity.	time.	This capacity issue currently exists today.								
B2 cont'd (g)						Kipling Avenue	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	A ten second transit advance phase will be provided to facilitate the access/ egress of the transit vehicle to/from the transit lanes. WBR is permitted during the transit advance phase.	The additional transit phase will operate at capacity. WBT, SBT, EBL & EBT will operate at capacity or approach capacity in AM/ PM peak hour.	Split phasing should be considered to allocate additional green time to the E-W phase as the N-S phase will operate at a minimum split of 38s. Alternatively, implementation of exclusive lanes in the SB approach for example an exclusive left, through & right turn lane should be considered.	Moderately Significant	Monitoring required for implementation of split phasing or exclusive lanes in the SB approach.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
B2 cont'd (h)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation (cont'd)	Reduction in main street intersection capacities due to rapid transit operations (cont'd)			✓	Islington Avenue	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	A ten second transit advance phase will be provided to facilitate the access/ egress of the transit vehicle to/from the transit lanes. EBR is permitted during the transit advance phase.	EBT, WBT, NBL & SBL will operate at capacity in AM/PM peak hour. Surrounding lands prevent road network improvements.	Pedestrian split phasing should be considered on the N-S phase to generate additional green time for the E-W movements. Improvements are not possible due to land/ grade constraints or would not improve	Significant	Monitoring required for implementation of split phasing or exclusive lanes in the SB approach. When the time comes to widen this section of the Highway 7 to 6 lanes, dual left turn lanes should be considered.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status

										operating conditions due to excessively high volumes. Minor remedial measures are not possible such as dual left turn lanes or signal modifications.							
(i)					✓	Pine Valley Drive	Implementation of RT reduces the intersection capacity.	N-S pedestrian crossing times have been increased. Protected-only EBL & WBL have been introduced. Due to property constraints, duel left turn lanes cannot be provided.	The number of permissive left turns will be limited due to the heavy E-W through volumes. WBL, EBL & NBL will approach capacity or operate at capacity during peak hours.	Review property impact during Preliminary Design Phase to assess the opportunities to provide a dual left turn lanes.	Moderately Significant	Review property impact during Preliminary Design Phase.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to “Closed” colour to better indicate review status
(j)					✓	Weston Road	Under 2021 considerations, the intersection is expected to operate at capacity during both peak hours.	None required.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required.	Significant	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to “Closed” colour to better indicate review status
B2 cont’d (k)					✓	Famous Avenue	Under 2021 considerations, WB will approach capacity during both AM and PM peak hours.	None required.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required.	Significant	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to “Closed” colour to better indicate review status
(l)					✓	Highway 400 S-EW off-ramp	Under 2021 considerations, NB dual left will approach capacity in the AM peak hour, and; no capacity constraints are expected during the PM peak hour.	None required.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required.	Significant	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to “Closed” colour to better indicate review status

(m)					✓	Highway 400 Interchange	As the area generates a significant amount of traffic, the interchange will operate at capacity conditions between Weston Road to Jane Street during the peak period.	None required initially. However, monitoring for active signal priority is required to confirm if active signal priority is necessary in the future.	None expected	None required.	Moderately Significant	Monitoring for active signal priority required	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
(n)					✓	Interchange Way	EBL, WBT & SBR will approach capacity or operate at capacity. Dual EBL could not be incorporated due to property constraints.	None required.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	Review property impact during Preliminary Design Phase to assess the opportunity for dual eastbound left turn lanes.	Moderately Significant	Review property impact during Preliminary Design Phase	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
B2 cont'd (o)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation (cont'd)	Reduction in main street intersection capacities due to rapid transit operations (cont'd)			✓	Jane Street	Some transit vehicles are required to turn south to reach the York University.	A ten second transit phase will be provided to facilitate the movements. The NB exclusive right turn lane will be permitted during the transit phase. Review opportunities for road network improvements to improve left turn lane capacity issues.	The intersection of Highway 7 and Jane Street will operate at capacity during both peak periods. The protected left turn restrictions resulting from the RT system will result in the eastbound and westbound left turns operating at capacity.	Split phasing should be considered during the detailed design phase to provide a minimum split for the N-S pedestrian movement. Review opportunities for road network improvements to improve left turn lane capacity issues.	Moderately Significant	Monitoring required for implementation of split phasing. Review opportunities for road network improvements to improve left turn lane capacity issues.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
(p)					✓	Interchange Way (Jane	East approach is operating as a shared left-through	Monitor east approach for widening	Intersection will continue to operate at	None expected	Moderately Significant	Recommend further intersection analysis during Preliminary	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status

						Street)	and shared through-right. Heavy left turn volumes suggest an exclusive or dual westbound left turn lane is required.		capacity.			Design Phase to determine if exclusive WB left turn widening is warranted.						
(q)					✓	Proposed East-West Road (Jane Street)	Under 2021 Considerations, SBL will operate at capacity and NBT will approach capacity during the AM peak hour. The opposing WBR will approach capacity during the PM peak hour.	Traffic volume should be monitored to determine if a SB dual left turn lane will be required to facility the heavy volume during the morning period.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None expected	Moderately Significant	Monitoring required for SB dual left turn lane.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
B2 cont'd (r)					✓	Northwest Gate (Steeles Avenue)	Under 2021 Considerations, the intersection will operate at capacity during the AM peak hour.	None required.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None expected	Moderately Significant	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
(s)					✓	Keele Street	Transit vehicles are required to turn onto Highway 7.	A ten second transit phase will be provided to facilitate the movements. The WB general traffic will be permitted during the transit phase.	Both peak periods show the left turn movements operating at capacity.	Additional green time to the critical movements should be considered in the detailed design phase; or road network improvements should be considered in the preliminary design phase.	Moderately Significant	Review opportunities to provide additional capacity for the left turn movements during detailed design phase/preliminary design phase.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status

(t)					✓	Creditstone Road	WBT, NBL & EBT will operate at capacity in the PM peak hour.	None required.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	A 2-stage pedestrian crossing should be considered during the detailed design stage.	Significant	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
(u)					✓	Bowes Road/ Baldwin Avenue	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	A ten second transit phase will be provided.	The intersection is expected to operate at good level-of-service with the RT system.	None expected	Positive effect	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
B2 cont'd (v)					✓	Centre Street/ North Rivermede	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	EB transit vehicle will utilize the existing channelized right turn lane and diverge into the transitway downstream of the intersection to avoid delay.	The intersection will operate at a satisfactory LOS. NBT & EBT will approach capacity. Minimal delays or queues are expected between the two transitional intersections.	None expected	Insignificant	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
(w)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation (cont'd)	Reduction in main street intersection capacities due to rapid transit operations (cont'd)			✓	Centre/ Bathurst Streets	Transit vehicles are required to negotiate an EBL or SBR in the dedicated transit ROW.	EBL/SBR for transit, & EBL/EBT for general traffic has been permitted during a 10-second transit phase. All the left turn lanes operate under protected-permissive phases as the transit phase operate under an exclusive phase.	EBL, NBL & SBT will approach capacity in the PM peak hour.	None expected	Moderately Significant	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
(x)					✓	Worth Boulevard /Flamingo Road (Bathurst Street)	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	A ten second transit phase will be provided. SBT will be permitted during this transit phase.	NBT will operate at capacity and SBT will approach capacity. Addition green time is required in the N-S direction.	Split phasing should be considered during the detailed design stage.	Significant	Monitoring required for split phasing.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status

(y)					✓	Bathurst Street Connection Road	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	Three SB left turn lanes will be provided: one for an exclusive SB transit left turn lane; two for SB general left turn traffic. A dual EB left turn lane will be provided.	No capacity constraints.	None expected	Positive effect	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
(z)					✓	Hunter's Point Drive	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	A ten second transit phase will be provided. EBT will be permitted during this transit phase.	No capacity constraints.	None expected	Positive effect	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
B2 cont'd (aa)					✓	Yonge Street Connection Road	Accessing the Richmond Hill Centre Intermodal Station complicates the intersection operation.	WB & SB right transit movements will operate in mixed traffic utilizing the existing channelized right turn lanes. EB & SB left transit movements will remain in the dedicated transit lanes. EB left transit & general traffic movements will operate together. Similarly, SB left transit & general traffic movements will operate together. Signal priority will likely be implemented to detect buses in the transitway & activate the appropriate phases to avoid long delays & prevent the buses from doubling up.	EBL and WBT will approach capacity during the PM peak hour.	None expected	Positive effect	Monitoring required for signal priority.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment Section 3.1.3 of the DBCR – Traffic Signal Technology – controlled transit priority [will be provided] at all major intersections. H3 Design provides for BRT in mixed traffic instead of Rapidway lanes at the intersection.	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) Final Scope of Work – H3 vivaNext, Bayview Ave to Warden Ave – October 1, 2010 (ID# 6564)	No	Closed (2014)	2013 ACR: noted that this item does not apply to the H3 segment. 2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status
(ab)					✓	Red Maple Road	Requirement of mixed-traffic transition complicates the intersection operation. Under 2021 Considerations, volumes from Bayview Glen Development show the eastbound left to operate at capacity during the PM peak hour.	An advance EB through phase will be implemented into the signal timing to permit the WB transit vehicle to transition to mixed traffic. The EB left will operate as protected only.	The intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS during the AM peak hour with the WB through approaching capacity. The WBT will operate at capacity in the PM peak hour.	None expected	Moderately Significant	Review potential to provide a dual eastbound left turn lane during the Preliminary & Detailed Design Phases.	York Region	Status –completed H3 Design provides for BRT in mixed traffic instead of Rapidway lanes at the intersection.	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551)	No	EF 2009 Closed (2009)	2.2.1 Highway 7 Corridor Existing Details …Red Maple Road….The section currently supports the operation of the Viva vehicles in mixed traffic...

(ac)					✓	Silver Linden Drive	EBL and WBT will operate at capacity or approach capacity in the PM peak hour.	None required.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required.	Moderately Significant	None required.	York Region	Status –completed H3 Design provides for BRT in mixed traffic instead of Rapidway lanes at the intersection.	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551)	No	EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: 2.2.1 Highway 7 Corridor Existing Details …Silver Linden Drive….The section currently supports the operation of the Viva vehicles in mixed traffic...
B2 cont'd (ad)					✓	Bayview Avenue Connection Ramp	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	[1] A ten second transit phase will be provided.	EBT will approach capacity in the AM peak hour.	[2] The implementation of a dual EB left turn and/or split phasing for pedestrians should be considered during detailed design phase.	Moderately Significant	[2] Evaluate option of implementing a dual eastbound left turn lane and/or review opportunity to provide split phasing for pedestrian.	York Region	Status –no action required The H3.1 segment from Yonge Street to Bayview Avenue has not yet started Detail Design. Preliminary Design called for this segment to operate BRT in mixed traffic. Turn lanes will be evaluated in Detail Design. Detailed Design has determined that BRT will operate in mixed traffic under Bayview Avenue[2]. Transit will transition to mixed traffic at a mid-block location east of Bayview, therefore this intersection will remain in its existing configuration. Therefore, no further action is required.	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551)	**No**	[2] EF (2012) Closed (2013)	2012 ACR: Condition numbering was added for clarity. Condition [1] was not reviewed. It is unclear how the assertion relates to the condition [2]. 2012 edit: through discussion with the Owner Engineer it was clarified that split phasing has been implemented and additional evidence provided (permanent traffic signal layout documentation: H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303_CXX_All) provided by the Owner Engineer supports the assertion of how the condition was addressed. ACR 2013: Owner Engineered confirmed that no changes were being undertaken for intersection.
(ae)					✓	South Park Drive/Chalmers Road	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	[2] A ten second transit phase will be provided.	E-W phase will operate at capacity during the PM peak hour. The EBL & WBT will operate at capacity.	[1] Pedestrian split phasing should be considered.	Moderately Significant	Monitoring required for pedestrian split phasing.[3]	York Region	Status – Complete [2011 ACR] Median station provides the opportunity for pedestrian split phasing, however, Region is still reviewing policy and impacts for split phasing pedestrian crossing.[1] Under stage 4 intersection construction staging, 2-stage pedestrian crossing operation along with	[1] INTERSECTION OPERATIONS STUDY – Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis, June 15, 2011(ID#7450) [1] Alternative Intersection Operations	Yes	[1] EF (2011) [1] EF (2012) [1] EF (2013)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7450) was found to support the assertions [1] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: 2012 ACR: Condition numbering was added for clarity. It is unclear how the assertion [3] relates to the condition and how the compliance document reference supports the assertion. The evidence

														protected only left turn phases on Highway 7 have been implemented.[1] Split phasing for pedestrian has been implemented and shown on Permanent Traffic Signals drawings.[1] The transition occurs west of the Chalmers/South Park station, therefore signal priority does not offer an advantage for bus transition. The transition operation has been managed through pavement markings and signage, including a flashing amber beacon in the WB direction. [2] [3] Since two stage pedestrian crossings (aka split phasing) have been implemented at this location, further monitoring is not required.	Analysis Meeting Minutes, July 7, 2011 (ID#7912) [1] Comparative Traffic Analysis – Dual Left Turn Lanes and Single Left Turn Lane, Apr 18, 2011. (ID#7190) [1]H3 Permanent Traffic Signals Layout IFC H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303 (ID9632) H3 Record Drawings, Sheets 102, 112 (ID#9499) [2]		[2] EFC (2013) Closed (2014)	provided (ID# 7190) indicates that, under the permanent design and Stage 4 of construction, it was assumed for the purposes of the duel left turn analysis that two-staged pedestrian crossings be used to cross Highway 7. 2012 edit: through discussion with the Owner Engineer it was clarified that split phasing has been implemented and additional evidence provided (permanent traffic signal layout documentation: H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303_CXX_All) provided by the Owner Engineer supports the assertion of how the condition was addressed. Bolding and underline was removed from monitoring condition as it is no longer applicable. 2013 Evidence found that supports assertion that [1] Pedestrian split phasing was included. Evidence of change found that no 10-second priority was needed [2]. Item [3] is ongoing. **2014: No review as Items [1-2] are closed and [3] is no longer applicable. Closed**
B2 cont'd (af)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation (cont'd)	Reduction in main street intersection capacities due to rapid transit operations (cont'd)			✓	Leslie Street	WBL, SBL, EBL, EBT & NBL will operate at capacity or approach capacity in the AM & PM peak hours. The N-S movements will require a minimum split of 49 s to serve pedestrian crossing	Improvements are not possible due to land/ grade constraints or would not improve operating conditions due to excessively high volumes. Minor remedial measures are not possible such as dual left turn lanes or signal modifications.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	Opportunities to reduce the minimum N-S split, such as a 2-stage pedestrian crossing, should be pursued as other critical phases	Moderately Significant	None required.	York Region	Status – complete [2011 ACR] Median station provides the opportunity for pedestrian split phasing, however, Region is still reviewing policy and impacts for split phasing pedestrian crossing.[1]	[1] INTERSECTION OPERATIONS STUDY – Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis, June 15, 2011(ID#7450)	No	[1] EF (2011) [1,2] EF (2012) **[3] EF (2013)**	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7450) was found to support the assertions [1] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: 2012 ACR: It is unclear how the assertion [2] regarding construction staging relates to an operational condition and how the

							times. Long-term conditions expect high vehicular volumes in all approaches. Additional road improvements are insignificant due to high traffic demands from Highway 404 and surrounding future development.			require the additional green time[1,2,3].				Under stage 4 intersection construction staging, 2-stage pedestrian crossing operation along with protected only left turn phases on Highway 7 have been implemented.[2] Split phasing for pedestrian has been implemented and shown on Permanent Traffic Signals drawings.[3]	[1] Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis Meeting Minutes, July 7, 2011 (ID#7912) [2] Comparative Traffic Analysis – Dual Left Turn Lanes and Single Left Turn Lane, Apr 18, 2011. (ID#7190) [3]H3 Permanent Traffic Signals Layout IFC H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303 (ID9632)		**Closed (2013)**	compliance document reference supports the assertion. The evidence provided (ID# 7190) indicates that, under the permanent design and Stage 4 of construction, it was assumed for the purposes of the duel left turn analysis that two-staged pedestrian crossings be used to cross Highway 7. 2012 edit: through discussion with the Owner Engineer it was clarified that split phasing has been implemented and additional evidence provided (permanent traffic signal layout documentation: H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303_CXX_All) provided by the Owner Engineer supports the assertion [1,2] of how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: numbering added for clarity. Evidence provided was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.
(ag)						✓	East Beaver Creek/ Commerce Valley Drive East	EBL & WBL will operate at capacity due to the protected-only phases. The reduction in east-west capacity is mainly attributed to the additional north-south green time required to accommodate pedestrians. Heavy volumes and proximity to the Highway 404	Improvements are not possible due to land/ grade constraints or would not improve operating conditions due to excessively high volumes. Minor remedial measures are not possible such as dual left turn lanes or signal modifications.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None expected	Significant	A two-stage pedestrian crossing should be considered at the Commerce Valley Drive intersection to reduce side street green time demands. [1,2,3]	York Region	Status – complete Median station provides the opportunity for pedestrian split phasing, however, Region is still reviewing policy and impacts for split phasing pedestrian crossing.[1] Under the stage 4 intersection construction staging, a 2-stage pedestrian crossing operation along with protected only left turn phases on Highway 7 have	[1] INTERSECTION OPERATIONS STUDY – Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis, June 15, 2011(ID#7450) [1] Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis Meeting Minutes, July 7, 2011 (ID#7912)	No	EF (2011) [2] EF (2012) [3] EF (2013) Closed (2013)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7450) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: 2012 ACR: It is unclear how the assertion [2] regarding construction staging relates to an operational condition and how the compliance document reference supports the assertion. The evidence provided (ID# 7190) indicates that, under the permanent design and Stage 4 of construction, it was assumed

							interchange result in capacity conditions with minimal improvement from minor remedial measures.							been implemented.[2] Split phasing for pedestrian has been implemented and shown on Permanent Traffic Signals drawings.[3]	[2] Comparative Traffic Analysis – Dual Left Turn Lanes and Single Left Turn Lane, Apr 18, 2011. (ID#7190) [3]H3 Permanent Traffic Signals Layout IFC H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303 (ID9632)			for the purposes of the duel left turn analysis that two-staged pedestrian crossings be used to cross Highway 7. 2012 edit: through discussion with the Owner Engineer it was clarified that split phasing has been implemented and additional evidence provided (permanent traffic signal layout documentation: H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303_CXX_All) provided by the Owner Engineer supports the assertion [2] of how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: numbering added for clarity. Evidence provided was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.
B2 cont'd (ah)					✓	Highway 404 N-E/W Ramp	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	The WB transit vehicles will be given a green indication in conjunction with the WB traffic [1]. A ten second EB transit phase will be provided [2]. The WBT will be permitted during this phase [3]. Upstream & stop bar detection of the transit vehicle will be provided to allow the controller with advance warning and confirmation that a transit vehicle requires the advance transit phase.[4]	Overall peak hour operations are not impacted. Transit delay between the two transition intersections is expected.	Should the resultant delays to transit vehicles be considered excessive, transit vehicle priority could be employed at both the transition intersections to advance the traffic signal display in anticipation of the arrival of the transit vehicle.	Moderately Significant	Review the need to provide transit vehicle priority.[5]	York Region	Status – no action required A single lane Rapidway with transit signal is proposed for the Highway 404 crossing. Report recommending single reversible direction lane under 404 currently under review by MTO and Region. The final design incorporates a separate transit-only signal with a waiting area to control the reversible operation on the transit lane under Highway 404. Therefore, transit signal priority is not required. Therefore, this requirement is no longer applicable.	Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (ID# 3881) Highway 404 Transit Operations Analysis, September 8, 2011 (ID#7804) H3 Permanent Traffic Signals Layout IFC H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303, Sheet (ID9632) Application for MTO Encroachment Permit filename	No	EF 2009 EF (2011) EFC (2013) Closed (2013)	2009 ACR:3881 Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (15-Oct-08) 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7804) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: Number revised for clarity. Evidence provided supports the change that transit signal priority is not required.

															H3-PMT-Q-ENV-030104 - MTO Encroachment Permit - Highway 404.zip – New Construction IFC H3-DWG-R-CIV-080405, Sheet 105 (ID#9607)		
B2 cont'd (ai)					✓	Highway 404 Interchange	Heavy volumes on off-ramps and through Highway 7 Corridor suggest major mitigative measures will be required in future.	Major mitigative measures should be considered in future.	Congestion within the interchange will remain.	None required.	Significant	Monitor queuing on off-ramps and on Highway 7 to assess need for improvements.[1] Monitoring required for active signal priority.[2]	York Region	Status **[1] – Completed Status [2] - completed** A single lane Rapidway with transit signal is proposed for the Highway 404 crossing. Report recommending single reversible direction lane under 404 currently under review by MTO and Region. MTO has approved the works within the Highway 404 area. No signal priority. {2} A monitoring program for traffic volumes will be prepared post-construction. [1] **[1] York Region continues to work closely the Ministry of Transportation Central Region to monitor, suggest and implement mitigative measures.**	Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing – Y2H3 4.10 (ID# 3881) Highway 404 Transit Operations Analysis, September 8, 2011 (ID#7804) MTO Encroachment Permit EC-2013-20T-322. To Construct and Maintain Traffic Signals at the Terminals of S-E/W Ramp and N-E/W Ramp of Hwy 404 and Regional Road 7 in Markham. September 25, 2013. (ID#9607) **[1] 6 Month Operation Report (DRAFT) Highway 404 and Highway 7, VIVANext**	No	EF 2009 EF (2011) [2] EFC (2013) Ops / Future (2014)	2009 ACR: 3881 Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (15-Oct-08) 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7804) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: Evidence found to support the change that [2] signal priority is not being undertaken. Item 2 is closed. **2014: No review as Item[1] is operational monitoring Suggest changing status to "future" Item 2 is closed.**

														Monitoring Plan, Technical Memorandum, May 2015 (ID# YORK-#6373429)			
B2 cont'd (aj)					✓	Highway 404 S-E/W Ramp	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	The EB transit vehicles will be given a green indication in conjunction with the EB traffic. A ten second WB transit phase will be provided. The EBT will be permitted during this phase. Upstream & stop bar detection of the transit vehicle will be provided to allow the controller with advance warning and confirmation that a transit vehicle requires the advance transit phase.	Overall peak hour operations are not impacted. Transit delay between the two transition intersections is expected.	Should the resultant delays to transit vehicles be considered excessive, transit vehicle priority could be employed at both the transition intersections to advance the traffic signal display in anticipation of the arrival of the transit vehicle.	Moderately Significant	Review the need to provide transit vehicle priority.	York Region	Status –no action required A single lane Rapidway with transit signal is proposed for the Highway 404 crossing. Report recommending single reversible direction lane under 404 currently under review by MTO and Region. It notes that this option does not impact off ramp queuing. The final design incorporates a separate transit-only signal with a waiting area to control the reversible operation on the transit lane under Highway 404. Therefore, transit signal priority is not required. Therefore, this requirement is no longer applicable.	Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (ID# 3881) Highway 404 Transit Operations Analysis, September 8, 2011(ID#7804) Application for MTO Encroachment Permit filename H3-PMT-Q-ENV-030104 - MTO Encroachment Permit - Highway 404.zip – New Construction IFC H3-DWG-R-CIV-080405, Sheet 106	No	EF 2009 EF (2011) **EFC (2013)** **Closed (2013)**	2009 ACR: 3881 Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (15-Oct-08) 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7804) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: Number revised for clarity. Evidence provided supports the change that transit signal priority is not required
B2 cont'd (ak)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation (cont'd)	Reduction in main street intersection capacities due to rapid transit operations (cont'd)			✓	Allstate Parkway/ East Valhalla	EBL, WBT & SBR will operate at or above capacity in the AM & PM peak hours due to heavy volumes generated from the high-density office area and future Seneca College. An extended advance phase is required, which impacts the E-W available green	Extended EB advance phase should be considered. [3] The implementation of a channelized SB right turn lane should be examined [4] as well as a dual EB left turn lane during the detailed design stage[5].	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required.	Moderately Significant	Review potential to provide a channelized right turn lane in the southbound direction [1] and a dual eastbound left turn lane.[2]	York Region	Status **[1,2] - completed** **Status [3] – completed** Report analyzing traffic signal operation in this area notes several right of way restrictions including the need for property purchase in order to provide for dual eastbound lanes. Property purchase for this option is currently under review by the Region. If additional ROW purchase is not possible in this area,	INTERSECTION OPERATIONS STUDY – Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis, June 15, 2011 (ID#7450)[2] Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis Meeting	Yes	[2] EF (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 3551) was found to support the assertion [2] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was not found to support the assertion [1] channelized right turn lane on how the condition was addressed. When asked, YC responded that a study on channelized right turn lanes

							time in the AM peak hour.							operation of a protected eastbound left turn lane phase for one eastbound left turn lane is recommended.[2] [1]Channelized right turn lane review is not required as York Region does not support by channelized right turn lane. **[1,2] York Region will continue to monitor operations and make adjustments to improve the Level of Service including considerations for a channelized southbound right turn and dual eastbound left turns.**	Minutes, July 7, 2011 (ID#7912)[2] [1] Email Regarding Right Turn Channelization from Lizuarte Simas. November 15, 2013. (ID#9642) **[1,2] Left Turn Signal Timing at Allstate Parkway (ID# YORK-#6373469)**		[1] EF (2013) Ops/ Future	may have been conducted during PE design, however they request that the referenced status and document be deleted and that the appropriate document reference will be provided in the future. As per this request, assertion [3] and compliance document reference was removed. 2013 ACR: the evidence provided was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. **2014: No review as Items [1-2] are closed and [3] is operational monitoring. Suggest changing status to "future"**
(al)					✓	Town Centre Boulevard (Town Centre Blvd. Alignment)	Transit vehicles are required to negotiate an EBR or NBL in the dedicated transit ROW.	EBR/NBL for transit, & WBT for general traffic has been permitted during a dedicated 10-second transit phase. The WBL will operate as protected-only in order to prohibit WBL vehicles from operating with the WBT volumes during the transit phase.	EBT will operate at capacity in the PM peak hour.	None required.	Significant	None required.	York Region	Status – Completed Signal phasing and timing is still to be developed. Design for this area is complete. A report was issued addressing the traffic signal phasing options at this location. Based on this report and feedback from the Region, the signalized intersection design was prepared.	110197-Rapidway Merge East of Town Centre (ID#9421) Refer to H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303-138-C03 (ID#9978)	**Yes**	**EF (2014)** **Closed (2014)**	**2014: The evidence provided supports the assertion that the design was completed. No evidence of feedback from the Region was provided however, it is the belief of the OE that no written feedback was received.**
(am)					✓	Clegg Road	WBT, SBL, EBL & NBL will approach capacity in AM/PM peak hour.	None required.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required.	Significant	None required.	York Region	Status -No action required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**

B2 cont'd (an)					✓	Helen Avenue/ future North-South Connection Road	Transit vehicles are required to enter/exit the dedicated median transitway lanes.	An exclusive transit only phase will be provided.	Under 2021 Considerations, EBL & SBL will approach capacity in the AM/PM peak hour.	None required.	Significant	None required.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(ao)					✓	Helen Avenue (Kennedy Road)	Transit vehicles are required to negotiate an EBL or SBR in the dedicated transit ROW. Under 2021 Considerations, heavy volumes generated from Markham Centre West and GO Unionville Station will result in capacity constraints on NBL, SBT & WBL during AM/PM peak hour.	A transit phase of 10 s has been incorporated into the signal timings to operate in conjunction with the EBL & EBT movements. Under 2021 Considerations, a dual northbound left and channelized right turn should be considered.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required.	Significant	Follow-up monitoring during full buildout conditions to examine the possibility of implementing a dual northbound left and channelized eastbound right turn lane.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(ap)					✓	Avoca Drive(Kennedy Road)	Implementation of RT will reduce the intersection capacity. The proposed Markham Centre West developments at this intersection show heavy north-south volumes on Kennedy Road. WBL, NBL & EBL will approach capacity in AM/PM peak hour.	NBL & SBL will operate as protected left phases. Io reduce the northbound advance phase, improvements such as implementing a dual northbound left turn lane should be considered in the detailed design phase.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required	Significant	Follow-up monitoring to assess capacity issues during the PM peak hour with NB/SB through movements and the NB left.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**

B2 cont'd (aq)					✓	Kennedy Road	Transit vehicles are required to negotiate a NBR or WBL in the dedicated transit ROW.	A transit phase of 10 s has been incorporated into the signal timings to operate in conjunction with the WBT movements.	None expected.	A 2-stage pedestrian crossing should be considered during detailed design phase to meet the minimum split requirements in both directions.	Moderately significant	A 2-stage pedestrian crossing should be considered during detailed design phase.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(ar)					✓	Bullock Drive/ Commercial Access	EBL will operate at capacity as a protected left turn phase in PM peak hour.	None required	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required	Moderately significant	None required	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(as)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation (cont'd)	Reduction in main street intersection capacities due to rapid transit operations (cont'd)			✓	McCowan Road	WBL & NBL will operate above capacity.	None required initially. Based on future operations, improvements to the westbound left and northbound left may be required to improve operations at the intersections during the AM peak hour. To improve operating conditions, a two-stage pedestrian crossing should be investigated in both directions during the detailed design stage.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required	Significant	Investigated the need to provide a two-stage pedestrian crossing in both directions during the detailed design stage. Review special needs for the westbound left and northbound left during the AM peak hour.	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(at)					✓	Grandview Boulevard / Galsworthy Drive	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	A ten second transit phase will be provided.	The intersection is expected to operate at an acceptable LOS.	None required	Positive Effect	None required.	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
B2 cont'd (au)					✓	Main Street Markham	E-W main phase is reduced significantly due to the pedestrian crossing time requirements to cross Highway 7.	WBL will operate at capacity in the AM peak hour and WBL & NBL will approach capacity in the PM peak hour.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required	Significant	None required	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**

(av)					✓	Wooten Way	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	A ten second transit phase will be provided.	The intersection is expected to operate at an acceptable LOS.	None required	Positive Effect	None required.	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(aw)					✓	Ninth Line	Under 2021 considerations, EBL, SBT, NBL, NBT & WBT will approach capacity or operate at capacity in the AM/PM peak hour.	None required	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required	Significant	None required	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(ax)					✓	Bur Oak Avenue	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation in the initial phase.	EBL transit and general traffic will operate together. Similarly, SB transit and general traffic will operate together. WBR transit vehicles will operate in conjunction with the SB phase.	The intersection is expected to operate without any capacity constraints.	None required	Positive Effect	None required.	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(ay)					✓	Future Markham By-Pass Extension	Under 2021 considerations, SBL will operate at capacity in the AM/PM peak hours.	Exclusive right turn lanes in all approaches should be considered in detailed design phase.	Intersection will continue to operate at capacity.	None required	Significant	Monitoring required for Exclusive right turn lanes.	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(az)					✓	Reesor Road	Requirement for transit to transition to mixed-traffic complicates the intersection operation.	A ten second transit phase will be provided for EB transit vehicle in conjunction with the WB through general traffic.	The intersection will not be significantly impacted.	None required	Insignificant	None required.	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(ba)		Need to divert from main street at various locations, as required for the preferred alignment.			✓	▪ TTC BRT Entrance/ Steeles Ave. ▪ IBM Entrance/ Town Centre Blvd.	New traffic signal will be required to facilitate a safe transit movement among the general traffic.	New traffic signal is introduced.	None expected.	None Expected	Insignificant	None required.	York Region	Status –completed IBM Entrance / Town Centre Blvd - A Cedarland Alignment Modification Report has been prepared (see Appendix 4 for monitoring) and the requirement for a new traffic signal remains.	Cedarland Alignment Modification Report –June 2009. (ID# 3018)	No	EF 2009 EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2009 ACR: Section 5.1 of new report Final Report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report provided. This Table should be updated to reflect final document. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 3018) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.

B2 cont'd (bb)		Potential conflict at transition points between mixed-traffic operations and median transitway operations			✓	▪ Proposed signalized Beechwood Cemetery Entrance SB	Rapid transit may have to wait for opportunity to merge with the general through traffic resulting in service delay. New traffic signal will be required to facilitate a safe transit movement among the general traffic.	New traffic signal is introduced to accommodate transit movements. Also, this new intersection provides a better access for the cemetery.	None expected.	None Expected	Positive	None required.	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(bc)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation (cont'd)	Critical left turn storage lengths			✓	Westbound dual left at Famous Avenue	High left turn volumes at this cinema's only access will deteriorate the intersection operation.	The dual left turn storage lengths have been maximized.	Due to the constraint of the intersection spacing (306 m), the maximized left turn storage lengths still cannot provide the required capacity. The left turn vehicles may spill out onto the adjacent through lane blocking the through traffic.	None Expected	Moderately Significant	None	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**
(bd)					✓	Eastbound and Westbound at Millway Avenue	High left turn volumes resulted from future Vaughan Corporate Centre development will deteriorate the intersection operation.	The left turn storage lengths have been maximized.	Due to the constraint of the intersection spacing (260 m in EB; 172 m in WB) and platform locations, the maximized left turn storage lengths still cannot provide the required capacity. The left turn vehicles may spill out onto the adjacent through lane blocking the through traffic.	None Expected	Moderately Significant	None	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to "Closed" colour to better indicate review status**

B2 cont'd (be)					✓	Eastbound and Westbound left at Chalmers Road/ South Park Drive	High left turn volumes resulted from the business park will deteriorate the intersection operation.	The left turn storage lengths have been maximized.	Due to the constraint of the intersection spacing (220m in WB), the maximized left turn storage lengths still cannot provide the required capacity. The left turn vehicles may spill out onto the adjacent through lane blocking the through traffic.	None Expected	Moderately Significant	None	York Region	Status -future		No	Closed (2014)	**2014:There is no commitment to review. Suggest change status to reflect this.**
(bf)					✓	Westbound left at Saddlecreek Drive	High left turn volumes resulted from new development will deteriorate the intersection operation.	The left turn storage lengths have been maximized.	Due to the constraint of the intersection spacing (250 m), the maximized left turn storage lengths still cannot provide the required capacity. The left turn vehicles may spill out onto the adjacent through lane blocking the through traffic.	None Expected	Moderately Significant	None	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**

(bf)					✓	Eastbound and Westbound left at Times Avenue/ Valleymede Drive	High left turn volumes resulted from the business park will deteriorate the intersection operation.	The left turn storage lengths have been maximized.	Due to the constraint of the intersection spacing (250 m in EB; 405 m in WB) and the platform location, the maximized left turn storage lengths still cannot provide the required capacity. The left turn vehicles may spill out onto the adjacent through lane blocking the through traffic.	None Expected	Moderately Significant	None	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
B2 cont'd (bg)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation (cont'd)	Critical left turn storage lengths (cont'd)			✓	Northbound left on Jane Street at Highway 407 north ramp	High left turn volumes accessing the Highway 407 will deteriorate the intersection operation.	The left turn storage length has been maximized.	Due to the constraint of the intersection spacing (230 m), the maximized left turn storage lengths still cannot provide the required capacity. The left turn vehicles may spill out onto the adjacent through lane blocking the through traffic.	None Expected	Moderately Significant	None	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**

(bh)					✓	Eastbound and Northbound left at Kennedy Road and Helen Avenue	High left turn volumes accessing the GO Unionville Station will deteriorate the intersection operation.	The eastbound left turn storage length has been maximized and the northbound left turn storage length remains as existing.	Due to the constraint of the intersection spacing (245 m in EB), the maximized left turn storage lengths still cannot provide the required capacity. The left turn vehicles may spill out onto the adjacent through lane blocking the through traffic.	None Expected	Moderately Significant	None	York Region	Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
B2 cont'd (bi)		Widening or construction of new structures resulting in major temporary disruption to highway or railway traffic during construction		✓		▪ Hwy 427 ▪ CP Mactier ▪ Hwy 400 ▪ McMillian Yard ▪ Hwy 407/ Jane St. ▪ CN Halton ▪ CN Bradford ▪ Hwy 407/ Bathurst St. ▪ Yonge St. ▪ CN Bala ▪ Future Cedar Ave. ▪ Bayview Ave. ▪ Hwy 404 ▪ CP	Construction staging at busy highway interchanges, such as at Hwy 404, could cause additional delay to general traffic. Temporary relocation of railway lines could cause delay to railway traffic.	Mitigation in the form of traffic accommodation plans and temporary works will be developed for all structures where disruption is unavoidable [1]. Mixed traffic operation is introduced in the area of CP Mactier, CN Halton, CN Bradford, Hwy 407/ Bathurst St., Bayview Ave., CN Bala, Hwy 404 and CP Havelock to avoid widening of structures. Lane reduction is used at Hwy 400 to minimize the widening of the structure. The widening of the rest of the structures is considered unavoidable.	Reduction in transit and general traffic operation speed. Some delays likely during construction period.	None	Moderately significant	Monitor traffic operation to confirm whether dedicated transit lanes are required in the future [2].	York Region	Status **[1] completed** **Status [2] – ongoing** H3 PE Design provides for BRT in mixed traffic instead of dedicated Rapidway lanes between Yonge Street Connection Ramp and Bayview Avenue. Traffic management concepts and plans have been developed. Measures to be further developed in the Detail Design phase. Highway 404 area is included in the H3 Detail Design work. A custom MTO Traffic Impacts During Construction Study[1] was prepared to present the traffic impacts during construction. A Highway 404 Transit Operations Analysis[2] was completed to assess the benefit/ disbenefit of Viva operating in mixed traffic	Constructability and Traffic Staging Report, May 3, 2010. (ID#5878) [1] Traffic Impacts During Construction Study Report – MTO Section, April 12, 2012.(ID#8456) [2] Highway 404 Transit Operation Analysis, Oct 08, 2011.(ID#7906)	Yes	[1] EF 2010 [1] EF	2009 ACR: NSE It was not clear that "Traffic management plans have been developed". [1] Measures to mitigate construction effects on residences, businesses, road traffic and pedestrians mentioned in Y2H3 Draft Constructability / Construction Staging Report (undated but provided 3-Oct-08) include general description of measures to mitigate construction effects on residences, businesses, road traffic and pedestrians [1] ACR 2010 - Traffic management plans are detailed in 5878 and include five stages of construction and attached schematic drawings that show how the traffic can be controlled. [1] 2012 ACR: Numbering was added for clarity. The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions

						Haveloc k								under Highway 404 or in a single reversible lane operation. [2013 clarification] The report resulted in early implementation of a single reversible dedicated transit lane. Monitoring of traffic operations will be required in the future to confirm whether an additional dedicated transit lane is necessary. **[2] York Region Traffic Signal Operations staff continues to monitor and undertakes a signal coordination review along this corridor every 2-3 years.**	**Traffic Signals and Corridor Travel Times Monitoring Mandate (ID# YORK-#6373090)**		(2012) Ops / Future **[2] EF (2015)** **Closed (2015)**	[1] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. It was unclear how assertion [2] was addressed when this is believed to be operational monitoring. The Status column should be reviewed to clarify 2013 ACR: clarification was provided for 2012 Unclear review. This changed the review status for [2]. No review was undertaken for 2013. Item remains ongoing. 2014: Item [1] was closed.in 2012. Item [2] is operational monitoring. Suggest that the status be changed to "Future" **ACR 2015: Evidence provided (6373090) support the assertion that York Region will undertake traffic monitoring. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake monitoring at intervals stated as traffic monitoring is part of its mandate. This item is closed.**

B2 cont'd (bj)		Access to minor side streets and properties along the Highway 7 Corridor transit routes	✓	✓	✓	Entire Corridor	Median transitway will eliminate random left turns into minor side streets and properties thereby requiring an alternative access route	In many cases, alternative access can be obtained to a site via another site access or an adjacent roadway with signalized access to Highway 7. The travel patterns for the major traffic generators will be changed. U-turns provided at major intersections for safe manoeuvres into side streets and to properties. Random permissive left turns eliminated thus increasing safety. Develop traffic management plans for construction. [1]	Conflict with U-turns and Right may decrease safety.	None necessary	Moderately significant	Monitor traffic [2] and prohibit Right Turns On Red movements from the side street at these locations if necessary [3]	York Region	Status **[1] – completed** **Status [2,3] – completed** Traffic management concepts and plans have been developed. [1] Measures to be further developed in the Detail Design phase. [1] [2011 ACR]Consideration will be given in Detail Design to prohibiting side street Right Turn on Red to mitigate potential conflict with mainline U-Turn vehicles. Mainline U-Turn traffic will have a separate signal phase to facilitate movement. [3] The Region indicated that Right Turn on Red prohibition is not required on side street. Side street traffic should follow rules of the road for right turning on red and proceed with the movement only when safe to do so. [3] A Transit Priority Measures Report was completed which includes analysis on U-turns and right turns on red.[1] As well, the permanent signal drawings show the U-turn permitted sign and do not have any right turn on red restrictions. [1, 3] **[2,3] York Region's goal is to reduce the number and severity of collisions that happen on Regional roads. The safety of all**	Constructability and Traffic Staging Report, May 3, 2010. (ID#5878) [3] ITS/ Electrical Taskforce Minutes of Meeting ELE_ITS-047 Oct 21, 2011. (ID#8947) [1] Transit Priority Measures Report, March 15, 2012 (ID#8371) [3] H3 Permanent Traffic Signals IFC Drawings H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303 (ID#9632) **[2,3] York Region Standard Practice, Monitor Accidents, Traffic Safety Review of Pedestrian and RTOR; and 2015**	**Yes**	EF 2010 [3] EF (2012) **[1] EF (2014)** **Ops /**	2009 ACR: NSE It was not clear that "Traffic management plans have been developed". Measures to mitigate construction effects on residences, businesses, road traffic and pedestrians mentioned in Y2H3 Draft Constructability / Construction Staging Report (undated but provided 3-Oct-08) including general description of measures to mitigate construction effects on residences, businesses, road traffic and pedestrians 2010 ACR: - Traffic management plans are detailed in 5878 and include five stages of construction and attached schematic drawings that show how the traffic can be controlled. 2012 ACR: Numbering was added for clarity. The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions [3] on how the condition was addressed. The evidence provided (ID# 8947) indicates that RTOR is generally permitted and YR is to let the ITS/Electrical Taskforce know which intersections do not need it. 2014: Evidence provided is for U-turns. However, the condition is *Develop traffic management plans for construction*. [1]. Evidence for this has been provided elsewhere in this

														Regional roads and intersections is appraised yearly. Based on the results, York Region can see which roads and intersections can be improved. Refer to http://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/transportation/yr/traffic/trafficsafetyprogram.	**Annual Traffic Safety Report (ID# YORK-#6373581)**		**Future (2014)** **EF (2015)** **Closed (2015)**	table. Item [1] is closed Items [2] and [3] are monitoring of traffic and actions if needed. Suggest the status be changed to "future". **Evidence provided (6373581) support the assertion that York Region will undertake traffic monitoring. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake monitoring at intervals stated as traffic monitoring is part of its mandate. This item is closed.**
B2 cont'd (bk)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation (cont'd)	U-turn movements and the corresponding side street right-turn-on-red (RTOR) movements			✓	▪ Hwy 7/ Helen St.; ▪ Hwy 7/Town Centre Blvd.; ▪ Town Centre Blvd/ Cedarland Dr.; ▪ Kennedy Rd./ Avoca Dr.;	The permitted U-turn movements at these locations may cause conflicts with RTOR movements.	Follow-up monitoring should be undertaken to review the interaction between the U-turn movement and any opposing cross-street RTOR movement [1]. A RTOR prohibition may need to be enacted to reduce conflicts at these intersections [2].	None Expected	None Expected	Moderately Significant	Further monitoring should be undertaken to ensure the conflicts been reduced [1].	York Region	Status **[1] – completed** **Status [2] – completed** [2011 ACR]Region is still evaluating the option of prohibiting side street Right Turn on Red to mitigate potential conflict with mainline U-Turn vehicles. Mainline U-Turn traffic will have a separate signal phase to facilitate movement. The Region indicated that Right Turn on Red	[1]ITS/ Electrical Taskforce Minutes of Meeting ELE_ITS-047 Oct 21, 2011. (ID#)	**Yes**	[1] EF (2012)	2012 ACR: Numbering was added for clarity. The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions [1] on how the condition was addressed. The evidence provided (ID# 8947) indicates that RTOR is generally permitted and YR is to let the ITS/Electrical Taskforce know which intersections do not need it. 2014: Item [1] was closed in 2012. Item 2 is operational monitoring. Suggest status be

						▪ Hwy 7/ Robinson St./ St. Patrick School Entrance; ▪ Hwy 7/ Grandview/ Galsworthy Dr.; ▪ Hwy 7/ McCowan Rd.; ▪ Hwy 7/ Laidlaw Blvd./Conservation; ▪ Hwy 7/ Wooten Way; ▪ Hwy 7/ Ninth Line								prohibition is not required on side street[1]. Side street traffic should follow rules of the road for right turning on red and proceed with the movement only when safe to do so. **[2] York Region's goal is to reduce the number and severity of collisions that happen on Regional roads. The safety of all Regional roads and intersections is appraised yearly. Based on the results, York Region can see which roads and intersections can be improved. Refer to http://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/transportation/yr/traffic/trafficsafetyprogram.**	**[2] York Region Standard Practice, Monitor Accidents, Traffic Safety Review of Pedestrian and RTOR; and 2015 Annual Traffic Safety Report (ID# YORK-#6373581)**		EF (2015) Closed	changed to "future" **Evidence provided (6373581) support the assertion that York Region will undertake traffic monitoring. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake monitoring at intervals stated as traffic monitoring is part of its mandate. This item is closed.**
(bl)		Potential for Traffic Infiltration			✓	▪ Monshee n Dr. Neighbo ur-hood; ▪ Willis Rd./ Chancell or Dr.; ▪ Westmin ster Dr.; ▪ Beverley Glen Blvd; ▪ South Park Dr/Com merce Valley Dr. E & W; ▪ Kennedy	In many neighbourhoods, traffic infiltration has already been occurring to circumvent Highway 7. With future constraints placed on Highway 7, it may prove more beneficial for traffic to utilize these local roadways.	Future traffic volumes through these neighbourhoods should be monitored before [1] and after [2] the implementation of the preferred transitway alternative to determine if additional measures are required to reduce traffic infiltration.	Infiltration may still require mitigation	Measures to reduce traffic infiltration could be implemented.	Insignificant	None	York Region	Status **[1] – completed** **Status [2] – ongoing** The Traffic Study for the corridor between Bayview Avenue and Kennedy Rd. in Section 5.1 notes that recent turning counts provided by the Region were used as part of the modelling of traffic signal impacts both during construction and with the start of operations. These represent "before" counts. Similar "before" data will be used for the Detail Design portion of the H3 segment between Yonge Street and Bayview Ave.	INTERSECTION OPERATIONS STUDY – Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis, June 15, 2011 (ID #7450) TRAFFIC IMPACTS DURING CONSTRUCTION STUDY REPORT, 2011-October-20 (refer to Section 3.2 and Exhibit 3.3 for January 2011 traffic counts) (Y-	Yes	EF (2011) **EF (2014)** **Future / Ops**	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7450) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. 2014: It is unclear how "Similar "before" data will be used for the Detail Design portion of the H3 segment between Yonge Street and Bayview Ave. Subsequently the description was revised and additional documents H3 Detail Design INTERSECTION OPERATIONS STUDY – Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis provided that support the assertion regarding pre-implementation monitoring (Item[1]). This item

						Rd. from Avoca Dr. to Swanse a Rd.								Turning movement counts for all intersections immediately prior to the start of construction were provided by York Region and form the baseline pre-construction condition. Monitoring of future traffic volumes is a future post-construction activity. **[2] South Park Drive/Commerce Valley Drive E&W are the only intersections listed that are in the H3 segment. Analysis of post-implementation conditions is ongoing.**	2014-008)			is closed. **Item [2] post-implementation monitoring is future.** **2015 ACR: Comment noted. As the segment transitions from DB to O/M,** consider **reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly"**
B2 cont'd (bm)	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation (cont'd)	Pedestrian Crossings			✓	▪ Vaughan Valley Blvd./ Roybridg e Gate; ▪ Hwy 427; ▪ Jane St./ Hwy 7; ▪ Creditsto ne Rd.; ▪ Keele St.; ▪ Islington Ave.; ▪ Aberdee n Ave./ Marycroft Ave.; ▪ Worth Blvd./ Flamingo Rd./ Bathurst St.; ▪ South Park/ Chalmer s Rd.;	Due to the width of the main street at intersection, pedestrians may not be able to cross the intersection in one signal phase based on the standard pedestrian crossing times of 7 seconds.	Transitway median facilities generally provide a pedestrian refuge at mid-crossing.	These intersections may require two-stage crossing in the future to accommodate heavy main street traffic.	The decision to implement these special provisions should be deferred until post-operation conditions are monitored and the need is identified	Moderately Significant	Monitoring is required to determine if the implementation of two-stage is a necessity.[1]	York Region	Status - completed Median station provides the opportunity for pedestrian split phasing. This option is currently being evaluated as part of Detail Design.[1] Under the stage 4 intersection construction staging, a 2-stage pedestrian crossing operation along with protected only left turn phases on Highway 7 have been implemented.[2] Two stage crossings have been provided at all intersections applicable to this segment (South Park/Chalmers, Leslie, Commerce Valley E/East Beaver Creek and Town Centre Blvd) with a refuge area in the median. No further monitoring is	[1] INTERSECTION OPERATIONS STUDY – Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis, June 15, 2011(ID#7450) [1] Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis Meeting Minutes, July 7, 2011 (ID#7912) [2] Comparative Traffic Analysis – Dual Left Turn Lanes and Single Left Turn Lane, Apr 18, 2011. (ID#7190) [2]H3 Permanent	**Yes**	EF (2011) [1] EF (2012)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7450, 7912) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: Numbering added for clarity. The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support assertion [1] regarding two-stage crossing (ID# 7190) indicates that, under the permanent design and Stage 4 of construction, it was assumed for the purposes of the duel left turn analysis that two-staged pedestrian crossings be used to cross Highway 7. 2012 edit: additional evidence provided by the Owner Engineer (Permanent Traffic Signals Layout Drawing H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303_CXX_All) and was found to support the assertion [3] on how the condition was

						▪ Leslie St.; ▪ Commerce Valley Dr. E./ E. Beaver Creek; ▪ Town Centre Blvd./ Hwy 7; ▪ Kennedy Rd. / Avoca Dr. ▪ Kennedy Rd./ Hwy 7; ▪ McCowan Rd.								required.	Traffic Signals Layout IFC H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303 – Sheets 105, 113, 115, 138 (ID# 9632) [1,2] H3 Early Handover Operational Fine Tuning Report (Task 11.02.95), 2013-October 7. (ID#9615)		[1] ENF (2013) [2] EF (2013) [1,2] EF (2014) Closed (2014)	addressed. This reference should be added to the Compliance Document Reference column. 2013 ACR: Numbering added for clarity. Evidence provided was found to support the assertion [2] on how the condition was addressed. Evidence (ID#9615) for assertion [1] was not provided in the reference documents. [1,2] 2014: Evidence provided is the noted report These items are closed. .

B3	Maintain a high level of public safety and security in corridor	Access for emergency vehicles	✓	✓	✓	Highway 7, Jane Street, Town Centre Boulevard, Kennedy Road, future Burr Oak Avenue	Incorporation of median and construction will have adverse effects on Emergency Response Services (ERS) access and time	Provided U-Turns at intersections [1]. Meet with emergency representatives [2]. Median breaks to be provided to allow access to Emergency Response Vehicles only [3].	Some risk may remain as access type will change after implementation of mitigation	Address during detail design in conjunction with ERS	Insignificant	Obtain feedback from ERS [4]	York Region	Status- **[1-3] – completed** **Status [4] – ongoing** [2] A strategy to provide access for EMS to properties and developments along the H3 segment was discussed with EMS on April 14, 2009. H3 Detailed Design is substantially complete and median breaks to allow access to Emergency Response Vehicles are shown on IFC Drawings and H3 Record Drawings [3]. Feedback will be obtained from ERS on the effectiveness of the median breaks following implementation [4]. **[4] York Region continues to collaborate with Emergency Response Services on various ongoing VivaNext projects and therefore maintains the same level of communication with ERS which was consistent throughout the design and construction of H3. ERS is free to continue to provide feedback/complications as they arise. There has been no complications noted since operation.**	[2] Memo - Emergency Services Access - Median Crossover Provisions (ID # 4216) [3] H3 Detailed Design New Construction IFC Plans H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403 (ID#9631) [3] H3 Record Drawings (ID#9499) **[4] Email from M. Hum (YRRTC) regarding EMS input, November 5, 2015 (ID# YORK-#6375292)**	**Yes**	[2] EF 2009 [3] EF (2013) [4] EF (2014) Future / Ops (2014)	2009 ACR: 4216 – Memo dated 14-Apr-09 2013 ACR: numbering added and altered for clarity. Evidence found in ID9631 that there are median breaks, such as 080403-405 maintenance area. Item 4 remain ongoing Evidence (ID#9499) was not provided in the reference documents. 2014: Items [1-3] were closed in 2013. No evidence was provided that Item 4- Obtain feedback from ERS has been met. ID 4216 requests information from EMS. OE confirmed that this feedback will be obtained in the future Item 4 is to be done during operations. Suggest that status be changed to future. **2015 ACR: Comment noted.**

B4 (a)	Minimize adverse noise and vibration effects	Noise effect for BRT and LRT due to widening of Highway 7 Corridor			✓	Entire corridor in proximity of residential uses	Combined effect of median transitway operation and general traffic on the widened Highway 7 Corridor roadways may result in increased noise levels for residents.	Modeling of future traffic activities indicated that expected noise increases in all, but one road segment, will not exceed the 5dB threshold at which mitigation measures are required. BRT and LRT sound level increases are expected to be marginal to none. However, at the future Markham Centre location, the BRT and LRT are predicted to exceed the background noise levels by as much as 8 dBA.	Transitway noise above likely background levels in Civic Mall at future Markham Centre location.	Depending on lower floor building uses, may require noise screening along transitway and/or noise control features in residential design along Civic Mall segment in Markham Centre area.	Insignificant	Undertake confirmation monitoring to verify compliance once the transitway is fully operational. In the event that the future noise level warrants mitigation, appropriate noise reduction measures will be put in place.	York Region	Status -future		No	Ops / Future (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status** **<u>2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly</u>"**
(b)		Vibration effect for BRT and LRT due to widening of Highway 7 Corridor			✓	Entire corridor in proximity of residential uses	Combined effect of median transitway operation and general traffic on the widened Highway 7 Corridor roadways may result in increased vibration levels for residents.	Modeling of future traffic activities indicated that expected vibration increases will not exceed the protocol limit of 0.1 mm/sec for LRT. BRT vibration levels are expected to be negligible.	None expected	None necessary	Negligible	Undertake confirmation monitoring to verify compliance once the transitway is fully operational.	York Region	Status -future		No	Ops / Future (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status** **<u>2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly</u>"**
B5 (a)	Minimize adverse effects on cultural resources	Displacement of Built Heritage Features (BHF)	✓	✓	✓	Brown's Corners United Church (Markham)	Widened roadway could displace some of the cemetery's graves, unless alignment is modified.	Alignment is shifted up to 5.5 m to the south	Displacement of cemetery property is completely avoided.	None required	Negligible	None required.	York Region	Status - No Action Required.		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(b)		Displacement of Cultural Landscape Units (CLU)	✓	✓	✓	None Expected	None Expected	None required	None expected	None necessary	Positive	None required	York Region	Status –No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**

B5 cont'd (c)	Minimize adverse effects on cultural resources (cont'd)	Disruption of Built Heritage Features (BHF)		✓		Residences in Vaughan: ▪ 5298 Hwy 7 (#2 CLU); ▪ 5263 Hwy 7 (#2 CLU); ▪ 1423, 1445, 1453 & 1139 Centre Street (1453 may have been demolished since survey)(#8 BHF;	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment around the cultural heritage features.	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 Segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(d)						Residences in Markham: ▪ 4592 Hwy 7; ▪ 5429 Hwy 7 (#10 BHF); ▪ 6881 Hwy 7 (#12 BHF); ▪ 7170 Hwy 7 (#13 BHF); ▪ 7265 Hwy 7 (#14 BHF); ▪ 7482	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment around the cultural heritage features.	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status- No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**

						Hwy 7 (#15 BHF).											
B5 cont'd (e)				✓		Brown's Corners United Church (Markham)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment around the cultural heritage features.	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(f)		Disruption of Built Heritage Features (BHF) (cont'd)		✓		Sabiston house (Markham) - 5110 Hwy 7 in shopping plaza (Markham) (#9 BHF)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment around the cultural heritage features.	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(g)				✓		Individual designated building within Markham HCD now Tim Hortons (#11 BHF)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment around the cultural heritage features.	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(h)				✓		Historic Plaque: Reesor Cairn (Markham)(#16 BHF)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment around the cultural heritage features.	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**

(i)		Disruption of Cultural Landscape Units (CLU)		✓		Farm complex in Vaughan: 6701 Hwy 7 (#1 CLU)	There is potential encroachment through widening to the CLU.	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
B5 cont'd (j)	Minimize adverse effects on cultural resources (cont'd)	Disruption of Cultural Landscape Units (CLU) (cont'd)		✓		Residences in Vaughan: 4976, 4908, 4902 & 4855 Hwy 7 (#2 CLU)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment to the cultural heritage features in the Cultural Landscape – former centre of settlement. (Brownsville)	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(k)				✓		Residences in Vaughan: ▪ 2060, 2063, 1985 & 1929 Hwy 7 (#3 – #6 BHF) ▪ Southeast of Hwy 7 & GO Bradford (no street address)(#7 BHF) ▪ GO Bradford railway overpass	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment around the cultural heritage features.	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**

(l)				✓		Farm complex in Vaughan: a) Stong Farm in York U. – 3105 Steeles Avenue (#6 CLU)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment to the cultural landscape feature	Complete photo documentation of site context prior to construction.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
B5 cont'd (m)				✓		Farm complex in Markham: ▪ 7996 Helen Avenue (#6 CLU)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment to the cultural landscape feature	Complete photo documentation of site context prior to construction.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(n)				✓		Centre of settlement: ▪ Markham Village Heritage Conservation District designated under Part V OHA (#11 CLU)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment to the cultural landscape feature	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**

(o)				✓		Elmwood Cemetery (Markham)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment to the cultural landscape feature	Transitway will operate in mixed traffic to avoid widening adjacent to the cemetery.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(p)				✓		St. Andrews Cemetery (Markham)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment to the cultural landscape feature	Transitway will operate in mixed traffic to avoid widening adjacent to the cemetery.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
B5 cont'd (q)	Minimize adverse effects on cultural resources (cont'd)	Disruption of Cultural Landscape Units (CLU) (cont'd)		✓		Farm complex in Markham: ▪ 6937 Hwy 7 (#12 CLU) ▪ 7323 Hwy. 7 (Likely demolished)(#13 CLU)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment to the cultural landscape feature	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(r)				✓		Locust Hill – historical centre of settlement (#15 CLU)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment to the cultural landscape feature	Transitway development will not extend eastward beyond Reesor Road. Any rapid transit through Locust Hill to Pickering will operate in mixed traffic.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status –No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**

(s)				✓		At grade historic railway corridor: ▪ CP Havelock rail line (#16 CLU)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment to the cultural landscape feature	Transitway development will not extend eastward beyond Reesor Road. Any rapid transit through Locust Hill to Pickering will operate in mixed traffic.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(t)				✓		Roadscape: ▪ Reesor Road landscape north side. (#14 CLU)	The potential introduction of rapid transit operation may cause changes in visual, audible and atmospheric environment to the cultural landscape feature	None required – transitway will be integrated with existing streetscape and road traffic operations.	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
B5 cont'd (u)		Possible impacts to areas with potential for identification of archaeological sites	✓			Entire Corridor	There is potential for identification of archaeological sites within the project impact area.	Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment has been conducted. Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment will be performed in detailed design: field survey in accordance with Ministry of Culture Stage 1-3 Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines to identify any sites that may be present within the proposed impact area. [1] If areas of further archaeological concern are identified during Stage 2 assessment, such areas must be avoided until any additional work required by the Ministry of Culture has been completed. Mitigation options, including avoidance, protection, or salvage excavation must be determined on a site-by-site basis.	Archaeological sites may be identified during the course of Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment. In the event that deeply buried archaeological remains are encountered during construction activities, the office of the Regulatory and Operations Group, Ministry of Culture should be notified immediately. In the event that human remains are encountered during	[3] Needs for further mitigation, possibly including Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment (test excavation) and Stage 4 Archaeological Assessment (further mitigative work, including mitigative excavation), must be determined following Stage 2 Archaeological	Negligible for stage 1 Archaeological Assessment	No requirement for monitoring has been identified as a result of Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment. Monitoring may be required, depending on the result of Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment.	York Region	Status – completed [1] A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment was undertaken for the H3 segment and concluded that at the historic Brown's Corners Cemetery, a Cemetery Investigation was to be undertaken in the Highway 7 ROW in front of the cemetery. The Stage 2 Assessment also concluded that no additional archaeological assessment is required for the remainder of the study corridor and these areas can be considered clear of further archaeological concern. The Cemetery Investigation at Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery found that all lands in the public	[1] Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detailed Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario, Revision 1(ID#7109) [2] Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance into the	No	[1-3] EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7109, 7108, 7535) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.

								If no potentially significant archaeological sites are identified during Stage 2, it will be recommended to the Ministry of Culture that the areas assessed be considered free of further archaeological concern. [2]	construction, both the Ministry of Culture and the Registrar or Deputy Registrar of the Cemeteries Regulation Unit, Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations should be notified immediately.	Assessment, if archaeological resources are identified during survey.				Highway 7 ROW in front of the Brown's Corners Cemetery can be considered clear of archaeological concern, and no further archaeological assessment is required. [2,3] The Ministry of Tourism and Culture accepted each of these findings. Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec was notified of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment findings via notification dated January 28, 2011 sent in French (the preferred language of communication) Notice of the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment findings were sent to the Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec on May 30, 2011.	Provincial Register of Reports of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detail Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7108) Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3 Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535) [3] Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance			

															into the Provincial Registry of Reports of the Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3 Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535) Huron-Wendat First Nation notification letters (ID# 7397 & 7913)			

B6 (a)	Minimize disruption of community vistas and adverse effects on street and neighbourhood aesthetics	Visual Effects	✓		✓	Entire Corridor	Introduction of transit may reduce visual aesthetics of road	Introduction of a comprehensive landscaping and streetscaping plan for the corridor [1].	Narrow sections of ROW where property cannot be acquired may limit incorporation of streetscaping		Significant	Monitor redevelopment and acquire property through redevelopment applications [2]	York Region	Status **[1] – completed** **Status [2] – completed** The DBCR incorporates streetscaping recommendations: Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.08), General Guidelines (Section 4.09etc.) A comprehensive landscaping and streetscaping plan has been provided for the corridor [1]. **[2] This is addressed with each site plan application. Refer to http://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/business/yr/landdevelopment/siteplanapplications.**	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) [1] H3 Streetscape Design Layout Plans IFC H3-DWG-R-LND-080407 (ID#9633) **[2] Property Development Commitments (ID# YORK-#6372888] and Municipal Streetscape Partnership Program Application Guidelines (ID# YORK-#6372895)**	Yes	EF 2009 [1] EF (2013) Ops / Future EF (2015) Closed 2015	4040 -Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 includes Section 4.10 and 4.11 Streetscape design guidelines plus several references to pedestrian and roadside safety 2013 ACR: numbering added for clarity. Evidence was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Item [1] was closed in 2013. Item [2] is operational monitoring and suggest status be changed to 'future" 2015 ACR: The evidence provided (6372888) supports the assertion that York Region has a process to monitor redevelopment elsewhere. It is assumed that this process will be applied to the corridor.
B6 Cont'd (b)		Visual Effects	✓		✓	Hwy 404 interchange	If necessary in the future, achieving a dedicated transitway through the interchange by adopting an elevated solution could have an adverse effect on vistas in the area.	Initially, the option of lengthening the span of the existing interchange bridges will be analyzed and only if found impractical under traffic operations, will an elevated solution be developed. This design can be made visually acceptable given the surrounding highway interchange environment and the remoteness of adjacent land uses from which vistas may be degraded.	The overall height of the interchange works would be increased to that of the neighbouring Highway 407 interchange.	None	Insignificant if span lengthening is adopted. Moderately significant if elevated design is required.	Monitor the level of traffic congestion affecting the reliability of the preferred mixed traffic operation to assess the effectiveness of the planned new Hwy 404 road overpass north of the interchange.	York Region	Status –completed Preliminary and Detail Design do not recommend implementation of elevated solutions at this time. A single lane Rapidway with transit signal is proposed for the Highway 404 crossing.	Traffic Impact Analysis (H3) Highway 7 – Yonge Street Connector to South Town Centre Boulevard (ID# 3354) Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (ID# 3881)	No	EF 2009 Closed (2009)	2009 ACR: 3354 VIVA Next TASK 4.12: TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (H3) HIGHWAY 7 - YONGE STREET CONNECTOR RAMP TO SOUTH TOWN CENTRE BOULEVARD REPORT (SEPTEMBER 2008 3881 Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (15-Oct-08)

(c)	Minimize disruption of community vistas and adverse effects on street and neighbourhood aesthetics (cont'd)	Landscaping	✓		✓	Entire Corridor	Landscaping species may not survive in winter months	Choose appropriate species for both winter and other months to maintain greenery throughout corridor. Place landscaping in planters and incorporate buried irrigation systems.	Species may still not survive	Change species, irrigation patterns, etc.[1]	Insignificant	Monitor health of landscaping continuously [2]	York Region	Status – **[1] – completed** **Status [2] – completed** H3 Design addresses sustainability of landscape features and a greater degree of greening – e.g. Section 4.21 of the DBCR. [2011] H3 Detail Design planting plan[1] incorporates only plant species that are hardy in this location. In addition, all plant species specified are salt and drought tolerant. **[2] York Region has contracted staff for inspection, maintenance and watering of the streetscape plantings**.	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) [1] Streetscape Design Planting List and Planting Plan Details(ID#8909): ▪ H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-501 ▪ H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-501A ▪ H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-506 ▪ H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-507 ▪ H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-508 **York Region contract specifications for landscape maintenance (ID# YORK-#6374042)**	**Yes**	EF 2009 [1] EF (2012) Ops / Future (2014) **EF 2015** **Closed 2015**	4040 -Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 includes Section 4.10 and 4.11 Streetscape design guidelines plus several references to pedestrian and roadside safety 2012 ACR: Numbering was added for clarity. The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions [1] on how the condition was addressed. The evidence provided (ID# 8909) provides a species list. 2014: Item [1] was closed in 2012. Item [2] is operational monitoring. Suggest changing status to "future" **2015 ACR: Evidence provided supports the assertion that York Region has system in place for plan maintenance elsewhere. It is assumed that York Region would apply this same approach to this segment. This item is closed.**
(d)		Encroachment on sites of existing buildings		✓	✓	Immediately west of Leisure Lane, south side	Modification of alignment is required to avoid the south building	Alignment shifted up to 2.3 m to the north	South building setback restored; internal parking required rearranging.	None	Insignificant	None Required	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	**Closed (2014)**	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**

B6 Cont'd (e)		Encroachment on sites of existing retaining walls		✓	✓	Between Islington Ave. and Bruce Street, north side	Relocation of existing retaining walls holding up residential properties would be required with the existing alignment.	Alignment shifted up to 2.8 m to the south	North retaining walls remain intact.	None	Negligible	None Required	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	**Closed (2014)**	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(f)		Encroachment on sites of existing property		✓	✓	In the proximity of Whitmore / Ansley Grove Roads	Additional road width required accommodate station platforms would result in property encroachment solely on the south side.	Alignment shifted up to 3.8 m to the north	Property impact on both sides becomes similar.	None	Insignificant	None Required	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	**Closed (2014)**	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(g)		Encroachment on sites of existing buildings		✓	✓	Northwest of Weston Rd. & Hwy 7	Additional road width required accommodate station platforms would result in removal of NW building. Modification of alignment is required.	Alignment shifted up to 4.7 m to the south	Encroachment to the NW building is avoided.	None	Negligible	None Required	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	**Closed (2014)**	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(h)		Encroachment on sites of existing property		✓	✓	Northwest of Town Centre Boulevard & Hwy 7	The NW is being developed and the future buildings will be constructed very close to the existing north ROW such that property negotiation is not feasible. Modification of alignment is required.	Alignment shifted up to 7.0 m to the south. Agreement has been made with the developer that they will grade YRTP's proposed sidewalk at the limit of ROW.	Property impact on the north side is avoided.	None	Insignificant	None Required	York Region	Status – No Action Required		No	**Closed (2014)**	2009 ACR: NSE - No documentation has been cited to verify this claim. 2010 ACR: NSE - No new documentation has been provided to verify this claim. 2011 ACR: Built In Positive Attribute. No assertion made.
(i)		Encroachment on sites of existing building		✓	✓	Southwest of Clegg Rd. & Town Centre Boulevard	Encroachment to the existing SW building would be required.	Alignment shifted up to 4.1 m to the east.	Encroachment to the SW building is avoided.	None	Negligible	None Required	York Region	Status – No Action Required		No	**Closed (2014)**	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**

(j)		Encroachment on sites of existing property		✓	✓	Between Bullock Dr. and McCowan Rd., north side	North property would be subjected to greater property impact than the south.	Alignment shifted up to 1.2 m to the south.	Property impact on the north side is minimized.	None	Moderately significant	None Required	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	**Closed (2014)**	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
B6 Cont'd (k)		Encroachment on sites of existing property		✓	✓	Northeast of Robinson Street/ Jolyn Road and Hwy 7	Encroachment to existing fenced residential property would be required.	Alignment shifted up to 3.5 m to the south and retaining walls along the limit of north ROW are introduced.	Property impact on the north side is avoided.	None	Insignificant	None Required	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	**Closed (2014)**	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**
(l)		Encroachment on sites of existing buildings		✓	✓	Galsworth Dr./ Grandview Blvd., south side	Encroachment on sites of existing buildings would be required.	Alignment shifted up to 1.5 m to the north.	Encroachment of new boulevard on sites of existing buildings is minimized.	None	Moderately significant	None Required	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	**Closed (2014)**	**2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status**

Notes: P – Pre construction, C – Construction, O – Operation

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment														Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																			
C1 (a)	Minimize adverse effects on Aquatic Ecosystems	Fuel spills, due to accidents during construction refuelling and accidents during operation, entering the watercourses		✓	✓	Entire Corridor	Fish kills due to chemical spills resulting in short term population decline.	No refuelling within 10 m of a watercourse[1] Emergency Response Plan[2]	Short term population decline. Some contaminants within storm-water system.	None practical	Insignificant	None required	York Region	**Status – Completed** An Emergency Response Plan will be developed during Detail Design. Contractor's Environmental Management Plan includes an Emergency Response Plan for spills.[2] Refuelling near a watercourse is included in watercourse alteration permit applications as a note on drawings [1]. [1] Weekly Environmental Checklist section 3.0 Fuel Storage and Fuel Management.	Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) Sample of application reference drawings: - H3-DWG-R-STR-080406-102-B05.pdf - H3-DWG-Q-ENV-030101-102-B02.pdf - H3-DWG-R-STR-080406-202 B05.pdf [1]TRCA Permits (see item 41 above for list) [1] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008)	Yes	[1,2] EF (2011) [2] EF (2012) [1] EF (2013) [1] EF (2014)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to support the assertions regarding emergency response plan [2], There is no provision found that limited refueling within 10 m of a watercourse [1]. Additional evidence provided (Sample application reference drawings) was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided (KED ID#2012-001) was found to support the assertion [2] on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: evidence was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. [1] 2014: Weekly environmental checklist provided indicates refueling however no distance is specified. OE pointed out this was specified in section 3.2.

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
															[2] (KED ID# 2015-014 vivaNext-SAF-Emergency Response Plan-R02-2014-09-19-CG, (KED ID# 2015-015) vivaNext Crisis Management Plan R0 2015-09-18. **[1] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**		Closed	Revised to EF. This item is on-going. For ACR 2015, sample of monitoring reports will be requested. [2] 2014: No emergency response plan has been provided. OE noted that this was provided for ACR 2012. Item [2] was not reviewed and is closed. 2015 ACR: This item is closed with completion of construction.
C1 cont'd (b)		Sediment laden stormwater entering watercourses during construction		✓		Entire Corridor	Fish kills and loss of aquatic habitat resulting in short term population decline.	Construction fencing at work areas near watercourses limiting area of disturbance.[1] [2] Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan.	Short term population decline.	None practical	Insignificant	None required	York Region	**Status – Completed** A Drainage Study has been prepared during PE design. [2] TRCA provided a letter to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan contained in the Drainage Study.[2] An Environmental Protection Plan was prepared during Detail Design for Phase 1 construction from Warden	Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230)[2] [2] May 19, 2011 Letter from TRCA to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan.[#7646][3]	**Yes**	[2] EF 2010 [1] EF 2009	2010 ACR: Confirm that a drainage study has been prepared. With regard to an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, it states that TRCA guidelines will be followed. 2009 ACR: 4111 – Env. Protection plan Drawing st 540+480 to Sta. 541-050 (11-Mar-09) 4112 – Memo – Use of Tarps (13-Mar-09) 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
														Avenue to Birchmount Road.[2] [2] Contractor's Environmental Management Plan includes A Component Environmental Management Plan for Sediment and Erosion Control. [A] [1] Silt fencing (construction fencing) constructed according to TRCA permit drawings to delineate work area. Weekly Environmental Checklist section 2.0 Environmental Control Measures for monitoring condition and effectiveness of fencing. [1][2] Water quality sampling is conducted weekly to ensure mitigation measures are functioning as intended [B] at Watercourse crossings where work is active [C].	[2] Environmental Protection Plan – ESP 1.01 (ID# 4111, 4112)[1] [2] Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) [2] Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) [1]TRCA Permits (see item 41 above for list) [1][2] [A] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) [B] Water Quality Data 2014 (KED ID #2014-011)		[3,4] EF (2011) [4] EF (2012) [2] EF (2012) [1] EF (2014)	25-ECH) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [2] was addressed. It is acknowledged that the TRCA has approved the SWMP in principle [2]. This item will remain 'Ongoing' until final approval and review. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided was found to support the assertion [2] on how the condition was addressed. This item will remain ongoing until final review and approval from TRCA. 2013 ACR:Numbering revised for clarity. Evidence provided supports [2] that TRCA permits have been obtained. Item [1] fencing is ongoing. 2014: Item [2] ESC Plan was closed in 2012. This was not reviewed again. [1] Weekly environmental checklist [A] or other documents [B, C] do not indicate that construction fencing is or will be installed

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
															[C] Water Quality Monitoring Map 2014 Rev 00,01 (KED ID #2014-010) **[1,2,A] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**		Closed (2015)	near watercourses to limit area of disturbance. The OE clarified that silt fencing, used as per TRCA permit, is the "construction fence" noted. This was reviewed previously (2012). The Weekly Environmental Checklist support that these fences are installed and being Checked. This item is ongoing. **2015 ACR: This item is closed with the completion of construction.**
(c)		Sediment laden stormwater entering watercourses during operation			✓	Entire Corridor	Loss of aquatic habitat resulting in population decline.	Stormwater management facilities such as grassed swales, oil and grit separators, stormwater ponds. Detailed Storm Water Management Plan will be prepared during the detailed design stage. [1]	Short term population decline.	Clean-out facilities as required. [2]	Insignificant	Monitor sediment accumulation in stormwater management facilities.[3]	York Region	Status **[1,2] – completed** **Status [3] – completed** A Drainage Study has been prepared during PE design.[1] TRCA provided a letter to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan contained in the Drainage Study.[1] An Environmental Protection Plan was prepared during Detail Design for Phase 1 construction from Warden Avenue to Birchmount Road.[3]	Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230)[2] May 19, 2011 Letter from TRCA to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan.[#7646][3] Environmental Protection Plan (ID# 4111, 4112)[1] Environmental	**Yes**	[1] EF 2009 [2] EF 2010	2009 ACR: [1] 4111 – Env. Protection plan Drawing st 540+480 to Sta. 541-050 (11-Mar-09) 4112 – Memo – Use of Tarps (13-Mar-09) 2010 ACR: Document 3230 [2] mentions use of OGS, dry ponds, and existing grass swales. NOTE table should be revised to show that monitoring sediment accumulation in stormwater facilities will be part of SWMP. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to support the assertions on how

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
														Contractor's Environmental Management Plan includes A Component Environmental Management Plan for Sediment and Erosion Control.[2,3] **[3] Current York Region road maintenance practices dictate that all York Region Oil-Grit Separators are inspected annually for sediment accumulation, servicing and cleaning.**	Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) [1]TRCA Permits (see item 41 above for list) **[3] Tender Documents (ID# YORK-#6373975):** **- Oil-Grit Separator Structure Inspection and Assessment Services At Various Locations Within the Regional Municipality of York** **- Oil-Grit Separator Structure Cleaning**		[3,4] EF (2011) [4] EF (2012) Ops / Future (2014 **EF (2015)** **Closed** (2015)	the condition [4] was addressed. It is acknowledged that the TRCA has approved the SWMP in principle [1]. This item will remain 'Ongoing' until final approval and review. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. This item will remain ongoing until final review and approval from TRCA. 2013 ACR. Note TRCA permits for SWMP aspects of fisheries , Item 2 and 3 remaining ongoing as they apply to operations (not construction) 2014: Item [1] was closed in 2013. Items [2-3] are operational monitoring and response Suggest changing status to "future" **2015 ACR: Evidence provided 6373975 supports the assertion that OGS are monitored and maintained. Items [2] and [3] This items is closed**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
															Including Disposal of Collected Liquid and Solid Materials at Various Locations in the Regional Municipality of York			
C1 cont'd (d)		Loss of site-specific habitat.		✓		All watercourses within entire corridor.	Potential loss of fish habitat as a result of new culverts/bridges, culvert/bridge extensions and/or culvert/bridge replacements or repairs.	Design transitway cross-sections to avoid modifications at culverts/bridges. Span meander belt or 100-year erosion limit of the watercourse. Avoid in-water work to the extent possible. Minimize the area of in-water alteration to the extent possible. Follow in-water construction timing restriction.[1] Perform all in-water work in the dry using a temporary flow bypass system.	A harmful alteration of fish habitat will likely result from culvert modifications at approximately 25 culverts that convey watercourses that support fish habitat.	Negotiations with regulatory agencies during detail design [2]. Compensate for the harmful alteration of fish habitat. [3]	Insignificant	On-site environmental inspection during in-water work. [4] Post-construction monitoring of fish habitat compensation measures.[5]	York Region	Status **[5]**- ongoing **Status [1,2,3,4]-completed** [2] Table 7 of Appendix D of the EA identifies locations of potential HADD (Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction of fish habitat). The draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report has identified a potential HADD associated with the Warden Avenue bridge widening – see Appendix 4 for monitoring. [2] No HADD was identified during the Detail Design of the Phase 1 of the Enterprise / Civic Mall section west of Birchmount Avenue. [3] See Item 38 above for listing of approved TRCA permits and permit	[2] Record of TRCA Meeting 2009-0304 – Y2H3 4.05 (ID# 4219) [3,4] Cedarland Alignment Modification Report – Y2H3 6.03 (ID# 3018) [3,4] Minutes of Meeting: TRCA with York Consortium – June 24, 2010 (ID# 6386) [1,5] Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061)	No	[1,2] EF 2009 [3] EF 2010 [4,5] EF (2011)	2009 ACR: 4219 - Memo – Permits and Approvals for Viva H3 Drainage 4-Mar-09 3018 - Response to comments on the draft report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report are provided in Appendix 4 of this Table. To review these changes, the final report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report (June 2009) was reviewed. This final report will be used to verify the condition provided in the main table. 2010 ACR- The meeting minutes between YC and TRCA on June 24, 2020 satisfy the condition. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
														applications. [3] At a meeting on June 24, 2010, TRCA staff indicated that, based on the information provided, the effects of the proposed works in these segments could be mitigated and that consequently, a Letter of Advice would be acceptable, since a HADD should not result at any crossing. [1,4] Contractor's Environmental Management Plan addresses methodology for in-water work activities. [1,4] Weekly Environmental Checklist demonstrates how in-water constructing timing restrictions have been monitored and generally how on-site environmental inspection during in-water work has been documented (Refer to Sections 2.0, 3.1,3.2, 4.1, .4.3). Timing restrictions are specifically addressed in 4.3 (i). [2] Letters of Advice prepared by TRCA on behalf of DFO confirm no HADD is likely, and permits	[1,5] Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) [3,4]TRCA Permits and MNR ESA approval (see item 41 above for list) [1][4] [A] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) [2] HADD status confirmed in LOA attached to each permit (see item 41 for list and document references)		[4] EF (2012) [3,4] EF (2013) [1,4] EF (2014)	25-ECH) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [1,5] was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided was found to support the assertion [3] on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: the evidence provided was found to support items [2,3] on FAA. Items 1,4 and 5 remain on-going. 2014: Items [2,3] were closed in 2013. Item [1]: evidence not provided for how in-water construction timing restriction will be followed OE noted that Weekly Checklist indicates that this is monitored. Results updated to EF. Item [4]: On-site environmental inspection during in-water work. Evidence has been provided for other items in this table (i.e., weekly environmental checklist) The Document Reference column should be updated with this reference. This is an ongoing item. Item [5] : Post-construction

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
														[3] were issued. [5] Post construction monitoring is future work. **[5] Post construction monitoring of the Apple Creek North (Crispin Ct.) Restoration Site is ongoing. The final (fall) site visit is scheduled for late November 2015. Upon completion of the final field visit the report will be compiled and submitted to the MNR on or before January 31st 2016.**				monitoring of fish habitat compensation measures. This is assumed to be a future item and not reviewed **2015 ACR: Updated noted.**
C1 cont'd (e)	Minimize adverse effects on Aquatic Ecosystems (cont'd)	Fish mortality		✓		All watercourses within entire corridor.	Fish may be injured or killed by dewatering.	Design transitway cross-sections to avoid modifications at culverts/bridges.[1] Avoid in-water work to the extent possible.[2] Perform all in-water work in the dry using a temporary flow bypass system.[3] Capture fish trapped during dewatering of the work zone and safely release upstream.[4] Prohibit the entry of heavy	None expected.	None	Negligible	On-site environmental inspection during in-water work [6].	York Region	**Status – Completed** Provision for site-specific measures for in-water are being made through the TRCA permit process. See Item #38 for permit listings.[1],[2].[3] Contractor's Environmental Management Plan includes A Component Environmental Management Plan for Sediment and Erosion Control.[4],[5],[6] Weekly Environmental Checklist section 4.1 TRCA / DFO [5, 6].	[1],[2].[3]Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) [4],[5],[6] Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) [2,3,4,5]TRCA	**Yes**	[1] EF (2011) [2] EF (2011) [2] EF (2012) EF (2013)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [1,2] was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided was found to support the assertions [1 to 6] on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: Evidence (TRCA permits) supporting items [1,2,3] was found. Items 4,5 and 6 remain on-going

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
								equipment into the watercourse. [5]						**[5] Weekly Environmental Checklist Section 4.1 ii) verifies that no heavy equipment is permitted to enter the water.** **[4] Although there were no in-water works conducted in 2015; during in-water works in previous years KED Environmental would be on-site to ensure there were no stranded fish, this was documented in the Weekly Environmental Checklist. Fish salvages were not required during construction as 100% dewatering of any watercourses did not occur. In some instances KED would contract a 3rd party consultant to oversee sensitive operations, and ensure that all works were carried out in accordance with all permits and Environmental Work Plans (EWPs).**	Permits and MNR ESA approval (see item 41 above for list) [5,6] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) **Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)** **[4] H3-ENV-LGL-KED_Overseeing in-water works_2014 (KED #ID 2015-021)** **[4] ENV_H3_EWP_Rouge River Enhancement Works_REV_01 (KED ID# 2015-022)**		[5,6] EF (2014) [1-6] EF (2015) Closed (2015)	2014: Items [1,-3] closed in 2013. Item[5]; checklist KED ID #2014-008. Prohibits disturbance – recommend for clarity that it explicitly prohibits equipment Item [6] : Weekly environmental checklist provided supports inspections. Item [4]: evidence was not provided how fish trapped during dewatering are handled or that it is not happening. This should be explicitly addressed for the **2015 ACR: Evidence provided was found to support that Items [1-6] were undertaken. With the completion of construction, this item is complete.**
(f)		Barriers to fish movement.		✓	✓	All watercourses within entire corridor.	Culvert/bridge extension, repair or replacement may create a barrier to fish movement.	Use open footing culverts or countersink closed culverts a minimum of 20% of culvert diameter.	Culvert extensions will be designed to avoid the creation of a barrier to fish movement.	Negotiations with regulatory agencies during detail design.[1]	Negligible	On-site environmental inspection during in-water work. [2]	York Region	Status-completed [1] At a meeting on June 24, 2010, TRCA staff indicated that, based on the	[1] Minutes of Meeting: TRCA with York Consortium – June 24, 2010	No	[1] EF (2011) [2] EF (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 6386) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [1,2] was

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
								Span the watercourse, meander belt or floodplain with new structures where warranted by site conditions. [2]						information provided, the effects of the proposed works in these segments could be mitigated and that consequently, a Letter of Advice would be acceptable, since a HADD should not result at any crossing. [2] Protection for fish movement is being reviewed and approved through the TRCA permit application process. See Item #38 for permit listings. [1]TRCA has approved the following permits: ▪ CV1 (German Mills east of Pond Dr.) on July 28, 2011; ▪ CV2 (German Mills west of Hwy 404) on August 15, 2011; ▪ Beaver Creek on January 4, 2012; ▪ Revision to Beaver Creek on May 8, 2012 ▪ Apple Creek on March 20, 2012; and ▪ Warden Bridge on June 4, 2012. See Item #38 for permit details. [1]MNR approved the proposed mitigation plan[5]	(ID# 6386) [1]MNR letter of approval on proposed		[1] EF (2012) Closed (2012)	addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed.

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
														on July 6, 2012 in order to minimize potential adverse effects on the endangered species Redside Dace as per Section 23.1 of Reg. 242/08 of the *Endangered Species Act 2007* at the sites. The flow of the watercourse, and fish passage, shall be maintained throughout construction. [3]	mitigation plan for the widening of Apple Creek Bridge and Warden Avenue Bridge dated July 6, 2012 (ID#8904) [1] Redside Dace Mitigation Report vivaNext Highway 7, Apple Creek and Warden Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation and Widening, July 6, 2012, and appendices (ID#8904)			
(g)		Baseflow alterations		✓	✓	All watercourses within entire corridor.	New impervious surfaces can lead to changes in the frequency, magnitude and duration of flows.	Reduce the area of impervious surfaces to the extent possible [1]. Use stormwater management practices that encourage infiltration and recharge of groundwater [2].	None expected.	None	Negligible	Post-construction inspection of stormwater management facilities to evaluate their effectiveness [3]. On-going maintenance as required.[4]	York Region	Status **[1,2] – completed** **Status [3,4] – completed** Final Drainage Study - Section 9.2 Treatment Levels[1] TRCA provided a letter to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan contained in the Drainage Study.[2] Refer to Item 46 for details of MOE Permits [2].	Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230)[1] May 19, 2011 Letter from TRCA to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan.[#7646][2] [2] TRCA Permits	Yes	EF 2009 –draft completed for some sections	2009 ACR: 3230 - Draft Drainage & Hydrology Report Highway 7 Corridor (H3) – Y2H3 4.05 (- Hwy 404 to Kennedy report in progress. DRAINAGE & HYDROLOGY REPORT HIGHWAY 7 CORRIDOR - H3 SEGMENT 2: HIGHWAY 404 to WARDEN AVENUE (March 2009) June 9, 2009 Memo H3 – Warden Avenue/Enterprise Boulevard Drainage Report

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
														Streetscape Design plans provide the details of planting boxes and ecopavers for infiltration of water. See examples of drainage holes in Streetscape drawings 408 and 411 which facilitates the infiltration of water from the boulevards [1]. Planting plan shows areas which are pervious Plant material will absorb rain water, in addition to some surface run off. The continuity strip and medians are paved in a permeable paver (Eco-Priora) which encourages water infiltration and recharge of ground water [1]. **[3,4] Current York Region road maintenance practices dictate that all Oil-Grit Separators are inspected annually for service and cleaning.**	and MNR ESA approval (see item 41 above for list) [1] H3 Streetscape Design Layout Plans IFC H3-DWG-R-LND-080407 (ID#9633) **[3,4] Tender Documents (ID# YORK-#6373975): Oil-Grit Separator Structure Inspection and Assessment Services At Various Locations Within the Regional Municipality of York; Oil-Grit Separator Structure Cleaning Including Disposal of Collected Liquid and Solid Materials at Various Locations in the Regional**		[2] EF (2011) [1,2] EF (2013) **Ops / Future (2014)**	The Birchmount to Kennedy report has not been submitted yet. 2010 ACR: NSE 2010 - Section 9.2 of the Drainage study provides recommendations for treatment levels but does not include any provisions to mitigate changes in frequency, magnitude, and duration of flows. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7646) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [1] was addressed. It is noted that the TRCA approval of the SWMP is in principle only. This item will remain 'Ongoing' until final approval and review. 2013 ACR: Numbering added and altered for clarity. The evidence provided was found to support the assertion [1,2] on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Items [1,2] closed in 2013. Item [3,4]: Post-construction inspection of stormwater management facilities and on-going maintenance are

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
															Municipality of York		[3,4] EF (2015) Closed (2015)	operational monitoring and action. Suggest this status column be changed to "future" **2015 ACR: Evidence provided 6373975 supports the assertion that OGS are monitored and maintained. Items [3] and [4] This items is closed**
(h)		Increased temperature		✓	✓	All watercourses within entire corridor	Clearing of riparian vegetation and stormwater management practices can impact temperature regimes.	Minimize the area of stream bank alteration to the extent possible. [1] Use stormwater management practices that encourage infiltration and recharge of groundwater. [2]	Shading provided by culvert/bridge offsets shading lost through removal of riparian vegetation.	Restore riparian areas disturbed during construction with native vegetation. [3]	Negligible	Post-construction inspection of stormwater management facilities to evaluate their effectiveness [4]. On-going maintenance as required [5]. Post-construction inspection of riparian plantings to confirm survival [6].	York Region	Status **[1-3] – completed** **Status [4-6] – completed** An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during Detail Design.[1] A Final Drainage Study has been prepared during PE design. [2] TRCA provided a letter to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan contained in the Drainage Study.[3] [1]TRCA approved applications for culverts/ bridge modifications that include a restoration plan that provides for mitigation or compensation to minimize the extent of stream bank alternation.	Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230)[2] May 19, 2011	Yes	[1,3] EF (2011)	2009 ACR: ECF 2009 –draft completed for some sections Draft Drainage & Hydrology Report Highway 7 Corridor (H3) – Y2H3 4.05 (ID# 3230) - Hwy 404 to Kennedy report in progress. DRAINAGE & HYDROLOGY REPORT HIGHWAY 7 CORRIDOR - H3 SEGMENT 2: HIGHWAY 404 to WARDEN AVENUE (March 2009) June 9, 2009 Memo H3 – Warden Avenue/Enterprise Boulevard Drainage Report The Birchmount to Kennedy report has not been submitted yet. 2010 ACR: ECF 2010 Confirmation that a Final Drainage Study has been

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
														MNR approved the proposed mitigation plan for bridge widening. [2]MOE approved the stormwater management practices including the finalized drainage report on H3. [2]Streetscape Design plans provide the details of planting boxes and ecopavers for infiltration of water. See examples of drainage holes in Streetscape drawings 408 and 411 which facilitates the infiltration of water from the boulevards. [2]Planting plan shows areas which are pervious Plant material will absorb rain water, in addition to some surface run off. The continuity strip and medians are paved in a permeable paver (Eco-Priora) which encourages water infiltration and recharge of ground water. **[4,5] Current York Region road maintenance practices dictate that all Oil-Grit Separators are inspected annually for**	Letter from TRCA to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan.[#7646][3] [1[TRCA Permits and MNR approvals (see item 41 above for list) [2]MOE ECA (see item 46 above for list) [2]H3 Streetscape Design Layout Plans IFC H3-DWG-R-LND-080407 (ID# 9633) **[4,5] Tender Documents (ID# YORK-#6373975): Oil-Grit Separator Structure Inspection and Assessment Services At Various Locations Within the Regional Municipality of**		[1,2] EF (2013) Ops / Future (2014)	completed. The table should be revised to show that mitigation measures to minimize stream bank alteration will be part of the SWMP. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7646, H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [3] was addressed. It is noted that the TRCA approval of the SWMP is in principle only. This item will remain 'Ongoing' until final approval and review. No evidence (ID# 3230) was provided for assertion [2] on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: the evidence provided was found to support the assertion [1,2] on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Items [1-3] were closed in 2011 and 2013. Items [4-6] are post-construction inspection of storm water management facilities and plants plus on-going maintenance . Assumed that these are

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
														service and cleaning. **[6] All riparian plantings were inspected post-construction for compliance with design.**	**York; Oil-Grit Separator Structure Cleaning Including Disposal of Collected Liquid and Solid Materials at Various Locations in the Regional Municipality of York**		**[4,5] EF (2015)** **[6] ENF (2015)**	operational monitoring and actions. Suggest that status be updated to 'future" **2015 ACR: Evidence provided 6373975 supports the assertion that OGS are monitored and maintained. Items [4] and (5] This items is closed** **Evidence was not provided that all riparian plantings were inspected post-construction (item [6]).**
(i)		Disturbance to rare, threatened or endangered species		✓	✓	All watersheds within entire corridor.	Humber River watershed known to support redside dace, American brook lamprey, and central stoneroller. Don River watershed known to support redside dace and American brook lamprey. Rouge River watershed known to support redside dace, American brook lamprey, and central stoneroller. [1-6]	Design transitway cross-sections to avoid modifications at culverts/bridges. [1] Mixed traffic operation has been introduced at the Humber River, West Don River, East Don River and Little Rouge Creek bridges to avoid widening and disturbance to rare, threatened and endangered species. [2] Avoid in-water work to the extent possible. [3] Perform all in-water work in the dry using a temporary flow bypass	None expected.	None required.	Negligible	None required.	York Region	**Status – Completed** Only the Rouge River bridges (Apple Creek and Warden Avenue bridges) are located in the H3 segment. An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during Detail Design. [4,5,6] MNR ESA Mitigation Plan for Rouge River provided for mitigation measures for rare, threatened or endangered species.[6] MNR approved [1,2,3,] the proposed mitigation plan[1,2,3] for the widening	Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) [4,5,6] Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) Mitigations Measures Table to MNR via email K. Roberts to MNR 2011-07-25	Yes	[6] EF (2011) [1,2,3] EF (2012)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7691, H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. It is noted that the assertion [1-6] applies to the Rouge River watershed only. This item remains ongoing until all watersheds listed are addressed. 2012 ACR: Numbering was added for clarity. The evidence provided [1,2,3] in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. It is noted that the assertion

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
								system. [4] Capture fish trapped during dewatering of the work zone and safely release upstream. [5] Prohibit the entry of heavy equipment into the watercourse. [6]						of Apple Creek Bridge and Warden Avenue Bridge over the Rouge River in order to minimize potential adverse effects on the endangered species Redside Dace as per Section 23.1 of Reg. 242/08 of the *Endangered Species Act 2007* at the sites. The flow of the watercourse, and fish passage, shall be maintained throughout construction. [4,5,6] Weekly Environmental Checklist section 2.1 [4] and section 4.1 TRCA / DFO [5, 6]. **[5] Although there were no in-water works conducted in 2015; during in-water works in previous years KED Environmental would be on-site to ensure there were no stranded fish, this was documented in the Weekly Environmental Checklist. Fish salvages were not required during construction as 100% dewatering of any watercourses did not occur. In some instances KED would contract a 3rd party consultant to**	(ID#7691][2] [1,2,3] MNR letter of approval on proposed mitigation plan for the widening of Apple Creek Bridge and Warden Avenue Bridge dated July 6, 2012 (ID#8904) [1,2,3] Redside Dace Mitigation Report vivaNext Highway 7, Apple Creek and Warden Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation and Widening, July 6, 2012, and appendices (ID#8904) [5,6] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) **[5] H3-ENV-LGL-KED Overseeing in-water works 2014**		[6] EF (2014) [1-4, 5] EF (2014)	[1-6] applies to the Rouge River watershed only. 2014: Items [1-4] – evidence was not provided that all crossings have been addressed. OE clarified that Apple Creek and Warden Ave (Rouge River) bridges are located in this segment. Item 5: No evidence provided that fish trapped were captured and safely release. Subsequently, Weekly Checklist provided as evidence. However, it is not explicit regarding fish trapped during dewatering. This should be explicitly addressed for the 2015 ACR. Item 6: No evidence has been provided that heavy equipment are prohibited from entering watercourses Subsequently, the Weekly Inspection Checklist has been added as evidence. The result was changed to EF. As noted in previous items in this table the prohibition on equipment is not explicit in the Weekly Inspection Checklist . The Weekly Checklist should be updated to be explicit and will be checked in the 2015 ACR.

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
														oversee sensitive operations, and ensure that all works were carried out in accordance with all permits and Environmental Work Plans (EWPs). **[5,6] Weekly Environmental Checklist section 4.1 ii) verifies that heavy equipment is prohibited from entering watercourses.**	**(KED #ID 2015-021)** **[5] ENV_H3_EWP_Rouge River Enhancement Works_REV_01 (KED ID# 2015-022)** **[5,6] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**		**[4-6] EF (2015)** **Closed (2016)**	**2015 ACR: The evidence provided supports the assertion regarding items [4-6]. With the completion of construction, this item is closed.**
C2 (a)	Minimize adverse effects on Terrestrial Ecosystems	Loss of wildlife habitat and ecological functions		✓	✓	Entire corridor.	Construction of the transitway and associated facilities may result in the removal of vegetation and ecological functions it supports.	Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible.[1] Minimize grade changes to the extent possible.[2] Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize the number of trees to be removed.[3] Delineate work zones using construction fencing/tree protection barrier.[4] Protect trees within the clear zone using guiderail, curbs, etc. to prevent	None expected.	Restore natural areas disturbed using construction with native vegetation, where feasible [6]. Replace ornamental vegetation as part of landscaping [7].	Negligible	None required.	York Region	**Status – Completed** [2011 ACR][1,3, 4,6] A Draft Tree Preservation Report for the Corridor is under development with requirements for minimizing impacts to vegetation and trees. An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during Detail Design. [2] [2011 ACR]Landscaping design will be finalized in 2012 [7].	[2011 ACR][1,3, 4,6] H3-RPT-Q-ENV-030201_TREE PRESERVATION REPORT_R04_2011-11-02 (ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan	**Yes**	EF 2009 EF 2010	2009 ACR: 3230 - Draft Drainage & Hydrology Report Highway 7 Corridor (H3) – Y2H3 4.05 (- Hwy 404 to Kennedy report in progress. DRAINAGE & HYDROLOGY REPORT HIGHWAY 7 CORRIDOR - H3 SEGMENT 2: HIGHWAY 404 to WARDEN AVENUE (March 2009) June 9, 2009 Memo H3 – Warden Avenue/Enterprise Boulevard Drainage Report The Birchmount to Kennedy report has not been submitted

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
								removal.[5]						[1,3,4,6]Tree Preservation drawings and Arborist Report completed. Landscaping design completed [7]. Weekly Environmental Checklist section 4.4 Municipal Compliance [4].	2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) [4,5] Tree Protection Details: - H3-DWG-Q-ENV-030201-301-C00 - H3-DWG-Q-ENV-030201-302-C00 - H3-DWG-Q-ENV-030201-303-C00 - H3-DWG-Q-ENV-030201-304-C00 [1,3,4,6] Tree Preservation Plans H3-DWG-Q-ENV-030201-001 to 304 (ID#8909) [1,3,4,6] H3 Detail Design Tree Preservation Report. November 02, 2011 (ID#7996). [1,3,4,6] Edge Management Plans, see Item		[1,4,5,6] EF (2011) [2,3] NSE (2011)	yet. 2010 ACR: Confirmation that a Final Drainage Study has been completed. UNCLEAR The table to be revised to show that measures to mitigate loss of wildlife habitat and ecological functions will be part of the Environmental Control Plan. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-RPT-Q-ENV-030201_TREE PRESERVATION REPORT_R04_2011-11-02) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [1,4,6] was addressed. It is unclear which conditions [2,3,5 and/or 7] the evidence (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) supports. Additional evidence provided (Tree Protection Details) was found to support the assertion on how the condition [5] was addressed. The evidence was not found to support the assertion [3] on how the condition was addressed. The evidence (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was not

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
															#42 for references. [1,3,4,6] Streetscape Design Planting List and Planting Plan H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-501, 501A, 506, 507, 508 (ID#8909) [7] Streetscape Layout 080407 H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-101 to 144(ID#8909) [7] Streetscape Planting 080407 H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-201 to 244(ID#8909) [4] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) **[4,5] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**		[7] EF (2012) [3] EF (2012) **[4,5] EF (2014)**	found to support the assertion [2] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertion [7] on how the condition was addressed. Evidence of Change was found to support assertion [3] that minimizes impacts to vegetation and trees (i.e., minimize the number of trees to be removed) but does not mention close cut clearing and trimming. The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was not found to support the assertions [2] on how the condition was addressed. No new evidence was provided to address the 2011 NSE review results for assertion [2]. 2012 edit: clarification from the Owner Engineer was provided for assertion [2] that this is not a compliance requirement. Item [2] closed. **2014: Items [1- 3,6,7] were closed previously.** **Items[4,5]: Weekly environmental checklist provided evidence of tree**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
																		protection. These remain ongoing.
C2 cont'd (b)		Wildlife mortality		✓	✓	Entire corridor.	Removal of wildlife habitat may result in wildlife mortality.	Perform vegetation removals outside of wildlife breeding seasons (typically April 1 to July 31). [i] [1,2] Perform culvert/bridge extension, repair and replacement outside of wildlife breeding season [ii]. [1,2]	None expected.	None required.	Negligible	None required.	York Region	**Status – Completed** An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during Detail Design[1] and bird nest surveys conducted prior to construction as required.[2] Wildlife breeding windows are communicated to contractor staff members through lunch and learn training [1] Weekly checklist to be revised as per the comments [2] **[2] Weekly Environmental Checklist was revised to address the comments**	Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) YRT H3 Segment_Dec092010(ID#8933) H3-Bird Nest Report 2011-05-02(ID#8934) H3-Bird Nest Report 2011-04-18(ID#8934) H3 Detail Design Wildlife Inventory Report, April 26, 2011.(ID# 7202)	Yes	EF (2011)	2011 ACR: It is not clear why this item has a status of "complete" while the project phase is "Construction". Also, The evidence does not reference any measures for protection of birds or nests. It references the procedures of IMS Reference Book; PRO-009. If these procedures support the assertion made they should be provided for review. Additional evidence provided (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH, YRT H3 Segment_Dec092010, H3-Bird Nest Report 2011-05-02, H3-Bird Nest Report 2011-04-18) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: Numbering added for clarity. Evidence was found that supported assertion [2] regarding migratory birds. However, when asked about other wildlife, YC replied that

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
															Letter dated 2011-07-07 included a report on Wildlife Screening for Species at Risk dated 2011-07-06 (ID#7528) [1] Environment 201 - H3 (KED ID# 2013-005) [2] H3-ENV-CKL-001-R02-ENG-2013-11-15-SGH (Weekly Env Checklist) (KED ID# 2013-006) **[1,2] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**		[1,2] NSE 2012	a Wildlife Inventory Report was completed on April 26,2011. (ID 7202). However, this report states that further work will be undertaken to confirm the" habitat and species". This report(s) should be provided. It was unclear which condition(s) for which the evidence (KED ID#2012-001) has been provided. When asked, KED replied that it was referenced to show the management and best practices being followed for H3 to ensure wildlife species are not impacted by the construction activities, and that the checklists included in the environmental management plan demonstrates inspections done by KED to enforce the permit requirements outlined by TRCA. Ked went on to say that the permits ensure that construction activities impacts are minimized and that all breeding/timing windows are being followed, and that the checklists ensure compliance with the breeding/timing windows and reducing env impacts to the environment surrounding H3. However, no mention of restrictions

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
																	[1,2] NSE 2013 NSE (2014)	regarding wildlife breeding seasons was found in ATTACHMENT A1 Weekly Environmental Checklist. KED also replied that "No other wildlife was found during clearing activities and therefore no wildlife reports/investigations were completed." See assertion 2 above regarding outstanding investigations. Also, the status column should be updated to reflect current status. 2013 ACR: Numbering added for clarity. evidence provided (KED ID# 2013-005) discusses 3 timing windows. The Weekly inspection report does not include one of the timing window (for Apple Creek) identified in the Field Essentials training presentation (KED ID#2013-005). 2014: Comments from previous ACR remain. No update provided. Findings do not change. **2015 ACR: EF that the checklist was updated.**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
																		This addresses the ENF in 2013/4. This item is closed with the completion of construction.
(c)		Barriers to wildlife movement and wildlife/vehicle conflicts		✓	✓	Entire corridor	Culvert/bridge extension, repair or replacement may create a barrier to wildlife movement. Increase in width of Highway 7 to accommodate transitway and associated facilities may create an additional impediment to wildlife movement and increase the potential for wildlife/vehicle conflicts. New crossings at Upper Rouge River & Rouge River Tributary 4 may create a barrier to wildlife movement.	Maintain or enhance riparian corridors and terrestrial wildlife passage under new/ realigned bridges. New or modified culverts and bridges [2] will be investigated during preliminary and detail design to identify opportunities to promote wildlife passage. Methods to enhance wildlife passage such as increasing vertical and horizontal clearances, drift fence, dry benches, etc. will be taken into consideration.	Transitway represents an incremental increase in road width compared to existing barrier created by Highway 7. Required culvert extensions will not impede wildlife passage under Highway 7.	Use of existing culverts/bridges maintains wildlife passage under transitway and does not offer opportunities to enhance wildlife passage.	Insignificant at new/ realigned bridges with appropriate mitigations	None required.	York Region	Status –Completed Existing culverts/bridges used maintaining wildlife passage under transitway[1]. There are no new or realigned culverts or bridges within the H3 segment. Permits were issued by TRCA for 4 culvert extensions and 2 bridge widening. The permit documents, included in Item 41, indicate design details and mitigation measures.	Refer to TRCA permits in Item 41 (3 culvert extensions, 2 bridge widenings)	No	EF 2009 **[1] EF (2014)** **Closed (2014)**	3018 -Response to comments on the draft report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report are provided in Appendix 4 of this Table. To review these changes, the final report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report (June 2009) was reviewed. This final report will be used to verify the condition provided in the main table. **2014: Item [1] Evidence was not provided to support the assertion that *Existing culverts/bridges used maintaining wildlife passage under transitway.* Subsequently, cross-reference to TRCA permits added. Results changed to EF and item is closed.**
(d)		Wildlife/vehicle conflicts			✓	Entire corridor.	Increase in width of Highway 7 to accommodate transitway and associated facilities may increase the potential for	Span bridges across the meander belt. Use oversized culverts to promote wildlife passage under the road. Stagger culvert inverts to	Transitway represents an incremental increase in road width compared to existing hazard to wildlife created by Highway	None required.	Insignificant	None required.	York Region	Status – No Action Required		No	EF 2009 Closed (2014)	2014: Review Results changed to better indicate review status

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment														Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																			
							wildlife/vehicle conflicts.	create wet and dry culverts.	7.										
C2 cont'd (e)		Disturbance to rare, threatened, or endangered wildlife		✓	✓	Entire corridor.	Three rare species were identified within the study area: rough-legged hawk (non-breeding migrant/vagrant, extremely rare breeding occurrence by MNR); northern shrike (non-breeding migrant/vagrant, very rare to uncommon breeding occurrence by MNR); and, milk snake ('special concern' by COSEWIC, and 'rare to uncommon' by MNR)	Prevent the harassment of eastern milk snake if encountered during construction. [1] Perform vegetation removals outside of wildlife breeding seasons (typically April 1 to July 31). [2] Perform culvert/bridge extension, repair and replacement outside of wildlife breeding season. [2,3]	None expected.	None required.	Negligible	None required.	York Region	**Status – Completed** An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during Detail Design and bird nest surveys conducted prior to construction as required. [2,3] Wildlife breeding windows are communicated to contractor staff members through lunch and learn training [2,3] Weekly checklist to be revised as per the comments [2,3] Weekly checklist to be revised as per the comments **[2,3] Weekly Environmental Checklist was revised as per comments**	Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) YRT H3 Segment_Dec092010(ID#8933) H3-Bird Nest Report 2011-05-02(ID#8934) H3-Bird Nest Report 2011-04-18(ID#8934) H3 Detail Design Wildlife Inventory Report, April 26, 2011.(ID# 7202) Letter dated 2011-07-07 included a report on Wildlife	Yes	EF (2011) [1,2,3] NSE 2012	2011 ACR: The evidence does not reference any measures for protection of wildlife. It references the procedures of IMS Reference Book; PRO-009. If these procedures support the assertion made they should be provided for review. Additional evidence provided (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH, YRT H3 Segment_Dec092010, H3-Bird Nest Report 2011-05-02, H3-Bird Nest Report 2011-04-18) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed 2012 ACR: Numbering added for clarity. YC replied that a Wildlife Inventory Report was completed on April 26,2011. (ID 7202). However, this report states that further work will be undertaken to confirm the" habitat and species". This report(s) should be provided. It was unclear which condition(s) for which the evidence (KED ID#2012-001) has been provided. When

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
															Screening for Species at Risk dated 2011-07-06 (ID#7528) [2,3] Environment 201 - H3 (KED ID# 2013-005) [2,3] H3-ENV-CKL-001-R02-ENG-2013-11-15-SGH (Weekly Env Checklist) (KED ID# 2013-006) **[2,3] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**		[,2,3] NSE	asked, KED replied that it was referenced to show the management and best practices being followed for H3 to ensure wildlife species are not impacted by the construction activities, and that the checklists included in the environmental management plan demonstrates inspections done by KED to enforce the permit requirements outlined by TRCA. Ked went on to say that the permits ensure that construction activities impacts are minimized and that all breeding/timing windows are being followed, and that the checklists ensure compliance with the breeding/timing windows and reducing env impacts to the environment surrounding H3. However, no mention of restrictions regarding wildlife breeding seasons was found in ATTACHMENT A1 Weekly Environmental Checklist. KED also replied that "No other wildlife was found during clearing activities and therefore no wildlife reports/investigations were completed." See assertion 2 above regarding outstanding investigations.

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
																	2013 NSE (2014) EF 2015 Closed (2015)	2013 ACR: Numbering added for clarity. evidence provided (KED ID# 2013-005) discusses 3 timing windows. The Weekly inspection report does not include one of the timing window (for Apple Creek) identified in the Field Essentials training presentation (KED ID#2013-005). Item [1] remaining on-going. 2014: Outstanding items as per 2013. Remains NSE **ACR 2015: Evidence provided is found to addresses the ENF in 2013/4. This item is closed with the completion of construction.**
(f)	Minimize adverse effects on Terrestrial Ecosystems (cont'd)	Disturbance to vegetation through edge effects, drainage modifications and road salt		✓	✓	Entire corridor.	Clearing of new forest edges may result in sunscald, windthrow, and invasion of exotic species. Ditching, grading and other drainage modifications may alter local soil moisture regimes.	Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible. [1] Minimize the grade changes and cut/fill requirements to the extent possible. [2] Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize	Vegetation communities within the study area are primarily cultural in origin and have been impacted by Highway 7. The transitway represents an incremental	Landscape treatments. [7]	Insignificant	None required.	York Region	Status **– Completed** An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during Detail Design. [1,2,3,4,6,7] Edge Management Plans were completed to mitigate vegetable disturbance.	Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-	**Yes**	Unclear (2012)	2012 ACR: Numbering added for clarity. It is unclear which condition(s) the evidence (KED ID#2012-001) has been provided for. [1] found in EMP The status should be updated.

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
							Road salt may result in vegetation mortality and die back.	encroachment on remaining vegetation. [3] Delineate work zones using construction fencing/ tree protection barrier. [4] Manage the application of road salt to the extent possible. [5] TRCA guidelines for Forest Edge Management Plans & Post-Construction Restoration will be followed. [6] All valley lands disturbed will require restoration with native herbaceous & woody species. [7]	encroachment into these already disturbed communities.					[1,2, 7]TRCA approved applications for culverts/ bridge modifications that include a restoration plan that provides for mitigation or compensation. MNR approved the proposed mitigation plan for bridge widening. [4] Weekly Environmental Checklist section 4.4 Municipal Compliance.	EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) [1,2,3,4,6,7]CV1 (German Mills East of Pond Dr.) Edge Management Plan April 20, 2011 (ID#7197) [1,2,3,4,6,7]CV2 (German Mills West of Highway 404) Edge Management Plan April 20, 2011 (ID#7198) [1,2]TRCA Permits and MNR approvals (see item 41 above for list) [4] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) **[4,5] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015**		[1,2,4] EF (2013) [4,5] EF (2014) **[4,5] EF (2015) Closed (2015)**	2013 ACR: evidence was found to support the assertion [4] in ID#7197 drawing H3-DWG-Q-ENV-030201-103-B03. TRCA and MNR permits and approvals in item 41 were found to support the assertion [1,2] on how the condition was addressed. Note items [1,2,3,4,6,7] are listed in ID#7197 . 2014: Items [1-2, 6,7] were closed previously. Item [3] close cut clearing was closed in C2(a). The information for this item should be updated to reflect this. Items [4,5] Weekly environmental checklist supports tree protection These two items are ongoing. **2014: Items [1-2, 6,7] were closed previously.** **Item [3]** close cut clearing **was closed in** C2(a). The information for this item should be updated to reflect this. **Items [4,5] Weekly environmental checklist supports tree protection These two items are**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
															(KED ID# 2015-016)			**ongoing.**
(g)		Disturbance to rare, threatened or endangered flora		✓		Entire Corridor.	Twenty-two regionally rare or uncommon species are located within the study limits including: Black Walnut, Common Evening Primrose, Cut-leaved Toothwort, Groundnut Hitchcock's Sedge, Michigan Lily, Ninebark, Purple-stemmed Angelica, Red Cedar, Red Pine, Red-sheathed Bulrush, Sandbar Willow Shining Willow, Showy Tick-trefoil, Spike-rush Spotted Water Hemlock, Spring-beauty, Stickseed, Tall Beggar-ticks, Three-square	Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible. [1] Minimize grade changes to the extent possible. [2] Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize the number of trees to be removed. [3] Delineate work zones using construction fencing/ tree protection barrier. [4] Protect trees within the clear zone using guiderail, curbs, etc. to prevent removal. [5] Transplant rare species to safe areas prior to construction. [6]	Trees may be removed by the transitway and its associated facilities.	None required.	Insignificant	Monitor clearing activities to ensure that minimum work zones are used to avoid any unnecessary tree removal.	York Region	Status- completed An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during Detail Design. The Natural Sciences Report identified that there are no plant species (Endangered, Threatened, Species at Risk, Vulnerable) as regulated under the Ontario Endangered Species Act or the Canada Species at Risk Act within the limits of the H3 project. There are also no plant species of provincial conservation concern (S1 to S3). Black walnut (Juglans nigra) is listed as rare within York Region. It is found within the black walnut deciduous forest (FOD7-4) ELC community. No black walnut was identified as impacted in the Tree Preservation Report.	Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) Natural Science Report Detail Design and Approvals for the Culvert and Bridge Works at Five Watercourse Crossing in the H3 Segment. December 2010. (ID#6979) H3 Detail Design Tree Preservation Report. November 02, 2011. (ID#7996)	No	UNCLEAR (2012) [1,2,4 6] EF (2013) EFC (2013) Closed (2013)	2012 ACR: Numbering added for clarity. It is unclear which condition(s) the evidence (KED ID#2012-001) has been provided for. 2013 ACR: evidence provided (ID#6979) was found to support the assertion [6] on how the condition was addressed. Evidence (ID#6979 and ID#7996) was found to support that there appears to be no disturbance to rare, threatened or endangered flora.

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
							Turtlehead and Virginia Wild-rye.											
C3 (a)	Improve regional air quality and minimize adverse local effects	Degradation of existing local and regional air quality when compared to MOE standards			✓	York Region	Situation expected to be unchanged or marginally better than 2001	The fleet average emissions will drop significantly due to technological improvements balancing the increase in traffic volumes. The BRT will divert commuters from individual highly polluting sources (single passenger automobiles)	Forecast improvement in all pollutants assessed (PM_{10}, NO_X, SO_2, CO) when comparing 2021 forecasts with and without the proposed Rapid Transit (see Tables 4.3 & 4.4 of Appendix L, 3.6% decrease in PM_{10} & CO, 4.4% in SO_2)	None required	Positive Effect	None recommended	York Region	Status –completed An updated Air Quality Impact Assessment Report for a Study Area Bounded by Hwy50 to York Durham Line was completed in April 2011 using the CAL3QHCR dispersion model as required in the terms and conditions for the Hwy 7 Corridor & Vaughan North-South Assessment Compliance Monitoring Program (CMP). The purpose of the Study was to assess the cumulative air quality effects that may arise due to the proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) undertaking. The MOE accepted the air quality assessment report on June 17, 2011 and is satisfied that Condition 5.4 of the EA Notice of Approval has been addressed.	H3-RPT-Q-ENV-030203-final AQ Report_ROI-2011-04-29Senses.pdf (ID#7270) MOE Letter of Acceptance, June 17, 2011 (ID#7713)	No	EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7713) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.
C3 cont'd (b)		Increase in emissions of Greenhouse Gases (GhG)			✓	York Region	Fewer GhGs are expected to be emitted	Compared to the status quo (no additional transit) there will be far less GhGs emitted per commuting person	Reduction per capita emissions of GhGs (overall annual reduction of 54 kilotonnes of CO_2 forecast in 2021)	None required	Positive Effect	None recommended	York Region	Status -completed An updated Air Quality Impact Assessment Report for a Study Area Bounded by Hwy50 to York Durham	H3-RPT-Q-ENV-030203-final AQ Report_ROI-2011-04-29Senses.pdf (ID#7270)	No	EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7713) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
														Line was completed in April 2011 using the CAL3QHCR dispersion model as required in the terms and conditions for the Hwy 7 Corridor & Vaughan North-South Assessment Compliance Monitoring Program (CMP). The purpose of the Study was to assess the cumulative air quality effects that may arise due to the proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) undertaking. The MOE accepted the air quality assessment report on June 17, 2011 and is satisfied that Condition 5.4 of the EA Notice of Approval has been addressed.	MOE Letter of Acceptance, June 17, 2011 (ID#7713)			
(c)		Degradation of air quality during construction		✓		Highway 7 Corridor	Some dust is expected during the construction period.	The law requires that all possible pollutant emission mitigation steps possible be taken during construction activities	Some PM emissions locally.	None required.	Negligible	Regular inspection of site dust [1] and construction vehicle exhaust emissions [2] during construction in compliance with MOE's standards and municipal by-laws.	York Region	**Status - Completed** An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during Detail Design. [1][2] Weekly Environmental Checklist section 2.0 Environmental Control Measures.	Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001)	Yes	[1] EF (2011) [2] NSE (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) does not reference any measures for inspection of dust and construction vehicle exhaust directly. It references the procedures of IMS Reference Book; PRO-009. If these procedures support the assertion made they should be provided for review. The item remains 'Ongoing' throughout construction.

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
															Weekly Environmental Inspection Checklist (H3-ENV-INR-WK-2012)(KED ID#2012-002) Construction Equipment Inspection Log (H3-ENV-INR-CEI-2012)(KED ID #2012-004) H3-ENV-INR-WK-2013 (KED ID# 2013-003) [1][2] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008) **[1,2] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**		[2] EF (2012) [1,2] EF (2013) [1][2] EF (2014) **[1][2] EF (2015)** **Closed (2015)**	The evidence provided (H3-Sample of Weekly Checklists-2012-01-21) was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided (KED ID#2012-001 – 004) in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions [2] on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: evidence was found to support the assertion [1,2] on how the condition was addressed. **2014: Items [1,2] Weekly environmental checklist supporting monitoring These two items are onging.** **2015 ACR: Items [1,2] Weekly environmental checklist supporting monitoring These items are closed with the completion of construction. .**
C4 (a)	Minimize adverse effects on corridor hydro-geological, geological,	Water quality in shallow groundwater that can affect quality in surface			✓	Areas located hydraulically down	Transitways will require de-icing salt and also will accumulate various	Dilution and other natural processes will attenuate elevated parameters in groundwater.	Potential effects to water quality of surface water courses.	Reduce application of road salt, where possible [1]. Curbs and gutters to convey	Moderately Significant	None required. Water quality effects are anticipated to remain acceptable.	York Region	Status – **complete** Curbs and gutters convey impacted runoff away from	Viva Next, H3. Highway 7 (Y.R.7) Transit Improvements	Yes	EF 2009	4183 -CD labelled VivaNext H3 Transit Improvements 30% submission Yonge to Warden Task 4.1 Cover

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment														Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																			
	hydrological and geomorphic conditions	watercourses				gradient of transit alignment, where receiving surface watercourses are present.	chemical substances that can impact water quality of runoff. Impacted runoff that infiltrates can increase concentrations in shallow groundwater. Potential to affect shallow groundwater that discharges to surface watercourses.		Groundwater quality effects are anticipated to be detectable.	impacted runoff away from permeable soil areas.				permeable soil areas. Existing rural road cross section segments converted to urban road cross section with run-off piped to stormwater management areas. **The use of de-icers, such as salt, is an important component of the Region's Winter Maintenance Program. In 2004, York Region developed a Salt Management Plan to reduce the use of salt as part of the Winter Maintenance Program. This plan was developed in response to Environment Canada's request for all road salt users to develop salt management strategies. The Region's Salt Management Plan was approved by Council in October of 2004.**	from Yonge Street to Warden Avenue. New Construction. (ID#4183) Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230) **York Region's Salt Management Plan, October 2004 (ID# YORK-#6373910)**		Ops / Future (2014) **EF (2015)** **Closed (2015)**	memo indicated drawings – did not have software to open drawing files 2014: Numbers added for clarity. Item [1] is operational. Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: The evidence proved supports the assertion that has a plan for Region's salt reduction throughout the region that would include this segment. This item is closed.**
C4 cont'd (b)		Water quality in shallow groundwater that can affect quality in water supply wells			✓	Areas located hydraulically down gradient of transit alignment, where shallow	Transitways will require de-icing salt and also will accumulate various chemical substances that can impact water quality of runoff. Impacted runoff that infiltrates	Dilution and other natural processes will attenuate elevated parameters in groundwater.	Potential effects to groundwater quality used as drinking water. Groundwater quality effects in water wells may be detectable.	Reduce application of road salt, where possible. [1] Curbs and gutters to convey impacted runoff away from permeable soil areas.	Moderately Significant	None required. Water quality effects are anticipated to remain acceptable within Ontario Drinking Water Standards. Well inspection will be performed during the detailed design phase	York Region	Status – **Complete** Curbs and gutters convey impacted runoff away from permeable soil areas. Existing rural road cross section segments converted to urban road cross section with run-off piped to	Viva Next, H3. Highway 7 (Y.R.7) Transit Improvements from Yonge Street to Warden Avenue. New Construction (ID# 4183)	No	EF 2009 Ops /	4183 -CD labelled VivaNext H3 Transit Improvements 30% submission Yonge to Warden Task 4.1 Cover memo indicated drawings – did not have software to open drawing files 2014: Numbers added for

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
						dug wells in active use are present.	can increase concentrations in shallow groundwater. Potential to affect shallow groundwater that is extracted by down gradient supply wells.					to confirm the relationship of the widened roadway to existing active water well will not have an adverse affect on water quality. If it does or domestic well use is confirmed, a contingency plan will be developed.		stormwater management areas. [1] **The use of de-icers, such as salt, is an important component of the Region's Winter Maintenance Program. In 2004, York Region developed a Salt Management Plan to reduce the use of salt as part of the Winter Maintenance Program. This plan was developed in response to Environment Canada's request for all road salt users to develop salt management strategies. The Region's Salt Management Plan was approved by Council in October of 2004.**	Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230) **[1] York Region's Salt Management Plan, October 2004 (ID# YORK-#6373910)**		Future (2014) **EF (2015)** **Closed (2015)**	clarity. Item [1] is operational. Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: The evidence proved supports the assertion that has a plan for Region's salt reduction throughout the region that would include this segment. This item is closed.**
C4 cont'd (c)		Baseflow in surface water courses		✓	✓	Recharge areas within proposed alignment, particularly in areas of Newmarket Till and sand textured glacial lake deposits.	Increase of pavement area decreases the pervious area that existed prior to construction, resulting in proportionally decreased recharge to shallow groundwater.	N/A	Decreases in recharge can decrease baseflow in surface water course(s). Reduced baseflow in surface watercourses.	Construction of pervious surfaces where practical, including grassed areas and permeable pavements.	Negligible	None required. The degree of impact is anticipated to be undetectable.	York Region	Status –No Action Required DBCR – Section 3.12 Drainage – Indicates provisions for use of pervious and semi-pervious surfaces in median works, side islands and platform bases. The surfacing of these median and side islands will be either open-topped planters or porous block surfaces (Eco-	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551)	No	EF 2009 Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
														uniblock or similar)				
(d)		Increased pavement; decreased infiltration			✓	Entire corridor	Minor increase in quantity of surface runoff. Minor decrease in quantity of groundwater.	Storm water management facilities such as grassed swales and storm water ponds.	Minor increase in peak streamflows. Minor decrease in groundwater.	None practical	Negligible	None required	York Region	Status –No Action Required A Final Drainage Study has been prepared during PE design and is the Stormwater Management Plan for this project.	Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230)	No	EF 2010 Closed (2014)	2010 – Confirm Final Drainage Study completion. **2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
(e)		Changes in flood levels from the widening of existing bridges and culverts			✓	Beaver Creek crossing at Sta 37+790	HEC-RAS model provided by TRCA was used to assess changes in flood level due to widening the existing culvert by 10 m.	No increase in Regional storm or return period flood levels upstream of the crossing. See **Appendix G** for results of the analysis.	N/A	N/A	Negligible	None required.	York Region	Status –No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
(f)					✓	Rouge River (Apple Creek) crossing at Sta 38+695	HEC-RAS model provided by TRCA was used to assess changes in flood level due to widening the existing bridge by 18 m.	Regional storm flood level upstream of the bridge would increase by up to 50 mm. No increase in return period flood levels upstream of the crossing. See Appendix G for results of the analysis.	Minor increase in Regional storm flood level. Widening will not adversely impact upstream water levels.	N/A	Negligible	None required.	York Region	Status –No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
(g)					✓	Rouge River crossing at Sta 43+256	HEC-RAS model provided by TRCA was used to assess changes in flood level due to widening the existing bridge by 8 m.	No increase in Regional storm flood levels. Return period flood levels upstream of the crossing would increase by up to 30 mm. See Appendix G for results of the analysis.	Minor increase in return period flood levels. Widening will not adversely impact upstream water levels.	N/A	Negligible	None required.	York Region	Status –No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
C4 cont'd		Changes in flood levels from the construction			✓	Proposed Rouge	HEC-RAS model provided by TRCA	Regional storm flood level upstream of the bridge	Minor increase in Regional storm flood	N/A	Negligible. The 100	None required.	York Region	Status – completed	Cedarland Alignment	No	EF 2009	3018 -Response to comments on the draft report Cedarland

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-3 Effects and Mitigation for Natural Environment													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
(h)		of a new bridge.				River crossing at Sta 540+190	was used to assess changes in flood level due to a proposed bridge with a width of 10 m and a span of 30 m.	would increase by up to 20 mm. The 100 year return period flood level would increase by 110 mm just upstream of the crossing The increase for the 25 and 2 year events would be 50 mm and 0 mm respectively. See Appendix G for results of the analysis.	level. Increase in 100 year flood level. The 100 year flood level is over 2 m below the Regional storm flood. No change in existing regulatory floodline or developable area.		year flood level is contained within the Regional storm flood plain and the increase is not significant.			A Cedarland Alignment Modification Report has been finalised following receipt of MOE and TRCA comments – see Appendix 4 for monitoring. H3 Design provides for crossing of the Rouge River on Warden Avenue, requiring 11m of bridge widening. The Cedarland Alignment Modification Report documents the results of a Warden Bridge Water Surface Elevation Study.	Modification Report (ID# 3018) Minutes of Meeting: TRCA with York Consortium – June 24, 2010 (ID# 6386) Navigable Waters Determination Letter. August 25, 2010 (ID#6429,6482)		EF 2010 Closed (2014)	Alignment Modification Report are provided in Appendix 4 of this Table. To review these changes, the final report Cedarland Alignment Modification Report (June 2009) was reviewed. This final report will be used to verify the condition provided in the main table. 2010 – condition has been satisfied through evidence of consultation with TRCA. **2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**

Notes: P – Pre construction, C – Construction, O – Operation

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-4 Effects and Mitigation for Smart Growth and Economic Development													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
D1 (a)	Support Regional and Municipal Planning Policies and approved urban structure	Need for pedestrian-friendly streets and walkways for access to stations		✓	✓	Entire corridor	Streetscape will create a more pedestrian-friendly atmosphere.	Signalized pedestrian crosswalks will be provided at all station locations and an appropriate number of intersections; Pedestrian safety will be considered in the design of station precincts and road signage will be highly visible to both pedestrians and automobiles.[1]	Potential for jaywalking in vicinity of stations, which could lead to increase in number of vehicle/pedestrian incidents.	Platform edge treatment will discourage illegal access	Negligible	Monitor traffic accidents involving pedestrians to establish whether cause is transit related. [2]	York Region	Status **[1] – completed** **Status [2] – completed** [1] The DBCR addresses pedestrian safety, for example: Guardrail / Railings (Section 4.5), Safety and Security Guidelines (Section 4.9.4), Placement of Streetscape Elements (Section 4.9.8), Crosswalks (Section 4.21), Public Telephone (Section 4.22), etc. [2] Traffic accidents monitored as per the Incident Management Protocol. [1] Permanent traffic signal and PHM drawings have been prepared and address pedestrian safety issues. **[2] York Region's goal is to reduce the number and**	[1] Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) [2] Appendix CO2 Incident Management_August 26 2011_R1_1_Issued_FC (ID#8061) [2] VPGM-PM-LET-2013-AUG-14-dm-KED re Incident Mgt Protocol (KED ID# 2013-001) [1] H3 Permanent Traffic Signals Layout IFC H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303 (ID#9632) and PHM Drawings (ID#9977) **[2] York Region Standard Practice, Monitor Accidents, Traffic Safety Review of Pedestrian and RTOR; and 2015 Annual Traffic**	**Yes**	[1] EF 2009 [2] EF (2011) [2] EF (2013) **[1] EF (2014)** **Op / Future (2014)** **EF (2015) Closed**	2009 ACR: [1] 3551 – Section 4.11.1 Appropriateness, Scale, Modularity. The design of the various streetscape elements must prioritize the needs of pedestrians…" 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (Appendix CO2 Incident Management_August 26 2011_R1_1_Issued_FC) was found to support the assertions on how the condition [2] was addressed. This item remains ongoing. 2013 ACR: Numbering added for clarity. Evidence provided was found to support the assertion [2] on how the condition was addressed. **[1] 2014: Evidence provided includes the drawings as noted. Item [1] is closed.** **Item [2] is operational monitoring. Suggest the status be changed to "Future"** **2015 ACR: Evidence provided (6373581) supports the assertion**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-4 Effects and Mitigation for Smart Growth and Economic Development													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
														severity of collisions that happen on Regional roads. The safety of all Regional roads and intersections is appraised yearly. Based on the results, York Region can see which roads and intersections can be improved. Refer to http://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/transportation/yr/traffic/trafficsafetyprogram.	Safety Report (ID# YORK-#6373581)			that monitoring is undertaken routinely by York Region annually elsewhere. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake this within H3. This item is closed.
(b)		Locating higher density and transit-oriented development where it can be served by transitway			✓	New and redevelopment/infill locations	Current landowners could object to implementation of existing land use pattern changes along transit corridor.	Regional/Municipal land use controls and approval processes to encourage transit-oriented development or re-development in support of OP objectives.	Redevelopment pressure on surrounding areas	Apply Municipal Site Plan approval process	Insignificant	Monitor re-development activity to control overall increase in development density	York Region / Vaughan / Markham / Richmond Hill	Status -future		No	Ops / future (2014)	**. Review Result colour changed to better reflect status** **2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly"**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-4 Effects and Mitigation for Smart Growth and Economic Development													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
D1 cont'd (a)		Reflection of historical districts through urban design and built form.			✓	Main Street Markham	Station aesthetics may not be compatible with the character of heritage districts along the corridor.	In the area of Main Street, the rapid transit is discontinued with rapid transit operating in mixed traffic. Incorporate station designs and features that reflect the surrounding historical districts where further redevelopment is limited through consultation with community and heritage groups.	Historical district is generally north of Highway 7.	Apply Municipal Site plan approval process	Insignificant	Municipalities to monitor nature of re-development in sensitive districts	York Region / Markham	Status -future		No	Ops / future (2014)	**2014. Review Result colour changed to better reflect status** **2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly"**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-4 Effects and Mitigation for Smart Growth and Economic Development													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
D2	Provide convenient access to social and community facilities in corridor	Potential barrier effects during construction and operation		✓	✓	Entire corridor	Transitway could be perceived as a barrier in access to future community centres, hospital(s), malls, parks, etc.	Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plan will avoid wherever possible, barriers to entrances/exits to large attractors along Highway 7. Transitway median design will recognize pedestrian access requirements, particularly in proximity to community facilities.	Alternative access routes to facilities may affect adjacent properties	Mark detours and alternative access points clearly	Insignificant	Monitor congestion levels during construction [1] and traffic patterns during operations.[2]	York Region	**Status – Completed** Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plans will be developed during Detail Design. Transitway design retains crossing opportunities at all existing crosswalk locations. **[1] KED documents traffic patterns both during construction and during operations via 'Daily Corridor Drive' video.** **[2] York Region monitors traffic patterns and undertakes a signal coordination review every 2-3 years.**	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) **[1] KED Daily Corridor Drive Sample Videos (KED ID# 2015-020)** **[2] Traffic Signals and Corridor Travel Times Monitoring Mandate (ID# YORK-#6373090)**	Yes	[1] ENF (2014) [1,2] EF (2015) Closed (2015)	2014:Item [1] Evidence not found regarding monitor of congestion levels during construction Item [2] is operational monitoring and a future item. **2015: Item [1] Evidence provided (2015-020) was found regarding monitor of congestion levels during construction. Item [2] Evidence provided (6373090) support the assertion that York Region will undertake traffic monitoring. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake monitoring at intervals stated as traffic monitoring is part of its mandate. This item is closed.**

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-4 Effects and Mitigation for Smart Growth and Economic Development													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
D3 (a)	Minimize adverse effects on business activities in corridor	The potential for an increase in business activity.	✓	✓	✓	Entire corridor	Increased pedestrian traffic via the implementation of a rapid transit system will increased the potential for business activity.	A higher density of development on underutilized sites, infill locations and on vacant land should increase the market for some business activity.	Increase in vehicular traffic; increase in workforce/ population.	Encourage intensification meeting urban form objectives.	Insignificant and positive	Monitor building applications/ permits, economic influences (employment rate, etc.)	York Region / Vaughan / Markham / Richmond Hill	Status - future		No	Ops / future (2014)	2013 ACR: item noted as future status. 2014. Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly"**
D3 cont'd (b)		The potential for a decrease in business activity.		✓	✓	Entire corridor	Modification of road access could lead to displacement and/or business loss.	Implement procedures to address requests of affected businesses; Incorporate design solutions and construction methods to minimize number of businesses affected.	Decrease in traffic; decrease in workforce/population	Encourage alternative compatible development	Moderately significant	Cooperative response to business loss concerns addressed to municipalities.	York Region	Status – completed Traffic management concepts and plans have been developed. Community liaison procedures and construction staging plans will be developed further during Detail Design.	Constructability and Traffic Staging Report, May 3, 2010 (ID#5878)	No	EF 2010 Closed (2010)	2009 ACR: NSE 2009 - It was not clear that "Traffic management plans have been developed". Measures to mitigate construction effects on residences, businesses, road traffic and pedestrians mentioned in Y2H3 Draft Constructability / Construction Staging Report (undated but provided 3-Oct-08) including general description of measures to mitigate construction effects on residences, businesses, road traffic and pedestrians 2010 - Traffic management plans are detailed in 5878 and include five stages of construction and attached

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-4 Effects and Mitigation for Smart Growth and Economic Development													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
																		schematic drawings that show how the traffic can be controlled.
D4 (a)	Protect provisions for goods movement in corridor	Ease of Truck Movement			✓	Entire Corridor	Median transitway will restrict truck movement in corridor	Provided U-turns at major intersections to allow for truck access to side streets and properties. Traffic analysis at intersections indicated sufficient capacity for trucks using U-turns.	In areas of 4-lane cross-section, intersections with no station or landscaping in median do not allow sufficient turning width for WB 17 (articulated trucks).	Traffic signs prohibit large truck at these intersections (see next entries). Designate truck routes.	Insignificant	Monitor and widen Highway 7 with right turn tapers at side streets to allow for movement	York Region	Status –completed DBCR Section 3.0 documents the justification for design on the basis of eliminating most right turn lanes at intersections. For design consistency and to improve pedestrian circulation, right turn tapers are not included in the design.	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551)	No	EF 2009	3551 - Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 provides justification in section 3.0 and Appendix A
(b)				✓		Entire Corridor	Construction may limit access for trucks	Traffic management plan to ensure truck access at all times	May not be possible in some areas	Designate alternative truck routes	Negligible	None required	York Region	Status-**completed** Construction Traffic Management Plans will be developed during Detail Design [1]. **Refer to Item 29.**		No	[1] EF (2014) Closed (2014)	2014:Item [1] Evidence was provided for hre for assertion. However, Item [1] covered in ITEM 29. This cross-reference should be made. Item [1] closed **2015 ACR also tem 29 also closed.**
D4 cont'd (a)		Truck U-turn Movement Prohibited			✓	Westbound at Kipling Ave. intersection	The effect is not anticipated to be critical because: the gas station at the SE corner also has an access on Kipling Ave.; there is no other commercial property on the south side between Kipling Ave. and Islington Ave.	None required.	None expected.	None required.	Insignificant	Monitor and widen Highway 7 with right turn tapers at side streets to allow for movement, or widen Highway 7 from 4 lanes to 6 lanes.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-4 Effects and Mitigation for Smart Growth and Economic Development													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
(b)					✓	Eastbound at Kipling Ave. intersection	There is a need for trucks to access to the many commercial properties on the north side between Kipling Ave. and Parkfield Crt/ Woodstream Blvd. The next U-turn permitted intersection, i.e. Islington Ave. is approximately 600m away and trucks will have to travel additional 120m to access these north side properties.	Truck U-turn Movement at this intersection cannot be prohibited.	Trucks making U-turn will have to negotiate with the EB through traffic as they will need to move out of the left-turn lane in order to make the U-turn.	Traffic signs required to warn EB through traffic of the truck U-turn movements.	Moderately significant	Monitor the truck u-turn operation to confirm if this operation will impede EB through traffic operation severely. Widen Highway 7 with right turn tapers at side streets to allow for movement, or widen Highway 7 from 4 lanes to 6 lanes.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
D4 cont'd (c)					✓	Westbound at Bruce St. intersection	The effect is not anticipated to be critical because: the commercial property on the SE corner has no access on Highway 7; there is no other commercial properties on the south side between Bruce St. and Helen St./ Wigwoss Dr.; and the next U-turn permitted intersection is only approximately 400m away at Islington Ave.	None required.	None expected.	None required.	Insignificant	Monitor and widen Highway 7 with right turn tapers at side streets to allow for movement, or widen Highway 7 from 4 lanes to 6 lanes.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 1 Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA - Table 10.4-4 Effects and Mitigation for Smart Growth and Economic Development													Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations[A]	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE D: To promote smart growth and economic development in the corridor																		
(d)		Truck U-turn Movement Prohibited (cont'd)			✓	Westbound at Swansea Rd. intersection	The effect is not anticipated to be critical because: the commercial property opposite Bullock Dr. can be accessed at the signalized Bullock intersection; there is no other commercial properties on the south side between Swansea Rd. and Bullock Dr.; and the next U-turn permitted intersection is only approximately 450m away at Kennedy Rd.	None required.	None expected.	None required.	Insignificant	Monitor and widen Highway 7 with right turn tapers at side streets to allow for movement, or widen Highway 7 from 4 lanes to 6 lanes.	York Region	Status –Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Notes: P – Pre construction, C – Construction, O – Operation

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
Ministry of the Environment – Technical Support	Mr. Ernie Hartt, Supervisor – Air, Pesticides and Environmental Planning Central Region	1	a) Section 8.3.2 – In this section, Alternative B1 is identified as preferred, noting that this alternative will attract the highest ridership on east-west Hwy 7 service, contradicting the evaluation findings in Table 8.3-1 which indicate that this alternative "circuitous route to York U for trips from the east reduces Hwy 7 service daily boardings by 7-10%. Clarification should be obtained to ensure that the increased capital costs and increased potential for environmental impacts associated with the selection of Alternative B1 are justified based on the broader goals and objectives of this undertaking.	a) Section 8.3.2.4 of the EA report indicates that the preferred alternative is a combination of Alternative B1 and continuation of the partially-segregated Phase 1 Keele St service. This combination has the highest potential to attract ridership to both major destinations, Vaughan Corporate Centre (VCC) and York University, thus overcoming the primary disadvantage of Alternative B1 alone while gaining some of the benefits of Alternative B2.	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) Section 8.3.4.2 – The alternative alignments under consideration were evaluated using an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of the various options (Table 8.3-4). This approach is not consistent with the approach used for the evaluation of other segments which consider a broader range of environmental features (Tables 8.3-3 and 8.3-5). As the EA is seeking two alternative alignments in this section, an evaluation method as included under Tables 8.3-3 and 8.3-5 is recommended as it includes a broader discussion of environmental impacts that is included in the advantages/disadvantages table. The general comments provided in Chapter 10 of the EA are not sufficient, as they do not specifically discuss the Hwy 404 area under Goal C2, natural environment.	b) The alternative methods of crossing the Hwy 404 interchange were not considered a comparison of alignments within a segment of the route but an evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of local design solutions to achieve a segregated right-of-way through the existing interchange. As noted in Section 8.3.4.2 of the EA report, the preferred initial strategy (option C-B1) is to avoid environmental impacts and significant capital costs by operating the rapid transit in mixed traffic through the existing underpass on Hwy 7, basically a "do nothing" approach between the inner traffic signals at the interchange.		b) Status –No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) Section 8.3.4.2 – Figure 8.3-13 identifies three local alignment options for alternative C-B2, which is the alternative for which approval is also being sought (as a contingency if the preferred alternative, C-B1, cannot provide the necessary level of service). Recognizing that this may be a highly urban area, the lack of an evaluation table does not allow us to determine if there are any natural features which could be impacted by the selection of one alignment over another. It is recommended that the Region identify the preferred alignment that this EA will be seeking approval for and discuss any potential environmental impacts.	c) The EA is seeking approval of Option C-B2, as an ultimate solution for phased implementation if Option C-B1 becomes unreliable. This option will focus on maintaining the transitway within the Hwy 7 right-of-way by modifying the lane arrangements or span of the existing Hwy 404 underpass as the preferred design solution. A table assessing the potential effects of the variations of alternative C-B2 is included as supplementary information.		c) Status –No Action Required Preliminary engineering design does not recommend implementation of Option C-B2 at this time. Therefore monitoring against the supplementary table titled "Assessment of Highway 404 Crossing" (Attachment 8 of the CMP) is not required at this time.	Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (ID# 3881)	No	EF 2009 Closed (2009	3881 Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (15-Oct-08)

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
		1 cont'd	d) Section 8.3.5.2 – The text in this section indicates that the "civic mall easement" is the preferred route alignment for this segment, while the accompanying table (Table 8.3-6) highlights the "Enterprise Drive Option" as being preferred over the "Civic Corridor Option". Clarification is recommended.	d) The highlighting in Table 8.3.6 of the EA report was inadvertently placed in the incorrect column. As stated in the text, the Civic Mall easement is the preferred option.		d) Status –No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			e) Section 12.5 – Central Region has received information from the TTC indicating the preferred alignment for the Spadina Subway Extension has been selected as the diagonal alignment at Steeles Ave. The result of the selection of this alignment is that the future works for the station at Hwy 407 would be located to the north of the future Hwy 407 rapid transit r.o.w. and would be constructed under the Hwy 407 ramps without directly impacting the Black Creek meander belt, reducing potential impacts to the watercourse. This section identifies that York Region is proposing to prepare an addendum upon final approval of TTC's EA to consider the extent of potential environmental impacts, including those on Black Creek, for the alignment recommended by the TTC. As indicated in Table 12.6-3, this amendment will include a detailed analysis of both subway tunnel and station construction methods and associated mitigation measures for the section from Hwy 407 to Steeles Ave. Central Region recommends this type of analysis be undertaken in the EA amendment for the entire subway length from Hwy 7 to Steeles Ave to ensure a consistent level of environmental impact assessment for the entire subway component of this undertaking.	e) The EA amendment will assess the effects of subway construction and operation of any components developed in more detail than in this EA between Hwy 407 and the limit of the TTC EA undertaking at Steeles Ave.		e) Status –No Action Required An EA amendment report subtitled "Response to Conditions of Approval – Vaughan N-S Link Subway Alignment Optimization" was approved by the Minister of the Environment on April 4, 2008. The TTC has prepared a separate CMP for the Spadina Subway Extension Project and is responsible for compliance monitoring related to the Vaughan N-S Link segment of the undertaking.	MOE letter of approval of the undertaking - Vaughan N-S Link Subway Alignment Optimization 0 (ID# 4160)	No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Mitigation and Monitoring f) With respect to environmental commitments and monitoring, the revision to Chapter 12 provides a more substantial level of detail than provided for in the draft EA document, and this information will provide greater direction to the Region in the development of the Monitoring Program. APEP is encouraged by the outline of construction and operations monitoring and the commitment to establish an independent Environmental Compliance Manager.	f) Comment noted (refer to Section 11.3 of the EA report for Environmental Commitments and Section 11.4 for Monitoring).		f) Status –No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		1 cont'd	g) It is important to note that these commitments should be identified as minimum monitoring requirements, and that monitoring of additional environmental elements may be included in the Monitoring Program if further environmental impacts are identified. APEP encourages the Region to prepare an Annual Monitoring Program Report, outlining the results of the Monitoring Program and how any environmental impacts experienced have been addressed.	g) Comment noted for consideration during development of the detailed Monitoring Program as noted in Section 11.4.1 of the EA report.		g) Status – Completed An annual monitoring program has been designed and is undertaken by the region[1]. The Annual Monitoring Program is the Compliance Monitoring Program, which includes the preparation of Annual Compliance Reports.	See Items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.	No	[1] EF (2014) **Closed (2015)**	2014: Item [1]: evidence not provided to support the assertion that an annual monitoring program has been designed and is undertaken by the region. Subsequently, cross reference made it previous item. It may be useful to close this item and rely on completing the cross referenced item. as it does not add to the review. **ACR 2015: "Closed" and colour updated.**
Ministry of the Environment – Air Quality	Mr. Ernie Hartt, Supervisor – Air, Pesticides and Environmental Planning Central Region	2	To a large degree, the comments are intended to reflect how effectively York Region and Senes have revised the EA report and Air Quality (AQ) appendix in line with Technical Support's July 29/05 comments that were provided to the Region with respect to the draft EA report. Technical Support (TS) continues to have some outstanding concerns with the August 2005 documents that require further attention with particular regard to: the incorporation of the Senes AQ Impact Assessment into the EA report with respect to "Future" cases, and the approach taken by Senes in their AQ Impact Assessment.		York Region	Status –completed An updated Air Quality Impact Assessment Report for a Study Area Bounded by Hwy50 to York Durham Line was completed in April 2011 using the CAL3QHCR dispersion model as required in the terms and conditions for the Hwy 7 Corridor & Vaughan North-South Assessment Compliance Monitoring Program (CMP). The purpose of the Study was to assess the cumulative air quality effects that may arise due to the proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) undertaking. The MOE accepted the air quality assessment report on June 17, 2011 and is satisfied that Condition 5.4 of the EA Notice of Approval has been Addressed.	H3-RPT-Q-ENV-030203-final AQ Report_ROI-2011-04-29Senses.pdf (ID#7270) MOE Letter of Acceptance, June 17, 2011 (ID#7713)	No	EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7713) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.
			Lack of Detail in EA Report on AQ Impacts of the Project (Future Cases) a) The details on the AQ impacts relating to the "Future Base Case" and the "Future BRT Case" have not been included in the body of the EA report in support of the brief summary statements made in Table 10.4-3 of the EA report. This approach is not considered appropriate by TS. It has consistently been TS's position that any evaluation of AQ impacts of a project such as this EA report should constitute the primary focus of the EA report as it relates to AQ. In the EA report, the Region continues to make the discussion of	a) The results of the AQ assessment are summarized in Chapter 10 (Table 10.4-3) of the EA report consistent with the summary of other potential environmental effects. The EA document references Appendix L which provides the detailed AQ assessment. The Proponent does not believe that a revision to the EA document is warranted.		a) Status – completed See above.		No	EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7713) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			existing conditions the primary focus (Section 6.6.1) and has relied solely on referring the reader to the Senes AQ Impact Assessment when it comes to the Future Cases. This definitely detracts from the stand-alone nature of the EA report as a means of supporting decisions on the impact of the project with respect to AQ. It remains TS's position that York Region should further revise the EA report accordingly to resolve this issue.							
		2 cont'd	*Focus of EA Report and Senes Report on Particulate Matter Emissions* b) TSP "was not assessed because the larger particles only affect visibility, while the PM_{10} has been associated with health impacts". Since TSP is a parameter regulated by the MOE, TS might have wished to see some further discussion of TSP and its role in defining existing AQ, however TS does acknowledge that it is not a health based parameter and agree to its being excluded from further discussion.	b) Comment noted.		b) Status- No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) $PM_{2.5}$ is included in the "Existing Conditions" discussion and has been discretely inserted into the text/discussions of the "Existing Base case", "Future base Case" and "Future BRT Case". However, overall PM emissions as discussed in the August 2005 AQ Impact Assessment continue to focus on PM_{10} as is demonstrated by Tables 3.2,.3.3 and 3.4 as well as Table 5.1 and 5.2, none of which have been revised to include $PM_{2.5}$. Figures 5.1 and 5.6 also focus on PM_{10}. TS feels that the adjustments made by York Region and Senes to include $PM_{2.5}$ are inadequate and continues to recommend that $PM_{2.5}$ be fully incorporated into all aspects of the AQ Impact Assessment.	c) As noted in the Senes AQ Impact Assessment, there is little information about $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from vehicles and roadways, and therefore the ratio method of PM_{10} to $PM_{2.5}$ was used in order to calculate the values for $PM_{2.5}$. Note in the Terms of Reference it says that respirable particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) will also be assessed in comparison with the proposed Canada Wide Std of 30 ug/m^3.		c) Status – No Action Required Refer to items 16 & 17 of this document.		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Comparison of Existing AQ Data with MOE AAQC Values d) Overall, some inaccuracies remain in the MOE AAQC's which have been included in the assessment of historical and measured data that appears in Section 6.6.1.3 of the EA report and in Section 2.3 of the Senes AQ report. However, TS does not require further clarification of these inaccuracies.	d) Comment noted.		d) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			e) TS acknowledges that Senes has reviewed the historical and monitored data bases in some detail and found them to be accurate and not in need of further adjustments or changes.	e) Comment noted.		e) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		2 cont'd	f) TS is in agreement with the comments in the preamble to Tables 6.6-6 and 6.6-7 of the EA report and Tables 2.6 and 2.8 of the Senes report that reflect PM as being the most significant parameter of concern with respect to both historical data and measured ambient monitoring data. The concerns identified with respect to PM (ie. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) are to be dealt with in comments which follow in terms of dispersion modeling and mitigation.	f) Comment noted.		f) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Development of Vehicle Emissions Data g) TS acknowledges that their concerns identified in the Vehicle Emissions data/discussion have been reviewed by York Region and dealt with satisfactorily. TS is in agreement that no further action is required on these concerns at this time.	g) Comment noted.		g) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Dispersion Modeling/Assessment of Air Quality h) TS still has some concerns with respect to the representation of the project measurement/monitoring locations and the accuracy of the measurement/monitoring data collected during the somewhat limited program. TS however do not feet such concerns are significant and acknowledge that they will not change the overall conclusions of the AQ Impact Assessment.	h) Comment noted.		h) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Matching of Alternatives Assessed in EA Report with Those Screened in the Senes Report i) The July 2004 Senes Report and the draft EA report did not clearly match-up in terms of the evaluation of alternatives noted in Section 8 of the EA report and the preliminary screening of alternatives dealt with in Section 3 of the Senes Report. To clarify this issue Senes removed Section 3 from their report. In order to clear up this matter, TS requests that York Region confirm that Senes' approach on screening with respect to AQ did not provide any different result on selection of the preferred alternative from that shown in Section 8 of the final EA report.	i) The assessment of the effects of route segment alternatives on air quality, while a factor in the evaluation of natural environmental effects, did not provide any different result in the selection of the preferred alternatives from that shown in Section 8 of the EA report.		i) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		2 cont'd	*Identification of Mitigation Measures* j) Section 9.1.1 of the EA report contains a statement noting the intent to plant trees as part of the landscaping plan and that "trees also act as a solid body for air pollutants to settle on and therefore reduce negative effects in the atmosphere". TS would identify such efforts as tree planting as a factor in such mitigation and requests that they be considered by York Region and the appropriate revisions reflected in Table 10.4-3.	j) A conceptual streetscape plan is identified in Section 9.1.1 of the EA report. A detailed streetscape plan will be developed during detailed design [1]. It is acknowledged that tree planting provides an additional built-in positive effect on air quality. Tree planting will be considered further in the development in the detailed streetscape plan.		j) Status – Completed The DBCR incorporates streetscaping recommendations: Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), etc. Further attention will be given to the development of a streetscape plan in detailed design. [1]Streetscape planting plans are complete and there is a net gain in tree planting (i.e. 1100 trees proposed to be planted versus removal of 375 trees).	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) [1]Streetscape Planting 080407 H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-201 to 244 (ID#8909)	No	[1] EF (2012) Closed (2012)	2012 ACR: Numbering added for clarity. The evidence provided was found to support the assertions [1] on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			k) Before any specific comment can be made on the implication of the landscaping plan, it is necessary to look at the AQ related statements in Table 10.4-3. The statement as noted under Proposed Mitigation Measures – Potential Residual Effects, suggests a 3.6% (it actually appears to be 1.6%) improvements (or decrease) in PM_{10} concentrations "when comparing 2021 (future) forecasts with ("Future BRT Case") and without ("Future Base Case") proposed rapid transit. The major difficulty that TS has with the conclusion on future PM_{10} concentrations (as noted above) is that it does not include consideration of Table 3.2, the existing base case pollutant concentration estimates. It is TS's opinion to include consideration of the fact that PM_{10} emissions will increase markedly from the existing base case to the future base case. As a result there will be a 38% increase in PM_{10} initially and it will decrease 1.6% with inclusion of BRT. For York Region to then conclude that the focus should be only on 2021 is misleading and not something we can easily agree to. At the very least TS feels that this change over the period 2001 to 2021 could be characterized in terms of BRT "slowing" the increase but it should in TS's opinion include consideration of "Further Mitigation" based on significant initial increase in PM_{10} concentrations.	k) The increase in PM (2001-2021) without the project is due solely to an increase in traffic volume. Without a change in the public's attitude toward the use of single-occupancy vehicles this increase is unavoidable. The introduction of the BRT system will slow this increase. The EA report's presentation of effects in 2021 is a true reflection of the conditions with and without the undertaking operating as a mature alternative transportation mode. The purpose of this undertaking is to provide an efficient alternative travel mode with the potential to reduce the growth in private automobile use and the consequent traffic volumes generated. Further mitigation to address the natural growth in trip-making in the Region's major corridors is beyond the scope of this EA.		k) Status – No Action Required Refer to items 16 & 17 of this document. (see corresponding comments)		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		2 cont'd	l) The reference for the statement in k above is data noted as being available in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 of the Senes Report, when in fact it should be Tables 3.3 and 3.4.	l) Comment noted. Table 10.4-3 of the EA report should refer to Tables 3.3 and 3.4 of the Senes AQ report, and not Tables 4.3 and 4.4.		l) Status –No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			m) In light of comments b and c, it is TS's opinion that the issue of $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations also needs further review and as such, Table 10.4-3 should be modified to include consideration of $PM_{2.5}$ as well as PM_{10}.	m) There will be a net positive effect to the environment from $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}, therefore no further mitigation is required.		m) Status – No Action Required Refer to items 16 & 17 of this document.		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Monitoring of Construction PM Emissions n) Table 10.4-3 of the EA report includes comments on "Degradation of air quality during construction: which indicates that "some PM emissions locally" are expected but no "Monitoring" is recommended. This information raises some concern with TS about its compatibility with information provided in Section 11.4.1 of the EA report, which does indicate that "Monitoring" will be done in the form of regular inspections of dust and vehicular emissions control. Table 11.4-1 of the EA report does provide some qualitative comment on "Monitoring" associated with "effect of construction activities on air quality (dust, odour)." TS strongly in favour of the need to do such monitoring and requests that York Region clarify what appears to be contrary statements in table 10.4-3 that no "Monitoring" is recommended.	n) Table 10.4-3 of the EA report was intended to indicate that no specific monitoring program beyond that normally required by the construction contract conditions is recommended. The Region will enforce the requirements of the standard contract conditions as described in Section 11.4.1 of the EA report.		n) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Senes Project Description o) The content of Section 1.1 of the Senes report has been reasonably clarified with the addition of explanatory paragraph.	o) Comment noted.		o) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Executive Summaries p) Both the EA report and the Senes report executive summaries need further review in order to substantiate that they are compatible with changes to the bodies of the reports as may occur in terms of addressing the comments provided by TS and noted in the memo.	p) There are no changes proposed to the main EA report to address comments provided by TS. Clarification will be provided as appropriate.		p) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		2 cont'd	*Overall Assessment of Air Quality* q) The Overall Assessment as noted in Section 8 of the Senes report and quoted in the EA report needs further review in order to substantiate that they are compatible with changes to the bodies of the reports as may occur in terms of addressing the comments provided by TS and noted in the memo.	q) There are no changes proposed to the main EA report to address comments provided by TS. Clarification will be provided as appropriate.		q) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
Ministry of the Environment – Water Resources	Ms. Ellen Schmarje, Supervisor, Water Resources Unit, Central Region – Technical Support Section	3	a) In reference to the definitions of "Insignificant" and "Significant" in Section 10.1: Assessment Methodology, an effect that is temporary or short term in duration may be considered significant as the release of suspended solids to a watercourse can potentially cause a permanent loss of critical or productive aquatic habitat.	a) Comment noted. As described in Section 10.1 of the EA report, the definition of significant effect includes a permanent loss of critical or productive aquatic habitat, regardless of the duration of the original net effect that precipitates the permanent effect.	York Region	a) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) The Proponent should note that Section 53 (OWRA) approvals from the MOE will be required for the new and expanded storm sewers and end-of-pipe stormwater management facilities prior to the construction phase (Section 11.2: Project Implementation Plan).	b) Comment noted and will be carried forward for consideration during detailed design. Section 11.2.1 of the EA report identifies examples of other approvals that may be required during the detailed design phase, but is not intended as a complete list of all post EA approvals that will be required.		b) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) A permit to take water must be obtained for all dewatering activities in excess of 50,000 L/day. The permit must be obtained prior to the commencement of any construction related activities requiring groundwater dewatering (Section 11.2: Project Implementation Plan).	c) Comment noted and will be considered during both the preparation of the EA amendment for the southern portion and during detailed design of the entire undertaking.		c) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) Table 11.3 indicates that "in the event a shallow or upward groundwater movement becomes an issue due to construction of the subway during the detailed design stage, TRCA's hydrogeologist will be consulted." It is important to note, that any groundwater issues (including dewatering or water quality issues) related to the proposed undertaking must be dealt directly with the MOE, which may consult with TRCA if necessary.	d) Comment noted. The MOE and TRCA will be consulted accordingly during detailed design.		d) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment To be addressed during design and construction of the Spadina Subway Extension, covered under a separate CMP.		No	Closed (2014	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			e) No major outstanding surface water or groundwater issues were identified regarding the preferred	e) Comment noted. The MOE will be consulted during development of the detailed Monitoring Program as		e) Status – **completed**	[1] Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for	**Yes**	EF 2010	2010 – a Final Drainage Study has been completed.

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			alternative. Additional input during the detailed design phase may be required to ensure that monitoring, mitigation and contingency plans adequately assess any adverse impacts to the natural environment and/or sufficiently protect the natural environment.	appropriate [i].		A Final Drainage Study has been prepared during PE design. It outlines the stormwater management plan for the H3 segment.[1] An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during detailed design.[2] MOE approved the application for storm sewers on June 6, 2011, and oil grit separators on August 4, 2011.[3,4] Reference document folders have been renamed correctly Permits have been issued by MOE for all drainage works associated with the project as listed in Item 46. Reference is made to the various plans and documents that were provided to MOE to support the applications. Conformance with permits is as per the Weekly Environmental Checklist, Item 4.2. Note that the checklist requires recording of parameters to include in a final report to MOE. Therefore, this item remains ongoing.	Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230) [2] Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) [2] Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) [3] MOE CoA #8813-8HDQKY for the storm sewers of Highway 7 from Bayview Avenue to Highway 404. (ID#7738) [4] MOE CoA #8613-8KDKP5 for Oil Grit Separator (OGS) Units 1 and 2.(ID#7939) MOE ECA (see Item 46 above for list) Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008)		[3,4] EF (2012) EF (2014) Closed (2014)	2011 ACR: Bolding and underline removed. Condition if for consultation with MOE during development of the detailed Monitoring Program. Item is ongoing and will be reviewed when assertion(s) and evidence of consultation is provided. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided was found to support the assertions [3,4] on how the condition was addressed. The evidence (ID# 7738 and ID# 7939) provided have incorrect ID#. The ID#s need to be switched. The table should be updated to reflect this. 2013 ACR: noted that ID#s were change as per the 2012 ACR. No review was undertaken. 2014:Item [i]. It is unclear if an Environmental Control Plan has been developed. This assertion should be revised or evidence provided to support it. Subsequently, the status columns was revised to indicate that MOE permits have been obtained and requirements have been rolled into the Weekly Checklist. This appears to complete Item [i] that MOE will be consulted during development of the detailed Monitoring Program as appropriate. It is suggested that the status be changed to closed.

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
Ministry of the Environment – Air and Noise Unit	Mr. Denton Miller	4	**Noise** a) With respect to Section 5 of Appendix K, there were several errors noted in the assessment of the 2021 baseline, BRT and LRT noise calculations. Some of the errors cancelled other errors and it is unlikely that the actual impact will change the overall conclusions drawn in Appendix K. Nonetheless the errors should be corrected.	a) Refer to responses below. As shown in the revised data attached, the conclusions drawn in the original report are still valid. Please refer to the attached Noise and Vibration Supplementary Information package for revised tables and appendices to Appendix K – Noise and Vibration impact Assessment, of the EA report.	York Region	a) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
			Surface Type Used in Stamson Calculations b) The majority of the calculations in Appendix K are based on absorptive ground surfaces. Based on drawings submitted with the proposal, it is the Air and Noise Unit's opinion that ground absorption was used incorrectly in the assessment of the roadway. The Proponent should revise the subject calculations accordingly or clarify why this approach was used.	b) In all cases where noise monitoring was conducted (receptors) the intermediate surface was covered by grass and therefore it was determined that an absorptive designation was appropriate. ORNAMENT Technical Document (MOE 1989), states that "Soft ground surfaces such as ploughed fields, or ground covered with grass, shrubs, or other forms of vegetation are considered to be sound absorptive". This is also reflected in the monitoring results. The predicted sound levels for existing conditions (2002) (section 4.0 in Appendix K) closely resemble the measured sound levels. To be consistent in the modeling approach, the absorptive surface was also used in the prediction of noise level for future cases. However, in light of the above comment b, the noise modeling was revised using a reflective ground surface. The predicted sound levels were found to be still within the range of the measured results in most instances. Therefore, all scenarios have been revised using a reflective ground surface and are attached for review.		b) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
			Daytime and Nighttime Receiver Heights Used in Stamson Calculations c) The receiver heights used in the assessment of the receptors are not consistent with Section 5.5.4 of the MOE's publication ornament where it is stated that for the purposes of assessing the noise impact on single family dwellings and townhouse units, the following receiver heights are used: 1.5 m for defining the outdoor living area, and 4.5 m for defining a 2nd storey window. The proponent should revise the subject calculations accordingly or clarify why this approach is used.	c) The purpose of Section 4.3 in Appendix K is to compare the predicted sound level (from traffic) with the existing sound levels using noise monitoring data collected at specific receptors along the route. For this purpose only, the actual height of the microphone of the noise monitoring equipment was used for a direct comparison with the traffic passby at each specific receptor location. However, for predicting future noise impact the noise modeling was carried out using 1.5 m for outdoor living area and 4.5 m for a 2nd story window.		c) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		4 cont'd	*Nighttime Receiver Source Distances Used in Stamson Calculations* d) When homes are backing onto the subject roadway, the daytime source receiver distance should not be equal to the nighttime source receiver distance. The daytime distances should address the sound levels in the outdoor living area (backyard), and the nighttime distance should address the sound levels at the plane of a bedroom window. In the majority of cases the two distances should differ by 3m. This was not the case in the assessments in Appendix K. The Proponent should revise the subject calculations accordingly or clarify why this approach was used.	d) The shorter of the two horizontal distances was conservatively used for both daytime and nighttime. In any case, the 3 m difference does not result in a significant/noticeable difference in the predicted sound levels. However, the nighttime receptor distances used in the revised model have been changed to reflect the 3 m difference. Refer to the attached STAMSON sheets.		d) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Percent Traffic Split of Provincial Roadways that should be used in Stamson Calculations e) The recommended day-night traffic volume ratios are 85%-15% for provincial roads. Hwy 7 is a provincial roadway. Clarification is required as to why the appropriate traffic split was not used in the assessment or the calculations should be adjusted accordingly.	e) The 90%-10% day-night traffic volume ratio used in the modeling was derived from traffic count data and adopted as an appropriate representation of conditions on Highway 7 in the study area.		e) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Designation of Buses in Stamson Calculations f) As noted in the MOE's publication ornament, buses are considered to be medium trucks; hence the percentage of medium trucks should not be the same in Appendices K-D (Predicted 2021 Baseline Traffic Noise Levels) and K-E (Sound Levels Due to Added Bus Transit Traffic). The Proponent should revise the subject calculations accordingly or clarify why this approach was used.	f) The added bus transit traffic was treated as an RT/Custom source for the STAMSON modeling, that is, a separate source from the regular traffic. Also, the traffic volume of bus transit was not included in the AADT volume for the regular traffic. Hence the percentage of medium trucks is indeed the same in Appendices K-D and K-E. The actual noise level for the bus transit was provided by the manufacturer.		f) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		4 cont'd	*AADT Inconsistencies* g) Section 5.2 of Appendix K (Scenario 2 – Bus Transit Option), states that "Scenario 2 predicts the sound levels on the same road segments for the same year (2021), but with the added influence of the bus transit traffic". However the AADT in Appendix K-E (54,144; Sound Levels Due to Added Bus Transit Traffic) is lower that the AADT in Appendix K-D (54,528; Predicted 2021 Baseline Traffic Noise Levels). The proponent should revise the subject calculations accordingly or clarify why this approach was used.	g) The data used were generated by the travel demand modeling with the model calibrated against York Region's most recent AADT counts for Highway 7. The AADT figure for the "with BRT" scenario represents general traffic only and does not include the BRT vehicles themselves. The modeling projects a minor reduction in auto vehicle use after BRT implementation however the overall person-capacity of the roadway is increased by the carrying capacity of the BRT service.		g) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
			Distances in Stamson Calculations h) Some of the distances in the assessment of the proposal are not correct. For example, the distance to the centre of the eastbound segment of the roadway is 28.6 m. This is clearly not correct when assessed against Figure 9.7 of the EA report. The proponent should revise the subject calculations accordingly or clarify why this approach was used.	h) The distances have been revised to reflect those shown in the figures in Chapter 9 of the EA report. Refer to the attached STAMSON sheets.		h) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			LRT Assessment i) The above concerns are for the most part also applicable to the assessment of the proposed LRT. The Proponent should revise the subject calculations accordingly or clarify why this approach was used.	i) The distances have been revised to reflect those shown in the figures in Chapter 9 of the EA report. Refer to the attached STAMSON sheets.		i) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Preferred Assessment Methodology j) The preferred assessment would see the dedicated bus lanes and the LRT, defined as separate segments in Stamson. This approach would simplify the Proponent's assessment and our review of the undertaking.	j) The recommended assessment methodology as suggested by the MOE was used in the study submitted. The bus transit and LRT were treated as a separate segment in the Stamson modeling. Please refer to Appendix K-E and Appendix K-F.		j) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Vibration *Reference Vibration Value* k) Confirm that the reference value for the vibration calculations in Section 6.1 of Appendix K is 1 micro-metre per second. If correct, please provide a detailed sample calculation of the results noted in Table 6.1. If incorrect please comment on the use of an appropriate reference value and the impact it will have on the calculations and the subsequent conclusions.	k) This issue had been previously responded to and discussed with Mr. Denton Miller of the MOE Noise Unit in June 2005. Please see the revised Table 6.1 attached.		k) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
Ministry of the Environment	Ms. Gemma Connolly, Special Project Officer	5	*CEAA Approval* a) Page 1-1 identifies that approval under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act is being sought through an integral parallel process. No federal trigger was identified by CEAA through their review of the provincial EA. Therefore, EAAB is unaware of any coordinated and/or concurrent federal approval process. [1-7],	a) Given that federal funding has not yet been approved, it is anticipated that the only likely trigger will be the DFO's approval of the major river crossings. The Region expects that this local approval will be obtained through DFO's delegation of authority to the TRCA[1-7].	York Region	a) Status – complete To date DFO has stated that there are no Navigable Waters and related permits required. [1] Transport Canada email to QSD of September 7, 2010 also confirms there is no need for a Federal EA. [2] TRCA, acting on behalf of DFO has provided permits for Watercourse Alteration at the CV1 [3] and CV2 sites [4]. [2011 ACR] Permits for Warden Bridge [5], Apple Creek [6], CV3 [7] and German Mills [8] are currently under review [4]. See Item #38 above. TRCA permits were approved for Warden Bridge [5], Apple Creek [6], Beaver Creek [7]. See Item #38 above. The above encompasses all watercourse crossings on the H3 segment.	Navigable Waters Determination Letter. August 25, 2010 .(ID#6429,6482)[1] September 7, 2010 Email between Transport Canada and QSD (ID#6482) [2] [3] Permit No: C-110565 to alter a Watercourse on German Mills Tributary across Hwy 7 east of Pond Drive, Town of Richmond Hill, Don River Watershed (ID#4234)(ID#7668) [4] Permit No: C-1106040 to alter a Watercourse on German Mills Tributary across Hwy 7, 400 m west of Hwy 404 in Town of Richmond Hill, Don River Watershed (ID#42345)(ID#7761) [5,6,7] See Item #38 above for permit reference.	No	[1,2,3,4] EF (2011) [5,6,7] EF (2012) Closed (2014)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 6429,6482) was found to support the assertion [1,2] on how the condition was addressed. No evidence was provided to support the assertions [3,4]. Additional evidence provided (ID# 4234,42345) was found to support the assertion [3,4] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided was not found to support the assertions [5,6,7] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: OE confirmed that all permits have been received for applicate watercourses. This item is closed
			Chapter 8 Evaluation Local Alignment Options b) It is difficult to follow the evaluation methodology used to select the preferred local alignment options. This analysis is identified in Tables 8.3.-3 to 8.3-7.	b) Generally, where applicable, these options were evaluated using the major objectives adopted for the primary route alternatives analysis. In some cases, such as the Markham Centre/Enterprise Dr area, more specific local factors were used to compare options.		b) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) Table 8.3-5 identifies Option C3-4 as the preferred	c) The table presents the basis for the evaluation of the		c) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed	2014: Review Result colour changed to better

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			option and Option C3-3 as the next preferred. It is unclear how these options were ranked and evaluated.	options by listing the key attributes or effects of each option in terms of the goals and primary objectives adopted for evaluation of the larger route segments along the corridor. Each option's performance against the goals was assessed by evaluating the individual attributes/effects to identify the preferred option in terms of each of the five main objectives. Options C3-3 and C3-4 were selected from this initial screening. The relative merits of these two options were discussed in the text supporting the evaluation table in Section 8.1.5.1. This comparison indicates that Option C3-4 is cost-effective and would provide the most convenient access to rapid transit for several trip types and destinations. At the same time the design of the new Rouge crossing to meet TRCA requirements will mitigate adverse effects on the natural environment.					(2014)	reflect status
		5 cont'd	d) Table 8.3-6 highlights Enterprise Dr as the preferred option, while the text identifies Civic Corridor as the preferred option. Qualitative rankings are provided in Table 8.3-6 indicating fair, good but no rationale is provided on what this means in the weighing of the criteria.	d) In Table 8.3-6, the Enterprise Drive option was inadvertently highlighted as the "Technically Preferred Option". The qualitative rankings shown against each indicator were assessed collectively with implicit weighting and found to support the conclusion in the text that the Civic Mall Option best met the objectives for improved transit service through the planned Markham Centre.		d) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			e) Table 8.3-7 provides check marks with no rationale on what these mean. Please provide further clarification on how these local alignment options were assessed and evaluated.	e) Each check mark in Table 8.3-7 indicates the alignment alternative (Option C-C1 or C-C2) that is preferred in terms of the individual planning criteria noted in the table. For some criteria, both options were considered to be equally responsive and thus both were checked. Again, these responses were assessed collectively leading to the recommendation of the northern alignment stated in the text.		e) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		5 cont'd	f) Section 8.3.4.2 is seeking approval for both C-B1 and C-B2. The preferred option is identified as C-B1. Any proposed changes to the preferred option would be considered an amendment to the undertaking.	f) The alternative methods of crossing the Hwy 404 interchange were not considered a comparison of alignments within a segment of the route but an evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of local design solutions to achieve a segregated right-of-way through the existing interchange. As noted in Section 8.3.4.2 of the EA report, the preferred strategy (option C-B1) is to avoid environmental impacts and significant capital costs by operating the rapid transit in mixed traffic through the existing underpass on Hwy 7, basically a "do nothing" solution. The Region is seeking approval of Option C-B2, as the preferred ultimate solution for phased implementation if Option C-B1 becomes unreliable. This option will focus on maintaining the transitway within the Hwy 7 right-of-way by modifying the lane arrangements or span of the existing Hwy 404 underpass as the preferred design solution. A supplementary table assessing the potential effects of the three variations of alternative C-B2 is attached. Option C-B2, grade separated right-of-way, will be the Region's preferred ultimate option if and when required to traverse the Hwy 404 interchange without congestion delays. Option C-B1, operation of the transitway in mixed traffic, will be used until such time congestion problems trigger the need for the grade separation Option C-B2. Improvements to the road system, currently planned by the municipalities will also influence the timing of and need for the ultimate grade separated right-of-way (C-B2).		f) Status – No Action Required H3 detail design engineering does not recommend implementation of Option C-B2 at this time. Monitoring against the supplementary table titled "Assessment of Highway 404 Crossing" (Attachment 8 of the CMP) is not required at this time.	Constrained Areas Report - Highway 404 Crossing (ID# 3881)	No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
			Intermodal Stations g) The York Region intermodal terminal and Richmond Hill intermodal terminal are discussed as part of the undertaking on page 9-2. These stations are not supposed to be part of this EA approval and should not be described as part of the approved undertaking.	f) Comment noted. These terminals were mentioned as examples of associated facilities in the context of inter-connectivity with other modes.		g) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Missing Information h) Please provide the missing information in Table 10.4-2 on page 10-9.	h) A completed page 10-9 of Table 10.4-2 from the EA report is provided as supplementary information.		h) Status – No Action Required Table 10.4-2 has been updated.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		5 cont'd	*Effects and Mitigation* i) On Table 10.4-2 some issues are evaluated as "Significant" after mitigation, yet monitoring is not recommended. Could you please justify why monitoring will not occur?	i) The issues identified as significant after mitigation are those concerning intersection levels of service analyzed as near or at capacity. The anticipated traffic volumes with or without the undertaking are such that monitoring will not lead to any further mitigation options.		i) Status – No Action Required Refer to Table 10.4-2 in Appendix 1 above for individual comments.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
			Vaughan North-South Link Ultimate Conversion to Subway Technology	Refer to the detailed supplementary information provided for the Vaughan North-South Link		Items j, k & l: Not applicable to H3 Design.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			j) Page 6 of the terms of reference allowed the Region to assess the environmental effects of a subway extension between the VCC to York University. This assessment was contingent upon the Spadina Subway being extended from Downsview Station to York U in the City of Toronto.	j) The extension of subway technology from York University to VCC was contingent on the extension from Downsview Station to York University being completed. The Region's EA for the extension into York Region is contingent on approval of the EA for the portion within the City of Toronto.		Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment An EA amendment report subtitled "Response to Conditions of Approval – Vaughan N-S Link Subway Alignment Optimization" was approved by the Minister of the Environment on April 4, 2008.	MOE letter of approval of the undertaking - Vaughan N-S Link Subway Alignment Optimization (ID# 4160)	No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			k) Chapter 12 identifies that the logical northern limit of the Spadina subway extension would be the VCC. As a result, a major component of the analysis would have built upon the conclusions and recommendations of the City's Spadina Subway Extension EA Study, which is still ongoing. Without the conclusions of the City's study, it is difficult to determine whether or not the protection of Alignment A-1 would be feasible and should be considered as part of this EA approval.	k) The Terms of Reference for the City's EA identify the Region-owned land north of Steeles as the northern limit of all alignment options to be analyzed in their EA. Only the orientation of the alignment at this limit is not specified. Chapter 12 of the Region's EA describes the rationale for selecting Alignment A-1 to access the VCC and identifies the potential zone where A-1 may have to be modified to link with the range of alignments being considered by the City's EA south of Steeles Ave.. The EA commits the Region to develop and assess the effects of any modification through this zone in an amendment carried out after the City's EA is approved. (Refer to detailed supplementary information)		Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment The TTC has prepared a separate CMP for the Spadina Subway Extension Project and is responsible for compliance monitoring related to the Vaughan N-S Link segment of the undertaking.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			l) Section 12.5 also defers most of the effects assessment of Alignment A-1 to be done as part of an amendment to the EA. It may be premature to protect a r.o.w. without having the benefits of what types of effects are anticipated to occur. EAAB would like the opportunity to meet with the Region and the City to discuss this component of the EA.	l) Refer to the detailed supplementary information.		Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
City of Vaughan	Mr. Roy McQuillan, Manager of Corporate Policy	6	Committee Report Recommendations (a through d): a) The MOE be advised that the City of Vaughan supports the approval of the Hwy 7 EA as submitted by the Region of York.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		6 cont'd	b) The Region of York be advised that the report entitled "Design Concept for Avenue 7 including Rapid Transit through the Vaughan Corporate Centre" also forms part of the City's comments on the Hwy 7 EA report and that the recommendation contained in that report be implemented as requested.	b) Comment noted and information will be carried forward for consideration during development of a detailed streetscape plan (refer to Section 9.1.1) at the time of detailed design. The Proponent will commit to consult the local municipalities during development of the detailed streetscape plan.		b) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment Attention will be given to the development of a streetscape plan in Detail Design. Consultation with municipalities commenced as described under item 33 of this document.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) The Region of York be requested to proceed with the amendment to the subway extension component of this EA (Vaughan North-South Link Ultimate Conversion to Subway Technology) at first opportunity, once the TTC Spadina Subway EA is approved, in order to finalize the subway alignment north of Steeles Ave.	c) Detailed comment noted. As noted on Figure 12-4 and described in Section 12.5 of the EA report, the final alignment of the subway from Hwy 407 to Steeles Ave will be determined following completion of the Toronto/TTC EA Study (Spadina Subway Extension from Downsview Station to Steeles Ave).		c) Status- Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) The Region of York be advised that the City of Vaughan is currently completing a number of land use studies along Hwy 7 and along the Vaughan North-South Link. It is requested that the Region of York work with the City in refining the transitway and boulevard treatments in response to the land use and design policies that may result from the studies in order to optimize the attractiveness of the urban environment and support the Region's and the City's development objectives; and that such consultation take place during the detailed design phase for the transitway and associated road allowances.	d) Detailed comment noted. York Region will work with the local municipalities, including the City of Vaughan, during detailed design and development of a detailed streetscape plan to incorporate recommendations from adjacent land use planning studies where feasible.		d) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			The Undertaking – Implications for the City of Vaughan e) The introduction of a rapid transit service will be a major catalyst in the transformation of the current Hwy 7 and Centre and Bathurst Streets from a Provincial highway to an urban arterial road. The City is looking to build on and support this initiative through the Centre St Study and the Hwy 7 Futures Study.	e) Detailed comment noted.		e) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			f) Generally, the impacts were positive or could be mitigated to a minimal level of significance. Given the diversity of the corridor and the form of the transitway, there will be impacts on traffic operations and urban design.	f) Detailed comment noted. As noted in Table 11.4-2 of the EA report, the Region is committed to monitoring traffic operations after implementation of the undertaking. In addition, a detailed traffic management plan will be developed prior to commencing construction (Section 11.2.2.1).		f) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		6 cont'd	*Urban Design* g) The plan shown in the EA for the Corporate Centre does not reflect the City's ultimate preference as illustrated in the report to Committee of the Whole on October 11, 2005. The plan currently shows minimal landscaping. The recommendations contained in this report should reaffirm the City's desire to see the streetscaping/transitway plan revised either by amendment to the EA or at the time of detailed design to reflect the City's ultimate intentions. It is noted that the subway extension portion of the EA deals specifically with this issue by stating that "Transit intermodal facilities will be developed in consultation with Vaughan as part of the introduction of a comprehensive landscaping and streetscaping plan for the VCC and station precinct". These measures will need to be taken into account in the original transitway design.	g) As described in Section 9.1.1 of the EA report, a conceptual streetscape plan has been developed as part of this EA and will provide the basis for the detailed streetscape design. The Region will commit to working with the local municipalities during detailed design to incorporate streetscape elements recommended through other studies where feasible.		g) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			h) In addition, the plan shows a "VCC Transit Square Concept" at the northwest corner of the intersection of Millway Ave and Hwy 7, which is identified as a transit terminal facility in Section 12 of the EA report. It is recognized that there will be the need for some surface intermodal facilities at a future subway terminal station. However, there is minimal information available on the facility identified in the EA study. It will have to be addressed further with the City in accordance with the statement quoted above, including the basis for the selection of this location.	h) The intention in showing a concept for the surface intermodal facilities is to identify the need for an efficient means of transferring passengers from feeder bus services to the rapid transit service. The concept, while not intended to be a detailed design is representative of the extent of surface facilities and indicative of the opportunities for integration of these facilities into the urban design of the transportation node. It also provides a basis for assessment of any potential effects on the surrounding built or natural environment. The location of the typical concept was based on the recommendations of the draft report on the City of Vaughan's study of streetscaping for the VCC.		h) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
			i) The study acknowledges that there are areas that have insufficient road allowance width to permit significant landscaping. An example is the section of Hwy 7 between Martin Grove and Pine Valley Dr. For such areas, the plan suggests that redevelopment be monitored and that property be acquired through redevelopment. An alternative would be to incorporate sufficient setbacks to allow for landscaping to be provided on the private lands between road allowance and the building.	i) Comment noted. The Region will work with the local municipalities to secure the required r.o.w. and setbacks through the development approval process.		i) Status – **Completed** This will be addressed if or when redevelopment proposals are received. **This is addressed with each site plan application. Refer to http://www.york.ca/wps/portal/yorkhome/business/yr/landdevelopment/siteplanapplications.**	**Property Development Commitments (ID# YORK-#6372888] and Municipal Streetscape Partnership Program Application Guidelines (ID# YORK-#6372895)**	No	Closed (2014)	2011 ACR: No evidence was provided to support the assertion. Additional comments added to the status column changes this item to 'Not reviewed' for the 2011 ACR. 2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		6 cont'd	j) The City is currently conducting several land use studies in areas that will be directly affected by the transitway. These include the Hwy 7 Futures Study and the Steeles Ave Corridor Study-Jane St to Keele St. Both studies are nearing conclusion. Each will have land use and urban design implications for these areas. In order to optimize the opportunities for aesthetic improvements along Hwy 7 and in the Vaughan North-South Link, the outcomes of these studies should be taken into account during the detailed design of the transitway and the surrounding road allowance. Improving the urban and aesthetic environment will support both the Region's and City's development objectives and improve the chances of their being achieved. A recommendation has been included requesting that the Region work with the City during the detailed design phase for the transitway to take into account the results of these studies.	j) Comment noted. York Region will work with the local municipalities, including the City of Vaughan, during detailed design and development of a detailed streetscape plan to incorporate recommendations from adjacent land use planning studies where feasible.		j) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Road Operations The introduction of the centre median will have a number of effects, which include: k) A prohibition on left turns in and out from driveways and minor roads due to the transitway – The EA indicates that alternative access can be obtained by way of another site or an adjacent roadway. Users will have to adapt and find alternative routes. The introduction of U-turns at signalized intersections is also provided. The impact of the introduction of U-turns to accommodate left-in and left-out turns – in some instances there might be conflicts between U-	k) Detailed comment noted. The Region will consult with the local municipalities [1] during development of the detailed Traffic Management Plan [2] (as described in Section 11.2.2.1 of the EA report).		Status- Completed k) [2011 ACR]Consideration will be given in Detail Design to prohibiting side street Right Turn on Red to mitigate potential conflict with mainline U-Turn vehicles. Mainline U-Turn traffic will have a separate signal phase to facilitate movement.	[1]ITS/ Electrical	No		ENF 2009: No evidence was found for prohibiting side street right turn on red in 3551 Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 – 2010 – removed from review as discussed with Owner Engineer as it is a detailed design consideration. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			turns and right turn movements onto Hwy 7 from side streets when the traffic signal is red. It may be necessary to restrict right turns on red lights from side streets. This should be monitored and measures taken to reduce any potential conflicts. It is noted that some of the intersections with four lane road sections may not permit U-turns by large trucks. Restrictions may have to be imposed where warranted.			The Region indicated that Right Turn on Red prohibition is not required on side street[1]. Side street traffic should follow rules of the road for right turning on red and proceed with the movement only when safe to do so. Lefts out/in crossing the Rapidway are prohibited; instead U-turns at signalized intersections help address this issue. Permanent Traffic Signals Layout drawings have been Issued for Construction. [2] [2] Traffic impact studies for each stage/phase of construction (Phase 1-14) were prepared. [1] Each report was circulated to the Town of Richmond Hill and the Town of Markham for review and comment. No comments were received.	Taskforce Minutes of Meeting ELE_ITS-047 Oct 21, 2011. (ID#8947) [2] H3 Permanent Traffic Signals Layout IFC H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303 (ID#9632) Traffic Impacts During Construction Study Report – Separate Reports for Phases 1-5, Phases 6-7 and Phases 8-14 (ID Y2014-009). Design Submission Log indicating circulations to the Town of Markham and City of Richmond Hill (see Rows 62, 167, 181, 186 of spreadsheet, highlighted in tan shading and red outline). Note columns X, Y with dates sent and columns AH, AI indicating response. (ID Y2014-009). CRS 045 and CRS-146 with comments on Phase 1-5, CRS-164 with comments on Phase 6-7 and CRS-159 with comments on Phase 8-14. Note City		[1] EF (2012) [1,2] EF (2014) Closed (2014)	assertions [1] on how the condition was addressed. [2] 2014:Item [1] no evidence was provided to support that the Region consulted with the local municipalities. Subsequently evidence was provided (e.g., CRS-159) support the assertion regarding comments from municipalities. Results changed to EF. This item is closed Item [2] Evidence found to include the noted drawing with respect to traffic management. This item is closed

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
							of Markham replied with no comments (denoted MAR); Town of Richmond Hill did not respond. (ID Y2014-009)			

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		6 cont'd	l) Pedestrian crossings given the additional road width in some areas – Given the introduction of the transitway and the station facilities, there is a substantial increase in the paved portion of the road allowance, especially at major intersections. Some pedestrians may not be able to cross in one signal phase. The transitway will have pedestrian refuge areas built into the design to allow them to wait at mid-crossing. A further alternative would be to have a two-stage crossing system to accommodate heavier traffic. Before proceeding to a two-stage system, monitoring should occur under operating conditions to determine if it is warranted. [1-3]	l) Detailed comment noted and will be carried forward for consideration of the detailed Traffic Management Plan (Section 11.2.2.1). Traffic Operation Monitoring (noted in Table 11.4-2) will include consideration of effects on pedestrians[1-3].		l) Status - **completed** [2011 ACR][1] Median station provides the opportunity for 2-stage pedestrian crossing and this option is currently under review by the Region for all key intersections [2]. The design is proceeding with 2 stage crossings for pedestrians at all intersections.[3] A Transit Priority Measures Report was completed which included modelling of various scenarios. [3]	[1] INTERSECTION OPERATIONS STUDY – Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis, June 15, 2011(ID#7450) [2011 ACR][2] Alternative Intersection Operations Analysis Meeting Minutes, July 7, 2011 (ID#7912) [3] Comparative Traffic Analysis – Dual Left Turn Lanes and Single Left Turn Lane, Apr 18, 2011.(ID#7190) [3] H3 Permanent Traffic Signals Layout IFC H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303 (ID#9632) [3] Transit Priority Measures Report, March 15, 2012 (ID#8371)	**Yes**	[1] EF (2011) [3] EF (2012) [3] EF (2013) **[3] EF (2014)** **Closed (2015)**	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7450) was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains 'Ongoing" and assertion [2] will be reviewed when completed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was not found to sufficiently support the assertions [3] on how the condition was addressed. The evidence provided (ID# 7190) indicates that, under the permanent design and Stage 4 of construction, it was assumed for the purposes of the duel left turn analysis that two-staged pedestrian crossings be used to cross Highway 7. 2012 edit: additional evidence provided by the Owner Engineer (Permanent Traffic Signals Layout Drawing H3-DWG-E-SGL-080303_CXX_All) and was found to support the assertion [3] on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: evidence provided was found to support the assertion [3] on how the condition was addressed. **[3] 2014: The noted report was provided as evidence.** **2015 ACR: While numbering is confusing, the evidence provided in 2014 supports that the status is closed/**

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			m) The potential for traffic infiltration in some areas – Traffic infiltration has been identified as a possible problem in certain neighbourhoods, resulting from drivers trying to avoid Hwy 7. This may increase as a result of the constraints introduced by the transitway. The following neighbourhoods may be affected: Monsheen Dr, Willis Rd/Chancellor Dr, New Westminster Dr, and Beverly Glen Blvd. The EA recommends that these neighbourhoods be monitored before and after the implementation of the transitway to determine if additional mitigation measures are required.	m) Detailed comment noted. York Region will work with the municipalities during monitoring of traffic operations after implementation of the transitway to address issues/concerns including traffic infiltration.		m) Status -future		No	Ops / Future (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status** **<u>2015 ACR: As the segment transitions from DB to O/M, consider reviewing the status of all "Future /Ops" items during 2016 and reporting updates accordingly</u>"**
			Vaughan North-South Link Ultimate Conversion to Subway Technology n) The EA study confirmed the alignment selected through the Higher Order Transit Corridor Protection Study, which was incorporated into OPA 529, subject to consideration of the results of TTC's current EA process.	n) Comment noted.		n) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			o) This EA is seeking the approval of this alignment with the option to finalize the portion south of Hwy 407 to tie into the alignment that may ultimately be chosen through the TTC's EA process for the Spadina Subway Extension. No change to the alignment to the north of Hwy 407 is proposed.	o) Comment noted. Refer to Section 12.5 and Figure 12-4 of the EA report.		o) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		6 cont'd	p) The recommendations of this portion of the EA study should be supported. Putting in place the EA approvals for a subway extension from Steeles Ave to the Corporate Centre is a welcomed initiative for a number of reasons. It will clearly establish a commitment to the development concepts that are being put forward in City, Regional and Provincial planning documents in the interim it will inform investment decisions by both the public and private sectors; it will allow for the necessary property protection; and the project will be design-ready so that the next steps in the process can take place quickly once financing has been committed.	p) Comment noted.		p) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
			q) There is a level of uncertainty surrounding the alignment between Steeles Ave and Hwy 407 as a result of the TTC's Spadina Subway Extension EA. This is unavoidable due to the timing of the two processes. Of primary concern is maintaining the Millway Ave alignment through the Corporate Centre in order to ensure that the Hwy 7 station can be built at its planned location and so property protection and acquisition can continue. The TTC has demonstrated that the three alignment alternatives currently under consideration in the Spadina EA will all work in the context of the City's objectives for the Corporate Centre. All three can provide for the location of an additional station at the planned Hwy 407 Transitway, on the west side of Jane St, south of the highway.	q) Comment noted.		q) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		6 cont'd	r) In order to overcome this issue, the EA recommends that additional studies take place when the preferred designs for the inter-related facilities have received EA approval. These studies would form the basis for an EA amendment. It is critical that none of the EA processes be slowed. Approval of this portion of the EA on the basis of the planned amendment should be supported. In addition, the Region of York should be requested to initiate the amending report shortly after the approval of the TTC's EA. Failure to proceed expeditiously with the amendment to the EA may be interpreted as a lack of commitment to the project, possibly altering investment decisions and compromising the preservation of r.o.w.	r) Detailed comment noted. As noted on Figure 12-4 and described in Section 12.5 of the EA report, the final alignment of the subway from Hwy 407 to Steeles Ave will be determined following completion of the Toronto/TTC EA Study (Spadina Subway Extension from Downsview Station to Steeles Ave).		r) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			s) The implementation of the YRTP will be a positive step in the evolution of the Region of York and the affected local municipalities. The plan will promote the transformation of southern York Region into a more urban place by shaping the style and intensity of development in the affected corridors, supporting economic development, increasing public mobility and improving environmental quality by offering an alternative to the private automobile. For these reasons the approval of the EA should be supported.	s) Comment noted.		s) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs (OSAA)	Mr. Richard Saunders, Director Negotiations Branch	7	a) In Section 14.2-Stakeholder Consultation of the EA Report, the Proponent indicates that they have followed OSAA's recommendations as outlined in correspondence dated July 28, 2005. This table indicates the responses and requests for information from the various First Nations contacted by the Proponent.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) OSAA recommends that the Proponent continue to contact the relevant First Nations and that follow-up contact be made with all the identified First Nations and Aboriginal organizations. [1-3]	b) Comment noted. The Proponent will continue to consult First Nations based on their identified interests/concerns and specific request for additional involvement (as an example, any First Nation that identifies an interest in archaeological findings will be forwarded any future archaeological reports prepared during detailed design)[1-3].		b) Status – **Completed** [1] Hwy 7 EA Notice of submission of CMP for public review and comment. [2] As stated in the H3 Detail Design Work Plan, notices of public consultation opportunities will be provided to First Nations that have expressed their wish to be kept informed of the implementation of the undertaking. [3] Huron-Wendat First Nation has been notified of the completion Stage 2 and Stage 3 Archaeological Assessments in the Highway 7 corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue. 2014 – No further consultation undertaken with First Nations. All archaeological studies and public consultation are complete for the design and construction phases. Status remains ongoing in case of any additional archaeological finds are discovered during the final construction activities in 2015. **No archaeological findings were discovered during construction activities.**	[1] Notice of Submission of CMP ID# 4121) and CMP distribution lists to First Nations, Government Review Team and other stakeholders (ID# 4122, 4123, 4124, 4125) [2] H3 Detail Design Work Plan - Final Version, September 17, 2010. H3 Detail Design Task 1.1.3 (ID#6550) [3] Huron-Wendat First Nation notification letters regarding the completion of Stage 2 and Stage 3 Archaeological Assessments. (ID#7913)	No	EF 2009 [3] EF (2012) **Closed 2015**	Notice of Submission of CMP – Y2H3 4.7 (ID# 4121) 22-Aug-08 4122 – email distribution list 16-Mar-09 4123 – First nations contact MOE 16-Mar-09 4124 – GRT CMP 4125 – Stakeholder Contact list 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to sufficiently support the assertions [3] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: Unclear if consultation was undertaken since 2012. Subsequently, status column updated to reflect current status. Result changes and this was not reviewed. Suggest that in ACR 21015, an update be provided. 2015 ACR: Comment noted. With the completion of construction, this item is closed.

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		7 cont'd	c) The Crown has a duty to consult with Aboriginal peoples where its actions may adversely affect established or asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights. OSAA recommends that MOE consult their legal branch for advice on whether the Crown has any constitutional or other legal obligations to consult Aboriginal peoples in these circumstances. [1-3]			c) Status – **completed** [1] Notices of "Open House" format public consultation opportunities were provided through newspaper advertising. [2] As stated in the H3 Detail Design Work Plan, notices of public consultation opportunities will be provided to First Nations that have expressed their wish to be kept informed of the implementation of the undertaking. [3] Huron-Wendat First Nation has been notified of the completion Stage 2 and Stage 3 Archaeological Assessments in the Highway 7 corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue. 2014 – No further consultation undertaken with First Nations. All archaeological studies and public consultation are complete for the design and construction phases. Status remains ongoing in case of any additional archaeological finds are discovered during the final construction activities in 2015. As per the stakeholder comment, MOE should consult their legal branch for further advice on consultation requirements. **2015 – No archaeological finds were discovered during construction, which is now complete.**	[1] Newspaper advertising (ID# 2865), YSS (ID# 3754) [2] H3 Detail Design Work Plan - Final Version, September 17, 2010. H3 Detail Design Task 1.1.3 (ID#6550) [3] Huron-Wendat First Nation notification letters regarding the completion of Stage 2 and Stage 3 Archaeological Assessments. (ID#7913)	No	EF 2009 [3] EF (2012) **Closed 2015**	2865- Article 18-Jun 3754 – Vaughan Citizen Article 16-Nov-05 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to sufficiently support the assertions [3] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: Unclear if consultation was undertaken since 2012. 2014. Subsequently, status column updated to reflect current status. Result changes and this was not reviewed. This items appears to relate to MOE and an action on their part. The applicability of this comment should be clarified for ACR 21015. **2015 ACR: Comment noted. With the completion of construction, this item is closed.**

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
Health Canada	Ms. Carolyn Dunn, Environmental Assessment Officer	8	These comments are in regards to the responses to Health Canada comments on the draft EA report dated July 8, 2005 a) Section 6.2.5 – A contingency plan for managing effects to drinking water wells needs to be developed as part of the environmental assessment, rather than later in the process [2-4]. Furthermore, no responses were provided related to the identification of municipal drinking water intakes; this is required as part of the assessment [1].	a) As noted in Table 11.3-1 (I.D.#4), the Proponent has committed to preparing a contingency plan to address potential effects to water wells during detailed design of the undertaking [i] [2-4]. Identification of wells and municipal drinking water intakes will be undertaken during detailed design [ii] [1].	York Region	a) Status- Complete Requirements to be addressed during Detail Design. Well location study has been completed [1]. Inspection is ongoing [2-4]Construction activities identified to have an impact on water wells were addressed during permit to take water application to the Ministry of Environment. [i] The PTTW applications (ID 8061) summarize the expert's determination that there are no anticipated negative impacts to surface or groundwater users. All permits were issued by MOE (ID Y2014-010). Contingency plans in the form of spills response and management, erosion and sediment control (including having additional materials on site), waste and hazardous materials management and dust control) are outlined in the Environmental Management Plan. Monitoring is via the Weekly Environmental Checklist (see Sections 1.0, 2.0, 3.0 and section 4.2 related to compliance with the PTTW.	Final Well Study Report_R00_2010-11-15-KR Well Locations Map (ID#6672)[1] Permit to Take Water Applications (ID#8061): -[2] H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW Application Culverts-2011-07-29 -[3] H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW Application Warden Bridge-2011-07-29 -[4] H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW-Application Apple Creek Bridge-2011-07-29 [i] Permits to Take Water – Culverts, Apple Creek Bridge, Warden Avenue Bridge (ID Y2014-010) Weekly Environmental Checklist 2014 (KED ID #2014-008)	**No**	[2-4] EF (2011) **[i] ENF 2014** **Closed (2014)**	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW Application Culverts-2011-07-29; H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW Application Warden Bridge-2011-07-29; H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW-Application Apple Creek Bridge-2011-07-29) was found to support the assertions [2-4] on how the condition was addressed. 2014: numbers added for clarity. Item[i] (contingency plan) no evidence has been provided that this plan has been prepared. Subsequently, the status column was updated and additional evidence provided that supports that the assertion with respect to contingency plans. This item is closed. Item [ii] (identification of wells) (contingency plan) was closed in 2011.

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
			b) Appendix K – it is crucial that construction noise be included in the EA. This is standard practice in EA, to consider the effects of all phases of the project. The changes in the acoustic environment during construction constitute an important potential effect to human health.	b) As noted in Table 11.4-1 (Construction Monitoring), the Proponent has committed to monitoring noise generated by construction activities to ensure compliance with Municipal By-Laws. [1]		**b) Status-Completed** An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during Detail Design. **Weekly Environmental Checklist section 4.4 Municipal Compliance visually verifies that excessive noise is not being generated during construction activities ie/ unnecessary use of back up alarms, banging of buckets etc.** **During the introduction of piling operations, which have the potential to produce significant noise levels, and have a potential to disturb sensitive areas noise monitoring was conducted to ensure compliance.**	Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) **H3_ENV_ToRH_Noise Exemption Permit_2015-05-15_CP (KED ID# 2015-013).** **Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)** **H3-ENV-LOG-NOISE-NS (KED ID# 2015-017)**	Yes	EF (2011) [1] EF (2012) **[1] EF (2014)** **[1] EF (2015)** **Closed (2015)**	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: Numbering added for clarity. The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Item [1] (monitoring) – no evidence has been provided to support that this had been completed and the status / description column is current. In other column (e.g., 35) indicates that 2014: Weekly environmental checklist support that noise is monitored. The Status/Decription column needs to be updated. This item remains ongoing. **2015 ACR: Evidence was provided that supports the assertion that noise monitoring was undertaken. With the completion of construction, this item is closed.**
		8 cont'd	c) Appendix L – In order to fully protect human health, ozone must be included in the air quality assessment of the EA. The reference for odour and formaldehyde in Section 4.2 of the air quality assessment should be provided in the EA (not referenced on the internet).	c) As noted in Table 10.4-3, there is a net positive effect on all air pollutants assessed related to the proposed undertaking.		b) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
Ministry of Transportation (MTO)	Mr. Robb Minnes, Project Manager	9	The notes below are items that the MTO raised on the draft EA report and how they have been addressed in the final EA report. *GO BRT and Hwy 407 Transitway* a) MTO indicated that the references in the EA to the relationship between the GO BRT project and the 407 Transitway were confusing. While not a critical issue, it would have been preferred if section 1.3g had included the following clarification: "The initial phase of the GO BRT project, as supported by MTO, consists of buses running in mixed traffic on existing road facilities including section of Hwy 407. The 407 Transitway, which has been planned and is being protected by MTO, is designed as a fully grade separated transit facility supporting bus or LRT technologies. It will run adjacent to, but outside of the Hwy 407 r.o.w. between Burlington and Oshawa".	a) Comment noted. The undertaking for the 407 Transitway will be defined through a separate EA by the MTO.	York Region	a) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) MTO had also requested that where the EA discusses Hwy 7 or Vaughan north-south transit service interface with Hwy 407 transit service, it should address both shorter term interface with GO BRT mixed traffic service on Hwy 407 as well as longer term interface with the grade separated 407 Transitway service. This has been done.	b) Comment noted.		b) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Plans and Figures c) All of the plans referring to "407 Transitway" have been changed to "Future 407 Transitway" except Figures 8.3-1 through 8.3-17.	c) Comment noted.		c) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) The proposed sidewalk on the south side of Hwy 7, shown on Figures 9-43 and 9-44 has been deleted as requested.	d) Comment noted.		d) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		9 cont'd	*Structures* e) Section 9.1.5 identifies work required to accommodate the transit corridor where it crosses CAH designations including lane width and sidewalk reductions as well as structure modifications. Pursuant to the MTO's request, the introduction to Section 9.1.5 now indicates that the identified modifications within the CAH must be reviewed and approved by the Ministry. Further, the CAH modifications are now identified throughout this section.	e) Comment noted.		e) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
			f) The Final EA document is acceptable to the MTO.	f) Comment noted.		f) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
Town[City] of Markham	Mr. Arup Mukherjee	10	General Committee Report re. Hwy 7 EA a) Recommendations include that Council endorse the findings of the Environmental Study Report for the Hwy 7 rapid transit project, and that staff continue to work with Regional and YRTP staff to finalize the design for the rapid transit facility.	a) Comment noted. York Region will continue to work with local municipalities including the Town[City] of Markham, during detailed design and implementation of the undertaking.	York Region	a) Status – **completed** Preliminary consultation with municipalities, including the Town [City] of Markham, regarding design approvals commenced during the PE design phase as described under Item 33 of this document.	Refer to item 33of this document for consultation references.	No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) Based on the above endorsement, staff has worked with the Proponents for the Liberty development to secure and protect sufficient r.o.w. along Town Centre Blvd for the rapid transit proposal. It is recognized that further consultation will be required with IBM to secure the remaining r.o.w. for this option.	b) Comment noted. The Region will work with the local municipalities to secure the required r.o.w.		b) Status – completed A Cedarland Alignment Modification Report has been finalised following receipt of MOE and TRCA comments – see Appendix 4 for monitoring. The report outlines the approach and the necessary r.o.w requirements.	Cedarland Alignment Modification Report – Y2H3 6.03 (ID# 3018)	No	EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided (3018) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
City of Toronto	Mr. Rod McPhail	11	Letter dated December 6, 2005 Hwy 7 EA a) The EA report indicates that, in the absence of an approved alignment for the Spadina Subway extension between Downsview Station and Steeles Ave, the study could not come to any conclusions regarding a recommended alignment and preferred design for a further extension of the Spadina Subway north of Steeles Ave. The EA report proposes, in spite of the lack of a recommended alignment or preferred design, that a subway extension from the potential Steeles Station to Vaughan Corporate Centre (VCC) be approved. The EA report recommends, however that in order to follow through on a subway extension, an amendment (or addendum) to the EA will be completed. This amendment would use the approved alignment from the TTC/City EA, once MOE approval is received, as a starting point to develop and assess alternative design concepts for the subway extension between Steeles Ave and VCC. Chapter 12 of the EA report contains a description of the components of the amendment report.	a) Throughout the Region's EA Study process, York Region, TTC and City of Toronto staff have participated in a reciprocal manner on the respective Technical Advisory Committees for the Spadina Subway Extension, both in Toronto and York Region. The confirmation of subway alignment recommended in prior studies relating to property protection for the VCC and the identification of the extent and scope of the tie-in alignment to be addressed in the addendum resulted from close collaboration with TTC staff and their consultant. This consultation has ensured that the alignment for the portion of the subway extension north of Hwy 407, for which approval is sought in the Region's EA is compatible with all alignment options from which the TTC/City of Toronto EA's preferred alignment will be selected. Also, the discussions and exchange of information form the basis of the description of components that are required to be addressed in the proposed addendum for the portion south of Highway 407 where the tie-in to the TTC's preferred alignment would be achieved.	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment An EA amendment report subtitled "Response to Conditions of Approval – Vaughan N-S Link Subway Alignment Optimization" was approved by the Minister of the Environment on April 4, 2008 The TTC has prepared a separate CMP for the Spadina Subway Extension Project and is responsible for compliance monitoring related to the Vaughan N-S Link segment of the undertaking.	MOE letter of approval of the undertaking - Vaughan N-S Link Subway Alignment Optimization (ID# 4160)	No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			EA Consultation b) Both the Hwy 7 EA and the Spadina Subway Extension EA had a TAC with staff representatives from York Region, City of Vaughan, YRT, City of Toronto and TTC.	A revised Figure 12-4 is included in the supplementary information regarding the Vaughan North-South Link and includes the preferred alignment identified in the TTC Spadina Extension EA (The preferred TTC EA alignment had not been confirmed at the time the Region's Hwy 7 and VNSL EA was being completed for formal submission).		Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
		11 cont'd	c) In addition to attending TTC/City EA TAC meetings for the Spadina Subway extension EA, York Region, YRT and City of Vaughan representatives have met with TAC staff regarding proposed Steeles Ave station options and subway design requirements to extend the subway beyond the proposed Steeles Ave station. The outcome of this work was the development and evaluation of concepts for the proposed Steeles Ave station, subway alignment, and ancillary facilities. The preferred concept for the Steeles Ave station, and the subway alignment in its vicinity, will be put forward to the MOE upon Toronto City Council approval of the Spadina Subway Extension EA findings and the completion of the EA report (early 2006). The preferred alignment (N-3 on attached figure) was identified through the TTC/City EA study process and was evaluated by the TAC during the summer of 2005. This alignment is not consistent with the preferred alignment A-1 shown in the Hwy 7 EA.			Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Timing of Evaluation/Selection of Alignments d) The draft Hwy 7 EA was circulated for review in April 2005. At that time the TTC/City Spadina Subway Extension EA study was finalizing the selection of a preferred route, which was shown at public meetings in May 2005. The City's review of the draft EA, noting no substantial comments, was based on their understanding that the component of the study dealing with the subway would be updated to reflect current work from the TTC/City study prior to York Region submitting its final EA report. In particular that Chapter 12 would be reworked to reflect the TTC/City EA work.			Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		11 cont'd	e) York Region changed the final version of Chapter 12 quite substantially from the draft EA. However, the evaluation of alignment options relies almost entirely on alignments generated based on the 1993 TTC EA for the subway extension. While the recommended A-1 alignment, for which approval is requested, is similar to one of the alignments evaluated in the more recent TTC/City EA (as far as the tail track north of Steeles Ave), it is not the preferred alignment that has been put forward to Toronto City Council for approval. The preferred alignment from the TTC/City EA was not evaluated in the Hwy 7 EA, even though that alignment was identified prior to the Region finalizing its EA report in August 2005.			Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Amendment to Hwy 7 EA f) The City of Toronto and TTC suggest that an addendum to the Hwy 7 EA, reflecting the preferred alignment to Steeles West Station, would be an appropriate venue to address the concerns that they have, assuming that an addendum is completed prior to the City and TTC considering a further extension of the Spadina Subway for approval through the City's and TTC's planning and approval processes.			Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
Region of Peel	Sabbir Saiyed, Principal Transportation Planner	12	a) The Region of Peel Official Plan places a strong emphasis on the increased use of sustainable transportation nodes such as transit, cycling and walking. Peel Region recently adopted the following transportation vision to focus efforts in achieving a desired future transportation system: "Peel Region will have a safe, convenient, efficient, multi-modal, sustainable and integrated transportation system that supports a vibrant economy, respects the natural and urban environment, meets the diverse needs of residents and contributes to a higher quality of life".	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
		12 cont'd	b) The Region of Peel supports a balanced transportation system that promotes both roads and transit. The Region encourages improved accessibility by road and public transit to major nodes and corridors. On page E-7, it is stated that the preferred alternative will be able to meet long-term growth needs and planning objectives. They suggest that the current EA should take into consideration the needs to move automobile and truck traffic safely and efficiently on the Hwy 7 corridor and examine an alternative that supports all modes of transportation. Thus, a balanced alternative needs to be investigated further.	b) Comment noted. A wide range of alternatives to the undertaking were included in the assessment (refer to Chapter 3 of the EA report) to address the purpose of the undertaking as approved by the Minister of the Environment. The purpose of the undertaking is summarized in Section E.2 of the EA report. The preferred alternative to the undertaking (described in Section 3.1.5) includes all components of the "current commitments" (described in Section 3.1.2), including all York Region Transportation Master Plan improvements. The Transportation Master Plan includes a multi-modal approach to address travel demand and goods movement to 2031.		b) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) Local public transit along Hwy 7 (Regional Rd 107) in Peel Region is operated by the City of Brampton. Therefore in order to improve future transit services on the Hwy 7 corridor, it is important to coordinate transit improvements in close partnership with the City of Brampton and Peel Region.	c) The Region of Peel has been included in the Technical Advisory Committee and the Government Review Team for this formal EA submission. York Region will work with Peel to integrate any future Hwy 7 transit improvements west of Hwy 50 with the York Region undertaking defined in this EA.		c) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) A station should be considered in the vicinity of Hwy 7 and Hwy 50. Schedule A of the City of Brampton Official Plan designates this area as a "Primary Office Node". Since this area will be a major trip generator, a station is justified at this location. Section 4.3.4.12 of the Peel Region's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) supports this position by directing the Region to "support gateways and interconnections between the local bus network and future transitways, especially at Regional urban Nodes".	d) As noted in Figures 9-1 and 9-2, a transit stop has been proposed at Hwy 50 which is the planned terminus of rapid transit service as defined through this EA. Should rapid transit service be planned west of Hwy 50 into Peel Region, York Region will work with Peel Region to integrate services appropriately.		d) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			e) A reference is made regarding Hwy 427 on page 9-8 as: "Between Hwy 50 and Hwy 27, the existing Hwy 7 alignment would shift to the north up to 6.7 m to incorporate the MTO's future Hwy 427 extension allowing Hwy 7 to be widened on the north side only". This should be discussed with Peel Region and MTO before proceeding further.	e) MTO will be consulted during detailed design as it relates to any work within their jurisdiction, including widening of the existing Hwy 7 structure over Hwy 427.		e) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			f) To ensure that there will be good connectivity between Peel and York Regions, the EA study area (page 2-1) should include areas west of Hwy 50 along Hwy 7 in Peel.	f) The study area for this EA extends from the York/Peel boundary (Hwy 50) to the York/Durham boundary. Should Peel Region or Brampton choose to define transit improvements west of Hwy 50, York Region will work with the neighbouring jurisdiction to integrate services accordingly.		f) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		12 cont'd	g) The Region of Peel LRTP has the following policies regarding transit improvements and promotion: LRTP Policy 4.3.4.4: Support fare integration and service coordination of inter-regional and local transit, especially at transfer points within Peel, with services in neighbouring municipalities and with GO Transit. LRTP Policy 4.3.4.9: Work with all levels of government to advance inter-regional transit plans including rapid transit, commuter rail, GTA transit corridors and GTA transportation centres. To make transit an attractive alternative between York and Peel Regions, Viva and the City of Brampton – AcceleRide – transit initiative should commit to plan and implement seamless travel between York and Peel with better fare integration and hassle-free transfer service.	g) Comments noted. The undertaking defined in this EA includes rapid transit service as far west as the York/Peel boundary. Should Peel Region or the City of Brampton choose to plan additional service within their municipal boundary, York Region will work with the neighbouring jurisdiction to integrate services accordingly. Transit fare integration is outside the scope of this EA.		g) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			h) The pedestrian environment is not adequately addressed at the boundary of Peel/York Region. The EA study indicates that Hwy 7 may be perceived as a highway-like road, which in turn with the introduction of transit service vehicles could create an unfriendly environment for pedestrians" (page 10-5). In order to attract transit users, it is important to provide a safe, comfortable and attractive pedestrian environment. An unfriendly pedestrian environment can be a barrier for commuters to choose transit as their preferred mode of transportation. Therefore, more effort should be taken to ensure the pedestrian friendliness of the project.	h) As shown on Figure 9-2, sidewalks are planned for both sides of Hwy 7 as far west as the York/Peel boundary (Hwy 50). A conceptual streetscape plan is described in Section 9.1.1 of the EA report. A detailed streetscape plan will be developed during detailed design. Page 10-5 (Table 10.4-2) identifies potential Environmental Effects. The table also identifies the Built-in Positive Attributes of the undertaking (i.e. Design transitway to facilitate safe pedestrian road crossings with median refuge. Improved streetscaping in order to create a friendlier pedestrian environment).		h) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment The DBCR addresses pedestrian safety, for example: Guardrail / Railings (Section 4.5), Safety and Security Guidelines (Section 4.9.4), Placement of Streetscape Elements (Section 4.9.8), Crosswalks (Section 4.21), Public Telephone (Section 4.22), etc. This requirement is maintained throughout Detail Design.	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551)	No	EF 2009 Closed (2014)	4.11.1 Appropriateness, Scale, Modularity. The design of the various streetscape elements must prioritize the needs of pedestrians…" 2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			i) On page E-5, the description of route alternatives is provided for Segment A: between Hwy 50 and Hwy 400. It is mentioned that "…the only feasible route alternative is to locate the transitway in the median of the existing Hwy 7 cross-section…". The above statement needs to be discussed further and coordinated with Peel Region and the City of Brampton for further service integration.	i) Chapter 5 of the EA report includes screening of route alternatives for Segment A (York/Peel boundary to Hwy 400) and includes the consideration of six different routes (Steeles Ave, Hwy 407, Hwy 7, Langstaff Rd, Rutherford Rd and Major Mackenzie Dr). See Table 5.1-1 (Preliminary Screening of Route Options) and Table 5.3-1 (Analysis of Alternative Routes and Technology Combinations).		i) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
Durham Region of Peel	Mr. Ramesh Jagannathan, Manager Transportation Planning and Research	13	a) As noted in the EA report, the preferred option proposes buses operating in mixed traffic between the York-Durham Line and Reesor Rd, until such time as an extension of the transitway is warranted. Durham Region supports the wording that has been added to Section 8.3.6.1 since the draft EA report, which states that additional r.o.w. east of Reesor Rd should be acquired through the site plan process for adjacent development, in order to accommodate dedicated transit lanes in the long-term.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) The Region will assume local transit services from the area municipalities on January 1, 2006. Accordingly, Durham Region Transit is committed to working with York Region Transit to coordinate future transit service delivery.	b) Comment noted.		b) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) The preferred option (Option 9-1.1) proposes a future transit station at Hwy 7 and the York-Durham Line. Durham Region note that this station has been detailed further, since the Draft EA report in the preferred alignment drawing (i.e. Figure 9-81). Durham Region suggests that additional wording be added in Section 8.3.6, noting that this station could potentially be moved to an easterly location in the future urban area of Seaton. This would provide a more direct connection with Durham Region Transit services. Please note that the proposed Draft Central Pickering Development Plan for the Seaton urban area identifies a future transit station (referred to as a Transit Interchange) at Hwy 407 and Sideline 26.	c) Comment noted. York Region Transit will work with Durham Region Transit to ensure coordinated service at the boundary between the two jurisdictions.		c) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) The choice of Hwy 7 for rapid transit services, over Hwy 407, is understandable given York Region's focus on intra-regional urban transit services. The Hwy 407 Transitway, however, is more significant from an inter-regional point of view. As such, rapid transit service on Hwy 7 should be treated and designed to be complementary with future Hwy 407 Transitway services, rather than competitive.	d) Comment noted. As noted in this comment and described in the Region's Transportation Master Plan and in various sections of the EA report, the undertaking is a key component of the York Region Rapid Transit Plan, which focuses on intra-regional urban rapid transit, with connections to inter-regional services (such as GO Rail and 407 Transitway) and other neighbouring rapid transit (TTC etc…).		d) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority	Ms. Beth Williston	14	a) TRCA recognizes that the Preferred Design requires a new crossing of the Rouge River (see figure 9-60). Staff met on site with York Region and Rouge Park representatives to discuss the implications of this crossing on November 18, 2005. Further to this meeting, staff completed its review of the document and advises that TRCA has no objection to the proposed crossing, as its impact to the placement and function of the transitway is now understood.	a) TRCA agreement in principle to the proposed Rouge River crossing is noted.	York Region	a) Status – completed A new crossing is not being pursued. A Cedarland Alignment Modification Report has been finalised following receipt of MOE and TRCA comments. H3 PE Design provides for crossing of the Rouge River on Warden Avenue, requiring 11m of bridge widening. TRCA was consulted during development of the Cedarland Alignment Modification Report.	Cedarland Alignment Modification Report (ID# 3018) Minutes of Meeting: TRCA with York Consortium – June 24, 2010 (ID# 6386) Navigable Waters Determination Letter. August 25, 2010 .(ID#6429,6482)	No	EF 2010 Closed (2010)	2010 – The meeting minutes dated June 24, 2010 between YC and the TRCA satisfy this requirement.
			b) Table 8.3-9 should be revised in order to clearly distinguish this alternative as preferable to the others, particularly as it will have the greatest negative impact on the natural environment.	b) A revised Table 8.3-9 is included in the attached supplemental information to TRCA. The table is revised to include more of the detailed information as presented in Table 8.3-5 and wording as summarized in the text of section 8.3.5.1 that better distinguishes the preferred alignment alternative.		b) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) Any new crossing of a valley or stream corridor has a significant impact on the ecological function of the system. In accordance with TRCA's Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program as well as Rouge Park programs and policies, valley and stream crossings must be minimized in order to preserve the environmental integrity of the system. To this end, TRCA is advising that any future crossings of the Rouge River and its tributaries in this area are of significant concern. TRCA and Rouge Park will require that future Environmental Assessment or Planning Act applications in this area be developed such that no new crossings of the Rouge River, Apple Creek or Beaver Creek are approved.	c) Comment noted for future Environmental Assessment or Planning Act applications in this area.		c) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) TRCA requests that York Region commit to restoring the surrounding valley land and floodplain as part of a compensation plan to address the impacts associated with this new crossing. This process would include the acquisition of the flood plain property west of Warden Avenue and south of Cedarland Drive for this purpose. A restoration plan should be prepared in consultation with TRCA staff to ensure that Terrestrial Natural	d) The Region will work with TRCA to develop a compensation plan during detailed design that satisfies the agencies requirements. [i] As noted in section 11.2.1, the requirement for TRCA permits are identified as part of post-EA approval activities. [1-5]		d) Status – Completed A Cedarland Alignment Modification Report has been finalised following receipt of MOE and TRCA comments [1]. TRCA was consulted during development of the Cedarland Alignment Modification Report [2].	Cedarland Alignment Modification Report (ID# 3018)[1] [2011 ACR] September 19,2011 Response to TRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06 Development	No	[1,2] EF 2010	2010 ACR – [1,2] The meeting minutes dated June 24, 2010 between YC and the TRCA satisfy this requirement. 2011 ACR: Bolding and underline removed. Item remains 'Ongoing' until completion of TRCA review of permit application.

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			Heritage objectives are met to maximize the ecological benefit to this area. Not withstanding the above, additional compensation may be required when this project moves to detailed design.			[2011 ACR] [3] A permit application for Warden Bridge is currently before TRCA and includes a restoration plan that provides for mitigation or compensation to meet terrestrial natural heritage objectives. [3][4][5] A permit application for Warden Bridge was approved by TRCA and includes a restoration plan that provides for mitigation or compensation to meet terrestrial natural heritage objectives. The issuance of the permit reflects TRCA and YR agreement on the scope of the work at the Rouge River crossing and the restoration requirements, and therefore addresses the compliance requirement.	Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Application 0278/09 Markham Viva project –H3- Rouge River Cross at Hwy 7 and Warden Ave.- Submission#1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, CFN45915 (ID#7902) [3] [3] Permit No. C-120363 to widen Warden Avenue from Cedarland Drive to Enterprise Boulevard including the widening of existing bridge across the Rouge River at Highway 7 and Warden Avenue, Town [City] of Markham, Rouge River Watershed (ID#8653) [4] MNR letter of approval on proposed mitigation plan for the widening of Apple Creek Bridge and Warden Avenue Bridge dated July 6, 2012 (ID#8904) [4] Redside Dace		[3,4,5] EF (2012) Closed (2012)	2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to sufficiently support the assertions [3,4,5] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: Status updated. Closed in 2012. Colour updated

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
							Mitigation Report vivaNext Highway 7, Apple Creek and Warden Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation and Widening, July 6, 2012, and appendices (ID#8904)			
		14 cont'd	Please note that other outstanding TRCA concerns are provided below: e) The sentence in the third paragraph on page E-7 that ends "… to preserve the aquatic habitat" should be revised to read "… to preserve the aquatic and terrestrial habitat".	e) Comment noted.		e) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		14 cont'd	f) It should be noted on Page 9-16 that the minimum crossing opening for Local Alignment C3-4 to satisfy geomorphic requirements is expected to be approximately 80 to 120 metres, and may be greater depending on site conditions. Additionally, the conceptual crossing structure profile and dimensions should be removed from Fig 9-60 to ensure that the EA is not misinterpreted to read that a 30 metre crossing may be permitted.	f) Section 9.1.5 (27) indicates that a [i] meander belt analysis and a 100 year erosion limit will be determined during preliminary and detailed design to determine the sizing of the bridge span for the planned Rouge River crossing. Figure 9-60 also indicates that the sizing of the structure will be determined during the design phase. A revised figure 9-60 is attached and has been revised to delete the reference to a 30 metre structure span[1-**5**].		f) Status – **completed** A Cedarland Alignment Modification Report has been finalised following receipt of MOE and TRCA comments. H3 PE Design provides for crossing of the Rouge River on Warden Avenue, requiring 11m of bridge widening [1]. TRCA was consulted during development of the Cedarland Alignment Modification Report [2]. The remaining items are being mitigated through the permit and design process with TRCA. [3] [3]TRCA has approved the permit for Warden Bridge on June 4, 2012. MNR was also consulted during the permit and design process[4][5]. MNR has approved the proposed mitigation plan for Apple Creek and Warden Bridge on July 6, 2012.[4][5] To address 2012 ACR comment, numbering was corrected in the	Cedarland Alignment Modification Report (ID# 3018)[1] [2011 ACR] September 19,2011 Response to TRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06 Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Application 0278/09 Markham Viva project –H3- Rouge River Cross at Hwy 7 and Warden Ave.- Submission#1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, CFN45915 (ID#7902) [3] [3] Permit No. C-120363 to widen	No	[1,2] EF 2010 [3-5] EF (2012) Closed (2012)	2010 ACR – [1,2] The meeting minutes dated June 24, 2010 between YC and the TRCA satisfy this requirement. 2011 ACR: Bolding and underline removed. Item remains 'Ongoing' until completion of TRCA review of permit application. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided was found to support the assertions [3-5] on how the condition was addressed. It is unclear what conditions numbering [1-7] is referring to in the response column. The table should be updated for clarity. 2013 ACR: it is noted that numbering was updated as per the 2012 ACR. No review was undertaken. 2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status Suggest status is changed to complete.

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						Response column to read [1-5]	Warden Avenue from Cedarland Drive to Enterprise Boulevard including the widening of existing bridge across the Rouge River at Highway 7 and Warden Avenue, Town [City] of Markham, Rouge River Watershed (ID#8653) [4] MNR letter of approval on proposed mitigation plan for the widening of Apple Creek Bridge and Warden Avenue Bridge dated July 6, 2012 (ID#8904) [5] Redside Dace Mitigation Report vivaNext Highway 7, Apple Creek and Warden Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation and Widening, July 6, 2012, and appendices (ID#8904)			
		14 cont'd	g) Table 8.2-1 has been revised to include an indicator under Objective C4 for "extent of channel realignment", but not for impacts to restriction of channel plan form as per previous comments. Staff considers the extension of existing watercourse crossings to be potentially detrimental to physical processes in the watercourse, as this will impede natural plan form migration by confining additional channel length in structures that are of insufficient width to allow full meander bend development and evolution. Table 8.2-1 and 10.4-3 should be revised so that this issue is reflected in the evaluation.	g) The indicator "extent of channel realignment" has been considered a measure of any additional restriction of channel plan form due to the channel having to be re-aligned locally at existing crossings to follow the increment of increase in length of existing crossing structures. Generally, this increase is under 5 metres at the entrance and exit of culverts and bridges which at present, have a length suitable for crossing a 5-7 lane roadway. The Region agrees that the textual assessment of effects preceding Table 10.4-3 should include recognition that the extension of existing crossings with insufficient width to allow full meander development will introduce a moderately significant effect on natural plan form migration		g) Status – Completed Mitigation measures and compensation is being determined through detail design and the TRCA permit process. [1-7] [1-6]TRCA has approved the following permits: ▪ CV1 (German Mills east of Pond Dr.) on July 28, 2011; ▪ CV2 (German Mills west of Hwy 404)	Record of TRCA Meeting 2009-0304 – (ID# 4219) [1] Permit No: C-110565 to alter a Watercourse on German Mills Tributary across Hwy 7 east of Pond Drive, Town of Richmond Hill, Don River Watershed	No	[1,2] EF (2011) [3,4,5,6, 7,8] EF	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 42344, 42345) was found to support the assertion [1,2] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. It was noted that evidence (ID# 4219) was provided of consultation with TRCA. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to sufficiently support the assertions [3,4,5,6,7,8] on how the

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				at existing crossing entrances and exits. This will be addressed further during the TRCA permit approval stage in the development of a compensation plan to maximize ecological benefit. [1-7]		on August 15, 2011; ▪ Beaver Creek (CV3) on January 4, 2012; ▪ Revision to Beaver Creek on May 8, 2012 ▪ Apple Creek on March 20, 2012; and ▪ Warden Bridge on June 4, 2012. The above permits reflect all works related to watercourses on the H3 segment. [7,8]MNR has approved the proposed mitigation plan for Apple Creek and Warden Bridge on July 6, 2012.	(ID#42344)(ID#7668) [2] Permit No: C-1106040 to alter a Watercourse on German Mills Tributary across Hwy 7, 400 m west of Hwy 404 in Town of Richmond Hill, Don River Watershed (ID#42345)(ID#7761) [2011 ACR][3] (CV3) September 15, 2011 Response to TRCA Comments on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project – H3- Rouge Beaver Creek crossing at Hwy 7, 110 m east of Frontenac – Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, CFN 42346 (ID #7820) [3] Permit No: C-120004 to extend existing culvert at Beaver Creek Crossing at Highway 7 east of Frontenac, Town [City] of Markham, Rough River		(2012) Closed (2012)	condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: Status changed to completed. 2012 found that a permit was given. Closed in 2012. Results column colour changed to reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
							Watershed(ID#8622) [6] Revision to Permit No: C-120004 (ID#8622) [2011 ACR][4] (Apple Creek) September 14, 2011 Response to TRCA Comments on Ont. Reg. #116/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alternatives to Shorelines and Watercourses Application 0279/09/MARK Apple Creek/Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and Warden Ave. Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, CFN 42347 (ID#7848) [4] Permit No: C-120145 to widen existing Highway 7 bridge spanning Apple Creek (Rouge River) Crossing at Highway 7 and Warden Avenue, Town [City] of Markham, Rouge River Watershed (ID#8378) [2011 ACR][5] (Warden) September 19, 2011 Response to RRCA on Ont. Reg.			

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
							#166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project –H3-Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and warden- Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York CFN45915 (ID# 7902) [5] Permit No. C-120363 to widen Warden Avenue from Cedarland Drive to Enterprise Boulevard including the widening of existing bridge across the Rouge River at Highway 7 and Warden Avenue, Town [City] of Markham, Rouge River Watershed (ID#8653) [7] MNR letter of approval on proposed mitigation plan for the widening of Apple Creek Bridge and Warden Avenue Bridge dated July 6, 2012 (ID#8904) [8] Redside Dace Mitigation Report vivaNext Highway 7, Apple Creek and			

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
							Warden Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation and Widening, July 6, 2012, and appendices (ID#8904)			
		14 cont'd	h) The number of new and widened watercourse crossings associated with each alternative route should be included in Table 8.3-2, as per evaluation tables in other sections.	h) The three alternatives for Segment B East (refer to page 8-10 of the EA report) have the following new/widened watercourse crossings. Alternative B4 – No new or widened crossings required. Alternative B5 – New crossings include: Westminster Creek east of Dufferin Street; West Don River east of Dufferin Street, west of Bathurst Street and east of Bathurst Street; Widened structures at Hwy 7 over East Don River. Alternative B6 – No new crossings or widened crossings required. With the inadvertent omission of listing the watercourse crossings from Table 8.3-2 in the EA report, the selection of Alternative B6 as the Technically Preferred Alternative does not change		h) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		14 cont'd	i) The transitway station on Fig 9-60 should be removed from the Rouge Valley corridor and regional floodplain. The note provided does not sufficiently indicate that the station location must be outside the valley corridor and floodplain.	i) During detailed design, the Region will refine the station location and design solution to meet TRCA requirements for protection of the valley corridor and flood plain based on a detailed survey of site conditions.		i) Status – completed A Cedarland Alignment Modification Report has been finalised following receipt of MOE and TRCA comments. H3 Design provides for a station on Cedarland Drive.	Cedarland Alignment Modification Report (ID# 3018) Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230)	No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			j) The Stormwater Management Preliminary Assessment provided in Appendix G is not sufficient to confirm that an effective stormwater management system for the transitway can be provided, and therefore the "insignificant" level of impact to water quality assumed in Table 10.4-3 cannot be confirmed. The material provided in Appendix G does not confirm the locations and availability of land for stormwater management measures and for many segments of the transitway no stormwater management measure are proposed. The consultant presents an argument to explain the latter in Appendix G as follows: "The	j) The Proponent will commit to working with the TRCA during preliminary and detailed design to ensure that the stormwater management plan provides a net improvement in water quality of the receiving watercourse. Opportunities to include treatment for this undertaking with broader infrastructure initiatives will be reviewed during the design phase. The proponent agrees that deferring the fulfillment of treatment of this objective is not acceptable. Additional information regarding the Stormwater Management Preliminary Assessment is included as supplementary information with this response to TRCA[1-3].		j) Status –**completed** TRCA provided a letter to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan contained in the Drainage Study.[2] This commitment is carried through the	May 19, 2011 Letter from TRCA to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan.[#7646][2] [3] MOE CoA #8813-	No	[3] EF (2011)	2011 ACR: NSE [1] The evidence submitted to support assertion [1] was not found in the evidence provided (ID# 3230). Assertion [1] in status column was removed by KED as was the supporting document reference. The evidence submitted to support assertion [3] was found in the evidence provided (Item #38) It is noted that the evidence provided for assertion [2] states approval in principle. This

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			existing roadway runoff has a greater impact on the downstream watercourses that the potential increase in runoff due to the proposed transitway. Stormwater management in urbanized areas should therefore be developed as part of an initiative to provide treatment on a watershed basis rather than trying to manage the incremental change resulting from the proposed transitway. This type of initiative would be separate from the current environmental assessment for the Hwy 7 Corridor Public Transit Improvements." This rationale does not justify that lack of proposed treatment for portions of the transitway, as it is the objective of the TRCA to obtain a net benefit in water quality treatment for all new transportation infrastructure projects. Deferring the fulfillment of treatment of this objective to large scale initiatives for urban stormwater retrofit, as the consultant suggests, is not acceptable, as it has been shown to be significantly more difficult and costly to provide stormwater treatment in a retrofit context than incrementally during the design and construction of new infrastructure. Therefore, the Proponent should demonstrate that stormwater measures for the transitway can be provided that will provide a net improvement in water quality in the receiving watercourses. The appendix should be revised to address stormwater management for all sections of transitway that will be service by each measure. It may be useful for the consultant to review the recent EA report for the Markham Bypass (southern portion) being prepared by the Regional Municipality of York, as it contains an appendix that addresses stormwater to a comparable level of detail as is expected in the response to the above comments.			TRCA permit application process for each of the river crossings that is currently underway. See Item #38 for reference [3]	8HDQKY for the storm sewers of Highway 7 from Bayview Avenue to Highway 404 (ID#7738) [3] MOE CoA #8613-8KDKP5 for Oil Grit Separator (OGS) Units 1 and 2 (ID#7939)		[2,3] EF (2012) Closed (2014)	item will remain ongoing until final approval is provided. 2012 ACR: the evidence provided was found to support the assertion [2,3] on how the condition was addressed. 2014:This item was closed in 2012. Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		14 cont'd	k) Suitable information has not been provided to confirm that impacts to terrestrial passage at stream crossings will be "insignificant", after mitigation, as indicated on Table 10.4-3 under objective C2. In particular, the extension of existing crossings may significantly reduce the potential for wildlife use and these effects cannot be entirely mitigated with the types of measures proposed, particularly as the option of "increasing vertical and horizontal clearances" is not available for the extension of existing crossings. In the absence of additional information, the level of significance after mitigation for this item should be ranked as at least "moderately significant".	k) Culverts/bridges that will not be replaced for transitway insertion in the roadway cross-section will be investigated further during detail design to formulate site-specific retrofit opportunities to enhance wildlife passage. The culvert extensions required are not expected to significantly impede or improve wildlife passage under Highway 7. As suggested by TRCA, the level of significance after mitigation can be considered to be moderate in the absence of additional information to be provided during the design and permit approval phase of the project. [1-5]		k) Status – **completed** TRCA permits for all impacted designs at watercourses are being obtained and include CV1 and CV2 which have been obtained [1,2] and ones currently under review by TRCA that include Apple Creek, CV3 and Warden [3,4,5]. TRCA permits for Apple Creek, Beaver Creek (CV3) and Warden were approved[3,4,5].	[1] Permit No: C-110565 to alter a Watercourse on German Mills Tributary across Hwy 7 east of Pond Drive, Town of Richmond Hill, Don River Watershed (ID#42344)(ID#7668) [2] Permit No: C-1106040 to alter a Watercourse on German Mills Tributary across Hwy 7, 400 m west of Hwy 404 in Town of Richmond Hill, Don River Watershed (ID#42345)(ID#7761) [3,4,5] See Item #38 for reference.	Yes	[1,2] EF (2011) [3,4,5] EF (2012) Closed (2014)	2011 ACR: Evidence was not provided to support the assertions [1,2] on how the condition was addressed. Additional evidence was provided (ID# 4234,42345) to support the assertions [1,2] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to sufficiently support the assertions [3,4,5] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: This item was closed in 2012. The status column should be updated to reflect this. Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			l) The monitoring frequency in Table 11.4-1 for "effect of construction on water quality and quantity in watercourses" should be revised to indicate that [1] monitoring should occur after every major storm event.	l) Comment noted and will be carried forward to the design and construction phase of the project.		l) Status – completed An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during Detail Design. The Environmental Management Plan (KED ID 2012-001) provided previously indicates the following: "Prior to any forecasted precipitation event, the Environmental Coordinator or designate will inspect all sediment control measures to ensure they are not close to the sediment handling capacity. If required, sediment will be removed or maintenance performed. During and after prolonged rain or snow fall events the sediment control measures will be monitored to ensure they are functioning as intended and are not overloaded. If required additional measures will be installed at the direction of the Environmental Coordinator." (Reference Appendix A, Erosion and Sediment Control CEMP, Section 3.4 "Precipitation Events"). **KED completes both 'Weekly Environmental Inspections' & Pre / Post Rain Inspections. In the event that an issue or deficiency was noted during either inspection KED Environmental would notify the construction team, and would ensure that immediate corrective actions are taken.**	Environmental Management Plan 2011 (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH)(ID#8061) Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001) **Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)** **H3-ENV-Pre-Post Rain Inspections_Correspondence_CP (KED ID# 2015-019**	Yes	EF (2011) EF (2014) EF (2015) Closed (2015)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item status should be stated. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided updates the EMP to 2012 and was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. **2014: No evidence was provided that monitoring "should occur after every major storm event" was carried forward Subsequently, status column was updated to reflect that post-storm event is done. This item is ongoing. FOR THE 2015 ACR, EVIDENCE OF THAT PRE AND POST-STORM MONITORING IS ACTUALLY UNDERTAKEN will be required. This item is ongoing.** **2012 ACR: The evidence provided was found to support the assertion that ESC is monitored / inspected . With the completion of construction, this item is closed.**

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		14 cont'd	m) The discussion of water quality and quantity monitoring in Table 11.4-2 is not satisfactory as the monitoring methods and frequency are not appropriate for the monitoring purposes. Specifically, monitoring of sediment accumulation in stormwater management facilities will not indicate the effect of snow and ice removal in corridor watercourses. It is recommended that separate monitoring items be developed for sediment accumulation, stormwater management facilities and impacts of snow and ice removal. Water quality impacts of snow and ice removal, as well as regular transit operations, should be monitored by measuring chlorides, suspended sediment, and other water quality parameters, at the outlets of the various stormwater management facilities during both storm and snowmelt events. The accumulation of sediment in stormwater management facilities should be monitored by measuring the accumulation at a reasonable interval based on the expected sediment loading and storage capacity of the facility. Table 11.4-2 should be revised accordingly.	m) The Region will develop a detailed monitoring program covering all aspects noted during detailed design in consultation with TRCA. All required measurements, specifically to assess the effect of the transitway insertion, will be included in the monitoring program.		m) Status – **Completed** Aspects noted are for operational stage. An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during detailed design. **Current York Region road maintenance practices dictate that all York Region Oil-Grit Separators are inspected annually for sediment accumulation, servicing and cleaning. [1] York Region is notified of any concerning water quality parameters and chloride levels by the MOE and will work closely with the MOE to address any concerns resulting from transit and maintenance operations.[2]**	**Tender Documents (ID# YORK-#6373975): Oil-Grit Separator Structure Inspection and Assessment Services At Various Locations Within the Regional Municipality of York; Oil-Grit Separator Structure Cleaning Including Disposal of Collected Liquid and Solid Materials at Various Locations in the Regional Municipality of York**	Yes	Ops / Future (2014) [1] ECF (2015) [2] ENF (2015)	2011 ACR: It is unclear if the evidence provided it meant to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Item status should be stated. Additional comments added to the Status column and removal of documents from the Compliance Document Reference column changes this item to "Not reviewed" for the 2011 ACR. 2014: Status should be changed to "future" Review Result colour changed to better reflect status **2015 ACR: Evidence of change found. Nowhile no monitoring plan was developed, evidence provided (6373975) supports the assertion that OGS inspections are routinely undertaken by York Region elsewhere. It is reasonable to assume that York Region will undertake this monitoring within H3. [1] This item is closed.** **Evidence was not provided to support the assertion that MOE is monitoring water quality in H3 [2].**
			n) It has been correctly identified that all culvert and bridge extensions or widenings may result in the Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction of fish habitat and that compensation under the Fisheries Act may be required. At the detailed design stage, TRCA ecology staff will review all culvert/bridge modifications, and will require that: a) Any potential impacts are mitigated whenever possible; b) Effective sediment and erosion controls are provided; and c) There will be a net benefit to the aquatic an floodplain system. Please note that it is possible that additional watercourses may be identified during detailed design stage, and that a TRCA permit and review under Fisheries Act, along with all other applicable legislation	n) Comment noted to be carried forward to the detailed design phase (as noted in section 11.2.1, the requirement for TRCA permits are identified as part of post-EA approval activities)[1-5].		n) Status – completed TRCA permits for all impacted designs at watercourses are being obtained and include CV1 and CV2 [1,2] which have been obtained and ones currently under review by TRCA that include Apple Creek, CV3 and Warden. [3,4,5] TRCA permits for Apple Creek, Beaver Creek (CV3) and Warden were approved [3,4,5] At a meeting on June 24, 2010, TRCA staff indicated that, based on the information provided, the effects of the proposed works in these segments	See Item j above [1,2] [3,4,5] See Item#38 for references. ID # 6792 - Final Minutes Meeting_24June2010 rev 09-08-10 [6] [6] LOAs are attached to the TRCA Permits – refer to Item 38 for reference documents.	No	[1,2,6] EF (2011) [3,4,5] EF	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 42344, 42345) was found to support the assertion [1,2] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. The evidence provided (ID#4219) was not found to support the assertion that the condition was met. There was no reference found for a meeting on June 24, 2010 with TRCA staff. Additional evidence provided (ID# 6792) was found to support the assertion [6] on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
			may apply.			could be mitigated and that consequently, a Letter of Advice would be acceptable as a HADD should not result at any crossing.[6] The LOAs are attached to the permits referenced in Item 38.			(2012) **EF (2014)** Closed (2014)	2012 ACR was found to sufficiently support the assertions [3,4,5] on how the condition was addressed. Item remains ongoing. 2014: Evidence was not provided that the Letter of Advice has been received Subsequently, it was clarified that LOA are appended to permits. Evidence (e.g.,ID8622) was found to support that a LOAs were given. This item is closed
		14 cont'd	o) Note that the tributary at station 541+300 (approx.) is being relocated to the east. Please contact Leslie Piercey for more information.	o) Comment noted to be carried forward to the detailed design phase (as noted in section 11.2.1, the requirement for TRCA permits are identified as part of post-EA approval activities).		Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 2 Action for Comments Received from the Government Review Team on the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
			p) Impacts to groundwater resources will need to be addressed in greater detail, particularly in terms of construction related impacts from any required dewatering. Studies will be required to identify quantities, durations and zones of influence associated with aquifer depressurization or dewatering, along with any other environmental impacts that may be anticipated. Mitigation plans will be needed to protect any associated natural heritage features and groundwater related resources. Areas of particular concern have been identified within the EA report (between Hwy 400 and Jane St, and Hwy 404 and McCowan Rd), however, groundwater resources and the features dependent on them will need to be identified and protected throughout the entire corridor during the detailed design phase.	p) Comment noted. [1] The impacts on groundwater resources and the features affected by them, throughout the entire Highway 7 Corridor, will be identified during the detailed design phase when the extent of any dewatering is known. [2] Mitigation plans will be developed to provide the necessary protection for natural heritage features and groundwater related resources in consultation with TRCA and other appropriate authorities.[3]		p) Status- **completed** Pavement Design Report - Section 4.2.2 "Groundwater" notes that "…Free water was not encountered in any of the boreholes." No requirement for dewatering has been identified so far during the H3 PE design phase. Dewatering requirements will be reviewed during Detail Design and if required, appropriate mitigation plans will be developed. Five (5) areas for dewatering were identified and Permits to Take Water including mitigation and monitoring plans were approved by the Ministry of Environment. [1,2]	Draft Pavement Design Report: New Median Rapidway Along Highway 7, from Yonge Street to Town Centre Boulevard. A length of approximately 9.0 km Region of York Ontario. June 2009. (ID#4635) Permit to Take Water Approvals (ID#8061): - H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW-BPC_CV1toCV3_1118-8KTNB4-2011-08-19 - H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW-BPC_Apple_8133-8KUQPN-2011-08-19 - H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW-BPC_Warden_6803-8KUJNS-2011-08-19 Permits to Take Water (KED ID# 2013-002)	**Yes**	[1,2] EF (2011) [1,2] EF (2013) Closed (2014)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW-BPC_CV1toCV3_1118-8KTNB4-2011-08-19; H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW-BPC_Apple_8133-8KUQPN-2011-08-19; H3-ENV-PMT-MOE-PTTW-BPC_Warden_6803-8KUJNS-2011-08-19) was found to support the assertion on how the condition [1,2] was addressed. 2013 ACR: the evidence provided was found to support the assertion [1,2] on how the condition was addressed. [3] 2014: Item 38 does not appear to satisfy this requirement. Items [1-3] were closed in 2013. TRCA permitting reference should be removed and the status updated to complete. Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			q) Please note that the area identified for the Vaughan North-South Link (between Hwy 400 and Jane St) is an area of shallow or upward groundwater movement. This is an issue that will need to be addressed by TRCA's hydrogeologist at the detailed design phase.	Comment noted. TRCA's hydrogeologist will be contacted during the detailed design phase.		q. Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**

Appendix 3 Action for Comments Received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
	Mr. Jeff Stone	1	a) Section 6.1.1.5 – To the locations of the additional terminals add the following: Promenade: *Southwest* of Bathurst and Centre; Vaughan Mills: *Southwest* of Jane and Rutherford; and York University: *Southwest* of Keele and Steeles.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) Section 6.1.2.5 – Add to the Bathurst St Station "for Hwy 7 West" or future GO Transitway.	b) Comment noted.		b) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) Yonge and Centre Station was omitted. Was the level unacceptable?	c) Both Yonge St and Centre St are included in the listings of level of service in Section 6.1.2.5 of the EA report.		c) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) Where are the ratios of traffic at Laidlaw Blvd?	d) Existing traffic at the Laidlaw Blvd. intersection is operating at an acceptable level hence it does not appear in the listing of intersections at or near unacceptable levels of service.		d) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			e) Section 6.1.2.6 – Add "High traffic volume on Beverly Glen" and "There is a threat of neighbourhood traffic infiltration" to the Wiltshire Neighbourhood.	e) Comment noted		e) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			f) Section 6.3.3.1 – Under the City of Vaughan, note that Thornhill is divided in half at Yonge St between Vaughan and Markham, not Vaughan and Richmond Hill. Note that Thornhill is not in Richmond Hill as it is entirely below Hwy 7.	f) Inadvertent error acknowledged. Reference to Richmond Hill is incorrect.		f) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			g) Section 6.3.3.2 – Add the future areas at Bathurst and Centre/Promenade.	g) Comment noted.		g) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			h) Section 6.4.1.1 – Under Thornhill (Yonge St and Centre St), add that Yonge and Centre is an epicentre.	h) Comment noted.		h) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			i) Section 7.2 – Add "Proximity to development and origin-destination node/traffic generators".	i) Comment noted.		i) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			j) Section 7.3 – Add "intrusion into land uses" and "Public comfort stations/commercial land uses nearby".	j) Comment noted.		j) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			k) Figures 8.3-7, 8.3-9 and 8.3-10 – Add transit station at Bathurst and Hwy 7 West (Connection to GO/407 Transitway).	k) Comment noted. Potential station at Bathurst St and Hwy 7 identified in Section 8.3.3 of the EA report.		k) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			l) Page 8.3.20 – The best choice for Hospital Complex as midpoint in the area, therefore is most accessible.	l) Comment noted.		l) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			m) Table 8.3-2 – Why was B6 chosen when B-3 has 11	m) B3 is an alternative to B1 and B2 and does not		m) Status – Does not apply to the H3		No	Closed	2014: Review Result colour

Appendix 3 Action for Comments Received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			most responsive and B5 and B6 have only 8 criteria?	correspond with the section of route containing B6.		segment			(2014)	changed to better reflect status
		1 cont'd	n) Table 8.3-2 – Why was B6 chosen when B-4 has 3 least responsive and B4 and B6 have no criteria?	n) B6 was assessed as having greater potential for the development of transit supportive land uses with convenient access to the stations while having no adverse effects that could not be mitigated.		n) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			o) Page 9.1 – GO stations in Woodbridge near Hwy 7 and Islington in Kleinberg are not shown in the plan.	o) Stations on potential future GO services are not shown in the figure.		o) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Figure 9-25 p) One bus terminal is shown on the North side, but two terminals are shown on the Spadina Extension EA plan.	p) The figure shows only the Region-owned land designated for future transit terminal use. Any additional terminal facilities required are part of the undertaking for the Spadina Subway Extension EA.		p) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			q) Add one terminal on the south side of Steeles Ave (i.e. permanent for TTC routes S. of Steeles Ave).	q) Terminals on the south side of Steeles Ave are not part of the undertaking for this EA but may be included in the City of Toronto/TTC's Spadina Subway extension EA.		q) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			r) Figure 9-35 – Add a second gap on Centre St to adequately serve retailers or some stores will die.	r) As shown in Figure 9-35 of the EA report, a full movement intersection (signalized) has been shown conceptually providing access to the lands north of Centre St between Vaughan Blvd and New Westminster Dr.		r) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Figure 9-36 s) The station site west of Promenade loop is on a slope and could pose stopping problems.	s) A station at the location shown will meet design standards.		s) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			t) The right turn lane should be extended south of Centre St to the condo building entrance for flow.	t) The extent of turning lanes will be determined after further analysis of needs during the detailed design phase.		t) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			u) Add a one to two lane northbound road versus three lanes shown in both directions on future plans.	u) Bathurst St will retain the existing two lanes in each direction, with the additional lanes being dedicated to rapid transit.		u) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			v) Note the northbound station north of Atkinson poses a problem for the retail strip plaza vehicle access.	v) Access to the plaza on the east side of Bathurst St will be possible by making either a U-turn SB at the Atkinson Ave intersection followed by a right-turn into the plaza, or a left turn into Atkinson Ave and a second left-turn into the southern entrance to the plaza.		v) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			w) Note the southbound station south of Atkinson poses a problem for school and community centre access.	w) Access to the community centre and school will be possible through the signalized intersection at New Westminster Dr.		w) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			x) Section 12 – A1 Station Site: The advantages are it is a better choice as it is under Steeles completely; lesser capital cost as no expropriation needed nor use of vacant land; better service to York University and has least effect on future development; and	x) Comment noted.		x) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 3 Action for Comments Received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			central location as perpendicular site allows access to all terminals. The disadvantage is that this location poses higher noise and vibration problems.							
			y) Page 12-4 – Add "Possible 2nd bus terminal" on the north side. Note that non-TTC routes can be accommodated by one terminal until Spadina is extended north.	y) Overall terminal requirements at the Steeles Ave subway station are being defined by the Spadina Subway Extension EA. The station site will be addressed as part of the Spadina EA.		y) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			z) In general, the EA omits reference to other potential east-west or north-south arterial corridors for rapid transit in future in south York Region.	z) The modeling of future rapid transit ridership has assumed enhanced transit service on parallel arterial routes in both the east-west and north-south directions.		z) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP	Mr. Stephen Waque	2	a) Counsel for property owners whose lands are located on the north side of Centre St, between New Westminster Dr and Dufferin St. It appears to their client that the analysis being undertaken is still defective in that it fails to recognize and implement the policies set out in City of Vaughan OPA 672. In particular, policies numbered 8 and 9 in that OPA. The lawyers would appreciate specific acknowledgement of their client's concerns and a specific response indicating how the Proponent will address them. The following are the excerpts from the City of Vaughan OPA 672: *OPA 672 – Section 8* notes that amending OPA#210, Section 2.2.3.6, General Commercial Areas, by adding the following paragraph to subsection b): "Council consideration should be given to broadening the permitted retail and service commercial uses within an implementing zoning by-law and definitions to allow a greater range of commercial uses which reflect evolving consumer needs without imposing negative impacts on neighbouring residential areas."	a) As shown on Figure 9-35 of the EA report, a full movement intersection (signalized) has been shown conceptually providing access to the lands north of Centre St between Vaughan Blvd and New Westminster Dr. As noted on Figure 9-35, the final location of the full movement intersection will be determined during detailed design and in consultation with affected property owners.	York Region	Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			OPA 672 – Section 9 notes that amending OPA#210, Section 2.3.6 by adding the following paragraph: "That the Region of York recognize the importance of maintaining full movement access to the existing commercial centres on the north side of Centre St between Vaughan Blvd and New Westminster Dr, and reflect this in the planning for any transit facilities in the Centre St Corridor between Bathurst and Dufferin St."					No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
	Mr. Lloyd Helferty	3	a) The entire length of the proposed transitway should include, for both environmental and health reasons, the accommodation of additional space along the transitway corridor for safe and "continuous" passage	a) Detailed comment noted and will be carried forward for consideration during development of the detailed streetscape plan (Section 9.1.1 of the EA report describes the conceptual streetscape plan). As identified on Figures	York Region	a) Status – Completed The DBCR incorporates streetscaping recommendations: Streetscape Design	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. ID# 3551)	Ys		2009 ACR: ENF 2009 - It was not evident from the information provided that cross sections were

Appendix 3 Action for Comments Received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			of non-motorized vehicles, particularly bicycles, foot traffic and other human-powered or small-capacity vehicles (e.g. scooters or segways). The path would be a positive environmental benefit to the users of the traffic corridor because the users of the transit corridor could choose, on those days which have appropriate weather for alternate modes of travel, to safely use a pathway instead of a private vehicle or public transit (which itself uses internal combustion technology and is beneficial in reducing emissions but does not eliminate them). A pathway along the transit route could significantly reduce both the traffic congestion along the corridor as well as reducing the emissions that would otherwise have resulted from elimination of the use of an additional vehicle on the road. "Continuous" meaning the pathway should not be broken along any section because of incompleteness or obstruction (such as highway bridges), and should allow the passage of small/light vehicles without the users of such a path having to resort to simultaneous use of the same roadway as heavy vehicles.	9.1-2 to 9.1-10, a 2.0 m sidewalk is proposed along each side of the transitway/road corridor for pedestrians. As shown on Figures 13.9-3 to 13.9-5, a 3.0 m bicycle path is proposed from Warden Ave to east of Sciberras Rd and has been developed in consultation with the local municipality. The local municipality has jurisdiction over bike paths. At the time of detailed streetscape design, York Region will continue to work with local municipalities to incorporate additional streetscape facilities and bicycle access to stations where feasible.		Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), etc. Consultation with municipalities commenced as described under item 33 of this document. Further attention will be given to the development of a streetscape plan in detailed design. Best practice Active Transportation principles have been incorporated into the design philosophy of the VivaNext system. Dedicated bicycle lanes have been provided along the H3 corridor[1]. [2] A 2 m-wide sidewalk has been provided throughout the corridor that is: pedestrian accessible, obstruction free and in compliance with AODA guidelines. Pedestrian amenities such as benches, bike racks, lighting, and trash bins have also been provided.	[2][2012]Streetscape Layout Plans H3-DWG-R-LND-080407 (ID#8909) [1] H3 Detailed Design Pavement Markings and Signage IFC (ID#9630)		EF 2010 EF (2012)	adjusted to provide for bicycle lanes and maximize median green space 3551 - Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 – 4040 - Transit Improvement H3 - From Warden Avenue to Sciberas Road Design Basis & Criteria Report (July 2009) 2010 ACR: Item 33 provides evidence of consultation with TRCA but there is no mention of cross section adjustments to provide for bicycle lanes and maximizing median green space. Further discussion with Owner Engineer explained that drawings would show the cross section adjustments. Review of Civil Drawings (1 - 001-141 - H3-Civil-40) provided evidence of bicycle lanes and median green space under the Typical Section drawings 1 through 6. 2012 ACR: based on the drawings provided it is unclear if the provisions described in the assertion are included. Provide legend with drawings. 2012 edit: additional evidence provided (Streetscape Design

Appendix 3 Action for Comments Received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
									[1] EF (2013) Closed (2013)	Drawings H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-607-Boulevard Treatment Miscellaneous) by the Owner Engineer was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: numbering was added for clarity. The evidence provided was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed. 2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
	Mr. James Puddy	4	a) Mr. Puddy mailed letters concerning the meetings at Markville on September 19, 2003 and September 17, 2004 and had no replies. He went to the Markham Town Centre to review the EA report and noticed that there were eighty replies from the total of twelve meetings and did not see his letter of September 19, 2003, although his letter of September 17, 2004 was recorded. The following are his comments on the EA report.	a) It appears that the Rapid Transit Program Office inadvertently omitted to acknowledge receipt of Mr. Puddy's letters and respond to the comments contained in them. However, the comments were taken into consideration in evaluating alternatives and developing the preferred design for the undertaking. The responses below indicate how his comments were addressed in the EA report.	York Region	a) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) The transit lane should be in the curb lanes with the transit stops at the far side of the traffic control intersections.	b) Curb side transit lanes were considered in the EA report (refer to Section 5.4.1, Alternative Locations within a Road r.o.w.). Table 5.4-1 provides an evaluation of the alternative locations for the transit lanes, with a median transitway identified as the preferred location. The typical station layout includes far side stops at intersections with traffic and pedestrian control signals (refer to Figure 7.3-1).		b) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) The transit lanes should run straight along the corridor with a subway or overpass at the GO crossing and not detoured up and down to the GO station where the trains operate approximately two hours each direction on working days.	c) Alternative routes and alignments were considered and evaluated in the EA (refer to Section 5.3.1, Analysis and Evaluation of Alternative Technology/Route Combinations and Section 8.3, Development of Segment Alignment Alternatives). In addition to inter-connectivity with GO Rail services, the routing selected serves the planned mixed-use Markham Centre where significant transit-supportive development is planned.		c) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 3 Action for Comments Received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			d) The raised transit lanes will separate the corridor into a north and south side of the community requiring at each traffic control intersection numerous traffic light functions such as through, right, left and U-turns.	d) As noted in Section 9.1.1 of the EA, a streetscape concept has been developed in consultation with local municipalities to be a catalyst for transit-oriented development and attract transit ridership by creating a pedestrian friendly environment. The effect on traffic operations was considered in the evaluation of options to locate a transitway in a roadway (refer to Table 5.4-1) and the analysis of traffic conditions during operation of the transit service (refer to Chapter 10). In addition, traffic operations will be monitored during rapid transit operations as noted in Table 11.4-2.		d) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		4 cont'd	e) Comments b through d will increase gridlock, pollution, safety and will affect the community environment (surroundings).	e) Environmental criteria for assessing the effects of the undertaking on congestion, pollution and safety are included in Section 10.4 - Analysis of Environmental Effects and Mitigation, of the EA report.		e) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Comments from PCC#4, September 17, 2004 f) Mr. Puddy spoke to a representative of Lynton Erskine at the Markville Mall presentation on September 17, 2004. He does not consider the present plan will enhance the quality of life in the Hwy 7 Corridor.	f) Protecting and enhancing the social environment in the corridor was a key objective in the development of the undertaking (refer to Chapter 1 and Chapter 10, Table 10.4-2).		g) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			g) The transit lanes should be in the curb lane of Hwy 7 corridor with stops at the far side of intersections	g) Curb side transit lanes were considered in the EA report (refer to Section 5.4.1, Alternative Locations within a Road r.o.w.). Table 5.4-1 provides an evaluation of the alternative locations for the transit lanes, with a median transitway identified as the preferred location. The typical station layout includes far side stops at intersections with traffic and pedestrian control signals (refer to Figure 7.3-1).		h) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			h) The level crossing on Hwy 7 in Unionville should have an underpass allowing safe passage for GO trains and Hwy 7 traffic which was done at Finch Ave, west of Leslie St.	h) Comment noted. Refer to Figure 9-63 of the EA report which shows a proposed underpass for the transitway crossing of the GO Stouffville line.		g) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			i) The transit line in the middle of Hwy 7 corridor with its left and U-turns at intersections are not safe and convenient for pedestrians or vehicles contributing to gridlock and pollution. The transit line should not be detoured off the Hwy 7 corridor to the GO station for four trains each way on working days.	i) Refer to responses c and d above.		h) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			j) The primary purpose of what used to be a provincial highway was for the movement of goods, people and	j) The purpose of the undertaking is presented in Section 1.2.2 of the EA report. The existing Social Environment is		i) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect

Appendix 3 Action for Comments Received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			services and should be the main function of this arterial road serving a commercial area.	described in Section 6.3 and includes a wide range of adjacent land uses						status
		4 cont'd	*Comments from PCC#3, September 19, 2003* k) The preferred plan for enhancing the quality of life in the Hwy 7 corridor is similar to the Spadina Ave transit in Toronto and Mr. Puddy does not consider that the Toronto system meets any of our criteria for the proposed plan.	k) Comment noted. Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives to the Undertaking is provided in Chapter 3 of the EA report.		j) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			l) Mr. Puddy suggests that the preferred plan for all purposes would be better located in either the hydro or 407 corridors.	l) Alternative alignments (including Hwy 407 and sections of hydro corridors) were considered in the EA (refer to Section 5.1, Rapid Transit Corridors).		k) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			m) The rapid transit line in the centre of the Hwy 7 corridor would not contribute to the safety and convenience of pedestrians or other users. The detouring of the transit line off the corridor to connect with the GO station for only 10 trains on working days.	m) Alternative alignments (including Hwy 407 and sections of hydro corridors) were considered in the EA (refer to Section 5.1, Rapid Transit Corridors).		l) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			n) The transit line should be built in the curb lanes and an underpass built at the Hwy 7 corridor and the GO level crossing which would allow passengers to transfer to the GO trains and provide a safe Hwy 7 corridor by eliminating a level crossing.	n) Alternative alignments (including Hwy 407 and sections of hydro corridors) were considered in the EA (refer to Section 5.1, Rapid Transit Corridors).		m) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
	Ms. Gloria Boxen	5	a) Ms. Boxen welcomes the Region's decision to improve transit but is concerned about the Region's inability to address land use planning where it works against good transit and community development and when it doesn't dare to hope that people will get out of their cars and walk.	a) Approval of site plan development is a local municipal jurisdiction and subject to the Ontario Planning Act, as well as conformance with land use as provided in the York Region Official Plan. The Region is also undertaking a Centres and Corridors Study to facilitate development of both the Regional Centres and Corridors with more intensive development supporting transit ridership (the Region's planning initiatives are briefly described in Section 12.1.1 of the EA report).	York Region	a) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) The evaluation and comments provided are based on the following principles: 1) Efficient use of resources, existing infrastructure, land, energy, and most direct route to service the most people and destinations, with least environmental impacts; 2) Promotes health, reduces air, water and soil pollution by reducing the use and need for private vehicles, and promotes walking and cycling; 3) Other environmental concerns – Decreases the need for paved and other impervious surfaces and reduces flood potential. Increases vegetation to reduce runoff, provide shade, filter pollutants, and absorb CO2. Reduces	b) Comment noted. Many of the factors noted here have been included throughout the EA (Chapter 5 - Alternative Methods of Improving Public Transit, Chapter 7 – Planning and Design Parameters, Chapter 8 – Development and Selection of Preferred Design, and Chapter 10 – Assessment of the Undertaking).		b) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 3 Action for Comments Received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			greenhouse gas emissions and moderated the effects of climate change; 4) Promotes community health – stops and terminals are located near centres of activity. Accessible to all residents in geographical sense and to those with physical handicaps. Inclusive of residents regardless of age and economical status; and 5) Convenience.							
		5 cont'd	*Current Events* c) Ms. Boxen presumes that the study does not include the impacts of the construction of the additional lanes on Hwy 407 in the central portion that are exempt from environmental assessment. These impacts should be added to those calculated for any added lanes to Hwy 7.	c) The widening of Hwy 407 is not included as part of the proposed undertaking and not under the jurisdiction of York Region.		c) Status – No Action Required.		No	Closed (2013))	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) Does the study take into account today's world? The world has changed since the study commenced. Gas prices have gone from cheap to a point where people are actively looking for other means of transportation such as walking and cycling, as well as transit.	d) Comment noted. The undertaking will have a positive effect on improving mobility as noted in Table 10.4-1 of the EA report.		a) Status- complete During Detail Design cross sections have been adjusted where possible to provide for bicycle lanes and maximize median green space. Viva Next is a complete street that accommodates the needs of all users: pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and motorists.	Typical Cross Section H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-303-C00. (ID#7494)(ID#8909) Streetscape Design Layout Plans H3-DWG-R-LND-080407 (ID#9633) H3 Detailed Design Pavement Markings and Signage IFC H3-DWG-R-CIV-080405 (ID#9630) H3 Detailed Design New Construction IFC Plans H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403 (ID#9631)	No	EF (2011) EF (2013) Closed (2013)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7494) was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: the evidence provided was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.
			e) Price volatility has mirrored the weather's volatility. Scientists have predicted the weather extremes and severity would increase with increased greenhouse gases and climate change.	e) Comment noted. As noted in Table 10.4-3 of the EA report, the recommended undertaking will have a net positive effect on local and Regional Air Quality.		b) Status- No Action Required		No	Closed	
			f) Decreasing the permeable surfaces through increased road pavement and loss of greenspace helps to increase the risk of flooding. If we are to	f) Comment noted. As noted in Table 11.3-1 (I.D. #5.1) of the EA report, the Proponent will develop a detailed storm water management plan during the detailed design phase		c) Status – completed A Final Drainage Study has been	Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7	No	EF 2010	2010 – a Final Drainage Study is confirmed.

Appendix 3 Action for Comments Received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			implement infrastructure changes to accommodate rapid transit, they must be taken from existing paved surfaces or be in the form of rail. In August there was local flooding in basements in Thornhill and North York. Finch Avenue near Jane Street was washed out at Black Creek. Look again at the calculated impacts of increased river crossings and determine if they are realistic in view of what happened in August.	of the proposed undertaking.		prepared during PE design and outlines the storm water management plan for the H3 Segment.	(Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230)		Closed (2010)	
			Road Capacity g) Four lanes of road at capacity is not a signal to add additional lanes of road. Rather they are an indicator for increasing road efficiency by adding more public transit, separated bike lanes and sheltered sidewalks. This is the point at which travel demand is high enough to support these alternative modes of transportation and opportunity to reduce car dependency. If instead road capacity is increased by adding more lanes, induced traffic demand results as it becomes initially easier to drive to further destinations, perhaps permanently changing travel patterns. Time, not distance, determines how far we go. If travel distances double, traffic volumes double. The above principles are achieved by focusing on people, not cars and to move people and goods, not cars and trucks.	g) Comment noted. The recommended undertaking is predominately transit related infrastructure (as described in Chapters 9 and 12 of the EA report). Proposed road widening from Lunar Crescent (east of Woodbine Ave) to east of Sciberras Rd is presented in Chapter 13 of the EA report. The Region's Transportation Master Plan (June 2002) includes a multi-modal strategy for dealing with travel demand in York Region to 2031, including significant planned transit infrastructure as well as road improvements.		d) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2010)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		5 cont'd	*Infrastructure* h) First build infrastructure that promotes convenience and safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Provide covered, separated bikeways [1] and sidewalks [2] along major arteries to allow the option of walking and cycling for commuting and doing errands. Provide covered bike lockers [3] for bicycle storage near transit stations and bike racks [4] on transit.	h) Safety and convenient access/mobility were important criteria used in the development of the undertaking (see Tables 10.4-2 and 10.4-4 of the EA report). Figures 9.1-2 to 9.1-10 present typical cross-sections for the transitway that include pedestrian sidewalks on each side of the r.o.w [1,2]. A conceptual streetscape plan is described in Section 9.1.1 – Transitway Elements. During the development of a detailed streetscape plan and transit station design, specific features such as bicycle storage will be considered. [3,4]		e) Status – complete [3,4] The DBCR incorporates streetscaping recommendations and bicycle storage recommendations for transit stations: Streetscape Design Guidelines (Section 4.8), General Guidelines (Section 4.9), Bicycle Racks (Section 4.11), etc. Further attention will be given to the development of a streetscape plan in Detail Design. [4] In H3 DD, bicycle racks have been provided at all signalized intersections including YRT stops. [2011 ACR] [1] For most of the route, Detail Design includes the addition of bike lanes [1].	[2] Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551) [1] Typical cross section showing bike lanes H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-303-C00 (ID#7494) [2, 3] Streetscape Design Layout Plans H3-DWG-R-LND-080407 (ID#9633)	No	[3,4] EF 2009 [1] EF (2011) [14] EF (2012)	2009 ACR: [2] 3551 - Highway 7 Rapidway - Section H3 – Yonge St to Kennedy Rd – Design Basis & Criteria Ver. 1.2 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7494) was found to support the assertion on how the condition [1] was addressed. 2012 ACR: Numbering was added/altered for clarity. It is unclear based on the evidence provided to support the assertion [4] on how the condition was

Appendix 3 Action for Comments Received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	#	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						[1] For most of the route, Detail Design includes the addition of dedicated bike lanes. Pedestrian environment is addressed in the Streetscape Design plans[2].			**[2] EF (2013)** Closed (2013)	addressed. 2012 edit: additional evidence provided (Streetscape Design Drawings H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-607-Boulevard Treatment Miscellaneous) by the Owner Engineer was found to support the assertion [1,4] on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: evidence was found to support the assertion [2] on how the condition was addressed.
			Land Use and Development i) Reducing of car use and dependency is achieved by land use that promotes walking and cycling. Compact, mixed-use development reduces car needs. Six to ten lanes of traffic and buildings opening onto parking lots rather than streets works against reducing car dependency and safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Researchers are examining the connection between community design, physical exercise and transit use, and are finding that pedestrian friendly environments promote walking and the use of transit. Examine land use and transportation through the eyes of children.	i) As described in Section 9.1.1 – Transitway Elements, a streetscape plan has been developed for the transitway that would be a catalyst for transit-oriented development and attract transit ridership. In addition, as described in Section 12.1.1, York Region is undertaking a number of land use planning initiatives to facilitate development of both the Regional Centres and Corridors with more intensive development supporting transit ridership.		i) Status- complete The DBCR incorporates streetscaping recommendations as described in (h) above.	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009H3 (ID# 3551)	Yes	**Closed (2012)**	2012 ACR: It is unclear how the assertion addresses the condition. 2012 edit: the Owner Engineer made changes to text in the status and compliance document reference columns to remove text. The modifications changed the review. 2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Conclusion j) Expensive infrastructure for rapid transit is unnecessary to get people out of cars and onto buses. For example, the Yonge GO Bus has been well used for decades. When high demand transit is established, then concentrate on rapid transit with its own r.o.w. Transit is well used when there is connectivity to the surrounding community. Unless it is a subway, transit on its own r.o.w. is isolating. With people now actively looking for options to driving, it is an opportune time to present residents	j) The analysis and evaluation of Alternatives to the Undertaking is presented in Chapter 3 of the EA report and includes consideration of local transit service improvements and GO Transit improvements. York Region Rapid Transit Corridor Initiatives was selected as the preferred alternative as described in Table 3.2-1 of the EA report.		j) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2012)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 3 Action for Comments Received from the Public on the Yonge Street Corridor Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment Final Report					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**#**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
			with a convenient system of public transit that provides excellent service.							
		5 cont'd	*Recommendation* k) It is imperative that we reduce pollution and car use in the GTA for health and safety of our children and unborn grandchildren. Change the streetscape first. Along Hwy 7, add continuous sidewalks and separated, covered bike paths, street-facing buildings with bike racks, litter receptacles, shade trees and benches. The lanes are too wide – they encourage speeding. Take the room for the bike lanes from the existing roadways. Place a treed median down the centre of Hwy 7. Once transit ridership is sufficiently high, examine other infrastructure changes. Implement changes with little disruption of the environment as possible. Perhaps, opportunities for environmental rehabilitation will emerge. Examine Portland Oregon's rapid transit system. It goes from being on its own surface r.o.w. in the suburbs, to a subway, to a system in mixed traffic stopping at ordinary street corners, to a track on its own city street. It is connected in the city to the street and pedestrians.	k) Chapter 1 of the EA report sets out the fundamental objectives of the undertaking which encompass many of the recommendations of Ms Boxen. As described in Chapter 9, the recommended undertaking includes a streetscape plan that will attract transit ridership within a pedestrian friendly corridor. As noted in Table 10.4-3, the recommended undertaking will have a net positive effect on local and Regional Air Quality. The expected environmental effects and mitigation are identified in Tables 10.4-1 to 10.4-4 in the EA report.		k) Status –completed The DBCR incorporates streetscaping recommendations as described in (h) above.	Design Basis and Criteria Report, December 15, 2009. (ID# 3551)	No	Closed (2012)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Other comments l) When rapid transit is implemented on Hwy 7, there should still be a good local Hwy 7 bus service accessible to all residents. For example, there should be stops at Hunter's Point, west of Yonge St and Silver Linden, east of Yonge St.	l) Detailed comment noted. As noted in Table 10.4-1, compatibility with proposed local transit network will be monitored.		l) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2012)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			m) Parking at the Bathurst connection ramp represents the loss of more pervious surface close to the East Don River. A good transit system should require only as bare minimum of commuter parking.	m) The bus platforms and parking facilities (shown on Figure 9-40) at the Bathurst St Connector Rd are identified as future 407 Transitway Facilities and are not part of the recommended undertaking. These facilities will be planned and assessed under a future EA for that undertaking.		m) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2012)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		5 cont'd	n) Vaughan Link to Spadina Subway – ensure that Black Creek is minimally avoided, keeping in mind the August flooding.	n) Minimizing adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems is included in the assessment Table 12.6-3 (Goal C1) in the EA report.		n) Status – Does not apply to the H3 segment		No	Closed (2012)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 4 Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Table 6-1 - Effects and Mitigation for the Modified Alignment															Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
OBJECTIVE B: To protect and enhance the social environment in the corridor																		
B1	Maintain or improve road traffic and pedestrian circulation	SB Warden Avenue access to IBM facility.			✓	Warden Avenue/IBM Access	The preferred rapid transit design will restrict right turn access at this location.	SB vehicles on Warden Ave. will turn right onto Cedarland Drive and make a WB left turn at the Cedarland Dr./Town Centre Blvd. intersection which will permit access to the IBM property	None expected	None necessary	Insignificant	None required	York Region	Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2012)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
OBJECTIVE C: To protect and enhance the natural environment in the corridor																		
C1	Minimize adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems	Loss of site-specific habitat.		✓		Rouge River	Potential loss of fish habitat as a result of bridge widening may include long term impact, loss of riparian habitat, and decrease in habitat productivity.	In-water work will probably be required but will be limited as much as possible. Minimize the area of in-water alteration to the extent possible.[1] Follow in-water construction timing restriction.[2] Perform all in-water work in the dry using a temporary flow bypass system.[3]	May include loss of riparian habitat and decrease in habitat productivity	Negotiations with regulatory agencies during detailed design to mitigate and / or compensate for the harmful alteration of fish habitat.[4]	Insignificant	On-site environmental inspection during in-water work.[5] Post-construction monitoring of fish habitat compensation measures.[6] In-water work will be monitored and/or compensated if necessary.[7]	York Region	**Status – [1-5, 7] complete** **Status – [6] ongoing** **[1,2, 3] Provision for site-specific measures for in-water work to be performed in the dry were made in design drawings which were approved through the TRCA permitting process. See Item #38 for list of approved TRCA permits.** **[4] At a meeting on June 24, 2010, TRCA staff indicated that, based on the information provided, the effects of the proposed works in these segments could be mitigated and that consequently, a Letter of Advice would be acceptable, since a HADD should not result at any crossing. See Item 38 above for listing of approved TRCA permits.** **[1,2] Contractor's Environmental Management Plan addresses methodology for in-water work activities.**	**[4]** Minutes of Meeting: TRCA with York Consortium – June 24, 2010 (ID# 6386) **[1-4] Refer to Item #38.** **[1,2] Environmental Management Plan 2012 (H3-ENV-EMP-R03-2012-08-16-NS)(KED ID#2012-001)** **[5,7] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)** **[5,7] H3-ENV-LGL-KED_Overseeing in-water works_2014 (KED #ID 2015-021)** **[5,7] ENV_H3_EWP_Rouge River Enhancement Works_REV_01 (KED ID# 2015-022)**	Yes	**[1-5,7] EF 2015**	2010 - Future actions confirmed in meeting minutes between YC and TRCA on June 24, 2010. **2014: The status is in correct Numbers added for clarity. Item [1-7] – no evidence provided. It appears that assertions and evidence for these items may have been provided elsewhere in this table. THESE ITEM MUST BE ADDRESSED FOR 2015 ACR.** **2015 ACR: Evidence provided was found to support the assertion regarding how items [1-5] and [7] were addressed.** **Item [6] remains on-going at the time of this report**

Appendix 4 Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Table 6-1 - Effects and Mitigation for the Modified Alignment														Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
														[5,7] Although there were no in-water works conducted in 2015; during in-water works in previous years KED Environmental would be on-site to ensure there were no stranded fish, this was documented in the Weekly Environmental Checklist. Fish salvages were not required during construction as 100% dewatering of any watercourses did not occur. In some instances KED would contract a 3rd party consultant to oversee sensitive operations, and ensure that all works were carried out in accordance with all permits and Environmental Work Plans (EWPs). **[6] Post construction monitoring of the Apple Creek North (Crispin Ct.) Restoration Site is ongoing. The final (fall) site visit is scheduled for late November. Upon completion of the final field visit the report will be compiled and submitted to the MNR on or before January 31st 2016.**				
C2	Minimize adverse effects on terrestrial ecosystems	Loss of wildlife habitat, riparian habitat and ecological functions		✓	✓	Rouge River	Widening of the bridge will result in the removal of vegetation and ecological functions it supports. A decrease in habitat area may occur.	Minimize the area of vegetation removals to the extent possible.[1] Minimize grade changes to the extent possible.[2] Use close cut clearing and trimming to minimize the number of trees to be removed.[3] Delineate work zones using construction fencing/tree	May result in a decrease in habitat area.	Restore natural areas disturbed using construction with native vegetation, where feasible.[6] Replace ornamental vegetation as part of landscaping. [7]	Negligible	None required.	York Region	Status **- Completed** Design work is in progress to address all requirements. Environmental Protection Plans and Restoration Plans with the requirements to minimize impacts and return conditions to same or better are being prepared in consultation with TRCA and will be include with the permit application..[1, 2, 3,4,5-10] [2014] All Environmental Protection Plans and Restoration Plans prepared were approved by TRCA as well as Edge Management Plans, which were created for the Rouge Crossings..	[1,2,3,4,5] See Item#38 for TRCA permit references. [1-10] Refer to Edge Management Plans for Apple Creek, and Beaver Creek (ID#9971, 9972) **[4, 5] Weekly Environmental Checklist 2015 (KED ID# 2015-016)**	**Yes**		2009 ACR: NSE 3230 - Draft Drainage & Hydrology Report Highway 7 Corridor (H3) (March 09) Section 6 is Erosion and Sediment control and does not expressly address the issue of the loss of wildlife habitat, riparian habitat and ecological functions. 2010 ACR: UNCLEAR Sections 2.0 to 8.0 include measures for erosion control and fish habitat and passage mitigation. It is unclear which built-in positive

Appendix 4 Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Table 6-1 - Effects and Mitigation for the Modified Alignment														Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
								protection barrier.[4] Protect trees within the clear zone using guiderail, curbs, etc. to prevent removal.[5]		Identify [8] as well as restore [9] plantings that will be needed to improve woody riparian cover to mitigate / compensate for any losses. A 3:1 tree replacement ratio will be followed if trees are removed.[10]				An Environmental Control Plan will be developed during Detail Design. [6, 7, 8, 9, 10] **[4, 5] KED Weekly Checklist section 4.4, subsection i) confirms that all tree protection measures are in place.**			[1,2, 7] EF (2012 [3] ECF (2012)	attributes and mitigation are addressed in the Final Drainage Study (3230) and which are still outstanding. 2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 42344. 42345) was provided to support the assertion [1,2] on how the condition was addressed. The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (H3-ENV-EMP-R01-2011-05-25-ECH) was found to support the assertions [6] but is unclear to which condition the assertion applies to. 2011 ACR: Initially marked as EF however, upon further review this item only applies to the Rouge River Crossing. We understand that design work is ongoing in 2012 and as such this not reviewed in 2011. We suggest that documents referenced not applicable to Rouge River be removed. We have revised the item numbering in an effort to make it easier to relate directly to reference documents to be provided in future. 2012 ACR: Bold and underline added. [1,2] EF with respect to TRCA permit references. The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertion [7] on how the condition was addressed. Evidence of Change was found to

Appendix 4 Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Table 6-1 - Effects and Mitigation for the Modified Alignment														Compliance Review (MMM)		
GOAL	Environmental Value/ Criterion	Environmental Issues/Concerns	Project Phase[1] P	C	O	Location	Potential Environment Effects	Proposed Mitigation Measures: Built-In Positive Attributes and/or Mitigations	Potential Residual Effects	Further Mitigation	Level of Significance after Mitigation	Monitoring and Recommendation	Compliance Monitoring: Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
																	[1-10] EF (2014) [4-5] EF (2015) Closed (2015)	support assertion [3]. [1-10] 2014: Evidence found as noted. Items [1-3, 6-10] are complete. Items [4,5] are ongoing **2015 ACR: Evidence was found to support the assertion of tree protection items [4,5]. With the completion of construction, this item is closed.**
Note 1: P=Pre-Construction, C=Construction, O=Operation																		

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**No.**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority	June Murphy, Planner II Environmental Assessments	1	Edits a) Modify the November 14, 2007 minutes to include the following statement: "TRCA Hydrology staff expressed concern for potential groundwater issues involving the subsurface conditions for the new bridge abutments and possible groundwater control concerns".	a) Minutes have been modified as requested.	York Region	a) to f): Status – No Action Required		No	**Closed (2014)**	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) Change the spelling of Lesley to Leslie Piercey.	b) Minutes have been modified as requested.				No	**Closed (2014)**	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) Submit a revised digital copy of the November 14, 2007 minutes to jmurphy@trca.on.ca.	c) Revised digital copy of the November 14, 2007 minutes will be provided to June Murphy.				No	**Closed (2014)**	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) Modify the December 14, 2007 minutes to change the spelling of Lesley to Leslie Piercey.	d) Minutes have been modified as requested.				No	**Closed (2014)**	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			e) Submit a revised digital copy of the December 14, 2007 minutes to jmurphy@trca.on.ca.	e) e) Revised digital copy of the December 14, 2007 minutes will be provided to June Murphy.				No	**Closed (2014)**	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			f) f) Ensure that these revised minutes are replaced in the Modification Report.	f) f) Both the revised November 14, 2007 and December 14, 2007 minutes are included in Appendix 2 of the Cedarland Alignment Modification Report.				No	**Closed (2014)**	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		2	Hydrogeology Comments a) Both option alignments (Alts. M-1 and M-2) eventually cross the Rouge River using the existing Warden Avenue bridge.	• Comment noted.	York Region	a) to c): Status – No Action Required		No	**Closed (2014)**	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) To accomplish either option requires an extension to the west side of the present bridge structure.	• Comment noted.				No	**Closed (2014)**	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) No conceptual details were included in the Modification Report relative to proposed bridge abutment/foundation elevations and current groundwater conditions.	• Comment noted.				No	**Closed (2014)**	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Action Required d) As per the previous hydrogeological comments when the bridge extension has been determined, provide preliminary geotechnical/hydrogeological information relative to dewatering/depressurization needs for abutment construction.	• Preliminary geotechnical / hydrogeological information will be included in the TRCA pre-permit approval application by the Proponent during detail design.		d) Status completed [2011 ACR]Where required, geotechnical/ hydro -geological data has been provided as part of the TRCA permit application process for each bridge alteration. [2]TRCA has approved the permit for Warden Bridge extension on June 4, 2012.	[2011 ACR](Warden) September 19, 2011 Response to RRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project – H3-Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and warden- Submission #1	No	ECF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7902) was provided to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. It is noted that the evidence provided shows that the Highway 7 Expansion – Warden Bridge Construction Dewatering PTTW Application July was included as an attachment to the evidence provided, however, was not itself provided. This item remains 'Ongoing' until the permit application is approved.

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
							Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York CFN45915 (ID#7902) [2] [2] See Item#38 for TRCA Warden permit references.			2012 ACR: Additional assertions made. Item not reviewed as completed in 2011. 2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			e) In regards to groundwater impacts due to construction and operation of either alternative, both are of equal ranking – one is not more favourable than another.	• Comment noted.		e) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		3	Geotechnical Engineering Comment a) There are no outstanding geotechnical engineering issues at this stage of the proposal.	a) Comment noted. Detailed geotechnical reports will be distributed to TRCA during detail design.	York Region	a) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		4	Ecology Comment a) The proposed change to the alignment along Cedarland Drive/Warden Avenue is generally acceptable from an ecological perspective, however there are a number of edits in the report that should be corrected as noted.	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		5	Ecology-natural areas – Page 5 Comment a) Page 5 of the report states that "there are no designated natural areas within the area considered for modified alignment alternatives…"	a) The statement has been deleted from the report.	York Region	a) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) This is not accurate as the area is identified as part of TRCA's Terrestrial Natural Heritage System, and the area presently supports existing natural cover, including remnant woodlands and meadow areas within the valley corridor immediately adjacent to Warden Avenue.	b) A modified statement has been incorporated in the report.		b) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Action Required c) This section needs to be revised to more fully describe the existing natural environment.	c) A summary of Ecological Land Classification Vegetation Communities within the Alignment Modification Area has been added. If required, further information will be provided as part of TRCA pre-permit approval submitted during detail design.		c) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) It would be correct to state that there are no Environmentally Sensitive Areas, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, Provincially Significant Wetlands, Locally Significant Wetlands or other Provincially or Federally designated natural areas (as it relates to the	d) Corrected statement included in the report.		d) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			Provincial Policy Statement within the modified alignment area).							
			e) However, the importance of the remnant natural, successional processes and wildlife within this reach of the system.	e) Comment noted.		e) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			f) Identify the location of the remnant natural areas that are present and include them on page 5.	f) A summary of Ecological Land Classification Vegetation Communities within the Alignment Modification Area has been added. If required, further information will be provided as part of TRCA pre-permit approval submitted during detail design.		f) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		6	Ecology-Bridge Span – Page 6 Comment a) On page 6 the bridge size is incorrectly stated.	a) / b) Comment noted.	York Region	a) to c): Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) The span/width of bridge (over the watercourse) is 15m.					No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Action Required c) Modify the text to change the span/width to 15m.	c) The text has been modified as noted.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		7	Ecology – matching to aerial photo – Figure 4-2, page 12 Action Required a) Modify page 12, Figure 4-2 to match alignments M1 and M2 with the road patterns on the aerial photograph (i.e. Highway 7 is off, Town Centre Boulevard is off, Cedarland Drive is off).	a) Figure 4-2 has been corrected.	York Region	a) to d): Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		7 cont'd	b) Label the roads at their appropriate locations.	b) Labels amended as noted to Figure 4-2.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) Label the Rouge River watercourse in its appropriate location.	c) Label added to Figure 4-2.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) Label the IBM flyover.	d) Label added to Figure 4-2.				No	Closed (2012)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		8	Ecology-environmental impacts of crossings – page 14 Comments a) On Page 14 the last *paragraph states, "in addition, the modified (Cedarland/Warden/Enterprise) alignment reduces the potential environmental impact on the Rouge Valley by eliminating the separate crossing in the original EA and consolidating the crossing with the existing Warden Avenue bridge.*	a) Comment noted. TRCA will be consulted during detail design regarding mitigation including improvements to adjacent riparian habitats. [1]	York Region	a) Status – completed [2011 ACR] A permit is currently being reviewed by TRCA for the Warden Bridge extension. It contains provisions to mitigate, protect and restore ecological habitats. A permit was approved by TRCA for	[2011 ACR] (Warden) September 19, 2011 Response to RRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project – H3-Rouge River	No	EF (2011) [1] EF (2012) Closed	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7902) was provided to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Status remains 'Ongoing'. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed.

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						the Warden Bridge extension on June 4, 2012.	Crossing at Hwy 7 and warden- Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York CFN45915 (ID#7902) See Item#38 for TRCA Warden permit references.		(2012)	
			b) Ecology staff is not in 100% agreement since the existing crossing at Warden Avenue does not support terrestrial passage at present, and will result in a loss of approximately another 20m of riparian habitat with the proposed extension.	b) Comment noted. TRCA will be consulted during detail design regarding mitigation including improvements to adjacent riparian habitats. [1]		b) Status – completed [2011 ACR] A permit is currently being reviewed by TRCA for the Warden Bridge extension. It contains provisions to mitigate, protect and restore ecological habitats. A permit was approved by TRCA for the Warden Bridge extension on June 4, 2012.	See above	No	EF (2011) [1] EF (2012) Closed (2012)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7902) was provided to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Status remains 'Ongoing'. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed.
			c) Ecology staff suggests that the ecological impacts may be neutral, as a "new crossing on the Rouge would have been appropriately sized".	c) Comment noted.		c): Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**No.**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		8 cont'd	d) However, TRCA staff has agreed in principle with the Warden Avenue bridge extension and will work with the proponent to mitigate impacts during detailed design and construction and will seek to have adjacent riparian habitats improved as mitigation/compensation.	d) Comment noted. TRCA will be consulted during detail design regarding mitigation including improvements to adjacent riparian habitats.		d) Status-completed [2011 ACR] Design for the Warden Bridge expansion and cross is currently part of a TRCA permit application under review by TRCA. Mitigation measures to satisfy TRCA concerns have been incorporated into the application. A permit was approved by TRCA for the Warden Bridge extension on June 4, 2012.	[2011 ACR] (Warden) September 19, 2011 Response to RRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project – H3-Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and warden- Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York CFN45915 (ID#7902) See Item#38 for TRCA Warden permit references.	No	EF (2011) EF (2012) Closed (2012)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7902) was provided to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. Status remains 'Ongoing'. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.
		9	Details on Impacts – Figures 5-1 and 5-2, pages 15 and 16 Action Required a) In the report include on Figures 5-1 and 5-2 the 100m long x12m wide edge of Cedarland woodlot as mentioned in Table 4-1 which will be impacted.	a) Impact on the Cedarland woodlot has been highlighted with a note on Figure 5-1.	York Region	a) to d): Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) In the report include on Figures 5-1 and 5-2 the 150m long and 15m wide strip of Rouge River floodplain land as mentioned in Table 4-1 which will be impacted.	b) The strip of Rouge River floodplain that will be impacted has been highlighted with a note on Figure 5-2.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) Add TRCA's Regulation Limit and Regional Storm Floodplain to the figures.	c) "Regulatory Flood Line (As per TRCA Flood Plain Mapping Approved 2007-01-05)" has been added to Figures 5-1 and 5-2.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) Add TRCA's Regulation Line (blue) to the legend on Figures 5-1 and 5-2.	d) "Regulatory Flood Line (As per TRCA Flood Plain Mapping Approved 2007-01-05)" (blue) has been added to the legend				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			e) Modify the report to describe the impacts to the Cedarland woodlot and the floodplain.	e) This information will be provided as part of TRCA pre-permit approval submitted during detail design.		e) Status – completed [2011 ACR] A permit application for the Warden Bridge widening is currently before the TRCA.[1] It	[2011 ACR] (Warden) September 19, 2011 Response to TRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interface	No	[1] EF (2011) [2] EF (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7902, 3230) was provided to support the assertion [1] on how the condition was addressed.

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						contains a copy of the Final Drainage Report outlining the impacts to the floodplain [2] and Tree Preservation Plans for the woodlot. [3] The Tree Preservation Plan is not finalized. However, current plan is to preserve two of the three oak trees in the woodlot on public property. The oak tree designated for removal was assessed to be declining. The woodlot further to the west on private property is to be protected during construction with a silt fence. TRCA issued a permit for the proposed widening at Warden Bridge on June 4, 2012 .[1]	with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project – H3- Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and Warden Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, CFN45915 (ID#7902)[1] Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230)[2] Tree Preservation Plan Drawing H3-DWG-R-LND-080407-112 -B06 [3] [1] See Item#38 for TRCA Warden permit references.		**[1,3] EF (2012)** **Closed (2012)**	The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 3230) was provided to support the assertion [2] on how the condition was addressed. It is noted that the Tree Preservation Report provided as evidence for assertion [3] is not finalized. This will be reviewed when finalized. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR (ID# 8365) was found to support the assertions [1,3] on how the condition was addressed. An editorial change was made to the text in the notes column for the 2011 review and does not change the review results.
		10	Ecology-Assessment – Table 6-1, page 20 Action Required a) a) As there is no intention to span the meander belt or 100-year erosion limit with the Warden Avenue bridge extension this table needs to be revised to include mitigation efforts to minimize the bridge extension and fill requirements to the extent possible.	a) Mitigation efforts to minimize potential environmental effects of the bridge widening and fill requirements will be identified and provided as part of TRCA pre-permit approval submitted during detail design.	York Region	Status – completed Environmental Protection Plans and Restoration Plans with the requirements to minimize impacts and return conditions to same or better have been prepared in consultation with TRCA and are included in the TRCA permit application for Warden Bridge widening. See above.	See Item#38 for TRCA Warden permit references.	No	**EF (2012)** **Closed (2012)**	2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						TRCA issued a permit for the proposed widening at Warden Bridge on June 4, 2012.				
			Comments b) TRCA Ecology staff disagrees with the assessment there will be no "potential residual effects".	b) Comment noted.		b) to l) Status – No Action Required Table 6-1 is incorporated in the compliance monitoring document and monitoring results are reported elsewhere.		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) As noted previously, there will be a minimum loss of 10m riparian habitat (10m of both banks) as well as a loss in productivity associated with the length of river under the solid bridge structure.	c) Comment noted.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Action Required d) Modify Table 6-1 to reflect the loss of riparian habitat.	d) Loss of riparian habitat has been added to goal C2 in Table 6-1.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			e) Modify the two blocks under "potential residual effects" to state the impacts (aquatic losses for example, may include long term impact, loss of riparian habitat, and decrease in habitat productivity. Terrestrial losses for example may include decrease in habitat area).	e) The examples as noted have been added to goals C1 and C2 in Table 6-1.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			f) Change "widening of the bridge may…" to "will"…result.	f) Comment noted and change made to Table 6-1.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			g) Change "span meander belt of 100 year erosion limit of the watercourse"...to what the project entails, a bridge extension.	g) Comment noted and change made to Table 6-1.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			h) Change "avoid in water work to the extent possible" to identify that the extension will probably involve in water work.	h) Comment noted and change made to Table 6-1.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		10 cont'd	i) Modify Table 6-1 to indicate that these impacts will need to be mitigated and/or compensated.	i) Table 6-1 modified as noted.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			j) Modify Table 6-1 in the "further mitigation" column to ensure that a minimum 3:1 tree replacement ratio will be identified for tree removals that may be necessary.	j) Comment noted and change made to Table 6-1.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			k) Identify as well as any restoration plantings that will be needed to improve woody riparian cover to compensate for any losses.	k) Table 6-1 modified as noted.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			l) Identify what P. C. O represent under Project Phase.	l) Comment noted and identification of P C and O added to the bottom of Table 6-1.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		11	Engineering: Comments a) With regards to the two alternatives presented, M-1 and M-2, both are equally acceptable from the engineering/floodplain management perspective, as they both proceed along Warden Avenue south of Cedarland Drive	a) Comment noted.	York Region	a) to c): Status - No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			b) As discussed during our various meetings with the proponents on the bridge at Warden Avenue, no other improvements are planned for the bridge except for an extension to carry the transitway.	b) Comment noted.				**No**	**Closed (2014)**	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
			c) Therefore, flood levels and flow mechanics are anticipated to remain unchanged.	c) Comment noted.				**No**	**Closed (2014)**	**2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status**
			Action Required d) However, the proponent will need to provide all the necessary updates to the HEC-RAS model to confirm that the final design of the proposed extension will have no negative implications to flooding either upstream or downstream, at the detailed design stage.	d) The HEC-RAS model will be updated and provided to TRCA during the detailed design stage.		d) Status –completed HEC-RAS model was updated and results reviewed with TRCA as part of the Final Drainage Report. This same report is provided for TRCA permit applications. TRCA issued a permit for the proposed widening at Warden Bridge on June 4, 2012.	Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230) See Item#38 for TRCA Warden permit references.	No	EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 3230) was provided to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.
		12	Modifications – Aerial Photograph-Top of Bank and 10m Setback Comments a) TRCA staff conducted a site visit on the Northwest quadrant of Enterprise Drive and Warden Avenue, just south of the Warden Avenue Bridge with MMM staff on March 10, 2008.	a) to h) Comments noted.	York Region	a) to n): Status - No Action Required	Minutes of Meeting: TRCA with York Consortium – June 24, 2010 (ID# 6386)	No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) The objective was to review the 10m setback from the top of bank line.					No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) An aerial photograph dated January 23, 2008 prepared by MMM was utilized as well as the top of bank stakes in the field installed by MMM staff.					No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			d) From the site visit a top of bank line/tree drip line was confirmed in the field by TRCA on the west bank of the valley approximately running from the parking lot north of Enterprise extension, northwards to the east-west orientation of the Regional Floodline.					No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			e) From the site visit it was determined that the new 10m setback from the new top of bank line/tree drip line needed to be updated on the aerial photo.					No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			f) MMM resubmitted a revised aerial photograph on March 26, 2008					No	Closed	2014: Review Result colour

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			with a revised 10 m setback.						(2014)	changed to better reflect status
		12 cont'd	g) The location of the Regional Storm Floodline as depicted on the March 26, 2008 aerial photograph compared to mapping in the TRCA office and is satisfactory.					No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			h) The location of the red top of bank/drip line immediately east of the Regional Floodplain Line is satisfactory.					No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Action Required i) Modify the legend to change" Fill Regulation Line" to "Regulation Line"	i) The legend has been modified as requested				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			j) Change "Regulatory" to "Regional Storm Floodline".	j) The wording has been changed as requested.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			k) Modify the legend to make the line width for the "Regulation Line" bolder.	k) The legend has been modified as requested.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			l) Revisit the "Regulation Line" on the aerial photograph and include it on the north and south sides of the Regional Floodplain.	l) The figure has been updated as requested.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			m) Modify the aerial photo to add this note beside the top of bank line north of the east-west orientation of the floodline. (Note: The Top of Bank line north of the Regional Floodline was not confirmed by TRCA staff since this top of bank area is within the Regional Floodline and the 10m setback is calculated from the greater of the hazard.).	m) As requested the note has been added to the figure.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			n) Modify the legend to add top of bank/tree drip line and send a final digital copy to jmurphy@trca.on.ca.	n) The legend has been modified as requested and the final digital copy will be sent to June Murphy.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		13	Engineering Hydraulics-Cover Letter and Memo re. Hydraulics of Bridge Widening Comments a) The York Consortium Report summarized previous discussions with TRCA staff and also provided supporting analyses resulting from investigating the various alternatives to replacing or extending the Warden Avenue Bridge at the Rouge River south of Highway 7.	a) Comment noted. Consultation was included in Appendix 2 of the Report.	York Region	a) to d): Status - No Action Required	Minutes of Meeting: TRCA with York Consortium – June 24, 2010 (ID# 6386).	No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) TRCA engineering staff concurs with the construction constraints identified, and recognizes that the presence of the IBM flyover precludes any significant relief from flooding over Warden Avenue from a crossing replacement, since the analysis shows the roadway low point would be below the Regional water level in the unimpeded condition (without any bridge in place).	b) Comment noted.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) TRCA engineering staff concurs with the short term fix that the existing bridge be extended to accommodate the Bus Rapid Transit lanes.	c) Comment noted.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			d) TRCA engineering staff concurs with the long term fix that a profile change in Warden Avenue would be required to bring the road outside the floodplain.	d) Comment noted.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			Action Required e) As per TRCA's policies, staff requires that the proposed bridge extension be designed in order that it will not adversely impact the floodplain, and also requires that the design incorporate an ecological net benefit.	e) TRCA will continue to be consulted during detail design of the bridge.		e) to f) Status – completed [2011 ACR] An application for TRCA permit relating to the Warden Bridge crossing is currently under review by TRCA. It contains Environmental Protection and Restoration Plans with actions consistent with TRCA stated requirements.	[2011 ACR] (Warden) September 19, 2011 Response to RRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project – H3-Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and warden- Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York CFN45915 (ID#7902)	No	EF (2011) EF (2012) Closed (2012)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7902) was provided to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR (ID# 8365) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.
		13 cont'd	f) For detailed design submit the Notice of Study Completion with the completed "Development, Interference with Wetlands, Alternative to Shorelines and Watercourses" application with the fee, checklist and 6 copies of the drawings for our review.	f) All of the TRCA application requirements will be met during detailed design.		A TRCA issued a permit for the proposed widening at Warden Bridge on June 4,2012..	See Item#38 for TRCA Warden permit references.	No	EF (2012) Closed (2012)	2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR (ID# 8365) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.
			g) Should you wish to separate the project into phases, submit 1 application per geographic area.	g) Comment noted.		g) Status - No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2013 ACR: item noted as having no action required. Closed 2014 Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		14	Geotechnical: Comments a) There are no Geotechnical Engineering issues with the submissions to date, however, comments will follow in the detail design stage.	a) Comment noted. TRCA will be consulted during detail design phase.		a) Status –completed [2011 ACR] An application for TRCA permit relating to the Warden Bridge crossing is currently under review by TRCA. It contains Environmental Protection and Restoration Plans	[2011 ACR] (Warden) September 19, 2011 Response to RRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and	No	EF (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7902) was provided to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. 2012 ACR: The evidence

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						with actions consistent with TRCA stated requirements. TRCA issued a permit for the proposed widening at Warden Bridge on June 4, 2012.	Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project – H3-Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and warden- Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York CFN45915 (ID#7902) See Item#38 for TRCA Warden permit references.		EF (2012) Closed (2012)	provided in the 2012 ACR (ID# 8365) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.
		15	Hydrogeology:Comments a) Based on the material submitted, the proponent envisages an extension of the western side of the existing bridge structure to accommodate a rapid transit bus lane.	a) Comment noted. The transit lanes will be added to the west side of the existing bridge structure.	York Region	a) to c) Status – No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			b) The submitted documentation focused on scenarios of bridge design and relative surface water flow and surface water back-up behind the specific bridge design.	b) Comment noted.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			c) At this time, there are no groundwater issues from the submitted hydraulic report.	c) Comment noted.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**No.**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
		15 cont'd	Action Required: d) During detailed design when the appropriate bridge extension has been determined, provide the preliminary geotechnical/hydrogeological information relative to dewatering/depressurization needs for abutment construction.	d) The preliminary geotechnical/hydrogeological information prepared during detailed design will be provided to TRCA. This will include information related to dewatering and depressurization needs for the construction of the abutment.		Status - completed [2011 ACR] This information was provided to TRCA as part of the permit application for the Warden Bridge Crossing. TRCA issued a permit for the proposed widening at Warden Bridge on June 4, 2012.	[2011 ACR] (Warden) September 19, 2011 Response to RRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project – H3-Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and warden- Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York CFN45915 (ID#7902) See Item#38 for TRCA Warden permit references.	No	ECF (2011) EF (2012) Closed (2012)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7902) was provided to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed. It is noted that the evidence provided shows that the Highway 7 Expansion – Warden Bridge Construction Dewatering PTTW Application July was included as an attachment to the evidence provided, however, was not itself provided. This item remains 'Ongoing' until the permit application is approved. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR (ID# 8365) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed.
			e) With the submission of the "Development" application, provide 2 copies of the geotechnical/hydrogeological reports.	e) Comment noted. When the Proponent provides TRCA with the application, two copies of the reports will be provided.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			f) Provide a summary of the construction of the Warden Avenue Bridge extensions since TRCA staff recalls a groundwater/construction issue during that project.	f) The Proponent will review reports from the construction of the Warden Avenue bridge extension and discuss with Peter Cholewa during detail design.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
			g) Contact Peter Cholewa, RMOY, for further details on the recent Warden Avenue Bridge extensions.	g) The Proponent will contact Peter Cholewa as suggested during detail design.				No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
Ministry of the Environment– Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch	Shereen Amin, Project Officer, EA Project Coordination	1	Section 1.1 Rephrase first sentence to read "York Region considers the local modification to the alignment to be a significant change from what was approved in the EA. However, York Region has determined that the modification does not alter the net effects of the undertaking and can therefore consider this modification to have neutral environmental net effects".	Comment noted and incorporated in Section 1.1.	York Region	Status - No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status
		2	Page 21, Section 7.0	A table of meetings with dates and attendees has been included in	York Region	Status - No Action Required		No	Closed	2014: Review Result colour

Appendix 4 Action for Comments Received on the Draft Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			If possible please include dates when discussions were initiated with the various agencies in review of this modified alignment, as well as, other dates specific to meetings and lists of all stakeholders that were in attendance.	Section 7.0 of the report.					(2014)	changed to better reflect status
		3	Confirmation is also required as to whether any comments were received from any landowners or the general public with respect to this proposed modified alignment. Section 7.5 states that the proposed alignment modification was discussed with affected land owners including H&W Development Corporation; please provide details of how this modification was relayed to the developer in questions and/or any other landowners.	All of the related correspondence to/from the affected landowners is included in Appendix 2 of the report.	York Region	Status - No Action Required		No	Closed (2014)	2014: Review Result colour changed to better reflect status

Appendix 5 Action for comments received on the Final Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment (March 2010)					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**No.**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
Ministry of the Environment – Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch	Solange Desautels Senior Project Coordinator, EA Project Coordination	1	It is assumed that subsequent reports required in the EA would include the Cedarland modification such as air quality assessment; SWM plan; Phase II archaeological report; hydrogeological report, contaminated sites.	Yes. Any subsequent reports associated with project implementation will include the Cedarland alignment modification.	York Region	Status –completed An updated Air Quality Impact Assessment Report for a Study Area Bounded by Hwy50 to York Durham Line was completed in April 2011 using the CAL3QHCR dispersion model as required in the terms and conditions for the Hwy 7 Corridor & Vaughan North-South Assessment Compliance Monitoring Program (CMP). The purpose of the Study was to assess the cumulative air quality effects that may arise due to the proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) undertaking. [1] As per MOE request, copies of the Air Quality Report were submitted to the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch[2] The MOE noted via letter that it had accepted the Air Quality Assessment report on June 17, 2011 and is satisfied that Condition 5.4 of the EA Notice of Approval has been addressed. [3]	H3-RPT-Q-ENV-030203-Final AQ Report_ROI-2011-04-29_Senses.pdf (ID#7270)[1] March 8, 2011 Letter of Submission to MOE (ID#7398) [2] MOE Letter of Acceptance, June 17, 2011 (ID#7713)[3].	No	[1-3] EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7270, 7398, 7713) was found to support the assertions [1-3] on how the condition was addressed. The evidence provided addresses air quality and not, however, the other areas listed in the comment (i.e. SWM plan, Archaeological reports, contaminated sites). If these will be addressed in the future the status should be changed to "Ongoing". If they have already been addressed evidence should be provided before this item can be marked as complete.
		2	Can you confirm there is no archaeological potential associated with lands around Cedarland Drive, and other items above, etc.?	Stage II archaeological assessment has been recommended in the approved EA, Appendix J.	York Region	Status – completed See Item 6 a) below		No	EF (2011) Closed (2011)	
		3	There are no changes to SWM-same outlet; volumes etc?	A Storm Water Management Preliminary Assessment was provided in Appendix G of the		Status –completed See Item 6 b) below	H3 Detailed Design New	No	EF (2012)	2012 ACR: the evidence provided was found to support the assertion on how the condition was addressed.

Appendix 5 Action for comments received on the Final Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment (March 2010)					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				approved EA and describes a SWM Concept Plan by transitway section including the following: **5.2.32 Town Centre Boulevard - Highway 7 to west of Rouge River (Sta. 439+580 to Sta. 440+170)** Drainage for this section was provided as part of a drainage master plan for the Clegg Road/Cedarland Drive area. The existing sewer has a direct discharge to the Rouge River. There is an existing storm water pond to the south of the storm outlet that was built after the storm sewer. Due to differences in elevation, the storm sewer outlet could not be included in the pond. The transitway will continue to discharge to the existing storm sewer on Town Centre Boulevard. (Proposed discharge to the existing storm sewer on Town Centre Boulevard from Highway 7 to Cedarland Drive would not change with the Cedarland alignment modification since this segment of the transitway is the same as the original alignment.) **5.2.33 Markham Centre Alignment - Town Centre Boulevard to Warden Avenue (Sta. 540+070 to Sta. 540+450)** This alignment crosses the Rouge River floodplain and consists of two 3.5 m wide transit lanes with a 0.5 m shoulder. Rather than a storm sewer system, individual outlets to the vegetated area adjacent to the transitway are proposed for this section. (Since the new alignment is proposed along Cedarland Drive rather than in a new transit only corridor across the Rouge River (see EA figure 9-60), the drainage will likely be into the storm sewer on Cedarland Drive. This would have to be		The H3 Detail Design optimized the existing storm sewer system at Town Centre Boulevard and Highway 7; hence, eliminated the need of proposed new sewer and directed the additional flow to the existing sewer. The H3 Detail Design maintains the existing sewer system on Cedarland Drive. Final Issued For Construction (IFC) drawings have been issued on this basis.	Construction Plans H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403 (ID#8909): ▪ H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-139-C00 ▪ H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-141-C00 ▪ H3-DWG-R-CIV-080403-144-C00		EF (2013) Closed (2013)	2013 ACR: Evidence provided to close item.

Appendix 5 Action for comments received on the Final Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment (March 2010)					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				confirmed during development of the detailed Storm Water Management Plan in conjunction with detailed design of the transitway. See detailed response below.)						
		4	Does original EA or will SWM plan include these components: a) A written commitment by the municipality of long-term maintenance/ownership of the Stormwater Management System(s) b) "Oil and grit separators shall be installed at all strategic locations to intercept stormwater run-offs and washings from stations and intersecting transit sections". c) "Post construction monitoring shall include regular TSS and heavy metals scan (semi-annual) of the discharged stormwater to the receiver, depending upon the sensitivity as determined by the Ministry. d) "monitoring of baseflow to surface water courses from the SWM ponds shall be undertaken for TSS & Temperature on a regular basis; and salt content (ionization potential) and heavy metal scan on semi-annual basis" as may be applicable.	As noted above, a Storm Water Management Preliminary Assessment was provided in Appendix G of the approved EA and describes a SWM Concept Plan by transitway section. The EA (Table 11.3-1 on page 11-2) includes a commitment to develop a detailed Storm Water Management Plan in accordance with MOE's guidelines. The commitment also indicates that the Storm Water Management Plan will outline monitoring and maintenance requirements for SWM facilities constructed as part of the undertaking. The 2009 Annual Compliance Report (page 17) tracks the compliance of the commitment related to surface water resources. The ACR indicates that a draft Storm Water Management Plan has been prepared during preliminary engineering and will be finalized in the detailed design phase. MOE is listed as a potentially interested agency in Table 11.3-1 of the EA and therefore will be consulted. I will forward this e-mail to the design team at Rapidco to ensure they consult MOE Technical Support at the appropriate stage with regard to the Storm Water Management Plan.	York Region	Status – completed See Item 6 b) below		No	Closed (2015)	2011 ACR: Not reviewed as Item 6 b) is Ongoing. The status of this item should be changed to Ongoing. 2014: As this is only a cross-reference should make permanent and say that this is closed when 6 is / closed and close.
		5	You don't mention noise –it will be closer to future sensitive receptors-can you confirm no increase in 5dba?	Based on the noise assessment undertaken in the original EA, we can conclude that the noise threshold will not be reached for the Cedarland Drive alignment. The proposed alignment is along the south side of Cedarland Drive, directly adjacent to lands designated for business park (not a sensitive receptor). The lands designated	York Region	Status – completed See Item 6 c) below		No	Closed (2015)	2011 ACR: Not reviewed as Item 6 c) is Ongoing. The status of this item should be changed to Ongoing. 2014: As this is only a cross-reference should make permanent and say that this is closed when 6 is / closed and close

Appendix 5 Action for comments received on the Final Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment (March 2010)					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				for mixed use (along the east side of Town Centre Boulevard and north of Cedarland Drive) are closer to the transitway along Town Centre Blvd (in the median of the road) as opposed to along Cedarland Drive (running along the south side of the road). The EA does not recommend consideration of noise mitigation except for the section along the Civic Mall within the Markham Town Centre (east of Warden Avenue) where the transitway will run within a pedestrian/transit corridor rather than within a road corridor as is the case for the remainder of the transitway, including along Cedarland Drive. In Table 10.4-2 of the EA (page 10-16), the following wording is included in the further mitigation column - "Depending on lower floor building uses, may require noise screening along transitway and/or noise control features in residential design along Civic Mall segment in Markham Centre area". The Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment is included in Appendix K of the EA and includes the following wording: **5.2.1 Bus Transit Noise Impact** Table 5.6 compares the traffic noise levels for Scenario 1 with those of Scenario 2. The data indicate that for all road segments, except for the Town Centre Boulevard South Alignment (future Markham Centre area), only a very small (0 to 2 dB) increase in sound levels will be experienced by the closest receptors due to the bus transit option in all road segments along the preferred route of the Highway 7 Corridor. This reflects the minimal contribution of YRTP bus transit volumes as compared to the very high baseline traffic volumes. Daytime sound levels at the future Markham Centre location are predicted to increase by						

Appendix 5 Action for comments received on the Final Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment (March 2010)					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				about 8 dB and nighttime by 6 dB. This is due to the fact that transit will be the only traffic in the immediate vicinity of the Mall. As noted earlier in Chapter 3, mitigation measures are to be considered at this location as the exceedance above the predicted background sound level as expected to be greater than 5 dB. Housing proposed for the Markham Centre area will most likely consist of low-rise condominiums. In areas where the noise impact exceeds the applicable criteria, warning clauses and mitigation measures such as site planning, architectural design, special building components and/or central air conditioning may be necessary.						
		6	I had previously reviewed the EA and I am aware of the requirements, however the change to the route onto to Cedarland is not addressed in the EA. It is not clear from your response whether my questions have been answered. I assume the following components and recommend the Addendum report address these items: a) Archaeological Resources Based on the findings in the EA, there is a potential for Archaeological resources associated with the Cedarland alignment hence the phase II archaeological assessment required in the EA will also include this portion of the alignment.	Technical Memorandum titled "Hwy 7 Corridor and Vaughan N-S Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment - Cedarland Alignment Modification - Response to MOE Comments of March 23, 2010 - December 15, 2010" addresses these items as follows: a) Archaeological Resources Provision has been made in the H3 Detail Design Final Work Plan for a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment of all areas within the H3 project that were identified as having archaeological potential in the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Appendix J of the Hwy 7 Corridor and Vaughan N-S Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment), as well as areas of the Cedarland Alignment Modification, as required.	York Region	Status – Completed A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment was undertaken for the H3 segment and concluded that a Stage 3 archaeological Study was required for the historic Brown's Corners Cemetery with a Cemetery Investigation to be undertaken in the Highway 7 ROW in front of the cemetery. The Stage 2 Assessment also concluded that no additional archaeological assessment is required for the remainder of the study corridor and these areas can be considered clear of further archaeological concern. The Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment (Cemetery Investigation) at Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery found that	Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detailed Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario, Revision 1 (ID#7109) Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance Letter of submission of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) VIVA NEXT H3 Detail Design: Highway 7 Corridor from Bayview Avenue to Warden Avenue, Public Transit and Associated Road Improvements, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario	No	EF (2011) Closed (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 7109) was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. Bolding and underline was removed.

Appendix 5 Action for comments received on the Final Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment (March 2010)					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
						all lands in the public Highway 7 ROW in front of the Brown's Corners Cemetery can be considered clear of archaeological concern, and no further archaeological assessment is required. MTC accepted each of these findings. Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec was notified of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment findings via notification dated January 28,2011 sent in French (the preferred language of communication) (ID#7397) Notice of the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment findings were sent to the Huron-Wendat First Nation of Wendake, Quebec on May 30, 2011.	(ID#7108) Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3 Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535) Ministry of Tourism and Culture Review and Acceptance Letter of submission of the Cemetery Investigation (Stage 3 Archaeological Resource Assessment) Brown's Corners United Church Cemetery, East Half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Highway 7 and Frontenac Drive), Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York, Ontario (ID#7535) Huron-Wendat First Nation notification letters (ID# 7397 & 7913)			
			b) SWM - Proposed discharge to the existing storm sewer on Town Centre Boulevard from Highway 7 to	b) Storm Water Management The preliminary engineering design work for Segment H3, including the modified Cedarland alignment has been completed, and included the	York Region	b) Status –**Completed** The "Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7	Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010. (ID# 3230)[1]	Yes	[1,2,3] EF (2011)	2011 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2011 ACR (ID# 3230, 7902) was provided to support the assertions [1,3] on how the condition was addressed.

Appendix 5 Action for comments received on the Final Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment (March 2010)					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
			Cedarland Drive would not change with the Cedarland alignment modification since this segment of the transitway is the same as the original alignment. - Since the new alignment is proposed along Cedarland Drive rather than in a new transit only corridor across the Rouge River (see EA figure 9-60), the drainage will likely be into the storm sewer on Cedarland Drive. This would have to be confirmed during development of the detailed Storm Water Management Plan in conjunction with detailed design of the transitway. - In accordance with the EA (Table 11.3-1 on page 11-2), the Cedarland alignment will be included in the development of the proposed detailed Storm Water Management Plan in accordance with MOE's guidelines. Also as stated in the EA, the Storm Water Management Plan will outline monitoring and maintenance requirements for SWM facilities constructed as part of the undertaking. The Cedarland alignment will be included in the draft Storm Water Management Plan that has been prepared during preliminary engineering and will be finalized in the detailed design phase. MOE is listed as a potentially interested agency in Table 11.3-1 of the EA and therefore will be consulted.	drainage study titled "Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010". The preliminary engineering design proposes the use of the existing stormwater sewer on South Town Centre Boulevard, which discharges to the Rouge River through the IBM property, as well as a new stormwater sewer along the east side of South Town Centre Boulevard, which connects to a new stormwater sewer running under the Viva Rapidway on the south side of Cedarland Drive and the west side of Warden Avenue, to discharge to the Rouge River at Viva stationing 540+200, near the Warden Avenue bridge. There will be no additional runoff to the existing South Town Centre Boulevard stormwater sewer. All runoff from the Viva Rapidway adjacent Cedarland Drive and Warden Avenue will be directed to the new stormwater sewer line under the Viva Rapidway. The "Final Drainage Study Revision 1 for Viva Next H3 Highway 7 (Y.R.7), June 10, 2010" incorporates the storm water management plan. Monitoring and maintenance requirements for storm water management facilities constructed as part of the undertaking will be outlined during the H3 detailed design phase. [i] [1-4]		(Y.R.7), June 10, 2010" incorporates the overall storm water management plan for the area.[1] TRCA provided a letter to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan contained in the Drainage Study.[2] Site specific measures are being incorporated through the TRCA permit process. [2011 ACR] The permit for Warden Bridge [3] is under review by the TRCA and the permit application[4] for Cedarland is underdevelopment. H3 Detail Design revised the proposed storm sewer design from the "Final Drainage Study" and optimized the existing storm sewer system; and a MOE permit application [1] for approval for Water and Sewage Works (Town Centre Blvd. & Cedarland Dr.) was submitted on August 28, 2012. [3]The permit for Warden Bridge was approved by the TRCA on June 4, 2012. [4]The storm sewer system revision eliminated the need of a proposed new sewer for Cedarland and a TRCA permit for is no longer required. **As per [4] above, no stormwater management facilities were required through the design**	May 19, 2011 Letter from TRCA to QSD noting approval in principle of the stormwater management plan.[#7646][2] [2011 ACR] (Warden) September 19, 2011 Response to RRCA on Ont. Reg. #166/06, Development Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses application 0278/09 Markham Viva Project –H3-Rouge River Crossing at Hwy 7 and warden-Submission #1 Rouge River Watershed, Town[City] of Markham, Regional Municipality of York CFN45915 (ID#7902)[3] [1] Submission for H3-MOE CofA (E3-Twon Centre to Warden)(ID#8824) [3]See Item#38 for TRCA Warden permit references.		[1,3,4] EF (2012) Ops / Future (2014) Closed (2015)	It is noted that the evidence provided (ID# 7646) to support the assertion [2] confirms the TRCA approval in principle. This will be reviewed when final approval is issued. 2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions [1,3,4] on how the condition was addressed. Assertion [4] is no longer a commitment. Item remains ongoing and will be reviewed when final MOE approval for assertion [3] is issued. Note, the table was updated in the column Review Status for the 2011 ACR to add assertion [2]. 2014 numbering updated for clarity. Item [i] Monitoring and maintenance requirements for storm water management facilities constructed as part of the undertaking will be outlined during the H3 detailed design phase. From Item 46. - Outstanding item is for monitoring [2] & maintenance [3] commitments for SWM facilities constructed as part of this undertaking Suggest status could be change to Future Work **2015 ACR: numbering updated for clarity.** **As confirmed by the Owner Engineer, SWM facilities were not required, therefore monitoring [2] & maintenance [3] are**

Appendix 5 Action for comments received on the Final Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment (March 2010)					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	**Name**	**No.**	**Comment**	**Response**	**Responsible person / agency**	**Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design**	**Compliance Document Reference**	**Reviewed in 2015**	**Review Results**	**Notes**
						revisions. Therefore there is no monitoring or maintenance required.				**not required**
		6 cont'd	c) Noise - It is noted that Mixed Use development is proposed on the north side of Cedarland Drive which potentially includes sensitive uses (residential condo's)? Noise assessment in Appendix K does not deal with new Cedarland alignment as such addendum report should note that: "Based on the noise assessment undertaken in the original EA, we can conclude that the noise threshold will not be reached for the Cedarland Drive alignment change". - If this is applicable this should be included: "Depending on lower floor building uses, may require noise screening along transitway and/or noise control features in residential design". ??? or maybe you need to do a noise assessment to confirm?	c) Noise A baseline study was completed as part of the EA and is not required as part of the H3 Detail Design work program. However, an additional noise impact analysis for the Cedarland Alignment Modification will be undertaken and the requirement has been incorporated in the H3 Detail Design Work Plan. [1]	York Region	c) Status – completed [2011 ACR] A Noise Study is currently underway. There is no draft report available yet. A Noise Study[1] was completed in February 2012. No further mitigation is required based on the 2012 Noise Study, therefore this item is complete.	H3 Detail Design Work Plan - Final Version, September 17, 2010. (ID#6550) [1] Cedarland Alignment Noise Impact and Mitigation Assessment, February 2012.(ID#8348)	No	[1] EF (2012) EF (2013) Closed (2013)	2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: Evidence provided to support change of status to completed..
			d) General - Addendum should indicate that required studies under EA such as…….shall include Cedarland amendment and ACR report will report on any additional commitments.	d) General The required studies under the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements EA will incorporate the Cedarland Alignment Modification as required. In particular, the following studies are included in the H3 Detailed Design Work Plan: - Tree preservation plan and edge management plan - Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment report - Air quality report, according to MOE-approved protocols - Noise report for Cedarland Alignment - Documentation of existing wells in project area - Summary of first nations consultation	York Region	d) Status -completed Studies completed: ▪ Tree Preservation Plans and H3 Detail Design Tree Preservation Report[1] ▪ Edge Management Plan[2] ▪ Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report[3] ▪ Air quality report according to MOE-approved protocols[4] ▪ Noise report for Cedarland Alignment[5] ▪ Documentation of existing wells[6]	H3 Detail Design Work Plan - Final Version, September 17, 2010. (ID#6550) ▪ [1]See Item#42 ▪ [2]See Item#42 ▪ [3]See Item #21 ▪ [4]Air Quality Impact Assessment for the Highway 7 Bus Rapid Transit Route (Highway 50 to York Durham Line), April 2011 (ID#7270) ▪ [4]MOE Letter of Acceptance on Air Quality	No	[1-8] EF (2012) EF (2013) Closed (2013	2012 ACR: The evidence provided in the 2012 ACR was found to support the assertions [1-8] on how the condition was addressed. 2013 ACR: Evidence provided to support change of status to completed..

Appendix 5 Action for comments received on the Final Cedarland Alignment Modification Report - Pertaining to the Highway 7 Corridor and Vaughan North-South Link Public Transit Improvements Environmental Assessment (March 2010)					Compliance Monitoring			Compliance Review (MMM)		
Representative	Name	No.	Comment	Response	Responsible person / agency	Status and Description of how commitment has been addressed during design	Compliance Document Reference	Reviewed in 2015	Review Results	Notes
				- Wildlife inventory report [1-8)		▪ Summary of first nations consultation[7] ▪ Wildlife inventory report[8] All of the required studies have been completed as referenced.	Impact Assessment, June 7, 2011 (ID#7713) ▪ [5]Cedarland Alignment Noise Impact and Mitigation Assessment, February 2012.(ID#) ▪ [6]Final Well Study Report Well Locations Map, November 15, 2010 (ID#6672) ▪ [7]Huron-Wendat First Nation notification letters (ID#7397, 7913) ▪ [8] H3 Detail Design Wildlife Inventory Report, April 26, 2011.(ID#7202) ▪ [8] LGL's Letter Outlining Results from Field Investigation and Wildlife Screening for Species at Risk, July 7, 2011.(ID#7528)			